



MEETING MINUTES

Administrative Review Team

Thursday, November 15, 2018 | 2:00 pm

ART Members and Designees: Vince Papsidero, Planning Director (Chair); Brad Fagrell, Director of Building Standards; Aaron Stanford, Senior Civil Engineer; Mike Altomare, Fire Marshal; Tim Hosterman, Police Sergeant; and Shawn Krawetzki, Landscape Architect.

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

Applicants: Kevin McCauley, Stavroff Land and Development, Inc. (Case 1); Heidi Bolyard, Simplified Architecture (Case 2); Chris Winkle, Noah's Event Venue (Case 3).

Vince Papsidero called the meeting to order at 2:02 pm. He asked if there were any amendments to the November 1, 2018, meeting minutes. [There were none.] The minutes were approved as presented. He made note of the following Minor Modification:

1. Bridge Park, Building D1

RECOMMENDATIONS

**1. BSD SCN – 6655 & 6665 Sawmill Road
16-042MSP**

Master Sign Plan

Nichole Martin said this application is a proposal for the establishment of sign standards for individual tenants within an existing multi-tenant commercial building. She indicated the primary impetus for the request is to address existing conditions. She said the site is west of Sawmill Road, at the northwest corner of the intersection with Bridge Park Avenue with a shared access on Sawmill Road and a full, dedicated access on Bridge Park Avenue. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Master Sign Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066 and the *Bridge Street District Sign Guidelines*.

Ms. Martin noted this application dates back to 2016 when the ART reviewed a preliminary proposal for a Master Sign Plan (MSP) but the applicant had decided at that time to turn their efforts towards a different tenant nearby. She presented the MSP review process, which allows flexibility to any sign regulation based on a cohesive and creative sign design for a single building or group of buildings to warrant deviation from the Code. She said Party City is located in the southern tenant space and Chateau Wine and Spirits is now in the northern tenant space and presented an aerial view of the site. As this MSP was not yet in place, she explained Chateau Wine and Spirits moved forward with a Minor Project Review application, which was approved by the ART on November 1, 2018, for a 52-square foot wall sign consisting of individually mounted channel letters in a single color of red since they were ready to open.

Ms. Martin said the shopping center has two existing ground signs for Party City as it was the only tenant, one located along Sawmill Road and one located on Bridge Park Avenue and a 50-square-foot wall sign of individually mounted channel letters in red for Party City as demonstrated in photographs of existing conditions. She noted since there are empty panels on the ground signs for additional tenants, Chateau Wine and Spirits could be added if there was a MSP in place. She stated the applicable sign standards do



not permit a combination of sign types, therefore, a MSP is required to address the existing conditions. She said the applicant has provided written standards that are in line with the allowances and limitations of the Code for the wall signs, and has provided a regulatory graphic for the ground sign design. She concluded any modifications to the ground signs, excluding changing of sign faces with tenant turnover, would require an amendment to the sign plan provisions.

Ms. Martin summarized the request before the ART was for a recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a MSP to permit a combination of sign types (ground and wall signs) for an existing auto-oriented shopping center within the Bridge Street District.

Ms. Martin said the application was reviewed against the BSD Sign Guidelines and the Master Sign Plan Criteria of which it met all requirements. Therefore, she said, approval was recommended to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the Master Sign Plan with no conditions added.

Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any other questions or concerns regarding this proposal. [Hearing none.] He called for vote to recommend approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the Master Sign Plan with no conditions added, which passed unanimously.

Ms. Martin said the application will be forwarded to the PZC for their review on December 6, 2018.

**2. BSD HR – Vessels' Residence
18-073ARB/MPR**

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

Nichole Martin said this application is a proposal for an approximately 1,020-square-foot, two-story addition with a first floor mudroom, and attached three-car garage with finished attic space. She 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. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board for a Waiver and a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.066 and 153.170, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Ms. Martin explained that even though a demolition is requested, the ART has no purview over demolitions but will make a recommendation to the ARB for the Waiver and the Minor Project Review (MPR).

Ms. Martin noted the Waiver review process, which allows flexibility to zoning regulations for properties located in the Bridge Street District. She said the applicant is requesting the same Waiver as with the original MPR from September 20, 2018, for encroachment into the side yard setback.

Ms. Martin presented an aerial view of the site for context and photographs of existing conditions. She pointed out the historic portion of the home that was built in the 1820's of which is contributing per the Historic and Cultural Assessment and National Register of Historic Places (Washington Township MRA). She said, per the Ohio Historical Inventory, it was originally built as a 1½ story structure that was used as a post office until 1831 until it was used as a residence by the Eberly family until 1991. She said the single story and second story additions were added in 1976 when the historic home shingle siding was replaced with wood siding and a standing-seam metal roof, while subsequent additions have asphalt shingles. She stated a concrete block garage was constructed in the 1950s at the rear of the property combined with a brick driveway to be removed while a historic stonewall exists on the southern property line that will remain.

Ms. Martin stated the application meets all required setbacks with the approval of a proposed Waiver for the home to encroach into the three-foot required side yard setback by one foot.

Ms. Martin said the development standards are supplemented by the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*, which provides additional direction on preservation, sensitive design, and complementary materials. She said setbacks, lot coverage, and maximum building height are regulated by each residential street within Historic Dublin to preserve the existing unique character.

Ms. Martin noted the Administrative Review Team (ART) and Architectural Review Board (ARB) reviewed a portion of proposal (Case 18-059ARB-MPR) in September 2018, namely for the 675-square foot second story addition and exterior modifications including roofing, siding, windows, trim replacement and shutter installation. The attached mudroom and three-car garage, she said, are new with this application and the roofline was determined to be very tall. She indicated the applicant wants to obtain approval for the improvements holistically at this time. She reported the ART and ARB expressed concern with the proposed application, specifically wariness of a false sense of history, fragmentation of the additions, overall height and mass of the additions, the complexity of the roof lines, and appropriateness of the material selections and finishes. She said the City's third party preservation consultant reviewed the applications in September and November of 2018 and the applicant has since made revisions as a result of all of the reviews.

Ms. Martin presented the proposed site plan and side-by-side comparisons of the previous elevations to the updated elevations and the building footprint. She said the applicant is proposing an AC unit on the north side of the building of which Staff and the ART conditioned that the unit meet the three-foot side yard setback and be screened from the adjacent property and right-of-way. She said a stone veneer is being proposed for the middle section of the home while a white vertical board and batten siding is used in the portion with the addition and the roof will be changed from an asphalt shingle to a black metal roof. She noted the mass, scale, and height complexities have been addressed. She said there is now a stone water table proposed on the garage and an inoperable shutter was proposed on the north elevation.

Ms. Martin presented the proposed colored renderings and noted the following proposed materials: White Hardi Plank Vertical Board and Batten Siding, limestone veneer, black standing seam roof, windows to be painted white with white trim, and operable two-panel shutters with louvers.

Ms. Martin concluded the Waiver meets all of the review criteria and the Minor Project Review meets the criteria with the addition of two conditions:

- 1) That the applicant ensures the existing historic stone wall is protected during construction; and
- 2) That the applicant reduces the attached garage addition to one story with a design that is free of dormers, subject to Staff approval prior to Building Permit submittal.

Aaron Stanford inquired about the driveway. Ms. Martin responded that the driveway meets the Code requirements and the applicant has updated the plans to reflect that compliance.

Vince Papsidero said the garage design appears to be moving in the right direction as compared to the November 1st submittal. He suggested the garage or the center addition be simplified per the ARB's recommendations and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Ms. Martin indicated that the best practices noted in the *Guidelines* state additions should be subordinate and this proposal is not. She asked if the garage could be a single story garage as there is no height step down to the alley.

Heidi Bolyard, Simplified Architecture, said the addition is being requested so the applicant may have a master suite, which requires reducing one of the small bedrooms into a hallway for the master. She said

there will also be a walk-in closet and bathroom. She explained this is already a narrow addition to get it under the roof structure.

Mr. Papsidero inquired about the width of the second-story addition. Ms. Bolyard answered 19.9 feet.

Ms. Bolyard indicated this is not a large house in the first place and there is no basement. She said the applicant has a growing family and additional family members may eventually come to live with them. She said the applicant needs an apartment-type space to accommodate a brother and there needs to be space for the children. She said she reduced the complexity as she removed the gable and added two shed dormers.

Mr. Papsidero indicated the ARB will resolve the architectural issues but he encouraged the applicant to work with Staff and the homeowner to reduce complexity even more. Ms. Bolyard reported the height of the previous two-story was approved with a low pitch and to connect anything with that is a huge challenge, while trying to keep yard space at the same time. She said she did not want to add to the footprint of the original structure as part of the yard would be lost, which they want for the children.

Mr. Stanford confirmed the applicant is not changing the siding on the original historic home. Ms. Bolyard answered in the affirmative.

Mr. Papsidero pointed out the siding selections appear busy on the elevations.

Ms. Bolyard said the size of the existing block garage is 956 square feet and the applicant has proposed an 867-square-foot garage that includes a mud room, which is a smaller footprint.

Brad Fagrell asked how deep the existing garage was. Ms. Bolyard answered large enough for two cars deep as it is a four-car garage.

Ms. Martin inquired about the height of existing garage as it appears to have a low-pitched roof, not a story and a half. Ms. Bolyard answered the height of the structure was approximately 15 feet tall.

Mr. Papsidero said he was not hearing any issues with the Waiver but the two conditions as written for the Minor Project Review do not seem to address all the issues. He indicated the ARB may want to simplify the architecture as it is very complex for the Historic District. He said whether the applicant resolves this with Staff and the homeowner prior or waits for the ARB's comments, the complexity will have to be resolved.

Ms. Bolyard referred to another new home that was built on the same street after the original home was removed. She said that house has more roofs and dormers than this house plus they have a flat roof included. She said it was a massive structure that was complicated because it also used many different materials, etc. She emphasized her client was just adding a mudroom and a garage and it is challenging to simplify it. She said she designed this project with others on the street in mind as they had already been approved by the ARB.

Mr. Papsidero explained this addition has to be compared to the existing structures and the house she is referring to is a new build and that is held to different standards.

Jennifer Rauch said the ARB will want to preserve the historic nature of this project. She understands Ms. Bolyard wanting to compare her design to that other house but in the end, the ARB reviews each project on its own merit. She said this is challenging because this family lives in an old house and they want to renovate

it for their growing family. She said the two-story structure added has caused problems along with the shed dormer on the west side.

Ms. Bolyard indicated that resale of this home will be difficult if it has a small master suite. Claudia Husak emphasized this home is in the Historic District and one of the oldest homes in Dublin so the design needs to be sensitive to the character of the community.

Ms. Bolyard said they are keeping the existing structure so it will stand on its own as a historic home.

Mr. Papsidero said there is enough lot space to detach the garage at the alley and asked if they would consider this alternative option. Ms. Bolyard answered they did not want a detached garage.

Mr. Papsidero asked what the programming is for the free-standing structure. Ms. Bolyard answered a kitchenette, studio space, and wet bar area. She said they moved the garage forward to get a window on a wall.

Ms. Martin asked the ART if they were satisfied with the revised second condition and the answer was yes.

Ms. Martin said approval is recommended to the Architectural Review Board for the Waiver as follows:

1. §153.063(A) – Minimum Yard Requirements for BSD Historic Residential District
Request: Encroach one foot into a required three-foot side yard setback.

Ms. Martin said approval is recommended to the Architectural Review Board for a Minor Project Review with two conditions:

- 1) That the applicant ensures the existing historic stone wall is protected during construction; and
- 2) That the applicant work with the Architectural Review Board to reduce the complexity of the design, including the roof lines.

Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any other questions or concerns regarding this proposal. [Hearing none.] He called for vote to recommend approval to the Architectural Review Board for the Waiver, which passed unanimously. He called for vote to recommend approval to the Architectural Review Board for the Minor Project Review with two conditions, which passed unanimously. He said the application will be forwarded to the ARB for their meeting on November 28, 2018.

CASE REVIEW

3. 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 said this would be a brief presentation as the technical review is still in process and when that is complete, a comment letter will be sent to the applicant. He presented an aerial view of the site in the West Innovation District. He presented a site plan comparison from January 2018 to November 2018 and noted the revisions made to the site plan were received positively. He said the applicant has moved the building

from the rear of the site to the front, southwest corner. He said today's meeting was to gather information from the Administrative Review Team (ART) for the benefit of the applicant.

Mr. Stang said the architecture proposed has been the main topic of discussion for Staff. He said he would turn over the conversation to the applicant to provide more information on the design intent, material selections, and maintenance for the materials.

Chris Winkle, Noah's Event Venue, said they have designed a two-story building rather than the originally proposed one-story structure, which they plan to make their new prototype. He reported that since January, they have met several times with Staff. He said the design was based off a vision their CEO saw in town that will fit into mixed-use districts. He said they like this floor plan. He said they have been in business since 2008 and they want to create a version that could easily be converted to a two-story office building should their use ever cease operating in the new building. He said they could even extend the second floor to the other side, if needed, as the building only has a second floor on one-half. He indicated that the warehouse look is the trend right now so they are proposing to use prefabricated tilt up panels, steel back panels, and wire mesh. He said the materials used inside will have an outside look and the internal walls will be moveable so the spaces can be adapted to clients' needs. He explained the building entry feature extends to the ground, which is a wire mesh and they plan to have ivy or similar feature that encompasses the main entrance door. He said this feature would be used on the other door, too. He said long-board siding is made to look like wood, which will be placed in sections on the building and the rest will be concrete. He indicated these materials were used in Toledo, Ohio on an adjacent building to theirs currently under construction.

Vince Papsidero asked if the windows were inset or flush to the façade as it appears flat. Mr. Winkle answered he did not have that information but could verify that for Staff. Mr. Papsidero indicated that inset windows create visual interest on facades.

Mr. Papsidero asked to see material samples. Mr. Winkle presented the concrete sample with its smooth finish and sealant. Mr. Winkle said the concrete was used on the Brew Dog Hotel in Canal Winchester, OHIO, if anyone wanted to see what it looked like installed.

Mr. Papsidero asked if ivy would even grow as high as the applicant is anticipating for the door features. Mr. Winkle was not sure what exact plant material they planned on using. Shawn Krawetzki said the applicant would have a limited palette to use there given the location and height.

Mr. Krawetzki asked about the finish on the "wood" aluminum, if there was a warranty on the finished stain, and if the dip application wears off or fades. Mr. Winkle said they used to use cedar but the aluminum is new for them and he did not have any information yet. Mr. Papsidero encouraged the applicant to have all the information in time for the review by the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Mr. Papsidero asked the ART how they felt about the concrete. Mr. Krawetzki said he did not like it but if it was an approved material then he could support its use. Mr. Winkle said it meets the design intent of the Code.

Brad Fagrell said he did not mind the concrete panels.

Aaron Stanford said the concrete feels cold especially for this use but he liked the two-story building. He said there are buildings in the area that are somewhat similar but emphasized this appears cold for wedding celebrations or wedding/baby showers. He said he liked the window detail. He said he has seen aluminum colored to look like red brick that was in a herringbone pattern, which appeared much warmer.

Mr. Stanford asked about a vertical striation in the concrete panels. Mr. Winkle said the building in Toledo has varied difference but the concrete panels are the same size.

Mr. Stang asked for clarification on the varying roof lines as the renderings do not show a changing parapet. Mr. Winkle said the elevations submitted were for a different model and that this was not proposed to have a varying parapet. He said when looking at the model being constructed in Toledo, Ohio, he was not a fan of the varying roofline. Mr. Stang encouraged the applicant to have design elements that break apart the façade so that it appears less like a box structure.

Mr. Papsidero asked if a brick base would help warm up the facades. He explained he is trying to anticipate what the Commission might want so he can get the applicant moving towards an approval. He emphasized the building needs to be warmed up.

Mr. Stanford encouraged the applicant to push the envelope, architecturally.

Mr. Winkle noted if they were to use the gray stone on the gray concrete then the whole building would appear the same. He said his clientele is of a younger generation and believes they would be comfortable with this architecture. He said there is a clear difference between the (former) Montgomery Inn that is very traditional and of all brick vs the new Marriott AC Hotel, which is very contemporary. Mr. Papsidero said a contemporary design makes sense but the building can be warmed up via accents. Mr. Papsidero cited the (future) Library for an example and noted how the dark gray stone warmed it up.

Mr. Winkle said they want to have a cleaner, industrial look, much different than their location in New Albany that was traditional in all brick. Ms. Husak said the New Albany roof lines were nice because they were broken up.

Mr. Krawetzki inquired about the tree selection because he sees conflicts with limited room available; tree canopies can be a conflict with a building. He recommended the applicant be careful with the tree selection or they will be trimming all the time. Mr. Winkle said the sidewalks are 12 feet wide and contain 4x4 tree wells.

Mr. Stang said the next step will be the comment letter and the applicant can expect to see items that were identified today such as landscaping, architecture, and zoning clarifications for roof/parapet. He said the applicant will have time to revise and resubmit a plan and the ART will review the plan again before making a recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Mr. Stang added signs will be a part of this review and are not a separate application in the WID so he recommended the applicant include more details on the proposed sign.

Mr. Winkle asked if they can be flexible on the height of the projecting sign because currently it is being shown at 15 feet above grade up to 22 feet in height. Claudia Husak indicated the applicant may need to lower the sign. Mr. Stang said the height of signs in the WID can be approved to exceed 15 feet above grade but that depends on the integration with the architecture.

Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any other questions or concerns regarding this proposal. [Hearing none.]

INTRODUCTION

4. BSD HR – Schmitt Residence 18-074ARB-MPR

109 S. Riverview Street Minor Project Review

Jennifer Rauch said this application is a proposal for a 720-square-foot building addition, covered porch, and associated site improvements for a 0.74-acre parcel zoned Bridge Street District Historic Residential. She said the site is southwest of the intersection of S. Riverview Street and Pinneyhill 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*.

Ms. Rauch presented an aerial view of the site and the proposed site plan. She reported the latest approval for this site was for a new door, roof, and windows for the existing historic structure. She said a series of additions were approved years ago. She said the size of the existing structure is significant and is located on two lots but the size is equal to three lots in the Historic District.

Ms. Rauch said this proposal is for another addition, which would be located to the rear of the historic structure and includes exterior modifications. She said this is a 1.5-story addition in line with the previous larger addition but with different colored siding. She explained they are adding siding to the previous addition to make all elevations white. She said the standing seam metal roof appears black in the images but it is not; it is actually a grayish color - "Weathered Zinc". She indicated traditionally, the additions would be white with white trim but they are adding this grayish coloring - Sherwin Williams "Iron Ore" for the windows, shutters, and the garage doors.

Ms. Rauch presented the proposed east elevation and Aaron Stanford noted the chimney on the addition appeared large compared to the two chimneys on the original, historic structure. He requested the chimney on the addition be resized to be more in scale with the others.

Ms. Rauch presented elevations of the addition from the south and north and asked the ART for comments on the material choices and colors.

Logan Stang said for the east elevation on South Riverview Street, the addition extending outwards is large when compared to the size of the historic home. Brad Fagrell agreed stating it would be very visible. Vince Papsidero pointed out the addition is still subservient to the original structure, which is required per the Guidelines.

Ms. Rauch presented the architectural details for the overall structure on the site for cohesiveness.

Ms. Rauch said a landscape plan is not necessary but one could be included to help screen the massing of the addition.

Shawn Krawetzki inquired about the rooflines and whether or not the proposed addition should have a lower pitch to not extend above the existing roofline. Ms. Rauch stated the historic consultant is currently reviewing this application and will share feedback.

Claudia Husak asked about the internal layout of the floor plan and if this plan could be altered. Mr. Papsidero said the ARB could discuss options with the applicant.

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 3:11 pm.

As approved by the Administrative Review Team on December 6, 2018.