



## MEETING MINUTES

# Administrative Review Team

Thursday, February 16, 2017 | 2:00 pm

**ART Members and Designees:** Vince Papsidero, Planning Director; Jeff Tyler, Building Standards Director; Jeremiah Gracia, Economic Development Administrator; Matt Earman, Director of Parks and Recreation; Aaron Stanford, Senior Civil Engineer; Shawn Krawetzki, Landscape Architect; and Mike Altomare, Fire Marshall.

**Other Staff:** Jennifer Rauch, Planning Manager; Claudia Husak, Senior Planner; Logan Stang, Planner I; Nichole Martin, Planner I; Cameron Roberts, Planning Assistant; and Laurie Wright, Administrative Support II.

**Applicants:** Peter Coratola, Sr., CBS Garvey LLC; and Frank Albanese (Case 1).

Vince Papsidero called the meeting to order at 2:02 pm. He asked if there were any amendments to the February 9th meeting minutes. The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

### DETERMINATIONS

**1. BSD HC – Mixed-Use Development (Biddies site)  
17-008ARB-SPR**

**76 – 82 S. High Street  
Site Plan Review**

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

Ms. Rauch presented the review process history and the recommendations expected today from the ART (3 motions) for the Architectural Review Board meeting February 22nd. She said the signs are removed from the application.

Ms. Rauch presented the Approved Basic Site Plan followed by the proposed Site Plan where the building had been reoriented on the site. She explained after the ART meeting on February 9, the applicant addressed the issues that were raised that included: updated grading, retaining wall details, material details and specifications, building type modifications, lighting, landscaping, and the dumpster enclosure. She said the dumpster enclosure is still in the same location as before but the applicant is proposing a trellis to be placed over the top.

Ms. Rauch said 15 conditions of approval of the Site Plan were proposed to be added and discussed each one of the following with the ART:

- 1) That the applicant works with staff to relocated transformer, AC units, and gas meters to a location more interior to the site;

Ms. Rauch asked the ART if the AC units, transformers, and gas lines should be relocated. Frank Albanese expressed his concern with that first condition. He said the mechanicals will have extensive screening and would be tough to move. He explained the applicant has completed some testing and found shale 3 feet below grade level.



Aaron Stanford said the location of the transformer might be dictated by AEP so they can have access and the gas meters need to stay and be removed from the condition.

Ms. Rauch said staff does not like the current location because they would be visible to the residents and she does not want them to perceive this elevation as the back of house.

Mr. Stanford suggested wrapping the street wall around it as an alternative in that area. Shawn Krawetzki said there is usually a 10-foot clearance required for transformers and landscaping would have to come out of that zone as well.

The ART decided to modify the first condition to remove the request to move the gas meters language, add "to the extent possible", and requested an additional condition to relocate the street wall to provide additional screening of mechanicals.

- 2) That the applicant works with staff to develop the open space area at the eastern end of the building along Blacksmith Lane as a publicly accessible open space;

Ms. Rauch asked for feedback from ART about the open space proposed on the west side of the new building. She said she has concerns about the public accessibility of the open space and how the proposed open space does not meet Code. She said staff suggests redesigning the area on the east end of the building and using that for the public open space instead.

Mr. Stanford asked if there is anticipated use of that proposed courtyard to which Ms. Rauch answered there was no programming established for that area.

The ART discussed condition number 2 and decided to remove the condition, and to recommend the ARB approve a Fee-in-Lieu of open space due to the constraints of the site.

- 3) That the applicant reduces the size of the upper balcony (length and depth) and detach the upper balcony from the lower balcony;

Ms. Rauch said the balconies need to be separated and simplified. ART agreed with the recommendation.

- 4) That the applicant works with staff to identify a more appropriate location for the bicycle parking area;
- 5) That the applicant revises the plan to show use of a stacked stone wall for the street wall provided on Blacksmith Lane in accordance with Code;
- 6) That additional shrubs of a similar mix as currently shown, be provide along the northerly street wall along Blacksmith Lane to meet Code;
- 7) That the applicant ensures all light fixtures and site photometrics meet Code, and any outstanding information be provided as part of the building permitting;
- 8) That the applicant file an application to combine the two lots prior to issuance of the building permit;
- 9) That the applicant conceals all roof penetrations (fans, exhaust, vents, etc.) and ensure these will not be visible from principal frontage streets;
- 10) That the doors for commercial uses along the street frontages shall be consistent with the design of the principal entrances and include full glass and full operating hardware;

11) That the applicant ensures all recesses and/or projections required for vertical facade divisions shall meet the required depth of 18 inches;

12) That the applicant work with staff to identify appropriate site furnishings for the public open space;

The ART determined condition number 12 was no longer applicable.

13) That all sign details shall be approved by the ARB, prior to the installation of signs;

14) That the construction of the proposed development is subject to the approval of the demolition request; and

15) That if a change of use should occur to include a different mix of uses for the existing or proposed buildings that require additional parking provisions, the applicant would be required to gain approval of a modified Parking Plan from the ARB.

Ms. Rauch asked the ART if the dormers should be recessed by 1-foot as suggested by staff. The ART agreed and said it should be added as a condition.

Jeff Tyler reiterated his previous concerns about the lack of distance between the existing building and the proposed building, and the how the building code requirements will be met given this lack of separation. He stated that the design of the western elevation may need to change in order to meet the building code, meaning the windows and openings may be required to be removed.

Ms. Rauch stated that removal of windows may have impacts on the transparency requirements and may require additional waivers to be requested.

Mr. Tyler requested a condition be added to ensure the applicant understands these challenges.

16) Northern portion of the proposed street wall be relocated to provide screening of the A/C units, gas meters, and transformer on the eastern side of the building.

17) That all dormers be recessed by 12 inches.

18) Approval of the western elevation design is subject to the building permit review process.

Ms. Rauch said there are eight Waivers proposed and discussed each of the following with the ART:

- Roof Type Requirements (3)
- Parking Location
- Transparency Requirements (2)
- Building Entrances
- Permitted Materials

Ms. Rauch stated the roof type Waivers discussed at last week's ART meeting remain unchanged.

Ms. Rauch said parking is not permitted within the building. She said a Waiver to permit parking within a building was approved during the Basic Plan but they were then in a different location. She said it seemed appropriate to reevaluate the proposed location. She said the parking is located to the rear of the building and the garages are setback from Blacksmith Lane.

Ms. Rauch said the applicant is not able to meet the requirement for building entrances due to the proposed building layout and site grading. She stated an entrance is provided on each elevation. She said the proposed entrances are easily identifiable and prominent.

Ms. Rauch said the proposed fiber cement siding is not identified as a primary material for a Historic Mixed-Use building type, requiring a Waiver.

Ms. Rauch asked if the requirements for foundation plantings had been met along the rear elevation and if there was not enough room to comply with the Code. She said the requirement is for 42 inches in depth and the applicant is showing only 32 inches. Mr. Krawetzki stated there is enough room to provide appropriate plantings, but the minimum depth is not met. The ART discussed possible alternatives and determined the addition of a Waiver should be included.

Ms. Rauch presented the change in retaining wall materials along the southern property line. She stated the retaining wall was reduced in length and size, and now includes a stone veneer on a concrete wall with railing on the top. She explained the exposed wall cannot exceed 6 feet above grade level and the area at the tallest height is a concern. She said not enough information is provided to determine the height. ART suggested the inclusion of an additional Waiver to permit the requested retaining wall and railing at the proposed height.

Ms. Rauch said a Parking Plan is proposed to reduce the number of parking spaces from 22 to 20 spaces. She stated the proposed uses have peak times that typically are offset, which eliminate potential conflicts. She confirmed this is also the case with the parking agreement in place for Harvest Pizza. Peter Coratola, Sr., CBS Garvey LLC, confirmed these spaces have not been used for Harvest Pizza users.

In conclusion, Ms. Rauch said based on the ART discussion there are four actions required today.

1. Ms. Rauch said a recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board for a Parking Plan is recommended.

22 parking spaces (required), 20 parking spaces provided

2. Ms. Rauch said a recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board for a Fee-in-Lieu of the open space provision is recommended.

3. Ms. Rauch said a recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board for 10 Site Plan Waivers as part of the Site Plan Review is recommended:

- 1) Roof Type Requirements (3)
- 2) Parking Location
- 3) Transparency Requirements (2)
- 4) Building Entrances
- 5) Permitted Materials
- 6) Retaining Wall Height
- 7) Foundation Plantings

4. Ms. Rauch said a recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board for a Site Plan Review with 16 conditions is recommended:

- 1) That the applicant works with staff to relocate transformers and AC units to a location more interior to the site, to the extent possible;
- 2) That the applicant reduces the size of the upper balcony (length and depth) and detach the upper balcony from the lower balcony;
- 3) That the applicant works with staff to identify a more appropriate location for the bicycle parking area;

- 4) That the applicant revises the plan to show use of a stacked stone wall for the street wall provided on Blacksmith Lane in accordance with Code;
- 5) That additional shrubs of a similar mix as currently shown, be provide along he northerly street wall along Blacksmith Lane to meet Code;
- 6) That the applicant ensures all light fixtures and site photometrics meet Code, and any outstanding information be provided as part of the building permitting;
- 7) That the applicant file an application to combine the two lots prior to issuance of the building permit;
- 8) That the applicant conceals all roof penetrations (fans, exhaust, vents, etc.) and ensure these will not be visible from principal frontage streets;
- 9) That the doors for commercial uses along the street frontages shall be consistent with the design of the principal entrances and include full glass and full operating hardware;
- 10) That the applicant ensures all recesses and/or projections required for vertical facade divisions shall meet the required depth of 18 inches;
- 11) That all sign details shall be approved by the ARB, prior to the installation of signs;
- 12) That the construction of the proposed development is subject to the approval of the demolition request;
- 13) That if a change of use should occur to include a different mix of uses for the existing or proposed buildings that require additional parking provisions, the applicant would be required to gain approval of a modified Parking Plan from the ARB;
- 14) That the northern portion of the proposed street wall be relocated to provide screening of the A/C units, gas meters, and transformer on the eastern side of the building;
- 15) That all dormers be recessed by 12 inches; and
- 16) That approval of the western elevation design is subject to the building permit review process.

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He confirmed the ART's recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board for the Parking Plan, Fee-in-Lieu of Open Space, the 10 Waivers, and the Site Plan with 16 conditions for the meeting on February 22, 2017.

**2. BSD HR  
17-009ARB-MPR**

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

Cameron Roberts said this is a request for a deck addition and modification to the front porch on an existing residence on a 0.66-acre parcel on the east side of S. Riverview Street, approximately 400 feet south of the intersection with Pinney Hill Lane. 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. Roberts reported the ART had previously reviewed the proposal and the applicant revised the proposal based on the comments. He said a fourth column was added to the front porch and the previously proposed shutters were removed. He stated that window boxes were added under the front windows, but no details were provided and staff proposed a condition of approval to address this concern. He said the other change from the previous review includes a door replacement along the rear elevation. Mr. Roberts stated the rear door is mahogany wood grain painted a brilliant white color.

ART was supportive of the proposed modifications.

Mr. Roberts said a recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board is recommended with the following condition:

- 1) Pending case approval, the applicant provides further details regarding the proposed design, material, and color of proposed flower boxes for the left and right front windows.

Vince 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 Architectural Review Board for a Minor Project Review for the meeting on February 22<sup>nd</sup>.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

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

As approved by the Administrative Review Team on February 23, 2017.