



ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM

RECORD OF DETERMINATION

APRIL 21, 2016

The Administrative Review Team made the following determination at this meeting:

3. BSD HC - Berkshire Hathaway - Sign 16-029ARB-MSP 109½ S. High Street Master Sign Plan

Proposal: Installation of two new projecting signs for an existing carriage house south of Pinney Hill Lane at the intersection with Mill Lane.
Request: Review and recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board for a Master Sign Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.066(G) and 153.170 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.
Applicant: Tom Calhoon and Sam Calhoon, Berkshire Hathaway
Planning Contact: Nicole Martin, Planning Assistant; (614) 410-4635, nmartin@dublin.oh.us

REQUEST: Recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board for a Master Sign Plan 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.

Determination: This application was forwarded to the Architectural Review Board with a recommendation of approval.

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Jennifer M. Rauch, AICP
Planning Manager

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 that standard is written in the Code. 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.



ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM

MEETING MINUTES

APRIL 14, 2016

ART Members and Designees: Jennifer Rauch, Planning Manager; Jeff Tyler, Building Standards Director; Aaron Stanford, Senior Civil Engineer; Alan Perkins, Fire Marshal; Mike Altomare, Deputy Fire Marshal; Donna Goss, Director of Development; Rachel Ray, Economic Development Administrator; Kyle Kridler, Economic Development Administrator; and Matt Earman, Director of Parks and Recreation.

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

Applicants: Robert Ferguson, UAS (Case 1); and Chris Crader, Grow Restaurants, Jon Stephens, Sullivan Bruck Architects, and Adrienne Consales, Black Ink Design (Case 3).

Jennifer Rauch called the meeting to order at 2:02 pm. She asked if there were any amendments to the April 7, 2016, meeting minutes. The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

DETERMINATIONS

**1. Verizon Wireless Tower Co-Location
16-021ARTW**

**6775 Bobcat Way
Administrative Review – Wireless**

Logan Stang said this is a request for the installation of antenna concealment panels, a panel antenna and associated coax cables on the roof of the Ohio University Heritage College of Osteopathic Medicine – Dublin Campus and the installation of an equipment shelter adjacent to an existing building. He said the site is on the north side of Bobcat Way and east of the intersection of Post Road and SR 161. He said this is a request for review and approval of a wireless communications facility under the provisions of Chapter 99 of the Dublin Code of Ordinances.

Mr. Stang presented the aerial view of the site where the proposal meets all applicable requirements for the antenna installation including color, height, and compatible design. He said the proposed equipment shelter for the southwest side of the existing building will match the adjacent building finish and utilize the existing concrete pad for the foundation. He said the 10-foot screening panels around the rooftop antenna will match the existing building façade.

Rachel Ray inquired about the dumpster in the graphic. Robert Ferguson, UAS, confirmed the proposed equipment shelter will go where the dumpster was shown but the pad will need to be expanded to create a complete foundation. He also clarified that the cables will run along the inside of the building so they will not be visible.

Mr. Stang said approval is recommended for this application for a wireless communications facility with no conditions.

Jennifer Rauch asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this case. [There were none.] She confirmed the ART's approval of a wireless communications facility.

**2. AT&T Tower Co-Location
16-025ARTW**

**7401 Avery Road
Administrative Review – Wireless**

Lori Burchett said this is a request for the installation and replacement of 2 LTE antennas, 1 new antenna, and associated coax cables on the Avery Park water tower located on the west side of Avery Road approximately 600 feet south of the intersection with Brand Road. She said this is a request for review and approval of a wireless communications facility under the provisions of Chapter 99 of the Dublin Code of Ordinances.

Ms. Burchett presented the site and the final tower elevation. She said the antenna is designed to be unobtrusive; does not extend above the highest point of the supporting structure; and complies with applicable provisions of §99.05.

Ms. Burchett said approval is recommended for this wireless communications facility application with one condition:

- 1) That any associated cables or other wiring should be trimmed to fit closely to the panels and shall be neutral in color or match the supporting structure.

Ms. Burchett noted the applicant was not present but had agreed to the above condition prior to the meeting.

Donna Goss reported that she met with the Legal Department and found that the City is the landowner and that Legal negotiated an agreement with the wireless provider.

Jennifer Rauch asked if there were any questions or concerns regarding this case. [There were none.] She confirmed the ART's approval of a wireless communications facility.

INTRODUCTIONS

**3. 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 presented an aerial view of the site and noted the former tenant was Sister's Sweet Shoppe. He described the one-story historic structure as a vernacular building from the 1880s with a stone foundation, cement shingle siding, and a standing seam metal roof with an addition of asphalt roof shingles. He said the proposed new roof vents, HVAC units, and air unit will be screened with materials that complement the site.

Jeff Tyler inquired about the exhaust fans. Jon Stephens, Sullivan Bruck Architects, explained the discharge is up. Mr. Tyler encouraged the applicant to read Ohio Mechanical Code Section 506.5.5.

Jennifer Rauch asked if the screening for the ground units encroach into the setbacks and if so, a Waiver would be necessary. Mr. Stang explained the various screening proposed and said he would research the setback requirements.

Mr. Stang said the proposed ground and awning signs will match the shape and size of the existing signs and meet Code requirements for size, height, and location. He added the sign colors and style complement the architecture and surrounding context. He said the awning on the west side will be the same measurements as the existing awning but the Harvest Pizza text and graphics will be represented. He said the previous awning was approved so he anticipates the proposed awning will still meet the Code.

For the ground sign, Mr. Stang asked if the moon was a registered logo. Chris Crader, Grow Restaurants, answered the logo is not registered but the name is. Mr. Stang said it appears the logo may need to be decreased in size slightly to meet the Code requirement.

Ms. Rauch inquired about the paint colors. The applicant said the colors are specific corporate colors.

Mr. Stang explained that 42 parking spaces required for the restaurant use cannot all be provided on-site so parking for employees will be provided off-site. He said there are only five spaces available on-site but there are 24 additional off-site spaces. He reported the three public lots in this district provide over 100 spaces so the parking plan meets the Code requirements.

Jennifer Rauch inquired about previously approved variances for parking.

Mr. Stang said a number of properties were granted variances to reduce the required parking, prior to zoning for the Bridge Street District. He said the applicant has provided a series of parking agreements to provide additional parking that cannot be accommodated on the site. Per the agreements, he said 60 – 75% of the spaces can be provided and that he would review the history of the variances.

Rachel Ray asked if the parking agreements include South High Street to which Mr. Stang said he would clarify. He said parking spaces closer to this building should be reserved for customers and employees should park farther away. Ms. Ray said she was interested in whether parking spaces have already been designated for other businesses in the area.

Mr. Tyler asked if a valet service would be provided. Mr. Crader replied they would use the valet service and have already reached out to the service.

Ms. Rauch asked the applicant if he planned to install a patio space. Mr. Crader said he was considering sharing the patio with the neighbor but does not plan to move forward at this time.

Mr. Stang noted the applicant plans to replace the existing barn door like-for-like as part of the exterior modifications.

Ms. Rauch said the target Administrative Review Team recommendation to the Architectural Review Board is scheduled for April 21st for the ARB meeting on April 27th.

**4. BSD HC - Berkshire Hathaway - Sign
16-029ARB-MPR**

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

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 aerial view of the site and explained this proposal is 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 for Gerber & Mitchell, LLC - main structure by the ARB in January. She said that projecting sign was on the front of the building while the directory sign was located on the back and they were to coordinate with the existing color scheme. She said the owner had intended on repainting the two buildings the same color scheme of Carriage Red with Capitol White for the trim. She reported the doors of both structures are painted Amber Slate. 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 said this application meets the Code for the number of colors but she asked the ART to consider if the colors should be consistent across the two buildings. She said the proposed colors are a custom Berkshire Hathaway Cabernet and Berkshire Hathaway Cream.

Jennifer Rauch stated the colors should coordinate with the building colors, therefore coordinating with the main structure signs. She indicated the proposed Berkshire Hathaway Cabernet is more of a purple tone and does not coordinate with the building colors. The ART agreed the Berkshire Hathaway Cream may be acceptable, but overall the concern is achieving signs that are complementary to the building. Matt Earman and Donna Goss said they visualized the Berkshire Hathaway Cabernet as clashing if it were the background color for the signs. Ms. Goss proposed Berkshire Hathaway Cream for the background color and Berkshire Hathaway Cabernet just as the accent color. Jeff Tyler requested a look at the true color palette rather than how the colors appeared in the illustrations, which might not be accurate. Aaron Stanford suggested the applicant update their submitted plans with the actual colors that they desire for the next ART review.

Ms. Martin said the Code requires two different sign types, the wall sign on Mill Lane is flush mounted and the second is the projecting sign on Pinney Hill. She confirmed they both meet the Code for height.

Mr. Tyler suggested two projecting signs may be more appropriate given the location of the structure to the rear of the property – one on Mill Lane and the other on Pinney Hill Lane. He suggested the applicant amend the application to a Master Sign Plan to permit two signs of the same type. Ms. Husak agreed.

Mr. Stanford asked if the signs would be illuminated. Ms. Martin answered that lighting is not proposed.

The ART questioned if the projecting sign was proportional to the wooden bracket and if the applicant would consider a bracket more in scale to the sign and the building.

Ms. Martin reported the applicant would be in attendance April 21st for the scheduled recommendation to the Architectural Review Board's April 27, 2016, meeting.

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 2:40 pm.

As approved by the Administrative Review Team on April 21, 2016.



City of Dublin

Planning

5800 Shier Rings Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236

phone 614.410.4600
fax 614.410.4747

www.dublinohiousa.gov

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

BOARD ORDER

JANUARY 27, 2016

The Architectural Review Board took the following action at this meeting:

**2. BSD HC – Gerber & Mitchell, LLC
16-004ARB-MPR**

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

Proposal: Installation of a new projecting sign and new directory sign for an existing building on the north side of S. High Street at the intersection with Pinney Hill Lane.

Request: Review and approval for a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.066(G), 153.170 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Applicant: Tim Mitchell, Gerber & Mitchell, LLC

Planning Contacts: Nicki Martin, Planning Assistant; (614) 410-4635, nmartin@dublin.oh.us and Jennifer M. Rauch, AICP, Planning Manager; (614) 410-4690, jrauch@dublin.oh.us

MOTION: Mr. Rinaldi moved, Mr. Munhall seconded, to approve a request for a Minor Project Review with the following condition:

- 1) That the plans be updated prior to sign permitting to show dimensioned sign location and mounting height meeting Code.

VOTE: 5 - 0

RESULT: This request for a Minor Project Review was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

David Rinaldi	Yes
Thomas Munhall	Yes
Everett Musser	Yes
Jane Fox	Yes
Shannon Stenberg	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Jennifer M. Rauch, AICP, Planning Manager

Mr. Rinaldi said he was prepared to make a motion to approve the proposal if the walkways were decreased to three feet.

Ms. Fox suggested allowing the paths to widen at the porches to make it more aesthetically pleasing.

Mr. King asked what would be appropriate for the end of the walkways where they meet the driveway. He said he would like to flare that out also to be consistent.

Mr. Munhall said he would be supportive of that as long as the interiors are three feet; he clarified they are not so concerned with the beginning and the ends of the walkways.

Mr. Rinaldi indicated the original plan would need to be modified.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Rinaldi moved, Mr. Musser seconded, to approve a request for a Minor Project Review with the following condition:

- 1) That the applicant reduce the width of the walkways from 4 feet to 3 feet but be allowed to increase the width of the end of the walkways where they meet the driveway and porches.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Munhall, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; Mr. Musser, yes; and Mr. Rinaldi, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

2. BSD HC – Gerber & Mitchell, LLC 16-004ARB-MPR

109 S. High Street Minor Project Review

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following application is a request for the installation of a new projecting sign and a new directory sign for an existing building on the west side of S. High Street at the intersection with Pinney Hill Lane. He said this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.066(G), 153.170 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*."

Katie Dodaro presented the aerial view of the site and a zoomed-in view of the site itself. She pointed out the main structure on the front, a carriage house on the back of the property, and existing parking. She said there are two existing signs, one at the front of the property on the main structure and one on the back. She said the proposal includes replacing the existing projecting sign with a three-inch thick HDU panel with ½-inch raised borders and graphics, installed on the existing wood bracket using existing hardware. She noted the proposed sign's background color will be Amber Slate (dark gray) and the border and graphics will be in the Capital White color. She said the proposed directory sign plaque will be the same color scheme, has three interchangeable panels for tenants, and the text and graphics will be applied with a high performance vinyl. She stated Code permits three signs and this application includes two, which match the size and shape of the existing signs. She said the signs meet the size and color requirements and since the proposed signs are being installed in the same locations as the previous signs, approval is recommended with one condition:

- 1) That the plans be updated prior to sign permitting to show dimensioned sign location and mounting height meeting Code.

The Chair asked if there were any questions or concerns with this application. [There were none.]

Jennifer Rauch explained the agenda was amended to reflect the change of this Minor Project Review. She said originally the applicant requested modifications to building, trim, and door colors and the installation of new shutters and light fixtures for an existing building and outbuilding. She indicated the

applicant intends to: paint the main building and carriage house using the existing color scheme; replace light fixtures; and replace plant material, which is considered maintenance and does not require action from the ART or the Architectural Review Board. She concluded she wanted the Board to be aware of the improvements in case they witnessed those changes.

David Rinaldi asked if red was the original color of the buildings. Ms. Rauch answered the original had not been identified but the color is appropriate per the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Jane Fox inquired about the white proposed for the signs as it did not appear to match the creamy white on the buildings trim. Ms. Rauch confirmed the light color on the signs will match the color of the trim used on the building.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Rinaldi moved, Mr. Munhall seconded, to approve a request for a Minor Project Review with the following condition:

- 1) That the plans be updated prior to sign permitting to show dimensioned sign location and mounting height meeting Code.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Musser, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Munhall, yes; and Mr. Rinaldi, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

Communications

Tom Munhall asked if there was an update on the glass company. Jennifer Rauch indicated it had been purchased and temporary improvements have been made but was not sure if they meet property maintenance requirements.

Jane Fox inquired about the historic and cultural assessment and inventory. Jennifer Rauch said the process for selection of a consultant is underway.

Ms. Rauch announced Mandy Bishop, the City's consultant, will be presenting the public improvements with the Bridge Street District to the Board in February 2016.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 7:07 pm.

As approved by the Architectural Review Board on February 24, 2016.



ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM

RECORD OF DETERMINATION

JANUARY 21, 2016

The Administrative Review Team made the following determination at this meeting:

2. BSD HC – Gerber & Mitchell, LLC **109 S. High Street**
16-004ARB-MPR **Minor Project Review**

Proposal: Installation of a new projecting sign and new directory sign for an existing building on the north side of South High Street at the intersection with Pinney Hill Lane.

Request: 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*.

Applicant: Tim Mitchell, Gerber & Mitchell, LLC.

Planning Contacts: Nicki Martin, Planning Assistant; (614) 410-4635, nmartin@dublin.oh.us and Jennifer M. Rauch, AICP, Planning Manager; (614) 410-4690, jrauch@dublin.oh.us

REQUEST: Recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board of this request for a Minor Project Review with one condition:

- 1) That the plans be updated prior to sign permitting to show dimensioned sign location and mounting height meet Code.

Determination: This application was forwarded to the Architectural Review Board with a recommendation of approval. This approval shall be valid for a period of two years from the date of approval in accordance with Zoning Code Sections 153.065(H) and 153.066(G).

STAFF CERTIFICATION



Vince Papsidero, FAICP, Planning Director

Aaron Stanford inquired about water and sanitary service to this building. Jon Stephens, Sullivan & Bruck said a water meter has been included in the plans all along. Mr. Stanford recommended the applicant consider the sanitary service while everything is under construction with John Shields Parkway.

Mr. Stanford said he was concerned about people parking in the parallel spaces and blocking the garage doors and asked how this would be prevented. Mr. Stephens said the pavement could be painted to designate restricted parking in front of the garage doors to block people from parking there.

Claudia Husak asked how much larger the proposed structure is compared to the approved structure. Ms. Shelly answered the original structure was 625 square feet and the proposed structure is 1,624 square feet.

Mr. Papsidero asked the ART to consider a determination today if they did not have any further questions or concerns. Ms. Shelly recommended that utility plans be submitted with permitting if a determination is to be made. She added in terms of tree replacement, she would rely on Michael Hiatt, Zoning Inspector on staff to monitor that as he has analyzed the trees on the property.

Mr. Tyler recommended tree replacement language should be included in the conditions of approval. Ms. Shelly proposed final permit drawings should show a landscape plan for foundation planting and screening.

Mr. Stephens agreed to provide the specifics requested in order to obtain the determination now.

Mr. Papsidero said the case could be approved under the conditions discussed.

Mr. Stephens asked for clarification on the next steps. Ms. Shelly said building permitting would be the next step, confirming this case did not need to be forwarded to the PZC.

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

DETERMINATION

**2. BSD HC – Gerber & Mitchell, LLC
16-004ARB-MPR**

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

Nicki Martin said this is a request for the installation of a new projecting sign and new directory sign for an existing building on the west side of S. High Street at the intersection with Pinney Hill 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), 153.170 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Ms. Martin stated a Minor Project was proposed at the ART meeting on January 14, 2016, but has been amended to include sign proposals versus architectural modifications. She reported the applicant intends to paint the main building and accessory structure using the existing color scheme, replace light fixtures, and replace plant material, which is considered maintenance and does not require action from the ART or the Architectural Review Board. She indicated it is appropriate to maintain the existing character of the structure by preserving the color scheme and detailing that make the structure unique to the District.

Ms. Martin indicated that three signs are permitted per Code but the applicant is requesting just one projecting sign and one directory sign plaque, which match the size and shape of the existing signs. She

indicated the sign design is respectful to the period of the structure built in 1842 and complements the simple vernacular architecture with a stone foundation, wood siding, and a metal roof.

Ms. Martin described the proposed colors as Amber Slate for the background panel and Capital White for copy and trim. She said the signs will replace the current signs in the same locations. Based upon that, she said the application meets Code for size, color, location, and height but requested the applicant provide updated plans to confirm the sign placement distance from the door.

Ms. Martin recommended approval to the Architectural Review Board for a Minor Project Review with the following condition:

- 1) That the plans be updated prior to sign permitting to reflect correct colors and that the sign location and sign mounting height meet Code.

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this case. [There were none.] He confirmed the ART's recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board for the meeting on January 27th.

CASE REVIEW

3. BSD SCN – Bridge Park, Block A Riverside Drive and W. Dublin-Granville Road 16-001DP-SP Development Plan/Site Plan

Marie Downie said this is a request for the third phase of development within Block A of the Bridge Park development, including a 104,350-square-foot hotel, 19,104-square-foot event center, a 514-space parking garage, and privately owned/maintained reserves for private drives. She said the site is located at the northeast corner of the Riverside Drive and Dublin-Granville Road intersection. She said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for Development Plan and Site Plan Reviews under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066(E)-(F).

Ms. Downie reported a summary from her meeting yesterday with the applicant. She said the applicant provided three different options/ideas of the pavilion revision but had not received any graphics yet. She indicated the applicant will pick an option, provide general details to the PZC, and will then go through the Minor Project Review for the final details.

Ms. Downie said Staff asked DESIGNGROUP to review the architecture of the application and provide comments to the applicant that will also be provided to the Commission. She indicated the applicant will provide a response letter that will reflect what has or has not been addressed as a result of the consulting group's comments.

Vince Papsidero indicated that the majority of comments from DESIGNGROUP were favorable for bigger items.

Ms. Downie said the applicant is considering putting additional windows along Longshore Loop to provide some additional transparency but questioned whether a window can be placed in the fire room. Mr. Papsidero responded a light box would be permitted but not a window.

Jeff Tyler inquired how close the opening is to the property line and if it required a fire rating for that type of structure, which Staff will need to research.

Ms. Downie noted modifications to the garage will be more simplified with materials.



ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM

MEETING MINUTES

JANUARY 14, 2016

ART Members and Designees: Vince Papsidero, Planning Director; Jeff Tyler, Building Standards Director; Matt Earman, Parks and Recreational Department Director; Aaron Stanford, Senior Civil Engineer; Alan Perkins, Fire Marshal; Tim Hosterman, Police Sergeant; and Laura Ball, Landscape Architect.

Other Staff: Marie Downie, Planner I; Jennifer Rauch, Planning Manager; Claudia Husak, Senior Planner; Nicki Martin, Planning Assistant; Katie Dodaro, Planning Assistant; and Laurie Wright, Staff Assistant.

Applicants: Tim Mitchell, Gerber & Mitchell, LLC (Case 1).

Vince Papsidero called the meeting to order at 2:01 pm. He asked if there were any amendments to the January 7, 2016, meeting minutes. The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

INTRODUCTION

**1. BSD HC – Gerber & Mitchell, LLC
16-004ARB-MPR**

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

Nicki Martin said this is a request for modifications to building, trim, and door colors and the installation of new shutters and light fixtures for an existing building and outbuilding on the west side of S. High Street at the intersection with Pinney Hill 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), 153.170 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Ms. Martin presented the existing bright red building previously occupied by State Bank. She said the building was built in 1850 with simple architectural character. She said the proposal includes painting the exterior body of the primary structure as well as the accessory structure that provides additional office space. She said the body of the structures are proposed to be painted a muted beige, the trim a lighter cream, the door red, and the proposed new shutters a mossy-gray, green.

Ms. Martin said Staff compared the past case history to the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* and found that since the structure has been this color since the 1990s, they suggest a color scheme closer to what is recommended in the *Guidelines*. She indicated some colors are more appropriate than others, depending upon a building's age, style, and setting. She said the *Guidelines* state early and mid-19th century buildings often were painted white, but fairly bright colors such as red, blue, yellow, dark green and even orange were used, sometimes as body colors for buildings and sometimes as trim. She noted the applicant's proposed color palette does not meet what is stated in the *Guidelines*. She said the shutters were not addressed in the *Guidelines*.

Jennifer Rauch reported that Staff looked at other historic structures in the area for comparison and the decisions about renovations have been very consistent.

Jeff Tyler stated this structure is an OHI "I-House", which was named for the common occurrence in the rural farm areas of **I**ndiana, **I**llinois, and **I**owa but was also common in Ohio as a version of the Federal

style. He said vernacular buildings do not have a lot of detail or height. He restated that the proposed colors came after the period this house was built and are not consistent with that era. He suggested the applicant consider choosing colors based on research into a building's original paint colors by chipping or scraping down through paint layers to expose earlier colors. He said if original colors cannot be discovered or are unacceptable, then alternate colors chosen according to the time-period colors recommended in the *Guidelines* should be considered. He noted with historic structures in Dublin, the *Guidelines* are used. He cautioned the applicant about adding shutters. The *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* state "each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken." He suggested the applicant provide evidence showing shutters as a part of this building.

Vince Papsidero asked if there were photographic records available for this property.

Mr. Tyler said evidence of hardware would also demonstrate that there were shutters at one time.

Tim Mitchell, Gerber & Mitchell, LLC, indicated shutters were proposed to add dimension to the building but indicated the spacing between the windows and door varied.

Mr. Papsidero asked the applicant what his perspective was on paint color.

Mr. Mitchell said they liked the proposed colors and found them similarly in the Historic District. He said they consulted a designer who provided eight different color palettes and this is the one they liked best. He said his business partner used to paint barns for many years while in school so he is tired of barn red.

Ms. Rauch said Staff has contacted a consultant to provide feedback on the proposal.

Mr. Tyler indicated there might be other consultants that could look at the structure as well.

Ms. Rauch said in order to stay with the original timeline to go before the Architectural Review Board January 27, 2015, Staff would need to see revisions to this application by the beginning of next week. She said otherwise this application could be pushed into February. Mr. Mitchell indicated the applicant was not in a hurry as painting could not be accomplished in this weather anyway.

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

DETERMINATION

2. Verizon Wireless Co-Location 15-127ARTW

6452 Shier Rings Road Administrative Review – Wireless

Marie Downie said this is a request to replace 12 existing panel antennas, 3 existing radio heads with 9 new radio heads, and install a new distribution box and hybrid cable to an existing wireless facility on Shier Rings Road, west of the intersection with Avery Road. She said this is a request for review and approval of a wireless communications facility under the provisions of Chapter 99 of the Dublin Code of Ordinances.

Ms. Downie added the proposal does not include any ground modifications. She explained Chapter 99 requires the height of wireless communication facility towers to be no higher than 120 feet as measured from grade at the base of the tower, unless a higher tower is required by conditions present in the vicinity that require a taller structure in order to function and remain stealth. She said the existing monopole is 130 feet in height from grade level and due to the existing conditions, the proposed panel