



# MEETING MINUTES

## Administrative Review Team

Thursday, December 20, 2018 | 2:00 pm

**ART Members and Designees:** Vince Papsidero, Planning Director (Chair); Colleen Gilger, Director of Economic Development; Brad Fagrell, Director of Building Standards; Aaron Stanford, Senior Civil Engineer; and Chad Hamilton, Washington Township Fire Department Inspector.

**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; Hunter Rayfield, Planning Assistant; and Laurie Wright, Administrative Support II.

**Applicants:** Don Brogan, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, Chris Meyers and Brian McNally, Meyers & Associates Architecture, John Woods, MKSK, and James Peltier, EMH&T (Case 2); Jody Wunderlich, Windsor Homes LLC (Case 3).

Vince Papsidero called the meeting to order at 2:05 pm.

### DETERMINATION

**1. BSD C – Hollywood Feed – Sign  
18-081MPR**

**6329 Sawmill Road  
Minor Project Review**

Hunter Rayfield said this application is a proposal for the installation of a wall sign for an existing commercial tenant space located within the Trader Joe's Shopping Center. He said the site is west of Sawmill Road, approximately 500 feet southwest of the intersection with West Dublin-Granville Road. 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. Rayfield said this application was reviewed on December 6, 2018, and is ready for a determination today.

Mr. Rayfield presented an aerial view of the site that highlighted the tenant space in the southernmost retail building in the shopping center with parking in the front on an 8.74-acre site. He said this application is for a pet store and the existing store frontage width is 40 feet, allowing for a buildable sign area of 40 square feet. He stated the proposed sign would be installed in an existing sign band and the background will be painted beige to match the existing background. He said the proposed sign is approximately 26 square feet in size, and is comprised of dark red and yellow copy, which will be internally illuminated. He presented a graphic of the sign as well as a photograph of the existing conditions, and renderings showing how the sign would appear during the day and an example of how it could appear at night, illuminated.

Mr. Rayfield said the application was reviewed against the *BSD Sign Design Guidelines* and the Minor Project Review criteria, which the proposal met. Therefore, he said, approval is recommended for the Minor Project Review without conditions.

The Chair, Vince Papsidero, asked if there were any questions or concerns. [Hearing none.] He called for a motion and vote.

Colleen Gilger moved, Brad Fagrell seconded, and the vote was unanimous for approval of this Minor Project Review.



## **CASE REVIEW**

### **2. BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Building F1 18-080DPR/SPR**

**PID: 273-008867  
Development Plan Review/Site Plan Review**

Claudia Husak said this application is a proposal for a six-story, 92,400-square-foot hotel, a commercial building, and associated site improvements southeast of the intersection of Bridge Park Avenue and Dale Drive. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Development Plan Review and Site Plan Review with a Parking Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Ms. Husak said she received revised materials the day before this meeting but has not had the opportunity to fully review them. Brian McNally, Meyers and Associates, passed out paper copies for everyone to review.

Ms. Husak said this was a Case Review today and the application is intended to be reviewed by the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) on January 17, 2019, after the ART has made a determination on January 3, 2019.

Ms. Husak reported Staff reviewed this application December 13, 2019, and indicated that the City's consultants reviewed the application as well from a Code adherence standpoint. She said the consultant found measurement issues as the applicant's measurements varied from how Staff measures. She said the numbers should all match for the future reviews and with the numbers aligned, Waivers or Administrative Departures can be identified. She said she would provide the applicant with a summary of the issues as soon as possible.

Ms. Husak said the renderings submitted appeared to show up-lighting on the buildings and that is not permitted in the BSD. She specifically noted the wall sconces on pages 16 and 20 of the materials distributed. She said sconces can only distribute light downwards. Mr. McNally said they were going for a dramatic effect to accent the architecture.

Ms. Husak questioned the alternative material proposed. She said she requires additional information on the product. She said it is being used as a primary material on the south facades as shown on pages 18 and 19 at 80% and this material is not permitted as primary or secondary. She asked to see a material sample board. Chris Meyers, Meyers and Associates, said they were working on a full mach-up with the materials painted but in the meantime, he brought out individual samples.

Brad Fagrell asked if the material would be painted after it was installed or if it would come prefinished from the manufacturer. Mr. Meyers answered the material would be painted after, all one color for the panels as well as the reveal system. Mr. Fagrell was concerned about painting such a smooth surface. Mr. Meyers said there is a certain paint they have to use.

Mr. Meyers said due to the rigidity of the material, it appears like metal panels and lighter. He noted the material has a high recycle content in terms of sustainability. Mr. McNally asked the ART if they were supportive of the elevations or if they had any concerns.

Ms. Husak encouraged the applicant to show the buildings as they would interact with the surrounding buildings via third-dimensional renderings. Mr. Meyers said the company that created all the animations for the video of Bridge Park for the City's website is in the process of making a video of these buildings. He explained they are taking a model using white box forms for the relationships as there are not actual buildings to show for the rest of the blocks. Mr. McNally referred to page 17 that included images of the Scioto River.

Ms. Husak said she wants to ensure the applicant has checked everything prior to the review from the PZC as they will ask very detailed questions.

Ms. Husak asked if the street name could be changed to something else. Aaron Stanford agreed the name should be different.

Mr. Stanford said this is a private access drive in a separate reserve and he wanted to see the mid-block crossing and where it was located. He indicated the canopy proposed extends into the reserve and may impact the easements.

Mr. Stanford asked about site lighting along the private drive. James Peltier, EMH&T, presented the site plan provided with an earlier submission and also referred to pages 8 and 9. He said they are proposing three standard light poles, identical to those used on Mooney Street, to achieve all the photometric requirements. He said lights will have to also be installed on Dale Drive.

Mr. Stanford said again he was interested in the pedestrian crossings. Mr. Peltier explained the mid-block crossing would impact loading/unloading and deliveries so it was moved further east. He said they also wanted to be able to accommodate a bus in the loading area without blocking traffic.

Chad Hamilton asked how wide the access road was. Mr. Peliter answered it is 18 feet wide at the largest point and shrinks to 14 feet wide to be more pedestrian friendly.

Mr. Hamilton asked where the fire department connection (FDC) would be located. Mr. McNally answered on the south elevation and added there is an existing fire hydrant by the restaurant.

Ms. Husak asked if anyone from the Fire Department or Engineering requested an Autoturn for the private drive. Mr. Peltier answered they will provide that with the resubmittal.

Ms. Husak said transparency and glass continuously comes up during Building Permitting. She asked what type of glass was being proposed. Mr. McNally said he would provide a cut sheet.

Mr. Peltier referred to page 3 and reported Crawford Hoying Development Partners are still conducting a parking study for the parking garage on B Block. He said the intent is for hotel guests to be able to use the B Block garage to park and then proceed over to building F1. He said there is an internal elevator proposed for the planter side of the building but the planter will need to be modified. He said he would provide Ms. Husak with a report.

Colleen Gilger said Crawford Hoying Development Partners have been stating how much of the garages remain empty and how this area is over parked but when a group from the City went down there for an event, public parking was scarce because all the spaces were marked reserved. She asked if those were spaces reserved for residents and if the apartments were not yet full. She stated that some of the signs for those reserved spaces could be removed for now and opened up to the public.

Ms. Husak said she was uncomfortable with the sidewalks on Bridge Park Avenue as they only appear to have 10 feet of sidewalk clearance. Mr. Peltier referred to page 4 of the earlier submission, which reflected the patio walls are closer than 12 feet. He said the walls are on the right-of-way line and do not encroach into the right-of-way.

Ms. Husak inquired about the materials to be used for the dumpster enclosure. Mr. Woods said they did not want to spend a lot of money on something that would be temporary. Ms. Husak said even a temporary

enclosure needs to be attractive. Mr. Woods said the enclosure may be a treated wood fence. Ms. Husak said Staff needs to know what it is proposed and when the permanent structure will be built. She said a condition can be added to speak to the timing of the permanent structure. Mr. Woods said they could also use plant material for temporary screening.

Ms. Husak said foundation plantings have not been provided and they are required. Mr. Woods asked if she was referring to the north side. Ms. Husak said Bridge Park Avenue has not had any but maybe the applicant could get there with the streetscape elements. Mr. Woods indicated they intend for the tenant space to the west will put their statement on it.

Mr. McNally explained why they are requesting a Waiver for floor to floor height.

Ms. Husak noted the signs will be addressed later.

Ms. Husak indicated the Commission was pleased with the open space that was accomplished with the pool being eliminated. She said it is a great amenity and makes the street successful. She inquired about the open space with the benches and trees and how the ART felt about that programming.

Ms. Husak said she will provide a list of needs from the applicant but the timing is tight with the holidays.

Mr. McNally requested feedback from the ART on the general architecture. Mr. Papsidero said it was well designed. Mr. McNally said he wanted to make sure there would be no significant changes needed due to the tight schedule and Ms. Husak indicated she did not anticipate that happening.

Mr. McNally asked for the ART's first impression of the alternate material. Mr. Stanford asked if it would appear different in sheen. Mr. Fagrell asked the applicant if they will use a flat paint. Mr. Meyers said they try to fight the impact of the sun and glare. Mr. Fagrell asked the applicant if they were satisfied with the performance of the material. Mr. Meyers answered it is a new product and they are relying on the testing that has been done. He added it will have a baked on finish and painting on site of the finished product is better than if the product was pre-finished.

Ms. Husak said she was concerned about this tight schedule. She said there are a lot of small details that need to be sifted through and is not sure how realistic the timeline is to be able to turn this around with the holidays in between. She said planning to go to the PZC for review on January 17, 2019, is unrealistic. Mr. Meyers agreed that the timing around the holidays was challenging. He said they are comfortable pushing this back to the February 7, 2019 Commission meeting but wanted to keep the plat for Block F on the January 17, 2019 meeting.

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

## **INTRODUCTION**

### **3. BSD HR – 86 Franklin Street 18-075ARB-MPR**

### **Minor Project Review**

Nichole Martin said this application is a proposal for exterior modifications and associated site improvements to an existing home located on a 0.36-acre site zoned Bridge Street District, Historic Residential. She said the site is east of Franklin Street, approximately 350 feet north of the intersection with John Wright Lane. She said this is a request for a review and approval of a Demolition and Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066, 153.170, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Ms. Martin presented an aerial view of the site as well as site context to show how the character of the homes in this area varies significantly. She presented photographs of the existing conditions as viewed from Franklin Street (front) and the rear from Mill Lane. She described the residence as a mid-century structure with a faux stone front façade, orange-red brick on the other three sides and windows with white or silver frames on each elevation. She said there are a couple of entrances on different levels of the structure. She noted the stone retaining wall along the driveway and said the applicant plans to shift it and provide a new asphalt drive at the rear of home.

Ms. Martin presented the proposed site plan and reported a survey has been completed. She explained the applicant is proposing to move the retaining wall to allow for a large deck and additional lawn. She said the shift to the retaining wall will decrease the width of the driveway extending to Mill Lane. She stated due to the site changes a couple of trees will be removed from the site.

Ms. Martin presented a photograph of the existing front façade (Franklin Street) next to the proposed image for a side-by-side comparison. She said the existing front door is a light, yellowish color that was very popular for mid-century architecture but the applicant is proposing a new front door with craftsman character in a dark brown color. She asked the ART to consider if that change would be appropriate. She said the applicant is also proposing to replace the two existing windows on the front with black-framed windows that are the same size. She said the existing stone post at the front door will be refaced with cedar but the other faux stone on the front façade will remain. She said the applicant would like to paint all the brick a white color, which is on three sides of the structure.

Ms. Martin pointed out that there is an exterior stairwell/tower, which the applicant has proposed to decrease its size to make room for the deck. She said originally the applicant proposed the tower to be clad in brown cedar but Staff recommended that if the structure is painted white, the tower should be painted the same so there is less contrast and provided an image for demonstration. She said the other option could be for going back to the original plan of having a cedar tower if the brick was not permitted to be painted and provided that image. She noted in the report from the historic preservation consultant that she recommended not painting the brick.

Jody Wunderlich, Windsor Homes LLC, said the brick on this structure is orange and it is unattractive so that is why they want to paint it. She said all the brick on the house next door is painted. Ms. Martin said the Architectural Review Board is the final reviewing body and they generally come from a preservation standpoint, therefore, the brick should not be painted. She said Staff is trying to prepare the applicant for their review. Ms. Wunderlich said the house next door is painted tan and not white. Brad Fagrill asked if painting was the issue or if a color other than white needed to be proposed. Ms. Martin said painting brick on a historic home is the issue as a practice, not necessarily the color. Ms. Wunderlich asked if the ARB had approved the painted brick for the house next door. Jennifer Rauch said it may or may not have been approved by the ARB.

Ms. Martin said when an exterior change like that is desired, the owner is required to gain approval from the ARB. She said in preparation for the ARB's review, the applicant will need to provide scaled elevations for each façade with all the details included. Ms. Rauch said the ARB will need a more cohesive package and recommended the applicant prepare a comparison between the existing and the proposed plans, which will need to be labeled for clarity. She said it is Staff's and the ART's job to help applicants be successful by gaining approval.

Ms. Wunderlich said she did not select the front door because it was a Craftsman style, they selected it because the vertical windows in it would match the other windows on the front. She said their intention is to modernize it in 2018/almost 2019 and they do not want to keep the light yellowish door. Ms. Martin said

that is a mid-century color. Vince Papsidero said the applicant does not have to use the same exact door, just select one from that period. He said the ARB will appreciate consistency in terms of the window designs but mixing and matching styles is a slippery slope. Ms. Rauch said the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* speak to that as well.

Ms. Martin said it is always a concern when an applicant wants to modernize the outside of a structure in the Historic District whereas there is no issue to modernize the inside. She encouraged the applicant to stay within the mid-century period for the exterior but to use a variety of style and color.

Ms. Martin asked about access to the proposed deck. Ms. Wunderlich said they are replacing some of the rear windows with sliding glass doors to access the deck from the inside. She said they are replacing all the windows with new, framed in black but all the same size.

Ms. Martin said the applicant will need to provide a treatment to finish off the bottom of the deck as it appears unfinished in the renderings.

Ms. Martin noted there were three doors on the exterior of the structure and they were all being proposed different and the applicant should look into using similar styles. Mr. Papsidero said the materials are too arts and crafts style, and the proposed color scheme is colonial. He encouraged the applicant to do some research on styles and to decide on one so they know what style is most appropriate for the home.

Ms. Martin asked why the front column was being changed to cedar. She said normally, there are no more than three exterior materials proposed and suggested the applicant limit the contrast.

Ms. Rauch asked what the ART thought of painting the brick. Mr. Papsidero asked what is happening on the rest of the street. He asked if maybe the ART would be setting a precedent by allowing the brick to be painted.

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

Ms. Wunderlich said she noted all of the ART's suggestions and recommendations and would consider the changes.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any additional administrative issues or other items for discussion. [There were none.] He adjourned the meeting at 4:00 pm.

As approved by the Administrative Review Team on January 17, 2019.