City of Dublin

Land Use and Long Range Planning
5800 Shier Rings Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016

phone 614.410.4600
fax 614.410.4747

www.dublinohiousa.gov

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM

MEETING MINUTES

SEPTEMBER 27, 2012

Attendees:

Gary Gunderman, Planning Manager; Laura Ball, Landscape Architect; Barb Cox, Engineering Manager; Jeff Tyler, Director of Building Standards; Ray Harpham, Commercial Plans Examiner; Fred Hahn, Director of Parks and Open Space; John DeJarnette, Police Lieutenant; Alan Perkins, Fire Marshal; Dan Phillabaum, Senior Planner; Jennifer Rauch, Planner II; Rachel Ray, Planner II; and Ebony Mills, Office Assistant II.

Gary Gunderman called the meeting to order. He introduced the first case on the scheduled agenda.

Introductions

1. 12-067MPR– BSC Commercial District – Shoppes at River Ridge – Bruegger's Bagels Signs – 4425 West Dublin-Granville Road

Rachel Ray said this is a request to install two new signs, including a 27-square-foot internally illuminated wall sign and a 6-square-foot projecting sign, in accordance with Code Section 153.066(H) for an eating and drinking facility in the Shoppes at River Ridge. She provided a brief overview of each sign and noted that it appears that both signs comply with all applicable requirements. She asked ART members to send any comments or recommendations to be incorporated into the ART report next week. She said the determination date for this case is October 4.

Gary Gunderman asked if there were any further questions for Ms. Ray. [There were none.]

2. 12-068ARB-MPR – BSC Historic Core District – The Scioto Room – Site and Architectural Modifications and Parking Plan – 38 West Bridge Street

Gary Gunderman asked Rachel Ray to present this application on behalf of the case manager, Jeannie Martin, who was unable to attend this afternoon's Administrative Review Team (ART) meeting.

Rachel Ray said this is a request for a new eating and drinking facility located at 38 West Bridge Street in the BSC Historic Core District including architectural modifications to an Existing Structure. She said the request also includes improvements to the existing parking lot, a new ground sign, a pocket plaza, and approval of a parking plan. She said this Minor Project Review application is proposed in accordance with

Zoning Code Section 153.066(G) and under the review standards of Zoning Code Section 153.170 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Ms. Ray said the storage facility at the rear of the building consisting of a loading dock and ramp will be enclosed. She said the installation of a street wall will incorporate the pocket plaza which will include bicycle parking. She said the mechanical units on the roof will be screened with metal screening. She said the frame windows on the sides of the building may be replaced with colored glass. She said there will be one wall sign on the front of the building and a ground sign on the street. She said the applicant may need to seek a waiver for the eight-foot setback requirement, since a three-foot setback is proposed.

Timothy A. Bass, Bass Studio Architects, the applicant, said the glazing in the front of the building is going to be replaced. He said the signs are expected to be placed in the same location as the J. Liu sign with the same lettering.

Ms. Ray noted that a parking plan is being proposed as part of this application. She asked the applicant to provide additional information about the intended use of the building.

Mr. Bass said the new location was originally planned to be used as a meeting and banquet space, but the use may evolve to include some regular restaurant hours. He said they currently have 20 parking spaces on the site, but need 9 more to meet the Code requirement for eating and drinking facilities.

Ms. Ray inquired if the location is going to focus on events.

Mr. Bass said there has been great demand for a meeting space, this location will have its own kitchen allowing them to serve food as well.

Ms. Ray said Jeannie Martin has scheduled a general staff meeting on Tuesday to review this case in greater detail prior to the ART determination scheduled next Thursday; ART members are welcome to attend that meeting as well.

Mr. Bass said Ms. Martin has already provided him with a list of questions he must review with his client. He said that he will have a new package of plans and application materials addressing those questions to Ms. Martin before Tuesday.

Ms. Ray instructed the ART members to send any comments or recommendations to Ms. Martin. She said the determination date for this case is October 4.

Gary Gunderman asked if there were any further questions for Mr. Bass. [There were none.]

3. 12-069MPR – BSC Commercial District – Bridge Pointe Shopping Center – Architectural Modifications – 6400-6550 Riverside Drive

Jennifer Rauch said this is a request for architectural modifications to an existing shopping center, including façade modifications and modified building materials and color palette. She said this Minor Project Review application is proposed in accordance with Zoning Code Section 153.066(G).

Ms. Rauch explained the applicant had previously received approval from the Planning and Zoning Commission for site and architectural modifications to the existing shopping center. She presented slides of proposed minor architectural modifications, and noted that no site modifications are proposed. She said the existing site plan has a breezeway located on the north end of the site which the applicant is proposing to remove. She said the applicant is proposing to alter the previously approved building materials, including the elimination of EIFS formed brick from the originally approved plans.

Ray Harpham stated the applicant will need to resubmit building plans for building permitting.

Ms. Ray instructed the ART members to send any comments or recommendations to Ms. Rauch. She said the determination date for this case is October 4.

Gary Gunderman asked if there were any further questions for Ms. Rauch. [There were none.]

Determinations

4. 12-064MPR – BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood District – Kentucky Fried Chicken – Modifications to Existing Structure, Signs, and Site Related Improvements – 6611 Sawmill Road

Dan Phillabaum said this is a request for exterior modifications to an existing building, including signs and site related improvements, for an existing restaurant located at 6611 Sawmill Road in the BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood District. He said this Minor Project Review application is proposed in accordance with Zoning Code Section 153.066(G).

Mr. Phillabaum said site modifications will include the addition of another ADA parking spot, restriping and modifications to the sidewalks to meet ADA standards. He said sign faces and monument signs will be replaced. He said the existing brick will be retained and the new areas of infill brick are very similar to the existing brick. He said the cooler will remain at the back of the building, and the front facing tower roof will be removed. He said the canvas awnings and gooseneck lights will be replaced with horizontal canopies with can lights mounted underneath. Mr. Phillabaum stated that approval is recommended with the following seven conditions:

1. That the applicant extend the new sidewalk along the east side of the building up to the curb in front of the building and eliminate the mulch bed;
2. That the material specification for the new aluminum door and storefront be revised to specify Dark Bronze as the aluminum color in order to match the existing aluminum window and door frames;
3. That the applicant correct the inconsistencies on the proposed landscape plan prior to building permitting, subject to Planning approval;
4. That all proposed light fixtures be full cutoff and meet all applicable Code requirements, subject to Planning approval;
5. That the Sunshades and Entry be completely enclosed to provide shade and shelter to meet the Code requirements for awnings and canopies, subject to Planning approval;
6. That the proposed south elevation be revised to retain the existing window adjacent to the drive-thru window and film be applied to the interior of this window to screen the storage area within from view; and
7. That the sign details for the proposed channel letters be revised to specify the sign face and aluminum return colors as Benjamin Moore Monterey White or similar alternate color to coordinate with the building colors, subject to Planning approval.

Mr. Phillabaum asked the applicant if he had any questions or concerns regarding the recommended conditions.

Adam Macke, GPD Group, the applicant, said he agrees with all of the conditions except condition number five. He said when it rains water will fall directly onto the walkway if the sunshades are completely enclosed, which could cause a problem with ice on the sidewalks in the winter. He requested that the sunshades be permitted to remain open and unenclosed at the top, since they will still function to shad sunlight, and portions of the canopies are covered, directly over the entry door.

Mr. Phillabaum agreed and noted that the applicant had brought this concern to his attention prior to the ART meeting. He said that he had discussed the functionality of the Sunshades with the applicant and determined that the Sunshades meet the intent of the Code requirement, and therefore Planning had no concern with eliminating condition five.

Gary Gunderman said condition number five will be removed.

Ray Harpham inquired if the internal seating arrangements will be changed since the entrances are changing.

Mr. Macke said yes, he will send Mr. Harpham plans showing the changes on Friday when he submits for a building permit.

Mr. Gunderman confirmed that the Administrative Review Team members had no further comments on this application and stated that this request for Minor Project Review had been approved with six conditions:

1) That the applicant extend the new sidewalk along the east side of the building up to the curb in front of the building and eliminate the mulch bed;
2) That the material specification for the new aluminum door and storefront be revised to specify *Dark Bronze* as the aluminum color in order to match the existing aluminum window and door frames;
3) That the applicant correct the inconsistencies on the proposed landscape plan prior to building permitting, subject to Planning approval;
4) That all proposed light fixtures be full cutoff and meet all applicable Code requirements, subject to Planning approval;
5) That the proposed south elevation be revised to retain the existing window adjacent to the drive-thru window and film be applied to the interior of this window to screen the storage area within from view; and
6) That the sign details for the proposed channel letters be revised to specify the sign face and aluminum return colors as *Benjamin Moore Monterey White* or similar alternate color to coordinate with the building colors, subject to Planning approval.

5. 12-061ARTW – Avery Park Water Tower – AT&T Antenna Co-Location – 7699 Avery Road

Rachel Ray said this is a request to co-locate three new antennas on the Avery Park water tower. She said the site is located on the west side of Avery Road approximately 530 feet south of the intersection with Brand Road. She said this is a request for review and approval of a wireless communications facility under the provisions of Chapter 99 of the Dublin Code of Ordinances.

Ms. Ray said that there are three sectors around the water tower in which the antennas are located; there will be a total of nine antennas which will be beneath the cap of the water tower. She explained that there are currently six antennas on the water tower, two in each sector, although there had been three more installed at one point that had since been removed. She said the applicant intends to use the existing brackets on which the antennas that had been installed on the water tower had been using, rather than installing new brackets. She said all other modifications are interior to the tower.

Ms. Ray noted that the applicant, Ed Block, with the GPD Group, was joining the meeting via telephone conference call. She asked if the applicant had any concerns with the following three conditions:

1. That the antennas be painted prior to their installation on the water tower;
2. That any associated jumper cables or other wiring be trimmed to fit closely to the antenna panels; and

3. That the applicant notifies Engineering prior to installation to coordinate access and installation of the antenna panels.

Ed Block, GPD Group, the applicant, stated that he agreed to all of the conditions.

Mr. Gunderman confirmed that the Administrative Review Team members had no further comments on this application and stated that this request for had been approved with 3 conditions:

1. That the antennas be painted prior to their installation on the water tower;
2. That any associated jumper cables or other wiring be trimmed to fit closely to the antenna panels; and
3. That the applicant notifies Engineering prior to installation to coordinate access and installation of the antenna panels.

Mr. Gunderman stated that all of the ART case introductions and determinations had been made, and noted that there was one more item on the agenda not yet requiring a determination. He noted that the applicant, Gerry Bird, was present to discuss the proposal with the ART members.

Open Case Review

6. 12-063ARB-BPR – BSC Historic Core District – North Riverview Street Mixed-Use Redevelopment – Demolition and Basic Plan Review – 40 Blacksmith Lane – 53 North Riverview Street

Dan Phillabaum said this is a request for approval of the demolition of six existing residential structures located on the west side of North Riverview Street between Bridge Street and North Street on six parcels zoned BSC Historic Core District. He said as part of the request for demolition, the applicant is requesting review of a mixed-use development proposal including restaurant, retail, office, and residential uses. He said this is a request for demolition under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.176.

Mr. Phillabaum explained that he had sent the applicant a comment letter with preliminary comments and suggestions for additional information recommended to support the request for demolition, on which all of the ART members were copied. He noted that in the letter, he recommended, after discussions among Planning staff, that the Basic Plan Review request will be postponed from the proposal when it moves forward to the Architectural Review Board (ARB) because of technical issues with the plan. He said additional meetings with the applicant can be scheduled to discuss those technical issues specific to the Basic Plan application in more depth if necessary.

Mr. Phillabaum said the purpose of this afternoon's discussion with the ART is to address the comments on each condition given to the applicant, summarized in the comment letter sent earlier in the week. He asked the applicant if he would respond to the comments on each condition.

Condition 1
Mr. Phillabaum stated that in order to best respond to the first condition, documentation from an impartial party about the historical significance of these structures is strongly recommended.

Gerry Bird, Bird Houk Collaborative, a Division of OHM, the applicant, said he tried to find a historic preservation professional that would recommend that the structures be demolished, but there simply isn't anyone. He said all but one of the historians he spoke with state that the properties add character to North Riverview, although only one or two of the six homes are salvageable.

Gary Gunderman inquired why the rest are not salvageable.

Mr. Bird said they are deteriorated to the point of needing to be completely rebuilt in order to make them marketable.

Jeff Tyler asked if the homes were inhabited. Mr. Bird said yes.

Mr. Tyler commented that not enough documentation has been provided to support the claim that the structures are unsalvageable. He said the fact that these structures are separated from the rest of the district may be a significant argument regarding the historic character of these properties, and perhaps the applicant should focus more on this particular aspect of the condition.

Mr. Bird agreed with Mr. Tyler and commented that that was the point he was trying to make in response to Condition 1.

Fred Hahn said the first Condition is probably the most subjective, because the condition of the homes is subjective to the reviewer, as well as the overall historical significance. He recommended that the applicant spend more time arguing the other conditions, since this Condition can likely be effectively argued in both ways.

Mr. Tyler asked if the homes are within the National Register boundary. Mr. Phillabaum said no, the boundary is largely south of Bridge Street.

Mr. Bird said all but one of the homes are on the Ohio Historic Inventory, but historic preservation consultants will not ever recommend that any structures built before 1950 be torn down.

Laura Ball asked if Mr. Bird has contacted Bob Loversidge, who was in charge of the historic building demolition on the corner of Broad and High Street. She said Bob has successfully had historic structures demolished.

Mr. Bird said he has not spoken to him yet but would try to get in contact with him.

Mr. Tyler suggested that Mr. Bird not ask the historic preservation consultants to comment on or make a recommendation specific to the request for *demolition*, but instead to comment on the overall historic significance of the structures, speaking directly to the condition rather than the demolition request.

Condition 2

Mr. Phillabaum said perhaps historic preservation could back up the argument that the homes are economically unfeasible to restore. He suggested that more information or market data from third party real estate consultants could be provided to address Condition 2, confirming the subjective aspect of the "market obsolescence" of these structures.

Mr. Bird said continuously spending the money for consultants to assess the property is becoming an issue for the property owner, and the owner simply doesn't have all of the documentation necessary to show what has been spent on the structures by way of repair, and what would need to be spent to restore the structures to the point that they could be rented at a market rate.

Mr. Phillabaum suggested that the applicant not to devote as many resources on conditions that are subjective, and focus more on providing data and other documentation to address some of the other conditions that are less subjective.

Mr. Harpham said an appraiser can report on the value and best use of a property.

Mr. Phillabaum asked if Mr. Bird had the dates of the appraisals.

Mr. Bird said he only has the Franklin County Auditor's appraisals, and there are no comparables since no properties in Historic Dublin have been sold within a mile of this property according the Board of Realtors database.

Mr. Phillabaum noted that with respect to the market comparables, there are buyers who will pay more for historic properties, and will take the time and effort to restore them.

Mr. Tyler said this goes back to the first condition, and the overall isolation of these structures on the north side of Bridge Street. He commented that the rehabbers and "DIY-ers" interested in restoring historic structures in places like Victorian Village, German Village, or Old Town East choose these places because there is a critical mass of other similar homes in the neighborhood, and that over time, the area can improve. He stated that it seems that despite the interest of individual interested in restoring old homes, they will still be isolated since there is no critical mass and therefore likely a lower return on investment.

Mr. Harpham said because the Architectural Review Board is, by their very purpose, in the business of preserving historic structures and historic character, documentation from a third party is going to be very important in favorably addressing these conditions.

Condition 3

Mr. Phillabaum said documentation of costs of upkeep would be useful to support this condition, in addition to costs of projected improvements necessary to make the homes marketable.

Mr. Bird said the homes are safe, they just don't have modern amenities such as modern kitchens, bathrooms, etc. He said to bring them up to date, the rent would have to go up 50%; when an unforeseen event occurs and the property needs to be repaired the owner is not seeing a return on investment.

Mr. Harpham suggested that the applicant needs to choose two of the four conditions they want to meet rather than trying to tackle all four.

Mr. Tyler said there needs to be an analysis of the money spent on these properties.

Condition 4

Mr. Harpham confirmed that the homes will not be demolished unless a project for that property is approved.

Mr. Phillabaum confirmed that the homes will remain, and noted that the ARB needs to approve at a minimum a conceptual project that contributes to the City's goals for the District as one of the conditions for demolition.

Mr. Bird said there are no plans to tear down the homes until a project is ready to move forward.

Gary Gunderman asked if there were any further questions for Mr. Bird or Mr. Phillabaum. [There were none.]

Administrative

Rachel Ray provided a brief update regarding potential upcoming applications.

Mr. Gunderman asked if there were any changes to the September 20, 2012 meeting minutes. (No changes requested.)

Mr. Gunderman accepted the minutes into record as presented. He confirmed there were no further items of discussion and adjourned the meeting.