City of Dublin

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM

MEETING MINUTES

OCTOBER 15, 2015

ART Members and Designees: Vince Papsidero, Planning Director; Alan Perkins, Fire Marshal; Jeff Tyler, Building Standards Director; Aaron Stanford, Senior Civil Engineer; and Matt Earman, Parks and Recreational Dept. Director.

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

Applicants: David Dirkhising and Andrew Marcon (Case 1).

Vince Papsidero called the meeting to order at 2:02 pm. He asked if there were any amendments to the October 1, 2015, meeting minutes. The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

DETERMINATIONS

1. BSD HC – Perimeter Fence **40 E. Bridge Street**
15-095ARB/MPR **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 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines.*

Ms. Dodaro presented an aerial view of the site and explained the residence previously fronted E. Bridge Street, but as a result of the elevation changes, the residence now fronts N. Blacksmith Lane. She noted where the proposed French Gothic picket fence is to be installed. She said the fence will be painted white and abut the house to extend to the existing stone wall along the rear of the property. She presented several photos showing the exisitng conditions. She indicated the existing lattice fencing and noted that the applicant is also considering replacing a portion of the existing lattice on the deck to the rear of the property with the proposed fencing as well.

Ms. Dodaro reported the applicant expressed concerns over the spacing of the pickets as the goal is to keep his dogs safely enclosed in the yard. She said Staff suggested the applicant line the picket fence with a wire or mesh material on the interior side of the fence to address this concern.

David Dirkhising indicated they plan to apply the material right below the top horizontal board for the best appearance and would not paint the mesh white.

Ms. Dodaro said approval is recommended to the Architectural Review Board for a Minor Project Review with the following Waiver and no conditions:

1. Rear Yard Setback – BSD Historic Residential Neighborhood – Code Section 153.063(B)(2)(e): 15-foot rear yard setback (required); zero setback (requested)

DRAFT

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

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 2:06 pm.

DRAFT

CASE REVIEW

3. BSD HC – Perimeter Fence **40 E. Bridge Street**
15-095ARB/MPR **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.

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 in 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 **40 E. Bridge Street**
15-095ARB/MPR **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 **4300 W. Dublin-Granville Road**
15-096MPR **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.