



MEETING MINUTES

Administrative Review Team

Thursday, February 9, 2017 | 2:00 pm

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

Other Staff: Jennifer Rauch, Planning Manager; Claudia Husak, Senior Planner; Lori Burchett, Planner II; Logan Stang, Planner I; JM Rayburn, Planner I; Cameron Roberts, Planning Assistant; and Laurie Wright, Administrative Support II.

Applicants: Tracey Diehl, ICH Hotel (Case 2); Peter Coratola, Sr., CBS Garvey LLC; David Meleca, Steve Lamphear, and Taylor Pfeffenberger, David Meleca Architects; and Frank Albanese (Case 3); and Heidi Bolyard, Simplified Architecture (Case 4).

Vince Papsidero called the meeting to order at 2:03 pm. He asked if there were any amendments to the January 26th meeting minutes. The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

Mr. Papsidero stated two minor modifications were approved administratively for Bridge Park. The first was for Building C2 (Cap City) for modifications deemed appropriate and the second was for A-Block for changes in building material or color.

DETERMINATIONS

1. BSD HC – Honest Advertising 16-108ARB-MPR

39 W. Bridge Street Minor Project Review

JM Rayburn said this is a request for the installation of two new signs on an existing office building on the south side of W. Bridge Street, approximately 80 feet west of the intersection with Mill 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. Rayburn presented an aerial view of the site. He said the applicant is proposing two wall signs at 7.75 square feet each to be located above the two entrances of the tenant space at an unspecified height. He said the building has pedestrian access and an entrance from W. Bridge Street and a vehicular access and building entrance from the rear alley, which are both considered frontages. He pointed out that one wall sign will be placed above the principal entrance from the rear parking lot, will be within six feet of the entrance, and will not extend more than 14 inches from the face of the structure. The other sign he said will be placed on the wall associated with the storefront on W. Bridge Street. He stated these signs are both identical and meet the Zoning Code for number, type, size, location, and color. He described the signs as having two colors with "Cool Gray" lettering on a "Map Black" background.

Mr. Rayburn said a recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board is recommended 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.



Mr. Rayburn stated the applicant had agreed to this condition prior to the meeting.

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 meeting on February 22, 2017.

**2. BSD C – Home 2 Hotel
17-006MSP**

**5000 Upper Metro Place
Master Sign Plan**

Logan Stang said this is a request for a Master Sign Plan including two wall signs and one monument sign for a hotel on a 2.57-acre parcel, south of US 33, at 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 Master Sign Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066.

Mr. Stang reported the ART had previously reviewed the proposal for three signs and provided feedback to the applicant and the applicant has since revised the signs based on the ART's concerns. He stated the applicant is proposing to install a 65-square-foot wall sign on the east elevation facing Frantz Road, a 22-square-foot projecting sign on the north elevation facing W. Bridge Street, and a 14-square-foot ground sign located 13 feet from Upper Metro Place right-of-way at the single access point servicing the site, which includes the hotel and the (future) office building. He explained the wall sign exceeds Code for size by 15 feet, height by 26 feet, and the 20% limit for secondary images; the projecting sign exceeds Code for size by 6 feet and height since it is proposed for the second floor instead of the first floor; and the ground sign meets all Code requirements. However, he said the sign plan responds to visibility and wayfinding needs of a hotel use, while working within the Bridge Street District Sign Guidelines. He explained that while a few provisions are not being met with regards to sign height and size, the design and display of the signs match the architectural character of the newly developed building.

Jeff Tyler inquired about the height of the projecting sign. Mr. Stang answered it is 36 feet at the top of the sign and 22 square feet in size.

Mr. Stang added the signs meet the context of the surrounding buildings, which have approved variances given the I-270 frontage and that the surrounding uses are predominantly hotel uses.

Mr. Stang said a recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission is recommended with no conditions.

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 Planning and Zoning Commission for a Master Sign Plan for the meeting on February 16th.

CASE REVIEWS

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

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

Lori Burchett 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. Burchett reported that during the initial review of the project, staff identified 20 Waivers and she explained each one of the following:

§153.062 – Building Types – Historic Mixed-Use Building Requirements

- 1) §153.062(D)2 Pitched Roof Type
 - *Roof Structure—gambrel roof and flat roof not permitted unless architecturally appropriate per required reviewing body*
- 2) §153.062(E)1.g. Materials
 - *Hardie Plank fiber cement siding is not a permitted primary material*
 - *Proposed Hardie Plank does not meet minimum butt thickness requirement of ½"*
- 3) §153.062(I)(b) Balcony Connection to Building
 - *Balconies must be independently secured and the proposed balcony is connected to the balcony below*
- 4) §153.062(O)(9)(a)3. Parking Location & Loading
 - *Parking not permitted within the building*
- 5) §153.062(O)(9)(d)1. Street Façade Requirements
 - *Ground Story Transparency—40% required, 21% provided at Eberly Hill Lane elevation, 15% provided at South Blacksmith Lane elevation.*
 - *Upper Story Transparency—20% required, 17% provided at Eberly Hill Lane elevation, 15% provided at South Blacksmith Lane elevation*
- 6) §153.062(O)(9)(d)2. Non-Street Façade Requirements
 - *Transparency—15% required, 8% provided at 1st story south elevation*
- 7) §153.062(O)(9)(d)3. Building Entrances
 - *Number Required on Street Facades—1 per 40 feet. 3 required at Eberly Hill Lane, 1 provided*
- 8) §153.062(O)(9)(d)4. Façade Divisions
 - *Vertical Increments no greater than 30 feet required with a minimum recess or projection of 18 inches. 33.67-foot-increment in the middle portion of the building, no recess or projection meets the minimum 18-inch requirement.*

§153.064 – Open Space Types

- 9) §153.064(G)(1)(a) Minimum Size
 - *Minimum Dimension—10 feet permitted, 6.33 feet proposed*
- 10) §153.064(G)(1)(b) Minimum Size
 - *Proportion Requirement—3:1 maximum length to width permitted, 4:1 proposed*
- 11) §153.064(G)(3)(b) Districts Permitted
 - *Frontage Orientation of open space to adjacent buildings—Front or Corner, Side or Rear proposed*

§153.065 – Site Development Standards

- 12) §153.065(B)(2)(a) Parking and Loading, Minimum Parking Required

- *Proposed Uses require 23 parking spaces, 20 parking spaces provided (Parking Plan Required) Off-site parking used to meet requirement shall require an approved Parking Plan*
- 13) §153.065(D)(5)(c)2. Landscaping, Surface Parking, Interior Landscaping
 - *Minimum width of landscape islands and peninsulas is 10 feet, 9 foot wide peninsula proposed (Administrative Departure)*
 - 14) §153.065(D)(5)(c)4. Landscaping, Surface Parking, Interior Landscaping
 - *Clear space required where parking space is immediately adjacent to landscape peninsula, parking spaces directly above street walls in two locations and the stairs in another*
 - 15) §153.065(D)(7)(b) Landscaping, Foundation Planting
 - *A minimum landscape bed depth away from the building of 42 inches is required, 39 inches proposed (Administrative Departure), and no landscape beds are provided in two other locations*
 - 16) §153.0365(E)(2)(b) Street Wall Standards
 - *Street walls shall be installed along same plane as building, proposed wall is recessed from the plane of the building by 2.83 feet*
 - 17) §153.065(E)(2)(c) Street Wall Landscaping
 - *Shrubs required adjacent to street wall, shrubs proposed but not in correct location*
 - 18) §153.065(E)(3) Screening
 - *Ground Mounted Mechanical Equipment shall be screened on all sides, proposed equipment requires additional screening*
 - 19) §153.065(H)(6) Signs, Number of Permitted Signs
 - *Tenants are permitted two signs of different types, proposed signs are the same type for each tenant*
 - 20) §153.065(H)(7)(b) Specific Sign Requirements—Projecting Sign
 - *Maximum size permitted—8 square feet, proposed 13.33 square feet*
 - *Location—Within 6 feet of principal entrance, proposed 25.67 feet from principle entrance (both projecting signs proposed)*
 - *Maximum height—15 feet to the top of sign, 20 feet to top of proposed projecting sign on south elevation*

Ms. Burchett said the applicant needs to address and eliminate as many Waivers as possible. She reported staff had general concerns about the retaining wall with the railing.

Jennifer Rauch pointed out that there are a lot of grade changes and additional detail is needed in the proposal regarding the height of the wall and landings along Eberly Hill Lane. As presented, she said it appears as if the landing is in the right-of-way. She encouraged the applicant to meet as many of the Waiver issues as possible.

Frank Albanese said the retaining wall is a lot higher to accommodate the grade changes. He said the retaining wall between the former Biddies building is 12 – 14 feet high but the applicant could taper the wall so it is then no higher than the curb and perhaps not all the railing is necessary. He explained that the grade by the barber shop is not as high as it appears on the rendering.

Ms. Rauch questioned if the image represented the plans accurately.

The changes in elevation and the heights of grading were discussed amongst the ART members. Mr. Albanese explained the wall is not exposed but the railing is.

Steve Lamphear, David Meleca Architects, explained the wall would be constructed from an interlocking, stackable material. Ms. Burchett presented the wheat weathered edge material proposed. Ms. Rauch noted the material appears like stone.

Jeff Tyler inquired about the height of the wall at the back of the parking lot, to which Mr. Lamphear answered 12 feet. Ms. Rauch confirmed the height of the wall from grade to the top of the wall and that there would be an additional railing on top of that.

Mr. Albanese asked if they needed the railing all across the wall. Mr. Tyler answered the stair has to be railed. Ms. Rauch said the drawing needs to better represent the proposal for the south elevation.

Ms. Rauch asked the ART how they felt about the stone wall height and materials as well as the railing. Donna Goss answered the material for the wall is fine. Ms. Rauch confirmed the railing detail was okay. Mr. Tyler said he had concerns with the wall's exposure and the massing. He asked if the wall could be broken up somehow because he sees a problem with the blank wall. He encouraged the applicant to consider the neighborhood and find a way to soften the wall.

David Meleca, David Meleca Architects, said there are trees along the street so he did not understand the concern about exposure and starkness. Mr. Tyler indicated the wall as presented would not be supported by the Architectural Review Board.

Ms. Rauch encouraged the applicant to present renderings showing the proposed landscaping along the wall to show how well the wall would be screened with those materials and that the image should include parked cars and trees.

Mr. Tyler inquired about the dumpster enclosure. He indicated it appears awkward, tucked into the stair. Mr. Albanese explained the dumpster will just be for office and residential use so a garbage truck will not have to back in there, the dumpster will instead be rolled out of the enclosure for pick-up.

Mr. Albanese said he was surprised at the number of Waivers identified as he thought there would only be two or three today.

Ms. Burchett went through several of the Waivers again. She asked the applicant to possibly add more windows to address the transparency issues.

Ms. Rauch said since the applicant reoriented the building, the surface parking was reduced but staff is supportive of that change, which would require a Waiver. However, she said the applicant should strive to meet the transparency issue.

Ms. Burchett restated the balconies are connected and need to be disconnected. She said she is still concerned about the mass of the roof all being on the same plane.

Mr. Tyler questioned the proximity of the two buildings. He indicated the porch cannot be in the location as shown on the plans. Mr. Meleca said the spacing between the buildings was based on the property line and that the setback should work.

Mr. Tyler said the property line affects the openings permitted. He asked the applicant if they could change the treatment of facades, while removing that porch.

Mr. Albanese asked the ART if the gambrel roof breaks up the massing appropriately. Mr. Meleca asked if the roof was shown in 3-dimensions if it would help, to which the ART answered it would help. Mr. Meleca said he saw the gambrel roof used on a house on High Street and that is why he pulled it into that vocabulary.

Ms. Burchett encouraged the applicant to break up the vertical increments. She said the projection would need to be at least 18 inches in depth.

Ms. Burchett requested the ART's comments on the overall design, overall structure in the back, the treatment of facades, consistency, and the use of railings.

Ms. Goss asked if the dormers were inconsistent on purpose. Mr. Meleca explained he was trying to achieve the appearance of three separate buildings built side by side that had evolved over time.

Vince Papsidero indicated the north elevation was fine but was concerned about the south elevation.

Mr. Tyler noted the problem with the north entrance is that it is too close to the existing buildings.

Logan Stang indicated a potential problem with the lot split. He suggested that if the property line was moved, the former Biddies building would be non-conforming. Mr. Tyler encouraged the applicant to review the Building Code and ramifications. He explained an imaginary lot line does not get into the lot split issue. He suggested the applicant go through the exercise.

Claudia Husak inquired about the windows in the yellow siding section as they appear out of scale with that portion of the building.

Mr. Albanese said the northwest corner encroaches in the easement where the column has been drawn. Aaron Stanford asked if it is actually encroaching in the easement or the right-of-way. Ms. Burchett said she would review that portion of the building. Mr. Lamphear added the line of sight passes through the column.

Mr. Lamphear asked how the applicant is over the right-of-way. Ms. Rauch answered the landing steps go down into the right-of-way. Mr. Lamphear said that was not the case. Ms. Rauch suggested the drawings accurately reflect what is going on there because the drawing was deceptive.

Ms. Burchett stated the Waiver for signs was due to the requirements being there needs to be two different kinds of sign types and the location has to be within 6 feet of the principle entrance.

Ms. Burchett inquired about the pocket plaza. She said she understands there are site constraints but the depth to width ratio is over what is permitted. Taylor Pheffenberger, David Meleca Architects, said the applicant can adjust the square size to be in compliance. Ms. Burchett warned it needed to be calculated accurately. Ms. Rauch added the dedication of the open space is supposed to be for public use. Ms. Rauch indicated that if the area is just 6 feet wide at the sidewalk, it will appear as private space and not public space. She suggested moving the pocket plaza to the corner or claim a different type of open space and not a public plaza. She indicated a change in location could be supported for a Waiver.

Ms. Burchett stated the applicant has requested a Waiver for foundation planting on Eberly Hill Lane but staff wants to see foundation plantings. She explained that nothing is required for the front but foundation plantings are required for the backside that are usually 42 inches from the edge of the elevation. She referred the applicant to the Code as it is very specific about foundation planting requirements. Ms. Rauch indicated the applicant was close to meeting this requirement on the side on Blacksmith Lane but the southern elevation is the problem. Obviously, she said garages cannot be landscaped.

Ms. Burchett presented the site plan, which is short parking by three spaces.

Mr. Stanford noted the transformers and AC units need to be fully screened.

Mr. Tyler cautioned the applicants to consider the location of dryer vents as they should be located out back. He said if that is not achieved, it will require a Waiver.

Mr. Albanese said there are just two residential units so he asked if it is possible to hide the vents amongst the stone. Mr. Tyler encouraged the applicant to take the dryer vents to the rear. Mr. Meleca indicated they are not sure yet about the interior layout.

Mr. Tyler said stacks need to be on the rear also. He added range hoods will require venting and it would be easier to deal with that now rather than later.

Mr. Meleca inquired about door hardware. Mr. Tyler said those elements could be dealt with later in the process.

Mr. Albanese requested conditional approval to happen today. Ms. Burchett explained the process and how the proposal could not be recommended for determination today. She suggested the applicant meet with staff on Monday so the ART would be better equipped to make a solid recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board.

Mr. Meleca said if there was foundation planting on the rear it could not stretch 42 inches.

Mr. Stanford inquired about the parking lot islands. Ms. Rauch indicated the landscape could be waived but to not eliminate curbs or cars could drive over the open spaces. Mr. Tyler suggested if the applicant moves the landscaping from one location to another and softens the wall, they may have a better chance of requesting a Waiver for something else.

Ms. Pheffenberger inquired about the parking lot issues. Ms. Burchett explained an island needs to be a minimum of 10 feet. Ms. Pheffenberger asked if planting around the garages counts toward the 5% requirement. Ms. Husak said having additional landscaping speaks to their favor but it would not count.

Mr. Meleca asked if the patio terraces were acceptable because they are stacked. He explained that is due to the office location on the left and the two residences stacked on top of each other to the right.

Mr. Tyler asked if the entrance on the yellow section of the building could be removed as it appears to stick out. Mr. Meleca answered he thought he could work that out.

Ms. Rauch restated the applicant should meet internally with staff to cover possible ideas.

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He stated the recommendation for approval is scheduled for February 16, 2017.

**4. 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 a 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 presented the aerial view of the site in historic Dublin, which contains a residential structure.

He noted the proposal summary as follows:

- Deck and stair addition to the existing rear patio
- Walkway from rear deck addition to existing stone stairs
- Three column additions to the existing front porch
- Replacement of an existing door at the front of the building with a window
- Addition of shutters/wood panel to three of the front windows

Mr. Roberts presented a site plan comparing the existing site and the proposed modifications. He presented the proposed rear deck addition as well as the existing rear elevation. He presented the plans for the rear deck addition to be constructed of 1-inch-square edge boards in a pebble grey color; new railing at 38 inches tall, which meets building code and will have charcoal black Azek posts with tempered glass sections between the posts with the top and bottom rails of Azek material in charcoal black. He explained part of the railing from the original rear patio will also be reused. He said the stairway will have pressure treated stringers with Azek treads and the railing will also be an Azek material. Lastly, he noted the new pathway will be made out of a natural stone material that matches the existing stone stairway on the property.

Mr. Roberts presented the proposed front modifications compared to the existing elevation and pointed out the locations for new columns, window replacement, and window shutters. He explained the three column additions will be 7 inches by 7 inches with an Azek trim; the shutters will be an Azek wood panel; and the new window will be a white, Jeld-Wen Premium Vinyl Casement window with Azek trim and an Azek panel below. He presented graphics of the proposed material samples.

Mr. Roberts reported staff suggested the following modifications to the proposal per their internal review:

- Adding a fourth column to make the columns appear more proportional to the front of the building;
- Proposed shutter width be increased to fit the actual size of the existing windows since there is some concern that they are currently too small;
- Material of the window be changed to something such as aluminum clad wood windows, at a minimum because the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* recommend that window replacements be made of a wood material or at least incorporate a wood component; and
- That the applicant provides the proposed colors for these modifications.

Heidi Bolyard, Simplified Architecture, said that shutter width would not fit. Claudia Husak suggested staff modify the condition approval to "remove the shutters or make them fit".

Ms. Bolyard said the columns have been updated already. She explained the applicant does not want to repaint so new products will match the existing color of off-white. She also noted the windows and doors illustrated on the rear elevation were drawn incorrectly and has since fixed the image.

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He stated the recommendation for approval was scheduled for February 16, 2017.

**5. BSD HC IMS Sign
17-010ARB-MPR**

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

JM Rayburn said this is a request for the installation of a new sign for an existing tenant space on the east side of S. High Street, approximately 80 feet south of the intersection with Eberly 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 Codes §153.066(G) and §153.170 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Mr. Rayburn presented the aerial view of the site and the proposed location for the projecting sign on the yellow painted building. He explained Code Enforcement had discovered the sign already constructed and hung, which is non-compliant. He said the applicant has now submitted the proposal to follow the process correctly.

Mr. Rayburn presented a photograph of the 5.33-square-foot projecting sign hung over the front entrance from an iron bracket using chains and locking clips attached to the I-hooks on the sign. He said the paint color for the text "ims" is Blue Pantone 7689, "INTEGRATED MARKETING SOLUTIONS" is Green Pantone 360, and "CREATIVE MARKETING" is Cool Gray 1, each with different letter sizes and type styles on a white background with green trim. He explained the sign meets Code for size, number, location, and height but the four colors exceed the Code requirements.

Mr. Rayburn asked the ART the following questions:

1. Are four colors appropriate? (Code limits the number of colors to three)
2. Are the colors compatible for the historic character of the neighborhood—specifically Pantone Green?
3. Should the sign reflect more dimensionality?
4. Is it appropriate for the sign to have three letter sizes and two type styles in three different font colors?

Jeff Tyler said the sign is not legible as presented. Jennifer Rauch questioned the color palette and lack of dimension.

The consensus of the ART was that everything about the sign except for location and size need to be changed to be in compliance with Code; all text currently shown is not permitted. They recommended the applicant re-design the sign and submit a new proposal.

Vince Papsidero said the applicant needs to read the Code before finalizing the appearance of the sign. He asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He stated the recommendation for approval as submitted is scheduled for February 16, 2017.

ADJOURNMENT

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any additional administrative issues or other items for discussion. [There were none.] He adjourned the meeting at 3:30 pm.

As approved by the Administrative Review Team on February 16, 2017.