



MEETING MINUTES

Administrative Review Team

Thursday, June 21, 2018 | 2:00 pm

ART Members and Designees: Vince Papsidero, Planning Director (Chair); Donna Goss, Director of Development; Ray Harpham, Commercial Plans Examiner/Chief Building Official; Aaron Stanford, Senior Civil Engineer; Shawn Krawetzki, Landscape Architect; Tim Hosterman, Police Sergeant; and Alan Perkins, Fire Plans Examiner.

Other Staff: Jennifer Rauch, Planning Manager; Lori Burchett, Planner II; Logan Stang, Planner I; Nichole Martin, Planner I; Mike Kettler, Planning Technician; Jimmy Hoppel, Planning Assistant; Richard Hansen, Planning Assistant; and Laurie Wright, Administrative Support II.

Applicants: Tom Warner, Advanced Civil Design (Case 2).

Vince Papsidero called the meeting to order at 2:02 pm. He asked if there were any amendments to the June 7, 2018, meeting minutes. [There were none.] The minutes were approved as presented.

Mr. Papsidero noted the Minor Modifications that were deemed appropriate by the Planning Director.

1. Swan Cleaners
2. Bridge Park, Buildings B1 & B2 Open Space

DETERMINATIONS

**1. R-1, Blazer Parkway Water Tower, Co-Location 5750 Blazer Parkway
18-039ARTW Wireless Communication Facility – Alternative Structure**

Logan Stang said this application is a proposal for the installation of six Wireless Communication Facilities affixed to the safety rail at the peak of the water tower for Washington Township Fire Station #95 in the Restricted Suburban Residential District, east of Blazer Parkway, approximately 600 feet southeast of the intersection with Rings Road. 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 an aerial view of the site and a graphic for the proposed installation of six devices measuring eight inches wide by eight inches high by twelve inches long in size to be installed at the peak of the tower along with two control panels that will be located at the base of the tower. He explained the devices at the top of the tower will be connected to a power box at the very base of the tower for general access. He added this proposal is not the traditional co-location installation but more specific based on the services provided.

Mr. Stang stated that Chapter 99 of the Dublin Code of Ordinances permits wireless facilities to be located on existing structures provided that they do not exceed 20 feet in height measured from the main roof structure to which they are attached. He said these devices will be located well within that requirement and are relatively small to blend in with the existing structure. He stated specifications regarding color of the devices and control panels has not been provided and therefore the applicant shall ensure the equipment maintains a neutral color that matches the existing support structure as a condition of approval.



Mr. Stang concluded approval is recommended with the following condition:

- 1) That the devices and supporting electrical and mechanical equipment shall maintain a neutral color that is identical to, or closely compatible with, the color of the supporting structure.

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He called for a vote on a motion to approve the Wireless Communication Facility with one condition as stated previously. Donna Goss motioned, Shawn Krawetzki seconded, and the Co-Location of a Wireless Communication Facility was approved.

**2. BSD SCN – Germain Honda, Phase I
18-042MPR**

**6715 Sawmill Road
Minor Project Review**

Nichole Martin said this application is a proposal for demolition of an existing building, removal of existing utility services from the area, and repaving the area for a parking lot expansion. She said the site is zoned Bridge Street District - Sawmill Center Neighborhood and is located west of Sawmill Road, approximately 500 feet south of the intersection with Dublin Center Drive. She said this is a request review and approval of a Minor Project Review and Demolition under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Ms. Martin explained the Minor Project Review process is intended to address modifications conducted after initial development. She said the ART is the final reviewing body for this application. She added that upon the ART's review and approval of this application, the applicant will be eligible to file for a Building Permit from the Building Standards Division.

Ms. Martin presented an aerial view of the site and noted only the 0.64-acre portion in the southeast corner of the Germain Honda campus is included in this first phase. She stated the proposal is to demolish a ±2,000-square-foot building (formerly used car sales) and associated site improvements that include parking, lighting, and landscaping for this portion of an existing automotive dealership.

Ms. Martin presented a current photograph of the used car sales building to be demolished.

Ms. Martin presented the existing site plan that showed 51 parking spaces, landscaping that included well established trees and an existing ground sign along the Sawmill Road frontage. She presented the proposed site plan that included the proposed interior landscaping, a new surface parking layout for 85 parking spaces with the removal of the building, and 12 new, 20-foot-tall lights with mounting bases that will also be incorporated across the campus in Phase II. She explained that 20 of the parking spaces will be pervious pavement and a parking lot pedestrian path will be provided to meet the walkability standards within the BSD Code.

Ms. Martin stated the applicant is requesting a Parking Plan for this portion of site because without a building they would not be permitted any parking spaces per the BSD Code. She said Staff is recommending approval given the current use of the property and the demonstrated need, despite the deviation from the BSD Code. She illustrated the applicant will modify the existing internal landscape and hardscape islands within the impacted area to meet the BSD Code standards and there are no plans to modify the established perimeter landscaping. She reported the applicant will need to remove two interior trees in good condition but indicated they would work with the City's Zoning Inspector and City Forester to relocate removed inches on-site. She explained it is anticipated the applicant will need to pay a Fee-in-Lieu of replacement inches as the perimeter of the site is already densely landscaped.

Ms. Martin added there is a condition of approval that a comprehensive Parking Plan be submitted to Planning with Phase II, which will include the entire site.

Ms. Martin concluded approval is recommended with four conditions:

- 1) That the applicant work with the City Engineer and City Forester to appropriately and sensitively align and construct a public sidewalk;
- 2) That the ground sign located south of the southernmost entrance from Sawmill Road be removed within 60 days of approval of a demolition permit for the structure by Building Standards;
- 3) That the applicant work with the Zoning Inspector and City Forester to determine the appropriate number of tree replacement inches that can be accommodated on-site with the remainder paid as a Fee-in-Lieu; and
- 4) That a comprehensive Parking Plan be provided to Planning for review and approval with Phase II.

Aaron Stanford suggested there is an option for Condition #1 due to the alignment being located in a sensitive spot. He said the applicant could bond the sidewalk construction for up to three years to allow time to identify an appropriate sidewalk path. Tom Warner, Advanced Civil Design, said he had questioned this condition because the modifications to the site will be evolving with the next phase so a bond makes sense.

Mr. Warner asked if Condition #2 was mentioned at the last meeting to which Ms. Martin replied the ground sign was mentioned but the ART had made no determination. Mr. Warner said he had not met with Mr. Germain to discuss this specifically but it will probably be okay so he agreed he could remove the ground sign with the demolition of the building.

Mr. Warner also said he would be comfortable paying a Fee-In-Lieu for tree caliper inches.

As for Condition #4, Mr. Warner said the Parking Plan was not set yet and asked if he would have to share it with Planning now, as part of this process. He reported Mr. Germain is paying for the use of other parking lots now to deal with all the inventory but it comes at a high cost so that is why the efficiency of parking on-site is being sought now but he will not have the Parking Plan for the whole site for a while as a cohesive parking layout is evolving. Ms. Martin said the Parking Plan can be provided with Phase II like the condition states.

Alan Perkins expressed concern for the main drive aisle for the fire apparatus access as he does not want cars parked in the lane so he advocated for several "No Parking" signs to remain. Mr. Warner said they maintained the Fire Lane for fire equipment on the plans. Mr. Perkins emphasized he wants signage maintained to ensure the lane is maneuverable. Ms. Martin recommended a condition of approval be added:

- 5) That the applicant provide directional signage for the FAAR designation of the Fire Lane to the satisfaction of the Fire Marshal.

Mr. Warner inquired about next steps in the review process to which Mr. Stanford and Ray Harpham explained. Mr. Harpham described the typical review timeframe for Review Services and stated they have checklists for submittals with their division. Mr. Warner determined he could check all the boxes in the timeframe allotted.

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He called for a vote on a motion to approve the Minor Project Review with five conditions as stated previously. Mr. Harpham motioned, Mr. Perkins seconded, and the Minor Project Review was approved.

RECOMMENDATION

3. BSD HC – Dublin Town Center - Exterior Modifications 18-034ARB/MPR

19 W. Bridge Street Minor Project Review

Lori Burchett said this application is a proposal for exterior modifications to an existing commercial building within Historic Dublin and zoned Bridge Street District Historic Core. She said the site is southwest of the intersection of West Bridge Street and High Street. She said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board for a Minor Project Review and Waiver Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.066 & 153.170, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Ms. Burchett explained the Minor Project Review process is intended to address modifications conducted after initial Site and/or Development Plan Review approval. She said the ART is the final reviewing body with the exception of the Architectural Review Board (ARB) in the Historic District or the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC), if warranted by the proposal and in this instance, the proposal will be forwarded to the ARB for review and approval.

Ms. Burchett presented an aerial view of the site as well as a photograph of the current north elevation on West Bridge Street. She presented photographs of the current conditions of the deteriorating wood windows and wood siding. She said the applicant is proposing a new siding material on several portions of the elevations and the replacement of multiple windows. The applicant is proposing HardiePlank and LP siding in place of the existing wood siding in a design and color that matches the current character. She explained a HardieShake siding is proposed where wood shake exists and a HardiePanel and LP siding are proposed for other portions of the elevations but the board and batten style that exists will be maintained. She noted the requested changes are on portions of all the elevations of the building; the roofing, stone, and trim will remain unchanged.

Ms. Burchett indicated the applicant would like to install a window with divided lites to match the window details as close to the original as possible and they are proposing a Jeld Wen vinyl window in almond to match the existing color. However, the sample that was submitted was not the same style and type as previously requested by applicant. She presented illustrations of each of the elevations to demonstrate where the replacements are proposed.

Ray Harpham asked if the applicant is replacing all of the windows. Ms. Burchett said the windows will be replaced where there will be siding replacement, so the windows surrounded by stone would not be replaced.

Ms. Burchett noted that the window specifications provided previously by the applicant did not appear to match the sample material that had been delivered prior to the meeting. She stated that further clarification from the applicant would be required to ensure the right material is being proposed.

Vince Papsidero said additional details on construction and installation is needed as maintenance appears to be the problem. He asked about the history of this building. Ms. Burchett said the ARB approved the construction of the building as a PUD, prior to the Bridge Street District Zoning. She said the project was approved with wood siding and wood frame windows, although these materials were not a specific condition of approval. In this instance, she said a Waiver is requested since the only materials permitted in the Code

are stone, brick, and glass and the applicant is requesting to use HardiPlank and LP siding on multiple elevations. She said the requested materials have been used in other projects recently within the Historic District on non-historic buildings. She specifically said the ARB approved HardiPlank to be used on the (former) Biddies building as well as in Block Z of the Bridge Park Development. She said vinyl clad wood windows have also been used in non-historic buildings.

Mr. Papsidero recalled the Architectural Review Board was very particular about the design of the building and how and where the materials would be used. He indicated vinyl windows would be a compromise.

Mr. Harpham suggested that if the applicant is not replacing all of the windows, they must match them as closely as possible. He asked if they are providing replacement windows with divided lites. He emphasized the applicant should not be permitted to replace any of the windows without first matching the existing with the proposed.

Jennifer Rauch asked if the applicant could provide the same divided lites, would the ART be supportive of vinyl clad wood windows. Mr. Papsidero indicated that is what is on for the Biddies infill project. Ms. Burchett said vinyl clad wood windows were used at 109 S. Riverview Drive in a historic design. Mr. Harpham said if the applicant wanted wood windows, he would recommend vinyl clad wood windows and they would need to have the same pattern of divided lites.

Aaron Stanford said if the applicant is just replacing some of the windows and not all, he thought they may appear different on the building but did not know enough about these materials to make that determination. Ms. Rauch suggested that the ART consider requesting that the applicant replace all the windows at the same time. Mr. Harpham said it would depend on how accurately the applicant can reproduce the windows. Mr. Harpham said requesting that the applicant replace all the windows on a façade makes sense. He said if the ARB is not satisfied, they can require the applicant to replace all the windows on a façade. Ms. Rauch reiterated that the applicant did not plan on replacing the windows that were set in brick. Mr. Harpham explained how removing a window within brick can be challenging and costly. Ms. Rauch determined if the applicant cannot assure the City that they can get a product that matches the original, then they will have to do solid wood windows and continue with proper maintenance.

Shawn Krawetzki asked how many additional windows that would include, if the applicant had to replace them all. Ms. Burchett indicated approximately two-thirds of the windows need to be replaced. Mr. Papsidero noted that leaves quite a few remaining. He suggested that if the issue is just peeling paint, perhaps the applicants can repaint the existing windows to the satisfaction of the ARB.

Mr. Harpham concluded the applicant will need to use vinyl clad wood windows with divided lites in the same patterns as the existing; and the windows not replaced must be seamless in comparison to the replacement windows. Mr. Papsidero added - or the applicant must restore what remains.

Ms. Burchett said a Waiver is recommended for approval to the Architectural Review Board:

1. §153.062 – Building Types (E)(1)(c) – Façade Materials: Permitted materials include stone, brick, and glass (required); Use of Hardie and LP siding on multiple elevations (requested).

Ms. Burchett said approval is recommended for the Minor Project Review with three conditions:

- 1) That the applicant selects a vinyl clad wood window with divided lites in an accurate reproduction of the design of the existing windows;

- 2) That the applicant provides maintenance and repair to the existing windows or the applicant agrees to simultaneously replace all the windows in the building; and
- 3) That the pattern and color of the HardiePlank and LP siding match the existing siding.

Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He called for a vote and it was unanimous that the request for the one Waiver would be recommended for approval to the Architectural Review Board and the Minor Project Review was approved with three conditions as stated.

INTRODUCTION

4. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Blocks A, B, & C Amendment 18-043MSP

6515 Longshore Loop Master Sign Plan

Nichole Martin said this application is a proposal for amendments to the Master Sign Plan for Bridge Park, Blocks A, B, & C, to include minor changes as necessary and the A1 office building zoned Bridge Street District - Scioto River Neighborhood. She said the site is east of Riverside Drive, north of the roundabout with SR 161 and West Dublin Granville Road. 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 Sections 153.065(H) and 153.066, and the Bridge Street District Sign Guidelines.

Ms. Martin presented an aerial view of the whole Bridge Street Development and highlighted the A1 office building she was referring that sits closest to the corner of Mooney Way and Longshore Loop, both private drives. She presented a detailed site plan and stated there are two tenants intended for the ground floor of the building with three stories of office use above.

Ms. Martin reported the applicant was not in attendance but she had a telephone conversation with Matt Starr, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, prior to the meeting and she provided him with feedback from the most recent comments from General Staff Review. She indicated she had encouraged Mr. Starr to include a total number of signs permitted for the upper stories.

Ms. Martin presented each of the four elevations of building A1 to illustrate the number and type of signs proposed. Vince Papsidero asked if one tenant per floor could have three signs because this building has three street-facing facades. Ms. Martin answered the regulation states office tenant signs are designated at the discretion of the landlord not to exceed one per tenant and referred to that section in the MSP. She thought the statement was open-ended so she suggested editing the language to state "to not exceed x number of signs for Level 2", of which would have to be determined.

Ray Harpham indicated it might be challenging to find tenants/businesses due to all of the new construction and he was concerned about seeing a multitude of signs on one building. He suggested naming the whole building for identification as opposed to individual signs. He said there can be two signs permitted on the first floor for pedestrians but not on the upper floors. Ms. Martin affirmed, from a wayfinding perspective, it is more appropriate for motorists to identify a building and not individual tenants, and then pedestrians (along Longshore Loop) to identify individual tenants. Donna Goss said anyone entering the building from SR 161 could then identify tenants on a building directory as opposed to exterior signage.

Ms. Martin noted the vertical area designated for a Fascia/Wall sign on the east does not meet the Level 2 regulations. She said she would encourage the applicant to consider this area as an opportunity for a building

identifier. Ms. Martin said the applicant intended for there to be a wall sign to be named later. She asked the ART, if that placeholder should be removed.

Aaron Stanford asked for confirmation that the blue spaces on the illustrations designated the location of the sign zone and not the size to which Ms. Martin confirmed. She said she would ask the applicant to update the elevations for simplicity by removing some of the architectural details.

Ms. Martin said there is an allowance for a Placemaking Art Sign on this building facing SR 161. She explained to the ART these types of signs are to be located on the second story but for first story businesses like a restaurant. She said there was a lot of back and forth with Mr. Starr regarding if a ground story will be occupied by a restaurant or an office and he was leaning toward mostly office during their most recent conversation. The ART agreed the opportunity for a Placemaking Art Sign should be eliminated on this building. Mr. Papsidero stated typically, Placemaking Art Signs are linked to retail and restaurant uses.

Mr. Papsidero suggested an office on the ground floor should not have any signs either or he anticipates it could become quite cluttered. The ART determined Window Signs as a sign type within Level 1 is not an appropriate sign type for office tenants and should be eliminated from the MSP. Ms. Goss said too many signs, especially if repeated on every window and door, would be visually alarming.

Mr. Stanford said for vehicles arriving on the backside of the building, there should be an address number near the main entrance. Ms. Martin recommended that the applicant should provide designed and dimensioned signs for any building identifiers.

Ms. Martin indicated a vehicle approaching this development will drive by the front of buildings looking for a particular building identified and once determined will then look for the tenant space.

Ms. Martin emphasized the number of individual signs permitted for the building within Level 2 should be limited. She concluded she would request that the applicant update the General Regulations Matrix to clarify that within Level 1, signs adjacent to publically accessible, private open spaces are not permitted.

Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any other questions or items for consideration by the ART. [Hearing none.] He stated the application is anticipated to be before the ART for determination on July 5, 2018.

ADJOURNMENT

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any additional administrative issues or other items for discussion. [There were none.] He adjourned the meeting at 2:52 pm.

As approved by the Administrative Review Team on July 19, 2018.