



ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM

MEETING MINUTES

OCTOBER 13, 2016

ART Members and Designees: Vince Papsidero, Planning Director; Donna Goss, Director of Development; Jeff Tyler, Building Standards Director; Matt Earman, Director of Parks and Recreation; Shawn Krawetzki, Landscape Architect; Aaron Stanford, Senior Civil Engineer; Mike Altomare, Fire Marshall; and Tim Hosterman, Police Sergeant.

Other Staff: Jennifer Rauch, Planning Manager; Claudia Husak, Senior Planner; Logan Stang, Planner I; Mike Kettler, Planning Technician; Tammy Noble, Senior Planner; and Laurie Wright, Administrative Support II.

Applicants: Mark and Judy Rigsby, Owners (Case 1); Peter L. Coratola, Sr., CBS Garvey LLC; Dave Meleca, David B. Meleca Architects, LLC; and Frank Albanese (Case 2).

Vince Papsidero called the meeting to order at 2:00 pm. He asked if there were any amendments to the October 6, 2016, meeting minutes. The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

DETERMINATIONS

**1. BSD HR – Rigsby Residence
16-065ARB-MPR**

**64 S. Riverview Street
Minor Project Review**

JM Rayburn said this is a request for a proposed driveway and walkway replacement with updates to the existing porch, and adding a picket fence with associated landscaping for an existing single-family residence on the east side of South Riverview Street at the northeast corner of the intersection with Eberly Hill. He said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board for a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Mr. Rayburn presented an aerial view of the site as well as photographs of the existing driveway, walkway, and porch. He presented a Site Plan and noted higher quality materials were proposed. He said the current driveway is concrete and would be replaced with new concrete and would include a cobblestone “apron” at the front with a possibility to incorporate a narrow cobblestone divider up the middle of the driveway. He said the current walkway from the driveway is concrete; the proposed new walkway would be made of bluestone. He stated the current porch is concrete with a wooden platform at the front door; the proposed porch would be made of bluestone, laid over the existing porch. He added a 4x4 timber picket fence is proposed to screen trash cans on the north side of the front elevation.

Mr. Rayburn said the proposed changes are within the existing right-of way and one of the conditions would reflect this concern from the City’s perspective.

Mr. Rayburn said approval is recommended for the Minor Project Review with two conditions:

- 1) That should the City need to perform construction in the right-of-way, the applicant would not be permitted to restore the area with the proposed materials but would instead use standard materials for driveways and related approaches; and

- 2) That the applicant relocate the trash enclosure to the north side of the house and use landscaping material for screening in lieu of the proposed fencing.

Aaron Stanford emphasized that if the City had to make changes to the right-of-way, the City would not replace the materials with the same custom materials the applicant is proposing. He explained that in order to permit the custom materials, the City is not going to take on the liability for higher quality materials.

Mark Rigsby clarified that the cobblestone apron would be replaced with concrete as condition #1 states. He questioned condition #2 as he noted where the grade drops, which cannot be built up. He explained they proposed a concrete pad with a fence for the trash receptacles there and that landscape is not possible on the driveway edge.

Vince Papsidero asked if a picket fence would be permitted with the potential Code change. Logan Stang answered the material is permitted in the amended Code section but the location is the issue. He said trash receptacles are not permitted in front of the structure.

Jennifer Rauch clarified the residence has a two-car garage and asked why the trash cannot be stored inside the garage. Mr. Rigsby answered he keeps a lot of work equipment in his garage so he did not think there was enough room for trash cans as well. Ms. Rauch emphasized the trash either needs to be stored in the garage or to the side or rear of the house.

Mr. Papsidero asked if the applicant could request a variance. Tammy Noble answered to get a variance through the Board of Zoning Appeals, the applicant would need to demonstrate that the trash needs to go in the front with a fence because there is nowhere else to put it. She indicated that because there was an ample garage, that the BZA would not likely approve a variance in this case.

Mr. Rigsby pointed out that his next door neighbor has a wooden enclosure in the front for his trash.

The consensus of the ART was that they could recommend approval to the ARB if the conditions were amended as follows:

- 1) That should the City need to perform construction in the right-of-way, only lawn and standard type, right-of-way materials would be replaced. However, the applicant may choose to restore the area with these proposed materials at their own cost.
- 2) That the applicant relocate the trash receptacles to the interior of the garage.

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

CASE REVIEW

2. BSD HC – S. High St. Mixed-Use Development 16-082ARB-BPR

76 – 82 S. High Street Basic Plan Review

Jennifer Rauch said this is a request for the construction of a mixed-use building with associated parking and site improvements along the east side of South High Street and approximately 35 feet southeast of the intersection with Eberly Hill Lane on a site with existing historic commercial buildings. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board of a Basic Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Ms. Rauch presented a Site Plan and explained Staff had met internally to review this application as well as with the City's consultant, Dan Phillabaum, Land Plan Studios. She noted there are six parking spaces under the building and there is a walkway with landscaping that steps down from the upper level on High Street down to Blacksmith Lane and there is landscaping on the perimeter of the site. She presented the elevations for each direction and noted how they relate to the existing historic buildings. She presented the view from High Street to show the comparison between the massing of the buildings.

Ms. Rauch discussed concerns identified:

- Two access points in the parking area when there should be one; eliminate the access closest to the intersection of Eberly Hill Lane.
- 30 parking spaces are required and two must be ADA spaces; the plans do not meet that requirement
- Parking circulation issues as the plans do not meet the minimum requirements for parking space size or number, or the drive aisle width. This can be dealt with through a Parking Plan.
- Parking spaces along High Street were not calculated accurately; only three would be permitted in this plan.
- No accommodation for bicycle parking
- Dumpster located off Blacksmith Lane – the doors cannot be permitted to open into the alley
- Shared parking agreements reference this site
- The overall lot coverage exceeds what is permitted
- 2.5 stories are permitted and 3 are being requested
- Dimensions of the sidewalk – fit in the streetscape as proposed?
- Building scale and massing
- Elevations and dimensions do not match up
- Blank wall on the south elevation
- Transparency
- Building separation

Ms. Rauch indicated parking issues could be resolved with a Parking Plan.

Jeff Tyler noted the Sketch-up model provided by the consultant really highlights the massing comparison.

Peter L. Coratola, Sr., CBS Garvey LLC, questioned the elevation models as compared to the existing buildings. Dave Meleca, David B. Meleca Architects LLC, verified that the drawings submitted were to scale and the massing comparison was accurate.

Mr. Tyler asked if the second floor of the former Biddies Coach House was going to be removed because that would make the massing comparison even more striking. Mr. Coratola answered they have not done anything yet but that is a consideration. He explained the exterior would still be the same height with the floor removed internally.

Mr. Tyler stated for garages underneath another use, sprinklers would be required for that floor. He also asked the architect to look at the building separation requirements in the building code. He said the west-facing wall of the proposed building and the east-facing walls of the existing buildings may be affected as far as wall rating requirements and the percentage of opening that may be allowed.

Mr. Coratola indicated the neighbors love the project as it is being presented. He said an Economic Development Agreement is being considered but they have not finalized the decision with the City.

Ms. Rauch clarified that if there is no Economic Development Agreement, the next step is for approval by the Architectural Review Board for a Basic Plan Review. However, she said if the applicant pursues an

Economic Development Agreement, the review by the ARB would only be an Informal Review and the application would be forwarded to City Council.

The ART recommended the applicant make the revisions to the plans and meet with the City's consultant and that a recommendation could be made to the ARB on November 3 for their meeting on November 16, 2016.

ADJOURNMENT

Jennifer Rauch asked if there were any additional administrative issues or other items for discussion. [There were none.] She adjourned the meeting at 2:50 pm.