



RECORD OF DETERMINATION

Administrative Review Team

Thursday, May 16, 2019

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

**4. Galbreath Realty
19-034ARB-MPR**

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

Proposal: Installation of an approximately 5.33-square-foot projecting sign for an existing tenant space zoned Bridge Street District Historic Core.
Location: Southeast of the intersection of South High Street and Eberly Hill Lane.
Request: Review and recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board for a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.066, 153.170, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.
Contact Information: Chase Ridge, Planner I; 614.410.4656, cridge@dublin.oh.us
Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/19-034

REQUEST: Recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board for a Minor Project Review with the following condition:

- 1) That the applicant revise the design of the west patio with a minimum landscape bed width of three feet.

Determination: The Minor Project Review was forwarded to the Architectural Review Board with a recommendation of approval.

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Vincent A. Papsidero, FAICP
Planning Director





MEETING MINUTES

Administrative Review Team

Thursday, May 16, 2019 | 2:00 pm

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

Other Staff: Logan Stang, Planner II; Claudia Husak, Senior Planner; Nicki Martin, Planner I; Chase Ridge, Planner I; Mike Kettler, Planning Technician; Richard Hansen, Planner I; and Laurie Wright, Administrative Support II.

4. Galbreath Realty 19-034ARB-MPR

75 S. High Street Minor Project Review

Mr. Ridge said this application is a proposal for site improvements for an existing historic property to include two new raised brick patios on the north and west sides of the existing building, parking lot improvements, and updated landscaping. He added the Architectural Review Board is the final reviewing body and would be reviewed at their next meeting on May 22, 2019.

Mr. Ridge presented an aerial view of the site, which is in Bridge Street District – Historic South. He presented photographs taken from Eberly Hill Lane out towards S. High Street that showed the limestone veneer and from the west-facing surface parking lot, which is a potential site for a future patio. He presented the current and proposed site plans whereas sites for both patios are proposed. He explained the proposed patio for the front will align with the existing front porch and the other patio will be constructed of the same materials.

Mr. Ridge noted the carriage walk is a connection point and to allow for the overhang of the parked cars. He presented the graphic for the proposed elevation for the site improvements intended along Eberly Hill Lane including the raised patio as well as for the site improvements proposed for the elevation facing to the west. He presented images of the proposed Belden Brick Indian Red Clear pavers for the raised patio and the base to be covered in the same limestone veneer currently used on the building. The proposed wrought iron railing has an arch design, which is the same as used by the neighbor.

Mr. Ridge ended his presentation by stating an approval is recommended to be forwarded to the Architectural Review Board for this Minor Project Review without conditions.

Mr. Krawetzki inquired about the dimensions of the carriage walk landscape beds. Mr. Ridge replied two feet, four inches. Mr. Krawetzki said it will be difficult to get anything to grow in that confined space. David Galbreath, Galbreath Real Estate said he was considering Boxwoods for that planting bed. Mr. Krawetzki advised against it as the Boxwoods would require constant pruning to keep them small enough and eventually they would grow too large to be healthy. He asked if the size of the bed could be increased to a minimum depth of three feet. Mr. Ridge noted the drive aisle was 22 feet wide and only 20 feet was required so the applicant could possibly have more room for the planting bed.

Mr. Stanford confirmed the right-of-way was not being affected by these requested modifications.



Mr. Galbreath indicated there is a tenant considering this location but their decision is contingent on the west patio being approved. He explained there is a severe slope on the west side. He said they find standing water there when it rains, which then backs up into the building so the same area being raised 18 inches to accommodate a patio creates a more useable area and helps water to drain into the lines below.

Mr. Papsidero asked if a condition can be added to request the rear planting bed meet a depth of three feet. He asked if there were any further questions or concerns. [Hearing none.]

Mr. Ridge said approval is recommended with the following condition:

- 1) That the applicant revise the design of the west patio with a minimum landscape bed width of three feet.

Mr. Papsidero called for a vote of a recommendation of approval of the Minor Project Review with the one condition. (Recommended for Approval 8 – 0) The Minor Project Review would be forwarded to the Architectural Review Board with a recommendation of approval.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Papsidero noted this was the last ART meeting where recommendations would be made to the higher authorities due to the recent amendments to the Code. He adjourned the meeting at 2:25 pm.

proposed five-square-foot sign that has the images and text screen-printed in black on a white MDO board. She indicated this situation was similar to an approved sign for a neighboring building to the north, which is a new toy store. MDO is not an approved material so the applicant will be required to revise the sign material. Staff's expectation is that the sign will have some dimensionality. Ms. Gilger asked if the sign is already installed. Per the image provided, it is hard to tell and Ms. Martin said she would verify with the applicant.

Ms. Gilger asked for clarification if the ART had approved this similar material. Ms. Martin clarified the ART had recommended approval to the Architectural Review Board (ARB) for a Master Sign Plan for the toy store. And then the ARB struggled with that decision as they determined this was not a good precedent to set allowing a lower quality material. They did so with the condition that the applicant would replace the sign with a better sign within a year to come into compliance. They wanted to ensure they did not set a precedent whereas if the applicant already had installed a sign that would not be approved that they could keep it.

Mr. Stanford asked if a different bracket could be used to hang the sign as the existing detracted from the sign. Ms. Husak said her concern was that the sign was white and flat which does not exist in the district. Mr. Stanford suggested the applicant could color the boxes and make the boxes project out for relief and added interest.

Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns. [Hearing none.]

**3. Galbreath Realty
19-034ARB-MPR**

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

Mr. Ridge said this application is a proposal for the construction of two patios and associated site improvements for an existing building zoned Bridge Street District Historic South. The ART will make a recommendation to the Architectural Review Board on May 16, 2019, for the Board's review on May 22, 2019.

Mr. Ridge presented an aerial view of the site. He presented photographs taken from Eberly Hill Lane out towards S. High Street that showed the limestone veneer and from the west-facing surface parking lot, which is a potential site for a future patio. He presented the current and proposed site plans whereas sites for both patios are proposed. He presented the graphic for the proposed elevation for the site improvements intended along Eberly Hill Lane including the raised patio as well as for the site improvements proposed for the elevation facing to the west. He presented images of the proposed Belden Brick Indian Red Clear pavers for the raised patio and the base will be covered in the same limestone veneer used currently on the building. The proposed wrought iron railing has an arch design, which the neighbor currently has.

Mr. Krawetzki asked if the fencing will run right along the lane and what the height will be. Mr. Ridge said he would have to verify. Ms. Husak indicated the Liquor Control Board may require a certain height.

Mr. Krawetzki asked if the parking spaces were shortened. Ms. Rauch inquired about the width of the lane and Mr. Krawetzki the width of the sidewalks connecting the patio to the entrance. Mr. Ridge said he would need to verify with the applicant as well as obtain more information about the proposed landscaping.

Mr. Stanford inquired about the side yard setback. Mr. Stang verified the patio is considered a permanent structure and added he thought there was a zero side yard setback in the Historic South District

Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns. [Hearing none.]

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Papsidero adjourned the meeting at 2:40 pm.