



ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM

MEETING MINUTES

APRIL 21, 2016

ART Members and Designees: Jennifer Rauch, Planning Manager; Ray Harpham, Commercial Plans Examiner; Aaron Stanford, Senior Civil Engineer; Alan Perkins, Fire Marshal; Mike Altomare, Deputy Fire Marshal; Jeremiah Gracia, Economic Development Administrator; Kyle Kridler, Economic Development Administrator; Matt Earman, Director of Parks and Recreation; and Tim Hosterman, Police Sergeant.

Other Staff: Lori Burchett, Planner II; Claudia Husak, Senior Planner; Logan Stang, Planner I; JM Rayburn, Planner I; Nicki Martin, Planning Assistant; Katie Dodaro, Planning Assistant; and Laurie Wright, Administrative Support II.

Applicants: Chris Crader, Grow Restaurants and Jon Stephens, Sullivan Bruck Architects, (Case 2); Sam Calhoon, Berkshire Hathaway (Case 3); Matt Starr, Crawford Hoying Development Partners (Cases 3 & 4); and Joell Angel-Chumbley, Kolar Design, Inc. (Case 4); and John Woods, MKSK (Case 5).

Jennifer Rauch called the meeting to order at 2:03 pm. She asked if there were any amendments to the April 14, 2016, meeting minutes. The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

DETERMINATIONS

**1. BSD P – Dublin Community Church
16-026ARB-MPR**

**81 W. Bridge Street
Minor Project Review**

Katie Dodaro said this is a request for exterior modifications to an existing door of a church within the Bridge Street Public District on the southwest corner of the intersection with West Bridge Street and Franklin Street. 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 153.066(G) and 153.170 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Ms. Dodaro said this application was introduced to the ART at the April 7, 2016, meeting. She said the applicant would like to replace the existing wooden double doors with an automatic metal and glass door that has glass on the upper half and a metal panel covering the bottom half. She reported the ART questioned if there was a reason there was a wooden door there in the first place and found there was no requirement for the use of wooden doors with previous approvals. She stated the proposed doors include a Tubelite framing in a dark bronze color with two glass panels on the top and two metal panels on the bottom of the door. She said the application also includes the addition of a carbon steel bollard to operate the door in the same dark bronze color. She said the proposed metal and glass doors are consistent with the other doors along the adjacent elevations, which was suggested by the ART.

Ms. Dodaro said the application meets all the Minor Project Review criteria. She said a recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board is recommended with the following condition:

- 1) That the door frame and bollard color match the existing black metal doors on the building.

Jennifer Rauch asked if there were any questions or concerns regarding this case. [There were none.] She confirmed the ART's recommendation of approval to the ARB for the April 27th meeting.

**2. BSD HC - Harvest Pizza
16-027ARB-MPR**

**45 N. High Street
Minor Project Review**

Logan Stang said the proposal is for exterior modifications to the roof, review of a parking plan, and the installation of a new awning sign and projecting sign for an existing building on the west side of North High Street approximately 100 feet south of the intersection with North Street. He 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 153.066(G) and 153.170 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Mr. Stang said the applicant is proposing to install the rooftop exhaust vents on the north portion of the roof and will be screened on the north side by a gray parapet wall with fiber cement siding that will match the existing building façade; the exhaust vents will be screened from all other angles by the existing roof structure. He said the proposed HVAC condenser units will be located on the ground adjacent to existing units on the north side of the building and will be screened using evergreen landscaping. He said an additional HVAC condenser unit and air unit will be screened with a gray fence matching the existing façade, similar to the rooftop screening and is proposed on the north property line approximately six feet from the building. He stated the fence screening is proposed at a height of 3 feet 9 inches in order to meet the Code requirement of being one-foot taller than the structure being screened.

Mr. Stang said the site contains five parking spaces on site, which were approved through a variance for the previous user. He explained the change in use requires additional parking spaces to be provided for the applicant to gain approval of a parking plan. He said the applicant is proposing to retain the existing parking spaces and has requested approval of a parking plan, as additional parking spaces cannot be accommodated on-site.

Mr. Stang reported the applicant has provided four, off-site parking agreements, which account for the provision of 24 off-site parking spaces largely reserved for use by employees. He said the properties located at 109 South High Street, 82 South High Street, 76-78 South High Street, and 58-66 South High Street are located south of Bridge Street making employee parking a more desirable use. He said the on-site spaces and surrounding public parking spaces will be for customer parking due to their proximity to the site. He said the applicant has indicated that they will also utilize the valet services provided at Bri-Hi Square in order to supplement their parking. He stated a few parking garages are currently under construction with surrounding developments and future parking garages will be developed in conjunction with development proposals in the Bridge Street District.

Mr. Stang stated the applicant is also required to provide bicycle parking as part of this application; Code requires one bicycle space for every 10 required vehicular parking spaces, or 4 bicycle spaces. He said the applicant has indicated the required bicycle spaces will be installed and all the necessary details will be provided, subject to Staff approval.

Mr. Stang said the applicant is proposing two signs: a ground sign located along N. High Street and an awning sign located to the rear of the building. He said the ground sign will replace the existing sign and use the existing posts. He described the sign as double-sided consisting of a wood background with "Harvest Pizzeria" located near the center in black on top of an orange moon. The text will be raised from the sign face while the background is recessed. The background is white with an orange trim consistent with the moon logo. He said the awning sign will utilize the existing awning frame and will consist of the "Harvest Pizzeria" text and moon logo located in the center with white copy and the orange moon; the left side of the awning will read "Pizzas – Salads" and the right side will read "Burgers - Sandwiches" both in white copy. He said the awning itself will be the same material as the existing awning along with the same red color that complements the building. He stated the shape and size of the proposed signs meet Code

requirements for size, height, and location and the sign colors and style complement the architecture and surrounding context.

Mr. Stang recommended approval to the ARB of the Minor Project Review with two conditions:

- 1) That the applicant provide revised sign drawings with all relevant sign details prior to filing for a sign permit, subject to Staff approval; and
- 2) That the applicant provide the bicycle rack detail and proposed location, subject to Staff approval.

Mr. Stang recommended approval to the ARB for a Waiver:

Section 153.062(O)(10)(2) – Buildable Area – minimum 3 feet (required) – 0 feet (requested)

Mr. Stang explained there needs to be space between the fence and the units for future maintenance so there is no room for additional landscape screening.

Chris Crader, Grow Restaurants, asked if the bike rack needs to meet a specific style. Jennifer Rauch said the Code includes a number of requirements. Ray Harpham encouraged the applicant to look at the bike racks in the area for examples.

Jennifer Rauch asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this case. [There were none.] She confirmed the ART's recommendation of approval to the ARB for the Waiver and the Minor Project Review with two conditions for the ARB meeting on April 27th.

**3. BSD HC - Berkshire Hathaway - Sign
16-029ARB-MSP**

**109½ S. High Street
Master Sign Plan**

Nicki Martin said this is a proposal for the installation of a new projecting sign and a new wall sign for an existing carriage house south of Pinney Hill Lane at the intersection with Mill Lane. 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 153.066(G) and 153.170 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Ms. Martin presented the graphics of the proposed projecting signs for the carriage house located on the property behind the main structure. She explained that a projecting sign and a directory sign plaque were approved by the ARB in January for Gerber & Mitchell, LLC - main structure, which was to be repainted Carriage Red with Capitol White for the trim. She reported the doors of both structures are painted Amber Slate and the carriage house was to be painted in the same Carriage Red and Capitol White color scheme as the main building. She said the GEM Law signs matched the building with Amber Slate as the background color and Capitol White as the trim and text color.

Ms. Martin explained the applicant had proposed custom Berkshire Hathaway Cabernet and Berkshire Hathaway Cream colors to the ART but the ART decided the colors should be consistent across the two buildings and the Berkshire Hathaway Cabernet clashed with the building color. Additionally, she said the ART determined two projecting signs are more appropriate for the accessory structure due to access and visibility. She said the ART also recommended the applicant consider a mounting arm for the projecting signs that is more appropriate to the scale of the structure and height of the proposed signs.

Ms. Martin presented three color scheme options for consideration. The ART recommended approval of the color scheme that coordinates with the primary structure's approved signs with the Amber Slate background

and Capitol White lettering. The proposed projecting signs are identical in size and meet Code requirements for size, and appear to meet the Code requirements for height and location. She concluded the applicant requested review and recommendation of approval for a MSP to permit two signs of the same type where signs of different types are required by the Code.

Ms. Martin presented the revised proposed bracket that is more in line with the scale of the structure.

Jennifer Rauch asked the applicant if they were in agreement with the ART's choice of an Amber Slate background with Capitol White lettering. Sam Calhoon, Berkshire Hathaway, said he was fine with the colors as long as Staff could provide a letter stating why both corporate colors were not approved that he could send to the corporate office.

Ms. Martin said a recommendation of approval to the ARB is recommended with three conditions:

- 1) That the applicant select the color scheme, Amber Slate (CW-685) with Capitol White (CW-10), coordinated with the primary historic structure;
- 2) That the plans be updated prior to sign permitting to show dimensioned sign location and mounting height meeting Code and updated to show approved sign type and mounting bracket; and
- 3) That the applicant provide a cut sheet detail of the approved mounting bracket prior to sign permitting.

Ms. Rauch asked if there were any questions or concerns regarding this case. [There were none.] She confirmed the ART's recommendation of approval to the ARB for the April 27th meeting.

INTRODUCTIONS

4. BSD SRN – Bridge Park East, Blocks B & C 16-028MSP

Riverside Drive and Dale Drive Master Sign Plan

Nicki Martin said this is a request for an amendment to a previously approved Master Sign Plan to include parking garage signs for a new 8.2-acre, mixed-use development east of Riverside Drive, ±430 feet north of the intersection with West Bridge Street, and south of the intersection with (future) Bridge Park Avenue. 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. Martin presented the proposed parking garage signs and explained how the Planning and Zoning Commission had reviewed this MSP and eliminated all the garage signs from the application for further review and that is why it is being presented again to the ART.

Ms. Martin said the PZC had discussed how the proposed "PARK" was too large and they preferred only a circle "P" as a more effective way to identify parking for the city-wide wayfinding signs. She recalled the Commission emphasized how the garages need to be distinguishable and the garage locations of "Longshore" and "Mooney" should provide that distinction. She said the Commission was concerned about the size and did not want the City's parking signs to be larger than the Placemaking Art signs. She said they requested that the same standards be applied that we hold applicants to and were hoping a sense of whimsy would be incorporated into the design.

Ms. Martin said the applicant submitted three new options for sign designs and each had several alternatives. She presented A, B, and C options for each. She reported the PZC had requested to see two

new options when they review the application again so she asked the ART to pick two to recommend for further review and next week for one recommended selection be provided for approval.

Matt Starr, Crawford Hoying Development Partners; and Joell Angel-Chumbley, Kolar Design, Inc.; described each design. Mr. Starr explained that the geometrical shapes incorporated into some of the signs was a reflection of a series of murals that will be painted inside the garages on each floor. Ms. Angel-Chumbley emphasized that the signs will be part of the city-wide wayfinding system but the canopies will maintain the name of the garage. She asked the ART to keep in mind that the garage signs need to be at least 100 square feet in size to provide a placemaking quality on garages that will be surrounded by trees, be in scale with the size of the building, and be visible from a distance of 100 feet.

The ART decided on 1C as their first choice and 2C as the second choice. Both just show the circle "P" with the garage name and a geometric design. Without the "PARK" being incorporated, the circle "P" is the main identifier but the name of the garage can be emphasized. Ray Harpham asked if the circle "P" could be shown in its entirety instead of having part of the circle cut off in the second proposed design. The group agreed to stay away from the signs with "PARK" as most of the Commission had already expressed issues with the word "PARK" being used in addition to a circle "P". Claudia Husak suggested that the applicant show the intended murals to the Commission to show the correlation of the signs.

Ms. Angel-Chumbley emphasized that fabrication time is 6 – 8 weeks but the applicant would need time before that for the submission as part of the whole sign package. Mr. Starr said they are installing the last concrete floor on Block C garage and signs would need to be installed in September so decisions about signs need to be made quickly in order to have time for the signs to be fabricated.

Jennifer Rauch asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this case. [There were none.] She stated the ART's recommendation to the PZC would be determined April 28th to be reviewed by the Commission at their meeting on May 5th.

**5. BSD SRN – Bridge Park East, Blocks B & C
16-030MPR**

**Riverside Drive and Dale Drive
Minor Project Review**

Lori Burchett said this is a request for a modification to revise open space and building materials for a previously approved Site Plan for a new 8.2-acre, mixed-use development east of Riverside Drive, ±430 feet north of the intersection with West Bridge Street, and south of the intersection with (future) Bridge Park Avenue. 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. Burchett presented Block C and noted three pocket plazas as well as two pocket plazas on B Block. She explained the applicant is requesting to remove the permanent entrance features to the design and extend existing paving to allow for maximum flexibility and a variety of visual interests through tenant improvements; this would include the tenant-driven spaces to be returned to brick sidewalk for the same reason. She said they would prefer to have free standing planters instead of planting beds that can be moved and changed out as the tenants change. She said the applicant is proposing to simplify isolated areas due to the lack of activation or likelihood that pedestrians would occupy them.

Ms. Burchett said they are also requesting that the current bio-retention planter in the B Block plaza open space be switched to a typical planter without bio-retention as the planter area is relatively insignificant to allocate significant resources and construction complexity.

Aaron Stanford requested more information about the change to the stormwater management plan.

Claudia Husak asked if any of the open space was being eliminated. John Woods, MKSK, said they were changing the designs, which was prompted by the tenant requests. He said some tenants are trying to establish a brand and a fixed in-grade planter may not meet their needs.

Jennifer Rauch asked if there will be a difference in quality. Ms. Husak said it appears some boulder placements will be removed. Mr. Woods confirmed a few boulders would be eliminated in the pocket plazas but the gateway features will remain the same.

Matt Starr, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, said accommodating the Ram Brewery tenant on the corner is proving to be a challenge as they are trying to accommodate a silo in the public space. He said this would entail removing everything in the public space.

Jeremiah Gracia asked how many areas would be affected. Mr. Woods said this would occur in seven places in Blocks B & C.

Mr. Gracia asked if all the locations are for restaurant tenants. Mr. Starr answered not necessarily.

Mr. Gracia indicated that if everything was removed from the public space to accommodate the brewery's silo, then what is to stop all the other six locations that will request the removal of public amenities. Mr. Gracia noted the silo would need to be installed on a foundation and not set in grass.

Ray Harpham asked if the applicant removes the in-ground design elements if the area will appear less green. Mr. Woods said the area will generally appear smaller but what they replace it with could be comparable. He said the applicant would like to remove the circle of boulders and replace it with a bench.

Ms. Rauch said it appears a majority of the character and informal design previously approved would be lost with these modifications.

Ms. Husak said Block A does not have this and suggested the applicant provide what was approved for Block A. Mr. Woods said the areas might change depending on the tenant but they will ask for the same layouts to be used throughout the blocks.

The ART requested more information and asked the applicant if the tenant is known, if what they actually want for their space could be provided. Mr. Starr said he only had the one example to discuss today because the other tenants are just getting started. Ms. Husak suggested information for all tenants needs to be brought back for review.

Mr. Gracia said this will set a precedent for the remaining blocks of Bridge Park.

Mr. Harpham indicated he would recommend a design that is of the same quality to what was approved.

Ms. Rauch asked if this will change the impervious calculations and the required open space requirements. Ms. Burchett said she would review the calculations.

Mr. Starr said the original plans were based on where they thought the logical entrances would be but the tenants are beginning to shift that plan to meet the needs of their space.

Matt Earman said these requested changes will make a big difference.

Mr. Woods said if they make changes per tenant then they would need to shuffle for the next tenant that occupies that same space so in-grade planters are not flexible. He said it all comes back to flexibility and by extending the brick paving, open space amenities can be moved within a block.

Mr. Earman said he is not seeing a solution that still keeps the character of free form design. He said he is willing to look at changes if they get more creative. He said he sees these requested changes as a result of value engineering. Ms. Rauch and Mr. Harpham agreed with that assessment.

Ms. Burchett said the applicant is proposing to replace the approved bollards and illuminated handrails with a catenary system (overhead lights strung on cables across the space).

Ms. Rauch confirmed the new lighting approach would be for the pocket plazas not over any streets. Mr. Woods said this would bring a continuity to Block B and to all the blocks.

Mr. Harpham inquired about lighting for stairs. Mr. Wood said the overhead lighting would provide more flexibility over stairs.

Ms. Rauch asked about the height proposed for the overhead lighting. Mr. Woods answered the cables would be brought down to 12 to 16 feet.

Mr. Stanford requested photometric calculations. Mr. Woods indicated it would be easy to hit the targets and ramp down the output of light. Mr. Gracia noted the higher light would cover more area where a bollard is more concentrated lighting. Mr. Woods said the LED lights can be directed and the lights could be maintained by using a ladder.

Mr. Woods said these lights are used at Easton.

Tim Hosterman said he supported the lighting changes based on previous experience maintaining an LED system.

Ms. Rauch requested details showing how the lights would be attached at the end of the cables and that the ART would need to see more pictures of this lighting system.

Ms. Rauch asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this case at this time. [There were none.] She stated the ART's determination was scheduled for Thursday, April 28, 2016.

ADMINISTRATIVE

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

Ms. Rauch adjourned the meeting at 3:24 pm.

As approved by the Administrative Review Team on April 28, 2016.