



**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

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM

MEETING MINUTES

APRIL 10, 2014

ART Members and Designees: Steve Langworthy, Planning Director; Gary Gunderman, Planning Manager; Dave Marshall, Review Services Analyst; Alan Perkins, Fire Marshal; Barb Cox, Engineering Manager; Fred Hahn, Director of Parks and Open Space; Laura Ball, Landscape Architect; Jeff Tyler, Building Standards Director; and Colleen Gilger, Economic Development Director.

Other Staff: Rachel Ray, Planner II; Jennifer Rauch, Sr. Planner; and Laurie Wright, Staff Assistant.

Applicants: Heidi Bolyard, Bolyard Architecture and Design Studio, LLC (Case 1); Kyle Kessler, Cardinal Health (Case 3); Teri Umbarger, BHDP Architects; Robin, Faires, Project Manager; Thomas Raabe, Ohio University; and Dr. Bill Burke, Dean of the OUHCOM (Case 4).

Steve Langworthy called the meeting to order. He asked if there were any amendments to the April 3, 2014, meeting minutes. [There were none.] The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

INTRODUCTIONS

1. BSC Historic Residential District – Stevens Residence – Request for Demolition
14-028ARB **143 S. High Street**
Demolition

Jennifer Rauch said this is a proposal for a demolition of an existing single-family home located on the west side of South High Street, south of the intersection with John Wright Lane. She said this is a request for review of a demolition under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.176 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Ms. Rauch said this case is being introduced quickly to proceed to the Architectural Review Board (ARB). She explained that this existing home is on the south side of John Wright Lane and is in extreme disrepair with major structural concerns. She said Gregory Fraker, PE, of Fraker Engineering provided an analysis on the framing and structural issues with the property but found numerous issues that may hinder plans for renovation. She said the applicant's analysis addressed all four criteria needed for the ARB to approve.

Ms. Rauch showed the proposed site plan with a similar footprint to the existing, which maintains driveway access off of John Wright Lane. She pointed out the two-story house on the front elevation drawing and the attached garage on the north elevation along John Wright Lane, which she thought was appropriate given the garage was lower than the main structure. She said an architectural consultant will be asked to review the subsequent rebuild.

Heidi Bolyard, Bolyard Architecture and Design Studio, LLC, said the main structure and foundation were in disrepair that included termite damage and cracked foundation stone to the extent that concrete blocks were added just to support the structure as it currently exists.

Ms. Rauch said this single-family home was not listed on the National Register of Historic Places and is not a significant structure as part of the Historic District, but was listed on the Ohio Historical Inventory (OHI) as a “background building” that retains the scale and character of the Historic District.

Ms. Bolyard said the owners originally wanted to renovate the home but after the analysis from the structural engineer that stated the foundation was unstable, they are requesting to demolish the home as further renovation and modifications to put it back in a condition suitable for occupancy may not be economically feasible or justifiable for a residence of this age and condition. She said wild animals were living in the second floor and crawl space of the residence.

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any questions or comments.

Jeff Tyler agreed that the stucco siding that had been applied to the exterior of the historic structure made it a “background” building. He suggested that the applicant show the existing and proposed home adjacent to the home next door for context, which could help with the application.

Mr. Langworthy asked the ART members to visit the neighborhood to see how the background fits before making a determination next week. He also requested that one of the City’s architectural consultants take a look at the request.

Ms. Bolyard confirmed that after many years of renovations and modifications the original wood siding and trim had been removed and replaced with stucco and aluminum windows.

Mr. Langworthy confirmed that there were no further questions or comments on this application at this time.

**2. Verizon Wireless Rooftop Co-Location
14-029ARTW**

**5127 Post Road
Wireless Communications Facility**

Rachel Ray said this is a request for Verizon to replace six antennas and install three new remote radio units and three fiber optic cables on the roof of an office building located approximately 1,200 feet west of the intersection of Post Road and Frantz 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 the office building was sited between Post Road and US 33, and the fiber optic cables they will be adding will be snaked through the existing cable tray along the side of the building to the cabinet on the ground behind the panel so the cables would not be visible. She explained that the proposed antenna panels are located behind a parapet wall, so they are not visible from the exterior. She noted that the applicant was not present.

Steve Langworthy asked if there were any questions or comments. [There were none.] He said the target ART determination on the Wireless Communications Facility is April 17, 2014.

**3. BSC Commercial District – Shoppes at River Ridge – Fuse By Cardinal Health – Sign
14-031MPR
4305 West Dublin-Granville Road
Minor Project Review**

Rachel Ray said this is a request to install a 20-square-foot wall sign for a new office tenant in the Shoppes at River Ridge shopping center located at the southeast corner of the intersection of West Dublin-Granville Road and Dale Drive. She said this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066(G).

Ms. Ray said the applicant has already submitted a building permit for their tenant fit-up to the interior of the space. She said Fuse is the commercial technology branch of Cardinal Health. She explained they are proposing an internally illuminated aluminum panel sign with red and white accents to be placed on the corner tower portion of the building at less than 15 feet above grade. She asked the applicant to submit a floor plan since the size allotment for the sign is based on linear footage of the tenant space.

Kyle Kessler, Cardinal Health, described the sign as an illuminated routed aluminum box, with a routed face to have white back-up plex for the "by Cardinal Health" portion and red acrylic added for the "fuse" portion of the sign.

Ms. Ray noted that there is some desire for three-dimensional character to signs in the Bridge Street District, based on the intent language of the sign regulations.

Mr. Kessler pointed out that the sign was set off of the brick wall by about six inches with hook-ups to existing electrical, but the panel itself gives some dimension from the building façade.

Ms. Ray said she asked one of the City's architectural consultants to review the sign and intends to provide feedback next week. She said the purpose of this week's review was to provide an introduction to the proposed sign.

Mr. Kessler stated he would include a floor plan as requested.

Steve Langworthy asked if there were any questions or comments.

Barb Cox inquired about the awnings. Mr. Kessler replied the yellow awnings were planned to be removed and replaced with charcoal black awnings and thought the color was selected after the submission.

Ms. Ray did not oppose the color change as long as the material used for the awnings was the same as before. She said the modifications to the awnings could be reviewed as part of this application.

Mr. Langworthy concluded the target ART determination is April 24, 2014.

CASE REVIEW

4. Ohio University Heritage College of Medicine - Signs

14-025WID-DP/SP

**7001 & 7003 Post Road
Development Plan/Site Plan Review**

Rachel Ray said this is a proposal for a campus identification sign, building-mounted signs, wayfinding signs and on-site directional signs for a college campus, located at the southwest corner of the intersection of Post and Eiterman Roads. She said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval for Development Plan/Site Plan Review in accordance with Zoning Code Sections 153.042(D) and 153.042(E)(7).

Ms. Ray reported that Teri Umbarger, BHDP Architects, provided an overview as an introduction at last week's ART meeting. Since that initial meeting, she said Planning had conducted a site visit to better understand the proposal, and Ms. Umbarger had provided additional sign dimension details as requested.

Steve Langworthy noted that in a campus setting, signs not visible from the road and used for internal wayfinding purposes only are not considered to be "signs" under the definition in the Zoning Code. He said that the sign regulations in the Zoning Code only apply to those signs that are visible from adjacent

properties or the right-of-way. After visiting the site, he determined the "college monument sign," intended to announce the entrance to HCOM, will not be included in the ART's determination as it is positioned in the middle of the campus. He stipulated that several of the proposed wall signs would be discussed since they will be included in the ART's determination. He stated if the dimensions exceed the requirements, ART has the ability to approve increased height, while the Planning and Zoning Commission would make any determinations for sizes and numbers of signs exceeding Code requirements. He said the ART is positioned to make the recommendation to the PZC.

Ms. Umbarger provided handouts to show examples of wayfinding signs at Ohio University's other campuses and noted the standards and what was used at the Athens, Ohio campus. She introduced Dr. Bill Burke, Dean of OUHCOM, Robin Faires, Project Manager, and Thomas Raabe, Ohio University, to say they have all been coordinating with each other as Mr. Raabe is involved in other OU projects. Ms. Umbarger said they were all available to answer any questions.

Ms. Umbarger said the site plan that was provided in the packet originally has been blown up to show the property boundaries, as requested by Ms. Husak at the previous ART meeting. She said the focus will now be on the wall signs. She noted the sign on the north elevation on the northern of the two office buildings, which is 126 square feet and the top of the sign reaches 42 feet above grade.

Ms. Ray said this exceeds the 50 square foot Code requirement. Ms. Umbarger said the request for the enlarged sign is because the building sits back so far from Post Road.

Mr. Langworthy inquired about the crest shield that was originally shown on the sign plan reviewed at last week's ART meeting. Ms. Umbarger said that has been eliminated and what is in the packet today is the final proposal from OU.

Ms. Ray asked if the sign lettering would be one color. Ms. Umbarger replied affirmatively. Robin Faires confirmed that clear anodized letters would be used to reflect in white.

Ms. Umbarger noted the south elevation of the same four-story building that faces the campus green would have a sign proposed at 53 square feet with the sign height at 24 feet above grade in the same color scheme. She emphasized that the south elevation does not face the property line or any adjacent rights-of-way.

Colleen Gilger said the south sign would only be seen on campus, internally, and would be difficult to see from the parking lot.

Ms. Umbarger explained that the southern of the two buildings faces US 33 and is the major face of campus. She said the building was set back quite a distance from the highway and is the first thing visitors will see, so that is why they are proposing a sign at 126 square feet and 43.8 feet above grade. She noted the letters for HCOM under Ohio University are 40 feet above grade. She understands that they are exceeding the Code requirements but they are passionate about recognizing the partnership between Ohio University and OhioHealth and want to provide the donor recognition.

Dr. Burke said this was a \$105 million deal and OU has a substantial investment in the campus. He said this is not inconsistent as to what is done on other campuses.

Ms. Umbarger noted the Anatomy Laboratory on the south elevation that faces internally into the campus green. She said this was a fairly small sign at 32 square feet, 10 feet above grade.

Ms. Ray inquired if any of the signs would be illuminated. Ms. Umbarger said they all use the same clear anodized metal.

Ms. Ray summarized for discussion that the north elevation sign for the building at former 7001 Post Road building was 126 square feet; the sign for the south elevation for the same building was 53 square feet; the signs for the east elevation of the building formerly identified as 7003 Post Road were 126 square feet and 53 square feet; and the Anatomy lab sign was 32 square feet.

Ms. Ray inquired about the building-mounted directory signs, and whether they were still proposed in addition to the larger building-mounted signs. Ms. Faires said they would incorporate both, mounted close to the entrance.

Ms. Umbarger interpreted the Code as stating that if the building would be visible from the interstate, and in this case, US 33, then the sign can be larger and reach upwards of 300 square feet.

Mr. Langworthy stated in order for that to apply, they would need to have property frontage on US 33.

Ms. Gilger said the "campus" frontage is on US 33, but not any one building.

Ms. Ray said the Code allows the ART to approve signs at a greater height than Code allows as long as it does not exceed the roofline, based on the specific architecture of the building. Ms. Ray asked if the sign could be moved to another area on each of the buildings where the additional height is requested.

Ms. Umbarger said due to the line of trees on Post Road they need the sign to be visible.

Ms. Ray raised the height issues as they exceed the 15-foot Code requirement. Ms. Gilger noted all the mirrored glass, which hinders other areas available for the signs.

Ms. Umbarger said it was her belief that the sign designs and dimensions best reflect the architecture.

Dr. Burke said currently it is difficult to identify the buildings on campus, and the first class starts on July 7, 2014. He said he is concerned about visibility for the new students to maneuver as they will not have anything on the road indicating where the campus is located, or where they need to go.

Mr. Langworthy reiterated that the ART will make a determination on the height and the Commission will make a determination for the sizes and number of signs.

Ms. Ray said the height and overall design is the focus for the Administrative Review Team, and there are no issues with the color.

Dave Marshall asked how the permits would be handled as sign permits were needed, not building permits, and the approval should be for certificates. He asked Alan Perkins, Fire Marshal, if he had any issues with the address numerals.

Ms. Umbarger said the addresses were not placed on the buildings yet and she had discussed this previously with Mr. Perkins. She said there are temporary numbers in place but the intent was not to have numbers on the buildings while the existing tenants will still be there for the next year, since the address is changing.

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any further questions or comments.

Barb Cox asked if the rain garden was included with this application and suggested that maybe that be kept separate from the sign proposal.

Jeff Tyler said he had questions about the scale of the signs and the buildings, and how it compares to the size proposed. He referenced some of the examples that the applicant provided on OU's main campus.

Ms. Faires noted the handout that showed the Student Recreation Center and said the proposed signs are about the same size but the proposed signs will be in white to better contrast with the building. Mr. Tyler said he did not see how the small letters used at the other campuses could serve as examples for this proposal. He said he was concerned with the size of the large building-mounted signs, and he was struggling with 18-inch letters. Ms. Faires said OU had used 13-inch letters elsewhere.

Ms. Umbarger said the proposed signs are more modern, as opposed to the Georgian letters used at the Athens campus. Mr. Tyler said he was not opposed to the more modern design proposed but felt they were still too large. He asked if the OhioHealth letters could be scaled down, to which Ms. Umbarger said the applicant would consider.

Mr. Langworthy asked the ART to visit the campus to view it from a distance prior to next week's determination.

Ms. Gilger said she did not think it appeared too large. She said the buildings were really far from Eiterman Road. She asked if the campus secondary signs could be relocated to the side of the doorway on the 7001 Post Road building, and not so high up.

Ms. Umbarger said they looked at that placement, but decided that it looked lopsided. Ms. Faires said with so much glass, there is no good place to move the signs other than where they are shown. Ms. Umbarger said she thought there could be some flexibility with the size.

Dr. Burke asked which signs were so concerning. Mr. Tyler said the level of signage. Ms. Umbarger said the size related to the donor recognition.

Mr. Langworthy said it would be helpful if a graphic was prepared, such as an aerial photo, showing how the signs would be facing in relation to the site plan. He said that more development will be coming to this campus and the ART should be mindful of how the decisions made on this project will affect others that come in later for three or four story buildings or higher and how the ART would make determinations based on the distance from the roads. He suggested that a better Code amendment might be to address the setback. He said that the sign regulations applicable to the West Innovation District would be reviewed after receiving feedback from the Commission.

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any further comments or questions at this time. [There were none.] He said the target ART determination on the Development Plan, and target recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the Site Plan is April 17, 2014.

ADMINISTRATIVE

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any administrative issues or other items for discussion. [There were none.] The meeting was adjourned at 2:55 pm.