



City of Dublin

Land Use and Long
Range Planning
5800 Shier Rings Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236
phone 614.410.4600
fax 614.410.4747
www.dublinohiousa.gov

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

MEETING MINUTES

JANUARY 25, 2012

AGENDA

- | | | |
|----|--|--|
| 1. | Tucci's
11-055ARB
(Tabled 5 – 0) | 35 North High Street
Exterior Modifications |
| 2. | 53 North High Street
11-074ARB
(Approved 5 – 0) | 53 North High Street
Sign Modifications |
| 3. | 83 South High Street
12-003ARB
(Approved 5 – 0) | 83 South High Street
Exterior Modifications |
| 4. | Bad Frog Frozen Yogurt
12-004ARB
(Approved 4 – 1) | 15 North High Street
Sign Modifications |

William Souders called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. Other Board members present were Robert Schisler, Bob Dyas, Tom Currie, and Tasha Bailey. City representatives present were Eugenia Martin, Steve Langworthy, Jonathan Lee, Alexis Dunfee, Tori Proehl, and Libby Farley.

Council member Amy Salay administered the Oath of Office to new member, Bob Dyas.

Council member Salay, on behalf of City Council, thanked the Board members and said they appreciated their service, time, and love for the community. She saluted the Board members for their work and volunteerism.

Motion and Vote

Robert Schisler made a motion, seconded by Tasha Bailey, to accept the documents into the record. The vote was as follows: Mr. Souders, yes; Mr. Currie, yes; Mr. Dyas, yes; Ms. Bailey, yes; and Mr. Schisler, yes. (Approved 5 – 0.)

Motion and Vote

Robert Schisler made a motion, seconded by Tom Currie, to approve the November 15, 2011, meeting minutes as presented. The vote was as follows: Ms. Bailey, yes; Mr. Souders, yes; Mr. Dyas, yes; Mr. Schisler, yes; and Mr. Currie, yes. (Approved 5 – 0.)

[Mr. Currie, after the motion asked that on page 4, 'regarding' be corrected to 'regrading'.]

Motion and Vote

Robert Schisler made a motion, seconded by William Souders, to approve the December 14, 2011, meeting minutes as presented. The vote was as follows: Mr. Currie, yes; Ms. Bailey, yes; Mr. Dyas, yes; Mr. Schisler, yes; and Mr. Souders, yes. (Approved 5 – 0.)

Communications

Eugenia Martin said Mo Dioun of The Stonehenge Company was requesting the application from November's meeting for the pedestrian-only ATM be reconsidered. She briefly explained the Board's Rules and Regulations regarding Reconsiderations. Ms. Martin said conversations after the vote for the case at the November meeting led her to believe there was some confusion about the ATM, the fact it was an approved use and had already received approval for a location on the public plaza side of Building A. She said a condition of approval for the first location was the requirements of Accessible Design be met, and after exploration, it was determined a better suited location would be on the corner of Building A. Ms. Martin said Planning was in support of this Reconsideration.

Tasha Bailey asked if the Board would be reconsidering the original location that would have required the regrading of the ramp, or the modified location farther down which included the addition of a faux window. Ms. Martin clarified it would be the modified location. She reiterated approval has already been given for the location in the middle of the ramp. She said it was the desire of the applicant to move it to the corner, so if the Board chooses not to reconsider, he still has permission to put the ATM in that location.

Ms. Martin explained the motion to reconsider would be to have the case heard at the February 22, 2012 meeting. If the motion to reconsider is approved, a new packet would be provided. Steve Langworthy pointed out a Reconsideration did not mean a Board Member had to vote differently. He said since both Mr. Currie and Ms. Bailey originally voted against it in November, it was necessary for one of them to make the motion for a Reconsideration.

Motion and Vote

Tom Currie made a motion, seconded by Tasha Bailey, to reconsider Case 11-063ARB Bridge and High PUD – Building A Modifications.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Dyas, yes; Mr. Souders, yes; Mr. Schisler, yes; Ms. Bailey, yes; and Mr. Currie, yes. (Motion to Reconsider Approved 5 – 0.)

Ms. Martin reported the Planning and Zoning Commission had a meeting on Tuesday, January 24, 2012 to review the Bridge Street Code and the intent was at their February 2, 2012 meeting to vote to forward the code to Council as well as the Area Rezoning. She thanked the Board for their help and said as soon as there is a document forwarded to City Council from the Commission a link of the finalized copy will be sent to the Board.

William Souders asked if the Board's requested portion regarding the parking garage was agreed with by the Commission. Mr. Langworthy said the only area of disagreement was the Planning Commission did not go with the Board's recommendation on the zoning of the North Riverview houses. He said Planning would still present the Board's recommendation to City Council. Mr. Souders said he appreciated that because it was the majority opinion of the Board.

Mr. Langworthy said the Commission also reviewed the Review and Approval chapter last night, and although it is worded and formatted differently, the Board has the identical approval authority that they did prior to the Code. He said it is shaped and functions differently but the powers remain the same.

Mr. Souders briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Architectural Review Board. He swore in those who wished to address the Board, including Craig Barnum, CLB Restaurants, representing the applicant, Thelma Hill; William Jacob, 8326 Autumnwood Way; Tom Samms, representing the applicant, Julie Seel; and Paul Koehneke, Sign A Rama, representing the applicant, Karen McKenzie, Bridge and High Ltd.; and city representatives.

**1. Tucci's
11-055ARB**

**35 North High Street
Exterior Modifications**

Eugenia Martin presented this request of exterior modifications to an existing building on the east, west and south elevations as well as a 600 square foot addition. She described the site and showed photographs of the surrounding area. Ms. Martin said the applicant received approval from the Board of Zoning Appeals in December for a variance to not be required to provide onsite parking.

Ms. Martin said that the proposed site plan includes modifications to the entrance along the front façade of the building and modifications to the rear which includes a conversion of the existing garage storage space into a private dining area. She said the proposal includes a 600-foot addition, which will be part of the dining area as well as part of an expansion of the kitchen and a cooler area. She presented a photograph of the existing building viewed from High Street. Ms. Martin said proposed is an extension of the elevated dining area and an extended open gabled roof to provide additional cover for patrons. She said because of the extension of the elevated dining area and roof, the applicant needs to relocate the handicap ramp as well as construct a larger staircase. Ms. Martin said an existing trellis is located on the south side elevated dining area and the applicant is proposing to install a retractable awning, similar to one approved for J Lui's a couple of months ago.

Ms. Martin said on the west elevation of the building the applicant is proposing to modify the existing garage storage area by raising the roof, installing dormers, and cladding the exterior with a stone veneer. She said the proposal also includes a 600-square-foot addition which will serve as the entrance into the private dining area, as well as additional space for the kitchen extension and a wine wall.

Ms. Martin said along the south elevation, the applicant proposes to install rooftop mechanical screenings which are not currently in place. She said the screening is to be a cedar board and batten style, similar to the cladding to be installed on the addition. She said the applicant has not indicated on the plans the height of the screening material and Planning has requested it be included at the building permit stage.

Ms. Martin said the exterior of the garage is to be clad with a Coronado Stone, similar to that used at the Bri Hi Square development. She said the 600-square-foot addition will be clad with a cedar board and batten material and the roof will be a gray architectural shingle, similar to what is on the rest of the restaurant. She said the existing brick on the building will not be changed.

Ms. Martin said regarding site amenities, the applicant proposes wall sconces, two on either side of the window area on the front façade and on either side of the rear entrance. She said the sconces are similar to the style currently existing around the patio. She said two ceiling fans are to be located underneath the open gable of the covered elevated patio. Ms. Martin said the existing railing will be reused where possible and new railing to match be used to fill in around the patio and on the ramp.

Ms. Martin said Planning has reviewed the proposal and Planning recommends approval with the condition the applicant revise the plan to specify the height of the mechanical screening at the building permit stage.

Craig Barnum, CLB Restaurants, representing the applicant, Thelma Hill, said most of their guests enter the restaurant from the rear of the building, where the lighting is poor and the building looks unappetizing for a restaurant. He explained the back room will have a completely different atmosphere from the rest of the restaurant and will be able to accommodate a party of thirty. Mr. Barnum said the small kitchen will be improved and expanded. He said with the improvements in the District, his business has never been better, however there is still a struggle with the valet. Mr. Barnum said they worked with Mo Dioun regarding the shared valet stand, although having two restaurants dinner patrons dropping off their cars cause some challenges during peak times. Mr. Barnum said he was willing to do whatever was necessary to move this process forward.

Robert Schisler referred to the schematic design drawings, and pointed out the property lines were indicated as 'lot lines.' He pointed out that they were capturing an open walkway area on the west side and putting a roof over it. Ms. Martin said the applicant was not permitted to enclose that area. Mr. Barnum said they needed the area for storage, but because that was an issue, it will remain as it exists.

Mr. Schisler said he preferred to see the existing wall, even if it goes off this property. Ms. Martin said the applicant was granted a right-of-way encroachment a couple of years ago, provided the area in question stays open and not be enclosed to become usable space.

Mr. Schisler noted typically by code, that you cannot have a door swing over the property line. He suggested it could be redesigned so that the exit is on the east of the corner. Mr. Barnum pointed out that was not a customer entrance. Mr. Schisler said that might change the aesthetics because things had to be moved. Ms. Martin said that was something that could be addressed at the building permit stage.

Mr. Schisler said the proposal for the rear elevation will be an improvement. He said, however, there is a very large gas meter with a couple of bollards located where the downspout comes down. He asked where they planned to put it and whether they had room to do some of the work with it there.

Marcus Brewer, Design Collective Incorporated, said they may move the gas meter if it is not too expensive, otherwise they would hide it with landscaping.

Mr. Schisler said he liked the front and the trellis. Mr. Barnum said the idea was not to increase the outside seating, but to provide a roof covered area to protect patrons from the weather and cooler temperatures. He said he thought he would put heaters there so they could still enjoy being outside.

Mr. Schisler noted the photograph of the building as it exists did not show any large pieces of ductwork sticking up out of the roof, but the rendering showed large pieces. He said they could be seen in the back and perhaps it was just the elevation view. He asked if the kitchen was moving to the east. Mr. Barnum said the kitchen will expand to the west. Ms. Martin said it was just the perspective of the drawing. Mr. Barnum said much of that will be screened, especially from the back, and the equipment will not be seen.

Tom Currie said this was an exciting plan and a great improvement. He referred to the west elevation and asked why the stone and board and batten siding was proposed rather than continuing the brick on the front of the building. He asked about the use of the back door. Mr. Barnum said that door will not be used as an entrance, but as an emergency exit. He said they chose the stone and board and batten siding to keep in the character of the other buildings as well as Bri Hi. Mr. Brewer said they tried to balance the materials and stone and board and batten were less expensive than the brick. Mr. Currie said that was subjective and he thought brick would be more appropriate.

Mr. Souders agreed and said there is not enough separation when the two buildings are joined to add stone. He said the wood did not bother him. He said adding more materials do not make it simpler. He said in context of the business, they have brick, and the material on the rear should be brick as well.

Mr. Schisler asked to see the elevation of the north side showing how it terminates to the brick. He said he assumed the stone would stop where the gable comes down so that it looks like a building that was joined to a brick building. He said he liked the mixture of stone in the front at the bases of the column with the patio setting.

Mr. Souder asked if the stone or brick just ends when turning the corner.

Mr. Barnum asked if the preference was the stone on the back be the same brick as on the front of the building. Mr. Souders said that was the opinion of two, not the majority, regarding the issue of whether it was stone or brick. He said how you turn a corner was important to some of them. Mr. Barnum said his preference would be to have the stone on the rear.

Bob Dyas asked if the north elevation could be changed where the stucco continued near where the electric service came into the building by extending the stone a couple of feet and trimming it out. Mr. Brewer said that was probably what they would do.

Mr. Souders clarified the Board was suggesting if they are going to have stone and the garage is like a building that joins with the brick, then the gable end needs to be all stone, turning the corner. He said the same way, the wood on the south side turns at the side, the stone needs to extend out further and go down the north face. Mr. Schisler said especially, since the City improved the walkway and it is so nice, actually to have stone, brick, or siding, other than the stucco would be a great improvement to that corner, especially when coming from the parking lot and alley.

Mr. Barnum said that they planned to add landscaping to cover some of that side of the building and the utility boxes. He said once the entrance changes, they are going to do everything they can to make sure it is pleasing because that is where most of his patrons are going to walk.

Ms. Martin highlighted one of the review criteria was that when additions or alterations are done, typically it is recommended by the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* the material be different so it is recognized as an addition, not something that is part of the original structure. She said that was part of how the material was selected by the applicant.

Mr. Currie said that was somewhat true, and read from the *Guidelines*, *'Materials for additions should be traditional to the District, but need not match those of the original structure to which the addition is attached.'* He said that was a criteria that was often debated. He said he did not know they had to necessarily have a different material on the addition.

Mr. Currie referred to the dormers on the west elevation. He asked if the ceiling height was going to be raised and would they be like skylights or just placed there with nothing behind them. Mr. Barnum said there was nothing behind the clear glass.

Mr. Souders asked if the scissors trusses opened into the private room. Mr. Currie asked if they were post and beam type trusses. Mr. Barnum clarified they were exposed. He said the architect's idea was to create sort of a Napa Valley winery feel with a high open exposed ceiling, similar to the front porch.

Mr. Souders said the drawings represented a two-hour barrier with exposed trusses above that. He asked if that was needed. Mr. Brewer said that was a separation preferred for fire separation, but it was not a firewall. Ms. Martin explained there had been many conversations with the City's Commercial Plans Examiner about it. Mr. Brewer said most of that wall will be existing masonry, so it should not be hard to accomplish. Ms. Martin said the applicant should be able to meet all applicable Building and Fire Codes with the proposed plan, and if they have any architectural modifications, it will come back to the Board for review and approval.

Mr. Souders asked if the space was within the square footage allowed for the use group even if it is not sprinkled, why you have to have a separation. Steve Langworthy explained that it was based on seating. Ms. Martin said the existing restaurant meets the Fire Code as far as seating and not have the interior sprinkled. She said with the addition, if there is no fire separation, it has to be sprinkled or have the fire barrier.

Mr. Currie asked if the vines or landscaping over the patio will be retained. Mr. Barnum said the vines located where the retractable awning was to go would remain because it was a nice look. Mr. Currie asked about plans for the existing plantings on the south side of the building. Mr. Barnum said one tree where the new entrance is will be relocated. Mr. Langworthy said there would be a discussion regarding that because they had talked about having a walkway along there instead of landscaping to allow people to have somewhere to walk without using the alley.

Mr. Currie said he was referring to the Wing Street plantings. Mr. Barnum said he did not think the plan was to touch the rose plantings near the back door. Mr. Currie asked if landscaping was proposed on the west side of the building. Ms. Martin said landscaping was proposed, but the city is requesting a walkway so that there is "safe refuge" for pedestrians as they walk along Darby Street. She said the pavers will match those that the city has.

Mr. Currie asked where their dumpster was located. Mr. Barnum said they do not have one. He explained they have a long term agreement to share one with J. Liu's which has worked out well.

Tasha Bailey said that for people walking out of Bri Hi north, towards this restaurant, one of the issues today is they have to go either around to the back or front of the building to enter and it was not accessible coming from the shopping area or green area. Mr. Barnum said there was a gate from the patio that you could walk through to get to the entrance, and that would not change.

Ms. Bailey said for locals that know where it is, it is not difficult, but it is not super visually welcoming and does not necessarily call you in because there is a large expansive wall with one open gate. She said you still have to go around to see the main opening of the restaurant. She asked if there were thoughts about bringing the patio around more, almost enticing people over from the green space at Bri Hi.

Ms. Bailey asked if currently, patrons using the valet go around the building between the restaurant and Sisters. Mr. Barnum said if they walk that way now, they have to walk to North High Street, take a right, and enter through the front of the restaurant. He said with this proposal, they would walk down the north side and cut into the sidewalk. Ms. Bailey asked what was the main route used now by the restaurant patrons. Ms. Martin said routes to Tucci's would include walking down the public walkway to the High Street public walkway and entering through the center of the patio or walk down Wing Hill and enter on the south side of the patio or walk through the dry storage area which accesses the elevated patio.

Ms. Bailey asked the envisioned future route. Mr. Barnum said if the valet remained where it is now, they could enter through Wing Street. Ms. Martin explained that the existing entrance would be maintained and indicated where the additional entrance would be near the north property line.

Ms. Bailey repeated her question about considering making the entrance more accessible since they are making modifications to the front elevation which is where you walk if you are walking the District, but if you are enjoying the green space walking through Bri Hi, it was still challenging to get to the front. She suggested coming around the side would be a little more enticing. Mr. Barnum said that they could, but there was a liquor liability consideration with gates and how large the size of the openings.

Ms. Bailey said the goal should be to get people walking the front of the building. Mr. Barnum agreed. He said hopefully the city would allow a sign saying "Entrance." Ms. Martin suggested that she could work with Mr. Barnum to see if there was a way through the landscaping to open views more while still meeting code. Mr. Barnum said he liked the existing landscaping. He said he had received comments from patrons that said the overgrown landscaping created an oasis. He said he hesitated eliminating the mature landscaping on the patio.

Ms. Bailey said she was thinking about the walkability when coming from behind Bri Hi, between Modern Male and the currently unoccupied space. She said if you do not know the area, you do not see Tucci's

until you get around to the front. Mr. Barnum said that maybe a tenant sign over there would help locate them. He said added lighting and signage in keeping with the character of the District would really be beneficial. Ms. Bailey agreed lighting would solve the problem.

Mr. Langworthy said many of the department heads periodically walk the District and they had discussed maybe looking at a design that looks more attractive, still keeping Wing Hill open. Mr. Barnum said currently, it is asphalt which is not real appealing or keeping in character of the District. Ms. Bailey said it was not so much about Tucci's property as it was about Wing Hill and how to get more people walking the whole District and stopping there.

Mr. Souders said he was fine with the shutter and the proposed colors and the continuation of the railing material. He asked if existing signs were being relocated. Ms. Martin said the existing sign on the front façade gable will be relocated lower on the gable. She said the Board approved a secondary sign on the rear elevation, and the applicant is moving forward with the approved sign.

Mr. Souders asked if a third sign would be allowed here, as was elsewhere if they had access to parking in the rear. Ms. Martin said if the new code section remains in place and is not modified, the applicant could have a third sign. She explained as the BSC code is written, they are permitted a ground or projecting sign in addition to a wall sign after the code has been approved and adopted.

Mr. Souders said he was okay with the proposed light fixtures and fans. He asked what the underside material on the front porch was. Mr. Brewer said the material for the underside of the porch had not yet been identified, but probably it would be an exterior wallboard type material. Mr. Souders suggested they look at what was approved for the underside of the porches for the Mezzo restaurant. He said he did not want cheap vinyl or tongue and groove plywood used.

Mr. Souders said he did not think stone was the right material, but he could live with it. He said how the corner is turned and how it is addressed is more important. He said he believed less is better. Mr. Souders reiterated he did not think stone was the right answer.

Mr. Souders addressed the Board, and said he was a little confused in that they spent a lot of time criticizing other buildings that went with Carpenter style and yet they all seemed to like it here. Mr. Schisler recalled previous applicants came to the Board with a building that was either a shingle or a pseudo-Gothic style, and they were trying to turn it into a Carpenter-style. He said this was a block garage behind a brick building and to him it was not trying to change. He said he preferred the material on the block garage to be brick. He said if it was a traditional historic lap siding, Victorian look or something, then he would say not to change it. He said that was not what he saw happening here.

Mr. Souders said with that explanation, he saw it as changing what it is. He said he did not have a problem with it because he liked it. He said he did not have the same opinion in that this is not a residence. He said they are changing the style of this building from a simple brick to a Carpenter style California Napa style. He said it was not part of the Historic District. Mr. Schisler said he did not see it as Napa, but he understood what Mr. Souders was saying. He said this character is not matching the front façade character. Mr. Souders said he thought it was because of the stone.

Mr. Schisler agreed, and said it was the stone and what was being done with the trestle front. He suggested the stone a wainscot that went all the way down the wall to the corner and then there was stucco or a stucco treatment above it. He said one of the things the architect needed to look at was in the roof plan, there is going to be a gable, and it is not really there now. He said there is a very short gable now and there will be a very tall gable. He said that was where the Board was saying this treatment, to just stop there was really a false front, and it would be much nicer if whatever happened across the façade went all the way down to that corner, and maybe if some of the character of the stucco remained and they intermixed either brick or stone wainscot, with wood siding on the gable.

Mr. Barnum asked if it should match the building siding where the doors are located. Mr. Schisler said he did not want to design the building. Mr. Barnum said they had to do something there because there are some windows that have been covered and it is not very pleasing. He said they would probably have to keep in character where the siding is and around the south, and probably should be wrapped around.

Mr. Schisler agreed full height stone all the way was not the right look. He said they needed to look at the character of the front and use it in the back. He said he agreed with Mr. Currie that if they are proposing heavy timber trusses are that open, the dormers could be used to open them up to create a great space.

Mr. Souders asked Ms. Bailey and Mr. Currie about the philosophy in the Historic District in terms of using this Carpenter style. Ms. Bailey said she thought the High Street part of the region has remained fairly intact with the exception of Bri Hi which is developing a look. She said the Darby Street area with the valet, Bri Hi, and now this addition is developing a very different look. She said we are going to get into very, very different looks from the back to the front, with much more Carpenter style in the back and much more original style in the front. She said it was just something to consider of what the visual experience will be for visitors to the District which will be completely different as they enter from Darby Street versus if they enter from High Street. She said it was clear a look is being developed across Darby Street.

Mr. Souders pointed out the front has a completely different look now than what was there. He said it did not bother him, but in his mind, they are setting a precedent. He said they struggle with other businesses because they try to be something they are not, even though there was not much character there visually anyway. He said he wanted everybody to be on record as understanding that they are changing something here, even though it may be better visually, it was different than what Dublin's Historic District has been.

Ms. Bailey said she agreed that it was very different. She said she did not think they are going to stop the progress of what Bri Hi started, but that they are going to have to consider how comfortable they are about modifications to the High Street view so that it matches the Darby Street view.

Mr. Souders said the Historic District entrusted the members' comments while they serve on the Board. He said regardless of their personal interests, they have a Historic District that they are obligated to preserve.

Ms. Bailey said if they were to try to preserve the High Street views of the buildings, there would be very little modification they could make to the Darby Street view of this building in her opinion. She said she saw exactly what was being said, but her bigger fear would be doing nothing to the front and doing this large change to the back, but it would look incongruent.

Mr. Schisler agreed it was not similar to the simplistic style which is a very simple brick building that may be something that was more Colonial-looking which would stay in the character better than the gables and the column. Ms. Bailey said to visually maintain the front as it is now, the Board would have to ask for significant modifications to the private seating addition proposed.

Mr. Currie said the building was not a historic structure. Ms. Martin said it was built in 1955 as a home and then converted into a business which has now evolved into a restaurant. Mr. Barnum said they opened Tucci's in January 1998. He said where the existing patio is located was a previously a parking lot.

Mr. Currie said Tucci's had its own identity now and he thought this modification crystallizes that identity and also adds the same feel to the rear if brick is used on the west elevation. He said it becomes its own

part of the Historic District. He said he could not see any way they could make it look historic. Mr. Currie said this may be changing style, but it looks like it is just giving identity to that particular place.

Mr. Souders said a consensus was needed on the brick versus stone material. He noted that two members thought brick was the better option and there were three other members voting.

Mr. Currie suggested a tabling so that they can come back with the north elevation and a redesign of the materials on the west elevation. Mr. Souders asked if Mr. Barnum would agree to a tabling. Mr. Barnum said his hope and goal was to agree there would be some changes and then move forward.

Mr. Schisler said they needed to figure out what they are going to do with the landscaping. Mr. Barnum said they discussed earlier that the four rose bushes would be left alone, but if that was the case, they would be moved to the front.

Mr. Schisler and Mr. Souders said they would like to see what the north elevation would look like.

Ms. Martin requested if the Board makes a motion to table, they include in their motion to waive the 15-day rule to assure that there is enough time for the applicant to submit information for the February meeting.

Mr. Barnum agreed to a tabling.

Ms. Bailey asked if the Board was asking the applicant to present a visual that shows the rear elevation in brick or not. Mr. Souders clarified that they were not, but that did not mean that some members might vote against it if they do not see that. Mr. Schisler said it might not hurt if they presented two options. Mr. Barnum said that was okay.

Mr. Langworthy asked if the Board wanted to see the brick before deciding or was it something that they could resolve now. Mr. Currie said he would like to see the brick. Mr. Schisler said he could see stucco as it exists, some stone, and wood treatment on the gable. He suggested they have three options, indicate which is preferred, and show how the corner is turned in all three situations.

Motion and Vote

Robert Schisler made a motion, seconded by Willaim Souders, to table this request for exterior modifications in order for the applicant to address Board comments on the west and north elevation, and waive the 15-Day Rule submission requirement.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Currie, yes; Ms. Bailey, yes; Mr. Dyas, yes; Mr. Souders, yes; and Mr. Schisler, yes. (Tabled 5 – 0.)

2. 53 North High Street 11-074ARB

53 North High Street Sign Modifications

Eugenia Martin presented this application for a sign plan for a one-story office building with frontage on North High Street, North Street, and Darby Street. She said a ground and window sign are proposed along North High Street, and a window and directory sign are proposed along Darby Street. She said the existing, 10.5-square foot multi-tenant ground sign located along North High Street is 5 feet in height and is externally illuminated with the addresses and names of two businesses. Ms. Martin said an unapproved additional sign panel for a third tenant was added below the approved sign. She said the applicant proposes to retain the existing sign posts and replace the existing 10.5-foot sign face to accommodate all three tenants. She explained code permits a 50-square-foot sign for office uses, but the *Dublin Historic Design Guidelines* specify a maximum area for ground signs at six square feet, and the sign will need to be revised to meet the *Guidelines*.

Ms. Martin said Code requires signs to have three colors and the proposed sign face has four colors, including dark green, light green, gold, and white. She said one of the colors must be eliminated to meet Code. She said that Code also requires signs to be located eight feet from the right-of-way, and the existing ground sign is placed five feet from the right-of-way without an approved sign permit. She said the applicant will be required to move the sign to be at least eight feet from the right-of-way of North High Street to comply with Code or obtain a variance from the Board of Zoning Appeals for its current location.

Steve Langworthy clarified that a sign permit was granted, but it was in error. He said it was shown and approved at the current incorrect location. He said staff will work with the applicant to get it corrected so it is legal.

Ms. Martin said Code permits a window sign in addition to a permitted ground sign with a total area not to exceed ten percent of the total window area, or ten square feet, whichever is less. She said the *Guidelines* permit a total area not to exceed ten percent of the total window area, or four square feet, whichever is less. She said the sum of the area of the window sign and the area of the ground sign may not exceed the maximum allowable area of 50 square feet. She said that the applicant proposes to keep the window sign on a secondary entrance door on North Street with the addresses and the tenants' names in white and green copy. Ms. Martin said Planning requests that the applicant submit information to verify the area of the existing window sign to ensure it does not exceed the permitted area.

Ms. Martin said the *Guidelines* permit a second sign identifying a rear entrance when the business or use has a parking area to the rear of the building. She said that the applicant is proposing to replace the directory sign on the rear of the building facing Darby Street with a new directory sign. She said the existing sign has address and tenant names in black, white, and green. Ms. Martin said the proposed sign contains only the address and four colors and will need to be revised to meet Code.

Ms. Martin said Planning recommends approval with four conditions as listed in the Planning Report. Robert Schisler noted every condition would change what the sign will look like and said that he did not know what they were reviewing for approval. Ms. Martin suggested the Board clarify with the applicant what they are voting on in order to feel comfortable with moving forward. Mr. Schisler asked which of the four colors would be removed from the sign.

William Jacob, 8326 Autumnwood Way, the owner and occupant of the building, said he could eliminate a color, but he was told that the greens are so similar that there would not be an issue. Mr. Schisler noted in the graphics, the greens looked very different. Mr. Jacob said they would eliminate the gold.

Mr. Schisler asked if the sign had to be six square feet. Mr. Jacobs said for the record, the Architectural Review Board approved the sign in 2006, as it currently exists. He said the original sign was submitted with the additional panels to be added to the bottom when they had a tenant. He said he understood when that additional tenant sign was added, it should have been submitted to the Board for approval.

Tasha Bailey asked if the original application was received prior to the Code modification permitting only three colors. Mr. Schisler noted what he had only showed three colors. Ms. Martin said due to the sandblasted background of the existing sign, it appears to have additional color. She explained because the wood ends up being exposed, it takes on a different color complexity. She said she understood in 2006, three colors were approved; green, gold, and white.

Mr. Schisler said he would be fine if they kept the light green, dark green and white and eliminated the gold color. William Souders said he understood four colors were approved in 2006. Mr. Jacobs said he did not know, as he was not involved with the original application.

Mr. Schisler asked what size sign was being proposed. Ms. Martin reiterated the proposed sign area was 10.5 square feet. She said it was permitted by Code to be 50 square feet and the *Guidelines* state it should be 6 square feet, however, the Board has the ability to waive the 6-foot requirement as long as it still meets the Sign Code. Mr. Jacob said that was what the Board did in 2006.

Mr. Schisler said there were a couple of existing signs on South High Street that were probably eight to ten square feet. He recalled the Board measuring legal and illegal signs in the District. Mr. Schisler said it would not look like what was shown if it was six square feet.

Tom Currie asked where the sign would be relocated to be eight feet from the right-of-way. Mr. Jacob said there were no plans to relocate the sign. Ms. Martin explained Mr. Jacobs was going to request variance approval from the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA) to encroach within the right-of-way in February. Mr. Jacob said many signs along North High Street were in the same line as the previously approved sign is currently. Mr. Currie said he would need to see how the sign would look if reduced down to six square feet.

Mr. Jacob said that he brought up numerous times the sign was approved in 2006 only because the word 'illegal' has been brought up and he would not do anything illegal, but he supposed it was a technical term. Ms. Bailey asked for 'illegal' to be defined.

Ms. Martin said in this case, where the sign was located, since it was brought before the Board in 2006, it was not an existing sign that had always been there before the requirement of being located eight feet from the right-of-way. She said this particular sign was installed in 2006, after that requirement was in place, so it was approved in error and should have been located eight feet from the right-of-way at the time, or should have received a variance from the BZA at that time.

Mr. Langworthy explained that a permit issued in violation of the code is an invalid permit, regardless of how it happened. He said the task now with the applicant, is to have him go before the BZA to see if they will approve a variance to allow it in its current location. He said if they do not, there would have to be something else done.

Ms. Bailey asked for the record, if the sign is technically illegal, but not at the fault of the owner. Ms. Martin reiterated that it was approved in error. Mr. Langworthy clarified it was illegal, but not because the applicant had done something wrong.

Mr. Schisler said it seemed that limiting the sign to six square feet seemed ridiculous, and he could not see how the names could be added or how the sign would work. Mr. Jacobs said at the end of the day, they were changing the lettering on the sign. Bob Dyas asked if the proposed 10.5-foot proposed sign would be made smaller to meet the *Guidelines* which would be six square feet. Ms. Martin said as long as it meets the Zoning Code as a whole, the Board has the ability to make modifications. Mr. Langworthy noted the size was not addressed in the ARB 2006 meeting minutes.

Mr. Souders asked if the existing window sign would be redone to meet the square footage required by Code. Ms. Martin said if it did not meet Code, the window sign would need to be replaced, and Condition 4 requested the applicant submit to Planning verification it did meet Code.

William Souders confirmed the information and colors were not issues, it was just the size. Mr. Jacob said if necessary, he would eliminate the '53' and the shamrock and make it much smaller. Mr. Souders confirmed regarding the rear sign Mr. Jacobs was okay with the proposed recommendations.

Mr. Jacobs asked what the recommendations were if they varied from what they submitted. He said it was the same supplier and sandblasted technique to give it dimension using the same colors. Mr.

Souders asked if the applicant would agree to use only three colors, one green, white, and gold on the 24-inch by 24-inch sign. Mr. Jacob agreed.

Mr. Schisler asked why the names would not be on the sign. He said he thought they were allowed to do it because the sign was in the rear parking lot. Ms. Martin said they could be included, but it was discussed if the tenants changed, it meant three signs would need changed, whereas in this case, you could either peel off the window sign or remove a panel on the front sign versus having to modify all three.

Mr. Souders said that he did not want to set the precedence of having four sign colors. He said whether the gold becomes white or the shamrock was eliminated, or the shamrock was white and the letters were green, was the applicant's decision. He said he did not care which green color was used. Mr. Jacob said most likely, the gold color will be replaced by white.

Ms. Martin explained currently the Zoning Code only permits three colors, and they are bound by that.

Motion and Vote

Robert Schisler made a motion, seconded by Tasha Bailey, to approve the sign modifications with the sign area proposed, because the proposal meet the criteria of the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* and Zoning Code, with three conditions:

1. The applicant revise the ground sign and the directory sign to eliminate one of the four proposed colors to meet Code.
2. The applicant relocate the ground sign to be eight feet from the right-of-way or obtain a variance from the Board of Zoning Appeals.
3. The applicant submit information to Planning verify the area of the existing window sign on the secondary entrance door located along North Street and modify the sign, if necessary to ensure it does not exceed four square feet.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Souders, yes; Mr. Currie, yes; Mr. Dyas, yes; Ms. Bailey, yes; and Mr. Schisler. (Approved 5 – 0.)

3. 83 South High Street 12-003ARB

83 South High Street Exterior Modifications

Eugenia Martin introduced Tori Proehl, who presented this application for exterior modifications to replace siding, windows, and doors on an existing building. Ms. Proehl described the site and the surrounding area. She said the building has aluminum siding on the east and north elevations which is proposed to be replaced with cementitious Hardie Shingle siding. She said the second-story window on the north elevation will be removed and the area covered with siding. Ms. Proehl said New Hardie Board trim is to be applied to the east and north elevations. She said the proposal also includes replacing the front door and seven windows on the east elevation and two windows on the north elevation. She said wood shingle siding covers the south and west elevations which will be repaired and maintained and the remaining trim will be replaced or repaired as needed.

Ms. Proehl said the applicant is proposing to remove air conditioner openings on the first and second floors of the south elevation and cover the area with wood shingle siding to match. She said three windows on the west elevation and four on the south elevation will be replaced with cementitious siding which is Hardie Shingle straight edge panel with an exposure of up to seven inches. Ms. Proehl said the applicant should ensure the new siding is installed with the same amount of siding exposure as the existing siding to achieve as close a match as possible. She said the new and remaining trim will be painted Sherwin Williams' Downing Sand. Ms. Proehl said the replacement windows will be a two over one-style aluminum clad, double-hung architect series window manufactured by Pella. She said the

window trim color will be Almond. She said the applicant proposes to replace the existing front door with Therma-Tru fiberglass entry door. She said the front and rear doors will be painted Sherwin Williams' Rookwood Dark Red.

Ms. Proehl said this proposal meets all of the general review standards and Planning recommends approval with one condition:

- 1) The applicant should ensure that the new siding is installed with the same amount of exposure as the remaining siding to closely match the siding on all sides.

William Souders asked about the replacement window lights.

Tom Samms, representing the applicant, Julie Seel, said the proposed replacement windows are a two-over-one divided light. Mr. Souders confirmed it was applied and not two pieces of glass. He said usually, they discuss how it is being addressed, but in this case, it is applied to the inside and outside. Mr. Samms said it was Pella's closest window style to resemble a true divided light.

Mr. Souders asked why they were changing from horizontal siding to shingle siding. Mr. Samms said the idea was to take it back to as much of a historic look as possible, assuming the aluminum siding was added in the 60s or 70s for probably not a good reason. He said they hoped when they removed it, they will find cedar shingles underneath it and not have to install any new shingles. He said it depended upon the condition of what is found underneath, so they want to have approval to give it the same shingle sided look as the rest of the house. He said they knew the shingles were not original. He said the house was built in 1830 and the original lapboard siding can be seen in certain areas inside.

Mr. Souders asked why, if they know it was done with lap siding originally and may have been redone into the shingles, they are going with shingle siding as opposed to the lap siding. Mr. Samms said only to not replace everything and every surface on the outside of the house.

Ms. Martin explained the applicant submitted photographs not included in the presentation that revealed the material on the south and west elevations had a similar look to the proposed siding, except what exists is a six-inch reveal and what is proposed is a seven-inch reveal. She described it as a straight edge shingle. Mr. Samms shared the photograph with the Board members.

Mr. Souders referred to the trim around the windows and asked if the profile would be the same as exists and the width would not get narrower than what they saw. Mr. Samms said that was correct.

Tom Currie asked if mantles were being considered for above the windows or wire wood boards on the sides. Mr. Samms said no, they were using the same 1-inch-by-1-inch trim on the top and sides and the sill on the bottom, without a trim board underneath it, to match the existing historic details.

Mr. Currie asked if the south elevation was plain. Mr. Samms said it was.

Mr. Currie pointed out there were no photographs of the south elevations included in the packets. He said the building width was just 34 feet. Mr. Currie asked why the second floor window on the north elevation was being removed. Mr. Samms said it was originally a bedroom with no closets and the interior plan includes a closet in that location. He said they discussed leaving the window intact with a closed shutter over it, which they could do, but because there are no other shutters on the elevations, they considered that might be inconsistent with the rest of the style of the house. He said they were open to doing it either way.

Robert Schisler asked if there could be a closed wood shutter inside. Mr. Samms said the window needed to be replaced.

Tasha Bailey asked if it was just for aesthetic reasons they were taking the color so dark, or did it have something to do with the shingles. Mr. Samms said it was just a color choice by the owner. He said they were the colors approved currently for the Dublin Village Tavern.

Mr. Currie asked if the front door had sidelights. Mr. Samms said that in the Dublin archives there was a picture from the 1800s that showed a covered porch, but there were no sidelights or transom window. He said they selected a door with two windows on the top sections which was accurate from a style standpoint that would also provide light.

Bob Dyas noted the more ornate trim on the original door and the more contemporary, plain trim on the replacement door. He asked if that met the historic character of the building. Mr. Samms said the original door treatment was not well done. He said it was cut off at the window above. He said it strictly had no historical significance to the building. He said they were taking it back to something that would have been more accurate to what it could have been when it was originally done.

Mr. Currie referred to the west elevation and asked if the porch would have a ceiling. Mr. Samms said they were not going to do anything to the porch because they were not sure how significant, from a historical standpoint, the structure is, and they did not want to make any major changes to it. He said they plan to leave it open. He said the old, handmade columns were a little out of scale, but they did not want to affect them.

Mr. Currie suggested a condition if the shingles underneath the aluminum are salvageable or usable, that they be used and not automatically use the Hardie siding. Ms. Bailey asked if only a percentage of the old shingles were salvageable, how will the Hardie siding match. Mr. Samms said they would not mix the two shingle types on any elevation. He said they would change the whole elevation to make sure it matches the other elevations.

Motion and Vote

Robert Schisler made a motion, seconded by William Souders, to approve this application because the proposed exterior modifications meet the criteria of the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* and Zoning Code, with two conditions:

- 1) The applicant use the existing siding under the aluminum siding if salvageable; and
- 2) If new siding needs to be used, the exposure of the new siding match the exposure of the existing siding.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Bailey, yes; Mr. Dyas, yes; Mr. Currie, yes; Mr. Souders, yes; and Mr. Schisler, yes. (Approved 5 – 0.)

4. Bad Frog Frozen Yogurt 12-004ARB

15 North High Street Sign Modifications

Eugenia Martin introduced Alexis Dunfee, who presented this application for sign modifications to the Bridge and High Sign and Graphics Plan. She explained this site was before the Board recently for modifications to the Sign and Graphics Plan as well as modifications to the Development Text. She said since that approval, the applicant is now requesting additional modifications. She said the Plan currently permits the background color of tenant wall signs and tenant blade signs to be one of four colors, Rookwood Red, Hunter Green, Rookwood Dark Brown, and Tricorn Black. Ms. Dunfee said the applicant is requesting to add a background color to include Commodore Blue. She said approval of this color modification will allow the applicant to utilize the blue color for a background, as well as any subsequent tenants of the Bri Hi Square development.

Ms. Dunfee said the applicant is also requesting additional modifications to the Plan to include an oval shape for blade sign. She said currently, four styles of blade sign shapes are approved; the rectangle with rounded inverted corners, a circle with dual extruded rectangular edges, circle, and hexagon. She said if the Board approves this blade sign shape, the applicant will be able to utilize that as a blade sign shape as well as any subsequent tenants of the Bri Hi Square development. Ms. Dunfee said Planning finds both the color and the blade sign shape are compatible with what exists at the Bri Hi Square development and is recommending approval with no conditions.

Robert Schisler asked if Bad Frog Frozen Yogurt was a national chain. Paul Koehneke, Sign A Rama, representing the applicant, Karen McKenzie, Bridge and High Ltd., said the business just started by opening three locations; one in West Chester, one in Dayton, and one in Dublin. He said there was no national franchised identity or brand. He said all locations will use the same colors and sign.

Tasha Bailey asked if the other two locations were in a historic district. Mr. Koehneke said they were not.

William Souders asked which approved historic font was closest to the proposed font. Ms. Martin explained the Board was reviewing the color and shape to be included into the Sign and Graphics Plan. She said Planning would work with the applicant to ensure the proposed font meets one of the approved fonts, or as close as possible within the Sign and Graphics Plan.

Mr. Schisler said the font seemed too large to meet the percentage allowed. Ms. Martin said the applicant will be required to meet all of the applicable Sign Code and Sign and Graphics requirements.

Mr. Schisler said he did not want to discourage business, but he was not interested in introducing a fifth color for a PUD that was approved for the development or an additional shape. He said if they were a national franchise identity, he would try to work a little bit. He said since they are just starting out, no one will know one way or the other.

Mr. Souders asked how many colors existed everywhere else. Steve Langworthy explained everybody was different. He said Planning had presented something to City Council recently on the issue, and it noted that Perimeter Center's PUD text has four or five different colors approved. He said every PUD and every area is different and there is not a lot of consistency particularly in most PUDs.

Mr. Schisler pointed out across the street, they were stuck with gold lettering on a green background. He said if you rent with Bri Hi, there are shapes and colors approved. He did not want to see more and more shapes and colors added with each tenant. He said he preferred to keep them to the character approved with the PUD.

Mr. Koehneke pointed out Commodore Blue was from the same palette family as defined by Sherwin Williams. He said they tried to stay within the palette family with their recommendation.

Tom Currie recalled being on the Board when the Bri Hi Square development PUD Sign and Graphics Plan was approved. He said he thought this sign shape and color would have been approved then as easily as the other shapes and four colors and shapes were. He said he saw no problem.

Tasha Bailey noted in print, the Commodore Blue did not look like it was from the same palette. She said it looked much brighter and like a primary color rather than a muted color. Mr. Koehneke pointed out that printing a specific color on a printer will cause a variation in how it looks. Ms. Bailey asked to see a sample of the color. She said she preferred a navy blue to an electric blue. Mr. Koehneke shared a paint stick of the Commodore Blue color. Ms. Bailey said the paint stick blue was less offensive visually than the printed copy but she was challenged to making modifications to what was approved.

Mr. Souders said he did not have a problem with the color or the shape proposed. He said the oval shape was something that could have been seen in a historic area. Mr. Souders said his bigger problem was with the font, which was not being reviewed tonight. Ms. Martin reiterated the proposed font had to meet, or closely match one of the approved fonts within the *Guidelines*. She said Planning would work with the applicant at the Sign Permit stage.

Motion and Vote

Tasha Bailey made a motion, seconded by Robert Schisler, to approve the proposed sign color and additional sign shape as they meet the intent of the approved Bridge and High Sign and Graphics Plan and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*, with no conditions.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Souders, yes; Mr. Currie, yes; Mr. Dyas, yes; Ms. Bailey, yes; and Mr. Schisler, no. (Approved 4 – 1.)

Administrative Business

Mr. Langworthy said Monday night, City Council directed Planning to prepare a memo for an amendment to the general zoning code that would permit a sign to have a 20 percent limitation on a secondary image, but allow the secondary image to be a logo that could be as many colors as is necessary, provided it is a registered trademark. He said that logo would count as one color and the sign would still be limited to three colors.

William Souders said he really did not like that. He said if the 20 percent rule is that the logo cannot be larger than 20 percent of the sign, that restriction minimizes its impact. He said that was good, in terms of limiting its impact. He asked if the shape of the logos was discussed. Mr. Langworthy said no. He said the way it is measured is like sign area, put a rectangle around the outside limits of whatever it is, whatever shape it is. He said the example used was the Nationwide "butterfly" logos which are scattered. He said it was not the actual area of the logo considered.

Mr. Langworthy reported the Planning and Zoning Commission has added a second provision that the secondary image can exceed 20 percent, but the total number of sign colors cannot exceed five. He used an example as a fish market that wanted a fish to be its logo. He said they could have a fish logo so that would exceed 20 percent, but the number of colors in that could not exceed five.

Mr. Souders asked why signs in the Historic District were being changed from having three colors permitted to five. Mr. Langworthy explained that it was only five colors if the logo exceeds 20 percent. He said if it does not exceed 20 percent, then it stays he just mentioned. He said he did not know if that part would be approved by Council.

Mr. Souders asked why that automatically made the Historic District have to do that. Mr. Langworthy said it was because it applied Bridge Street-wide as one regulation for the entire corridor. Mr. Souders said he thought the Historic District had its own set above that in some respects. Mr. Langworthy said it did, but it also includes size, location, and number limitations. He said the five colors have to meet the palette.

Mr. Souders adjourned the meeting at 9:21 p.m.