City of Dublin
Land Use and Long Range Planning
5800 Shier Rings Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236
phone 614.410.4600
fax 614.410.4747
www.dublinohiousa.gov

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

MEETING MINUTES

JULY 25, 2012

AGENDA

1. Winan's Fine Chocolates & Coffees **52 S. High Street**
12-038ARB-MPR **Signs and Parking Plan**

Robert Schisler called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Board members present were Bob Dyas, Tasha Bailey, William Souders, and Tom Currie. City representatives present were Steve Langworthy, Dan Phillabaum, Jonathan Lee, and Libby Farley.

Administrative Business
Motion and Vote
Tom Currie made a motion, seconded by Robert Schisler, to accept the documents into the record. The vote was as follows: Ms. Bailey, yes; Mr. Dyas, yes; Mr. Schisler, yes; Mr. Currie, yes; and Mr. Souders, yes. (Approved 5 – 0.)

Mr. Currie requested page 1 of the May 23, 2012, meeting minutes correctly reflect the terms of office for Mr. Souders and Mr. Schisler as 2012-2013.

Motion and Vote
William Souders made a motion, seconded by Tasha Bailey, to approve the May 23, 2012, amended meeting minutes. The vote was as follows: Mr. Currie, yes; Mr. Dyas, yes; Mr. Schisler, yes; Ms. Bailey, yes; and Mr. Souders, yes. (Approved 5 – 0.)

Communications
Steve Langworthy briefly highlighted the Newsletter regarding the Community Plan Update website being prepared in house by GIS and Planning. He said for the Historic District, you will be able to hover over a building and a screen will come up that will provide a photograph and other links. He said a link will be provided for all applications filed as well as Board and Commission Action Items, Records of Action, Board Orders and any information filed for sites outside of the Historic District.

Tom Currie asked when the Community Plan Update was to be completed. Mr. Langworthy said the draft will probably be finished by the end of the year and the Update will probably be adopted by City Council by early 2013.

Mr. Currie asked what the deadline was for community input. Mr. Langworthy explained there was an open page where public comments about certain aspects of the Plan could be made at any time. He said there will be specific links for the certain aspects of the Plan. He said when Planning gets to areas that involve the Historic District, they will bring them to the Board to review for input. He said they also have to reflect the Bridge Street District and West Innovation District, formerly known as the COIC, Central Ohio Innovation Center, and the changes they made to the Zoning Code and how they translate into the Community Plan. He said the rest of the Update will be demographics and the reflection of developments since the 2007 Community Plan was adopted.

William Souders asked who would review the online comments. Mr. Langworthy said the comments would be emailed directly to Justin Goodwin, the project manager. Mr. Souders suggested the comments be grouped to emphasize the most important issues. Mr. Langworthy said that if there were many comments made on one subject, they would be grouped.

Mr. Schisler briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Architectural Review Board and swore in those intended to speak in regards to the case including the applicant, Ryan Hulme, (4768 Hayden Boulevard, Columbus, Ohio 43221), and City representatives.

1. Winan's Fine Chocolates & Coffees **52 S. High Street**
12-038ARB-MPR **Signs and Parking Plan**

Dan Phillabaum presented this request for two new signs for an Eating and Drinking Establishment in the Historic District and for the approval of a Parking Plan resulting from the change in use in the building from General Office to the proposed Eating and Drinking Establishment. He said the site was zoned Bridge Street Corridor – Historic Core, and this existing building has been determined to be a Historic Mixed Use building type under the Bridge Street Code. Mr. Phillabaum said because of the two separate requests included on this application, two separate motions will be necessary for each request.

Signs

Mr. Phillabaum said the site is the southernmost tenant space of the building which has three, first floor tenants. He said in the Bridge Street Code, a ground floor tenant in a multi-tenant building is permitted two building mounted signs of different types such as the proposed projecting sign and window sign. He said that no illumination is proposed for any of the proposed signs.

Mr. Phillabaum described the projecting sign as being 6.67-square feet in area, oval-shaped, and located over the doorway to the tenant space. He said the sign face of the projecting sign features a black background and white script lettering with a border of white and brown. He presented a detail of the projecting sign depicting the 11-foot, 5-inch height to the top of the sign and 9-foot, 5-inches to the bottom, mounted with a bracket.

Mr. Phillabaum said each window sign is 1.33-square-feet, totaling 5.32-square feet. He said they are located in the lower portion of the storefront windows. He said the window signs are white and feature a script 'W' with 'Fine Chocolates and Coffees' in block capital letters.

Mr. Phillabaum said that the Administrative Review Team has reviewed the proposed signs based on the Architectural Review Board criteria, and they meet all of the criteria applicable to signs. He said that the proposed signs also fall under the Minor Project Review Criteria of the Bridge Street Code and all applicable Bridge Street Code sign regulations are met.

Parking Plan

Mr. Phillabaum explained the applicant is requesting approval of a Parking Plan under the Bridge Street Code to modify the number of parking spaces that would be required for this use. He said for Eating and Drinking Establishments, one parking space is required for every 100 gross square feet of floor area under the Bridge Street Code. He said in this proposal a minimum of ten spaces and a maximum of thirteen spaces are required for the use.

Mr. Phillabaum said the combination of existing uses in the building, which include professional office, personal services, and general retail requires 15 parking spaces. He said including the proposed Eating and Drinking Establishment, a total of 25 parking spaces are required for the site. He said the existing unstriped parking lot at the rear of the building has approximately 19 spaces that are shared by the uses in the multiple tenant building. He said the parking plan is therefore requesting 6 fewer spaces than required by Code.

Mr. Phillabaum reported the Administrative Review Team has considered a number of factors in reviewing this proposed reduction of parking spaces. He said the Town Center II public parking lot is within a convenient walking distance of less than 300 feet from the tenant space. He said the other uses in the building typically experience a high rate of vehicle turnover in the shared existing parking lot. He said the amount of interior patron seating associated with the proposed use is minor compared to the amount of space devoted to retail display, storage and operations. Mr. Phillabaum said the hours of operation, including evenings and weekends, are complimentary to the other uses in the building and their ability to share the existing parking. He concluded by noting on-street parking exists along South High Street which would be available for use by this tenant.

Mr. Phillabaum reported the Administrative Review Team has reviewed the proposed Parking Plan based on the Bridge Street Code Parking Plan criteria and found the proposal meets those applicable criteria. He said any change of use occur within the building that would require the combined total number of spaces to go above 19 would require a new Parking Plan approval.

Mr. Phillabaum stated the Administrative Review Team recommends approval of this Minor Project Review for signs based on Bridge Street Code and the Architectural Review Board Code criteria, and the Administrative Review Team also recommends approval of the Parking Plan to allow 6 fewer spaces than required by the Zoning Code for a total of 19 spaces for this site.

William Souders referred to the projection sign over the right-of-way and noted staff felt there was no issue with it encroaching into the right-of-way because of its height above the sidewalk. He asked if there were other signs approved over the right-of-way regardless of the height.

Mr. Phillabaum said there are several instances of projecting signs which encroach over the right-of-way in the Historic District given the location of buildings relative to the right-of-way. He said they require a minimum of 8 feet from the established grade to the bottom of the sign so there is not a conflict with pedestrians on the sidewalk.

Mr. Langworthy said Planning was working with Engineering to get documentation for the ground signs that are in the right-of-way because they were more concerned about those. He said records are created when the encroachments are approved.

Mr. Souders asked if the canopy, although not part of this application, was also a height concern.

Mr. Langworthy explained that was governed by Engineering, who had not expressed any particular issues with it. He said the only Engineering issues were related to ground signs closer to the curb lawn.

Motion #1 and Vote – Signs
Tom Currie made a motion, seconded by Bob Dyas, to approve this application for signs because the proposal meets the criteria of the Historic Dublin Design Guidelines and Zoning Code with no conditions. The vote was as follows: Mr. Schisler, yes; Mr. Currie, yes; Mr. Dyas, yes; Ms. Bailey, yes, and Mr. Souders, yes. (Approved 5 – 0.)

Mr. Souders asked what the overall width of the parking lot was and if angled parking would increase the number of parking spaces by providing a center lane of parking. Mr. Phillabaum said the dimension is only slightly wider than 60 feet, so it is not wide enough to have a one-way circulation loop with angled head-in parking. He said it was about as efficient as it can be.

Steve Langworthy said they laid out almost all of the parking areas in Historic Dublin to try to work out the efficiencies and this particular one is wider than 60 feet, but not wide enough to add another aisle. He said you tend to lose spaces when you angle them.

Mr. Souders asked if parallel, end-to-end, tandem-type parking spaces could be placed in the middle of the lot to pull out into the drive lane on either side. Mr. Phillabaum explained in that scenario two 22-foot wide drive aisles would need to be maintained for the 90 degree spaces on either side of a row of parallel spaces in the middle, and an overall width of about 90 feet would need to be maintained--44 feet for drive aisles, 36 feet for two rows of 90 degree spaces, and ten feet for the row parallel in the middle.

Mr. Souders asked if there could be head in parking spaces directly off of Spring Hill. He said that way there would not be another drive aisle. Mr. Phillabaum said Spring Hill was one-way to the east and does not have sufficient width for 90 degree spaces. He said there is an existing stone retaining wall along the south side of Spring Hill that is taking up some of the grade along Spring Hill.

Tasha Bailey asked what the change in use was and why parking spaces were being eliminated. Mr. Langworthy explained that although the use is permitted, it still has to meet all the other individual requirements of the Zoning Code, and if they do not, it cannot go into the building.

Ms. Bailey asked if the Administrative Review Team considered the overall use of the parking area which went far beyond the tenants of that building. She said as an adjacent resident, she had observed the lot was always full and even used for drivers' education classes. She asked that it be documented for the record that it was a highly used parking lot.

Tom Currie asked if there were ever more than 19 cars parked in the lot. Mr. Phillabaum said it was possible that more than 19 could fit, depending upon how tightly the cars were parked. He said Planning's approximation of 19 spaces was based on code required dimensions for parking spaces.

Ms. Bailey pointed out the parking lot was in extreme disrepair, so the level of erosion and tree stumps affected the available parking. She said she also witnessed people parking in the lot that were not patrons of any of the businesses the lot belongs to. She asked why it was not enforced or ticketed. Mr. Phillabaum clarified that as a private parking lot, the property owner and/or tenants were responsible for enforcement.

Robert Schisler suggested Ryan Hulme, the applicant, ask his landlord to post signs regarding parking restrictions. Mr. Hulme said they do plan to have their employees park elsewhere to make more parking available for their customers. Ms. Bailey suggested that restricting general parking might limit walk-in business. She said the heavily used parking lot may be a benefit to the business.

Mr. Currie asked if the other tenants had sufficient parking available. Mr. Phillabaum said the parking for the other tenants was sufficient based on the Bridge Street Code requirements for parking by use, but the amount of remaining parking spaces for the area of the building proposed for use as an Eating and Drinking Establishment would create a deficiency.

Mr. Schisler asked if the other tenants were aware of this change of use. Mr. Langworthy said the landlord had been notified. Mr. Schisler noted there was no one present at the meeting regarding this application.

Ms. Bailey said she thought this was the most cosmetically challenged part of the District. She said it was a detractor from the foot traffic. She asked if, as they get more patron-driven tenants in the building, there was a chance for the City and the ARB to appeal to the landlord to fix the parking lot.

Mr. Langworthy said City Council has asked Jeff Tyler and staff work with the landlords to improve the parking situation. He pointed out there is a combination of absentee and onsite landlords. He explained they are not necessarily difficult to work with, but it has been difficult to get the momentum going. Mr. Langworthy said upcoming proposed changes to the District the Board will see are interesting innovations that are being nicely done.

Mr. Currie asked for these comments to be included in the record. He said to the east, there are nice backyards and so forth, but to the west, it is kind of a hodgepodge.

Mr. Souders asked if there could be a condition added the parking lot be sealed and/or striped. Mr. Langworthy said he preferred a condition that staff would work with the building owner to make a more efficient parking layout, including striping and things that need to be done, rather than conditioning this tenant and letting the burden be on him alone.

Mr. Souders asked if a change of use required any standards to be met such as the dumpster location and screening. Mr. Langworthy explained that only if substantial changes were made to the parking area would it be required to meet Code. He said not as many complaints were received about parking in this area as in the northwest area of the District. He said a turnover and occupancy parking study had recently been done to identify who uses those parking spaces for the longest period of time. He said Planning expects that they are employers and employees, and will appeal to their better nature to park in the Indian Run lot, which would free between 30 and 40 parking spaces at night. He said they are also working with the valet operator to get additional spaces on the school property. He said on-street parking on South High Street is getting more use, which is encouraging to see.

Ms. Bailey said she thought there were fewer complaints on this end because there is no reason to come there, and if patron-driven businesses continue to come, which is what we want, there will be more parking issues. She said the parking issue is very significant. Mr. Langworthy said Planning will keep an eye on the parking situation as the area expands.

Motion #2 and Vote – Parking Plan
Bob Dyas made a motion, seconded by Tasha Bailey, to approve this application for a Parking Plan to reduce the number of required spaces from 25 to 19 due to the change of use, and requested staff work with the property owner to upgrade and improve the parking lot to enhance the appearance and efficiency. The vote was as follows: Mr. Souders, yes; Mr. Schisler, yes; Mr. Currie, yes; Ms. Bailey, yes; and Mr. Dyas, yes. (Approved 5 – 0.)

Mr. Schisler adjourned the meeting at 7:21 p.m.

As approved by the Architectural Review Board on August 29, 2012.