



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 unsupportive 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 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 the ART to elevate this request to the ARB for their decision.

Mr. Papsidero agreed and asked if there were any further 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.

Tate Chaney, Vine and Tap, said they selected the medium density material because he thought that was the ART's recommendation from the last meeting. He added he did some research and found the medium density material to be a durable material recommended for outdoor use. He said the other conditions he is in agreement with to represent his business well.

Donna Goss asked for an explanation of how the sign would be attached to the building. Mr. Chaney presented a graphic to show there will be a 3/8 inch gap between the stone wall and the proposed sign.

Aaron Stanford inquired about lighting. Mr. Chaney said he would not be adding lighting as there was sufficient outdoor lighting already hanging off the building. He indicated the sign would be visible with the contrast of the sign with the stone wall.

Mr. Rayburn said Staff is concerned with the proposed material's durability as that will be a concern with material quality with the ARB. Lori Burchett restated there are certain permitted materials in the Code and this is not one of them. She recommended the applicant consider one of the permitted materials.

Mr. Rayburn said another option would be to route letters instead of affixing the letters to the background of the sign. Mr. Chaney said he has seen other signs in the district with raised letters and that is what he prefers.

Claudia Husak asked how the letters are affixed. Mr. Chaney explained they are secured with screws that are painted and sealed over as to not be visible.

Mr. Chaney said he would find a permitted material in order to move forward.

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

**3. BSD HC – P.M. Title – Sign
17-123ARB/MPR**

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

Sierra Saumenig said this application is a proposal for a projecting wall sign for an existing office space on a 0.37-acre parcel zoned Bridge Street District Historic Core. She said the site is east of South High Street, 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 Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.066 and 153.170 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

The aerial view of the site was presented as well as the proposed projecting wall sign added to the photographs showing the view facing south and the view of the sign facing north.

Ms. Saumenig said the sign will be mounted to an existing sign post structure painted black, hanging from chains and the height measured from the bottom of the sign to grade level is approximately 8 feet. She said the sign is six square feet in size; contains the colors – brown, black, and white; and includes a brown, white, and black Bulldog logo, which is less than 20% of the sign, and is permitted.

Ms. Saumenig reported Staff reviewed the sign against the BSD Sign Design Guidelines, the Minor Project Criteria, and the ARB Review Standards and found that all the criteria has been met. Therefore, she said approval is recommended for the Minor Project Review with no conditions.

Aaron Stanford inquired about the size of the font as it appears that the logo overpowers the letters "PM TITLE, LLC". He asked if there was any discussion about the size of the letters to be visible eight feet in the air. Lori Burchett answered that the sign contractor brought this to the applicant's attention but the applicant still wanted the sign to go this way with the Bulldog logo as the focus.

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

**4. BSD-HC – Cramer & Associates – Sign
17-120ARB/MPR**

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

Lori Burchett said this application is a proposal for a wall sign for an existing office space on a .24-acre parcel zoned Bridge Street District Historic Core located east of South High Street, approximately 125 feet south of the intersection with Bridge Street. She 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*.

Ms. Burchett presented an aerial view of the site as well as the proposed projecting wall sign with the view facing south as it would be mounted on the building. She said the sign is 5.3 square feet in size and made of a high density urethane (HDU) material. She reported the clearance needs to be 8 feet from grade and this proposal is shy six inches so the applicant will need to revise the plans to comply. The sign, she said, will be in three colors - orange for the logo, gray for the text, and a white background. She added the secondary logo is less than 20% of the total size.

Ms. Burchett reported that Staff reviewed the sign against the BSD Sign Design Guidelines, the Minor Project Review criteria, and the Architectural Review Board (ARB) Review Standards and found that the criteria has been met with two conditions.

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

- 1) That the applicant revise the drawing to meet the required minimum of 8 feet of clearance between the sidewalk and the bottom of the sign; and
- 2) That any future signs are to be reviewed by the Architectural Review Board for approval.

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

**5. BSD SCN – Charles Penzone – The Grand Salon
17-119MPR/WR**

**6645 Village Parkway
Minor Project Review/Waiver Review**

Lori Burchett said this application is a proposal for site improvements for the 12,000-square-foot Charles Penzone Grand Salon on a 1.8-acre parcel zoned Bridge Street District Sawmill Center Neighborhood. She said the site is west of Village Parkway, northwest of the roundabout with Shamrock Crossing. She said

this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Minor Project Review and Waiver Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Ms. Burchett presented an aerial view of the site.

Ms. Burchett said the applicant is requesting to remove the previously approved acrylic awning on the northern and eastern elevations and replace it with an awning made of a corrugated metal material, which she presented. She stated this is the part of the application that is for the Minor Project Review, which the Administrative Review Team (ART) is permitted to elevate to the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) for their decision, if they want, because of the discussion that took place at the approval of the Site Plan Review. She recalled the PZC and the ART had appreciated the artistic element of the canopy and thought that it provided a unique detail to the structure.

The Waiver the applicant is requesting, Ms. Burchett said, is to permit just one entrance on the west elevation as opposed to the two entrances required for every 100 feet. She said the applicant would continue the stone material with the entrance eliminated. She explained the reason for this request is as the interior layout evolved, the owner identified this area as more suitable for a private function space than originally programmed and had concerns with access control in this location. She added the Waiver request would allow the owner to provide a more secure, single access point on the back of the building that is not street facing.

Waiver

1. §153.062(O)(4):1 entrance for every 100 feet is required; 1 entrance for ± 125 feet is requested.

Ms. Burchett said approval is recommended to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Minor Project Review and a Waiver Review with no conditions.

The ART asked about the Commission's discussion about the canopy. Ms. Burchett answered she recalled it as a minor discussion and that the presentation from the applicant promoted the canopy as a creative, artistic detail for that element. She said the ART was supportive of that canopy as well.

The ART asked the applicant the reason for the change in materials for the canopy. Christopher Meyers, Meyers and Associates, answered the intent of the canopy was to create light with shadows but as it is on the north side, and is the prom entrance, they decided they are not going to get enough light. He explained the overall scale of the canopy itself would require a panel that exceeds what the manufacturer can provide. He said they wanted a long expansive panel but all the supports that would be needed would defeat the purpose of the artistic element and in reality, this effect could not be achieved. He added that the pattern for the canopy mimics the pattern from the interior, which has since been removed and in reality of the aerial view, only the underneath would experience an occasional pattern.

Ms. Burchett asked if the size of the canopy changed. Mr. Meyers said the size did not change.

Donna Goss asked if the same number of supports would be used for the replacement material. Ms. Burchett answered the frame is the same. Vince Papsidero noted the canopy has already been installed.

Claudia Husak confirmed the sign presented on the elevation had not been approved and requested that it be removed from the graphics or replaced with an approved elevation graphic.

Ray Harpham inquired about the Waiver. He said it was an unusual requirement for a freestanding building. He asked if this condition is similar to other building types within areas such as Bridge Park.

Ms. Burchett explained this is a form-based Zoning Code so constructing a structure on a site development with constraints as a standalone building without development occurring around the building at the same time is unusual. She added this is not seen at Bridge Park but development in the area could progress over time.

Mr. Papsidero asked what Staff's perspective is to be presented to the PZC. Ms. Burchett answered that Staff is supportive. She cited other times when they have made this recommendation for the PZC to review and believe that the Commission would appreciate the opportunity to review the Minor Project. She added that it fits within the review criteria.

Ms. Husak clarified that there are two components to this application. The Minor Project Review, she said, can be determined by the ART as the final decision or the ART has the right to kick it up to the PZC for a final review. On the other hand, the Waiver must be reviewed by the PZC so the ART is just making a recommendation.

The ART agreed the Minor Project Review should be forwarded to the Commission for review. And for the Waiver, they recommended approval to the PZC.

Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He called for a vote, the motion carried, and the Minor Project Review and Waiver Review was recommended for approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission, which will be reviewed at their meeting on February 1, 2018.

INTRODUCTIONS

6. BSD SRN – Fado Irish Pub 18-001MPR

6642 Riverside Drive Minor Project Review

Lori Burchett said this application is a proposal for a 600-square-foot patio addition and associated site improvements for a restaurant space in Building C1 in the Bridge Park development. She said the site is zoned Bridge Street District Scioto River Neighborhood and is east of Riverside Drive, approximately 300 feet north of the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue. She said this is a request for a review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Ms. Burchett presented an aerial view of the site as well as the proposed site plan and pointed out the outside patio being proposed. She said the applicant is proposing to extend the material on the patio for its use.

Claudia Husak noted some façade modifications to the building skin.

Vince Papsidero noted the roof does not go over the patio and only part of the patio is covered and part of it is not. He asked why so much of the covered patio is open. James Peltier, EMH&T, said he would have to ask the applicant.

Aaron Stanford said there is still a lot of detail to review. He inquired about the applicant achieving the ADA requirements for this space as the width is the concern as well as the size of the patio, overall. Mr. Peltier said he was not sure but the patio appears to encroach the right-of-way by one foot. Mr. Papsidero asked if patio would be permitted to encroach the right-of-way. Mr. Stanford said it depends on the building type.

Mr. Peltier said it is considered a corridor building. Ms. Burchett said she would have to review the Code for allowable encroachments.

Mr. Papsidero asked how wide the patio is and Mr. Peltier responded nine feet from the back of the planters.

Ms. Husak said the wall and supports for the roof in the right-of-way is concerning. Ms. Burchett indicated six feet of clear space would be necessary.

Mr. Stanford indicated there were a lot of utilities on the upper part on at that location.

Mr. Peltier said the water services would not impact this site.

Ms. Husak asked if the building façade was painted and if any other building had paint on the elevations. Ms. Burchett said there were no other buildings with a painted façade. Mr. Peltier confirmed a painted façade is proposed and pointed out the burgundy colored area that is painted.

Ms. Husak asked what material with the fancy design was around the outside lighting fixtures. Mr. Peltier said he was not sure and Nichole Martin indicated it was paint used with a stencil pattern.

Mr. Papsidero asked if metal was being used on the patio enclosure. Mr. Peltier noted that he thought it was metal but could confirm. He asked if the applicant plans to pursue the use of vinyl as weather protection. Mr. Peltier said he would ask the applicant. Ms. Burchett said if they do want vinyl it will require a Waiver.

Colleen Gilger asked if this was a new logo for Fado to which Mr. Papsidero answered affirmatively. He added it goes with the new branding.

Ms. Husak stated the signs presented in graphics for the proposal still need to match the Master Sign Plan. She encouraged the applicant to not show what the ART cannot approve.

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

**7. BSD SRN – Local Cantina Awnings
18-002MPR**

**4537 Bridge Park Avenue
Minor Project Review**

Lori Burchett said this application is a proposal for the installation of window awnings for a restaurant space located in Building B3 in Bridge Park. She said the site is zoned Bridge Street District Scioto River Neighborhood. She said the site is southwest of the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue and Mooney Street. She said this is a request for a review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Ms. Burchett said the applicant had been approved for the patio and now would like to install window awnings, which she presented, starting with the framework. She said the applicant is requesting the awnings to be a solid orange color that matches their sign and no logo or other detail will be printed on the awnings. She indicated she would request a rendering from the applicant and better detail on the site plan. While no awnings exist right now, it is a permitted material. Vince Papsidero inquired about fully enclosed awnings in the Code. Claudia Husak said a flat style is permitted versus a curved style but that is all it addresses. Mr. Papsidero said awnings help soften a façade.

Ms. Burchett asked the ART if they were supportive of the burnt orange color for the awnings. The ART inquired about the color of the brick. Nichole Martin indicated the brick is a grayish black color. Ms. Burchett said she would get a sample of the brick color for the next review.

Ms. Burchett concluded a Minor Modification goes beyond what Staff is authorized to approve so that is why a Minor Project Review is being requested.

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. [There were none.] He adjourned the meeting at 2:50 pm.

As approved by the Administrative Review Team on February 1, 2018.