City of Dublin

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM

RECORD OF DETERMINATION

OCTOBER 6, 2016

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

3. BSD HC – Mesh Fitness **12 E. Bridge Street**
16-081ARB-MPR **Minor Project Review**

Proposal:	Installation of a new wall sign for an existing tenant space on the north side of E. Bridge Street at the northeast corner of the intersection with N. High Street.
Request:	Review and recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board for a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066(G) and §153.170 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines.*
Applicant:	Kipp Edgington, Mesh Fitness.
Planning Contact:	Lori J. Burchett, AICP, Planner II; (614) 410-4656, lburchett@dublin.oh.us

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

1) That the applicant provide revised drawings indicating the exact height of the sign not to exceed 15 feet, subject to staff approval.

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

Jennifer M. Rauch, AICP
Planning Manager

Mr. Roberty said they have taken care in selecting the fabric that will work well with the finished panels selected. He indicated this would add to the space rather than detract and it would also define the space.

Jennifer Rauch said Staff has a sense of permanence with this proposal that includes small heaters for cold weather and fans for warm weather, which would extend the use of the patio beyond a normal patio season. She said the screening should be more of a permanent material to match its use. She suggested sliding glass doors as an option. She said since this is across from the plaza, Staff would like to see higher quality alternatives.

Mr. Roberty indicated any other solution would be more permanent and would make this space more of an exterior addition rather than a patio. He said by enclosing the space they no longer have an umbrella-like fixture and no longer exude the outdoor feel.

Mr. Tyler said he disagreed.

Mr. Tyler inquired about the warranty of the screening. Mr. Roberty answered the warranty is for five years. Mr. Tyler said he has concerns if the product is only good for five years.

Mr. Roberty asked if this is like awnings. Ms. Burchett said the BSD Code addresses awnings and canopies but nothing like this.

Shawn Krawetzki stated he has seen this product used and the clearness goes away over time and becomes an eyesore.

Mr. Roberty asked if a re-approval process was possible; perhaps their application could be reviewed annually. Ms. Rauch said if the PZC is willing to approve this material, they could agree to a re-approval process but they will not receive a recommendation of approval from the ART. She said the PZC will review this on October 13, 2016.

Mr. Tyler cautioned that if the PZC were to approve an annual renewal, the applicant is at risk a year from now that the PZC will no longer support the vinyl screening and want a permanent solution, which would be major construction. Ms. Rauch said it is possible the applicant would be required to replace the material outright every few years.

Ms. Burchett concluded the proposed Waiver is inconsistent with the applicable review criteria; therefore, disapproval is recommended to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the Waiver Review request.

Ms. Rauch asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] She confirmed the ART's recommendation of disapproval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the Waiver Review based on the Code.

3. BSD HC – Mesh Fitness **12 E. Bridge Street**
16-081ARB-MPR **Minor Project Review**

Lori Burchett said this is a request for the installation of a new wall sign for an existing tenant space on the north side of E. Bridge Street at the northeast corner of the intersection with N. High St. She 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(G) and §153.170 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Ms. Burchett presented an aerial view of the site and the proposed sign as it faces E. Bridge St. She described the proposed wall sign as 8 square feet in size at 24 inches high and 48 inches wide made out of a high density urethane panel with a baby blue background and routed letters painted white. She stated

the proposal meets all Code requirements except for height, which is a condition of approval that the applicant not exceed a height of 15 feet.

Jennifer Rauch asked the applicant how long they intend on occupying this space. Kipp Edgington, Mesh Fitness, answered January or February of 2017 at the latest.

Donna Goss thanked the applicant for taking up space in this building as a new roof was added.

Ms. Burchett concluded with a recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board for a Minor Project Review with the following condition recommended:

1) That the applicant provide revised drawings indicating the exact height of the sign not to exceed 15 feet, subject to staff approval.

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

4. ID-3 - Vadata, Building 2 **Crosby Court**
16-087WID-DP **Development Plan Review**

Jennifer Rauch said this is a request for the construction of a data center building within the West Innovation Center for phase two, including associated site improvements on a 68-acre site on the east side of Houchard Road, north of Darree Fields, and south of SR 161 and Crosby Court. She said this is a request for a review and approval for a Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.042(D).

Ms. Rauch presented the site location and noted the access off Crosby Court. She reported that in February 2015, the ART approved the initial Development Plan that included parking and extensive landscaping for the entire perimeter of the site. Phase 2 she said includes the construction of the second building.

After an initial review of the proposal, Ms. Rauch said additional information and details are needed on the plans. She stated this should include property lines, setbacks, landscape material, internal drive dimensions, lot coverage, a photometric plan, and primary/secondary material calculations. She encouraged the applicant to refer to the Code and the plans approved for Phase 1, which demonstrates the correct level of detail. She said this second proposed building appears to mirror the building from Phase 1 with a similar layout. She indicated concerns with the previously approved Phase 1 plan where either all concrete or all gravel was to be in between generators. She said the previously approved plan differs from this proposal. She inquired about parking as the correct number of spaces has not been provided. She asked if the number would include sharing spaces with the future office building. She explained that if the proposal does not meet Code, the applicant would need to go before the PZC. She asked the applicant to verify any information about the pond.

Aaron Stanford asked what would be built with this phase as a grading plan was included. Ann McGee, Gresham Smith Partners, said this is not their final design and stormwater management would still need to be worked out.

Mr. Stanford inquired about the applicant's intentions for additional building pads and how the site would be graded. Ms. McGee said she was not the civil engineer but they were trying to prepare for the next building.