



ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM

MEETING MINUTES

JUNE 11, 2015

ART Members and Designees: Gary Gunderman, Planning Manager; Jeff Tyler, Building Standards Director; Alan Perkins, Fire Marshal; Matthew Earman, Director of Recreation Services; Fred Hahn, Director of Parks and Open Space; and Aaron Stanford, Senior Civil Engineer.

Other Staff: Rachel Ray, Planner II; Jennifer Rauch, Senior Planner; Nicki Martin, Planning Assistant; Katie Dodaro, Planning Assistant; Lia Yakumithis, Planning Assistant; and Laurie Wright, Staff Assistant.

Applicants: Jack Vos, Universal Sign Systems joined via conference call (Case 1); Kurt Dehner, Sister's Sweet Shoppe (Case 2); and Tanner Nelson and Brian Lensink, Pepper Construction; as well as the architects from Perkins + Will in Chicago that joined via conference call - Agnieszka Chapman, Don Pikul, and Jeremy Franklin (Case 3).

Gary Gunderman called the meeting to order. He asked if there were any amendments to the June 4, 2015, meeting minutes. The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

DETERMINATION

**1. BSD Office District – Gordon Food Services – Signs 3901 W. Dublin-Granville Road
15-051MPR Minor Project Review**

Katie Dodaro said this is a request for installation of a new 42-square-foot wall sign and replacement of two existing ground signs for a retail tenant at the southwest corner of the intersection of West Dublin-Granville Road and Dublin Center Drive. 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).

Jack Vos, Universal Sign Systems, joined the meeting via conference call.

Ms. Dodaro said since this application was introduced last week, the client has decided on the option of the wall sign on the front of the building facing toward W. Dublin-Granville Road at 42 square feet as opposed to the smaller wall sign for the side of the building facing Dublin Center Drive.

Ms. Dodaro said approval is recommended of this request for Minor Project Review with the following condition:

- 1) That the applicant verify the ground signs meet the minimum 8-foot setback from the right-of-way at sign permitting.

Gary Gunderman asked if the ground signs were being replaced with signs of the same size. Rachel Ray clarified that the ground sign facing Dublin Center Drive will be entirely replaced, and the ground sign facing West Dublin-Granville Road will remain, with only the face changing.

Mr. Vos confirmed he can provide a site plan that shows the sign locations are set back eight feet from the right-of-way in accordance with the condition.

Gary Gunderman asked the ART if there were any questions or comments regarding this application. [There were none.] He confirmed the ART's approval of the Minor Project Review.

INTRODUCTIONS

2. **BSD Historic Core District - Sister's Sweet Shoppe - Signs** **55 West Bridge Street** **15-056ARB-MPR** **Minor Project Review**

Nicki Martin said this is a request for installation of new signs and architectural modifications for an existing multiple-tenant building located on the south side of West Bridge Street, east of the intersection with Franklin Street. She said the proposal includes a new 7.5-square-foot projecting sign, two new 2.25-square-foot window signs to be installed on the doors, six new transom-window signs, a new awning with an awning sign, and a new exterior paint scheme. 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 153.065, 153.066, and 153.170 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Ms. Martin explained the business is currently at 45 N. High Street but is moving next door to La Chatelaine on West Bridge Street and that they are adding ice cream to their product line.

Ms. Martin presented the north and east elevations and pointed out the locations of all the proposed signs, a new proposed awning for the north elevation, and the proposed exterior paint scheme. Because the applicant has access to a public parking lot, she said one additional sign is allowed. She explained a Master Sign Plan is necessary when extra signs are proposed that are not normally permitted.

Fred Hahn inquired about the window signs. He asked what type of text would be used.

Kurt Dehner, Sister's Sweet Shoppe, said a projecting sign was needed on the east elevation for pedestrians as there is a lot of vegetation, and it is difficult to identify the entrance.

Mathew Earman asked if there were other examples of window signs elsewhere in Historic Dublin. Rachel Ray responded that Winans Chocolates and Coffees have window signs.

Jennifer Rauch affirmed that this applicant is not asking for extra text, they are requesting additional signs – three signs where two are permitted, as well as consideration for the signs within the window transoms.

Mr. Hahn asked if the product text on the windows (Cookies, Ice Cream, and Chocolates) are each considered signs per Code. Ms. Rauch answered they are considered secondary images, which are signs. She explained that Code would allow a group of the signs to be considered a single sign for the purposes of the overall measurement of window signs, but they still exceed the number of permitted signs and total sign area.

Gary Gunderman requested clarification on the number of signs being proposed to which Ms. Martin confirmed there were two projecting signs, two window signs on the doors, an awning sign, and additional window signs on the transoms.

Mr. Hahn confirmed with Ms. Rauch that the ARB has final review authority on this application.

Mr. Gunderman asked what the transom lettering would look like. Mr. Dehner said it is white vinyl-cut lettering for each of their products and each would be on a separate window. He specified that the only color used for the window signs is green for the shamrock.

Mr. Tyler cautioned the applicant about two issues: 1) that the sign permits cannot be issued until the interior tenant fit up permit is issued; and 2) that the parking situation is much different on this side of Bridge Street, as compared with the north side in their current location. He added there are no dedicated spaces with this new tenant space.

Mr. Dehner said he was fully aware of the parking situation.

Aaron Stanford asked if any of the signs would be illuminated or encroach the right-of-way. Ms. Rauch said the signs are not to be illuminated and would verify that the signs are not in the right-of-way.

Mr. Dehner asked the ART if they were concerned with the colors proposed. He said the colors selected are in keeping with the other colors on the surrounding buildings and they were respective of the Historic District.

Ms. Rauch concluded this application would be reviewed next week, with a recommendation to the ARB.

Gary Gunderman asked the ART if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He said the target date for ART's recommendation to the Architectural Review Board is June 18, 2015, for the ARB meeting on June 24, 2015.

3. BSD Indian Run Neighborhood District – OCLC

**Kilgour Building Entrance Improvements
6565 Kilgour Place
Minor Project Review**

15-057MPR

Rachel Ray said this is a request to refurbish the visitor and employee entrances on the north and east sides of the existing office building located north of Post Road in the BSD Indian Run Neighborhood District. She said the proposal includes a request to add a new decorative structural steel canopy at the main entrance of the facility, install new canopy light fixtures, structural steel components, concrete footers, roofing, and finish surrounds. 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).

Agnieszka Chapman, Don Pikul, and Jeremy Franklin joined the meeting via conference call as they are the architects on this project from Perkins + Will located in Chicago, IL.

Ms. Ray presented an aerial photo of the site and noted the main entrance location of the new canopy and curtainwall on the north elevation as well as the second location of a new curtainwall on the east elevation. She said OCLC submitted an application for site modifications to the grounds last fall and believed those have all been completed. She said now, the applicant would like to make improvements to the main entrance for visitors and employees on the north side and some improvements on the east side. She stated the proposal includes two new rooftop units that will be recessed back away from the end of the office building parapet with a finish screen of dark louvers that match the existing penthouse. She explained that these two mechanical units will provide air circulation into the new north and east entry areas.

Ms. Ray presented a photo showing the existing north entry that can feel cavernous as well as the new design with a canopy and more light that is proposed. She invited the applicant to provide details of the proposal.

Agnieszka Chapman, Perkins + Will, referred to the existing entrance photo in the application, agreeing with Ms. Ray's description that the main entry is cavernous and added the design currently provides no

definition of entry. She said they are proposing to enlarge the public space on the inside by encapsulating the entry by filling in the void with a new glass curtainwall system. She referred to the proposed entrance, which will be a much brighter space. She added the design is an updated contemporary design following the geometry of the building. She said the supports and the front of the canopy will be clad in metal panels and the underside will have an ultra-smooth stucco system. She added the canopy has LED recessed light fixtures for a fairly strong visual element. She explained that a skylight effect is produced and the wood panel transitions into the space for an indoor/outdoor feel.

Ms. Ray stated the existing building is clad in precast concrete panels. She asked if stucco would be used anywhere else on the building. Ms. Chapman responded the ceilings and the on underside of the third floor have stucco but that will be encapsulated by the interior now; there is no stucco on any vertical surfaces.

Jeff Tyler inquired about the material used on the elongated column. Tanner Nelson, Pepper Construction, answered it was metal cladding.

Ms. Ray asked how this entry will look at nighttime; if it would be well lit 24-hours a day or shut off at certain periods. Ms. Chapman thought that was an operational question. Mr. Nelson thought the lighting might be part of a timer system and not on all the time.

Mr. Tyler asked if the Bridge Street District Code was being used for design guidance on this application.

Ms. Ray explained that since this is an existing structure, BSD Code does not require all of the building type requirements to be applied. She said it is up to the ART to decide if the proposal is architecturally appropriate. She added the screening for the rooftop mechanicals does, however, have to be consistent with the BSD Code.

Ms. Ray inquired about the improvements for the east entrance. Mr. Nelson said the focus has shifted to one entry point there. He explained the east entrance will be closed off with one entrance/exit door through the exterior curtain wall for emergency exits or to access the patio. Ms. Ray confirmed they are enclosing the large space with glass like the north entrance.

For the benefit of the applicants on the phone, Ms. Ray said an ART determination is scheduled for June 18th at 2 pm and to expect the Planning Report to be distributed June 17th.

Mr. Nelson asked if the applicant needed to be present for ART's determination next week. Ms. Ray indicated that if there are any conditions placed on the approval that it is recommended that the applicant attend to discuss any issues, otherwise, it may not be necessary to appear.

Gary Gunderman asked the ART if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He said the target date for ART's determination is next week.

ADMINISTRATIVE

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

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