



MEETING MINUTES

Administrative Review Team

Thursday, November 1, 2018 | 2:00 pm

ART Members and Designees: Vince Papsidero, Planning Director (Chair); Donna Goss, Director of Development; Colleen Gilger, Director of Economic Development; Brad Fagrell, Director of Building Standards; Aaron Stanford, Senior Civil Engineer; Mike Altomare, Fire Marshal; and Shawn Krawetzki, Landscape Architect.

Other Staff: Claudia Husak, Senior Planner; Logan Stang, Planner II; Jennifer Rauch, Planning Manager; Nichole Martin, Planner I; Richard Hansen, Planning Assistant; Jimmy Hoppel, Planning Assistant; and Laurie Wright, Administrative Support II.

Applicants: Logan Dilts, DaNite Signs (Case 1)

Vince Papsidero called the meeting to order at 2:03 pm. He asked if there were any amendments to the October 11, 2018, meeting minutes. [There were none.] The minutes were approved as presented. He made note of the following Minor Modifications:

1. 16-Bit Arcade
2. Bridge Park, Block D
3. Bridge Park, Block A, Building A1
4. Bridge Park, Block H

DETERMINATION

**1. BSD SCN – Chateau Wine & Spirits - Sign
18-071MPR**

**6665 Sawmill Road
Minor Project Review**

Jimmy Hoppel said this application is a proposal for the installation of a 52-square-foot wall sign for an existing commercial tenant space. He said the 3.2-acre site is zoned Bridge Street District - Sawmill Center Neighborhood and is northwest of the intersection of Sawmill Road and Bridge Park Avenue. He said this is a request for a review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Mr. Hoppel presented the process for a Minor Project Review and stated the sign proposal is in front of the ART as the final reviewing body for a determination; the location of the site is not within the Historic District and therefore, does not warrant an additional review by the Architectural Review Board.

Mr. Hoppel presented an aerial view of the site. He presented a photograph of the existing conditions of this tenant space located next to Party City fronting Sawmill Road. He highlighted where the proposed sign would be installed over the main entrance of the 60-foot storefront, which allows for a sign to be 60 square feet in size.

Mr. Hoppel said it is important to note the history of this site. He reported that in 2017, Party City was approved to have a wall sign and a ground sign per the BSD zoning code. He noted since that approval, City Council has approved amendments to the BSD sign provisions to require pre-BSD buildings to revert back to the Standard Sign Code that was in place prior to the BSD zoning code.



Mr. Hoppel said Chateau Wine & Spirits is permitted either a wall sign or a ground sign under the Standard Sign Code, unless a Master Sign Plan (MSP) is requested that includes both sign types, which would need to be approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Mr. Hoppel presented a graphic of the proposed 52-square-foot sign, which is within the maximum of 60 square feet permitted by Code. He described the sign as flush-mounted, white-LED illuminated, channel letters, consisting of one color (a dark red vinyl face), all of which meet Code.

Mr. Hoppel presented a graphic of the proposed placement of the sign in context of this tenant space. He reported the maximum height of the sign is below 15 feet, which also meets Code. He summarized this application was reviewed against the Minor Project Review Criteria and approval was recommended with the following condition:

- 1) That the applicant shall not install any ground sign panels unless a Master Sign Plan is approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Colleen Gilger remarked there is currently a blank panel on the Party City ground sign that the applicant is not allowed to use because there was never a Master Sign Plan approved for the entire plaza with all tenants inclusive.

Aaron Stanford clarified this application meets the Standard Sign Code. He asked then why this application could not have just been forwarded for a Building Permit. Logan Stang explained that even though this application fully met the Standard Sign Code, it still needed approval by the ART because it falls within the Bridge Street District.

Ms. Gilger said if there were a Master Sign Plan application for this location, she would fully support it. Mr. Stang explained the landlord previously submitted an application for a Master Sign Plan for the plaza but it never moved forward in the process so one tenant, Party City submitted a Minor Project Review for a sign as they were opening and did not want to wait on the landlord. Ms. Gilger asked if individual tenants may apply for a MSP to which Mr. Stang answered in the affirmative and stated Staff prefers a MSP cover the whole building so the process is less complicated as tenants move in/out.

Logan Dilts, DaNite Signs, said the applicant asked the landlords about the MSP but they answered they thought they had completed that process.

Brad Fagrell asked if the existing MSP application could be used as a foundation for a new one to move this along more quickly for the applicant. Mr. Stang affirmed that the landlords were permitted to continue from the open application but the applicant/tenant could not reopen that MSP.

Vince Papsidero said the ART would accommodate a Master Sign Plan that would then need to be forwarded to the PZC for their final determination.

Mr. Dilts asked how long that process would take. Mr. Stang noted that since there is just one PZC meeting scheduled in December, the process could take a few months. Mr. Papsidero encouraged the applicant to speak to the owner/landlord about a MSP.

Mr. Papsidero asked the applicant if they agreed with the one condition. Mr. Dilts revealed there is to be a state mandated image to be added to their wall sign, which is still being designed. Mr. Stang asked the applicant to contact Staff when that had been determined as well as the scale, dimension, and color for that additional image.

Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any other questions or concerns regarding this proposal. [Hearing none.] He again asked the applicant if he agreed to the one condition and he answered affirmatively. He called for a motion to approve the Minor Project Review with one condition. Mr. Krawetzki made the motion, Ms. Gilger seconded, and the Minor Project Review passed unanimously.

CASE REVIEWS

2. ID-2 – Noah’s Event Venue 17-108WID-SP

**PID: 274-001353
Site Plan Review**

Logan Stang said this application is a proposal for the construction of an approximately 8,000-square-foot conference center and associated site improvements on a 4.15-acre parcel, zoned ID-2, Research Flex District. He said the site is at the northeast corner of the intersection of Shier Rings Road and Eiterman Road. He said this is a request for a review and approval of a Site Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.042(E)(7).

Mr. Stang reported this proposal was filed at the end of 2017; it was last reviewed in January 2018. He explained the applicant has returned with a new proposal showing major changes to the architecture and site layout.

Mr. Stang presented an aerial view of the site and the site plan comparison from January 2018 to what is now being proposed in November 2018. He pointed out that the old plan consisted of a contemporary, one-story building placed at the far rear of the site with the stormwater ponds placed along the frontage. He recalled there were two access points to the site, which engineering identified concerns, the parking was in the center, and the architecture was not consistent with the intent of the West Innovation District. He pointed out the new plan has a single point of entry off Eiterman Road with the contemporary, second-story building oriented at a 45-degree angle with a plaza out front that connects to the entrance to the public sidewalk. He noted the stormwater pond had been pushed to the back of the property with parking in the center.

Mr. Stang presented the front elevation comparison from January 2018 to November 2018. He pointed out the previous elevation was clad mostly with EIFS, stone accents, and brick with enlarged glass windows wrapping the building with the entry in the middle of the front facade. He said the current plan has mostly precast concrete panels, aluminum siding made to resemble a cherry wood pattern, black aluminum siding, and two entrances on the front and rear facades. He said the entrances open into a main lobby area for the building with one half of the building being the main event space that is open to the second story. He said the second floor contains a large ceremony/conference area, which is capable of being divided. He presented building renderings from January from the north and south perspectives for comparison to the current proposed renderings.

Mr. Stang presented the proposed floor plans and said there are portions of the second floor façade that open inward on three sides to provide an indoor/outdoor element. Brad Fagrell asked if there were balconies there to walk out onto or if there were just railings across the openings. Mr. Stang confirmed there were guardrails extending the opening.

Mr. Stang presented the roof line that varies in height, which has a black metal coping cap on parts of the parapet. He noted the black siding accents and the corrugated black metal used to screen the mechanicals on the roof. He said the canopies shown on the exterior contain a mesh metal interior to provide a unique design element.

Donna Goss inquired about the location of the primary entrances. Mr. Stang clarified the entrances were located on both sides of the building with access to the central lobby.

Ms. Gilger asked if the “hidden door” as shown in the center of the front façade with no outside hardware was an emergency exit to which Mr. Stang answered affirmatively.

Ms. Gilger inquired about outdoor spaces since that was highly desirable by the applicant in the past. Mr. Stang affirmed there were just the areas surrounding the building; no designated outdoor area was being proposed.

Aaron Stanford asked if the precast concrete was a permitted material to which Mr. Stang answered it is both a permitted primary and secondary material in the West Innovation District.

Mr. Stanford asked if there was enough room between the stormwater basin/pond and the Stream Corridor Protection Zone. Mr. Stang said he would ensure that was the case but stated the applicant had shown adherence to that previously.

Mr. Stanford verified the applicant had agreed to the one access point on Eiterman Drive. He said improvements will need to be made to the culvert north of this site and the applicant will be responsible for that to be completed. Mr. Stang said the applicant was aware and is working with the EPA. He said the applicant has also provided a traffic study as well as roadway improvement plans that are currently being reviewed by our transportation department.

Mr. Papsidero confirmed this Site Plan application will be recommended to the Planning and Zoning Commission for their review and asked if there were any other questions or concerns regarding this proposal. [Hearing none.]

**3. BSD HR – Vessels’ Residence
18-073ARB/MPR**

**63 S. Riverview Street
Minor Project Review**

Richard Hansen said this application is a proposal for the demolition of an existing 960-square-foot detached concrete block garage and an approximately 1,020-square-foot, two-story addition with a first floor mudroom, and attached three-car garage with finished attic space. He said the 0.25-acre site is zoned Bridge Street District Historic Residential and is west of S. Riverview Street, northwest 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 Code Sections 153.066 and 153.170, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Mr. Hansen presented the Minor Project Review (MPR) process and reported the ART had recommended approval to the Architectural Review Board (ARB) on September 20, 2018, for a MPR for this property that consisted of a second-story addition and exterior modifications to an existing home but the applicant was not prepared to move forward then with the demolition of the garage. He reported that MPR application was approved by the ARB on September 26, 2018. He said the applicant has now returned to request a MPR to deal with the demolition and replacement of the garage of which the ART will make a recommendation to the ARB at the meeting on November 15, 2018; the application would then be reviewed by the ARB at their meeting on November 28, 2018.

Mr. Hansen presented an aerial view of the site for context and said the site itself was not deemed contributing to the Historic District whereas the original home had been deemed contributing as it was built in the 1820's. He presented the existing conditions as viewed from South Riverview Street. He presented

photographs of the existing conditions of the original home's east elevation on South Riverview Street and the west elevation of the garage on Blacksmith Lane requested to be demolished.

Mr. Hansen presented the existing east and west elevations versus the proposed elevations and the existing south elevation versus the proposed south elevation. He said the proposal is substantially similar to what was approved in September 2018. Brad Fagrell said that the proposed roof pitch for the garage seemed steep and should be reduced.

Mr. Hansen noted the previous review in September was prepared against a single-family building type so that needs to be altered with the addition of the attached garage. He said the setbacks and the lot coverage requirements still need to be met.

Aaron Stanford inquired about the driveway dimensions. Mr. Hansen said the widest part closest to the garage door openings was 30 feet but the applicant will need to provide the dimensions of the driveway width where it meets the street.

Shawn Krawetzki asked if cultured stone was being used to which Mr. Hansen answered affirmatively.

Colleen Gilger asked if any of the ART members had an issue with the demolition of the garage. Jennifer Rauch said the demolition will be a separate application to be brought to the Architectural Review Board as they would be the final reviewing body. She reiterated that the garage was not contributing so she did not anticipate a disapproval from the ARB.

Claudia Husak stated there was a lot of different materials proposed, which could make the elevations appear busy. Ms. Hansen said that was an issue during the last review as different wood was used on various parts of the house and its additions. Mr. Stanford asked if the applicant could provide a color rendition of the existing materials with the additions and changes proposed to provide more clarity and ease for the ART to make a recommendation.

Ms. Rauch recalled the ARB had an issue with the roof and did not like the stone during their last review but the application for the additions to the house were still approved. She indicated that because there were significant compromises on both sides at the previous review, she is concerned about the new changes being requested.

Ms. Rauch reported the Historic consultant is reviewing this application and she intends on obtaining that feedback for the next meeting on November 15, 2018.

Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any other questions or concerns regarding this proposal. [Hearing 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 2:43 pm.

As approved by the Administrative Review Team on November 15, 2018.