

**FACILITIES & PARTNERSHIPS SUBCOMMITTEE**

**October 5, 2020**

Due to the ongoing situation with COVID-19 and pursuant to H.B. 197, this Community Center Feasibility Task Force, Facilities & Partnerships Sub-Committee Meeting was convened in a hybrid in-person and remote format via video-conference using Zoom.

This meeting was called to order by Chair Comfort at 3:00 p.m.

**SUBCOMMITTEE**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Subcommittee Chairperson Greg Comfort, Yanitza Brongers-Marrero, Wendy Gomez, Chuck Manofsky and Bill Westbrook

**SUBCOMMITTEE**

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** None

**TASK FORCE MEMBERS**

**PRESENT:** Chairperson Margie Pizzuti, Chairperson Nick Lashukta, Linda Mauger, Linda Moulakis

**STAFF PRESENT:**

City Manager Steve Schoeny, Assistant City Manager Dan Ralley, Community Affairs Director Emma Speight, Parks & Recreation Director Debbie McLaughlin, Parks Planning & Development Manager Jeff Anderson, Economic Development Director Joseph Henderson, City Attorney Darren Shulman

**CONSULTANTS**

**PRESENT:** Nan Weir, Williams Architects; Aaron Domini/Rick Fay, OHM

**GUESTS**

**PRESENT:** Frank Kass, Continental Real Estate

**1. Welcome / Opening Remarks**

Chair Comfort welcomed attendees and explained the ZOOM/in person hybrid format. He then shared how the subcommittee had reached a ranking for the top two sites for further investigation. Kingsdale was ranked as the number one site

and MSC as number two. He explained that the goal would be for the subcommittee to make a recommendation on a single site to the full Task Force.

**1a. Motion to Approve the September 14, 2020 Facilities & Partnership Subcommittee Minutes**

Mr. Westbrook moved, seconded by Ms. Gomez, to approve the minutes of the September 14, 2020 Facilities & Partnership Subcommittee Meeting.

**VOTING AYE:** Comfort, Brongers-Marrero, Gomez, Manofsky, Westbrook

**VOTING NAY:** None

**ABSENT:** None

Motion carried.

**2. Presentation of Preliminary Site Concepts and Building Staking**

Nan Weir began the presentation with a reminder of the Core Activities that were recommended in Phase I and then Rick Fay gave an overview of the site evaluation and selection process, including a parking analysis. Following this Nan shared preliminary blocking and stacking diagrams, but explained that they were still very early in the process. The first site shared was the MSC site and included a conceptual site plan. This concept included administrative and police functions in the same building as the community center.

Frank Kass then shared the concept for the overall Kingsdale development, giving an overview of the parking and three different buildings planned for the site. This included an alternative site plan that allocated space for the community center. After this Nan shared a blocking and staking diagram for how a community center could fit within the allotted space.

At the end of her presentation Nan shared a calendar with upcoming meetings including focus groups and a community meeting. She indicated that development of potential costs would be part of the next step along with additional development of the concepts.

**3. Discussion of Concepts and Next Steps**

Following the presentation, subcommittee members asked a series of questions.

Bill Westbrook asked for further explanation of how the community center building on the Kingsdale site was located in relation to the office uses. Nan clarified that the offices would be located in the same building as the community center, but on the upper floors.



Yanitza Brongers-Marrero asked for additional detail on how the community center uses on the Kingsdale site would relate to the other buildings being proposed. Nan responded that as they continue to develop the concepts in more detail, they will be able to adjust each building concepts to the specifics of each site.

Greg Comfort asked about potential traffic impacts and the need for additional traffic study on both sites. Nan indicated that traffic flow would be something they continue to study as they develop the plans. Greg also clarified that Williams had looked at options at the MSC site that preserved the existing building, but that these required a separate parking garage and that it was very difficult to work around the existing building.

Wendy Gomez asked for additional detail on how the other buildings in the Kingsdale development might change depending on whether or not the community center was built. Frank provided additional information on the amenities that would be included in the senior housing and the populations that they would serve. He clarified that there was the same amount of office in both options.

Chuck Manofsky asked about the schedule for the Continental development and Frank provided detail on their schedule for closing on the property.

City Manager Steve Schoeny asked what Continental planned to do with the blue bricks. Frank shared that they did not want them, but that they may try to make them available to the community.

Bill Westbrook requested that Williams Architects provide some photos and examples of vertically stacked community centers for the committee to review, which they agreed to provide.

Greg asked for additional detail on the office located on the Kingsdale site and City Manager Schoeny explained that the City felt the office use would be very desirable given the proximity to various amenities.

Greg shared that he felt there was potential for more synergy at the Kingsdale location. Yanitza agreed with Greg and also brought up that the design should provide an enhanced pedestrian connection on the south side of the site for people accessing the community center from Northwest Blvd. Bill brought up that the potential for expansion should be considered on each site.

Greg indicated that next Monday would not be enough time to revise the concepts and recommended that the revised concepts and costs be reviewed at the October 26<sup>th</sup> meeting.

#### **4. Public Comment**

Task Force Chairperson Margie Pizzuti thanked the subcommittee, consultants, and City staff. Task Force member Linda Moulakis asked if the subcommittee would recommend one site to City Council. There was consensus among the subcommittee that recommending one site would be the preferred approach.

\* \* \*

The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairperson

ATTEST:   
\_\_\_\_\_


Secretary

Secretary



City of Upper Arlington

Community Center Feasibility Task Force – Facilities & Partnerships Subcommittee Meeting



City of Upper  
Arlington®

# Community Center Feasibility Study

## Facilities Sub-Committee Meeting 5 October 2020



# OVERVIEW OF PRESENTATION

Opening Remarks

Core Activities

Site Evaluation and Selection

Preliminary Concept Development

Municipal Services Center Site – Municipal Services & Community Center

Kingsdale Site - Mixed Use Development


Kingsdale Site - Community Center

Next Steps - Upcoming Meetings

Oct. 7 - Stakeholder Focus Group Meetings

Oct. 8 – Stakeholder Focus Groups Meetings

Oct. 8 – Community Meeting




City of **Upper  
Arlington**<sup>®</sup>



# Community Center Feasibility Study

CORE ACTIVITIES



City of Upper  
Arlington®

# Core Activities



Pickleball



Basketball



Swim Lessons



Lap / Fitness Swim



Volleyball



Badminton



Exercise



Active Play

ATHLETICS

AQUATICS



# Core Activities



Health & Fitness

EXERCISE



Adventure Play



Group X - Yoga / Pilates / TRX / Aerobics

GROUP FITNESS

# Core Activities



Exercise - Silver Sneakers



Arts & Crafts



Arts & Crafts



Dance Class



Café Meet-Ups



Meeting Space

SENIORS

CULTURAL

# Core Activities



Culinary



Art Exhibitions



Indoor Play



Kid's Activities



Community Events

MULTI-USE



Inclusivity



Gaming

YOUTH




Teens




# Community Center Feasibility Study

SITE EVALUATION  
& SELECTION



City of *Upper*  
**Arlington**<sup>®</sup>



PRELIMINARY SITE EVALUATION															Total	
SITE NAME	SITE AREA (acres)	SITE AREA NOTES	SITE CONTROL	Factor (2)	LOCATION PROTECTS EXISTING PARKLAND	Factor (1.5)	LOCATION HAS ABILITY FOR CREATIVE FUNDING	Factor (1.5)	LOCATION IS ACCESSIBLE TO ALL MODES OF TRANSPORTATION	Factor (1)	LOCATION SUPPORTS MULTIGENERATIONAL USE, PARTICULARLY SENIORS AND MIDDLE/ HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS	Factor (1)	SITE IS CENTRALLY LOCATED	Factor (2)		Rank
<b>Fancyburg Park</b>	23		5	10	1	1.5	1	1.5	3	3	2	2	3	6	24	5
<b>Kingsdale</b>	6.2	Integrated with mixed use development	4	8	5	7.5	5	7.5	5	5	5	5	5	10	43	1
<b>MSC</b>	7.4	Integrated with city administration, terminates view from Southbound Kenny Rd.	5	10	4	6	5	7.5	4	4	3	3	4	8	38.5	2
<b>Northam Park</b>	23		5	10	1	1.5	3	4.5	5	5	5	5	5	10	36	3
<b>Northwest Kiwanis Park/ Burbank Park</b>	27.6		5	10	1	1.5	1	1.5	2	2	2	2	1	2	19	8
<b>Reed Road Park</b>	18.8	Site access and parking is through school property; ballfields are part of school programming; ac. includes fire	3	6	1	1.5	3	4.5	2	2	3	3	4	8	25	4
<b>Sunny95 Park</b>	14.7	Limited access, deep within neighborhood.	5	10	1	1.5	1	1.5	3	3	2	2	1	2	20	7
<b>Thompson Park</b>	49.4		5	10	1	1.5	1	1.5	2	2	2	2	2	4	21	6
			City owned (5), control via a partner (5), or no control requiring acquisition (1); developer partner opportunity (3).		Development would not reduce existing parkland (5), or development would reduce existing parkland (1)		Location can be part of a TIF, partnership, or other creative funding mechanism (5); no creative funding mechanism available related to site location (1);		Location is accessible via walking, bike, public transportation immediately adjacent, and cars (5); less than all modes above and/ or limitations to access (range 1-4)		Location is conducive to being accessible for both seniors and students (5); location may be more limited to access by either or both groups (range 1-4)		Rate central location (range 1-5)			


Footnotes

1. Ohio State University adjacent property: OSU ownership and not available.
2. Griggs Reservoir Park: city of Columbus ownership and not available.
3. Tremont Center: private ownership, not currently available, well-tenanted with local businesses.
4. Tree of Life: private ownership, not currently available; zoning not compatible.
5. Smith Nature Park: Insufficient acreage, and significant natural features.
6. Miller Park: Insufficient acreage, and significant natural features.
7. Senior Center: Insufficient acreage without absorbing adjacent Board of Education owned property and existing recreation facilities.

SITE NAME	PREFERRED SITE EVALUATION																											
	SITE SIZE (Parcel Acres)	SITE SIZE (potential building area acres)	SITE ACQUISITION COST	Weight Factor (1.5) / Score	SITE/BUILDING DEVELOPMENT COST	Weight Factor (1.2) / Score	SITE IS CENTRALLY LOCATED	Weight Factor (1.2) / Score	INFRASTRUCTURE/STORMWATER CONSIDERATIONS	Weight Factor (1) / Score	ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS	Weight Factor (1) / Score	ACCESSIBILITY - VEHICULAR	Weight Factor (1) / Score	ACCESSIBILITY - WALKABLE	Weight Factor (1.2) / Score	PARKING CONSIDERATIONS	Weight Factor (1.1) / Score	ZONING / NEIGHBORHOOD COMPATIBILITY	Weight Factor (1.2) / Score	ABILITY TO EXPAND AND GROW	Weight Factor (1) / Score	PARTNERSHIP OPPORTUNITIES	Weight Factor (1) / Score	ACHIEVES OTHER COMMUNITY GOALS/ECONOMIC GOALS	Weight Factor (1.1) / Score	Total Score	
<b>Kingsdale</b>	6.2	6.2	3	4.5	3	3.6	5	6	3	3	5	5	5	5	5	6	5	5.5	5	6	2	2	3	3	3	3	3.3	<b>52.9</b>
<b>MSC</b>	7.4	7.4	5	7.5	4	4.8	4	4.8	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	4.8	4	4.4	4	4.8	3	3	3	3	3	3	3.3	<b>50.4</b>

PREFERRED SITE EVALUATION REMARKS														
SITE NAME	SITE SIZE (Parcels/Acre)	SITE SIZE (potential building site acres)	SITE ACQUISITION COST	SITE/BUILDING DEVELOPMENT COST	SITE IS CENTRALLY LOCATED	INFRASTRUCTURE/STORMWATER CONSIDERATIONS	ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS	ACCESSIBILITY - VEHICULAR	ACCESSIBILITY - WALKABLE <small>(WALKSCORE.COM)</small>	PARKING CONSIDERATIONS	ZONING / NEIGHBORHOOD COMPATIBILITY	ABILITY TO EXPAND AND GROW	PARTNERSHIP OPPORTUNITIES	ACHIEVES OTHER COMMUNITY GOALS/ECONOMIC GOALS
<b>Instructions</b>	X acres	X acres	Low, medium, or high with notes describing acquisition.	Low, medium, or high with notes describing development considerations.	Indicate where the site is located and how 'central' the site is.	Describe the availability of existing infrastructure, cost to upgrade, and storm water impacts.	Note if there are any environmental concerns or benefits.	Describe how accessible the site is by vehicle, good access, signalized intersections, etc.	Describe how accessible the site is by walking and biking. Are there: good access, signalized intersections, etc.	Describe parking conditions, is there ample parking, opportunity for shared parking.	Description of the zoning of the property and how it fits in the context of the neighborhood.	Indicate if the site has the opportunity to expand and grow over time for indoor and outdoor activities.	Does the site particularly lend itself to being developed under a partnership, or being available for provider/ operator/ wellness partnerships?	Does the project achieve other community goals and economic benefits?
<b>Kingsdale</b>	6.2	6.2	Medium: ability to coordinate with developer partner	High: construction through development partner; shared elements with mixed uses (parking, access, utilities); ability to use TIF	Middle; central; access via city arterial streets	All available utilities; stormwater limited to urban techniques	No significant natural features; impervious site.	Highly accessible site from city arterial streets: Tremont Road and Northwest Blvd. Access to signalized intersections on both streets shared with shopping center to the south.	<b>Walk Score: 68</b> Highly walkable from adjacent neighborhoods, access to signals <b>Transit Score: 32</b> Public Transit access via COTA route 3 and 32 on Tremont Road (directly adjacent) and Northwest Blvd (+/- 250' south). <b>Bike Score: 57</b> Bike lane existing on Tremont; COGO station located at Northwest/ Zollinger (.25 mi.)	Parking would be developed with mixed use development and shared among uses. Structured parking likely necessary to maintain urban forms.	Zoning: PMUD Kingsdale - Town center with a mix of uses including office, retail, residential, and civic.  Compatible with the vision of the PMUD as a civic use, integrated in and supportive of a mixed use district with strong connectivity to neighborhoods.	No - likely limited, if any future growth ability, unless vertical.	Developer partnership opportunity; health partnerships may be limited due to proximity and current lease agreements.	Supports urban redevelopment of a vacant building in an urban core. Will help to support adjacent businesses
<b>MSC</b>	7.4	7.4	Low: currently owned by city	Medium: coordinate reuse of existing building or replace; potentially ability to use TIF	Middle: slightly central; access via city arterial streets	All available utilities; stormwater limited to urban techniques	Existing greenspaces with mature trees	Highly accessible site from city arterial streets: Tremont Road and Kenny Road. No signals.	<b>Walk Score: 32</b> Existing sidewalks, few signalized intersections; continuous right at Tremont/ Kenny <b>Transit Score: 35</b> COTA #1 adjacent on Kenny Road. <b>Bike Score: 37</b> Bike lane existing on Tremont	Existing parking may be utilized, share with city uses if remaining; may require structured parking to accommodate all uses.	Zoning: RCD Residential Community Development District: residential uses in medium- to high-density residential complexes. Also permits institutional, cultural, recreation uses.  Permitted use. Generally compatible with density intent of surrounding zoning districts, and proximity to other recreation uses. Site terminates a prominent roadway vista.	Limited growth potential, will be dependent on parking availability.	No current development partnership opportunities; no known restrictions on health partnerships.	Potential to utilize currently underutilized city-owned land; potential to share space with city services








# Shared Parking Analysis – MSC Site

Shared parking based on layering of uses:

Adjusted JAN Weekday Parking Demand



- Office and Assembly offset
- Potential reduction factor: 32%

Shared parking based on use-reduction variables:

Building / Space	Count	Units	Non-Captive	Lease Occupancy	Single Driver
City Admin Office	14,000	Square Feet	100%	100%	100%
City Assembly	398	Seats	95%	100%	90%
Community Center	98,000	Square Feet	100%	100%	80%

- Accounts for car pooling, visiting more than one use in single trip.
- Potential reduction factor: 18%

# Parking Analysis – MSC Site

## Building Use Area

### Community Center:

1st Floor:	49,000	sq.ft.
2nd Floor:	49,000	sq.ft.
Total:	98,000	sq.ft.

### Existing Municipal Service Center Uses (excludes lobby and main circulation)

City Admin. Office:	14,000	sq.ft.
Assembly	5,519	sq.ft.
Police	8,900	sq.ft.
specified 55 dedicated spaces		

## Parking Required

Community Center (2.5/1000): (1/5 occupants)	250 spaces
Office (3/1000):	42 spaces
Assembly: (1/5 occupants):	<u>80 spaces</u>
SubTotal:	372 spaces

Shared Parking Reduction (18%)	-66 spaces
Dedicated Police Parking:	<u>55 spaces</u>

**Total Parking Required: 361 spaces**

### Parking Provided (Existing MSC with addition):

Surface:	54 spaces
Structured Parking (4 levels)	316 spaces
<b>Total</b>	<b>370 spaces</b>

### Parking Provided (New Build):

Surface:	133 spaces
Structured Parking (4 levels)	284 spaces
<b>Total</b>	<b>417 spaces</b>

# Parking Analysis – Kingsdale Site


## Community Center Building:

Community Center:	98,000 sq.ft.
Office:	50,000 sq.ft.

## Parking Required

Community Center (2.5/1000): (1/5 occupants)	250 spaces
Office (5/1000):	<u>250 spaces</u>
Total:	500 spaces

Shared Parking with developer-coordinated mixed-uses.



City of **Upper  
Arlington**<sup>®</sup>

# Community Center Feasibility Study

**MUNICIPAL SERVICE CENTER (MSC) SITE  
BUILDING MASSING, STACKING  
& CIRCULATION**


# MSC SITE BUILDING OPTION STUDIES

## QUICK STUDIES



# CITY ADMINISTRATION, POLICE & COMMUNITY CENTER BUILDING WITHIN EXISTING PAVED AREA ON SITE

## SITE PLAN




\*BUILDING PROGRAM (ALONG WITH POOL EXPANSION AREA) CAN BE FLIPPED LEFT-RIGHT ACROSS AXIS OF SYMMETRY.



# CITY ADMINISTRATION, POLICE & COMMUNITY CENTER BUILDING WITHIN EXISTING PAVED AREA ON SITE

## LEVEL 1 PLAN




### LEGEND

- AQUATICS
- ATHLETICS
- FITNESS
- COMMON SPACE
- MUNICIPAL
- SENIORS
- SENIORS & PROGRAM
- CHILD CARE / INDOOR PLAY
- ADMINISTRATION
- ENTRANCE

PROGRAM CAN BE FLIPPED LEFT-RIGHT ACROSS AXIS OF SYMMETRY


# CITY ADMINISTRATION, POLICE & COMMUNITY CENTER BUILDING WITHIN EXISTING PAVED AREA ON SITE

## LEVEL 2 PLAN



# CITY ADMINISTRATION, POLICE & COMMUNITY CENTER BUILDING WITHIN EXISTING PAVED AREA ON SITE

LEVEL 3 PLAN




## LEGEND

- AQUATICS
- ATHLETICS
- FITNESS
- COMMON SPACE
- MUNICIPAL
- SENIORS
- SENIORS & PROGRAM
- CHILD CARE / INDOOR PLAY
- OUTDOOR FITNESS PATIO
- ENTRANCE

PROGRAM CAN BE FLIPPED LEFT-RIGHT ACROSS AXIS OF SYMMETRY


# CITY ADMINISTRATION, POLICE & COMMUNITY CENTER BUILDING WITHIN EXISTING PAVED AREA ON SITE

LEVEL 4 PLAN



# CITY ADMINISTRATION, POLICE & COMMUNITY CENTER BUILDING WITHIN EXISTING PAVED AREA ON SITE

## BUILDING MASSING & PROGRAM STACKING




### LEGEND

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <span style="display:inline-block; width:15px; height:15px; background-color:lightblue; border:1px solid black;"></span> AQUATICS     | <span style="display:inline-block; width:15px; height:15px; background-color:darkblue; border:1px solid black;"></span> SENIORS   |
| <span style="display:inline-block; width:15px; height:15px; background-color:orange; border:1px solid black;"></span> ATHLETICS       | <span style="display:inline-block; width:15px; height:15px; background-color:purple; border:1px solid black;"></span> SENIORS & PROGRAM                                 |
| <span style="display:inline-block; width:15px; height:15px; background-color:lightpink; border:1px solid black;"></span> FITNESS      | <span style="display:inline-block; width:15px; height:15px; background-color:darkpink; border:1px solid black;"></span> CHILD CARE / INDOOR PLAY / TEEN                 |
| <span style="display:inline-block; width:15px; height:15px; background-color:lightgrey; border:1px solid black;"></span> COMMON SPACE | <span style="display:inline-block; width:15px; height:15px; background-color:teal; border:1px solid black;"></span> ADMINISTRATION-REC                                  |
| <span style="display:inline-block; width:15px; height:15px; background-color:yellow; border:1px solid black;"></span> MUNICIPAL       | <span style="display:inline-block; width:15px; height:15px; border-bottom:2px solid black; border-left:2px solid black; border-right:2px solid black;"></span> ENTRANCE |

TOTAL GSF: 125 K SF BUILDING PLUS 104 K SF GARAGE

ORGANIZATION: MUNICIPAL PROGRAM (LEFT) | CENTER LOBBY | COMMUNITY CENTER PROGRAM (RIGHT)





City of Upper  
Arlington®

# Community Center Feasibility Study

**KINGSDALE SHOPPING CENTER SITE  
MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT**






**Parking Demand:**

Senior: 104 IL/AL: @1 /unit	104
Apartments: 438 @1.25 /unit	548
Total:	652
Office: +/-50,000sf	+200
Retail: +/-6,000sf @4/Ksf	+24
	876
Less Office (shared):	-200
<b>Total Parking Need:</b>	<b>676</b>

**Parking Provided:**

Garage:	562
Under Mixed-Use B:	135
On-Street (parallel):	43
Head-in surface:	15
<b>Total New:</b>	<b>755</b>
Giant Eagle (shared):	+150
<b>Total Available:</b>	<b>905</b>

**Parking Under Apartments (NTS)**



**Parking Under Mixed-Use Building (NTS)**

Green Space at Northern Corners (potential stormwater facility)

Chase Bank View Corridors

Townhouses fronting NW Blvd.

Ground Floor Clubhouse/Leasing Offices Wrapping Southeast Corner of Garage (2-Story)

Relocate 8 spaces

Relocate Signal Lose approx. 8 spaces







Townhouse & Apartment Building - View looking Northwest along Northwest Boulevard

## Kingsdale Mixed-Use

Preliminary Plan Submittal

October 2020



Townhouse & Apartment Building - View looking Southwest from Northwest Boulevard

# Kingsdale Mixed-Use

Preliminary Plan Submittal  
October 2020



Senior Building - View looking Southeast along Tremont Road

## Kingsdale Mixed-Use

Preliminary Plan Submittal

October 2020




Senior Building - View looking Northwest from within the site


## Kingsdale Mixed-Use

Preliminary Plan Submittal

October 2020







City of **Upper  
Arlington**<sup>®</sup>



# Community Center Feasibility Study

**KINGSDALE SHOPPING CENTER SITE  
COMMUNITY CENTER  
BUILDING MASSING, STACKING  
& CIRCULATION**






# KINGSDALE SITE DEVELOPMENT OPTION STUDIES




# KINGSDALE SITE BUILDING OPTIONS


## QUICK STUDIES



- LEGEND:**
- FITNESS & GROUP X
  - SENIORS & PROGRAM
  - AQUATICS
  - ATHLETICS
  - CIRCULATION
  - MECHANICAL
  - OFFICE (33K SF)




- LEGEND:**
- FITNESS & GROUP X
  - SENIORS & PROGRAM
  - AQUATICS
  - OFFICE (45K SF ON 2 LEVELS)
  - ATHLETICS
  - CIRCULATION
  - MECHANICAL




# TALL MULTI-GENERATIONAL SPINE CONCEPT: 6 OR 7-LEVEL BUILDING + 60 PARKING

GROUND LEVEL PLAN / SITE PLAN



# TALL MULTI-GENERATIONAL SPINE CONCEPT: 6 OR 7-LEVEL BUILDING + 60 PARKING

## LEVEL 2 PLAN




- LEGEND**
- AQUATICS
  - ATHLETICS
  - FITNESS
  - COMMON SPACE
  - ADMINISTRATION
  - SENIORS
  - SENIORS & PROGRAM
  - CHILD CARE / INDOOR PLAY / TEEN
  - OFFICE
  - ENTRANCE



# TALL MULTI-GENERATIONAL SPINE CONCEPT: 6 OR 7-LEVEL BUILDING + 60 PARKING

## LEVEL 3 PLAN




- LEGEND**
- AQUATICS
  - ATHLETICS
  - FITNESS
  - COMMON SPACE
  - ADMINISTRATION
  - SENIORS
  - SENIORS & PROGRAM
  - CHILD CARE / INDOOR PLAY / TEEN
  - OFFICE
  - ENTRANCE



# TALL MULTI-GENERATIONAL SPINE CONCEPT: 6 OR 7-LEVEL BUILDING + 60 PARKING

## LEVEL 4 PLAN




- LEGEND**
- AQUATICS
  - ATHLETICS
  - FITNESS
  - COMMON SPACE
  - ADMINISTRATION
  - SENIORS
  - SENIORS & PROGRAM
  - CHILD CARE / INDOOR PLAY / TEEN
  - OFFICE
  - ENTRANCE



# TALL MULTI-GENERATIONAL SPINE CONCEPT: 6 OR 7-LEVEL BUILDING + 60 PARKING

## LEVEL 5 PLAN




### LEGEND

- AQUATICS
- ATHLETICS
- FITNESS
- COMMON SPACE
- ADMINISTRATION
- SENIORS
- SENIORS & PROGRAM
- CHILD CARE / INDOOR PLAY / TEEN
- OFFICE
- ENTRANCE



# TALL MULTI-GENERATIONAL SPINE CONCEPT: 6 OR 7-LEVEL BUILDING + 60 PARKING

LEVEL 6 / LEVEL 7 PLAN



**LEGEND**

- AQUATICS
- ATHLETICS
- FITNESS
- COMMON SPACE
- ADMINISTRATION
- SENIORS
- SENIORS & PROGRAM
- CHILD CARE / INDOOR PLAY / TEEN
- OFFICE
- ENTRANCE


TOP-MOST OFFICE LEVEL TO INCLUDE A SOUTHEAST FACING ROOF PATIO













# TALL MULTI-GENERATIONAL SPINE CONCEPT: 6 OR 7-LEVEL BUILDING + 60 PARKING

## BUILDING MASSING & PROGRAM STACKING



### LEGEND


- |   |   |
|---|---|
|  AQUATICS       |  FITNESS                         |
|  ATHLETICS      |  SENIORS & PROGRAM               |
|  OFFICE         |  CHILD CARE / INDOOR PLAY / TEEN |
|  ADMINISTRATION |  ENTRANCE                        |





# Community Center Feasibility Study

NEXT STEPS




City of Upper  
Arlington®



# NEXT STEPS - PUBLIC INPUT


- Oct. 7 Stakeholder Focus Groups Meetings
- Oct. 8 Stakeholder Focus Group Meetings
- Oct. 8 Community Meeting - 7:00 PM



City of **Upper  
Arlington**<sup>®</sup>



# Thank You



City of *Upper*  
**Arlington**<sup>®</sup>