



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**

**FEBRUARY 22, 2012**

**AGENDA**

**Reconsidered Case:**

- 1. Bridge and High PUD – Building A Modifications  
11-063ARB  
(Approved 3 – 1)**

**12 Darby Street  
Exterior Modifications**

**Previously Tabled Case:**

- 2. Tucci's  
11-055ARB  
(Approved 4 – 0)**

**35 North High Street  
Exterior Modifications**

William Souders called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. Other Board members present were Robert Schisler, Bob Dyas, and Tom Currie. Tasha Bailey was absent. City representatives present were Eugenia Martin, Dan Phillabaum, Jonathan Lee, and Libby Farley.

**Motion and Vote**

Robert Schisler made a motion, seconded by Tom Currie, to accept the documents into the record. The vote was as follows: Mr. Souders, yes; Mr. Currie, yes; Mr. Dyas, yes; Mr. Currie, yes; and Mr. Schisler, yes. (Approved 4 – 0.)

**Motion and Vote**

Robert Schisler made a motion, seconded by William Souders, to approve the January 25, 2012, meeting minutes as presented. The vote was as follows: Mr. Currie, yes; Mr. Dyas, yes; Mr. Souders, yes; Mr. Schisler, yes. (Approved 4 – 0.)

**Communications**

Eugenia Martin noted the latest edition of the Ohio Historical Society newsletter for Certified Local Governments was included in the packet. She said the First reading of the Bridge Street Corridor Development Code and proposed area rezoning to the Bridge Street Corridor zoning districts was heard by City Council at their February 2, 2012 meeting. She said the second reading for the code and the area rezoning is scheduled for February 27, 2012.

William Souders briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Architectural Review Board. He swore in those who wished to address the Board, including Mo Dioun, The Stonehenge Company, Marcus Brewer, Design Collective, Inc., and city representatives.

- 1. Bridge and High PUD – Building A Modifications  
11-063ARB**

**12 Darby Street  
Exterior Modifications**

Eugenia Martin presented this request for reconsideration of the Board's November 2011 decision regarding the proposed exterior modifications. She described the site located in the Bridge and High planned unit development. She said approved uses in the development text include pedestrian-only ATMs. She said on August 24, 2011, the application received approval for a pedestrian-only ATM to be

located on the north façade of Building A, also known as the Bridge Street Building. She said a condition of approval was the applicant ensures that accessible design requirements were met. She explained it was found the entire ramp would need to be reconstructed so there could be an appropriate-sized landing located where the ATM would be in order to meet accessible design requirements.

Ms. Martin said with this application the applicant proposes to relocate the ATM to the northwest corner of Building A where a double-hung window is currently located. She said this location would require a little work to the ramp in order to meet accessible design requirements, but not impact the entire ramp. She reiterated the applicant does have approval for the previous ATM location and even if the application before the Board tonight is disapproved, the applicant may move forward in the original location approved in August.

Ms. Martin said another part of this application proposes a sign over the ATM and to relocate the existing gooseneck fixtures to be over the ATM. She said the sign is limited in size to be either the width of the ATM or four feet, whichever is less. She said the ATM is approximately two feet, 4 inches wide; therefore, the sign will be limited to that width. Ms. Martin said the applicant is also proposing to install a window in the previously approved ATM location similar to the adjacent window in order to have continuity along that façade.

Ms. Martin said Planning has reviewed the proposal based upon on the general review standards as well as the alteration to building, structure, and site and has found the application meets all of the applicable review criteria and recommends approval with no conditions.

Tom Currie asked if the proposal includes replacing the blank wall with a window and moving the light fixtures over at the same height they currently are. Ms. Martin confirmed that was correct.

Mr. Currie asked how the area where the lights currently are will be repaired. Mo Dioun, The Stonehenge Company, said the holes made by the light fixture installation will be hidden with new siding.

Mr. Currie asked if the ATM would be serviced from inside the dumpster area. Mr. Dioun explained the ATM would be serviced from inside the dumpster area, in a secured location. He said it would be boxed-in as a room of its own where only the ATM personnel would have access.

Mr. Currie asked if there would be a hood to protect the machine or was it to be flush with the side of the building. Mr. Dioun said it would be flush, except any indentation that the machine area has itself.

Mr. Currie asked if there was a slot for refuse and receipt slips. Mr. Dioun said there was a public trash can next to the dumpster garage door. He said he did not know if the ATM had a disposal slot.

Mr. Currie asked who owned the walkway. Ms. Martin said it was public property. She explained the work to meet the accessible design requirements will be the responsibility of the developer.

Mr. Currie asked if a sign would be allowed on the wall above the previously approved location in the future. Ms. Martin said signs are only permitted where there are gooseneck fixtures or a use. She explained in this case, the gooseneck fixtures are being moved to be associated with the ATM and the ATM sign. She said if the applicant chooses to return to make modifications to the Sign and Graphics plan, they would have to go through the PUD process because it was part of the approved development text for the proposal.

Mr. Souders recalled that last time, it was verified the ATM only got that one sign. Ms. Martin said that was correct, the ATM only got one sign in that particular location.

Bob Dyas asked if only the front edge of the ramp was being raised a little. Mr. Dioun said he thought the ramp slope was less than 1½ percent and met the requirements, but if necessary, they would raise the front edge slightly. Ms. Martin said information would be submitted as part of the permitting process which will ensure all applicable accessible design requirements are met.

Mr. Currie said he had a problem with the new ATM location from an overall safety standpoint because it was next to the dumpster entrance and shielded by the utility box enclosure. He said it could give the feeling there may be things going on around the corner that may make it hazardous to the person using the ATM. He said that it seemed like there were more comfortable places to place the ATM. He asked if they had looked at other locations.

Mr. Dioun said that they chose the corner because they believed that portion of the façade on the north side of the building was highly visible and the location allows accessibility to service the ATM. He said regarding safety, they believe the project is very safe and the community is quite safe. He said he did not have the slightest problem with any kind of concern from the tenants. He said the tenants think this is a wonderful and very safe project, not only this project, but the whole district.

Mr. Souders said he really liked this location much better in terms of the scale of the building and not having to come up with some funny things to duplicate the window. He said for that elevation, this is good and spending money to add the glass to make it even better was good. Mr. Souders said he had no problems with this proposal.

Mr. Dioun complimented staff for suggesting this location. He said the ATM would definitely look better here than the previous location. Mr. Souders said definitely the profile of the ATM looks better in the narrow window slot than it did sitting in the middle. He said this was a good compromise which made the previously approved ATM better.

#### **Motion and Vote**

Robert Schisler made a motion, seconded by Bob Dyas, to approve this application because the proposed exterior modifications meet the criteria of the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* and the Zoning Code, with no conditions.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Currie, no; Mr. Souders yes; Mr. Schisler, yes; and Mr. Dyas, yes. (Approved 3 – 1.)

#### **2. Tucci's 11-055ARB**

#### **35 North High Street Exterior Modifications**

Eugenia Martin presented this request for exterior modifications to an existing restaurant which was tabled at the January meeting at the applicant's request in order to address Board comments. She said modifications made to the proposal since it was last before the Board consisted of the inclusion of elevations of the north façade, updated elevations to reflect the underside of the gabled roof on both the east and west façade, two options for exterior finishes on the west façade, information on the mechanical screening, and site layout on the west side of the building.

Ms. Martin presented the front elevation and said the applicant had not proposed any changes to what was previously submitted. She reviewed the proposal again and highlighted the extension of the elevated dining area on the northeast corner of the building and gabled roof to provide covered dining in that area. She said as a result of the extension of the gabled roof, the existing accessible ramp will need to be relocated as well as the construction of new stairway to provide restaurant access. Ms. Martin said the applicant is proposing to install a retractable awning as part of the underside of the existing wood trellis.

Ms. Martin said along the rear façade, the applicant is proposing to raise the roof of the existing garage and make interior modifications to provide a private dining area. She said the applicant is proposing to add dormers on the roof to break up the expanse of the roof. She said the applicant is also proposing a 600-foot addition on the southwest corner of the building which will provide a secondary access to the private dining area as well as house the expansion of the renovated kitchen cooler and wine area.

Ms. Martin said the Board had requested additional information on the site plan for the west side. She said the applicant has upgraded the site plan to reflect, at Planning's request, a walkway extension from the existing public walkway on the north side of the building to the south side of the building in order to provide connection to the existing walkway in front of Modern Male. She said the applicant has not indicated what this material is to be, but at the last meeting, it was requested by the Board to use a brick similar to that used on the existing public sidewalks in the District.

Ms. Martin said also at the request of the Board, the applicant has provided additional information as well as two options for exterior finishes of the renovated garage and the addition. She said Option A includes a continuation of the existing brick on the front of the restaurant to clad the exterior of the garage area. She said the exterior of the addition would be clad with a board and batten material and have a stone water table. Ms. Martin said Option B is a reverse of the two types of material. She the applicant is proposing to clad the addition with brick and the exterior of the existing garage would be clad with a board and batten material. She said a water table is not being proposed in Option B, but the columns for the gabled roof and covered entrance would be clad with stone.

Ms. Martin said the Board had requested the applicant provide an elevation for the north side of the restaurant which would depict the material change as well as how the material would wrap the corner on the northwest side. She presented the elevation showing the gabled roof end and pointed out the mechanical screening shown for the rooftop mechanicals. She said the applicant indicated the screening would be three-foot three and a half-inches in height and constructed of a board and batten material. Ms. Martin said in Option A, the applicant proposes to wrap the northwest corner with the brick, extending east approximately six feet.

Ms. Martin said Planning is recommending Option A as the preferred exterior material covering for the addition and the renovated garage. She said additionally, they are requesting the applicant add a trim piece in the gable area which would match the gable treatments on the west façade where the addition is located. She said it is recommended the gable end trim would be similar in style and color to the gabled end on the addition entrance. She said that Planning is also recommending a condition that the wrapped corner with the brick would extend only about two feet and then be capped or not extend above the trim piece extending along the infill of the gabled end of the garage. She said that would be more in line with the Residential Appearance Code and provide a finished edge, which is in line with the character of the District.

Ms. Martin said on the south elevation, the applicant does not propose any changes in regards to the addition, showing again the extended roof gabled end, the mechanical screening, and the 600 square-foot addition.

Ms. Martin said the water table proposed is to be of Coronado Stone Venetian Stucco Stone, similar to that used on the Bri Hi development. She said the addition siding proposed would be a cedar board and batten treatment stained clear. She said the shingles proposed for the renovation would be a gray architecture shingle to match what exists on the restaurant. Ms. Martin pointed out that the proposed brick, although not depicted as such in the elevations, would be the same as exists on the restaurant.

Ms. Martin said in regards to site amenities, the applicant proposes wall sconces which match the sconces located on the piers around the patio. She said on the front façade, there would be a sconce on both sides of the bar area window and one on the side of the main entrance. She said on the rear façade, there would be one sconce on the side of the entrance into the private dining area. Ms. Martin said the applicant is proposing the installation of two ceiling fans to be located underneath the elevated dining area. She said parts of the existing railing will be reused when possible and what needs to be filled in will be fabricated to match. She said the applicant is proposing copper downspouts and the manufacturer as well as the size will need to be identified at Building Permits.

Ms. Martin said that Planning has evaluated this proposal based upon all the applicable review criteria and has found the application can meet approval with five conditions:

- 1) The north elevation should be revised to reflect the recommendations of the Board by incorporating a flush mounted trim inside the gabled end on the northwest corner to match the other gables on the building;
- 2) The walkway along the west façade of the restaurant be constructed of brick, similar to what is used for the public walkways in the Historic District;
- 3) The applicant work with the City on the connection to the existing public walkway on the north side of the site;
- 4) The applicant use Option A for building materials on the rear façade of the restaurant and to the gabled end and that board and batten siding be used on the remaining north façade to the existing brick and that the brick veneer wrap the northwest corner two feet in lieu of the six feet as shown; and
- 5) The applicant revise the plans to specify the size and manufacturer of the copper downspouts at the building permit stage.

Mr. Dyas asked why Planning recommended Option A. He said it seemed if the board and batten material went around the corner, it would have a better transition point on the other side and there would not be a brick line. Ms. Martin explained Planning felt there was a little more character in Option A as far as different types of materials. She said it ends up making the addition and the renovation of the existing garage identifiable as a renovation, which is in line with the *Guidelines* recommendation that additions are recognized as periods of their own time.

Mr. Dyas asked if the brick was brought back two feet, would it be stopped at the top of the wall so the cross member piece of the trim would be above the brick. Ms. Martin said that was correct.

Mr. Dyas recalled the applicant had agreed to move the gas meter if possible. He asked if it was not shown on the elevation, did that mean it would be relocated. Marcus Brewer, Design Collective, Inc. said their engineer was working with Columbia Gas to determine the criteria and ramifications of moving the meter around to the north side.

Mr. Currie asked if the meter would be screened or shielded. Ms. Martin said in an urban environment, it is not possible to effectively screen meters all the way, but there are ways to try to blend it in, similar to what was done at Bridge and High Streets with the meters which were painted to match the siding. She said if it is unable to be moved, Planning will work with the applicant to make sure it is blended in some way.

Mr. Schisler said he preferred Option B because he liked the fact the wood would wrap the side. He said he thought Option B works better in the transition of materials around the building. Mr. Brewer explained they preferred Option A because they felt the transition of materials created a better architectural rhythm. Mr. Schisler pointed out it would be easier to deal with the gas meter in its current location with

Option B than if they went to brick in Option A. Ms. Martin said it was certainly up to the Board's discretion if they preferred Option B.

Mr. Schisler said everything else the Board had requested had been addressed. Mr. Currie said his preference was what the applicant preferred, which was Option A. He asked if the dormers would be open to the inside. Mr. Brewer said yes.

Mr. Souders asked if the brick and stone proposed were real or were they thin brick and stucco stone. Mr. Brewer said the brick was real, but the stone was stucco stone. Mr. Souders asked if the brick rested on the footing. He noted that there was no brick ledge now on the building. He asked what supported the brick. Mr. Brewer said they had not discussed that yet. Mr. Souders said it all leads to where it ends after it turns the corner, how far it is sticking and all that.

Mr. Brewer said that actually was one of the other reasons they preferred Option A. He said in Option B, the brick pushes out very close to the south side lot line on that side. Ms. Martin pointed out that with the Building Permit process, if it is found to be on a lot line, they will have to adjust it back in to meet required setbacks. She said as far as installing the installation of the brick veneer, that it would be addressed with the Building Permit process.

Mr. Souders said if he preferred Option A, the brick would have to go across the entire north to the gable end. He said it could not just end at two feet. He said if that was not what the applicant wanted to do, then he could only support Option B because he thought it was the better solution given turning the corner as well as all the mechanicals and electrical and things there. Mr. Souders reiterated that for him to support Option A, brick would have to go across the gable end. He said Option B was the better solution all the way around for the mechanics, and not having to turn the corner. He said whether there was a stone base with the wood there as opposed to just taking the wood down to the sidewalk to protect it from shoveled snow and all that, those would be an option.

Ms. Martin pointed out the applicant had not indicated how the north side would be addressed in Option B. She said she understood this would be the existing stucco and/or still a concrete block. Mr. Souders modified what he said about Option B, that it would extend the board and batten siding all the way down to the existing brick to cover all the garage and existing building.

Ms. Martin confirmed if Option A was selected by the Board, it would be brick to end of the garage with the gable end trimmed out and finished, and if Option B was selected, it would be board and batten siding along the west façade and the north façade all the way to the existing brick on the north façade.

Mr. Souders asked the Board members if they could support one or both options, if in Option A, the brick would go to the end of the gable and stop at the end of the garage space, with the wood trim in the upper gable and board and batten siding for the balance of the space, and if in Option B, the entire thing would be wrapped in board and batten siding.

Mr. Currie said he would support either option, but preferred Option A. Mr. Dyas said he liked Option A with the brick all the way to the end of the gable as Mr. Souders suggested. Mr. Souders asked if Mr. Brewer still preferred Option A and was okay extending the brick. Mr. Brewer said they had no problem with that. Mr. Schisler said he would support Option A, modified, but he thought they would have issues, and would have to work on them.

Dan Phillabaum asked if the brick was extended to the other return treatment of the gable on the north elevation, would the Board still look for the decorative bracketing detail within that pediment, as is on some other elevations.

Mr. Phillabaum said the recommendation of Planning was to give a better termination to the brick as it was proposed and to add a little more visual entrance to the side. He said he thought based on the direction the Board was going, it is probably unnecessary to add the extra decorative bracketing similar to the south elevation.

Mr. Souders asked if it was okay to extend the brick up into the gable which as a better solution. Mr. Brewer agreed that was the best solution.

Ms. Martin suggested Condition 1 be stricken and that Condition 4 be reworded: The applicant use Option A for building materials on the rear façade of the restaurant and the brick veneer wrap the northwest corner to the gabled end and board and batten siding should be used on the remaining north façade for the existing brick.

#### **Motion and Vote**

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

- 1) The walkway along the west façade of the restaurant be constructed of brick, similar to what is used for the public walkways in the Historic District;
- 2) The applicant work with the City on the connection to the existing public walkway on the north side of the site;
- 3) The applicant use Option A for building materials on the rear façade of the restaurant, with the brick veneer wrapping the northwest corners to the gabled end and board and batten siding be used on the remaining north façade to the existing brick; and
- 4) The applicant revise the plans to specify the size and manufacturer of the copper downspouts at the building permit stage.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Souders, yes; Mr. Currie, yes; Mr. Dyas, yes; Mr. Schisler, yes. (Approved 4 – 0.)

Mr. Souders adjourned the meeting at 7:29 p.m.

As approved by the Architectural Review Board.