



## MEETING MINUTES

# Administrative Review Team

Thursday, February 10, 2022 | 2:00 pm

5200 Emerald Parkway

Development Building – Large Conference Room

### CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Rauch welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order at 2:04 pm.

### ROLL CALL

ART Members and Designees present: Jennifer Rauch, Planning Director, (Chair); Brad Fagrell, Building Standards Director; Heidi Rose, Civil Engineer II; Jenna Goehring, Economic Development Administrator; Jake Stoll, Sergeant of the Police Department; and Chad Hamilton, Fire Inspector.

Staff Members present: Christopher Will, Planner II; Nichole Martin, Senior Planner; and Laurie Wright, Administrative Assistant II.

Applicants present: (Case 1) Kerry La Prees, Thomas English Retail Real Estate; (Case 2) Ben Penturi, Ford & Associates Architects, Inc., James Whitacre, Advance Civil Design; Brice Harrison, Pete Gray, and Emily Wieringa, VanTrust.

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Rauch made a motion and Mr. Fagrell seconded to approve the minutes from the January 13, 2022, meeting.

Votes: Ms. Goehring, yes; Ms. Rose, yes; Sergeant Stoll, yes; Mr. Hamilton, yes; Mr. Fagrell, yes; and Ms. Rauch, yes.

The minutes were approved 6 – 0.

### DETERMINATION

#### 1. 3800 Tuller Road, 21-192MPR, Minor Project Review

This request is for exterior modifications to an existing building on a 1.87-acre site zoned Bridge Street District, Sawmill Center Neighborhood. The site is located northeast of the intersection of Tuller Road with Dublin Center Drive.

#### Staff Presentation

Mr. Will presented an aerial view of the site and photographs of the existing conditions of the building, which was previously a bank. There is a glass canopy attached to the building used for a drive-thru. The applicant has proposed to remove the north glass canopy, the previous window used for drive-thru bank tellers, and the tubing, which served as the canister system. Asphalt that will be removed during the removal of the canopy supports will need to be replaced. The width of the drive aisle will be reduced.

This Minor Project was reviewed against the Minor Project Review Criteria. Approval is recommended with two conditions:

- 1) That the applicant work with Staff to match the existing brick on the building, subject to Staff approval; and
- 2) That the applicant work with Engineering and Planning Staff to meet the maximum drive aisle width of 24 feet on the north side of the building as required by Code, subject to Staff approval.

### **Applicant Presentation**

Kerry La Prees, Thomas English Retail Real Estate, joined the meeting virtually on the phone and stated he did not have anything more to add.

### **Questions for the Applicant**

Ms. Rose – Questioned the one-way path shown as the outer ring. The width is 24 feet so that could be turned into a two-way lane. She appreciated the reduction in pavement. She requested curb modifications near the drive entrance.

Ms. Rauch – Questioned if any public open space is required or if there will be an outdoor relief/play area for the business.

Mr. La Prees – The extent of the work is shown on the drawing. He was not sure if the tenant will pursue an outdoor area.

Ms. Martin – Per the Zoning Code's use specific standards, all activities for a veterinary offices/hospitals are required to occur indoors for this type of business.

### **Public Comments**

No public comments were received on this case.

### **Team members' discussion**

Ms. Rauch – There were no additional questions or comments.

Ms. Goehring made a motion and Mr. Fagrell seconded, to approve the Minor Project with two conditions:

- 1) That the applicant work with Staff to match the existing brick on the building, subject to Staff approval; and
- 2) That the applicant work with Engineering and Planning Staff to meet the maximum drive aisle width of 24 feet on the north side of the building as required by Code, subject to Staff approval.

**Votes:** Mr. Hamilton, yes; Sergeant Stoll, yes; Ms. Rose, yes; Ms. Rauch, yes; Mr. Fagrell, yes; and Ms. Goehring, yes.

[The Minor Project was approved 6 – 0.]

## **INTRODUCTION**

### **2. 6777 Crosby Court, 22-013WID-DP, Minor Project Review**

This application is for the construction of ±140,000-square-foot, flex/industrial building located within the West Innovation District. The 9.34-acre site is zoned ID-3, Research Assembly District and is located southwest of the intersection of Crosby Court with Dublin Plain City Road.



## Staff Presentation

Ms. Martin presented an aerial view of the site and photographs of the existing conditions. The site is located within the West Innovation District (WID) in the most western part of the City. The site is presently owned by the City of Dublin and is proposed to be developed in partnership with VanTrust.

Ms. Martin reviewed the process for the WID, which starts with a Development Plan reviewed by the ART to be followed by a Site Plan Review that requires review by the Planning and Zoning Commission.

The Development Plan proposal is for construction of a 140,000-square-foot flex office industrial building, which is a permitted use within the WID. Noting this is an introduction, ART will be asked to approve the site/building layout, architecture, landscaping, and stormwater at their March 10, 2022 meeting. Two items require Site Plan review by the PZC, specifically parking count and parking location.

Ms. Martin stated two vehicular access points are proposed along Crosby Court. No vehicular access is proposed along Dublin-Plain City Road or Houchard Road. The southern access point on Crosby Court provides access to loading docks and the northern access point provides access to employee and visitor parking. A total of 171 parking spaces are proposed where 63 are permitted. Compliance with required building and pavement setback will need to be confirmed, prior to ART's formal consideration. Engineering has identified that the stormwater management basin requires further design revision to ensure compliance with all applicable regulations. A landscape plan is also provided that provides dense buffering along Dublin-Plain City Road in alignment with PZC's request. The ART will also be asked to approve architecture. The architectural character is compatible with surrounding structures including Command Alkon and VaData. The building is proposed to be clad in precast concrete wall panels, metal accent panels, and an aluminum storefront. The building is shades of gray and white with a blue accent band.

## Applicant Presentation

Brice Harrison, VanTrust – He had questions on utilities, landscape, and encroachment. He did not believe there was an encroachment. Updated elevations were provided, prior to the meeting.

## Questions for the Applicant

Ms. Rose – The retention basin needs to meet the requirements in the design manual, which this plan does not meet, currently.

Ms. Rauch – Asked the members if there were any other site layout or access concerns.

Ms. Rose – On-site circulation could be improved by connecting both entrances with a drive-aisle. This would remove the need to use Crosby Court to circulate the site.

Ms. Rauch – Improvement of the on-site circulation could also add parking.

Mr. Harrison – From an operational perspective, a separate truck entry is preferred.

Mr. Hamilton – Noted all fire access routes are required to have heavy duty pavement.

Pete Gray – Asked what type of heavy duty pavement would be required.

Mr. Hamilton – The auto-turn needs to demonstrate adequate maneuverability around the site. The current configuration requires a turnaround point.

Mr. Penturi – Asked if there were approval implications if adding the connection increased lot coverage above 70%.

Ms. Rose – That may depend on the final design.

Ms. Rauch – There could also be some give and take elsewhere on the site to mitigate the small increase in lot coverage.



Mr. Harrison – Restated from an operational standpoint, keeping the front and truck entrances separate is preferred.

Mr. Gray – Asked if permeable pavers over grass with 'Emergency Use Only' would suffice.

Ms. Rose – Pavers are not acceptable. A 'No Through-Traffic' sign could be posted but would be challenging to enforce.

Mr. Hamilton – The drawing illustrates the separation of provisions necessary for fire service north of the employee drive where water is coming in. The Washington Township Fire Department would prefer this be consolidated.

Mr. Gray – Stated a hydrant is accessible.

Mr. Hamilton – Asked if the Fire Department Connection (FDC) hydrant could be shifted to the north side of the north entrance.

Ms. Rose – The proposed location for the water service tap is in very close proximity to the existing service for the site to the east. Staff prefers to expand coverage rather than duplicate it.

Mr. Gray – Answered he was aware of that.

Mr. Harrison – Asked if a water line extension is required?

Ms. Rose – The City will not require the water line to be extended at this time.

Mr. Fagrell – Asked what rationale or model was used to determine the amount of parking proposed.

Mr. Harrison – This is a successful layout used elsewhere, which tries to build in flexibility for how the building is used when it's outfitted for users.

Ms. Rauch – Asked if the applicant would consider less parking.

Mr. Harrison – The parking has already been slightly decreased to allow for the buffer.

Ms. Rauch – The Planning and Zoning Commission is supportive of parking on all sides but requested justification or data to substantiate the need.

Ms. Rauch – The ART appreciates the incorporation of the landscape buffer to screen parking along Dublin-Plain City Road. Clarification was requested regarding required building and pavement setbacks along public roads.

Ms. Martin – In review of the Zoning Code, the three-sided site with three public frontages is considered to have three front yards.

Mr. Fagrell – Asked if an entrance was proposed along Houchard Road.

Ms. Martin – No, all access is provided from Crosby Court.

Ms. Rauch – From an operations and marketing perspective, the understanding is the size of the building needs to be optimized. She asked if more landscaping could be provided due to the proximity to three adjacent public streets, even at the cost of a decreased building footprint.

Mr. Harrison – Clarification was requested for the City's tree removal and replacement policy.

Ms. Rauch – Staff member Brian Martin can clarify and answer any additional questions. The City's policy is to preserve trees that are 6-inch calibers or greater in size that are in good condition. Trees removed of that size that are removed must be replaced.

Ms. Martin – As part of the review process, an applicant needs to provide a tree survey. Trees less than 6 caliper inches, in poor condition, or dead would not need to be replaced. If a significant number of trees are to be removed, the applicant should consider a mound with a 3:1 grade ratio that is planted with clustered trees.

Mr. Penturi – Asked if the City would clear the trees since the property is currently owned by the City, prior to the purchase by this applicant.

Ms. Martin – Staff strongly encouraged the applicant to provide a tree survey that includes the species, size and condition of all the trees on the property, noting it is not the City's practice to clear trees without study.

Ms. Rauch – The applicant can continue to work with the City's zoning inspector, Brian Martin.



## Public Comments

A public comment was received from Mark Harris, VP of Command Alkon on Crosby Court.

Ms. Martin read his statement as follows:

Mr. Harris expressed concern over traffic congestion on Crosby Court stemming from the VaData facility. He noted traffic often backs up and blocks the Command Alkon driveway entrance. He is concerned additional development will worsen the traffic.

Ms. Rauch – The City will look into this claim that VaData is causing traffic problems.

Mr. Whitacre – Existing traffic created by VaData is due to the security check-point located close to the Crosby Court cul-de-sac. This is mostly construction traffic at certain times of the day and predicts when construction is complete the traffic would no longer occur.

Ms. Rauch – Appreciated making the entrances architecturally prominent.

Ms. Martin – From an architecture perspective, the applicant needs to demonstrate how the mechanicals will be screened.

Mr. Fagrell – Inquired about the parapet height.

Mr. Whitacre – The parapet will be as high as it can possibly be made. The applicant would additionally consider mechanical screens for on-roof elements.

Mr. Fagrell – Inquired about the small, light-colored squares shown on the building.

Mr. Whitacre – The squares are clerestory windows.

Ms. Rose – Noted the applicant is required to resubmit through Eplan early next week.

Ms. Rauch – Summarized the primary elements of discussion were parking location, setbacks, and lot coverage, tree preservation, and stormwater design.

## ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Rauch asked if there were any other comments or questions.

Ms. Rauch adjourned the meeting at 2:50 pm.

