



# RECORD OF DETERMINATION

## Administrative Review Team

Thursday, October 29, 2020

The Administrative Review Team made the following determination at this meeting:

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>1. TownePlace Suites - Signs<br/>20-166MPR</b> | <b>5155 Upper Metro Place<br/>Minor Project Review</b>  |
| Proposal:   | Installation of a 24-square-foot ground sign and a 95-square-foot wall sign for the TownePlace Suites hotel zoned Bridge Street District, Commercial. |
| Location:   | South of Upper Metro Place, ±250 feet west of the intersection with Frantz Road.  |
| Request:  | Review and approval of a Minor Project under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.   |
| Applicants:                                       | Lisa Hawkins and Pamela Meeks, DaNite Sign Co.  |
| Planning Contact:                                 | Chase J. Ridge, Planner I   |
| Contact Information:                              | 614.410.4656, cridge@dublin.oh.us   |
| Case Information:                                 | www.dublinohiousa.gov/art/20-166  |

**Request:** Approval for a Minor Project without conditions.

**Determination:** This application was approved (6 – 0). This approval shall be valid for a period of two years from the date of approval in accordance with Zoning Code §153.065(H) and §153.066(G).

### STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:  
  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 C68B79E6958D44D...  
 Jennifer M. Rauch, AICP  
 Planning Director







## RECORD OF ACTION

# Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, November 2, 2017 | 6:30 pm

The Planning and Zoning Commission took the following action at this meeting:

2. **BSD C - Towneplace Suites Marriott** **5515 Upper Metro Place**  
**17-087CU/DP/SPR/PP/FP** **Conditional Use/Development and Site**  
**Plan Reviews/Preliminary and Final Plats**

**Proposal:** A five-story, 64,000-square-foot hotel with 105 guest rooms and associated site improvements on a 4.24-acre site, zoned Bridge Street District Commercial.

**Location:** South side of Upper Metro Place, approximately 550 feet west of the intersection with Frantz Road.

**Request:** Review and approval of a Conditional Use under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.236; review and approval of a Development and Site Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066; and review and recommendation of approval to City Council for Preliminary and Final Plats under the provisions of the Subdivision Regulations.

**Applicant:** Steven M. Roberts, Architect.

**Planning Contact:** Logan M. Stang, Planner I.

**Contact Information:** (614) 410-4652, [lstang@dublin.oh.us](mailto:lstang@dublin.oh.us)

**Case Information:** <http://dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/17-087>

**MOTION #1:** Mr. Stidhem moved, Ms. De Rosa seconded, to approve this Conditional Use because it complies with all the applicable review criteria.

**VOTE:** 4 – 0.

**RESULT:** This Conditional Use was approved.

### RECORDED VOTES:

Victoria Newell	Yes
Amy Salay	Yes
Cathy De Rosa	Yes
Robert Miller	Absent
Deborah Mitchell	Absent
Stephen Stidhem	Yes





## RECORD OF ACTION

# Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, November 2, 2017 | 6:30 pm

The Planning and Zoning Commission took the following action at this meeting:

2. **BSD C - Towneplace Suites Marriott** **5515 Upper Metro Place**  
**17-087CU/DP/SPR/PP/FP** **Conditional Use/Development and Site**  
**Plan Reviews/Preliminary and Final Plats**

**MOTION #2:** Mr. Stidhem moved, Ms. Salay seconded, to approve this Waiver Review, because it complies with all the applicable review criteria:

- 1) Building Types (D)(1)(a) – Parapet Height: Permitted to vary in height from one foot at the lowest to 10 feet at the highest.
- 2) Building Types (E)(2)(a) – Façade Material Transitions: Fiber cement panels are permitted on the same plan as brick on the north and south elevations (stories 2 through 5).
- 3) Building Types (O)(6)(a)(1) – Required Build Zone Treatment: Landscaping along Upper Metro Place instead of patio or streetscape.
- 4) Building Types (O)(6)(d)(1) – Ground Story Street Facing Transparency: Permitted to be 26% on the north elevation and 9% on the west elevation.
- 5) Building Types (O)(6)(d)(1) – Upper Story Street Facing Transparency: Permitted to be 20% for upper stories of north elevation and 15% for upper stories of west elevation.
- 6) Building Types (O)(6)(d)(1) – Blank Wall Limitations (Street): Permits 19 feet of blank wall on all stories of the north elevation and 18 feet of blank wall on ground story of the west elevation.
- 7) Building Types (O)(6)(d)(2) – Blank Wall Limitations (Non-Street): Permits 35 feet of blank walls on ground story of the south elevation.
- 8) Building Types (O)(6)(d)(3) – Street Façade: Requires only one entrance provided on the north elevation.
- 9) Building Types (O)(6)(d)(4) – Vertical Increments: Permits increments of 62 feet on the north elevation and 60 feet on the south elevation.
- 10) Open Space (G)(1)(a) – Open Space Size: Permits an open space of 2,900 square feet total size.
- 11) Open Space (G)(4)(h) – Fencing and Walls: Permits 48-inch tall stone walls.
- 12) Landscaping & Tree Preservation (D)(5)(c)(2) – Interior Landscaping: Permits a run of 19 spaces for the southernmost parking row without a tree island.
- 13) Fences, Walls and Screening (E)(2)(b) – Street Wall Design and Location: Permits a street wall outside of the RBZ on the west side of the site and is offset from the plane of the proposed building.

**VOTE:** 4 – 0.

**RESULT:** This Waiver Review was approved.

**RECORDED VOTES:**

Victoria Newell	Yes
Amy Salay	Yes
Cathy De Rosa	Yes
Robert Miller	Absent
Deborah Mitchell	Absent
Stephen Stidhem	Yes





## RECORD OF ACTION

# Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, November 2, 2017 | 6:30 pm

The Planning and Zoning Commission took the following action at this meeting:

2. **BSD C - Towneplace Suites Marriott** **5515 Upper Metro Place**  
**17-087CU/DP/SPR/PP/FP** **Conditional Use/Development and Site**  
**Plan Reviews/Preliminary and Final Plats**

**MOTION #3:** Mr. Stidhem moved, Ms. Salay seconded, to approve this Development Plan Review because it is consistent with all applicable review criteria, with one condition:

- 1) That all future access point location for the remaining developable properties be subject to review with their respective developments and approval by the City Engineer.

\*Steven Roberts, agreed to the above condition.

**VOTE:** 4 – 0. **RESULT:** This Development Plan Review was approved.

**RECORDED VOTES:**

Victoria Newell	Yes
Amy Salay	Yes
Cathy De Rosa	Yes
Robert Miller	Absent
Deborah Mitchell	Absent
Stephen Stidhem	Yes

**MOTION #4:** Mr. Stidhem moved, Ms. De Rosa seconded, to approve this Site Plan Review because it is consistent with all applicable review criteria, with 12 conditions:

- 1) That the applicant provide the operating hardware details for the doors with the building permit submittal;
- 2) That the applicant revise the architecture to provide window trim around all windows proposed within siding clad walls with the building permit submittal;
- 3) That the applicant ensure all roof penetrations are properly concealed and screened, subject to verification with the building permit;
- 4) That the applicant work with staff to find appropriate landscaping material substitutions with the building permit submittal;
- 5) That the applicant update the landscaping plan to include additional shrub plantings along the street facing side of the street wall with the building permit submittal;
- 6) That the applicant meet the screening requirements for the dumpster enclosure, subject to verification with the building permit;
- 7) That the applicant provide an updated photometric plan with the inclusion of the existing street lights with the building permit submittal;
- 8) That the applicant provide additional cut sheets and fixture information with the building permit submittal;
- 9) That all signs receive approval by the required reviewing body through the zoning review process, prior to the installation of any signs;





## RECORD OF ACTION

# Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, November 2, 2017 | 6:30 pm

The Planning and Zoning Commission took the following action at this meeting:

2. **BSD C - Towneplace Suites Marriott** **5515 Upper Metro Place**  
**17-087CU/DP/SPR/PP/FP** **Conditional Use/Development and Site**  
**Plan Reviews/Preliminary and Final Plats**

- 10) That the applicant work with Engineering to demonstrate continued compliance with stormwater requirements as defined in Chapter 53 to the satisfaction of the City Engineer;
- 11) That the applicant rectify any conflicts between the landscaping design elements (stone columns, walls, pavers, etc.) and the existing utilities prior to filing for building permits; and,
- 12) That the applicant revise the standalone surface parking lot to provide an additional north-south drive aisle connection at the eastern edge with the building permit submittal.

\*Steven Roberts, agreed to the above conditions.

**VOTE:** 4 – 0. **RESULT:** This Site Plan Review was approved.

**RECORDED VOTES:**

Victoria Newell	Yes
Amy Salay	Yes
Cathy De Rosa	Yes
Robert Miller	Absent
Deborah Mitchell	Absent
Stephen Stidhem	Yes

**MOTION #5:** Mr. Stidhem moved, Ms. Salay seconded, to recommend approval to City Council for this Preliminary and Final Plat because it is consistent with all the applicable review criteria, with two conditions:

- 1) That the applicant removes the building and parking setbacks from Lots 4 & 4a from the Final Plat prior to City Council submittal; and,
- 2) That the applicant ensures that any minor technical adjustments to the plat are made prior to City Council submittal.

\*Steven Roberts, agreed to the above conditions.

**VOTE:** 4 – 0. **RESULT:** These Plats were recommended for approval to City Council.

**RECORDED VOTES:**

Victoria Newell	Yes
Amy Salay	Yes
Cathy De Rosa	Yes
Robert Miller	Absent
Deborah Mitchell	Absent
Stephen Stidhem	Yes

**STAFF CERTIFICATION**



\_\_\_\_\_  
 Logan M. Stang  
 Planner I



### **Motion and Vote**

Mr. Stidhem moved, Ms. Salay seconded, to approve the Final Development Plan with seven conditions:

- 1) That a Parking Plan be provided to the City at Building Permitting;
- 2) That vehicle display and parking cease on any pervious area as it impacts stormwater management of the site;
- 3) That six additional evergreen trees be planted along Mercedes Drive to adequately screen the site from the adjacent residents and, the trees be field located with approval of the Zoning Inspector;
- 4) That the landscape plans be updated to clarify that trees will be replaced per Code, and all fees be paid per the City's fee schedule;
- 5) That a landscape plan be provided for the retaining wall and planting bed at the intersection of Perimeter Loop Road and Mercedes Drive to the satisfaction of the Zoning Inspector, prior to issuance of Building Permits;
- 6) That the Final Development Plan zoning information be updated to incorporate all development text requirements; and
- 7) That signs for other sites within Crown Campus be reviewed by the Planning and Zoning Commission for approval.

The vote was as follows: Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; and Mr. Stidhem, yes. (Approved 4 – 0)

### **2. BSD C - TownePlace Suites by Marriott 17-087CU/DP/SPR/PP/FP**

### **5515 Upper Metro Place Conditional Use/Development and Site Plan Reviews/Preliminary and Final Plats**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is a proposal for a five-story, 64,000-square-foot hotel with 105 guest rooms and associated site improvements on a 4.24-acre site, zoned Bridge Street District Commercial. She said the site is on the south side of Upper Metro Place, approximately 550 feet west of the intersection with Frantz Road. She stated this is a request for a review and approval of a Conditional Use under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.236; a review and approval of Development and Site Plans under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066; and a review and recommendation of approval to City Council for Preliminary and Final Plats under the provisions of the Subdivision Regulations. She said the Commission has final authority on the Conditional Use, Development and Site Plan portions of this application and those wishing to address the Commission on this case need to be sworn in. Therefore, she said, there will be three motions requiring votes this evening.

The Chair swore in anyone intending to address the Commission on this case.

Logan Stang presented an aerial view of the site. The site plan that was approved with the Basic Plan Review was also presented, which included the hotel that is located along Upper Metro Place with two access points, a pocket plaza near the northern entrance, and a 112-space parking lot comprising the majority of the site.

Mr. Stang reported that during that review, the Commission expressed concern about the impact the parking lot would have on the existing tree row located along the southern property line as well as the request for exceeding maximum parking spaces as outlined in the Code.

Mr. Stang noted the architecture presented at the Basic Plan Review consisted of a five-story building clad in brick for the first four-stories with fiber cement panels on the fifth story and parapets. The principal entrance, he pointed out, is located on the south façade with the northern entrance designated by a full-length curtain wall in the center of the facade. He said many of the details had not yet been finalized, given the step in the zoning review process.

Mr. Stang said the Commission expressed concern regarding the amount of fiber cement siding and that the architecture did not contain enough visual interest with the materials and color palette that had been selected.

Mr. Stang reported the Basic Plan Review included the approval of five Waivers, mainly to address the unique layout of this site, since all of Upper Metro Place frontage is considered the front yard because the existing utility easement that runs along the frontage prevents the applicant from meeting certain building type requirements, such as the Required Build Zone.

The proposed site plan was presented. Mr. Stang reported the applicant has revised the site plan to address the Commission's concerns as well as staff recommendations. He noted the building and pocket plaza have remained in the same location, while the parking lot has been pulled back from the southern property line and will be constructed of permeable pavers to aid in the preservation of the existing tree row.

Mr. Stang said the updated tree survey that was provided, revealed that a number of those trees in the southern tree row were in poor condition; however, the applicant is able to preserve the three landmark trees in addition to other healthy trees and will supplement the voids with new plantings.

The applicant is proposing a surface parking lot, he said, on the eastern property that is created with the Preliminary and Final Plats as part of this application that will include a shared parking easement that crosses both properties and will eventually be incorporated into the neighboring development. Since the parking lot is located on a different property, he said, a Conditional Use is required to permit this as the primary use until the site develops. A condition has also been added to create a drive aisle connection on the eastern edge to aid in the circulation of that parking lot, he said.

Mr. Stang said there are a few Waivers associated with the site, specifically: the Required Build Zone treatment along Upper Metro Place to allow landscaping in the pocket park where streetscape is required; and a Waiver to allow a run of 19 parking spaces in the southernmost row between landscape islands where 12 spaces is the maximum run permitted.

Mr. Stang presented part of the landscape plan with the proposed pocket plaza design, highlighted. He stated the landscaping provides a mixture of plant materials that accents the site with significant perimeter buffering along the southern property line. Boulder walls are incorporated throughout to define the edges of the property with a landscape treatment applied to the majority of the frontage of Upper Metro Place. He said the design of the pocket plaza is an elevated gathering space containing a checkboard pattern made from turf and pavers with stone seating and a stone wall lining the edge of the space. An at-grade entrance is provided from the west with two additional pedestrian connections in the center and to the east connecting to the sidewalk on Upper Metro Place.

Mr. Stang indicated there are two Waivers associated with the pocket plaza: 1) per the error in the Zoning Code – there is a gap between two open space sizes that a number of open spaces fall into so a Waiver is required to allow this to be larger than what the maximum would be; and 2) to allow stone walls at a height of 48 inches/or four feet where 36 inches/3 feet is the maximum. He said this is primarily due to this gathering space being elevated up from Upper Metro Place and lining that edge and



providing additional amenities to that open space, namely those stone seating walls. He said a condition has been added to rectify any conflicts between the landscaping materials and existing public and private utilities that are located within the utility easement. He said the majority of this pocket plaza is within that 20-foot utility easement on Upper Metro Place.

The proposed architecture was presented. Mr. Stang said the architecture has been revised to include: a wider color palette with additional architectural features that aid in the massing of the structure; and increased percentage of brick cladding to include all five stories with fiber cement only used for the parapets and as the red accent in the center of the northern and southern elevations.

Mr. Stang noted signs are shown on the elevations; however, these are not included for review this evening, as not enough information was provided to ensure compliance with all the requirements. He added the applicant will need to file the appropriate zoning application at a later date for the approvals before any signs can be installed.

The proposed architecture for the western and eastern elevations were presented. Mr. Stang explained the palette includes a total of four brick colors - a light red and gray and a dark red and gray along with four colors of fiber cement panels that complement the brick selections. He pointed out that material samples are available for this evening's review.

Mr. Stang said the revised parapet features along the roofline create dimensionality and include up-lighting to accent the features near the entrances. He noted that a number of architectural Waivers are required for transparency and blank walls, which is primarily due to the interior function of the hotel's spaces for efficient operations.

Mr. Stang indicated the applicant has worked to achieve the intent of the requirements with the limitations imposed by a hotel use; however, additional Waivers are required to cover the number of entrances, parapet height, and façade material transitions.

A night rendering of the northern elevation was presented that faces Upper Metro Place and shows the parapet lighting, material palette, and entrance curtain wall near the open space.

Mr. Stang stated the second part of the application includes a Development Plan for the existing block created between Upper Metro Place and the edge of the Bridge Street District. He explained this is a unique block as it is already defined by the existing Road Network Plan with no new connections proposed. One condition has been added, he said, "Any future access points must be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer with their subsequent reviews." He explained this is due to the existing connections on the northern side and proximity to Frantz Road for the eastern sites.

Mr. Stang said the last portion of this application is a request for a Preliminary and Final Plat for the property, which he presented. He indicated this was initiated due to platted setbacks being present on all the properties on Upper Metro Place; Home2 had to go through the same process to address these issues and remove those setbacks. The Final Plat includes the creation of the shared parking and access easement, he said, as well as the creation of a new lot for surface parking lot and future development.

Mr. Stang concluded there is a total of five motions that require action this evening:

**1. Conditional Use**

For a surface parking lot, which the ART recommended with no conditions

**2. 13 Site Plan Waivers**, which the ART recommended for approval:

- 1) Building Types – Parapet Height
- 2) Building Types – Façade Material Transitions
- 3) Building Types – Required Build Zone Treatment
- 4) Building Types – Ground Story Street Facing Transparency
- 5) Building Types – Upper Story Street Facing Transparency
- 6) Building Types – Blank Wall Limitations (Street Facing)
- 7) Building Types – Blank Wall Limitations (Non-Street Facing)
- 8) Building Types – Street Façade: Number of Entrances Required
- 9) Building Types – Vertical Increments
- 10) Open Space – Open Space Size
- 11) Open Space – Fencing and Walls
- 12) Site Development Standards – Landscaping & Tree Preservation – Interior Landscaping
- 13) Site Development Standards – Fencing, Walls, and Screening - Street Wall Design and Location

**3. Development Plan**, which the ART recommended for approval with one condition:

- 1) That all future access point locations for the remaining developable properties be subject to review with their respective developments and approval by the City Engineer.

**4. Site Plan**, which the ART recommended for approval with 12 conditions:

- 1) That the applicant provide the operating hardware details for the doors with the building permit submittal;
- 2) That the applicant revise the architecture to provide window trim around all windows proposed within siding clad walls with the building permit submittal;
- 3) That the applicant ensure all roof penetrations are properly concealed and screened, subject to verification with the building permit;
- 4) That the applicant work with staff to find appropriate landscaping material substitutions with the building permit submittal;
- 5) That the applicant update the landscaping plan to include additional shrub plantings along the street facing side of the street wall with the building permit submittal;
- 6) That the applicant meet the screening requirements for the dumpster enclosure, subject to verification with the building permit submittal;
- 7) That the applicant provide an updated photometric plan with the inclusion of the existing street lights with the building permit submittal;
- 8) That the applicant provide additional cut sheets and fixture information with the building permit submittal;
- 9) That all signs receive approval by the required reviewing body through the zoning review process, prior to the installation of any signs;
- 10) That the applicant work with Engineering to demonstrate continued compliance with stormwater requirements as defined in Chapter 53 to the satisfaction of the City Engineer;
- 11) That the applicant rectify any conflicts between the landscaping design elements (stone columns, walls, pavers, etc.) and the existing utilities prior to filing for building permits; and,
- 12) That the applicant revise the standalone surface parking lot to provide an additional north-south drive aisle connection at the eastern edge with the building permit submittal.

**5. Preliminary and Final Plats**, which staff is recommending for approval to City Council with two conditions:

- 1) That the applicant removes the building and parking setbacks from Lots 4 & 4a from the Final Plat prior to City Council submittal; and
- 2) That the applicant ensures that any minor technical adjustments to the plat are made prior to City Council submittal.

Steve Stidhem inquired about existing stone walls. Mr. Stang said these walls will be removed because of the existing access point where the stone walls are constructed, in order to shift the access point further to the east. Mr. Stidhem asked if there was a historic nature to those walls. Mr. Stang indicated they were not as they were installed when the entry points were added.

Cathy De Rosa commented that there appears to be an awful lot of Waivers and conditions being requested. Mr. Stang said the majority of the conditions with the Site Plan are just clean up items. In terms of Waivers, he said these are items that have come up in the past with other hotel applications due to the operations. Because the site has been vacant, he explained there are site specific limitations to be addressed.

Ms. De Rosa inquired about the illumination at the top of the building as shown in the rendering presented as nighttime. She asked if there have been other buildings that have top-level illumination. Mr. Stang clarified the parapet, tower feature, and side parapets will have LED up-lighting on those features. He added he does not recall another project having similar up-lighting but the ART and staff determined the illumination was a nice design feature to accent the angled portions of the building.

Amy Salay said she did not mind the lighting but she would like to see the fifth story sign removed because this is meant only for frontage on a freeway.

Vicki Newell indicated that having both the sign and the light draws a lot of attention to the sign in that location. She asked that the applicant consider one without the other.

Ms. Salay reiterated that she liked the lighting and this hotel is within an office park. She said she is concerned all the hotels in the area will compete for air signs.

Steven Roberts, 5803 Destiny Court, Cincinnati, Ohio, 45237, said he is encouraged by the feedback. He said since July, they have been positively addressing comments and concerns the Commission had made previously. He indicated they have accomplished that and staff is very supportive in providing solid solutions that were amicable to everybody. He said the moves they have made were to preserve the trees to the south and to shift some of the parking off-site to begin shared usage that they will proceed with in the future. He noted they moved the trash receptacle away from the building down to the south, which also provides better access to the trash receptacle.

Steve Stidhem asked about the four-foot wall requested as opposed to a three-foot wall permitted.

Gayle Frazier, 7377 Bridge Point Pass, Cincinnati, Ohio, said she is the landscape architect. She explained for the wall, four feet is exposed on the street side and only 18 inches of wall are exposed on the plaza side.

Mr. Stidhem asked if the plan is to include stone walls like Dublin already has around the city. Mr. Roberts answered the plan is to replace the walls. He noted this site is on the border of the Bridge Street District and they have proposed a kind of deconstructed wall as one gets further and further away from the

uptown area of the BSD. He said they were hoping to have a terraced approach and the walls would start to form more solidly as one continues down Upper Metro Place.

Mr. Stidhem inquired about the brick proposed. Mr. Roberts answered it will be a utility brick, which is a larger scale brick.

Mr. Stidhem inquired about the parking. Mr. Roberts finds the applicant needs one extra space due to the positioning of the landscape islands to preserve trees. Mr. Stidhem applauded that effort.

Mr. Stidhem asked if there were plans to add electric charging stations to the parking lot. Mr. Roberts answered they did not currently plan on it but it is something they might be able to consider. Mr. Stidhem encouraged the applicant to at least do the plumbing for it because it is something the City will need at some point.

Mr. Stidhem asked if the applicant is considering any renewable energy resources like solar panels. Mr. Roberts answered it was something they could definitely look into. Mr. Stidhem indicated solar panel performance has been improved and also now cost effective. Mr. Roberts agreed and noted there are also tax incentives.

Ms. Newell noted that in the renderings, there are a lot of horizontal detail lines across the building. She asked if those were reveals or beams. Mr. Roberts answered they are projected. Ms. Newell affirmed that was a nice feature that ties the whole elevation together. Mr. Roberts added the intent is to bring shadow lines with the brick projection.

Ms. Newell stated, overall, she liked the architecture of the building.

Ms. De Rosa inquired about the pocket plaza. Mr. Roberts stated the plaza is  $\pm 2,700$  square feet with a grove of trees and the checkerboard made of turf and pavers. He said they are trying to establish something that can be continued down Upper Metro Place as they continue developments. He said the playfulness of the checkerboard might prompt a variety of different games - something to draw people in off of the street. Ms. De Rosa asked if tables and benches would be incorporated. Mr. Roberts confirmed there are benches proposed outside and a business center and a breakfast area are located just inside to encourage guests to go out and enjoy their cup of coffee or work on their laptop outside. Ms. De Rosa stated she liked that programming.

Ms. Frazier said the sculpture will be a chess piece. Ms. De Rosa asked if there is a sidewalk all the way down. Mr. Stang answered there is a sidewalk on the south side and a proposed sidewalk connection on the west side of the plaza with additional connections that would also run out to the sidewalk.

Mr. Stidhem noted there is not a lot there to walk to. He added he loves the great pocket plaza. He stated he is obviously not an architect but as a general population, he indicated they are going to get tired of the color block style because it is everywhere now. Mr. Roberts said it provides the illusion of construction over time. He said it also gives a nod to the townhome, which is the underlying theme of TownePlace Suites, a home away from home.

Ms. De Rosa asked for the applicant's thoughts on the lighting and the sign. Mr. Roberts answered the sign conforms to the requirements for a building identification sign. He said the lighting helps identify the primary entrance point, plus the lighting is iconic.

The Chair emphasized the sign package is not part of the application this evening. Mr. Roberts indicated he believes the signage component adds to the aesthetics of the façade.

Ms. Newell requested the applicant remove one more parking space to permit a landscape island. Ideally, Mr. Roberts said he would like to align all the landscape islands but it felt awkward to move the middle one on the middle row, over to align with where they are trying to capture two trees. He offered to add one back, if it is necessary. Ms. Newell confirmed the plan is what it is because the applicant is saving a landmark tree, which she can support.

The Chair invited public comment. [Hearing none.]

Mr. Stidhem reiterated that he really likes this proposal and that it will fit in well to the area. He particularly likes the wings, he said, and the illumination, which might in itself identify the building.

Ms. De Rosa said she likes the proposal as well. She noted she liked the gray brick and dark brick together, she very much likes the plaza, the idea of the decomposed wall to the final stone wall, or whatever that transition is, that could be interesting but hard for her to visualize from the renderings. She stated the applicant has done a good job at creating character and maybe that will differentiate them from some of the other hotels. She said she is unsure about the lighting. She said she is glad trees were preserved and is supportive of the proposal, overall.

Ms. Salay said this proposal is really nice and she likes it a lot better than where they started. She noted the curtain wall, the variety and quantity of bricks, the plaza, the landscaping, and added she really likes the lighting, which appears unique in the night rendering. She thanked the applicant for all the improvements and for saving the trees.

Ms. Newell inquired about a color board. Mr. Roberts presented samples of the brick colors.

#### **Motion and Vote**

Mr. Stidhem moved, Ms. De Rosa seconded, to approve the Conditional Use with no conditions. The vote was as follows: Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; and Mr. Stidhem, yes. (Approved 4 – 0)

#### **Motion and Vote**

Mr. Stidhem moved, Ms. Salay seconded, to approve 13 Site Plan Waivers with no conditions:

1. §153.062 – Building Types (D)(1)(a) – Parapet Height: Required - Parapets shall be high enough to screen the roof and any roof appurtenances provided that the parapet is no less than 2 feet and no more than 6 feet high; Requested - Parapet varies in height from one foot at the lowest to 10 feet at the highest.
2. §153.062 – Building Types (E)(2)(a) – Façade Material Transitions: Required - Vertical material transitions shall occur at inside corners; Requested - Fiber cement panels are proposed on the same plan as brick on the north and south elevations (stories 2 through 5).
3. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(a)(1) – Required Build Zone Treatment: Required - Patio or streetscape permitted treatments; Requested - Landscaping along Upper Metro Place.
4. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(d)(1) – Ground Story Street Facing Transparency: Required - Minimum ground story transparency of 65%; Requested - 26% on the north elevation and 9% on the west elevation.
5. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(d)(1) – Upper Story Street Facing Transparency: Required - Minimum upper story transparency of 30%; Requested - 20% for upper stories of north elevation and 15% for upper stories of west elevation.
6. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(d)(1) – Blank Wall Limitations (Street): Required - No horizontal distance greater than 15 feet per story shall be blank or windowless; Requested - 19 feet of blank

wall on all stories of the north elevation and 18 feet of blank wall on ground story of the west elevation.

7. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(d)(2) – Blank Wall Limitations (Non-Street): Required - No horizontal distance greater than 15 feet per story shall be blank or windowless; Requested - 35 feet of blank walls on ground story of the south elevation.
8. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(d)(3) – Street Façade: Number of Entrances Required: One entrance per 75 feet of façade minimum (3 entrances required); Requested - One entrance provided on the north elevation.
9. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(6)(d)(4) – Vertical Increments: Required - Vertical increments shall be no greater than 45 feet; Requested - 62 feet on the north elevation and 60 feet on the south elevation.
10. §153.064 – Open Space (G)(1)(a) – Open Space Size: Required - Minimum size of 300 square feet and maximum size of 1,200 square feet for a Pocket Plaza; Requested - 2,900 square feet total size.
11. §153.064 – Open Space (G)(4)(h) – Fencing and Walls: Required - Walls shall not exceed 36 inches as measured from the established grade; Requested - 48 inches tall for stone walls.
12. §153.065 - Landscaping & Tree Preservation (D)(5)(c)(2) – Interior Landscaping: Required - Maximum run of 12 parking spaces permitted without a tree island; Requested - Run of 19 spaces for the southernmost parking row.
13. §153.065 - Fences, Walls and Screening (E)(2)(b) – Street Wall Design and Location: Required - Street walls are to be placed within the front and/or corner side RBZ and installed along the same plane as the nearest building; Requested - Street wall is proposed outside of the RBZ on the west side of the site and is offset from the plane of the proposed building.

The vote was as follows: Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; and Mr. Stidhem, yes. (Approved 4 – 0)

**Motion and Vote**

Mr. Stidhem moved, Ms. Salay seconded, to approve the Development Plan with the following condition:

- 1) That all future access point locations for the remaining developable properties be subject to review with their respective developments and approval by the City Engineer.

The vote was as follows: Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; and Mr. Stidhem, yes. (Approved 4 – 0)

**Motion and Vote**

Mr. Stidhem moved, Ms. De Rosa seconded, to approve the Site Plan with 12 conditions:

- 1) That the applicant provide the operating hardware details for the doors with the building permit submittal;
- 2) That the applicant revise the architecture to provide window trim around all windows proposed within siding clad walls with the building permit submittal;
- 3) That the applicant ensure all roof penetrations are properly concealed and screened, subject to verification with the building permit;
- 4) That the applicant work with staff to find appropriate landscaping material substitutions with the building permit submittal;
- 5) That the applicant update the landscaping plan to include additional shrub plantings along the street facing side of the street wall with the building permit submittal;
- 6) That the applicant meet the screening requirements for the dumpster enclosure, subject to verification with the building permit;

- 7) That the applicant provide an updated photometric plan with the inclusion of the existing street lights with the building permit submittal;
- 8) That the applicant provide additional cut sheets and fixture information with the building permit submittal;
- 9) That all signs receive approval by the required reviewing body through the zoning review process, prior to the installation of any signs;
- 10) That the applicant work with Engineering to demonstrate continued compliance with stormwater requirements as defined in Chapter 53 to the satisfaction of the City Engineer;
- 11) That the applicant rectify any conflicts between the landscaping design elements (stone columns, walls, pavers, etc.) and the existing utilities prior to filing for building permits; and,
- 12) That the applicant revise the standalone surface parking lot to provide an additional north-south drive aisle connection at the eastern edge with the building permit submittal.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; and Mr. Stidhem, yes. (Approved 4 – 0)

#### **Motion and Vote**

Mr. Stidhem moved, Ms. Salay seconded, to recommend approval to City Council for the Preliminary and Final Plats with two conditions:

- 1) That the applicant removes the building and parking setbacks from Lots 4 & 4a from the Final Plat, prior to City Council submittal; and
- 2) That the applicant ensures that any minor technical adjustments to the plat are made prior to City Council submittal.

The vote was as follows: Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; and Mr. Stidhem, yes. (Approved 4 – 0)

### **3. BSD SRN – Cap City Diner – Outdoor Speakers 17-105CU**

### **6644 Riverside Drive Conditional Use**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is a proposal for outdoor speakers for a patio and entrance for a 6,000-square-foot restaurant in the Bridge Park Development, zoned Bridge Street District Scioto River Neighborhood. She said the site is east of Riverside Drive, approximately 150 feet northeast of the intersection with Bridge Park Avenue. She said this is a request for a review and approval of a Conditional Use under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.236. She said the Commission has final authority on this application and we will have to swear in anyone intending on addressing the Commission regarding this case.

The Chair swore in anyone intending to address the Commission on this case.

Logan Stang presented an aerial view of the site and noted the tenant space is located in the northern portion of Building C2 of the Bridge Park development and it lies between Riverside Drive and Longshore Street. He then presented the proposed speaker locations - five overhead speakers for the patio space along Riverside Drive at a distance of one every 12 feet and two overhead speakers for the entryway on the eastern façade at 12 feet apart.



# RECORD OF DETERMINATION

## Administrative Review Team

Thursday, October 19, 2017

The Administrative Review Team made the following determinations at this meeting:

**1. BSD C - TownePlace Suites by Marriott** **5515 Upper Metro Place**  
**17-087CU/DP/SPR/PP/FP** **Conditional Use/Development and Site**  
**Plan Reviews/Preliminary and Final Plats**

Proposal: A five-story, 64,000-square-foot hotel with 105 guest rooms and associated site improvements on a 4.24-acre site.

Location: South side of Upper Metro Place, approximately 550 feet west of the intersection with Frantz Road.

Request: Review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Conditional Use under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.236 and of Development and Site Plan Reviews under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066; and, a request for a review and recommendation of approval to Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council for Preliminary and Final Plats under the provisions of the Subdivision Regulations.

Applicant: Steven M. Roberts, Architect.

Planning Contact: Logan M. Stang, Planner I.

Contact Information: (614) 410-4652, [lstang@dublin.oh.us](mailto:lstang@dublin.oh.us)

### REQUEST 1: ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTURES

1. §153.062(O)(6)(d)(1) Building Types – Blank Wall Limitations: No horizontal distance greater than 15 feet per story shall be blank or windowless (Permitted); 16 feet of blank wall on the north elevation, ground story. (Requested)
2. §153.062(O)(6)(d)(2) Building Types – Blank Wall Limitations: No horizontal distance greater than 15 feet per story shall be blank or windowless (Permitted); 17 feet of blank walls on all upper stories of the south elevation (Requested).
3. §153.062(O)(6)(d)(2) Building Types – Transparency: Minimum non-street façade transparency of 15% (Permitted); 14% transparency for the upper stories of the east elevation (Requested).
4. §153.062(O)(6)(d)(4) – Building Types – Vertical Increments: Vertical increments shall be no greater than 45 feet (Permitted); 46 feet on the north and south elevations (Requested).
5. §153.065(B)(4) – Parking & Loading – Off-Street Parking and Aisle Dimensions: The maximum permitted two-way drive aisle is 22 feet, and the maximum 90 degree standard parking dimensions are 9 feet wide by 18 feet long; 24 foot wide drive aisle for the eastern entrance (Requested).





6. §153.065(B)(6)(c)(6) – Parking & Loading – Surface Parking Lot Design: Driveways shall be no wider than 22 feet at the intersection with the adjacent street right-of-way (Permitted); 26 foot wide driveway for the eastern shared drive at the Upper Metro Place right-of-way (Requested).

**Determination:** The six Administrative Departures were approved.

#### **REQUEST 2: CONDITIONAL USE**

Request for an approval recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Conditional Use with no conditions.

The surface parking lot will be integrated in the eastern development.

**Determination:** The Conditional Use was recommended for approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

#### **REQUEST 3: SITE PLAN WAIVERS**

Request for an approval recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission for 13 Site Plan Waivers:

1. §153.062(D)(1)(a) Building Types – Parapet Height: Parapets shall be high enough to screen the roof and any roof appurtenances provided that the parapet is no less than 2 feet and no more than 6 feet high (Permitted); Parapet varies in height from one foot at the lowest to 10 feet at the highest (Requested).
2. §153.062(E)(2)(a) Building Types – Façade Material Transitions: Vertical material transitions shall occur at inside corners (Permitted); Fiber cement panels are proposed on the same plan as brick on the north and south elevations [stories 2 through 5] (Requested).
3. §153.062(O)(6)(a)(1) Building Types – Required Build Zone Treatment: Patio or streetscape permitted treatments (Permitted); Landscaping along Upper Metro Place (Requested).
4. §153.062(O)(6)(d)(1) Building Types – Ground Story Street Facing Transparency: Minimum ground story transparency of 65% (Permitted); 26% on the north elevation and 9% on the west elevation (Requested)
5. §153.062(O)(6)(d)(1) Building Types – Upper Story Street Facing Transparency: Minimum upper story transparency of 30% (Permitted); 20% for upper stories of north elevation and 15% for upper stories of west elevation (Requested)
6. §153.062(O)(6)(d)(1) Building Types – Blank Wall Limitations: No horizontal distance greater than 15 feet per story shall be blank or windowless (Permitted); 19 feet of blank wall on all stories of the north elevation and 18 feet of blank wall on ground story of the west elevation (Requested).
7. §153.062(O)(6)(d)(1) Building Types – Blank Wall Limitations: No horizontal distance greater than 15 feet per story shall be blank or windowless (Permitted); 35 feet of blank walls on ground story of the south elevation (Requested).
8. §153.062(O)(6)(d)(2) Building Types – Street Façade: Number of Entrances Required: One entrance per 75 feet of façade minimum (3 entrances required); One entrance provided on the north elevation (Requested).

9. §153.062(O)(6)(d)(3) Building Types – Vertical Increments: Vertical increments shall be no greater than 45 feet (Permitted); 62 feet on the north elevation and 60 feet on the south elevation (Requested).
10. §153.064(O)(6)(d)(4) Open Space – Open Space Size: Minimum size of 300 square feet and maximum size of 1,200 square feet for Pocket Plaza (Permitted); 2,900 square feet total size (Requested).
11. §153.064(G)(1)(a) Open Space – Fencing and Walls: Walls shall not exceed 36 inches as measured from the established grade (Permitted); 48 inches tall for stone walls (Requested).
12. §153.065(G)(4)(h) Site Development Standards – Fencing, Walls and Screening – Street Wall Design and Location: Street walls are to be placed within the front and/or corner side RBZ and installed along the same plane as the nearest building (Permitted); Street wall is proposed outside of the RBZ on the west side of the site and is offset from the plane of the proposed building (Requested).
13. §153.065(D)(5)(c)(2) Site Development Standards – Landscaping & Tree Preservation – Interior Landscaping: Maximum run of 12 parking spaces without a tree island (Permitted); Run of 19 parking spaces for the southernmost parking row (Requested).

**Determination:** The 13 Site Plan Waivers were recommended for approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission as part of the Development and Site Plan Reviews.

#### **REQUEST 4: DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW**

Request for a recommendation of approval to Planning and Zoning Commission for a Development Plan Review with one condition:

- 1) That all future access point locations for the remaining developable properties be subject to review with their respective developments and approval by the City Engineer.

**Determination:** The Development Plan Review was recommended for approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

#### **REQUEST 5: SITE PLAN REVIEW**

Request for a recommendation of approval to Planning and Zoning Commission for a Site Plan Review with 12 conditions:

- 1) That the applicant provide the operating hardware details for the doors with the building permit submittal;
- 2) That the applicant revise the architecture to provide window trim around all windows proposed within siding clad walls with the building permit submittal;
- 3) That the applicant ensure all roof penetrations are properly concealed and screened, subject to verification with the building permit;
- 4) That the applicant work with staff to find appropriate landscaping material substitutions with the building permit submittal;

- 5) That the applicant update the landscaping plan to include additional shrub plantings along the street facing side of the street wall with the building permit submittal;
- 6) That the applicant meet the screening requirements for the dumpster enclosure, subject to verification with the building permit;
- 7) That the applicant provide an updated photometric plan with the inclusion of the existing street lights with the building permit submittal;
- 8) That the applicant provide additional cut sheets and fixture information with the building permit submittal;
- 9) That all signs receive approval by the required reviewing body through the zoning review process, prior to the installation of any signs;
- 10) That the applicant work with Engineering to demonstrate continued compliance with stormwater requirements as defined in Chapter 53 to the satisfaction of the City Engineer;
- 11) That the applicant rectify any conflicts between the landscaping design elements (stone columns, walls, pavers, etc.) and the existing utilities prior to filing for building permits; and
- 12) That the applicant revise the standalone surface parking lot to provide an additional north-south drive aisle connection at the eastern edge with the building permit submittal.

**Determination:** The Site Plan Review was recommended for approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission with twelve conditions.

**STAFF CERTIFICATION**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Vince Papsidero, FAICP  
Planning Director



# MEETING MINUTES

## Administrative Review Team

Thursday, October 19, 2017 | 2:00 pm

**ART Members and Designees:** Vince Papsidero, Planning Director; Donna Goss, Director of Development; Colleen Gilger, Director of Economic Development; Matt Earman, Director of Parks and Recreation; Ray Harpham, Interim Chief Building Official; Aaron Stanford, Senior Civil Engineer; Shawn Krawetzki, Landscape Architect; Mike Altomare, Fire Marshal; and Tim Hosterman, Police Sergeant.

**Other Staff:** Claudia Husak, Senior Planner; Lori Burchett, Planner II; Logan Stang, Planner I; Nichole Martin, Planner I; Mike Kettler, Planning Technician; Lia Yakumithis, Planning Assistant; and Laurie Wright, Administrative Support II.

**Applicants:** Wayne A. Schick, Cameron Mitchell Restaurants (Case2); Charles and Deborah Penzone, Penzones; Chris Meyers and Tony Colt, Meyers and Associates; (Case 3); Teri Umbarger, Moody Nolan; Nelson Yoder, Crawford Hoying Development Partners; John Woods, MKSK; and Brian Sell, Moody Nolan (Case 4); Matt Starr, Crawford Hoying Development Partners (Cases 5 & 6); and Zac Romer-Jordan, BBCO Design (Case 7).

Vince Papsidero called the meeting to order at 2:03 pm. He asked if there were any amendments to the October 5 meeting minutes. The minutes were accepted into the record as presented. He noted the following Minor Modifications:

- ✓ Bridge Park, Building B4 – Parking Garage
- ✓ WID, Darree Fields

### RECOMMENDATIONS

1. **BSD C - TownePlace Suites by Marriott  
17-087CU/DP/SPR/PP/FP** **5515 Upper Metro Place  
Conditional Use/Development and Site  
Plan Reviews/Preliminary and Final Plats**

Logan Stang said this is a proposal for a five-story, 64,000-square-foot hotel with 105 guest rooms and associated site improvements on a 4.24-acre site. He said the site is on the south side of Upper Metro Place, approximately 550 feet west of the intersection with Frantz Road. He said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Conditional Use under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.236 and Development and Site Plan Reviews under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066. He said there is also a request for a review and recommendation of approval to City Council for Preliminary and Final Plats under the provisions of the Subdivision Regulations.

Mr. Stang presented an aerial view of the site and the previously proposed site plan. He noted the location of the dumpster and the standalone parking lot on the east property. He presented the proposed site plan for comparison and to reflect the revisions that have been made. He pointed out that the dumpster enclosure was relocated to the southeast corner of the site at the terminus of the eastern driveway and pedestrian path.



Mr. Stang said the proposal includes the construction of a standalone surface parking lot on the eastern property with a shared access drive to Upper Metro Place. The parking lot will be constructed, he said, with the development of this proposal and will be integrated into the future development that occurs on the eastern property. He explained a Conditional Use is requested for the surface parking lot proposed as a principal use, subject to the requirements of surface parking lot design outlined in the BSD Code.

Mr. Stang said there were six Administrative Departures proposed and explained each of the following:

1. Building Types – Blank Wall Limitations (2)
2. Building Types – Transparency
3. Building Types – Vertical Increments
4. Site Development Standards – Parking & Loading – Off-Street Parking and Aisle Dimensions
5. Site Development Standards – Parking & Loading – Surface Parking Lot Design

*Details of the departures can be found in the Planning Report.*

Mr. Stang requested a conversation about the surface parking lot because if it is filled, circulation is not efficient and that had been relayed to the applicant prior to this meeting. He suggested reworking the existing layout or considering a turnaround at the edge.

Aaron Stanford agreed with the suggestion of a turnaround. He said if there is an access aisle on the eastern edge, circulation would be improved and that would be simple to add to the plan but requested input from the other members. The ART agreed it was a reasonable request. Mr. Stang said the applicant can design it on the Master Plan and he would add it to the list of conditions needed for the Site Plan approval.

Claudia Husak mentioned the amount of parking spaces needed for hotels in general and if additional parking spaces should be added as a standard requirement as hotels in suburban locations can be challenging. She noted that Embassy Suites has said that guests of Home 2 are parking in their lot so the requested shared-parking may be appropriate.

Mr. Stang indicated that the landscaping has been revised but it is very similar to what was shown before. He said the proposed landscape plan includes the design of the pocket plaza, perimeter buffering, and supplemental plantings along Upper Metro Place frontage. He explained a mixture of plant materials will be used that create a cohesive theme throughout the site. Stone walls, he said, are incorporated into landscape beds along Upper Metro Place. He stated a majority of those trees are in poor condition. He said the applicant has indicated the intent to preserve the landmark trees and the majority of healthy trees throughout the site while removing those in poor condition. The portions of the site suffering loss of the poor condition trees, he said, will be supplemented with new plantings included in the landscape plan.

Mr. Stang reported the applicant has provided stormwater management details for the proposed system including underground storage, bio-swales, and permeable pavement. He said the site will be served by public utilities located on the south side of Upper Metro Place with sanitary and water provided within the existing utility easement. Additional private utilities are located within the easement, he noted, and the applicant will need to rectify any conflicts between proposed landscaping design elements such as stone columns, walls, pavers, or similar and the existing public and private utilities prior to filing for building permits.

Mr. Stanford reported Engineering identified some possible utility conflicts, which could mean modifications to the plan. He said he was specifically concerned with the patio columns on the edge. He indicated these

might need to be relocated or sacrificed. Vince Papsidero suggested that the applicant simplify the plan, specifically the number of plantings in the pocket plaza.

Mr. Stang presented the various elevations and pointed out the proposed modern architecture that contains five stories and a varying parapet roof feature that uses LED-stripe lighting to accent the angular forms. He noted that up lighting at grade level has been added as well. He pointed out a total of four colors of brick masonry will be incorporated on all five stories with fiber cement panel accents in the middle of the structure and along the parapet. In terms of brick colors, he stated a light and dark gray are the predominant colors with a dark and light red used as accents for the massing of the structure. Additionally, he said, four colors of fiber cement panels are proposed that correspond to the brick palette. He highlighted a curtain wall system extending to the roof that is proposed for the main entrance on the north façade and architectural canopies that are proposed above the entrances with a larger vehicular canopy on the south façade near the drop-off area. He presented a rendering that showed the front of the hotel as it would be lit in the evening.

Mr. Papsidero asked the ART if they were comfortable with the architecture and they all responded affirmatively.

Mr. Stang pointed out that the applicant included proposed signs for the site consisting of a ground sign, projecting sign, and building identification sign but the signs shown are not part of this application. He indicated that the signs appear to meet Code as is but will have to come back before the required reviewing body for approval.

Mr. Stang said 13 Waivers are proposed and explained the need for each of the following:

1. Building Types – Parapet Height
2. Building Types – Façade Material Transitions
3. Building Types – Required Build Zone Treatment
4. Building Types – Ground Story Street Facing Transparency
5. Building Types – Upper Story Street Facing Transparency
6. Building Types – Blank Wall Limitations (2)
7. Building Types – Street Façade: Number of Entrances Required
8. Building Types – Vertical Increments
9. Open Space – Open Space Size
10. Open Space – Fencing and Walls
11. Site Development Standards – Fencing, Walls and Screening – Street Wall Design and Location
12. Site Development Standards – Landscaping & Tree Preservation – Interior Landscaping

Mr. Stang said a Conditional Use is recommended for approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission with no conditions.

Mr. Stang said approval is recommended for six Administrative Departures:

1. Building Types – Blank Wall Limitations (2)
2. Building Types – Transparency
3. Building Types – Vertical Increments
4. Site Development Standards – Parking & Loading – Off-Street Parking and Aisle Dimensions
5. Site Development Standards – Parking & Loading – Surface Parking Lot Design

Mr. Stang said approval is recommended to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the 13 Waivers:

1. Building Types – Parapet Height
2. Building Types – Façade Material Transitions
3. Building Types – Required Build Zone Treatment
4. Building Types – Ground Story Street Facing Transparency
5. Building Types – Upper Story Street Facing Transparency
6. Building Types – Blank Wall Limitations (2)
7. Building Types – Street Façade: Number of Entrances Required
8. Building Types – Vertical Increments
9. Open Space – Open Space Size
10. Open Space – Fencing and Walls
11. Site Development Standards – Fencing, Walls and Screening – Street Wall Design and Location
12. Site Development Standards – Landscaping & Tree Preservation – Interior Landscaping

Mr. Stang said approval is recommended to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the Development Plan Review with the following condition:

- 1) That all future access point locations for the remaining developable properties be subject to review with their respective developments and approval by the City Engineer.

Mr. Stang said approval is recommended to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the Site Plan Review with 12 conditions:

- 1) That the applicant provide the operating hardware details for the doors with the building permit submittal;
- 2) That the applicant revise the architecture to provide window trim around all windows proposed within siding clad walls with the building permit submittal;
- 3) That the applicant ensure all roof penetrations are properly concealed and screened, subject to verification with the building permit;
- 4) That the applicant work with staff to find appropriate landscaping material substitutions with the building permit submittal;
- 5) That the applicant update the landscaping plan to include additional shrub plantings along the street facing side of the street wall with the building permit submittal;
- 6) That the applicant meet the screening requirements for the dumpster enclosure, subject to verification with the building permit;
- 7) That the applicant provide an updated photometric plan with the inclusion of the existing street lights with the building permit submittal;
- 8) That the applicant provide additional cut sheets and fixture information with the building permit submittal;
- 9) That all signs receive approval by the required reviewing body through the zoning review process, prior to the installation of any signs;
- 10) That the applicant work with Engineering to demonstrate continued compliance with stormwater requirements as defined in Chapter 53 to the satisfaction of the City Engineer;
- 11) That the applicant rectify any conflicts between the landscaping design elements (stone columns, walls, pavers, etc.) and the existing utilities prior to filing for building permits; and
- 12) That the applicant revise the standalone surface parking lot to provide an additional north-south drive aisle connection at the eastern edge with the building permit submittal.

Shawn Krawetzki inquired about landscape requirements for the surface parking lot. Mr. Stang answered, landscaping is not required to screen the surface parking lot proposed for the eastern development since it sits back from the right-of-way but the applicant will use the existing mounding.

Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He called for a vote, the motion carried, and the Conditional Use was recommended for approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission; the Development and Site Plan Reviews were recommended for approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission; the Waivers were recommended for approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission; and the Administrative Departures were approved.

**2: BSD SRN — Cap City Diner — Outdoor Speakers  
17-105CU**

**6644 Riverside Drive  
Conditional Use**

~~Lia Yakumithis said this is a request for the use of outdoor speakers in an existing patio and exterior entrance space for a 6,000-square-foot restaurant in the Bridge Park Development, zoned Bridge Street District Scioto River Neighborhood. She said the site is west of Riverside Drive, approximately 150 feet northeast of the intersection with Bridge Park Avenue. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Conditional Use under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.236.~~

~~Ms. Yakumithis presented an aerial view of the site and highlighted the tenant space.~~

~~Ms. Yakumithis presented a floor plan that included the patio along Riverside Drive that showed the proposed overhead speaker locations of which there are five planned approximately every 12 feet and two for the entry way on Longshore Street that are also approximately 12 feet apart. She presented photographs of the actual speakers installed. She presented a graphic showing the area within 50 feet of the patio speakers that include public sidewalks, private, publically accessible open space, and the developer's leasing office.~~

~~Ms. Yakumithis said the Nuisance Code states that the emission of sound that is 'plainly audible' at a distance of 50 feet from the building is an emission of sound that may disturb the peace, and is therefore not permitted. 'Plainly audible' is defined as any sound that can be detected by a person using his or her unaided hearing faculties. She reported the applicant is not requesting live music with the use of additional outdoor speakers or sound amplification but a Conditional Use would be required if this is desired in the future.~~

~~Per the BSD Code, Ms. Yakumithis said, speakers are only permitted in conjunction with Outdoor Seating and Dining as a use specific standard. Therefore, she said, speakers in the entry way along Longshore Drive will need to be removed in order to meet the Code requirement.~~

~~Ms. Yakumithis reported the outdoor speakers will be used during operating hours only and the patio hours of operation are as follows:~~

- ~~• Monday through Thursday, 11:00am — 11:00pm~~
- ~~• Friday and Saturday, 11:00am — 12:00am~~
- ~~• Sunday, 11:00am — 10:00pm~~

~~Ms. Yakumithis concluded approval is recommended to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Conditional Use with three conditions:~~



Mr. Stang pointed out there is potential for parking on one side of the neighborhood street and asked if it would need striping. Mr. Stanford said it could be handled like Tuller Flats with the striping on one side.

Vince Papsidero asked if any Waivers had been identified. Mr. Stang answered some Waivers would pertain to the architecture so those could be pushed back to the final. He indicated that the floor height for the ground story of a civic building will need to be verified.

Ms. Menerey added she had provided Mr. Stang with some possible Waivers she identified. Mr. Stang stated he would review possible Waivers but they are not a huge concern for the Basic Plan Review and will not be refined until the Final Site Plan Review.

Alan Perkins stated the site looks good from fire's perspective. He emphasized they need access to the drive aisle. He asked if the generator would be enclosed in masonry. Ms. Menerey answered the enclosure would match the building. Mr. Perkins said the Fire Marshal's office would need to check the materials.

Mr. Perkins inquired about access to water. Mr. Nixon answered the water is along SR 161. Mr. Perkins asked about the proximity of electrical to the fire hydrant. Mr. Nixon said it was at the front of the building. Mr. Perkins said that would be suitable as they could access it from SR 161.

Ray Harpham asked where the service entry would be. Mr. Nixon pointed out the location the box trucks would deliver various items.

Mr. Harpham said there needs to be a break in the wall to allow for stairs to lead to/from SR 161.

In order for the ART to make a recommendation next week to be reviewed by the PZC at their meeting on September 21, Mr. Stang said the additional materials requested will be needed the next day.

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He indicated the ART could make their recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission at the meeting on September 21 to be forwarded to the Architectural Review Board for their meeting on September 27, 2017.

## **INTRODUCTIONS**

### **4. BSD C - TownePlace Suites Marriott 17-087CU/DP/SPR/PP/FP**

### **5515 Upper Metro Place Conditional Use/Development Plan/ Site Plan Review/Preliminary Plat/Final Plat**

Logan Stang said this is a proposal for a five-story, 64,000-square-foot hotel with 105 guest rooms and associated site improvements on a 4.24-acre site on the south side of Upper Metro Place, approximately 550 feet west of the intersection with Frantz Road. He said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to Planning and Zoning Commission for a Conditional Use under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.236 and a Site Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066. He said this is also a request for a review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Preliminary Plat and a Final Plat under the provisions of the Subdivision Regulations.

Mr. Stang presented the aerial view of the site and the layout for the Basic Plan Review. He reported the Planning and Zoning Commission had concerns with the substantial tree row on the southern property line that included three landmark trees with parking so close. He said the brand wants one parking space per guest room with a few additional spaces to accommodate trailers and such that equates to 112 spaces; Code permits 88 spaces. He said the PZC urged the applicant to demonstrate shared parking with the site they own to the east with a buildout planned for the future.

Mr. Stang presented the most recent proposal where the building was shifted to the west. He explained the applicant removed a row of parking in the center so now the southern property line is nine feet away from that last row of parking and the shared parking would be established for future development on the east. He said the tree line on the southern property line helps the character and permeable pavers will be added in the southern spaces to ensure the trees have enough access to water. Mr. Stang provided an updated tree survey that demonstrates a fair amount of trees in poor condition. He said the new landscape plan has the detail requested and the design of the pocket plaza that contains pavers and turf in a checker board pattern in the recessed portion. He said this area will have an at-grade connection with bike racks. He explained the applicant is now proposing a rubble wall combined with a standard Dublin wall. He said this may not work out; the PZC may prefer the standard design for the wall.

Mr. Stang presented a rendering for the front elevation. He noted that the architecture is basically the same. He reported that the PZC had requested the applicant remove as much fiber cement as possible because the overall color scheme was dreary. He pointed out the applicant took the brick up to the 5<sup>th</sup> story; there are four colors of brick; and the fiber cement colors match the brick colors. He said the applicant also provided refined details.

Vince Papsidero indicated it was hard to read the colors in the graphics presented.

Mr. Stang pointed out the light and dark gray brick, dark brown brick, and the fiber cement in a rich red of which the applicant has samples. He explained the primary materials were increased so that calculation meets Code. He said there are blank walls but that is a common issue with hotels.

Mr. Stang presented the development plan and the master plan that includes all three parcels owned by the applicant. He noted there are no real pedestrian connections through the parcels or an additional roadway connection but a number of Waivers will be needed.

Aaron Stanford inquired about the location of the dumpster as it stands out. Mr. Stang said it is difficult to incorporate it into the building because of the pool location. Mr. Stang pointed out that the enclosure for the mechanicals had been enlarged to contain them all in one area.

Mr. Papsidero inquired about the material used for the dumpster. Mr. Stang answered a darker gray brick is proposed to match the portion of the building it is adjacent to and there would be landscaping around the brick to soften the appearance.

Matt Earman suggested the dumpster be moved to the southeast portion of the building because of the orientation and the proximity to the patio area. Ray Harpham agreed.

Mr. Stang indicated the applicant may need a landscaping screen on the side of the parking located on the shared space. He said 88 spaces are proposed on the lot. He reported the applicant is establishing a parking easement so the parking count could now be 110 spaces in combination with the shared parking lot.

Mr. Stang reported that Michael Hiatt walked the site with the applicant's landscaper to discuss the existing trees and potential landscaping.

Mr. Stang indicated the case would again be reviewed by the ART on September 7, 2017.

Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He said the ART would make their recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council on September 21, 2017.

**5. BSD-SRN – Bridge Park, Block F – Mass Excavation & Demolition 4351 Dale Drive  
17-092MPR Minor Project Review**

Lori Burchett said this is a proposal for the Demolition of the existing building and mass excavation for a 2.31-acre site in Block F, which is located on the west side of Dale Drive, approximately 750 feet northwest of the intersection with West Dublin-Granville Road. 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 said stormwater and erosion control needs to be evaluated by Engineering. Aaron Stanford noted there is a lot under construction at the same time. James Peltier, EMH&T, reported the storm infrastructure was left in place so it will need to be removed. He explained they are proposing to create a head wall and temporary drainage ditch until Dale Drive is built out.

Mr. Stanford asked if there will be tree removal. Brian Quackenbush, EMH&T, answered just some trees here and there.

Mr. Stanford said this parcel is up against three sides that have finished conditions and is concerned about damage to those finished areas. He encouraged the applicant to be very careful and to ensure they do not damage more new infrastructure.

Mr. Peltier reported the water main is now abandoned. He said they will work with the City to get off-site water as it is currently running under the building. He said the same thing is true with the sewer line so they will relocate the man hole.

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He said the ART is scheduled make their determination on September 7, 2017.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any additional administrative issues or other items for discussion. [There were none.] He adjourned the meeting at 3:25 pm.

As approved by the Administrative Review Team on September 7, 2017.



## RECORD OF ACTION

# Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, July 13, 2017 | 6:30 pm

The Planning and Zoning Commission took the following action at this meeting:

**2. BSD C – TownePlace Suites by Marriott  
17-044BPR**

**5155 Upper Metro Place  
Basic Plan Review**

**Proposal:** A five-story, 64,000-square-foot hotel with 105 guest rooms along the south side of Upper Metro Place, approximately 550 feet west of the intersection with Frantz Road.

**Request:** Review and approval of a Basic Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

**Applicant:** Steven M. Roberts, Architect

**Planning Contact:** Logan Stang, Planner I.

**Contact Information:** (614) 410-4652, lstang@dublin.oh.us

**MOTION #1:** Mr. Brown moved, Ms. Salay seconded, to approve a request for five Basic Plan Waivers (#'s 1-3, 5, & 6) and disapprove a request for one Basic Plan Waiver (#4):

- 1) §153.062(O)(6)(a)(1) Front Property Line Coverage: 33% provided along Upper Metro Place.
- 2) §153.062(O)(6)(a)(1) Front Required Build Zone: 30 feet for the entire front façade.
- 3) §153.062(O)(6)(a)(3) Parking Location: Parking located in the front along Upper Metro Place.
- 4) ~~§153.062(O)(6)(b) Ground-Story Height: 14 feet.~~
- 5) §153.065(B)(1)(b)(1)(A) On-Site Parking: Parking located within principal structure area.
- 6) §153.065(I)(2)(a) Mid-Block Pedestrianways: None.

**VOTE:** 6 – 0.

**RESULT:** Five of the six requested Basic Plan Waivers were approved and one was disapproved.

**RECORDED VOTES:**

Victoria Newell	Yes
Amy Salay	Yes
Chris Brown	Yes
Cathy De Rosa	Yes
Robert Miller	Yes
Deborah Mitchell	Absent
Stephen Stidhem	Yes

**MOTION #2:** Mr. Brown moved, Mr. Stidhem seconded, to approve this Basic Plan Review because it meets the applicable review criteria, with seven conditions.

- 1) The applicant submit a preliminary and final plat either prior to or concurrently with the Site Plan Review;
- 2) The applicant continues to refine the architectural details and Building Type requirements, as part of the Site Plan Review;
- 3) That the applicant revise the civil drawings to coordinate with the proposed property configuration, prior to filing for Site Plan Review;
- 4) That the applicant continue to work with staff on the location of the northern access point with the Site Plan Review;





# RECORD OF ACTION

## Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, July 13, 2017 | 6:30 pm

The Planning and Zoning Commission took the following action at this meeting:

**2. BSD C – TownePlace Suites by Marriott  
17-044BPR**

**5155 Upper Metro Place  
Basic Plan Review**

- 5) That the applicant provide an updated tree survey and tree preservation/replacement plan with the Site Plan Review;
- 6) That the applicant submit a parking plan for the proposed adjustment with the Site Plan Review; and,
- 7) That final details regarding landscaping, lighting, utilities and stormwater management be provided with the Site Plan Review.

\*Steven Roberts agreed to the above conditions.

**VOTE:** 6 – 0.

**RESULT:** This Basic Plan Review was approved.

**RECORDED VOTES:**

Victoria Newell	Yes
Amy Salay	Yes
Chris Brown	Yes
Cathy De Rosa	Yes
Robert Miller	Yes
Deborah Mitchell	Absent
Stephen Stidhem	Yes

**MOTION #3:** Mr. Brown moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to appoint the Planning and Zoning Commission as the Required Reviewing Body.

**VOTE:** 6 – 0.

**RESULT:** The Planning and Zoning Commission will be the Required Reviewing Body.

**RECORDED VOTES:**

Victoria Newell	Yes
Amy Salay	Yes
Chris Brown	Yes
Cathy De Rosa	Yes
Robert Miller	Yes
Deborah Mitchell	Absent
Stephen Stidhem	Yes

**STAFF CERTIFICATION**



\_\_\_\_\_  
Logan Stang  
Planner I



**2. BSD C – TownePlace Suites by Marriott  
17-044BPR**

**5155 Upper Metro Place  
Basic Plan Review**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is for a five-story, 64,000-square-foot hotel with 105 guest rooms along the south side of Upper Metro Place, approximately 550 feet west of the intersection with Frantz Road. She said this is a request for a Basic Plan Review in the Bridge Street District under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066. She added the Commission is the final authority on this case.

The Chair swore in anyone interested in addressing the Commission with regard to this case.

Logan Stang reiterated this is a proposal for the construction of TownePlace Suites, which is a five-story, ±64,000-square-foot hotel. He presented an aerial view of the site and noted its unique position as it lies on the border of the Bridge Street District. He pointed out the BSD boundary with everything north being located within the district and as such means that this and the neighboring sites to the east will act as transitional pieces to existing development and Bridge Street development. He presented the existing site conditions and said the site contains a single access point to the north across from the Embassy Suites hotel and is mostly vacant with a pocket in the center and a fairly dense tree row that runs along the southern property line.

Mr. Stang presented the proposed site plan and explained the hotel will be located near the northern property line with a proposed open space along Upper Metro Place, private amenities on the south side of the building, and a 112-space parking lot. He stated the applicant is proposing to shift the existing access drive to the west to allow for the building footprint and install a new access point in the southwest corner.

Mr. Stang said the proposal includes the creation of a smaller lot, which will require a future plat application. The existing lot, he said, has a 20-foot utility easement running along the south side of Upper Metro Place, which forces the building and pavement to be further from the road. Due to this and the unique curve of Upper Metro Place, he said, a number of Waivers will be required for the building and site since there is substantially more frontage than a typical corner lot and the easement prevents construction near the roadway.

As this is the Basic Plan Review, Mr. Stang said, more details will be provided with the Site Plan Review such as the open space design, final architectural details, stormwater management, and other items. He stated the parking will require a Parking Plan as it exceeds the 125% maximum allowed by Code. He stated there are a number of landmark trees located in the southern tree row, which the applicant has been notified of and is working with staff to preserve.

Mr. Stang presented the proposed architecture that consists of two different shades of brick for the lower levels with fiber cement panels for the entire fifth floor and panels used as accents. He said the roof has varying parapet heights with a few angled parapets to provide better definition of the roof mass. The main entrance along Upper Metro Place, he said, has a canopy and curtain wall that extends to the fifth floor to define the public entrance. He stated the actual main entrance will be located on the south side of the building facing the parking lot and would have a similar canopy to what is shown for Upper Metro Place. He restated that additional materials regarding building type requirements will be provided with the final Site Plan Review.

Mr. Stang said the other component to this application is a Development Plan, which he then presented that includes the creation of a block using the existing infrastructure of Upper Metro Place and Frantz Road. He said the applicant has provided options for future phases of development including this proposal and two additional lots to the east. He stated those applications will all require separate approval processes but the existing block will not change as no street connections are proposed through

this site. As such, he noted this block will not meet certain requirements such as block width, perimeter length, mid-block pedestrianways, and a number of other items due in part to the existing layout as well as being on the edge of the BSD and not necessarily being able to provide the connections to the existing development to the south.

Mr. Stang stated there will be three motions required by the Planning and Zoning Commission this evening.

Mr. Stang presented the Waiver Review Criteria and said six proposed Basic Plan Waivers are being requested:

1. Building Type – Section 153.062(O)(6)(a)(1) – Front Property Line Coverage - Minimum of 95% coverage (required); 33% provided along Upper Metro Place (requested).
2. Building Type – Section 153.062(O)(6)(a)(1) – Front Required Build Zone – 0 to 10-foot minimum with 25% of front façade permitted between 10-20 feet (required); 20 feet for the entire front façade (requested).
3. Building Type – Section 153.062(O)(6)(a)(3) – Parking Location – Parking in rear or within the building (required). Parking located in the front along Upper Metro Place (requested).
4. Building Type – Section 153.062(O)(6)(b) – Ground Story Height – 16-foot minimum to 24-foot maximum (required). 14 feet (requested).
5. Building Type – Section 153.062(B)(1)(b)(1)(A) – On-Site Parking – Surface parking only permitted in areas not required to be occupied by a structure (required). Parking located within principal structure area (requested).
6. Building Type – Section 153.062(I)(2)(a) – Mid-Block Pedestrianways – On all blocks exceeding 400 feet in length (required); None (requested).

Mr. Stang reported the Administrative Review Team has recommended approval of all six Waivers.

Mr. Stang presented the Basic Plan Review Criteria as well as the seven conditions recommended with approval from the Administrative Review Team:

- 1) That the applicant submit a Preliminary and Final Plat either prior to, or concurrently with, the Site Plan Review;
- 2) That the applicant continues to refine the architectural details and Building type requirements, as part of the Site Plan Review;
- 3) That the applicant revise the civil drawings to coordinate with the proposed property configuration, prior to filing for Site Plan Review;
- 4) That the applicant continue to work with staff on the location of the northern access point with the Site Plan Review;
- 5) That the applicant provide an updated tree survey and tree preservation/replacement plan with the Site Plan Review;
- 6) That the applicant submit a Parking Plan for the proposed adjustment with the Site Plan Review; and,
- 7) That final details regarding landscaping, lighting, utilities and stormwater management be provided with the Site Plan Review.

Mr. Stang presented the possible Required Reviewing Bodies and stated the Commission must designate a required reviewing body for all future applications, as applicable, which could be the Administrative Review Team or the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Steve Stidhem asked if the applicant had proposed any other façade options to Staff. Mr. Stang answered what was presented this evening to the Commission is the same that was submitted with the original so no alternatives have been proposed. He added that since this is the Basic Plan Review, the conditions allow Staff to work with the applicant through to the Final Site Plan to work on the materials, design of the architecture, etc. so there is latitude moving forward.

Mr. Stidhem reported that what he found online for TownePlace Suites by Marriott was not consist at all around the country so that is why he inquired about the architecture presented. Mr. Stang restated this was the only design presented to Staff. He recalled that the applicant brought forward a pre-application in the fall of 2016 and conceptual ideas from other hotels had been presented that clued Staff in as to the direction the applicant was headed in terms of design but the design this evening is the one submitted.

Chris Brown inquired about the Architectural Master Site Plan that contains Options A and B and wanted to know if the Commission was reviewing that or if it was just showing potential development. Mr. Stang answered this property owner owns both of those properties so the intent is they could design this as a Master Plan including all three properties. He emphasized the only one getting approved this evening is this western site.

Victoria Newell inquired about landmark trees since the Commission was not provided with a tree survey. She asked where the trees are located on the site, just in general. Mr. Stang pointed out the locations of the three landmark trees. He said there was an issue with the tree survey in a portion of the site that did not appear to have been included in the survey so Staff did not have all of the details regarding the trees which is why a condition was added.

Mr. Stidhem asked if there are stormwater issues. Mr. Stang said stormwater management and open space is reviewed and required for each development. He added the Master Plan options are only conceptual at this point and could change significantly moving forward. He said stormwater details for this site will be provided with the final Site Plan but the intent is that the applicant would be using underground storage.

Cathy De Rosa asked if there was sidewalk access. Mr. Stang said there is an existing sidewalk on Upper Metro Place and the applicant would be providing connections from the main entry through their pocket park or plaza as well as a connection along the parking lot to get secondary access to the building.

The Chair invited the applicant to come forward.

Steven M. Roberts, 5803 Destiny Court, Cincinnati, Ohio, said he does not have anything to add but is here to answer any questions.

Ms. De Rosa asked why extra parking is needed. Mr. Roberts answered that the brand (Marriott) has a 100% money-back guarantee for their customers to have a parking space provided on site. He said they anticipate additional vehicles that might be towed that would take up a few extra spaces as well as a few staff members parking on site. He explained the calculations include 110% of the room count and in this case there are 105 guest rooms.

Ms. De Rosa asked how that compares to other surrounding hotels. Mr. Stang said those hotels were developed under older standards and he would have to look into it. He indicated the standard Code requires one parking space per room and the intent in the BSD is to reduce parking. For this site, he



explained, 70 spaces are required as a minimum and they are allowed to do 125% more, which would be 87 spaces. He restated the Parking Plan is needed to obtain more than that, which is 112 parking spaces. He said Staff has determined they do not desire this and do not want to set a precedent for moving forward but what helps is the property to the east, which could be developed out with complimentary uses and shared parking arrangements could be considered for the overflow and provide a cohesive project. He emphasized the property is difficult because it is on the boundary of the BSD, surrounded by existing development, so Staff is allowing accommodations for transitioning.

Ms. De Rosa asked if the extra parking would take out the existing tree row, to which Mr. Stang answered affirmatively. He said that is a concern, especially the landmark trees, and Staff is hoping to preserve as much of that as possible. He said the applicant has worked to pull the parking and the building back slightly to give more space but more than likely a lot of those trees would get removed with this application.

Ms. De Rosa asked how many parking spaces would impact those trees. Mr. Stang answered every tree along the southern line extending from the southwest corner to the southeast and beyond. He said there are a lot of trees there on this property as well as the property to the south and because the parking is so close to the property line, some of the trees off-site could be impacted as well. Ms. De Rosa said that seems congruent to what the Commission discusses often.

Ms. Newell added that is why she made the comment about the tree survey. She said she is uncomfortable taking out those trees for the sake of parking.

Mr. Roberts asked if there was a way to replace the trees and Amy Salay said there was not. Ms. Newell said the landmark trees and ages of trees are a consideration.

Gayle Frazer, 7377 Bridge Point Pass, Cincinnati, Ohio, said she is a tree hugger too. She said some of the trees are worth saving and others are not. She indicated that when they remove the understory and the Honeysuckle and all the invasive species, the tree line is not going to look as good as 80% of those trees are Hackberry and a lot of those are leaning. She said she anticipates a lot of the trees will break as they remove the understory because they are weak and lean to the northwest. She stated she would like to keep two landmark trees but the third landmark tree was in poor condition.

Mr. Brown said it would help the Commission to have a good tree survey to be able to walk the site and actually see what is being proposed. He said he understands the understory material and the Hackberry but landmark trees should be preserved whenever possible.

Ms. Newell suggested that a presentation including photographs would provide a clearer picture and platform to discuss with the Commission rather than just trying to describe the conditions only verbally. She emphasized that when a tree row like that is proposed to be removed, and there is potential for cutting down healthy trees, typically, an applicant needs to prove to the Commission the trees really need to be removed.

Ms. Frazer said it is hard to see as it is extremely overgrown. She asked if they can clear out the Honeysuckle to provide a clearer picture of the trees.

Ms. Newell affirmed that other applicants have struggled with the same challenges.

Ms. Salay said the Commission is used to walking sites. Mr. Brown said if there is a landmark tree noted on a tree survey, he will make a point to check it out to judge the health of the tree. He said if a tree is not healthy and will not last, there is no need to save it and work against ourselves.

Mr. Stidhem clarified there is nothing to the east except for grass. Mr. Stang responded that the tree row continues along both properties. Mr. Stidhem said his point is that if there is room to expand the parking to the east, as opposed to the south, if that was an option. Mr. Stang said the applicant could push the property line further to the east in order to move the parking in the south elsewhere on the site.

Mr. Stidhem asked again about the architecture and if there were other options to which the applicant answered there were not; they are using the current prototype and would not go backwards to older designs.

Mr. Brown said a lot of effort has been put into planning Metro Place including future office massing and parking. He asked how this interrelates to that.

Vince Papsidero said the difference with this location is that it falls within the BSD Code instead of separate from that process. He said the Code updates they are pursuing would be for south of this area. He said with the BSD Code, from a development standpoint, he anticipates the whole site maximized to a greater extent. He said the idea of shared parking between multiple buildings should play out over time and Staff would hold the applicant to that expectation as we see future development. At this point, he said there is not commitment regarding future development, just an opportunity depending on the market.

Mr. Roberts indicated that one of their goals was to take advantage and capture the offset peak hours that will happen between office and hotel operations.

Ms. Salay said she was concerned with the amount of fiber cement siding proposed; she would rather see brick, stone, and glass. She indicated that as we evolve and do more and more hotels in Metro Place, the quality of materials is decreasing. She stressed she does not mind the massing of the building but has issues with the materials; therefore, she cannot support the concept with the amount of fiber cement proposed or the colors. She realizes this is just a rendering, she said, but the colors are cold and remind her of February in Ohio when everything is gray and awful. She said she would prefer warmer tones and less fiber cement.

Ms. Salay suggested the parking be shifted to the east side so the trees do not have to be touched. She added that as many trees as possible should be preserved. She said the north elevation should be dressed up, given its location, to provide a 'sense of place'. She stated she does not see a good reason to have 16 feet for the first floor.

Ms. De Rosa said she visited the site again recently and noticed it has a tough curve around and asked how this can be made into this walkable space that we want it to be. She indicated we are going to have one shot at connecting this up to Frantz Road and making it walkable so making more than one part of the property interesting as we are trying to make it feel like a community rather than individual properties would be much appreciated by the Commission.

Ms. Salay asked if the Dublin Convention and Visitor's Bureau has been contacted about hotels that are coming online. She asked what their needs are in terms of a community because we do not want to overbuild hotel space only to find some not succeeding. She asked if someone can reach out to our Economic Development team and have that conversation. Mr. Stang said that could happen as Planning gets a lot of development inquiries about hotels and in the past couple of years they have seen a resurgence of hotels.

Mr. Stidhem asked where this same architectural design exists for this hotel for him to view. Mr. Roberts said there is one in Richmond, KY, which is 10 – 15 miles south of Lexington, KY.

Bob Miller inquired about mechanicals to which Mr. Roberts responded would be placed on the roof with the exception of the pool condenser that would be ground mounted. He explained the condenser would be screened on two sides by the inside corner of the building and by landscaping on the other two sides as well as the electrical transformer on the northwest side. Mr. Miller confirmed the applicant cannot do anything about the transformer.

Mr. Brown remarked there is a ton of fiber cement proposed. He said he just drove by two mid-tier hotels in New Albany, Ohio that were entirely brick so it has to be financially feasible. He emphasized the Commission does not want to see lower standards because Bridge Park is a little more special.

Ms. Newell agreed.

The Chair asked for clarification on Waivers and seven conditions before motions are made. With a Basic Plan Review, she asked if this is locking the Commission into all of those parking spaces. Mr. Stang answered not at all. He explained that with the Final Site Plan Review, the applicant has to file a Parking Plan with that to approve the adjustment over the 125% permit so it is still negotiable at this point.

Mr. Stang presented the information needed for the three motions.

Ms. De Rosa asked how the trees and parking are being handled, which Mr. Stang explained.

#### **Motion and Vote**

The Chair requested that Waiver #4 for ground story height be removed from their motion based on the discussion this evening. She said the applicant has the opportunity to further refine these details and meet the minimum story height with the site plan review. The Commission agreed unanimously to remove the ground story height waiver. [The motion reflects the reordered waivers with Waiver 4 removed]

Mr. Brown moved, Ms. Salay seconded, to approve the requested Basic Plan Waivers:

1. Building Type – Section 153.062(O)(6)(a)(1) – Front Property Line Coverage - Minimum of 95% coverage (required); 33% provided along Upper Metro Place (requested).
2. Building Type – Section 153.062(O)(6)(a)(1) – Front Required Build Zone – 0 to 10-foot minimum with 25% of front façade permitted between 10-20 feet (required); 20 feet for the entire front façade (requested).
3. Building Type – Section 153.062(O)(6)(a)(3) – Parking Location – Parking in rear or within the building (required). Parking located in the front along Upper Metro Place (requested).
4. Building Type – Section 153.062(B)(1)(b)(1)(A) – On-Site Parking – Surface parking only permitted in areas not required to be occupied by a structure (required). Parking located within principal structure area (requested).
5. Building Type – Section 153.062(I)(2)(a) – Mid-Block Pedestrianways – On all blocks exceeding 400 feet in length (required); None (requested).

The vote was as follows: Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; and Mr. Brown, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

#### **Motion and Vote**

Mr. Brown moved, Mr. Stidhem seconded, to approve the Basic Plan Review with 7 conditions:

- 1) That the applicant submit a Preliminary and Final Plat, either prior to, or concurrently with, the Site Plan Review;

- 2) That the applicant continues to refine the architectural details and Building type requirements, as part of the Site Plan Review;
- 3) That the applicant revise the civil drawings to coordinate with the proposed property configuration, prior to filing for a Site Plan Review;
- 4) That the applicant continue to work with staff on the location of the northern access point with the Site Plan Review;
- 5) That the applicant provide an updated tree survey and tree preservation/replacement plan with the Site Plan Review;
- 6) That the applicant submit a Parking Plan for the proposed adjustment with the Site Plan Review, and;
- 7) That final details regarding landscaping, lighting, utilities, and stormwater management be provided with the Site Plan Review.

The Chair asked the applicant if they agreed with the seven conditions. Steven Roberts agreed.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Miller, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; and Mr. Brown, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

### **Motion and Vote**

Mr. Brown moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to designate the Planning and Zoning Commission as the required reviewing body for all future applications, as applicable. The vote was as follows: Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; and Mr. Brown, yes. (Approved 6 – 0)

### **3. BSD SRN - Bridge Park Block H 17-055SPR**

### **John Shields Parkway/Dale Drive Site Plan Review**

~~The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is for a residential development with 64 condominiums in six buildings located within the Bridge Park Development. She said the five-acre site is on the west side of Dale Drive, south of the intersection with John Shields Parkway. She said this is a request for a review and approval of a Site Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.~~

~~The Chair swore in anyone intending on addressing the Commission in regard to this case.~~

~~Lori Burchett reported the applicant received approval for a Site Plan Review for this project in December 2016. Since then, she said, the applicants have made some changes to the individual units and to the façade. She said the changes did not meet the requirements for a Minor Project Review and therefore requires a new Site Plan Review.~~

~~Ms. Burchett presented an aerial view of the site and noted the project is located in Bridge Park, south of John Shields Parkway and north of Tuller Ridge Drive between Dale and Mooney Streets.~~

~~Ms. Burchett presented the previously approved site plan that showed 73 townhome units with a pool in the open space area for residents. She then presented the proposed site plan that showed a reduction in units to 64 to enlarge some of the units but the footprint of the buildings is relatively similar to the previously approved plan. She indicated this change is in response to market demand. She said the applicant has also removed the private pool from the open space.~~

~~Ms. Burchett stated the applicant is proposing changes to the exterior facades of the buildings. She explained that some of the porch areas have been redesigned or have shifted location, responding to changes to the interior. She said the materials and overall contemporary aesthetic is similar to the approved plan. She presented site plan elevations for H2 West and H1 West on Mooney Street for comparison. She then presented another example of the proposed changes versus the previously~~



# RECORD OF DETERMINATION

## Administrative Review Team

Thursday, July 6, 2017

The Administrative Review Team made the following determinations at this meeting:

**1. BSD C – TownePlace Suites by Marriott 17-044BPR** **5155 Upper Metro Place Basic Plan Review**

Proposal: Construction of a five-story, 64,000-square-foot hotel with 105 guest rooms along the south side of Upper Metro Place, approximately 550 feet west of the intersection with Frantz Road.

Request: Review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Basic Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066.

Applicant: Steven M. Roberts, Architect

Planning Contact: Logan Stang, Planner I; (614) 410-4652, lstang@dublin.oh.us

### REQUEST 1: BASIC PLAN WAIVERS

Request for an approval recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission for six Basic Plan Waivers:

1. §153.062(O)(6)(a)(1) – Front Property Line Coverage – Minimum of 95% coverage (required). 33% provided along Upper Metro Place (requested).
2. §153.062(O)(6)(a)(1) – Front Required Build Zone – 0-10 feet minimum with 25% of front façade permitted between 10-20 feet (required). 20 feet for the entire front facade (requested).
3. §153.062(O)(6)(a)(3) – Parking Location – Parking in rear or within building (required). Parking located in the front along Upper Metro Place (requested).
4. §153.062(O)(6)(b) – Ground Story Height – 16 feet min. to 24 feet max. (required). 14 feet (requested).
5. §153.065(B)(1)(b)(1)(A) – On-Site Parking – Surface parking only permitted in areas not required to be occupied by a structure (required). Parking located within principal structure area (requested).
6. §153.065(I)(2)(a) – Mid-Block Pedestrianways – On all blocks exceeding 400 feet in length (required). None (requested).

**Determination:** The six Basic Plan Waivers were recommended for approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission as part of the Basic Plan Review.



**REQUEST 2: BASIC PLAN REVIEW**

Request for a recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Basic Plan Review with seven conditions:

- 1) The applicant submit a Preliminary and Final Plat either prior to, or concurrently with, the Site Plan Review;
- 2) The applicant continue to refine the architectural details and Building Type requirements, as part of the Site Plan Review;
- 3) That the applicant revise the civil drawings to coordinate with the proposed property configuration, prior to filing for a Site Plan Review;
- 4) That the applicant continue to work with staff on the location of the northern access point with the Site Plan Review;
- 5) That the applicant provide an updated tree survey and tree preservation/replacement plan with the Site Plan Review;
- 6) That the applicant submit a Parking Plan for the proposed adjustment with the Site Plan Review; and
- 7) That final details regarding landscaping, lighting, utilities and stormwater management be provided with the Site Plan Review.

**Determination:** The Basic Plan was recommended for approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission with 7 conditions.

**STAFF CERTIFICATION**

  
Jennifer M. Rauch, AICP  
Planning Manager



## MEETING MINUTES

# Administrative Review Team

Thursday, July 6, 2017 | 2:00 pm

**ART Members and Designees:** Donna Goss, Director of Development; Colleen Gilger, Director of Economic Development; Ray Harpham, Interim Chief Building Official; Matt Earman, Director of Parks and Recreation; Shawn Krawetzki, Landscape Architect; Aaron Stanford, Senior Civil Engineer; and Mike Altomare, Fire Marshall.

**Other Staff:** Jennifer Rauch, Planning Manager; Claudia Husak, Senior Planner; Lori Burchett, Planner II; Logan Stang, Planner I; Nichole Martin, Planner I; Cameron Roberts, Planning Assistant; and Laurie Wright, Administrative Support II.

**Applicants:** Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners and James Peltier, EMH&T (Case 2); Dan Noble, Verizon Wireless. (Case 3); and Carter Bean, Bean Architects (Case 5).

Donna Goss called the meeting to order at 2:04 pm. She asked if there were any amendments to the June 22 meeting minutes. The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

### DETERMINATIONS

#### 1. **BSD C – TownePlace Suites by Marriott 17-044BPR**

#### **5155 Upper Metro Place Basic Plan Review**

Logan Stang said this is a proposal for construction of a five-story, 64,000-square-foot hotel with 105 guest rooms along the south side of Upper Metro Place, approximately 550 feet west of the intersection with Frantz Road. He said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Basic Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066.

Mr. Stang presented a site plan and pointed out that this property is located at the southern edge of the Bridge Street District. He said that this case had been introduced and reviewed by the ART with two concerns being the focus of conversation. He said the first was parking located within a utility easement that runs along the south side of Upper Metro Place to which the applicant has revised by shifting the east property moving everything 20 feet to the east. He said the other concern was tree preservation as there is a healthy tree row that runs along the southern property line.

Mr. Stang reported a tree survey was provided indicating the existing conditions, species, and sizes of all trees on the property. After a close inspection, he said staff identified a number of areas that were not included in the survey. He stated the applicant will be required to provide an updated survey with the Site Plan Review as well as a tree replacement and preservation plan accounting for all inches removed with this proposal.

Mr. Stang said a recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for six Waivers is recommended and he reviewed each:

1. Front Property Line Coverage
2. Front Required Build Zone



3. Parking Location
4. Ground-Story Height
5. On-Site Parking
6. Mid-Block Pedestrianway

Mr. Stang said a recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Basic Plan Review is recommended with seven conditions:

- 1) The applicant submit a Preliminary and Final Plat either prior to, or concurrently with, the Site Plan Review;
- 2) The applicant continue to refine the architectural details and Building Type requirements, as part of the Site Plan Review;
- 3) That the applicant revise the civil drawings to coordinate with the proposed property configuration, prior to filing for a Site Plan Review;
- 4) That the applicant continue to work with staff on the location of the northern access point with the Site Plan Review;
- 5) That the applicant provide an updated tree survey and tree preservation/replacement plan with the Site Plan Review;
- 6) That the applicant submit a Parking Plan for the proposed adjustment with the Site Plan Review; and,
- 7) That final details regarding landscaping, lighting, utilities and stormwater management be provided with the Site Plan Review.

Donna Goss asked if there were any questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] She called for a vote, the motion carried, and the Basic Plan Review was recommended for approval by the ART and forwarded to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the meeting on July 13th.

**2. BSD-SRN – Bridge Park Block H  
17-055SPR**

**John Shields Parkway/Dale Drive  
Site Plan Review**

~~Lori Burchett said this is a proposal for a residential development with 64 condominiums in six buildings located within the Bridge Park Development. She noted the 5-acre site is on the west side of Dale Drive, south of the intersection with John Shields Parkway. She said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Site Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066.~~

~~Ms. Burchett reported that on December 1, 2016, the Planning and Zoning Commission approved a Site Plan Review for Block H (16-097SPR-BSD) for 73 Townhome Units and related site improvements. She said changes have been proposed since that original Site Plan was approved that include:~~

- ~~• Use of fiber cement as a primary material on interior façades facing the auto-court~~
- ~~• Reduction of the total number of units from 73 to 64 units~~
- ~~• Relocation of balcony areas on some units~~
- ~~• Second story balcony and porch designs~~

~~Ms. Burchett indicated the contemporary architecture has not changed and is consistent throughout all six buildings.~~



Mr. Stang presented the proposed patio furniture (chair, table, and umbrella) and two fence details they are considering. Mr. Crader said a wood picket fence is preferred over a form of metal or wrought iron. Mr. Stang said he was concerned with the two fences proposed that the applicant would not meet the requirement of 50% opacity. Mr. Crader said they are considering the white picket wood fence as they believe the character blends better with their architecture and they would paint the fence the same color as the trim on the structure. He said other properties in Historic Dublin have a wood fence.

Claudia Husak said the proposed fence is not appropriate for a business patio enclosure. Mr. Papsidero said black metal fencing is typical for the Historic District and named several establishments with that type of fence. Two wood fence designs were proposed and Shawn Krawetzki asked the applicant which design they preferred. Mr. Crader said he preferred the fence shown on the left side of the screen. Mr. Krawetzki said the opacity is better with that design and asked the applicant to design what the fence would be with the opacity requirements and also consider using some of the detailing from the columns on the building with the fencing design.

Mr. Papsidero asked everyone to consider what the public sees. Matt Earman said black metal tends to disappear more and would be consistent with the other restaurants in the area.

Mr. Stang said the fence is to help define the character since it will rest on the property line and adjacent to the sidewalk. He said the fence needs to delineate the patio space but not block it off and suggested the fence appear more open.

Mr. Stanford inquired about the color of the pavers. Mr. Stang presented a picture of the proposed pavers and explained they would be on one side of the fence and the typical City bricks would be used on the other side for the sidewalks. Mr. Stanford said it was challenging to visualize all the elements together when they are not presented in that manner.

Mr. Crader addressed the patio furniture he is proposing. He said they are made of a Trex composite material intended to last and the design is more fitting to their brand versus the metal furniture used across the street.

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.]

Mr. Stang stated the intent is for the ART to make a recommendation to the ARB at the meeting on June 22 in order to be reviewed by the ARB on June 28, 2017.

**4. BSD C – TownePlace Suites by Marriott  
17-044BPR**

**5155 Upper Metro Place  
Basic Plan Review**

Logan Stang said this is a proposal for construction of a five-story, 64,000-square-foot hotel with 105 guest rooms along the south side of Upper Metro Place, approximately 550 feet west of the intersection with Frantz Road. He said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Basic Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066.

Mr. Stang reported issues with the site were identified. He said the proposal shows parking up to the southern property line where there is a significant tree line. He said the applicant is in the process of a tree survey as the tree line is 2.5 feet from the parking lot and they are not certain which trees are actually on their property and which belong to the adjacent property. He said the parking within the utility easement has been resolved per moving the east property line so there is no encroachment and they have condensed some of the spaces.

Mr. Stang said the proposal is fairly similar to the previous submission. He presented the proposed architecture for the north and south elevations and noted the glass curtain wall that extends vertically up all five stories at the main entrance facing Upper Metro Place indicating it is an iconic location on the facade. Additionally, he said there is a projecting overhang above the entry at the second floor level to notify visitors of the sheltered entry. He explained the entry will also be located in the proposed Open Space with outdoor seating, bike racks, upscale landscaping, and hardscaping that really helps identify it as an active space.

Mr. Stang said brick is used primarily on the facades of four floors and more fiber cement is used on the higher level – fifth floor. He explained the applicant added windows to the north and south facades to remove blank walls where there was an issue of transparency and a green screen to cover a utility room where a window was added but said a Waiver will still be needed.

Aaron Stanford inquired about the width of the drive aisle. Shane DeLong, RVP Engineering, answered 22 feet but that Marriott is requesting 24 feet in width.

Gayle Frazer, Landscape Architect, pointed out that the southern property line that is adjacent to the parking lot and neighboring development is heavily wooded with brush, Hackberry, Mullberry, and rotting Cherry trees. She asked for the ART's input for what they could put there as they pull out scrub material because they cannot plant evergreens. She said they are considering a variety of viburnums, assorted hydrangeas, or ornamental grasses. Shawn Krawetzki responded the only real option out of the three proposed were the ornamental grasses but they would not grow year round and the viburnum cannot live in a 2-foot-wide space.

Mr. Stang emphasized that the Code requires some buffering. Ms. Frazer said that will depend on the existing trees and brush that will be kept. Mr. Stang stressed that staff will work with the applicant after reviewing the tree survey. He noted that some trees have been identified as landmark trees and those should be preserved depending on where they are located.

Ms. Frazer asked what constitutes a landmark tree. Mr. Stang answered when a tree is greater than 24 caliper inches in size. He cautioned the applicant that the PZC is passionate about preserving or replacing as many trees as possible. Mr. Krawetzki added that a minimum of a 24-foot radius is needed for a landmark tree in order to protect the root zone.

Ms. Frazer asked if adjustments could be made involving the three landscape islands around trees to which Mr. Stang indicated would require a Waiver but staff would be supportive if it meant preserving landmark trees.

Steven Roberts, Architect, asked if buffering has to be vegetation or if another material could be used to provide coverage for all four seasons. He asked if a green screen ivy broken up with grasses would be appropriate. Mr. Stang responded he would look into the code requirements further.

Ray Harpham inquired about mechanicals. Mr. Roberts answered all the mechanicals are located on the roof except the filtration system for the pool and an electrical transformer. Mr. Harpham then asked about screening. Mr. Roberts said there are very tall parapets planned for on the roof.

Mr. Stang said July 6 is scheduled for the ART's recommendation to the PZC and July 13 would be the meeting for the PZC to review this proposal.

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.]

14) That the applicant provide documentation of an ADA accessible path from the structured parking garage to the building, at the time of building permitting.

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He confirmed the Administrative Departures were approved and a recommendation of approval for the Parking Plan and Site Plan Review will be forwarded to the Architectural Review Board.

**3. BSD-SCN – Flourish Chiropractic – Sign  
17-048MPR**

**6677 Dublin Center Drive  
Minor Project Review**

Nick Badman said this is a request for the installation of an internally-illuminated wall sign for a tenant space located within the Dublin Village Center. He said the site is approximately 1,200 feet northwest of the intersection of Dublin Center Drive and Village 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 and §153.150 through §153.164.

Mr. Badman presented the aerial view of the site. He reported the following BSD Sign Code Amendment became effective March 29, 2017:

- Only applicable to existing buildings in select BSD zonings
- 'Existing buildings' are those that do not comply with BSD form-based building types
- Signs for these buildings/tenant spaces will comply with the 'Standard' Sign Code until they are redeveloped
- Ensures signs are consistent with the style of development
  - Auto-oriented = fewer, larger signs
  - Pedestrian-oriented = more, smaller signs

Mr. Badman presented the proposed wall sign that is approximately 11.8 square feet in size and 12 feet above grade for a single tenant in a multi-tenant building with ±24 feet of frontage facing a parking lot along Dublin Center Drive. He said the sign is comprised of black aluminum channel letters with black trim cap, white face letters, a white vinyl stripe, and no secondary image. He said the sign meets all of the Code requirements that include number/type, size, location, height, color, and secondary image. He said the application meets the Minor Project Review criteria as well.

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

- 1) That any future permanent window signs for the tenant space be reviewed and approved by the Administrative Review Team prior to sign permitting and installation.

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He confirmed approval for the Minor Project Review.

**INTRODUCTIONS**

**4. BSD C – TownePlace Suites by Marriott  
17-044BPR**

**5155 Upper Metro Place  
Basic Plan Review**

Logan Stang said this is a request for the construction of a five-story, 64,000-square-foot hotel with 105 guest rooms along the south side of Upper Metro Place, approximately 550 feet west of the intersection with Frantz Road. He said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Basic Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066.

Mr. Stang presented the location plan of the site, as well as a conceptual future site plan for the entire property (two of the three proposed parcels remain vacant with this proposal). Per the location plan, the building appears to be located as close to Upper Metro Place as possible, given the 20-foot easement that

runs along the south side of the road. He explained the applicant will not meet the Required Build Zone requirement, so a Waiver will be needed. He said the hotel has five stories with parking at the rear of the hotel.

Mr. Stang said a new access point is proposed requiring a new curb cut on the southwest portion of the site. He indicated that staff is questioning the location of the mechanicals and the dumpster. He said it appears that parking in the southwest portion of the site would encroach into the 20-foot utility easement, which is a problem. An entrance would be shared with the site next door.

Mr. Stang indicated the civil plans and architectural plans differ in terms of lot lines. He asked the applicant if they plan to adjust the lot lines later and if they do, he will need clarification and a separate process will ensue.

Mr. Stang presented the floor plans for the first and second floors and indicated floors three through five match the second floor. He noted this is an extended stay hotel.

Mr. Stang presented the architectural renderings for each of the elevations. He suggested the applicant remove all the signs shown on the plans for now as that is not part of this application. He confirmed the materials were brick, glass, and fiber cement panels. Steve Roberts, Architect, said the primary materials are brick, stone, and glass but fiber cement panels were also to be used. In terms of colors, gray and tan bricks are proposed and the fiber cement panels are to be various shades of gray and tan depending on the placement.

Mr. Stang pointed out that large blank walls are an issue (they appear to enclose the stairwells). He stated blank walls that are 27 feet wide by five stories high are not appropriate; the walls will need detailing. He also noted that the transparency amount is fairly low but hotels are unique. Mr. Roberts explained the stairs are tucked internally so it may be possible to add windows on those guest room walls to break up the blank walls and increase transparency.

Mr. Roberts noted there are also canopies on the south side, which is the parking lot side and the north elevation will have an overhang at the entrance. Vince Papsidero suggested the applicant create a stronger visual presence at the entrance along Upper Metro Place.

Mr. Roberts noted the curtain wall will extend to the top of the elevation creating an additional element at the entrance that helps to define the space. He said the open space will also help define the location from Upper Metro Place.

Mr. Stang emphasized that Staff needs to see a stronger presence at the street side entrance even though it is not the main entrance as that is to the rear with the parking lot.

Mr. Stang said staff would like to see a tree survey earlier rather than later; it must demonstrate the existing conditions and what is being removed, etc. He said the landscape plan needs more detail but that will come with the Site Plan Review. He inquired about the pocket park near the street entrance. Mr. Roberts said that may become a place for dining or bike racks; it is not programmed yet.

Mr. Stang said the applicant exceeds parking by four spaces, which will require a Waiver but staff does not typically support extra spaces and asked the applicant to consider changing the layout. Mr. Roberts said the hotel wants one space for every guest room and there are 105 rooms proposed; all the parking is on-site as there is no on-street parking available.

Mr. Roberts inquired about accessory uses. He said only guests will use the facilities like the pool or the restaurant and wants to ensure the parking spaces are being calculated accurately. Ideally, he said they would prefer to have more than one space for every room as someone might be traveling with a trailer, etc. and require extra space.

Mr. Roberts addressed the question about the location for the dumpster and mechanicals. He explained he thought the location chosen was the lesser of all evils for the dumpster, pool heater, and HVAC units to all fit along one side. He indicated traffic will come from the east and he also does not want the dumpster anywhere near the pool patio. As proposed, Donna Goss asked if the turn radius will accommodate the garbage trucks to which Mr. Roberts said it would.

Aaron Stanford asked the applicant if he envisions a lot split or a plat in order to further develop the site. Mr. Stang said the master plan might trigger a Development Plan as it involves the creation of multiple lots and an existing block. Mr. Stanford questioned whether there have been multiple lot splits achieved already in Upper Metro. Mr. Stang indicated there was a plat for two parcels but would verify the information. He added that if the land were to develop further in the future, a lot split could be achieved at that time.

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.]

**5. BSD SRN - Bridge Park East, Blocks A, B & C  
17-045MSP**

**Riverside and Dale Drives  
Master Sign Plan**

Nichole Martin said this is a request for a Master Sign Plan for Blocks A, B and C within the Bridge Park Development. She said the site is on the east side of Riverside Drive at the intersection with Bridge Park Avenue. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Master Sign Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066.

Ms. Martin presented the blocks included in the Bridge Park East Development. She presented the sign design for the event center named "The Exchange" in block A that was previously recommended for approval by the ART at a size of 100 square feet. She also presented the proposed newly revised west facing sign that has flowing text at a size of 103 square feet. She described the pin mounted letters as being 3 inches wide and 5 inches deep made of anodized aluminum to be painted to match "Driftwood Mica Cool PVDF-2". She said the letters will be internally illuminated and have a perforated face backed with white acrylic. She stated the east façade will have a similar design but will be much smaller at 41 square feet, whereas the previous sign proposed was 40 square feet in size.

Aaron Stanford indicated he preferred the first version of the "Exchange" sign the ART was shown and was concerned that the revised sign is not easy to read, especially from a distance. Several members expressed agreement with Mr. Stanford's comment.

Claudia Husak asked why the square footage changed from 100 square feet to 103 square feet. Matt Starr, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, explained the square footage increased due to the font style. Ms. Husak supported consistency with the previous ART and PZC action regarding the original proposal for this sign.

Jeff Tyler said the sign is oriented towards pedestrian activity but vehicles will also be driving by and it should be visible and legible to them as well.

On a separate matter, Ms. Martin explained the Master Sign Plan previously permitted full window coverage serving as a Leasing Window Cover during vacancy and turnover with a logo that may occupy ≤30% but the information used either had to state Crawford Hoying or Bridge Park. She said the applicant is now requesting the same type of storefront window sign to serve as a Tenant Leasing Window Cover, during construction and for up to 180 days as the tenants want to announce they are "coming soon". She said the solid background color would be gray with white letters and up to three colors and again, the graphic element is limited to 30%.

Ms. Martin stated the applicant is also proposing a single, one-square-foot window sign indicating the name of the business and/or a logo to be permitted only on a public entrance to the tenant space. This would not require a sign permit, provided not more than one low-chroma, neutral color is used, such as black,