

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

MEETING MINUTES

JUNE 26, 2013

1. Historic Dublin Markers 13-017ADM

Planning Presentation Discussion Only

Robert Schisler called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Board members present were Bob Dyas, Neil Mathias, Thomas Munhall, and David Rinaldi. City representatives present were Jennifer Rauch, Jonathan Lee, and Libby Farley.

Motion and Vote

Robert Schisler moved, Bob Dyas seconded, to accept the documents into the record. The vote was as follows: Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Mathias, yes; Mr. Munhall, yes; Mr. Dyas, yes; and Mr. Schisler, yes. (Approved 5 – 0.)

Motion and Vote

Bob Dyas moved, David Rinaldi seconded, to approve the May 22, 2013 meeting minutes as presented. The vote was as follows: Mr. Schisler, yes; Mr. Mathias, yes; Mr. Munhall, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; and Mr. Dyas, yes. (Approved 5 – 0.)

Mr. Schisler briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Architectural Review Board.

Communications

Ms. Rauch said Bridge Street District regulations could now be accessed at the following link: <http://dublinohiousa.gov/bridge-street/developing-the-district/> and it could also be downloaded to iPads as a pdf, so that the Board members could access it anytime. She said that, in addition to the link, a DropBox folder had been created with reference material for the Board which included the Bridge Street Code, the Bridge Street Zoning Map, the ARB section of the Zoning Code, Demolition criteria, and the ARB review criteria for cases. She said that if the Board members wanted additional material, they should let her know so that during meetings, they could access it. Ms. Rauch said that at the end of the meeting, the Board member iPads would be distributed and explained.

1. Historic Dublin Markers 13-017ADM

Planning Presentation

Jennifer Rauch presented a review similar to what was given at the public open house regarding the Historic Dublin Markers on June 11 2013. She included an overview of the project and objectives. Ms. Rauch led the Board members into a discussion to gain their input regarding the next steps. She said that the public open house had minimal attendance and she said that she would like suggestion from the Board as to how to better engage the stakeholders and public participation in the future in this process to ensure input is received from everyone.

Ms. Rauch said that City Council has asked staff to work with the Architectural Review Board to look at the existing Dublin Historic Dublin markers and make recommendations as to how they could be improved, keeping in mind the historic character and the character of the District.

Ms. Rauch explained that by using the electronic survey devices that each member had been given to use, they would be able to gauge views of the Board and how they wish to move forward with this project.

Ms. Rauch explained that the Bridge Street District includes an area larger that surrounds the Historic District, which is located in the High Street/State Route 161 area. She said the Historic District is one of the most significant areas of the City and thus, important to preserve the area, attract different types of people to live, work and interact.

[The following reflects majority results of the Board member survey, followed by comments made on each subject.]

How familiar are you with the Bridge Street Planning efforts?

The majority of the Board members indicated that they were somewhat familiar with the Bridge Street planning efforts.

The current Historic District markers are sufficient to identify the Historic District for visitors and residents.

The majority of the Board members indicated that the markers were not sufficient to identify the Historic District.

Bob Dyas said that he lived nearby for two years before he had noticed the markers. He said that everyone he asked about them wanted to know where they were located indicating a lack of visibility. He said he thought the existing markers looked like tombstones.

Robert Schisler suggested non-obstructive standard markers.

Thomas Munhall said the question was where the markers should be located and what information they would include. He said the existing stone markers should be utilized elsewhere based on the fact that they were good architectural pieces. He suggested that Dublin residents and others be invited to a design competition.

Neal Mathias said that the existing markers are not legible enough from a vehicle. He suggested markers be within the sight of each other.

Mr. Schisler asked how old the existing markers were.

Ms. Rauch suggested that Mr. Dyas, the Board's Dublin Historical Society representative, perhaps could find out how old the markers were.

Libby Farley recalled that in 1991, the markers were purchased and installed by the City.

Mr. Mathias asked if the boundaries of the Historic District were being changed.

Ms. Rauch said that the boundaries were not being changed.

The existing Historic District markers are located properly for identifying the entrances to the District.

The majority of the Board members indicated that the existing marker locations were not properly located for identifying the entrances to the District.

Mr. Dyas said that the markers needed to identify the district sooner so that drivers could slow down considering the pedestrian movement and need for safety.

Mr. Rinaldi suggested that markers could be located on the east side of the bridge after the construction is completed.

Mr. Munhall said that the markers could go along with some of the redevelopment and the new roads that will go around Indian Run instead of through the District. He said it would go hand-in-hand with other improvements within the District.

The existing Historic marker design is appropriate for identifying the entrances to the District.

The majority of the Board members indicated that the marker design was not appropriate for identifying the entrances to the District.

Mr. Schisler said he did not object to the current marker design, but if the goal was something to slow down traffic in the Historic District, the existing markers were not visible enough. He said if the goal is to improve the marketability of the District, the design could be more pronounced.

The design for the Historic District markers should...

The majority of the Board members indicated that the marker design should be highly visible, but restrained.

Mr. Rinaldi said that the markers should be noticeable so that drivers realize that they are entering a different area.

Mr. Schisler said that he would not want a standard historic marker like Savanna, Georgia, because it was uninteresting and includes only one color. He said that the markers should have more uniqueness.

Mr. Rinaldi suggested a cobblestone crosswalk could be used to mark the borders of the District.

Mr. Mathias suggested that stacked stone could be added to the existing vertical markers.

Mr. Dyas said that if stacked stone was added to the existing markers it might be enough to bring attention to drivers entering the District.

Which style of sign should be considered?

The majority of the Board members indicated that the style of the markers should be a sign.

Mr. Schisler said that he did not think the District was large enough for gateways. He said that he thought the unique obelisk markers were most appropriate for the scale of the District.

Mr. Munhall said he did not think a gateway would work anywhere but on the bridge. He suggested a brick surface on the bridge with a gateway and a sign. He suggested that a standard historic plaque should be placed in other locations within Dublin.

Mr. Schisler recalled that about two years ago, that the City implemented signs for way-finding and lampposts were unique to the District. He stated that his helped identify the district.

Mr. Rinaldi suggested that shingle-type signs on lampposts would fit into the Historic District.

Mr. Munhall asked if the text on the markers would state "Welcome to Old Dublin". Ms. Rauch explained that it would be 'Welcome to Historic Dublin'.

Ms. Rauch explained that there were different options for relaying the Board's discussion

Mr. Dyas suggested that a presentation could be given at the President's Cup.

Ms. Rauch said she did not know what the format of the event would be but suggested that information could be placed on the City's website, and have contact with the Historic Dublin businesses and the residents association to attract more comments. She asked for recommendations.

Mr. Munhall suggested also surveying the Planning and Zoning Commission for their input. He asked if Council had indicated what they preferred regarding the markers or what the budget would be. Mr. Munhall said the more fine-tuned the survey was, the better the results would be.

Ms. Rauch said that she appreciated the Board members input. She asked if they thought of other things or opportunities to get people involved, they contact her or call Mr. Langworthy.

iPad and Electronic Packet Discussion

Ms. Rauch explained that the goal of the iPad project was to reduce the amount of paper used to copy planning reports and meeting documents, be more environmentally minded regarding the distribution of meeting documents, and provide a professional and accessible environment for the board members to work in. She stated that it is the goal of the City to provide packets electronically in order to accommodate those objectives. She stated that as part of the project, the City has allocated iPads for all board and commission members so that information can be accessed at any location. She stated that this does not eliminate the ability to access the information from a desktop computer but simply provides an alternative to access materials in any location, including during the meetings. She said another objective for tonight's presentation was to make sure that the members have training, know what to do and who to contact if an iPad is lost or stolen, and ensure that they understand the legal issues associated with public records.

Ms. Rauch said that the City has a Records Retention program which identifies how long emails and other types of correspondence have to be maintained and when these documents can be destroyed. She explained that as City representatives, if they create or receive digital or paper documents, they are considered public records. She also stated that the City's Technology Policy has also been distributed to the Board members that needed to be read, signed, and returned at the next meeting.

Ms. Rauch said that hard copy material packets will be distributed until the end of the year in order to allow the members to transition to electronic packets. She stated that if the members need any additional training or have questions, to please contact her directly. She stated that any issues that she could not solve, she would contact our IT division.

Communications

Mr. Mathias referred to the existing sandwich boards in the District and stated that the requirements seem vague. He said many of the sandwich boards did not seem to meet the requirements and are not being enforced.

Mr. Schisler stated that he thought the height restriction for sandwich boards was 36 inches. He said that the Board did not want to be too restrictive, but regulations should include location and time limitations for display.

Mr. Mathias said that it seemed that restriction related to sandwich boards was contradictory to how restrictive the City is with permanent signs. He pointed out that the Mr. Susi's sign said 'Now Open Daily,' and they have been open daily for two years.

Ms. Rauch explained that the City is not allowed to regulate content, and that is part of the reason the Code is vague. She said several options have been discussed in order to deal with signs in the Historic District including having a sign package for the district. She said this was discussed as part of the Bridge Street Code process. She said that there were many meetings where the Board discussed the desire to make Bridge Street District as uniform as possible so that everyone had the same opportunity to identify their business. Ms. Rauch said that the way the Code is written is that there is one sandwich board per ground floor tenant. She said there was a lot of discussion about the location. She said that they are permitted immediately in front of the building, within six feet of the primary public entrance, that they maintain an unobstructed five-foot clearance on the sidewalk, and not impede pedestrians and vehicles by their location. She said the size permitted for a sandwich board is six square feet, and the maximum height is three feet. Ms. Rauch said the sandwich board requirements are that chalkboards are encouraged with subdued colors, and that they have to be removed during nonbusiness hours.

Mr. Schisler said that he did not prefer the white plastic sandwich boards because they did not have a historic look. He said he thought many of them were taller than 36 inches, and the Jeni's sign was a smaller, chalkboard sign. He said to be fair to all businesses it should be enforced.

Mr. Mathias said his question was whether or not the Code is specific enough regarding aesthetics.

Mr. Schisler said that the difficult part is personal preference. He said that his issue was that some of the existing sandwich boards were actually the businesses' primary signs. He said sandwich boards are not supposed to have the same message every day.

Mr. Mathias said there was also the question of whose interpretation is 'frame of a subdued nature,' and does white PVC meet a subdued nature or is it too bright.

Ms. Rauch said it used to be an informal policy that sandwich boards could be used in the District and there were no requirements, and just having the requirements is an accomplishment. She said the other part was balancing small businesses who are trying to remain competitive by advertising their products.

Mr. Munhall suggested waiting until the August meeting to see the results of the Code Enforcement project.

Ms. Rauch said that Code Enforcement is in the District at least twice a week conducting parking counts, so if they see a sign out of compliance, the business is notified.

Ms. Rauch summarized the Board's comments and that the next step was to discuss compliance with the regulations at the August 2013 meeting.

Mr. Schisler adjourned the meeting at 7:44 p.m.

As approved by the Architectural Review Board on July, 24, 2013.