



**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](http://www.dublinohiousa.gov)

**ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM**

**MEETING MINUTES**

**JUNE 12, 2014**

**ART Members and Designees:** Steve Langworthy, Planning Director; Gary Gunderman, Planning Manager; Dave Marshall, Review Services Analyst; Fred Hahn, Director of Parks and Open Space; Barb Cox, Engineering Manager; Jeff Tyler, Building Standards Director; and Michael Clarey, Economic Development Administrator.

**Other Staff:** Rachel Ray, Planner II; Jennifer Rauch, Senior Planner; Claudia Husak, Planner II; Joanne Shelly, Urban Designer and Landscape Architect; Devayani Puranik, Planner II; Marie Downie, Planner I; Katie Ashbaugh, Planning Assistant; Jonathan Staker, Planning Assistant; Andrew Crozier, Planning Assistant; Logan Stang, Planning Assistant; Nicole Martin, Planning Assistant; and Laurie Wright, Staff Assistant.

**Applicants:** Ross Sanford, Lincoln Construction; Mark Ford and Gayle Zimmerman of Ford & Associates Architects; Dan Magly, Faris Design & Planning; and Matt Booms, State Bank (Case 1); Larra Thomas, U Crew Holdings, LLC (Case 2); and Bruce Sommerfelt, Signcom, Inc. and Chad Morgan, Coldwell Banker (Case 3).

Steve Langworthy called the meeting to order. He asked if there were any amendments to the June 5, 2014, meeting minutes. Jeff Tyler reported that he had sent his edits to Ms. Wright prior to the ART meeting. The minutes were accepted into the record as amended.

**DETERMINATIONS**

**1. BSC Office District – State Bank                      Shamrock Boulevard & West Dublin-Granville Road  
14-047BSC-SP/MSP/PP/FP                                      Site Plan Review/Master Sign Plan/Preliminary Plat/Final Plat**

Gary Gunderman said this is a request for an 11,500-square-foot loft building for State Bank with a retail banking facility, a drive-through kiosk and all associated site improvements. He said this proposal also includes the subdivision of one 2.8-acre lot into two lots. He said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Bridge Street District Site Plan Review and Master Sign Plan Review with requests for Waivers under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066. He said this is also a request for review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a preliminary and final plat under the provisions of the Subdivision Regulations.

Mr. Gunderman announced that the applicant had submitted revised plans to address some of the ART's comments prior to the Planning and Zoning Commission's review. He presented the revised plans and asked if there were any questions. [There were none].

Mr. Gunderman referred to the ART Report and explained that he had a presentation summarizing the recommendations and discussion items. He stated that the first set of recommendations related to the proposed Waivers:

- 1) Code Section 153.065(D)(3)(c) – A request to waive the structural soil requirement in trenches along Banker Drive.
- 2) Code Section 153.065(D)(5)(c)2.A – A request to waive the requirement to install structural soil in and around the parking lot islands.

Mr. Gunderman said this area is not highly compacted, and the applicant is proposing an alternative method that Staff finds acceptable. He presented the third Waiver:

- 3) Code Section 153.062(O)(4)(a) – Siting the building outside of the Required Building Zone (approximately 16-19 feet from the right-of-way, where 0-15 is required).

Mr. Gunderman concluded that approval of the building siting Waiver is recommended due to the existing natural gas easement. He explained the fourth Waiver:

- 4) Code Section 153.062(O)(4)(d)4 – Vertical façade divisions exceeding 40 feet on two elevations (east and west).

Mr. Gunderman presented the two building elevations in question. He said the overall, the architecture is very good and all of the other requirements have been met. He stated that Zoning Code Section 153.062(N)(4)(b)1 and 153.062(O)(4)(d)4 for the Loft building type require a vertical façade division a maximum of every 40 feet “to divide the surface of the façade into pedestrian-scaled increments appropriate to the architectural character of the building type.” He pointed out that the Code provides two examples of architectural elements – such as recesses or projections a minimum of 18 inches, or architectural elements a minimum of three inches in depth – to meet the requirement.

Mr. Gunderman explained that the east elevation has a 40-foot, eight-inch span before the wall plane changes by a depth of two feet, eight inches. He summarized that for the east elevation, the requirement is exceeded by eight inches. He referred to the west elevation, which is 49 feet, four inches wide, with an eight-inch change in the plane of the elevation toward the center of the building adjacent to the stairwell. He explained that the requirement would be met if the change in plane was a minimum of 18 inches instead of just eight inches.

Mr. Gunderman stated that it was Planning’s opinion that there are no exceptional circumstances present to grant the Waiver to meet all of the criteria, and therefore disapproval of the requested Waiver is recommended. He indicated that the applicant feels very strongly that they do meet the criteria given the features inside the building. He asked the applicant to explain their position on the request.

Ross Sanford, Lincoln Construction, said he believes there are two separate issues in question, on each of the elevations. He said he agreed with Planning’s analysis about the east elevation, but that the same interpretation should not be applied to the west elevation. He referred to the eight-inch change in plane along the west elevation, which he considered being a “building step,” and not a “recess,” which are found on the north and south sides of the building. He referenced the Code Section 153.062(N)(4)(b)1, which states, “architectural elements or forms shall be used to divide the surface of the façade into pedestrian-scaled increments appropriate to the architectural character of the building type. Acceptable divisions include, but are not limited to...” He said he considered the eight-inch change in plane to be an “architectural element,” even if it was not one of the two examples listed. He said since the provision states that they are “not limited to” those two elements, the ART should consider this as an alternative means of meeting the requirement. He said he was concerned that this issue had not been discussed previously, and neither had it been brought up at the Basic Plan Review. He said he was concerned how the request would be received by the Planning and Zoning Commission without a recommendation of approval from the ART.

Rachel Ray confirmed with Mr. Sanford that he interpreted the change in wall plane to be an “architectural element.”

Mr. Sanford said yes, and it also related to the interpretation of what should be considered a “recess” or “projection.”

Ms. Ray said she was not sure she agreed with Mr. Sanford’s interpretation, because if the Code specifically lists two other types of features, one of which requires an 18-inch recess or projection, applicants could always opt for a smaller change in wall plane instead.

Jeff Tyler said Mr. Sanford’s interpretation is reasonable; however, he referred to the specific purpose and intent of this Code section, which he believed to be the creation of dimension and shadow lines. He said that being the case, he thought the eight inch change in wall plane would help, but it wouldn’t create the same degree of depth intended by the Code.

Mr. Sanford said Section 1 had to do with pedestrian scale increments in the architectural character of the building type. He noted there is no pedestrian walkway on the east side of the building, and the pocket plaza is on the west side of the building. He thought this section was more applicable for buildings and elevations in areas with greater pedestrian activity.

Mr. Tyler said he disagreed with Mr. Sanford’s interpretation. He said “pedestrian scale” refers to the intent to provide shadow lines and dimension, and not just apply to elevations along sidewalks. Mr. Tyler said he agreed with Mr. Sanford’s interpretation about recesses and projections but he was not sure if this proposal accomplishes the intent to provide visual relief and scale down the building.

Ms. Ray said the “architectural element protruding from or recessed into the façade” implies something that projects from the building, but then has a distinct return. She said she understood Mr. Sanford’s interpretation and that the architecture could be interpreted to meet the intent of the requirement. However, she said there still does not appear to be a specific reason why the requirement cannot be met, and therefore staff prefers to err on the side of requiring the architecture to be modified to meet the requirement. She reiterated that the Planning and Zoning Commission, however, may disagree and feel that the elevations as shown are appropriate. She said the Commission had indicated that they would entertain Waiver requests as long as there was a reason to depart from the Code requirement – principally that the result would be better building than if the Code provision were strictly followed. She asked the applicant if they believed that the Waiver would result in a better building than if they were required to modify the building to meet the requirement, or conversely, if the modification would leave the building worse off.

Mark Ford, Ford & Associates Architects, said his concern with changing the architecture to meet the requirement was twofold, and mainly for the west elevation. He said if the wall plane projected further to be about 20 inches, that would impact the spacing between the windows on the south and west elevations. He said it was a matter of recalculating the spacing, and it could probably work, but he was not sure. He pointed out the detail of the windows, indicating the same dimension on all sides of the building. He also indicated the west elevation was the place to have an offset as that is the stair on the interior. He said if he slid the wall plane over to meet the 40-foot dimension, it would produce a weird condition inside on the stairwell. He asked what the degree of the offset should be.

Ms. Ray asked if the wall plane could be moved out by at least 10 inches. Mr. Ford said if they pull the plane forward, they need to move it 12 inches to keep a consistent brick module. He said the south elevation would grow one foot.

He said his secondary concern was that the degree of "non-transparent" façade would thereby increase on the south elevation, which he did not would be an issue in terms of meeting the transparency requirement on the south elevation, but he was not sure. He said they would evaluate the impact on the building further prior to the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. He was concerned that trying to solve one problem would create another.

Ms. Ray suggested they justify their reasons why the building either can or cannot be changed to meet the requirement when they present to the Commission.

Mr. Sanford said he was frustrated with Staff's position, but he was willing to ask the Commission for their consideration of the Waiver.

Steve Langworthy confirmed that the ART was recommending approval of the first three Waivers but the fourth was the issue before the ART, as the present recommendation is to deny the fourth Waiver.

Ms. Ray pointed out that with respect to the east elevation, the length is off by 8 inches, but the depth of the change in wall place is acceptable at two feet, eight inches, but disapproval is still recommended.

Mr. Langworthy asked that the ART review the Waiver criteria. Mr. Gunderman read the Code requirements and restated this was a typical site, and not a unique circumstance. Mr. Ford agreed.

Mr. Langworthy asked if all the criteria had to be met.

Ms. Ray responded that all of the criteria did not need to be met, but considered. She asked if the proposal will bring a higher quality with the Waiver. Mr. Ford said he needed to work the math out. Ms. Ray restated her question. She asked if not approving the Waiver would result in a worse building than by trying to meet Code. Mr. Ford replied that it likely would not be a worse building.

Mr. Langworthy stipulated that the ART's interpretation requires both elevations to be included in one Waiver. Mr. Ford said they could revise the west elevation to meet Code but not the east elevation. He said trying to find 8 inches would be problematic.

Fred Hahn asked if the argument degraded the quality on the east elevation and Mr. Ford answered yes that it would lower the quality of the building.

Barb Cox asked if moving the face of building on the west side out one foot farther to west, if it would cause a ripple effect.

Mr. Ford said it would likely cause a ripple effect on the spacing of the windows and the percentage of glass/opacity. He said it would only affect the south elevation by maybe one percent but the east elevation is problematic. He did not know where to take the eight inches from. He restated he could likely accommodate the west, but not the east.

Joanne Shelly asked if the difference would even be noticeable to pedestrian traffic, since buildings are not often viewed head-on as they are in elevation renderings. Mr. Ford said he hoped that the average pedestrian would notice. More discussion ensued over the interpretations of the Code.

Ms. Ray confirmed recommendation of disapproval for the vertical façade division Waiver applicable to both elevations. Mr. Langworthy confirmed that the ART members agreed with the recommendation of disapproval, requiring the applicant to meet the vertical façade division requirement on both the east and west elevations. [There was consensus].

Mr. Gunderman presented the two Administrative Departures described in the report, for which approval is recommended:

- 1) 153.065(B)(6) – Driveway curb cut width – allowing 24-foot driveway curb cuts at Banker Drive where 22 feet is required, due to existing conditions; and
- 2) 153.065(D)(5) – Parking lot screening – to ensure a continuous landscape treatment, the same landscape character and screening is recommended along all portions of the parking area since a street wall would only be required for a small portion of the parking area due to the curve in Banker Drive.

Mr. Gunderman stated that a request for a third Administrative Departure had been identified since the report was distributed, related to the proposed wall lighting fixtures. He described the proposed decorative fluorescent wall light fixtures proposed adjacent to the building entrances on the north, south and west elevations. He said the exterior lighting requirements in Code Section 153.065(F)(9)(a) allows decorative wall lighting, provided it does not exceed a specific wattage. He said the requirement refers to LED and incandescent fixtures, but does not address fluorescent fixtures. He explained that 28 watt fluorescent lights are proposed, which exceeds the requirement for LED lights, but not incandescent lights.

Mr. Sanford asked if the requirement was intended to address lighting levels or energy efficiency.

Ms. Ray stated that the Code requirement had been written primarily to restrict fixtures that are too bright.

Mr. Sanford said they could provide a shorter fixture to get the fixture under 20 watts, but he didn't think that would look right on the building.

Mr. Langworthy confirmed that the ART found the two Administrative Departures listed in the report and the proposed Administrative Departure related to lighting to be acceptable:

- 3) 153.065(F)(9)(a) – Decorative wall lighting – Allowing a decorative 28 watt fluorescent light fixture, since the regulations only address LED and incandescent fixtures.

Mr. Gunderman presented the recommendation of approval for the Site Plan Review, with the following four conditions:

- 1) That the drive-through stacking lanes are delineated, and the stacking spaces modified to measure a minimum of 20 feet;
- 2) That the applicant provide Sterling Silver Linden street trees 40 feet on center along Banker Drive between the site and David Road, subject to approval by the City Forester;
- 3) That the applicant site the ground sign in a manner that meets the required 8-foot setback from the right-of-way with a minimum of 3 feet of landscaping around the base, subject to Planning approval; and
- 4) That the applicant address the other Planning and Engineering comments contained in this report.

Mr. Langworthy asked the applicant if he understood the conditions and agreed to them. Mr. Sanford agreed to the four conditions. Mr. Langworthy confirmed ART's recommended approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission with four conditions.

Mr. Gunderman presented the request for a Master Sign Plan, which was recommended for approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission. He said the Master Sign Plan allows for the building-mounted (wall) sign on the south elevation facing SR161 to be located more than 14 inches from the nearest wall. He described the proposed sign, which included lettering installed on the awning above the entrance.

Mr. Langworthy said this type of sign has been approved by the Commission before, with a nice outcome. He said this might prompt a change in the Code, since this type of sign is likely to be requested by others. Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any issues with this proposed Master Sign Plan. [There were none.] He confirmed the ART's recommendation of approval of the Master Sign Plan.

Mr. Gunderman presented the ART's recommendations for the Preliminary and Final Plats with the following conditions:

- 1) That the applicant ensure that any minor technical adjustments and other adjustments as noted in this report are made prior to City Council submittal; and
- 2) That the utility easements be labeled as private on the final plat.

Mr. Langworthy confirmed that the ART members had no further comments on this application. He stated this application will be forwarded to the Planning and Zoning Commission with recommendations of approval.

Mr. Langworthy thanked the applicant for their cooperation and stated this request would be forwarded to the Planning and Zoning Commission for determination next Thursday, June 19.

**2. BSC Historic Core District – Architectural and Sign Modification 113 South High Street  
14-043ARB-MPR Minor Project Review**

Jennifer Rauch said this is a request for modifications to building, trim and roof colors and the installation of a new 8-square-foot sign for an existing commercial building on the west side of South High Street, between Pinney Hill and John Wright Lane. She said this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review in accordance with Zoning Code Sections 153.066(G) and 153.170 and the Historic Dublin Design Guidelines.

Ms. Rauch said the ART reviewed this application in May and the applicant has provided revised materials. She said, originally, the proposed color for the main structure was dark blue with lighter trim and a gray roof that the ART determined needed modification to better fit the era from which the structure was built. She said the applicant is now proposing Sherwin Williams "Porcelain" color for the main body of the house; Restoration Hardware "Flint Gray" for the shutters and trim; and the doors Benjamin Moore "Van Buren Brown" that is a dark brown shade.

Ms. Rauch said the 8-square-foot sign consists of a single, 1-inch thick wooden panel with two individual sign panels for each tenant. She said the proposed sign background color has been revised to better blend with the structure using the same color as the main structure ("Porcelain"). She said each tenant will include a routed rectangle with carved text and a secondary image. She explained that two different text colors will be used: "Van Buren Brown" for the left panel and "Commodore Blue" for the right panel. She explained the sign will be hung in same space as the previous tenant's sign, which is under the existing porch roof fronting South High Street, flush with the face of the porch. She stated that all of the requirements have been addressed and met and recommends ART approval with no conditions.

Steve Langworthy confirmed the ART's recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board with no conditions.

## INTRODUCTION

### 3. BSC Commercial District – Shoppes at River Ridge – Coldwell Banker Sign 4535 West Dublin-Granville Road 14-057MPR/MSP Minor Project Review/Master Sign Plan Review

Jennifer Rauch said this is a request to construct a new 44-square-foot wall sign exceeding the height requirement for a new office tenant in the Shoppes at River Ridge shopping center on the south side of West Dublin-Granville Road at the intersection with Dale Drive. She said this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review, and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Bridge Street District Master Sign Plan in accordance with Zoning Code Section 153.065(H) and under the provisions of Code Section 153.066.

Ms. Rauch said there are two different tenant spaces that need signs, both associated with Coldwell Banker. She indicated the wall sign proposed over the main entrance does not meet the 15-foot height requirement for signs on Existing Structures in the Bridge Street District. She said vinyl graphics are proposed for the entrance doors on both the left and right sides of the main entrance doors. She said the graphics will be applied directly to the glass surface. She presented an illustration of the proposed window signs.

Ms. Rauch said a Master Sign Plan is required to address the height of the proposed wall sign. She said the main entrance sign meets the overall size for a permitted sign, but the sign as proposed exceeds the 15-foot maximum height permitted. She explained the sign is proposed at 23 feet in height because of the architectural design of the elevation. She presented a photo of the elevation and pointed out the window, with a blank space above the front window facing Dale Drive. She indicated that based on previous discussions with the Planning and Zoning Commission on signs in this shopping center, they have consistently stated signs must meet the height requirement, regardless of the building's architecture.

Fred Hahn asked about the canopy and asked if the sign could be installed under the canopy. Ms. Rauch said she had discussed several different alternatives with the applicant.

Joanne Shelly, Urban Designer and Landscape Architect remarked there is too much architectural detail behind the canopy that would make the lettering difficult to read.

Bruce Sommerfelt, Signcom, Inc. explained the sign is scaled to fit the empty space on the tower very well, which also has the best visibility. He said the applicant is fully aware of the issues and they have evaluated many alternatives to meet the Code but nothing has been workable. He indicated the two lateral wings are covered by foliage, which makes most of the alternatives that meet the height requirement difficult to see.

Chad Morgan, Coldwell Banker, said that Coldwell Banker King Thompson selected this specific tenant space because of its architectural character and prominence.

Mr. Sommerfelt said this may be an ongoing problem with other tenant spaces in the shopping center.

Claudia Husak pointed out that there have been problems with signs conflicting with architecture in this shopping center from the beginning.

Barb Cox asked if the window could be removed and replaced with the sign. Mr. Morgan said the window is 14 feet, 9 inches from grade, which would still not allow the sign to meet the height requirement.

Mr. Sommerfelt said he believed the proposed sign met the intent of the Code as the sign fits well within the architectural character of the building, because it is a natural place for a sign.

Ms. Husak recommended that all options be explored first.

Ms. Shelly suggested that the applicant prepare to demonstrate why all of the other options do not work to support their request.

Mr. Morgan referred to the Wendy's wall sign that exceeds the height limitation. Steve Langworthy stated that Wendy's obtained a variance for the height, among other aspects of their sign package.

Mr. Morgan said he would like to ask the Planning and Zoning Commission for permission to install the sign at a greater height than permitted by Code. Ms. Rauch said it would be within the Commission's authority to review and approve this request.

Ms. Husak said a sign integrated on the canopy may be a more viable option for the Commission to approve.

Mr. Morgan explained "Coldwell Banker" is the national brand and "King Thompson" is the local brand, and the two components need to stay together and the location on the canopy does not fit.

Mr. Langworthy said the applicant needs to work on their materials to demonstrate no other viable options exist. He said the ART would review this application further next week. Ms. Rauch encouraged the applicant to look holistically at a Master Sign Plan for the entire shopping center.

Mr. Langworthy confirmed that there were no further items for discussion, and noted that a recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission for this application is planned for next week's ART meeting.

#### **ADMINISTRATIVE**

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any administrative issues or other items for discussion.

Rachel Ray reported that the Red Roof Inn had requested a Time Extension, but they were ready to return to the ART for a determination. She explained that she had shared the ART's concerns with the proposed sign design with the applicant, and noted that the ART may elect to forward the request for Minor Project Review for the sign to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a final determination. She said a recommendation on the case was scheduled for next week's ART meeting.

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any other issues or comments. [There were none.] The meeting was adjourned at 3:28 pm.