



**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

AUGUST 14, 2014

ART Members and Designees: Steve Langworthy, Planning Director; Gary Gunderman, Planning Manager; Alan Perkins, Washington Township Fire Marshal; Jeff Tyler, Building Standards Director; Colleen Gilger, Economic Development Director; Barb Cox, Engineering Manager; Laura Ball, Landscape Architect; Dave Marshall, Review Services Analyst; Ray Harpham, Commercial Plans Examiner; and Sergeant Rodney Barnes, Police.

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

Applicants: Bob Sochor, Howard Hanna Realcom Realty (Case 1); and Jill Waddell, DaNite Sign Co. (Case 2).

Steve Langworthy called the meeting to order. He asked if there were any amendments to the August 7, 2014, meeting minutes. He confirmed that the ART members had sent their modifications to Ms. Wright prior to the meeting. The minutes were accepted into the record as amended.

CASE REVIEWS

1. BSC Historic Core District – Howard Hanna Realcom Realty – Sign

14-082ARB-MPR

**37 W. Bridge Street
Minor Project Review**

Katie Ashbaugh said this is a request for installation of a new 7.83-square-foot wall sign for an existing commercial building on the south side of West Bridge Street, between Franklin Street and Mill Lane. She said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.066(G) and 153.170 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Ms. Ashbaugh said this site is just one block west of Jeni's Splendid Ice Cream. She said the tenant occupies a historic building, built in 1944 as the Perry Township fire house.

Ms. Ashbaugh presented the proposed sign on a slide showing dimensions of 47 inches wide, 24 inches high, and 1 5/8 inches deep. She said the sign is made of a solid cedar plank with cove-routed edges and routed letters with a dark green background and gold text. She stated the sign as proposed will be centered above the storefront, at a height of 15 feet per Code rather than the original submission proposing 16 feet, and mounted two inches from the stone surface.

Ms. Ashbaugh said two sign types, including ground signs and building mounted signs, are permitted for each street-facing building façade or frontage. She said the existing ground sign will stay and the text reads "37 Bridge Street Firehouse". Upon site review, she reported it was found that there were two

existing window signs on each of the front doors that are not permitted since they had not been approved by the ART or the ARB, nor had permits been submitted for the window signs.

Steve Langworthy clarified for the applicant that there are currently two window signs and one ground sign where only two signs are permitted total, even if the applicant did have the proper permits.

Bob Sochor, the applicant, said he would remove the graphics on both doors. He explained the door on the left is not used for ingress or egress. He also understood that these signs would have to come down by the time the new proposed sign was installed.

Dave Marshall asked if this was single-tenant occupancy. Mr. Sochor answered affirmatively. Mr. Marshall asked if there were any plans for additional tenants. Mr. Sochor said there were no plans for other tenants at this time.

Mr. Marshall inquired about illumination of the sign. Mr. Sochor said the sign is not illuminated itself but there is existing ground lighting providing spot wash on the face of the building.

Mr. Langworthy asked the ART if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application at this time. [There were none.] He stated that a recommendation to the Architectural Review Board for this request was scheduled for next week's ART meeting.

Mr. Langworthy reminded the applicant to remove the window graphics as soon as possible as there is no sign permit for them on file.

**2. BSC Commercial District – Chevrolet of Dublin – Wall Signs
14-084MPR**

**5002 Post Road
Minor Project Review**

Jonathan Staker said this is a request to install two new 45.92-square-foot wall signs for an existing vehicular sales facility on the north side of Post Road, north of the intersection with Frantz Road. He said this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066(G).

Mr. Staker presented an aerial view of the site that contains two buildings with two different Post Road addresses: 5002 and 5016. For the purpose of illustration, he said the sign for 5016 is labeled 'A' and the one for 5002 is labeled 'B'. He explained that both signs face Post Road. He said the applicant is proposing one wall sign for each building with identical designs. They will each have text that reads "Chevrolet of Dublin" and will be the same size at 14 feet, six inches wide and three feet, two inches tall. He said three colors were proposed, including the logo, which meets Code. He explained that each sign will be mounted four inches from the façade and placed 15 feet above grade at both locations. Mr. Staker said in the Bridge Street District, Commercial standards had been met as one wall sign was allowed for each building.

There were questions as to how wall sign 'A' would be mounted. Mr. Staker provided drawings that showed the installation instructions and the electrical components, etc., which was typical wiring. The question was also asked how wall sign 'B' would be mounted given the ledge that appears to be on the building.

Jill Waddell, DaNite Sign Co. said the applicant considered having an engineer review the plans but wanted to see if the ART would grant approval for the signs before moving forward. She explained that sign 'A' will have individual letters mounted with a backer panel that attaches to the building.

Ray Harpham asked if all of the installation details would come in with the sign permit if the ART approves this proposal. Ms. Waddell confirmed they would.

Jennifer Rauch questioned the height as the reports are conflicting: the tables state the sign is 18 feet, one inch above grade and the graphic shows the top of the sign at 15 feet, which is permissible.

Rachel Ray clarified that the proposed signs are shown not exceeding 15 feet above grade.

Steve Langworthy asked for more information for the attachment of sign 'A'. Ms. Waddell said there is a panel on the back. Jeff Tyler asked if the sign was aluminum. Ms. Waddell stated it was brushed aluminum, painted silver.

Mr. Langworthy asked the applicant if she had anything else to add to which she replied that she did not.

Mr. Harpham asked if this was a temporary or permanent sign or whether it was a permanent sign being installed in a temporary location. He said it looks like a banner. He asked if this application was being forwarded to the Planning and Zoning Commission. Mr. Staker confirmed it is not.

Mr. Harpham asked if the applicant has been asked to remove their neon sign. Ms. Rauch reported that Code Enforcement is working on the removal of neon signs city-wide. Mr. Staker thought the neon sign had been removed when he conducted a site visit the previous day.

Barb Cox asked if the site was on two parcels of land. Rachel Ray clarified it was a single parcel.

Ms. Rauch asked if the applicant thought 'Sign A' was in the best location.

Ms. Waddell said they considered the side along Post Road but it was not the right height so the sign is shown in the best location they could identify. She said the elevation along Post Road was blocked by trees.

Mr. Langworthy asked the ART if there were any questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He stated that a determination on this request was scheduled for next week's ART meeting.

**3. BSC Public District – Dublin Community Preschool – Sign 81 ½ W. Bridge Street
14-085ARB-MPR Minor Project Review**

Logan Stang said this is a request for the installation of a new 7.9-square-foot wall sign for an existing pre-school on the south side of West Bridge Street at the intersection with Franklin Street. He said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.066(G) and 153.170 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Mr. Stang said the applicant is proposing to remove the existing sign and replace it with a new one near a corner of the north side of the wall. He stated that this site is zoned Bridge Street District Public District. He presented several graphics that showed the location of the site and the existing sign. He said the preschool is connected to the church which has a ground sign on the corner. He presented a graphic that showed the existing approximately 7.9 square foot sign, mounted at approximately four feet, six inches above grade. He explained the proposed sign will be installed at the same height. He said there are two colors: the background is a wood-grain texture painted in Emerald Green and the raised letters and border are in white.

Mr. Stang said the applicant was not present.

Jennifer Rauch said that in the Zoning Code for signs in the Bridge Street District, there are districts identified as Historic Core, Historic Transition and All Other Districts. She said this application falls under the "All Other" category so the applicant could be eligible for more signs. She said the applicant could consider two building mounted signs with one on the rear facing the parking lot. She questioned whether the proposed sign on the wall of the playground was the best location.

Jeff Tyler said it was an appropriate location as it is not used for advertising, just for noting the establishment's location. He asked if it would make a difference. Ms. Rauch said no phone number is going on the replacement sign and thought most people already know where the entrance to the preschool is located.

Steve Langworthy asked the ART if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application at this time. [There were none.] He stated that a recommendation to the Architectural Review Board for this request was scheduled for next week's ART meeting.

4. Bridge Park East – Mixed-Use Development Project, Phase 1
14-071DP-BSC
Riverside Drive and Dale Drive
Development Plan Review

Rachel Ray said this is a request for review and approval for four new blocks for development on approximately 17.28 acres, including new public rights-of-way for a future mixed-use development on the east side of Riverside Drive, south of the future John Shields Parkway, west of Tuller Ridge Drive, and north of West Dublin-Granville Road. She said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Bridge Street District Development Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Ms. Ray said the applicant was not present and there were no updates to report on this application. She indicated she had met with the applicant yesterday to cover streetscapes and other public realm details. She said the applicant is busy going through the materials and considering extending the timeline by two weeks, which means they would go before the Planning and Zoning Commission on September 18, 2014. If that is what they decide, she said they will need to complete a Time Extension form. She said she would keep the ART posted on their progress but expects the applicant to meet with the ART over the next couple of weeks.

Steve Langworthy inquired about the timing for the other applications. Ms. Ray responded the applicant is preparing to submit the Basic Site Plan Review, but the applicant is reviewing the materials and trying to determine how to scale back their more advanced building permit drawings to a reasonable level of detail for the submittal.

Mr. Langworthy asked the ART if there were any questions or concerns regarding this application at this time. [There were none.]

ADMINISTRATIVE

Steve Langworthy asked if there were any additional administrative issues or other items for discussion. [There were none.] The meeting was adjourned at 2:25 pm.