



MEETING MINUTES

Administrative Review Team

Thursday, May 18, 2017 | 2:00 pm

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

Other Staff: Jennifer Rauch, Planning Manager; Claudia Husak, Senior Planner; Lori Burchett, Planner II; Logan Stang, Planner I; Nichole Martin, Planner I; Tammy Noble, Senior Planner; JM Rayburn, Planner I; Mike Kettler, Planning Technician; Nick Badman, Planning Assistant; and Laurie Wright, Administrative Support II.

Applicants: James Peltier, EMH&T; and Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners (Cases 1 & 2); Karen Danko, Moody Nolan (Case 2); Mark Rubcich, DaNite Sign (Case 3); Steve Roberts, Architect (Case 4); Matt Starr, Crawford Hoying Development Partners (Cases 5 & 6); and James Peltier, EMH&T (Case 7).

Vince Papsidero called the meeting to order at 2:02 pm. He asked if there were any amendments to the May 4th meeting minutes. The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

DETERMINATIONS

**1. BSD HTN – Bridge Park West – Building Z2
17-050ARB-DPR**

**88 N. High Street
Development Plan Review**

Logan Stang said this is a request for construction of a mixed-use building with associated site improvements along the east side of N. High Street, approximately 180 feet north of the intersection with North Street. He said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board for a Development Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Mr. Stang explained the Development Plan and Site Plan will proceed concurrently but the Development Plan must be approved first.

Mr. Stang presented an aerial view of the site and explained the existing site consists of a parking lot area and construction entrance for Building Z of the Bridge Park West development to the north and an additional connection is provided to the southeast at N. Riverview Street. He explained the site has a significant grade change from west to east towards the Scioto River. He noted that there are no buildings present on the site and all existing conditions will be modified or removed as part of the Site Plan Review and building permitting process.

Mr. Stang presented the proposed Development Plan and said it includes the creation of a single block consisting of two lots, one for development and one for open space that the City owns. He noted the southern lot is designated for the Z2 development proposal while the northern lot is for the (future) Pedestrian Bridge landing and the West Plaza. The block has an irregular shape, he explained, due to the existing site conditions and remaining property under development. He said the block follows an "L" configuration formed by the existing Oscar's Restaurant and office building to the south and has



approximately 186 feet of frontage on N. High Street with a 260-foot depth between N. High Street and N. Riverview Street. He said pedestrian access is allowed from any frontage while vehicular access would be limited to N. Riverview Street. However, due to the grade, he said this access would be difficult to achieve but more details will be provided with the Site Plan Review.

Mr. Stang stated the lots and blocks proposed with this application meet the Code requirements but a Waiver is required for the creation of a flag lot that will eventually be resolved once a plat application is filed alongside the City's application. He explained the block perimeter length is unique given the existing site conditions and the properties included with this application. The block length exceeds the maximum length by a slim margin, he said, based on the current properties, but this will also be resolved through the plat application. He indicated the street system is consistent with the BSD Street Network Map and is consistent with the Principles of Walkable Urbanism.

Mr. Stang said the proposal utilizes the existing infrastructure for N. High and N. Riverview Streets. However, he noted that modifications will be made to open spaces and public streets through separate processes, which this proposal has taken into account.

Mr. Stang said approval is recommended for the following Administrative Departure:

1. §153.060(C)(2)(a) Maximum Block Dimensions – Perimeter Length: 1,000 feet maximum perimeter length (required); 1,030 feet perimeter length (requested).

Mr. Stang said a recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board for the following Waiver is recommended:

1. §153.060(C)(8)(b) Flag Lots: Flag lots are prohibited (required); Flag lot proposed for Z2 (requested).

Mr. Stang said a recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board for a Development Plan Review is recommended with four conditions:

- 1) That the final design of the Pedestrian Bridge landing and West Plaza will be approved as part of a separate Site Plan Review application;
- 2) That the applicant continue to work with the City on the submission of a Preliminary & Final Plat to address existing property concerns;
- 3) That the details and location of the proposed easements will be finalized with the future plat applications; and
- 4) That the applicant either receive approval for the inclusion of PID 273-004079 & PID 273-000027 from the property owner or revise all plans to remove work proposed on the properties, prior to filing for building permits.

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He confirmed the Administrative Departure was approved and a recommendation of approval for the Development Plan Review will be forwarded to the Architectural Review Board.

**2. BSD HTN – Bridge Park West – Building Z2
17-015ARB-SPR**

**88 N. High Street
Site Plan Review**

Logan Stang said this is a request for construction of a mixed-use building with associated site improvements along the east side of N. High Street, approximately 180 feet north of the intersection with North Street. He 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*.

Mr. Stang provided the case background and presented the Proposed Site Plan. He noted the proposed building on N. High Street is just south of the flag lot strip and Building Z in Bridge Park West. He explained the building sits approximately six feet from the property line on N. High Street and is on the northern property line, which abuts the West Plaza for the landing of the (future) Pedestrian Bridge. He added patios have been incorporated into the building footprint and provide direct connections to adjacent open spaces. Balconies, he said, are located above the patio spaces for the multiple-family dwellings. He noted the building is 10-15 feet from the southern property line to provide ample separation between this development and the existing Oscar's Restaurant.

Mr. Stang said the proposal includes a two- to three-story, mixed-use building consisting of a two-story structure on the west with a three-story structure facing east due to the grade change. He said the building contains a total of 9,586 square feet of restaurant spaces on the lower and ground levels with four multiple-family dwellings comprised of 2 one-bedroom apartments, 1 two-bedroom apartment, and 1 three-bedroom apartment located on the 2nd story and presented the proposed floor plans. He stated 8,276 square feet of Open Space are dedicated as part of the West Plaza, just north of the site and no on-site parking or vehicular access is proposed. However, he said the site incorporates a number of pedestrian connections to the adjacent Riverside Park and surrounding development. He noted the site is currently being used as construction access for the Bridge Park West Building Z site and will be removed as part of this application.

Mr. Stang presented the Proposed Landscaping Plans for the Upper and Lower Levels that included:

- Rubble Stone for Grotto Wall and Patio Wall
- Stone Veneer Wall
- Unit Paver Terrace
- Brick Paver Walk
- Architectural Concrete Paving
- Wood Trellis
- Tables, Chairs, Fire Pit
- Evergreen Hedge Utility Enclosure
- Ornamental Plantings

Mr. Stang presented renderings showing the exterior materials proposed for the northeast and northwest perspectives that included dimensional asphalt shingles, two variations of brick - one light and one dark, wood siding, fiber cement siding and trim, aluminum windows and canopy, rubble stone, and a rail system consisting of metal and cable.

Mr. Stang explained the two requested Administrative Departures (roof height that exceed requirements by less than a foot) are due to massing, architecture, and upper story height, which is less than the required height but is still deemed appropriate. He presented a graphic of the north and west elevations to show the roof height and the east elevation to show the upper story height.

Mr. Stang said the following Parking Plan is requested while a surplus of parking spaces remains:

To allow 102 required parking spaces be provided off-site by utilizing three on-street spaces on N. High Street and the remaining 99 spaces from the parking structure in the Bridge Park West Development.

Colleen Gilger inquired about ADA spaces. Mr. Stang answered they are designated in the parking garage. James Peltier, EMH&T, said there will be a pathway leading from the parking garage to the building. Mr. Stang indicated he would verify the details for the pathway and include a condition of approval whereas the applicant would need to provide documentation of an ADA accessible path from the structured parking garage to the building, at the time of building permitting.

Mr. Stang reviewed and presented graphics for each of the following 16 Site Plan Waivers requested:

1. §153.062(D)(2)(e) Gable Ends: An architecturally appropriate element such as vent, window, or decorative (required); No architectural element on North Riverview Street and plaza gable ends (requested).
2. §153.062(I)(1)(a) Balcony Size: Minimum open area of six feet deep and five feet wide (required); Balcony size of five feet deep by 10.8 feet wide on North Riverview Street (requested).
3. §153.062(O)(9)(a)(1) Occupation of Corner: Occupation (required); No occupation at North Riverview Street & North Street (requested).
4. §153.062(O)(9)(a)(1) Front Required Build Zone = 0 - 20 feet (required); >20 feet at North Riverview Street (requested).
5. §153.062(O)(9)(a)(1) Corner Side Required Build Zone = 0 - 10 feet (required); >10 feet at North Riverview Street & North Street (requested).
6. §153.062(O)(9)(a)(1) Required Build Zone Treatment = Patio or streetscape (required); No treatment at North Riverview Street (requested).
7. §153.062(O)(9)(a)(2) Minimum Lot Width = 30 feet (required); 10 feet (requested).
8. §153.062(O)(9)(a)(2) Maximum Impervious Lot Coverage = 85% maximum (required); 94% (requested).
9. §153.062(O)(9)(b) Ground Story Height = 10 - 12 feet (required); 14.67 feet on the west elevation (requested).
10. §153.062(O)(9)(b) Upper Story Height = 9 - 12 feet (required); 14.67 feet for second story on the east elevation (requested).
11. §153.062(O)(9)(d)(1) Ground Story Street Facing Transparency = 40% minimum (required); 10% on east elevation (requested).
12. §153.062(O)(9)(d)(2) Non-Street Façade Transparency = 15% minimum (required); 1% on first story of south elevation, and 13% on second story of south elevation (requested).
13. §153.062(O)(9)(d)(2) Non-Street Façade Blank Wall Limitations = Limitations (required); Blank wall on first story of the south elevation (requested).
14. §153.062(O)(9)(d)(3) Parking Lot Façade Entrances: 1 (required); None (requested).
15. §153.062(O)(9)(d)(5) Primary Materials: 80% minimum (required); 69% on west elevation, 69% on east elevation, 53% on north elevation, and 60% on south elevation (requested).
16. §153.065(E)(1)(b) Fence and Wall Height: 6 feet maximum (required); 10 feet, 10 inches along southern property line (requested).

This concluded Mr. Stang's presentation and he called for any further questions. [Hearing none.]

Mr. Stang recommended approval of two Administrative Departures:

1. §153.062(D)(2)(f) Roof Height: 18 feet maximum (required); 18.33 feet on North High Street and 18.67 feet along the West Plaza (requested).
2. §153.062(O)(9)(b) Upper Story Height: 9 - 12 feet (required); 8.44 feet on the third story of the east elevation (requested).

Mr. Stang said a recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board for a Parking Plan is recommended:

To allow 102 required parking spaces be provided off-site by utilizing three on-street spaces on N. High Street and the remaining 99 spaces from the parking structure in the Bridge Park West Development.

Mr. Stang said a recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board for 16 Site Plan Waivers is recommended:

1. §153.062(D)(2)(e) Gable Ends: An architecturally appropriate element such as vent, window, or decorative (required); No architectural element on North Riverview Street and plaza gable ends (requested).
2. §153.062(I)(1)(a) Balcony Size: Minimum open area of six feet deep and five feet wide (required); Balcony size of five feet deep by 10.8 feet wide on North Riverview Street (requested).
3. §153.062(O)(9)(a)(1) Occupation of Corner: Occupation (required); No occupation at North Riverview Street & North Street (requested).
4. §153.062(O)(9)(a)(1) Front Required Build Zone = 0 - 20 feet (required); >20 feet at North Riverview Street (requested).
5. §153.062(O)(9)(a)(1) Corner Side Required Build Zone = 0 - 10 feet (required); >10 feet at North Riverview Street & North Street (requested).
6. §153.062(O)(9)(a)(1) Required Build Zone Treatment = Patio or streetscape (required); No treatment at North Riverview Street (requested).
7. §153.062(O)(9)(a)(2) Minimum Lot Width = 30 feet (required); 10 feet (requested).
8. §153.062(O)(9)(a)(2) Maximum Impervious Lot Coverage = 85% maximum (required); 94% (requested).
9. §153.062(O)(9)(b) Ground Story Height = 10 - 12 feet (required); 14.67 feet on the west elevation (requested).
10. §153.062(O)(9)(b) Upper Story Height = 9 - 12 feet (required); 14.67 feet for second story on the east elevation (requested).
11. §153.062(O)(9)(d)(1) Ground Story Street Facing Transparency = 40% minimum (required); 10% on east elevation (requested).
12. §153.062(O)(9)(d)(2) Non-Street Façade Transparency = 15% minimum (required); 1% on first story of south elevation, and 13% on second story of south elevation (requested).
13. §153.062(O)(9)(d)(2) Non-Street Façade Blank Wall Limitations = Limitations (required); Blank wall on first story of the south elevation (requested).

14. §153.062(O)(9)(d)(3) Parking Lot Façade Entrances: 1 (required); None (requested).
15. §153.062(O)(9)(d)(5) Primary Materials: 80% minimum (required); 69% on west elevation, 69% on east elevation, 53% on north elevation, and 60% on south elevation (requested).
16. §153.065(E)(1)(b) Fence and Wall Height: 6 feet maximum (required); 10 feet, 10 inches along the southern property line (requested).

Mr. Stang said a recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board for a Site Plan Review is recommended with 14 conditions:

- 1) That the applicant provide the manufacturer specifications for the wood and fiber cement siding at the building permitting stage to ensure minimum butt thickness is being met;
- 2) That the applicant provide the operating hardware details for the doors to the commercial uses at the building permitting stage;
- 3) That all signs receive approval by the ARB through the zoning review process, prior to the installation of any signs;
- 4) That the applicant continue to work with the City on the implementation of the design and construction of the Pedestrian Bridge West Plaza to ensure compliance with all requirements listed under Zoning Code §153.064 – Open Space Types;
- 5) That the applicant work with staff to provide additional bicycle parking spaces on-site to the extent possible, prior to filing for building permits;
- 6) That the applicant work with Engineering to ensure compliance with Stormwater Management requirements at the time of building permitting;
- 7) That the applicant provide landscape material specifications by a registered landscape architect with the building permit to ensure all landscaping requirements are being met;
- 8) That the applicant provide foundation planting for any area not occupied by streetscape, patio, sidewalk or similar feature with the building permit to ensure compliance with this requirement;
- 9) That the applicant provide the material details for the rubble stone with the building permit, subject to staff approval;
- 10) That the applicant either receive approval for the inclusion of PID 273-004079 & PID 273-000027 from the property owner or revise all plans to remove work proposed on the properties, prior to filing for building permits;
- 11) That the applicant provide the details for mechanical screening at the time of building permitting to ensure compliance with screening requirements;
- 12) That the applicant provide the details of the mechanical units with the building permit and that any access doors face away from the public right-of-way to the maximum extent practicable;
- 13) That the applicant continue to work with the City to ensure exterior lighting requirements are being met; and

- 14) That the applicant provide documentation of an ADA accessible path from the structured parking garage to the building, at the time of building permitting.

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He confirmed the Administrative Departures were approved and a recommendation of approval for the Parking Plan and Site Plan Review will be forwarded to the Architectural Review Board.

**3. BSD SCN – Flourish Chiropractic – Sign
17-048MPR**

**6677 Dublin Center Drive
Minor Project Review**

Nick Badman said this is a request for the installation of an internally-illuminated wall sign for a tenant space located within the Dublin Village Center. He said the site is approximately 1,200 feet northwest of the intersection of Dublin Center Drive and Village Parkway. He said this is a request for a review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066 and §153.150 through §153.164.

Mr. Badman presented the aerial view of the site. He reported the following BSD Sign Code Amendment became effective March 29, 2017:

- Only applicable to existing buildings in select BSD zonings
- 'Existing buildings' are those that do not comply with BSD form-based building types
- Signs for these buildings/tenant spaces will comply with the 'Standard' Sign Code until they are redeveloped
- Ensures signs are consistent with the style of development
 - Auto-oriented = fewer, larger signs
 - Pedestrian-oriented = more, smaller signs

Mr. Badman presented the proposed wall sign that is approximately 11.8 square feet in size and 12 feet above grade for a single tenant in a multi-tenant building with ±24 feet of frontage facing a parking lot along Dublin Center Drive. He said the sign is comprised of black aluminum channel letters with black trim cap, white face letters, a white vinyl stripe, and no secondary image. He said the sign meets all of the Code requirements that include number/type, size, location, height, color, and secondary image. He said the application meets the Minor Project Review criteria as well.

Mr. Badman said approval is recommended with the following condition:

- 1) That any future permanent window signs for the tenant space be reviewed and approved by the Administrative Review Team prior to sign permitting and installation.

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He confirmed approval for the Minor Project Review.

INTRODUCTIONS

**4. BSD C – TownePlace Suites by Marriott
17-044BPR**

**5155 Upper Metro Place
Basic Plan Review**

Logan Stang said this is a request for the construction of a five-story, 64,000-square-foot hotel with 105 guest rooms along the south side of Upper Metro Place, approximately 550 feet west of the intersection with Frantz Road. He said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Basic Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066.

Mr. Stang presented the location plan of the site, as well as a conceptual future site plan for the entire property (two of the three proposed parcels remain vacant with this proposal). Per the location plan, the building appears to be located as close to Upper Metro Place as possible, given the 20-foot easement that

runs along the south side of the road. He explained the applicant will not meet the Required Build Zone requirement, so a Waiver will be needed. He said the hotel has five stories with parking at the rear of the hotel.

Mr. Stang said a new access point is proposed requiring a new curb cut on the southwest portion of the site. He indicated that staff is questioning the location of the mechanicals and the dumpster. He said it appears that parking in the southwest portion of the site would encroach into the 20-foot utility easement, which is a problem. An entrance would be shared with the site next door.

Mr. Stang indicated the civil plans and architectural plans differ in terms of lot lines. He asked the applicant if they plan to adjust the lot lines later and if they do, he will need clarification and a separate process will ensue.

Mr. Stang presented the floor plans for the first and second floors and indicated floors three through five match the second floor. He noted this is an extended stay hotel.

Mr. Stang presented the architectural renderings for each of the elevations. He suggested the applicant remove all the signs shown on the plans for now as that is not part of this application. He confirmed the materials were brick, glass, and fiber cement panels. Steve Roberts, Architect, said the primary materials are brick, stone, and glass but fiber cement panels were also to be used. In terms of colors, gray and tan bricks are proposed and the fiber cement panels are to be various shades of gray and tan depending on the placement.

Mr. Stang pointed out that large blank walls are an issue (they appear to enclose the stairwells). He stated blank walls that are 27 feet wide by five stories high are not appropriate; the walls will need detailing. He also noted that the transparency amount is fairly low but hotels are unique. Mr. Roberts explained the stairs are tucked internally so it may be possible to add windows on those guest room walls to break up the blank walls and increase transparency.

Mr. Roberts noted there are also canopies on the south side, which is the parking lot side and the north elevation will have an overhang at the entrance. Vince Papsidero suggested the applicant create a stronger visual presence at the entrance along Upper Metro Place.

Mr. Roberts noted the curtain wall will extend to the top of the elevation creating an additional element at the entrance that helps to define the space. He said the open space will also help define the location from Upper Metro Place.

Mr. Stang emphasized that Staff needs to see a stronger presence at the street side entrance even though it is not the main entrance as that is to the rear with the parking lot.

Mr. Stang said staff would like to see a tree survey earlier rather than later; it must demonstrate the existing conditions and what is being removed, etc. He said the landscape plan needs more detail but that will come with the Site Plan Review. He inquired about the pocket park near the street entrance. Mr. Roberts said that may become a place for dining or bike racks; it is not programmed yet.

Mr. Stang said the applicant exceeds parking by four spaces, which will require a Waiver but staff does not typically support extra spaces and asked the applicant to consider changing the layout. Mr. Roberts said the hotel wants one space for every guest room and there are 105 rooms proposed; all the parking is on-site as there is no on-street parking available.

Mr. Roberts inquired about accessory uses. He said only guests will use the facilities like the pool or the restaurant and wants to ensure the parking spaces are being calculated accurately. Ideally, he said they would prefer to have more than one space for every room as someone might be traveling with a trailer, etc. and require extra space.

Mr. Roberts addressed the question about the location for the dumpster and mechanicals. He explained he thought the location chosen was the lesser of all evils for the dumpster, pool heater, and HVAC units to all fit along one side. He indicated traffic will come from the east and he also does not want the dumpster anywhere near the pool patio. As proposed, Donna Goss asked if the turn radius will accommodate the garbage trucks to which Mr. Roberts said it would.

Aaron Stanford asked the applicant if he envisions a lot split or a plat in order to further develop the site. Mr. Stang said the master plan might trigger a Development Plan as it involves the creation of multiple lots and an existing block. Mr. Stanford questioned whether there have been multiple lot splits achieved already in Upper Metro. Mr. Stang indicated there was a plat for two parcels but would verify the information. He added that if the land were to develop further in the future, a lot split could be achieved at that time.

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

**5. BSD SRN - Bridge Park East, Blocks A, B & C
17-045MSP**

**Riverside and Dale Drives
Master Sign Plan**

Nichole Martin said this is a request for a Master Sign Plan for Blocks A, B and C within the Bridge Park Development. She said the site is on the east side of Riverside Drive at the intersection with Bridge Park Avenue. She said this is a request for a 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 blocks included in the Bridge Park East Development. She presented the sign design for the event center named "The Exchange" in block A that was previously recommended for approval by the ART at a size of 100 square feet. She also presented the proposed newly revised west facing sign that has flowing text at a size of 103 square feet. She described the pin mounted letters as being 3 inches wide and 5 inches deep made of anodized aluminum to be painted to match "Driftwood Mica Cool PVDF-2". She said the letters will be internally illuminated and have a perforated face backed with white acrylic. She stated the east façade will have a similar design but will be much smaller at 41 square feet, whereas the previous sign proposed was 40 square feet in size.

Aaron Stanford indicated he preferred the first version of the "Exchange" sign the ART was shown and was concerned that the revised sign is not easy to read, especially from a distance. Several members expressed agreement with Mr. Stanford's comment.

Claudia Husak asked why the square footage changed from 100 square feet to 103 square feet. Matt Starr, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, explained the square footage increased due to the font style. Ms. Husak supported consistency with the previous ART and PZC action regarding the original proposal for this sign.

Jeff Tyler said the sign is oriented towards pedestrian activity but vehicles will also be driving by and it should be visible and legible to them as well.

On a separate matter, Ms. Martin explained the Master Sign Plan previously permitted full window coverage serving as a Leasing Window Cover during vacancy and turnover with a logo that may occupy ≤30% but the information used either had to state Crawford Hoying or Bridge Park. She said the applicant is now requesting the same type of storefront window sign to serve as a Tenant Leasing Window Cover, during construction and for up to 180 days as the tenants want to announce they are "coming soon". She said the solid background color would be gray with white letters and up to three colors and again, the graphic element is limited to 30%.

Ms. Martin stated the applicant is also proposing a single, one-square-foot window sign indicating the name of the business and/or a logo to be permitted only on a public entrance to the tenant space. This would not require a sign permit, provided not more than one low-chroma, neutral color is used, such as black,

white, or gray. She added that a provision will also permit tenants to grant one of their signs to a sub-tenant in the event there are multiple businesses occupying a single tenant space. She said that any granted signs to a sub-tenant will still count towards the overall permitted number of signs as outlined in the Master Sign Plan.

Ms. Martin reported she submitted the proposed "Exchange" sign to the City's sign consultant, Studio Graphique, for review and comments.

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

**6. BSD HTN – Bridge Park West
17-046ARB-MSP**

**94-100 N. High Street
Master Sign Plan**

Nichole Martin said this is a request for amendments to an existing Master Sign Plan to allow for tenant window coverings for the Bridge Park West Development on the east side of N. High Street, approximately 275 feet north of North Street. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board for a Master Sign Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066 and §153.170 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Ms. Martin presented the sign plan that was approved in December 2016. While there are no tenants yet, the applicant is requesting the changes similar to the Block A, B & C requests.

Ms. Martin stated a single, one-square-foot window sign for the storefront door on the ground level is proposed indicating the name of the business and/or a logo, provided one, low-chroma color is used, such as black, white, or gray and not to exceed 30% of the door glass.

Again, Ms. Martin said the applicant is proposing the same type of storefront window sign to serve as a Tenant Leasing Window Cover, during turnover and for up to 180 days as the tenants want to announce they are "coming soon". She said the solid background color would be gray with white letters and up to three colors and again, the graphic element limited to 30%. She said the applicant would like to enable the tenant to grant a sign to a sub-tenant.

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

**7. BSD SRN - RAM Restaurant and Brewery
17-047MPR**

**6632 Longshore Street
Minor Project Review**

Lori Burchett said this is a request for a patio, accessory structure, and associated site improvements for a tenant space in the Bridge Park Development. She said the site is on the northeast corner of the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue and Longshore Street. She said this is a request for a review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066.

Ms. Burchett presented several graphics showing the restaurant on the corner with the front facing west on Longshore Street and the south elevation on Bridge Park Avenue. The graphics incorporate the proposed accessory structure/silo at the corner but on Bridge Park Avenue. With this building on the corner, she said it is awkward to define the front and the side. She said there were some allowances for some encroachments in the Economic Development Agreement, which dictates where this accessory structure can be placed but perhaps the unique elements should accommodate this structure.

Ms. Burchett noted the sign on the silo, which would be part of the MSP - considered a placemaking art sign.

Jeff Tyler stated Building Standards has been working with the applicant on the silo relative to compliance with the Building Code.

Vince Papsidero asked if the rendering is an accurate representation of the appearance of the exterior, because it appears to have a shiny finish. James Peltier, EMH&T, indicated the exterior was a glossy silver finish. Mr. Papsidero asked if the exterior would have a texture to it to which Mr. Peltier stated he was not sure but typically these silos are made of stainless steel.

Mr. Papsidero asked how the material for the silo relates to the sign band and surface material of the canopy. Matt Starr noted that the exterior would complement the canopy materials and colors.

Shawn Krawetzki asked if furnishings would be incorporated near the silo and how the public might impact the silo. He asked if there were concrete benches planned for that corner that would now appear to be under the silo. Since the silo is operational, he asked how the silo would be shielded from the public because if the silo was simply raised up, it would cover the windows of the building. Mr. Peltier offered to work with the architect on a solution.

Aaron Stanford said he would like to know about the operations of the silo, how it is loaded, and how often, as well as how the silo would interact with the street.

Mr. Stanford asked if additional lighting is proposed. Mr. Peltier answered the applicant plans to use the existing patio lighting for the silo as well. Mr. Papsidero asked the applicant to consider up-lighting the silo, which would make it more interesting in the evening. Mr. Peltier said he would speak with the client.

Mr. Tyler said he was also interested to know how the silo would operate and that there must be piping that goes into the building.

Mr. Starr said the silo would be built in the street but does not know how it will connect to the building but thought any connections would be fairly high.

Mr. Stanford asked if the foundation of the structure would encroach into the right-of-way to which Mr. Peltier responded it would not.

Mr. Papsidero asked if the intention is for the silo to be painted. He referenced a silo in Indianapolis that was painted silver with a matte finish. Mr. Starr indicated he was not certain but the silo is stainless steel and the intent was to have that look. Mr. Papsidero emphasized the silo should not be so glossy or it should have a texture. Mr. Stanford said the silo needs to appear to be similar to like materials in the area so it blends into the architecture and environment.

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. [Hearing none.] He adjourned the meeting at 3:25 pm.

As approved by the Administrative Review Team on June 1, 2017.