



RECORD OF DETERMINATION

Administrative Review Team

Thursday, January 18, 2018

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

1. BSD HTN – Bridge Park West 17-046ARB/MSP 94-100 N. High Street Master Sign Plan

Proposal: Amendments to an existing Master Sign Plan to permit modifications to regulations and to provide regulations for a future mixed-use building located east of N. High Street approximately 200 feet north of North Street. The site is zoned BSD-HTN, Bridge Street District Historic Transition Neighborhood.

Location: East side of N. High Street, approximately 275 feet north of North Street.

Request: Review and recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board for a Master Sign Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.066 and 153.170 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Applicant: Matt Starr, Crawford Hoying Development Partners.

Planning Contact: Nichole M. Martin, Planner I

Contact Information: 614.410.4635, nmartin@dublin.oh.us

Case Information: <http://dublinohiousa.gov/arb/17-046>

REQUEST: Recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board for a Master Sign Plan with two conditions:

- 1) That the applicant provide an approved MSP containing all the approved amendments to Planning, prior to sign permitting; and
- 2) That Level 2 tenants be permitted only one projecting sign.

Determination: This application was forwarded to the Architectural Review Board with a recommendation of approval.

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Vince A. Papsidero, FAICP
Director of Planning





MEETING MINUTES

Administrative Review Team

Thursday, January 18, 2018 | 2:00 pm

ART Members and Designees: Vince Papsidero, Planning Director; Donna Goss, Director of Development; Colleen Gilger, Economic Development Director; Ray Harpham, Commercial Plans Examiner/Chief Building Official; Matt Earman, Director of Parks and Recreation; Aaron Stanford, Senior Civil Engineer; Mike Altomare, Fire Marshal; and Tim Hosterman, Police Sergeant.

Other Staff: Claudia Husak, Senior Planner; Logan Stang, Planner I; Tammy Noble, Senior Planner; Nichole Martin, Planner I; JM Rayburn, Planner I; Sierra Saumenig, Planning Assistant; and Laurie Wright, Administrative Support II.

Applicants: Matt Starr, Crawford Hoying Development Partners (Case 1); Tate Chaney, Vine and Tap (Case 2); Christopher Meyers, Meyers and Associates (Case 5); and James Peltier, EMH&T (Case 6).

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

DETERMINATIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS

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

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

Nichole Martin said this application is a proposal for Amendments to an existing Master Sign Plan to permit modifications to regulations and to provide regulations for a future mixed-use building located east of N. High Street. She stated the site is zoned BSD-HTN, Bridge Street District Historic Transition Neighborhood. She said the site is on the east side of N. High Street, approximately 200 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 Sections 153.066 and 153.170 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Ms. Martin presented an aerial view of the site and noted it includes two parcels. Since this is a request for an Amendment to an existing Master Sign Plan, she discussed the background of this case. She reported in 2015, the ARB reviewed and approved a Master Sign Plan for the Bridge Park West development – Building Z1 with five conditions but then there was discussion regarding size, construction/design quality, and the number of signs so two conditions were added at the meeting:

- 1) That the document be revised to clarify the window sign allowances that include the entire window area and not individual window panes; and
- 2) That the second floor tenants are permitted only a single projecting sign.

More significantly, she reported, in May 2017, the ART reviewed a limited scope of modifications to the Master Sign Plan tailored to address tenant specific requests. She said the ART urged the applicant to consider modifications with the construction of the future Z2 mixed-use building. In December 2017, she said, the applicant resubmitted an application that holistically considered modifications to the Master Sign Plan.



Ms. Martin noted the modifications made to existing sign types and the new sign types as follows:

- **Leasing Window Cover:** Intended to provide full coverage of a tenant space during turnover. A Crawford Hoying or Bridge Park graphic is permitted to cover 30 percent or less of the window, which is consistent with the Window Sign regulation in the plan.
- **Tenant Leasing Window Cover:** A new sign type to build excitement for new tenants for a maximum of 180 days, prior to opening. It is proposed to be full coverage to screen construction activity. It may be a maximum of three colors and graphic area may not exceed 30 percent of the window area.
- **PED Art Sign:** New sign type intended to allow for select tenants with over 50 feet of frontage on a public right-of-way to request this sign type at the discretion of the Planning Director. This type allows for a sign meeting all the design requirements of a Placemaking Art Sign to be located within the first level of the building at a size not exceed 25 square feet, which is more appropriate for pedestrian traffic.
- **Window Sign/Graphic:** Window signs were permitted under the original approval; however, tenants have expressed a desire to have graphics that complement the theme of their brands but are not explicitly signs. Window graphics are not permitted to include name or logo; may cover up to 30 percent of the window area; and do not count toward a tenant's total number of allowable signs.
- **Awning Sign:** Clarified to be consistent with the BSD Sign Code to permit 20 percent of the surface area of the awning to permit printing on the awning up to a maximum of 8 square feet.
- **Canopy Edge Sign:** Clarified to permit the sign to be located on top, on the face of, or below the canopy, and to be permitted at a maximum size of 1 square foot/linear foot of frontage up to a maximum size of 12 square feet.
- **Logo/Name on Storefront Door:** Regulation proposed to be consistent with the BSD Sign Code provision for a one square foot, one low chroma color sign on a store front door. A permanent sign permit is not required and it does not count toward a tenant's total number of permitted building mounted signs.

Ms. Martin noted the modifications made to sign design requirements:

- **Number:** Level 2 tenants are proposed to be permitted two projecting signs if the whole office suite is occupied by one tenant. Allowance of only one projecting sign per second floor tenant was a condition of the original approval, therefore, Staff is unresponsive of modifications to this regulation.
- **Lighting:** The plan is clarified to prohibit neon.
- **Colors:** Three are permitted.
- **Tenant Licensee Sign:** Tenants are allowed to grant a permitted sign to a tenant within their tenant space. The total number of signs permitted per tenant space remains the same. The intent is to allow flexibility for small businesses within the district to gain exposure.

Ms. Martin demonstrated the process modifications for:

- Tenant Licensee
- Sign Locations finalized at Building Permitting

The amendments for all signs for Building Z2 was presented as a graphic of the east elevation.

Ms. Martin stated staff reviewed this application against the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*, the BSD Sign Design Guidelines, and the intent of the Master Sign Plan.

Ms. Martin said approval is recommended to the Architectural Review Board for a Master Sign Plan as it meets the development character of the area with two conditions:

- 1) That the applicant provide an approved MSP containing all the approved amendments to Planning, prior to sign permitting; and
- 2) That Level 2 tenants be permitted only one projecting sign.

Matt Starr, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, said he agreed to the above conditions. He said they are asking for a maximum of two signs for over the south building only as it is a complicated building to understand as far as wayfinding. He explained there is no lobby at the south side of the building but rather on the north side and it is not intuitive as to how to get to that space. Therefore, he said, he proposes a sign for the south elevation facing the plaza. He said they could have up to three tenants, but as of now one is tenant is expected to occupy the space. He said he would like to take this to the ARB.

Vince Papsidero said Staff could modify the conditions. Donna Goss said Mr. Starr's request is fine. Ms. Martin added she had a discussion with the landlord, Mr. Starr, and this is a valid argument for this tenant.

Mr. Starr reported there was going to be a kiosk marker in the plaza area but through iterations of the Plaza, the City requested the kiosk marker to be removed. From a staff perspective, Ms. Martin said they are trying to be respectful of the Board so she would recommend ART to elevate this request to the ARB for their decision.

Mr. Papsidero agreed and asked if there were any questions or comments regarding this application. [There were none.] He called for a vote, the motion carried, and the Master Sign Plan was recommended for approval to the Architectural Review Board, which will be reviewed at their meeting on January 24, 2018.

**2. BSD HC – Vine and Tap – Sign
17-114ARB/MPR**

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

J.M. Rayburn said this application is a proposal for the installation of a new projecting wall sign for an existing tenant space, west of S. High Street, approximately 125 feet southwest of the intersection with Spring 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 Sections 153.066 and 153.170 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

An aerial view of the site was presented as well as several graphics. Mr. Rayburn said the proposed sign is eight square feet in size and made of a medium density overlay but that material is not a permitted material in the Code. He said it is to be mounted eight feet from the ground measured to the bottom of the sign and attached with lag bolts.

Mr. Rayburn said that Staff reviewed the sign against the BSD Sign Design Guidelines, the Minor Project Review criteria, and the ARB Review Standards and found that criteria has been met with three conditions. Therefore, he said, approval is recommended to the Architectural Review Board for the Minor Project Review with the three following conditions:

- 1) That the applicant use a permitted wood material for the sign background and lettering (HDU, cedar, redwood, treated lumber or equivalent material);
- 2) That the sign be affixed to building at the back of the sign with all the hardware concealed; and
- 3) That any future permanent window signs for the tenant space should be reviewed and approved by the Architectural Review Board (ARB) prior to sign permitting and installation.

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.

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

BOARD ORDER

DECEMBER 16, 2015

The Architectural Review Board took the following action at this meeting:

**2. BSD HTN – Bridge Park West 94-100 North High Street
15-100ARB-MSP Master Sign Plan**

Proposal: A Master Sign Plan for a new mixed-use development on the east side of North High Street, approximately 280 feet north of the intersection with North Street.

Request: Review and approval for a Master Sign Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Applicant: Matt Starr, Crawford Hoying Development Partners.

Planning Contact: Jennifer M. Rauch, AICP, Planning Manager;
(614) 410-4690, jrauch@dublin.oh.us

MOTION: Mr. Rinaldi moved, Ms. Fox seconded, to approve a request for a Master Sign Plan with five conditions:

- 1) That the general regulations matrix outlining the sign types and allowance should be updated to clarify the building mounted sign types from the other sign types;
- 2) That the applicant provides additional graphics for the north and south elevations of the Historic Mixed-Use buildings to provide additional sign location options for the corner tenants;
- 3) That the MSP includes a zoning review timeline graphic, which will need to be revised to accurately reflect the review and permit process following the approval of the MSP;
- 4) That the document be revised to clarify the window sign allowances that include the entire window area and not individual window panes; and
- 5) That the second floor tenants are permitted only a single projecting sign.

VOTE: 5 - 0

RESULT: This request for a Master Sign Plan was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

David Rinaldi	Yes
Thomas Munhall	Yes
Everett Musser	Yes
Jane Fox	Yes
Shannon Stenberg	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION


Jennifer M. Rauch, AICP, Planning Manager

Katie Dodaro presented the site that is approximately 200 feet away from Bridge Street. She presented the existing conditions that include a six-by-three-foot aluminum window on the first floor and six-over-six double-hung vinyl windows and shutters on the second floor. She said the applicant proposed to replace the first floor windows with vinyl three-by-two grid with 1 3/16-inch SDL grilles with in-glass spacer bars, which is a wider grille layout for a more traditional storefront look and replace the second floor windows with two-over-two, double-hung windows, including 1 3/16-inch SDL grilles and four-inch trim. She said the second story windows will also include vinyl shutters that are 18 inches wide with decorative strap hinges and S-hooks that will be mounted on the casing for an operable look. She said the applicant proposed to replace the windows on both stories with the following scheme:

Material: Vinyl
Color: White interior and dark bronze exterior
SDL Grilles: 1 3/16"
Color: Ivory cream

Ms. Dodaro stated the existing second story shutters are green vinyl with no decorative features. She said the applicant proposed to replace the shutters with the following scheme:

Material: Vinyl
Color: Musket Brown
Decorative Features: Black decorative strap hinges and S-hook accessories
Decorative Features Material: Faux iron finish

Ms. Dodaro reported the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* states the replacement windows should duplicate the appearance of the originals as closely as possible and to use the same material, usually wood and to avoid vinyl and aluminum-clad. She indicated the ART discussed the recommendation in the *Guidelines* and determined the previous changes made to the building over time, including exterior materials and prior window replacement have altered the historic significance of the structure and determined the proposed modifications are appropriate and supported, particularly because the existing window sizes are maintained.

Ms. Dodaro said approval is recommended with no conditions.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Munhall moved, Ms. Stenberg seconded, to approve a request for a Minor Project Review with no conditions. The vote was as follows: Mr. Musser, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; and Mr. Munhall, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

2. BSD HTN – Bridge Park West 15-102ARB-MPR

94-100 North High Street Minor Project Review/ Waivers

The Chair said the following application is a request for modifications and Waiver requests to the approved Bridge Park West development on the east side of North High Street approximately 280 feet north of the intersection with North Street. He said this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code 153.066 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Jennifer Rauch presented the site reviewed through the approval process for the project. She said working through the building permit phase has prompted modifications and Waivers. She explained the proposal includes two motions: 1) Minor Project Review; and 2) seven Site Plan Waivers.

Ms. Rauch presented the approved elevation of the apartment building showing the eyebrow or cornice detail. She said due to constructability, the applicant has requested a change. She presented the

proposed diminished profile and said both proposals meet the Code. She said it is a change of the aesthetics, as well as the mass and depth of the approved detail.

Ms. Rauch presented the approved bio-retention area with a kidney-shaped design intended to be a bio-swale. She said the applicant has discovered significant bedrock, which changed the overall design. She presented the proposed changes to the area, which takes advantage of the rock face wall and the main area becomes an open lawn area. She said the landscape portion and pedestrian access is retained but with better functionality.

Ms. Rauch said there are seven Waivers and explained each:

1. Blank Wall Limitation - 30% maximum permitted, no greater than 15 feet of horizontal distance. The request is for the interior courtyards of the Apartment Building on the 5th story and the Historic Mixed-Use Building on the 4th and 5th story to exceed this requirement.
2. Primary Building Materials – Historic Mixed-Use Building – 80% maximum permitted. The request is for the north and south elevations and the interior courtyard areas for the Historic Mixed-Use buildings to exceed this requirement. The overall design is not significantly impacted.
3. Primary Building Materials – Accessory Structure – 80% maximum permitted. The request is to permit the original brick and stone enclosure to be composite materials with stone columns.
4. Façade Material Transitions – Required to occur at inside corner – The request is to permit the change in materials to occur on the balconies and along the north elevation of the Historic Mixed-Use Building to vary from this requirement.
5. Balcony Dimensions – 6-foot depth and 5-foot width required – The request is to permit additional smaller balcony areas.
6. Parapet Height – 6-foot maximum permitted – The request is to permit an increased parapet height to 8 feet on a portion of the Historic Mixed-Use building to screen exhaust equipment.
7. Street Wall Height – 3-foot maximum permitted – The request is to permit a varied street wall height to accommodate grade changes and ADA compliance.

Thomas Munhall asked about the eyebrow detail changes.

Gary Sebach, OHM Advisors, 101 Mill Run, Gahanna, OH, said the concern was about the three-foot eyebrow staying in place as cantilever concrete. He said the cornice would still be made of concrete but would not extend as previously approved. He stated it was largely a maintenance issue.

Mr. Munhall asked for clarification on the primary building materials. Ms. Rauch explained the original calculation was not correct and once updated, the minimum requirement was not met.

Mr. Munhall inquired about the material proposed for the accessory structure. Mr. Sebach explained the material is a solid composite. He said the design concept is similar to a shadowbox fence.

Mr. Rinaldi asked if the location for the pedestrian bridge landing had been determined. He questioned what this area is going to look like from the bridge.

Shannon Stenberg asked if the composite material was being used anywhere else on the site. Mr. Sebach confirmed this was the only location. He explained this is a solid color material in a cedar/redwood tone that will not fade.

Mr. Rinaldi asked if the generator will be visible behind this shadow fence design. Mr. Sebach said the panels will be staggered so the contents will not be visible.

Mr. Sebach presented several additional elevations and explained the proposed changes. Mr. Munhall indicated the south side is more of a concern for the ARB than the north side as it will be more visual.

Mr. Sebach discussed the proposed modifications regarding the parapet height and the proposed screening solutions. He offered an alternative design from what was shown for the Board's consideration, which included additional wrapping of the parapet to provide an integrated finish. The Board was supportive of this change and requested a condition of approval be added.

Ms. Rauch said approval is recommended for a Minor Project Review with seven Waivers and no conditions.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Munhall moved, Mr. Musser seconded, to approve a request for a Minor Project Review with one condition:

- 1) The applicant provide additional wrapping of the parapet wall to ensure an integrated design, as shown in the meeting.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Munhall, yes; and Mr. Musser, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Munhall moved, Mr. Musser seconded, to approve a request for seven Waivers. The vote was as follows: Ms. Stenberg, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Musser, yes; and Mr. Munhall, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

Communications

Jennifer Rauch said there were no communications to relay.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 7:16 pm.

As approved by the Architectural Review Board on December 16, 2015.