



ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM

MEETING MINUTES

OCTOBER 22, 2015

ART Members and Designees: Vince Papsidero, Planning Director; Alan Perkins, Fire Marshal; Jeff Tyler, Building Standards Director; Donna Goss, Director of Development; Colleen Gilger, Director of Economic Development; Matt Earman, Parks and Recreational Dept. Director; Laura Ball, Landscape Architect; Aaron Stanford, Senior Civil Engineer; and Tim Hosterman, Police Sergeant.

Other Staff: Marie Downie, Planner I; Jennifer Rauch, Senior Planner; Joanne Shelly, Urban Designer/Landscape Architect; Claudia Husak, Planner II; Katie Dodaro, Planning Assistant; Nicole Martin, Planning Assistant; and Laurie Wright, Staff Assistant.

Applicants: Matt Starr, Crawford Hoying Development Partners (Cases 1 & 2); James Peltier, EMH&T (Case 4); Laura Timberlake and Brad Chapman, Big Sandy Superstores (Case 5).

Vince Papsidero called the meeting to order at 2:05 pm. He asked if there were any amendments to the October 15, 2015, meeting minutes. The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

INTRODUCTIONS

- | | | |
|----|---|--|
| 1. | BSD SRN – Bridge Park East, Blocks B&C
15-099MSP | Riverside Drive and Dale Drive
Master Sign Plan |
| 2. | BSD HTN – Bridge Park West
15-100ARB-MSP | 94-100 North High Street
Master Sign Plan |

Jennifer Rauch said the first case is a request for a Master Sign Plan for a new 8.2-acre mixed-use development on the east side of Riverside Drive, south of the intersection with Tuller Ridge Drive. She said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Master Sign Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Jennifer Rauch said the second case is a request for a Master Sign Plan for a new mixed-use development on the east side of North High Street, approximately 280 feet north of the intersection with North Street. She said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board for a Master Sign Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Ms. Rauch presented the Master Sign Plan submitted by Crawford Hoying Development Partners for cases 15-099MSP and 15-100ARB-MSP. She said the materials submitted are very similar and the issues Staff has identified crossover both cases. She explained the proposals include similar graphics to the *BSD Sign Guidelines*. She suggested as the case moves forward Staff recommends the Master Sign Plan definitions and measurements match what is found in the Bridge Street District to ensure consistency. She said the proposal contains sign allowances above what the Zoning Code allows. She presented examples of the increased height and number of signs for a variety of the elevations. She presented the proposed sign types.

Ms. Rauch said as the process stands currently, once the Master Sign Plan is approved, no other approvals will be required of the Planning and Zoning Commission or the Architectural Review Board. She asked the applicant if he wanted to elaborate on the Master Sign Plan documents.

Matt Starr, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, explained the sign types and locations on each building are shown in blue. He said the sign integration will not be determined until the tenants have been identified, thus specifying the amount of space being allocated as well as the location. He said colors and design will also have to be considered to coordinate signs as tenants come forward.

Mr. Starr explained for the development of their MSP, they started with the Zoning Code and applied the *BSD Sign Guidelines*. He reported they have compared and evaluated the differences with this project to what is permitted in the Code as these are four-sided buildings and many consist of six stories. He said they have tried to strike a balance between what would work best visually for pedestrians, cyclists, and vehicles. He noted Code permits four signs for a tenant occupying three-sides of a building. In contrast, he provided the example of building C2 that will contain a restaurant that would need more signs. He added that primary or secondary entrances for large spaces also need to be considered. He indicated the applicant has contemplated all possible scenarios. He said the applicant understands the desire for the signs in this area to be high quality, creative, unique, and innovative. He said the submission of the MSP is only for Blocks B&C and a MSP for Block A will follow shortly.

Claudia Husak asked that the MSP be made clearer in regards to the area it includes and as more blocks come forward they be added to this document. She said this will simplify the process and keep the MSP comprehensive.

Ms. Husak asked if the wayfinding signs would be included in the City wayfinding project. Mr. Starr answered the wayfinding for the Bridge Park and Bridge Park West projects were developed with the citywide wayfinding project. Mr. Starr said the proposed wayfinding sign on the east side of High Street is a taller kiosk to be more visible because the parking entrance is set back. He said they have added information to that sign instead of proposing an additional wayfinding sign that would then clutter the sidewalk. He said the issue of permitting this sign in the right-of-way will need to be resolved; if the sign is set back on private property it will not be visible.

Ms. Husak questioned the process the applicant would use to approve individual signs on their end. She suggested presenting examples of signs that might be proposed for the PZC and ARB.

Mr. Starr explained the applicant would like the tenants to present their proposed signs to Crawford Hoying Development Partners first prior to submitting for sign permits.

Vince Papsidero asked if Crawford Hoying Development Partners had created an internal committee to review tenant signs. Mr. Starr answered the committee would likely consist of himself and Russ Hunter.

Donna Goss asked if guidelines and regulations for signs would be achieved through the lease agreement. Mr. Starr said the lease agreement would give Crawford Hoying Development Partners something to fall back on.

Jeff Tyler asked the applicant if they have met with any sign fabricators regarding the proposed signs. He said the ART has seen a lot of sign fabricators and they generally put out the same products. He indicated that while the applicant understands the need for creative and unique signs, he is not certain the local sign fabricators will be able to achieve those goals.

Mr. Starr said they have not met with the sign fabricators yet, but plan to find the right sign firm to do the job. He said signs they have used for garages on other projects were created from a company that was not local and they liked the quality product they produced. He indicated they are contemplating using that company to meet the high standards required in Dublin since they have been pleased with their products in the past for other projects.

Mr. Starr indicated he was concerned with Council's push back on the *BSD Sign Guidelines*. He said he wished one of his tenants was further along in the process to use as a guide.

Ms. Husak cautioned the applicant not to leave signs as their last concern, which the ART has witnessed with other developers in the past. She said signs need to be integrated into the architecture and not left as an afterthought.

Mr. Starr said he would provide materials that would illustrate where the applicant is headed.

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

Ms. Rauch said the ART's recommendation for 15-099MSP will target the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting on December 3, 2015, and 15-100MSP will target the Architectural Review Board meeting on November 17, 2015.

**3. BSD HTN – Bridge Park West
15-102ARB-MPR**

**94-100 North High Street
Minor Project Review/ Waivers**

Jennifer Rauch said this is a request for modifications and Waivers to the approved Bridge Park West development on the east side of North High Street approximately 280 feet north of the intersection with North Street. 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 Section 153.066 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Ms. Rauch said Staff is currently working through the list of requested Waivers. She provided an overview of several of the larger issues, with a more detailed analysis to be provided at next week's ART meeting.

Ms. Rauch said the most significant request from an architectural perspective is the change to the approved eyebrow detail on the apartment building due to constructability issues. She presented a rendering illustrating the proposed change to the former cornice detail. She stated the smaller eyebrow detail would still meet Code, but poses a character issue for the overall building design.

Ms. Rauch discussed the proposed changes to the design of the bio-retention basin due to changes in the stormwater management plan. She said the review is for the open space design and not the stormwater changes.

Ms. Rauch discussed the changes to the balconies on the apartment building elevations. She said the applicant has added several balcony areas as service balconies, which are narrower and shorter than required by Code. She said the purpose of the service balconies is to allow maintenance on the outside (cleaning, etc.). She indicated this will need to be formally approved by the ARB.

Ms. Rauch said another Waiver is related to the requirements regarding blank walls. She said there are areas within the interior courtyard, which do not meet the requirements and will need approval. She explained these areas are interior and would not be visible to the public.

CASE REVIEW

5. BSD SCN – Big Sandy Superstore – Signs 15-090MSP

6825 Dublin Center Drive Master Sign Plan

Joanne Shelly said this is a request for the installation of one primary and two secondary entrance signs to be coordinated with proposed façade and site renovations. She said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Master Sign Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Ms. Shelly presented the two design concept plans that were submitted:

Plan 1 includes revised signs with sculptures pinned to the interior back wall that are visible through the glass on the front of the building. Ms. Shelly said the metal sculptures will be of furniture and appliances to represent the type of products for sale. She described the sculptures as laser-cut shapes out of brushed aluminum and presented an example.

Plan 2 includes the existing brand font to best project the brand image on a proposed brush metal box with the letters back-lit also with pieces of sculpture.

Ms. Shelly said an additional metal sculptured bench and bollard are proposed to elevate the pedestrian experience in the public space in the front of the building.

Laura Timberlake, Big Sandy Superstore, said she is concerned with the impression the PZC is getting from the presentations. She indicated the PZC seems to have trouble seeing beyond the look of the existing structure. She said she wants the PZC to understand the concessions the applicant has made thus far as they are trying to appease all fronts.

Jeff Tyler asked if she preferred Plan 1 with the sculptures.

Ms. Timberlake replied she just wants a sign on the building as soon as possible. She said the applicant would love to have a sign that represented their brand, but also respects the integrity of the Dublin guidelines. She indicated the applicant has received a mixed review between the PZC and the Code and is open to suggestions. She asked the ART how the PZC might react to the revised proposal as the applicant does not want disapproval.

Ms. Timberlake said the local artist is fantastic and will customize benches that will be bolted onto the concrete. She said the decorative bollards are not necessary but add an artistic feel for pedestrian traffic.

Vince Papsidero said the PZC may be having trouble reading the renderings and therefore challenged with envisioning this proposal. He encouraged the applicant to show more dimension for the preferred option to bring it to life more.

Ms. Timberlake said the canopy over the entrances is curved and she has yet to be successful obtaining 3-dimensional samples from sign fabricators. She said there is a lack of signage companies that have the ability to do what the applicant is requesting.

Mr. Papsidero emphasized that the current proposal is not communicating visually.

Ms. Shelly said a 3-dimensional model of the space would tell the best story. She said the problem is the pieces are so small, they blend in and a close-up view would help.

Donna Goss encouraged the applicant to show the bollards as well.

Ms. Timberlake said drawn custom pieces are hard to conceptualize and anything else becomes cost prohibitive.

Colleen Gilger asked if the applicant can provide any material samples that the PZC can get their hands on and see up close. Ms. Timberlake answered that DaNite Sign indicated they could provide a brushed aluminum box the letters would be formed in for Plan 1.

Claudia Husak suggested it is better to not have sketch art because it does not accurately represent the idea. She recommended providing an explanation rather than a visual example.

Ms. Timberlake pointed out that what is placed on that internal wall is 12 feet from the door and the PZC cannot regulate what is on that wall, even if it is visible from outside the building.

Mr. Papsidero said providing a material sample will help her proposal. He agreed that an internal display cannot be regulated at all.

Ms. Timberlake said she needs a sign plan approved and that she has never had this much trouble even in bigger markets. She believes this is unfair as she is following the Code, but this has become a result of subjective opinions. She inquired again about striking a balance.

Ms. Husak pointed out that this applicant is not the first to struggle with Dublin regulations versus their own brand. She said many businesses have been successful in spite of the restrictions. She noted that Dublin is home to many international brands.

Ms. Husak encouraged the applicant to best represent exactly what they want.

Ms. Shelly presented sculptures in Dublin's Recreation Center that are 15 examples of the type of sculpture proposed and suggested using the current approved public art as an example. She included the Maps of Dublin sculptures explaining they represent the past and present. She said she can make note of this in her Planning Report to remind the PZC what has been supported and approved.

Ms. Shelly said it may be enough to explain that the applicant is working with a local artist to create sculptures like those in the Recreation Center to be installed on the internal walls.

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this case. [There were none.] He said the ART's recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission is next week, the 29th of October.

ADMINISTRATIVE

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

Mr. Papsidero adjourned the meeting at 2:51 pm.

Approved by the Administrative Review Team on October 29, 2015.