



**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

SEPTEMBER 4, 2014

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

Other Staff: Rachel Ray, Planner II; Jenny Rauch, Planner II; Devayani Puranik, Planner II; Andrew Crozier, Planning Assistant; and Laurie Wright, Staff Assistant.

Applicants: Laura Schweitzer, Sign Vision Co. (Case 3); and Tim Tucker, Halloween Express (Case 4).

Steve Langworthy called the meeting to order. He asked if there were any amendments to the August 28, 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.

INTRODUCTION

**1. BSC Historic Core
14-090ARB-MPR**

**48-52 S. High Street
Minor Project Review**

Jennifer Rauch said this is a request for architectural modifications to a building and trim colors for an existing commercial building on the east side of South High Street, between Spring Hill and Eberly Hill. She said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board for a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.170 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Ms. Rauch presented a slide that showed the existing building that houses five tenants. She pointed out that the roof had recently been replaced with a new standing seam metal roof. She said the applicant would now like to repaint the building and change the awnings. She stated that the applicant is proposing the following paint colors: Benjamin Moore "White Dove" for the body and the trim for all upper windows; Benjamin Moore "Revere Pewter" for the trim detail around the doors and windows on street level; and Valspar "Vintage Frame" for the exterior doors at street level. She said the applicant would like to replace the green canvas awnings with a dark bronze standing seam metal awning to be consistent with the dark bronze color of the doors.

Steve Langworthy inquired if the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* permitted standing seam metal awnings.

Ms. Rauch said the *Guidelines* allowed for canvas awnings, and for a building built in the mid-1800s, the awning should not be continuous across the entire storefront. She said she would need to confirm if the metal awnings would be appropriate. She reported that one long canvas awning was already in place.

Ms. Rauch confirmed that white was the original paint color of the body of this building so using another light color seemed appropriate. She said she did not have any issues with the colors selected, but had concerns with the materials proposed, as they seemed out of character.

Rachel Ray asked if there were right-of-way encroachment issues with the awning.

Barb Cox said Engineering had less concern with an awning projecting over the right-of-way than something encroaching at ground level. She noted that a process for dealing with such right-of-way encroachments was needed.

Mr. Langworthy asked if contrasting trim was required.

Ms. Rauch said the *Guidelines* did not require the trim color to contrast with the body color.

Gary Gunderman asked if this proposal was being reviewed by one of the City's architectural consultants. Ms. Rauch said a consultant's services could be engaged.

Jeff Tyler said he thought the awnings continuing all the way across the entire storefront did not seem appropriate.

Mr. Langworthy asked the ART if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He stated that a recommendation on this request was scheduled for September 18, 2014.

DETERMINATIONS

2. Verizon Wireless Co-Location – O'Shaughnessy Dam Tower 6013 Glick Road 14-087ARTW Administrative Review - Wireless

Andrew Crozier said this is a request to replace six panel antennas and install nine remote radio heads and two OVP distribution boxes on an existing monopole tower. He said the site is on the south side of Glick Road approximately 850 feet east of the intersection with Dublin Road. He 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.

Mr. Crozier said an Administrative Departure was needed as Chapter 99 limits the height of wireless communication facility towers to a maximum of 120 feet in all non-residential districts as measured to the top of the antennas. He said the proposed overall height for the Verizon antennas (154 feet, 2 inches from grade) and the existing tower (152 feet) exceed the height maximum. He explained that the tower and antennas were erected prior to the adoption of the amendments to Chapter 99. He added that this proposal does not add height changes as the new equipment will be installed at the same height, however, the plan measures the height of the tower from the centerline of the tallest antennas, whereas Chapter 99 requires that height be measured to the top of the antennas. He stated that an Administrative Departure was recommended to accommodate the increased height of the antennas.

Mr. Crozier said approval with two conditions was also recommended:

- 1) That the new equipment should be unobtrusive and maintain similar color; and
- 2) That any associated cables are trimmed to fit closely to the panels.

Gary Gunderman confirmed with Mr. Crozier that the cable ran on the outside of the pole.

Rachel Ray stated there is to be no ground modifications; no building permit was needed, just a Certificate of Zoning Plan Approval; and that the applicant had accepted the conditions prior to the meeting.

Steve Langworthy asked the ART if there were any questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He clarified that the Administrative Departure was for the additional two feet, two inches when correctly measured according to Chapter 99. He confirmed the ART's approval of the Administrative Departure.

Mr. Langworthy also confirmed the ART's approval of this application with two conditions.

**3. BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood District – Visionworks – Signs 6465 Sawmill Road
14-088MPR Minor Project Review**

Rachel Ray said this is a request for a 33-square-foot wall sign, a 6-square-foot wall sign, and a 12.6-square-foot ground sign for a new commercial building on Sawmill Road approximately 220 feet south of Banker Drive. She said this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.065(H) and 153.066(G).

Ms. Ray said all three signs meet Code for size, location, height, color, and number. Ms. Ray said she sent this application to the City's sign consultant, Studio Graphique, for review to which they recommended approval with no additional comments in terms of sign design.

Ms. Ray said approval for this request for three signs is recommended with one condition:

- 1) That the applicant provides a landscape plan for the ground sign as part of the sign permit.

Laura Schweitzer, Sign Vision Co., stated that the applicant agreed to the condition.

Mr. Langworthy asked the ART if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He confirmed the ART's approval of this request for Minor Project Review with one condition.

**4. BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood District – Halloween Express – Sign
6655 Sawmill Road
14-089MRP Minor Project Review**

Rachel Ray said this is a request for a new 72-square-foot wall sign for a retail facility within an existing commercial building at the northwest corner of the intersection of Sawmill Road and Village Parkway. She said this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.065(H) and 153.066(G).

Ms. Ray said the proposed 72-square-foot wall sign exceeds the size requirement of 42 square feet permitted by Code while all other dimensional requirements were met. She said both the size and the black raceway visible behind the lettering were concerns as part of the sign's design. She explained that the raceway makes the sign appear temporary, and the overall appearance is inconsistent with the quality and design standards for signs in the Bridge Street District. She stated there were also questions about whether the electrical had been installed appropriately.

Ms. Ray said disapproval is recommended for this request for Minor Project Review. She stated that the recommendation included a requirement that the sign be removed by September 15, 2014.

Steve Langworthy suggested that a sign of correct size with regular channel lettering could be an alternative to the lettering installed over the black raceway.

Tim Tucker said he understood that the sign was not installed correctly and asked what internal processes he could pursue to maintain the sign.

Ms. Ray explained that the ART's decision on this application could be appealed to the Board of Zoning Appeals, but the applicant would need to demonstrate that the ART inappropriately arrived at the decision to disapprove the sign. She said the applicant could also request approval of a Master Sign Plan from the Planning and Zoning Commission, but it was unlikely to be approved, and there is a much more substantial application fee involved.

Mr. Langworthy said a Master Sign Plan would be the most logical approach, but he agreed with Ms. Ray that approval was unlikely.

Mr. Tucker said this is a temporary business and by the time he would get through the appeal process, he would be closing his doors for the season.

Mr. Langworthy said there are temporary sign alternatives and asked the applicant to explore those options. He explained that the problem the applicant is likely to run into with obtaining a temporary sign is that it is only good for 30 days. He emphasized and confirmed with the applicant that the existing sign has to be removed by September 15.

Steve Langworthy asked the ART and the applicant if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He confirmed the ART's disapproval of this request for Minor Project Review, and that the sign be removed by September 15, 2014.

CASE REVIEW

5. 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 reported the applicant requested another time extension. She said they met yesterday to discuss the streetscape design, and the applicant indicated they would now like to take this application forward to the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) in October. She explained this would require a determination from the ART at the September 25th meeting. She said there is more work to be done, including more detail for walkway, cycletrack, and patio pavement.

Ms. Ray said the applicant would however like to submit the Basic Site Plan application for Blocks B and C next week to begin that review process.

Ms. Ray concluded the time extension request was for two weeks and the ART's recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission would be tentatively scheduled for September 25, 2014.

Steve Langworthy asked the ART if there were any additional questions or concerns regarding this application. [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 2:30 pm.