



ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM

MEETING MINUTES

SEPTEMBER 24, 2015

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

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

Applicants: Kevin McCauley, Stavroff Interests, LLC. (Cases 1 &2); Kenny Rupp (Case 1); Chris Grilli, Sign Vision Co., Inc. (Case 2); Laura Timberlake, Big Sandy Superstores (Cases 3 & 4); Randy L. VanTilburg, The Mannik & Smith Group, Inc. and Craig Breedlove (Case 3); Logan Dilts, DaNite Sign Company (Case 4); and David Dirkhising and Andrew Marcou (Case 6).

Vince Papsidero called the meeting to order at 2:02 pm. He asked if there were any amendments to the September 17, 2015, meeting minutes. The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

PRE-APPLICATIONS

1. BSD SCN – Billiards Plus – Site Improvements

6525 Sawmill Road Pre-Application Review

Jennifer Rauch said this is a potential future proposal for modifications to landscaping, signs, and site improvements for the existing Billiards Plus building on the west side of Sawmill Road, north of the intersection with Banker Drive. She said this is a request for review and feedback for a potential future application within the Bridge Street District under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Ms. Rauch presented the site and noted the location of the tenant space, which occupies the southern end of a building, as well as Toys R Us and Big Lots to the north. She said two other businesses occupy the area between this building and Sawmill Road (KFC and Boston Market).

Ms. Rauch presented potential modifications to landscape islands to replace some of the dying trees with low-level mixed plantings. She indicated she would review the proposal with regards to Code requirements for landscape island plantings.

Ms. Rauch presented the tenant wall sign location. She said the 76-square-foot sign exceeds Code, but with a Master Sign Plan the applicant could request this sign exceed Code requirements.

Ms. Rauch said two monument signs are proposed: one for the Sawmill Road entrance and the other for the Banker Drive entrance. She described the proposed 24-square-foot signs as having a primary panel internally illuminated with a white background including panels for each of the three tenants. She said the signage cabinet is mounted on a cast stone water table and masonry base of brick veneer. She stated that Code permits two ground signs at a height not to exceed 8 feet, which these two signs meet, but all three tenants combined exceed the maximum permitted colors by Code.

Kevin McCauley, Stavroff Interests, LLC. and Kenny Rupp, the building owner, explained the obstacles as there are three separate property owners. Mr. McCauley said he was agreeable to a Master Sign Plan, but needed to obtain input from the other businesses. He indicated the other businesses would likely be receptive to the ground sign limitations if they could keep their existing wall signs.

Vince Papsidero said it may be possible for the existing wall signs to remain with the Master Sign Plan.

Mr. McCauley said the landscape modifications have not been determined yet. He indicated that Toys R Us did not want to contribute money for landscaping for the area in front of their store.

Ms. Rauch said a proposed drive aisle would be positioned on the south side of the building/tenant space under a porte cochere for loading/unloading merchandise. She said the applicant has indicated that landscaping could be added to screen the area. She noted that a drive-through is only permitted in the BSD if the use is for a bank. She indicated that depending on the purpose of the area, drive aisle may be considered a loading dock.

Mr. McCauley explained the drive lane would be a drop off/loading zone; there would be no loud speakers, or orders transacted.

Mr. McCauley explained they were looking for a new tenant and uncertain what their needs would be. He said this is challenging since Sawmill Road is a desired location, but the businesses are hidden behind large mounds, trees, and parking lots.

Mr. McCauley stated that landscaping is a priority over signage. He reported a tree survey was conducted and 85% of the trees are dead or dying. He said many of the Ash trees have been replaced, but the irrigation system is practically nonexistent and would be too costly to modify. He said the majority of trees are Callery pear trees and are recommended for removal, but that there are very few other varieties that can be saved. He added the arborist noted the areas where the trees are planted do not have irrigation, the majority of the trees have too much mulch, and there is limited space for the root zones.

Laura Ball encouraged the applicant to use trees that could survive in the current conditions to meet the Code requirements. She said she is not surprised to hear that the Ash trees had to be removed. She asked the applicant to do a soil test.

Mr. McCauley said the Ash trees were replaced with others that are also not thriving.

Jeff Tyler asked if trees are required and what rights the ART would have to guide the applicant towards meeting that requirement.

Ms. Rauch said a Waiver could be requested, which would be forwarded to the PZC. She said this landscaping plan was based on the previous Code, but is now under the provisions of the BSD Code.

Ms. Rauch indicated a compromise may be possible to meet the requirements by requesting to plant smaller trees in larger landscape islands.

Mr. Tyler pointed out that the ART will have to make a recommendation to the PZC.

Mr. McCauley said he is interested in a reasonable solution. He said the building is in bad repair and it is tough to sell.

Ms. Ball referred to Mr. McCauley's earlier comment about the landscaping on the Sawmill Road mounds and suggested a low-level planting be considered to draw the eye to the building.

Mr. McCauley asked if a hedgerow would be appropriate for the BSD. He said he could beautify the mound, but did not wish to add trees.

Ms. Rauch cautioned that a proposal without trees could be hard to support. She recommended the applicant work with Staff to find a solution.

Mr. Tyler requested more information regarding the loading area to compare it to the Code definition of a drive-through.

Mr. McCauley said there would be no window, but there would be a door, which they use now for services. He said the drive-aisle area is to delineate the area so people do not park there and allow for pick-up/drop-off of merchandise or service.

Ms. Rauch noted that in this instance it may be considered a drive-aisle.

Mr. Papsidero emphasized a window would not be permitted. Mr. McCauley answered a window was not needed.

Mr. McCauley asked if a second dock door could be added to the rear of the building. Ms. Rauch indicated there were no issues with that request.

2. BSD SCN – Party City – Signs

6655 Sawmill Road Pre-Application Review

Nicki Martin said this is a request for the potential installation of one wall sign and two ground signs for an existing building west of Sawmill Road, north of Village Parkway. She said this is a request for review and feedback for a future application within the Bridge Street District under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Ms. Martin presented the site and the locations for the proposed signs. She noted the proposed signs are larger than permitted and asked the ART if a Master Sign Plan would be appropriate. She said architectural modifications are being shown on the plans as well. She explained Party City would share the building with Goodwill as the second tenant and a Master Sign Plan would need to incorporate both tenants.

Ms. Martin presented the illustrations for the two proposed identical ground signs at 72 square feet while only 40 square feet is permitted by Code.

Ms. Martin asked for clarification regarding the architectural modifications. Kevin McCauley, Stavroff Interests, LLC stepped in to address questions regarding the architectural modifications. He said the drawings provided were from a previous proposal and there are no planned improvements at this time. He said the proposed signs are a little different given the way the building exists today.

Ms. Martin presented the street view of Party City's designated space. She asked the applicant if they intended to apply for a Master Sign Plan or a Minor Project Review.

Marie Downie said from a Planning perspective a Master Sign Plan would need to include the entire building. She said a Minor Project Review would be an appropriate process if the applicant wanted

approval for a single tenant space in which case Staff would recommend the applicant meet all Code requirements.

Vince Papsidero asked if the two ground signs currently exist. Ms. Martin answered that no ground signs currently exist.

Mr. McCauley asked if Goodwill was willing to be part of the Master Sign Plan, if they would be required to change their wall sign today or allow what they have but add their logo to the ground signs. He said if Goodwill would have to change their wall sign, he would need to ask them how they would like to proceed.

Ms. Martin said a Master Sign Plan could include the existing features.

Jenny Rauch said a Master Sign Plan would ensure future signs are in compliance and asked the ART for their perspective.

Mr. McCauley said the ground signs are crucial to notify customers of access from Sawmill Road and access from Village Parkway.

Ms. Martin said only five colors are permitted and clarified that the background color is included in that count and the ART would recommend meeting this requirement. She asked the applicant if they could coordinate with Goodwill.

Chris Grilli, Sign Vision Co., Inc. said a monochrome ground sign could be designed.

Ms. Martin explained that the ART makes a recommendation and the application is forwarded to the PZC for final review and approval. Mr. Grilli said he would provide more current artwork.

Jeff Tyler said if Party City was a new tenant, they are required to obtain a building permit. He said there was an error on the submitted drawings that should state NEC 2012 and this would need to be corrected prior to the submission for a building permit.

DETERMINATIONS

3. BSD SCN – Big Sandy Superstore – Site Improvements 6825 Dublin Center Drive 15-089MPR Minor Project Review

Joanne Shelly said this is a request for façade and site renovations to an existing building northwest of the intersection of Tuller 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.

Ms. Shelly presented the site showing the warehouse type building and noted the delineation of the property as a whole. She said the proposal includes the minor demolition of the existing front façade, drive aisle, and parking islands. She presented a rendering to illustrate and said the façade renovations include the addition of a glass and metal entry portico for the main entrance, two similar smaller secondary entrances, additional brick detailing for the existing insets, and the addition of a wing wall along the eastern façade to provide balance and symmetry to the building mass.

Ms. Shelly said the main drive aisle and adjacent sidewalks in front of the building will be realigned and seven parking planter areas will be relocated. She indicated new trees, shrubs, and groundcovers are proposed as upgrades to the existing landscape.

Ms. Shelly reported preliminary stormwater plans have been submitted and demonstrate a slight increase to the pervious surfaces with no change in impact to the existing stormwater management system. She added the existing building currently has public water and sanitary sewer services. She noted that there are private fire hydrants proposed to be relocated with this project.

Ms. Shelly said replacement of existing dead or dying trees and an increase in the number of trees and ornamental vegetation for the site are proposed. She said the applicant has agreed to work with the Zoning Inspector to bring the condition of the existing trees in the adjacent parking lot up to Code by pruning and repairing the trees.

Ms. Shelly said approval is recommended for this Minor Project Review with three conditions:

- 1) That the permit (Site-Only Permit) plans demonstrate compliance with the requirements of the Ohio EPA and Section 53.300 of the Dublin Codified Ordinances regarding erosion and sediment control;
- 2) That the applicant obtains all required permits prior to beginning work, not limited to a Demolition Permit; and
- 3) That the applicant and applicable contractors attend a pre-construction meeting with City Staff prior to beginning work.

Vince Papsidero asked the applicant if she was agreeable to the conditions to which she answered in the affirmative.

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

**4. 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 entrance sign and two secondary entrance signs to be coordinated with the 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 existing conditions of the site as well as the site improvements requested in the previous case (15-089MPR), which include the addition of glass and metal structures for the three entries and additional brick detailing for the existing insets. She added that applicant's site improvements include upgrades to the landscaping, canopies, and a wing wall to provide balance and symmetry to the building mass.

Ms. Shelly presented the proposed sign locations: one wall sign over the main entrance in the middle of the building and two secondary wall signs for the entries on either side of the main entry. She said Code permits one wall sign per street frontage or one sign facing an off-street parking area, therefore, a Master Sign Plan is required. She illustrated the detail:

Size Permitted

50 square feet - maximum (½-square-foot per lineal foot of storefront width)

Size Proposed

- Primary sign
80 square feet on 160 linear feet
- Secondary sign (left)
46 square feet on 140 linear feet
- Secondary sign (right)
51 square feet on 124 linear feet

Ms. Shelly said all three signs meet the maximum height requirement of 15 feet from grade and the limitation of three colors. She described the proposed signs as having white channel letters with a red edge placed on a grey back plate. She said Code states the letters may not be more than 12 inches from the building, which the primary entrance sign meets. However, she said, the secondary entrance sign letters are placed on a canopy that arcs away from the building and its furthest point is four feet, six inches from the building. She presented the installation details for the two canopies.

Ms. Shelly explained the purpose of a Master Sign Plan is to allow a greater degree of flexibility and creativity in sign design and display. She said Master Sign Plans are intended to be used for multiple signs for either a single building or group of related buildings to ensure that the requested signs work in a coordinated fashion to meet the general intent of signs in the District. She said it is not intended to simply permit larger, more visible, or additional signs without any consideration for unique sign design and display.

Ms. Shelly said the applicant has met the purpose and intent for a Master Sign Plan, therefore, approval is recommended to the Planning and Zoning Commission with the following condition:

- 1) That the applicant obtains all required permits prior to beginning work.

Jeff Tyler inquired about the monument sign that was previously included in this proposal. Ms. Shelly replied the applicant has withdrawn that sign from the proposal at this time. She said if they would like a ground sign in the future, they are aware that they will need to request an amendment to the Master Sign Plan.

Vince Papsidero asked the applicant if they agreed to the condition to which they replied affirmatively.

Ms. Shelly stated the proposal will be forwarded to the Planning and Zoning Commission to be reviewed on October 1, 2015.

Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He confirmed the ART's recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Master Sign Plan with one condition.

INTRODUCTIONS

**5. 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 presented both the existing sign and the proposed sign. She stated that all signs were approved with variances under the previous Code. She said the applicant is proposing to replace the sign along SR 161, but was unsure the reasoning for only replacing one sign. She said the sign cabinet is being changed, but the sign will remain the same size.

Vince Papsidero asked if the sign will meet the current Code. Ms. Noble responded that she would have the exact calculations with the Planning Report.

Laura Ball asked if the landscaping would remain intact. Ms. Noble answered she was not certain but the vegetation would need to be low so the sign would remain visible.

Ms. Ball remarked that a lot of trees were lost on that site.

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

**6. 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 presented the existing fence that encloses the deck and said the applicant has requested to add a fence that will enclose the backyard. She said the proposed fence will be added to two sides of the yard, starting at the house and attaching to the stone wall at the rear of the property. She said the fence will be set back 13 feet from both side yards to avoid damaging the tree on the south side.

David Dirkhising said the fence would be constructed to match the existing wood lattice fence.

Joanne Shelly asked if the proposed fence meets the proper fence type.

Jenny Rauch said the side yard setback requirement is 15 feet.

Ms. Shelly said a Waiver will need to be requested for the rear-yard setback because the fence will connect to the stone wall and will encroach into the rear yard setback approximately three feet.

Ms. Rauch asked how the fence will be attached to both the house and the stone wall.

Mr. Dirkhising said the wall is constructed of the typical Dublin stone.

Jeff Tyler requested a picture be provided for proper review. He asked how the existing fence would be trimmed out and encouraged the applicant to be prepared to demonstrate that.

The applicant said he could provide that information.

Mr. Tyler said the trim or frame needs to be on both sides of the lattice. He said the ARB will need to see what the finished product will look like.

Ms. Shelly said the next step will be the ART's recommendation to the ARB October 1st to be forwarded to the ARB meeting being held October 21, 2015.

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

**7. BSD SRN – Capitol Cadillac – Sign
15-096MPR**

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

Jennifer Rauch said this is a request for the installation of two new wall signs 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. Rauch presented an aerial view of the site and noted a new ground sign located at the corner was approved on August 27, 2015. She said in addition, the applicant is requesting a wall sign for the front and rear elevations. She said proposed sign 'A' will be placed over the main entrance on the west façade and proposed sign 'B' will be placed over the service bay area. She reported both signs meet Code for height, number, color, and size. She said she would verify that no other signs are being proposed.

Ms. Rauch said the text for sign 'A' reads "Cadillac" in 36-inch illuminated letters and the text for sign 'B' reads "Certified Service" in 16-inch illuminated letters. She indicated the letters look black during the day and white at night when illuminated as the acrylic channel letters are perforated.

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

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 3:10 pm.

Administrative Review Team approved on October 1, 2015.