



## ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM

### MEETING MINUTES

**AUGUST 20, 2015**

**ART Members and Designees:** Steve Langworthy, Planning Director; Jeff Tyler, Building Standards Director; Matt Earman, Parks and Recreation Department Director; Alan Perkins, Fire Marshal; Colleen Gilger, Economic Development Director; and Aaron Stanford, Senior Civil Engineer.

**Other Staff:** Marie Downie, Planner I; Katie Dodaro, Planning Assistant; Rachel Ray, Economic Development Administrator; and Laurie Wright, Staff Assistant.

**Applicants:** Laura Schweitzer, Sign Vision Co., Inc. (Case 2); Heidi Bolyard, Simplified Living Architecture + Design (Case 3); James Peltier, EMH&T (Case 4).

Steve Langworthy called the meeting to order. He asked if there were any amendments to the August 13, 2015, meeting minutes. The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

#### INTRODUCTIONS

##### 1. **Bridge Street District Sign Guidelines 15-040ADM**

##### **Administrative Request**

Rachel Ray said this is a request to create a guide intended to help applicants understand and apply the sign requirements in the Bridge Street District and provide direction for sign design and placement in a pedestrian-oriented environment. She said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for Bridge Street District Sign Guidelines.

Ms. Ray said she started creating these guidelines the winter of 2014 as a follow up to the most recent amendment to the BSD zoning regulations, since there was a lot of discussion about the sign requirements. She explained she has been working with the City's sign consultants, Studio Graphique, who helped provide images and reviewed the text. She said the Guidelines were first reviewed by the Architectural Review Board and the Planning and Zoning Commission in June 2015, and they each provided valuable feedback. She reported there have been good conversations in the past on this subject from these reviewing bodies as well as with City Council. She said the Commissioners recommended more pictorial references in the beginning of the Guidelines to emphasize forward thinking sign designs, and the Board members suggested the topic of context to emphasize the importance of signs fitting into its surroundings.

Ms. Ray said some of the signs shown in the Guidelines are above and beyond what has previously been permitted in Dublin but are included to allow and encourage creative and unique sign designs – a hint to the applicant to 'bring their best'. She said signs proposed through a Master Sign Plan need to be innovative and as unique as the businesses they represent to be considered. She noted that Dublin has traditionally been more conservative with sign design, but within the Bridge Street District, signs are to help establish a unique sense of place to be experienced by pedestrians and cyclists up close while remaining visible to those traveling by car. She explained the signs should adorn and enhance the distinctive buildings constructed in the BSD that are of high quality materials and architecture in well-landscaped sites and streetscapes.

Ms. Ray requested any additional comments be sent to her this week before the revised Guidelines are to be presented to the PZC at their meeting on September 3rd.

Ms. Ray went through the Guidelines presenting each of the eight sections: 1) Purpose and Intent; 2) Applicability; 3) Process; 4) Master Sign Plans; 5) Requirements Summary; 6) Quality and Character; 7) Sign Character Principles; and 8) Sign Type Requirements.

Ms. Ray said these sign guidelines will replace the sign discussion in the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*, an approach to which the ARB has agreed.

Ms. Ray said the ARB has long been concerned with sandwich board signs in their district but the PZC has indicated they would be open to seeing sandwich board signs permitted in the BSD outside of the Historic District as they believe they can contribute to and enhance any urban environment.

Steve Langworthy asked how the use of sandwich board signs outside of the Historic District could be balanced with the unique character that they bring to the Historic District. He said he is not enthused about permitting these types of signs throughout the whole BSD. Ms. Ray answered that sandwich board signs can be a great addition to the urban streetscape.

Ms. Ray reiterated that more creative signs need to be encouraged and proposed for the BSD and the process is through a Master Sign Plan, not a variance or a Waiver.

Ms. Ray noted the pages that address questions that are often asked by applicants, such as process and submission requirement, and noted the Quality and Character principles that are new. She indicated this should help guide sign fabricators and encourage creative sign design. She explained that the rest of the guide is set up like the building type requirements in the BSD zoning regulations. She pointed out how the layout is designed to help an applicant who may just be interested in designing a ground sign and allow them to quickly locate that information. She said the guide presents the requirements as well as examples of signs, both recommended and what to avoid.

Jeff Tyler questioned the font size used in the guidelines. Ms. Ray suggested that the paper copy may be more visible, but the document is intended to reside on the web, which allows them to be maximized or zoomed in as needed for visibility.

Mr. Tyler asked if sign permitting is noted as a "next step" following the zoning review. Ms. Ray pointed out where in the "Process" section that information is highlighted.

Aaron Stanford asked why signs for parking garages were not included. He said from a wayfinding standpoint, he would like to see signs standardized for what we would permit for travelers to find entrances. Ms. Ray said the information provided in the Guidelines was based solely on the types of signs in the Zoning Code, which does not currently address signs for parking structures. She indicated that once a few signs are proposed for parking garages, the ART can better determine what is acceptable for parking garage signs in terms of size, design, location, etc. and then have that information codified.

Mr. Stanford inquired about valet parking and did the ART think that it could be an issue in the BSD. Mr. Tyler asked if valet parking would fall under temporary sign requirements. Ms. Ray said she would default to Code requirements for temporary signs, which (other than sandwich board signs) are not included in the Guidelines.

Mr. Langworthy asked how the ART would use these guidelines to evaluate a sign, ideally. He said the applicant can propose the minimum that meets Code but our hope is that designers would take ideas

from this guide, which would allow them to go further with their design for more creative signs for the BSD. He indicated applicants have been proposing signs that are conservative given Dublin's reputation and submitted for approval in the shortest amount of time.

Ms. Ray said ideally, the applicant would consult these Guidelines prior to the sign proposal submission. She noted these are simply Guidelines, and if a sign meets Code, then the sign would need to be approved. But through Staff's review and analysis, she said Staff consults with Studio Graphique for example for sign design comments when a sign does not meet the intent or character required by the Code for the BSD. She noted that these criteria are a little broader and leave some room for interpretation, for which the Guidelines would be useful. She added this is also guidance to give rationale and foundation to the requirements. She indicated that to do something "really cool" the applicant may need to go to the PZC or ARB for a Master Sign Plan, which has been viewed as a limiting factor due to the additional time, cost, and risk.

Mr. Langworthy concluded that he liked the design and layout of the Guidelines, and that the language read well too. He reiterated that any further comments need to be sent to Ms. Ray as soon as possible.

**2. Capitol Cadillac  
15-079MPR**

**4300 W. Dublin-Granville Road  
Minor Project Review**

Marie Downie said this is a request to install a new monument sign in place of an existing sign for a car dealership at the northeast corner of West Dublin Granville Road and Dale 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.

Ms. Downie presented the proposed monument sign face design. She explained that the applicant modified their original lollipop-shaped monument sign at the recommendation of Staff to be in line with what matches the architecture of the building. She reiterated that the proposed sign will replace the existing sign in the same location and presented an aerial view of the site to note the sign location.

Laura Scheitzer, Sign Vision Co., Inc., said this has been an on-going process to adhere to the brand standard while meeting the requirements of the City's regulations.

Ms. Downie confirmed that the sign is not internally illuminated.

Steve Langworthy questioned the size of the secondary image. Ms. Downie said she would calculate the size and ensure it meets the Code requirements for size and color. Ms. Scheitzer said she could make any changes necessary.

Rachel Ray inquired about the thin white lines shown on the proposal. Ms. Scheitzer confirmed that those lines are not on the sign but on the proposal just to show that the face of the sign is embossed and formed and not a flat base. She said the protrusion of the plastic base is typically  $\pm 1.5$  inches.

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He stated the determination of the ART is scheduled for next week.

## DETERMINATIONS

### 3. **Bryan Residence** **15-074ARB/MPR**

### **84 S. Riverview Street** **Minor Project Review**

Jennifer Rauch said this is a request for the replacement of an existing deck and construction of a new 336-square-foot deck with new stairs and railing for an existing single-family home in the Historic District on the east side of South Riverview Street north of the intersection with Short Street in Historic Dublin. 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 153.062, 153.063, 153.066, 153.174, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Ms. Rauch reiterated the applicant is requesting to remove the existing deck and sliding glass door, and replace it with an expanded deck, sliding window, single French door to match the existing, and stairs. She said the new AZEK railing will have tempered glass sections between the posts at 44 inches tall and ±56 inches wide. She presented pictures of the product line as well as photos of the existing 204.4-square-foot deck. She said the site that backs up to the Scioto River with a steep 40-foot grade change. She noted stairs are proposed to help with access.

Ms. Rauch said approval is recommended to the ARB with no conditions.

Steve Langworthy asked if there were any questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He confirmed the ART's recommendation to the Architectural Review Board for their meeting on August 26, 2015.

### 4. **Tim Horton's Demolition** **15-077MPR**

### **6490 Riverside Drive** **Minor Project Review**

Katie Dodaro said this is a request for the demolition of an existing commercial building, foundation and utilities within five feet of the building footprint in preparation for future development and infrastructure. She said this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Ms. Dodaro said approval is recommended with no conditions.

Steve Langworthy asked if there were any questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He confirmed the ART's approval of this Minor Project Review with no conditions.

Jeff Tyler confirmed that the applicant could now submit the demolition permit from Building Standards as the next step.

## ADMINISTRATIVE

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

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