



ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM

MEETING MINUTES

JULY 21, 2016

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

Other Staff: Logan Stang, Planner I; Jenny Rauch, Planning Manager; Claudia Husak, Senior Planner; JM Rayburn, Planner I; Nichole Martin, Planner I; Nick Badman, Planning Assistant; and Laurie Wright, Administrative Support II.

Applicants: Julie Seel (Case 1); and Kevin McCauley, Stavroff Land and Development, Inc.; Nathan Wellman, Goodwill; and Adam Welker, Ford and Associates (Case 2).

Vince Papsidero called the meeting to order at 2:05 pm. He asked if there were any amendments to the July 14, 2016, meeting minutes. The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

DETERMINATION

**1. BSD HC – Seel Residence
16-053ARB-MPR**

**83 S. High Street
Minor Project Review**

Jennifer M. Rauch said this is a request for the construction of a new porch on the front elevation of an existing single-family residence for a property on the east side of South High Street, approximately 65 feet south of the intersection with Mill Lane. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066, and §153.170 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Ms. Rauch presented the front elevation of the traditional I-House style, built in the 1830s with a concrete base porch and stairs. For a historic perspective, she provided a photo of the greatly detailed porch from the 1860s. She said the proposed porch will contain a standing seam roof, spindles, running picket trim, and brackets and the colors will match the existing color scheme. She noted the three color samples (Downing Sands, Rookwood Shutter Green, and Rookwood Dark Red) and where the colors would be painted on the different parts of the ornate porch. She reported these colors agree with the Secretary of the Interior and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Ms. Rauch said the applicant requested to add a railing at the bottom, just prior to the meeting. She asked the ART to take the bottom rail into consideration.

Julie Seel said she purchased this property six years ago when it was falling apart and has been restoring it ever since, keeping many of the original internal features. She indicated this is an appropriate structure located in the center of old Dublin. She said she used the porch on the Irish shop next door and porches down street as guides. She referenced the photograph taken in 1860 but added she found documentation of other porches in Ohio that have railings on the bottom. She indicated that would make it look complete and provide more privacy since it is within close proximity to the street.

Jeff Tyler asked if the applicant intends to replace the concrete stoop and what the height is. Ms. Seel answered she was not replacing the stoop of 8 – 10 inches in height. Mr. Tyler said at that height, a rail would not be required.

Vince Papsidero asked if the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* permit some flexibility. Ms. Rauch said the guidelines state to adhere to original details whenever possible.

Mr. Tyler explained that often times, several porches will appear similar on a street or small area because they would have been built by the same person and it is likely they reside in the area as well.

Ms. Seel said some of the porches have railings. She asked if that was a matter of taste because she found more with a rail than without. Generally, Mr. Tyler said the intent of the Secretary of the Interior does not allow for conjecture. He noted that sometimes where there is visible scarring, that is enough to request a variation.

Ms. Seel said she does not have her heart set on a rail but thought the rail would be an enhancement.

Mr. Papsidero suggested that the ART approve the application as it was originally presented and let the Architectural Review Board decide if a railing is appropriate; the applicant should present more photographs to further her case for the ARB to make the call.

Ms. Rauch said approval is recommended to the Architectural Review Board for a Minor Project Review with no conditions. She agreed the applicant should save the rail for the ARB to consider on July 27th.

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 ARB for the Minor Project Review.

CASE REVIEW

2. BSD HC – Goodwill 16-041MSP-MPR

6525 Sawmill Road Master Sign Plan*/Minor Project Review

Nichole Martin said this is a request for the installation of a comprehensive sign package, modifications to an existing building, and associated site improvements for an existing tenant space located within a retail center at the intersection of Banker Drive and Dublin Center Drive. She said this is a request for a review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code §154.066 and review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Master Sign Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066.

Ms. Martin presented the signs as they exist on the multi-tenant spaces. She noted that Goodwill would like to use the southern tenant space, previously occupied by Billiard's Plus. She said the applicant is requesting the following updates:

- 80-square-foot wall signs
- Two wall signs per tenant space
- Creative options for a second wall sign (Projecting or Awning)
- A maximum of 3 colors for the wall and ground signs
- Remove language regarding a corporate identity
- Logo/secondary image limited to 20% sign area
- Ground signs as shown during the informal discussion
- Exterior modifications to the vehicular canopy and fascia panel to better match the ground signs proposed

Ms. Martin noted that Goodwill would not meet the 20% sign area limitation.

Ms. Martin presented the finalized ground sign design and a graphic to show the exterior modifications that include a "Metallic Silver" for the new canopy and the sign bands on the building to be painted

"Reflection". She said these modifications would be approved administratively as they meet the criteria for a Minor Modification. She described the ground sign as having a brick base with a limestone masonry cap topped with a charcoal gray metal cabinet partially covered with a metallic silver background for white pin-mounted letters, halo lit from behind; the text for the tenants are presented in the company brand specific designs. She said the ground signs meet the Code for size, height, location, and number; however, the text proposed only permits signs as presented here.

Vince Papsidero asked what happens when a new tenant comes forward and either wants to change the tenant name or be added to the list. Ms. Martin said all white text on gray background would be permitted but an additional tenant would decrease the font size.

Ms. Martin requested feedback from the ART specifically on the following:

- Height and number of wall signs
- Second creative sign
- Type substitution (Awning/Projecting)
- Proposed logo size

Ms. Martin concluded that there is a complex history over the last 20 years for this site. She said the text today is meant to memorialize the variances permitted over time but she said Staff is concerned about the layering variances.

Kevin McCauley, Stavroff Land and Development, Inc., explained they are trying to integrate the design of the sign into the building and tie it in with all the different tenants across the building. Potentially, he said they could do more exterior modifications but with three owners, it takes time to get everyone on the same page. He stated they are asking for the front sign to remain at 22 feet in height to stay within the sign band designed on the building and to preserve what the other tenants have today. He said those other tenants were permitted 80-square-foot wall signs so he is requesting the same for Goodwill.

Mr. McCauley also requested a second sign, serving as the logo. He said it was presented at just under 40 square feet as it is ±200 feet from Banker Drive that contains a row of trees that reduce visibility. The proposed height for this second sign is 22 feet he said so that it will be positioned in the middle of the sign band. He stated a sign for the wall at a lower height is not an option because it is obstructed by a row of trees they would like to keep. He said the rear has a large screen wall so he believes this request is reasonable. He said if the ART feels differently, he is open to recommendations.

Mr. McCauley added that this second sign provides a visual, quick identifier and is not intrusive. He asked if it was possible to stipulate that it is just permitted for Goodwill and if they were to leave, that any incoming tenant would not be permitted a sign in that location at that size and height. He indicated there is a possibility that Goodwill will not sign a lease if they are not permitted these signs as proposed.

Mr. Papsidero asked if the sign on the rear of the Toys R Us space was approved as a variance. Ms. Martin said the history is unclear; she could only find documentation that referred to exhibits.

Mr. Papsidero indicated that the second sign is a concern; there is no precedent for a second sign in a multi-tenant building. Ms. Martin said many have been requested and for the most part, approved but they met the requirement for size and provided a different sign type for the second sign.

Donna Goss asked for confirmation that the building is located ±200 feet from Banker Drive. Mr. McCauley confirmed the distance and said the sign shown in the graphics is 37.6 square feet in size.

Claudia Husak said the second sign as a logo would be acceptable if the front wall sign was a different sign type. She indicated her concern was the mixing and matching of Code provisions.

Mr. Tyler said he would not approve the second sign. He suggested the PZC make the determination as to whether there is enough distinction between the two signs. Mr. Papsidero explained the ART has to be conservative but the PZC has more latitude. He recommended the ART approves this application but with a condition about the second sign.

Mr. McCauley asked if the second sign was not the logo but just had the Goodwill text would it be more appropriate. Mr. Papsidero answered he would be more comfortable with that on the rear of the building given the situation with Toys R US and it would be visible from the street.

Ms. Husak suggested the applicant request a smaller size for the second sign but there is still no guarantee the PZC would permit it.

Ms. Martin said staff recommended omitting the language about a second sign, even if it was a different sign type because the other tenants did not have it and this might cause more confusion.

Ms. Goss said she liked the exterior modification of painting the sign bands silver on the entire building because it ties everything together, nicely.

Tim Hosterman said the ground sign on Banker Street will help with visibility on that side of the building.

Mr. McCauley asked if this proposal could be approved today for everything but with a condition for the second sign to not be supported. Ms. Husak said an ART determination was not possible today as there is no Planning Report provided yet.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any additional administrative issues or other items for discussion. [There were none.] He adjourned the meeting at 2:45 pm.

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