

- 4) That a landscape plan, including evergreen screening of the entire compound to meet the requirements of the Zoning Code, is submitted subject to Planning approval prior to permitting.

Ms. Downie asked the applicant if he was in agreement with the Administrative Departure and four conditions of approval. Bryan Brawner agreed to the conditions, but inquired about the new expanded area that is being leased from Dublin City Schools. He asked how to proceed if the school does not allow the landscaping at the required height.

Ms. Downie said the evergreen screening has three years to get to the full height per Code.

Tim Hosterman pointed out that the second antenna on this property houses the police network and the base building belongs to them. He said they are following up with Verizon to confirm that there will be no interference.

Jeff Tyler asked if the landscaping requirement and screening requirement could be met separately. Ms. Downie answered affirmatively.

Mr. Tyler recommended the condition remain as written. He said if Dublin School cannot support the landscaping, the application will need to be brought back to the ART for further review.

Mr. Brawner said he would contact the school and work on supplying a landscape plan.

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any further comments. [There were none.] He confirmed the ART's approval of this Minor Project Review.

**2. BSD C – Embassy Suites Hotel – Sign
15-094MPR**

**5100 Upper Metro Place
Minor Project Review**

Tammy Noble said this is a request for replacement of an existing ground sign for the Embassy Suites Hotel on the north side of Upper Metro Place, approximately 350 feet west of the intersection with Frantz Road. 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. Noble stated the proposal is for the installation of a new cabinet and sign face to the existing 46-square-foot monument sign. She said the proposed sign design includes changing the existing beige background to a gray background and revised text, but the logo will remain the same. She said that of all the existing signs on the site, this location was the most visible and indicated the potential for future proposals.

Ms. Noble said she will review the required landscaping with the applicant. She said the application meets the requirements of the Code for location, size, height, color, and number of signs as well as the previously approved variances.

Ms. Noble said approval is recommended for the Minor Project Review with no conditions.

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He confirmed the ART's approval of the Minor Project Review.

CASE REVIEW

3. BSD HC – Perimeter Fence 15-095ARB/MPR

40 E. Bridge Street Minor Project Review

Katie Dodaro said this is a request for the installation of a fence on a residential property located within the BSD Historic Core, northeast of the intersection of N. Blacksmith Lane and E. Bridge Street. She said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Ms. Dodaro pointed out that originally this was scheduled for a determination, but upon further analysis more discussion was requested.

Ms. Dodaro presented an aerial view of the site; the proposed site plan, which had not changed since the introduction last week; and photos of the proposed white lattice fence. She also presented a photograph of the existing stone wall and noted the grade change of the backyard of ± 12 feet. She provided a view of the front of the house where the main entrance is as well as the existing lattice along the deck. She explained the existing portion of vinyl fence to the north of the structure has been there prior to 2005.

Ms. Dodaro posed three discussion questions:

1. Does the lattice fence type meet the standards of the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*?
2. Does the proposed fence meet the BSD Code?
3. Does the proposed fence meet the intent of the 50% opacity requirement or is a Waiver appropriate?

Jenny Rauch questioned if a lattice-type fence will be viewed by the Architectural Review Board as the most appropriate type even when the material meets Code. She noted there are already different types of fencing on this property and this application will need to also be reviewed by the ARB.

Jeff Tyler indicated the existing lattice appeared more like a screen for the deck.

Ms. Rauch asked the ART's opinion of the existing vinyl fence as well as the dog-eared fence on the back deck.

Vince Papsidero asked what purpose the vinyl fence provided. Ms. Dodaro answered the short segment of vinyl fencing enclosed the edge of the porch.

Mr. Tyler inquired about the Historic District standards for fencing. Ms. Rauch said the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* suggest traditional fence and wall types that might include low stone walls in the traditional, distinctive Dublin design; low picket fences, iron fences or in a backyard area, board fences with straight or "dog-eared" top edges; and even rows of trees and shrubs. She said the *Guidelines* suggest avoiding non-traditional materials such as concrete or "cyclone" fencing and avoid non-traditional wood fencing designs like basket-weave, shadow-box, or stockade fences. Further she said, the *Guidelines* recommend paint or an opaque stain on wood fencing, rather than leave it natural. She added the *Guidelines* low fences for side and rear yards.

Mr. Tyler reiterated fence details need to be provided of the lattice treatment and how it is going to look and be installed.

Mr. Tyler said the lattice type fence did not appear to be stable and is being used as a temporary solution. He said he would need to see more than what was provided.

Ms. Rauch asked the ART if the vinyl style or similar design would be appropriate as this property has some significance to the Historic District.

Mr. Papsidero suggested introducing a white picket fence.

The ART noticed a wrought-iron gate incorporated in the rear stone wall.

Mr. Tyler said he thought a four-foot picket fence would be appropriate.

Donna Goss indicated pre-fabricated picket fence panels are available.

Laura Ball said the ART is tasked with making a recommendation to the ARB for the most appropriate fence.

Ms. Shelly said she would like to provide the applicant with a very clear direction.

Ms. Rauch said additional drawings need to be provided.

Mr. Tyler indicated he is sympathetic to the applicant's limitations, but this would be requested of every applicant, no matter the circumstances.

Ms. Goss suggested an invisible fence as an option. Ms. Ball recommended a three or four-foot fence be installed.

Aaron Stanford asked if the application had been signed by the property owner. Ms. Shelly confirmed that the property owner had signed the application.

Ms. Shelly asked if the fence posts would need to be set in concrete. Mr. Tyler replied affirmatively since that would be the proper way for installing the posts.

Ms. Rauch requested that detail be provided for how the fence will be joined to the stone wall. Ms. Shelly said it would just abut to the wall, therefore not causing any damage to the historic stone wall.

Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns. [There were none.]

ADMINISTRATIVE

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any administrative issues or other items for discussion. [There were none.]

Mr. Papsidero adjourned the meeting at 2:30 pm.

As approved by the Administrative Review Team on October 15, 2015.