



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

AUGUST 28, 2013

AGENDA

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. BSC Historic Core District – Advantage Bank
13-070ARB-MPR/MSP | 12 Darby Street
Sign and Architectural Modifications |
| 2. BSC Historic Core District – Oscar’s Restaurant
13-087ARB-MPR/MSP | 84 North High Street
Sign Modifications |
| 3. Cosslett Residence
13-090ARB | 8055 Dublin Road
Site Modifications |

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 were Jennifer Rauch and Libby Farley.

Motion and Vote

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

Communications

Ms. Rauch requested communications be discussed after the cases were heard.

Mr. Schisler briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Architectural Review Board. He swore in those wishing to speak in regards to any application on the Agenda, including Mike Tibbetts, (25 North Street, Dublin, Ohio); representing Jack Eggspuehler (84 High Company Ltd.), Stephen Cosslett, (8055 Dublin Road, Dublin Ohio), and City representatives.

Ms. Rauch said the applicant for Case 2 had requested to be heard first. She asked if there were any objections. [There were none.] [The minutes reflect the order of the published Agenda.]

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. BSC Historic Core District – Advantage Bank
13-070ARB-MPR/MSP | 12 Darby Street
Sign and Architectural Modifications |
|---|---|

Jennifer Rauch presented this request for approval of a sign and an ATM machine proposed to be located along the north elevation of the Bridge Street Building within the Bridge and High Building. She said this application was reviewed and approved by the Architectural Review Board previously, but there was a statute of limitations once the Bridge Street District took effect. She said anyone that had prior approval had to apply a building permit and/or sign permit within a certain timeframe, and this application did not receive permit approval within that timeframe. She said therefore, the applicant has to gain approval of this proposal despite its prior approval by the Architectural Review Board.

Ms. Rauch presented the existing building elevation with the ATM machine and sign superimposed. She said the two existing storefront windows are shown as well as the trim outlined area where the machine

will be located. Ms. Rauch said the light fixtures will be located above the ATM machine and the proposed sign.

Ms. Rauch presented the proposed sign design and stated Code permitted a wall sign with a maximum of 8 square feet. She said the proposed sign is 2½ square feet, located above the ATM, and will be the same width as the machine. She said the proposed sign colors, height, and location meet Code.

Ms. Rauch said the Administrative Review Team has reviewed the proposal and recommends approval with no conditions.

Ms. Rauch said the applicant was available if there were any questions. [There were none.]

Motion and Vote

Thomas Munhall moved, David Rinaldi seconded, to approve this application for sign and architectural modifications because this proposal meets the criteria of the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* and the Zoning Code, with no conditions.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Mathias, yes; Mr. Dyas, yes; Mr. Schisler, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; and Mr. Munhall, yes. (Approved 5 – 0.)

2. BSC Historic Core District – Oscar’s Restaurant 13-087ARB-MPR/MSP

84 North High Street Sign Modifications

Jennifer Rauch presented this request for approval of sign modifications on the existing restaurant located within a multi-tenant building on the east side of North High Street, north of North Street. She said Oscar’s is in the center of the multi-tenant building, which is connected to 72 North High to the south. She presented a drawing of the existing elevation which showed the existing wall sign with gooseneck fixtures which is the subject of this application. She showed a drawing of the existing planting bed where the proposed ground sign will be located.

Ms. Rauch said as part of this proposal, the applicant is requesting two signs. She presented a slide showing the sign proposed to replace the existing wall sign. She said the applicant is permitted, per Code two different types of signs for the storefront in the multi-tenant building. She explained the size requirements for both signs are a maximum of 8 square feet, which they meet. She said both signs are consistent in design with a black background with white and red lettering. She said the wall sign is located adjacent to the entrance door and the two existing light fixtures will remain. She said the wall sign meets the height requirement at 14 feet from grade, where 15 feet is permitted.

Ms. Rauch said the ground sign is proposed within the existing ivy bed located adjacent to the North High Street sidewalk. She said the applicant indicates a post arm design with the same background and color scheme as the wall sign. She said it meets the Code for height. She said no lighting is proposed. Ms. Rauch said the proposed ground sign location does encroach into the minimum 8-foot setback that Code requires. She said the Administrative Review Team recommends approval of this request, as similar signs have been approved in the District and given its scale it is appropriate and pedestrian in nature.

Ms. Rauch said the Administrative Review Team reviewed this application, noted that it identified where the ground sign is proposed, but Engineering wanted to be more specific about its orientation in that the post is located closest to the building, and ensuring it will not project over the public sidewalk and into the right-of-way. She said the applicant has been asked to modify the site plan to include that information when submitting for the sign permit.

Ms. Rauch said Dublin's architectural consultant has also reviewed the sign and requested the red shown on the top of the cedar post be removed and left natural. She said in addition, a condition was added regarding the existing gooseneck fixtures requesting they be painted to match the trim of the building. Ms. Rauch said approval of this application is recommended with three conditions.

Robert Schisler asked if the ground sign would be in line with the other existing signs. Ms. Rauch confirmed it would and it would also in line with the existing Oscar's patio.

Robert Munhall asked if the existing building color scheme would remain the same or change to match the sign. Mike Tibbetts, (25 North Street, Dublin, Ohio) said the sign color scheme was consistent throughout the restaurant.

Mr. Munhall said the red, white, and black signs had a different feel and he wondered if they were planning on changing the building colors. Mr. Tibbetts said the building color scheme was changed about two years ago when the building addition was approved.

Motion and Vote

David Rinaldi moved, Bob Dyas seconded, to approve this Minor Project Review application for sign modifications, because it meets the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.065(H), 153.170, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*, with three conditions:

- 1) A revised site plan be provided identifying the proposed ground sign location and orientation to ensure the sign does not encroach the right-of-way and project over the public sidewalk, subject to approval by Engineering;
- 2) The applicant revise the proposed ground sign detail to eliminate the red band on the top of the sign post; and,
- 3) The applicant paints the existing gooseneck lights above the proposed wall sign to match the trim of the building.

Mr. Tibbetts, on behalf Jack Eggspuehler, agreed to the conditions.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Munhall, yes; Mr. Mathias, yes, Mr. Schisler, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; and Mr. Dyas, yes. (Approved 5 – 0.)

3. Cosslett Residence 13-090ARB

8055 Dublin Road Site Modifications

Jennifer Rauch presented this request for site modifications to an existing historic property which is located outside of the District, but under the jurisdiction of the Architectural Review Board. She said the site is located at the northwest corner of the intersection of Dublin Road and Ashford Drive. She said it contains a two-story, single-family house built in 1850s. Ms. Rauch said currently, stone walls are located in the southern portion of the site, and the applicant as part of this proposal is requesting to extend the stone wall to the northern portion of the site. She said the proposed dry laid stone wall with a bookend top on it has a maximum height of 36 inches. She said this is another instance of an application approved previously by the Board, but there is a one-year limitation of the validity of a Board Order, so the applicants are before the Board with the same circumstance since the wall was not constructed within that timeframe. Ms. Rauch said no changes have been proposed since the previous approval by the Board.

Ms. Rauch said this application meets all the review criteria, and Planning is recommends approval with three conditions. She said the stone wall extension to the north will need to be located around two existing trees and Planning has asked the that the applicant work to field locate the wall appropriately to ensure those trees are not negatively impacted by the installation of the wall. Ms. Rauch said Planning also recommended a right-of-way encroachment and a revised or new Certification of Zoning Plan Approval are obtained.

Neil Mathias asked if there would be any work done on the existing wall. Stephen Cosslett, (8055 Dublin Road, Dublin, Ohio), said they are planning to repair the parts of the stone wall that had deteriorated.

Motion and Vote

Bob Dyas moved, Neil Mathias seconded, to approve this application for site modifications because this proposal meets the criteria of the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* and the Zoning Code, with three conditions:

- 1) The applicant work with Planning to field locate the wall to minimize the impact on the existing trees;
- 2) A right-of-way encroachment permit be obtained prior to construction of the new section of wall; and
- 3) The applicants obtain a new certificate of zoning plan approval prior to construction.

Mr. Cosslett agreed to the conditions.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Munhall, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Schisler, yes; Mr. Mathias, yes; and Mr. Dyas, yes. (Approved 5 – 0.)

Communications

Ms. Rauch said since the newsletter had been distributed, IT had resolved the issue experienced in transferring existing Board member emails from GroupWise to Outlook and their emails should be there with no problem.

Ms. Rauch referred to the comments Mr. Mathias had brought up a couple of months ago regarding sandwich board signs. She said this topic has come to City Council's attention and their interest is related to the fee and the compliance date for the existing and new businesses within the District. She said Planning prepared a memo to Council regarding the need for a permit and the history, including information about the fee and recommendation to City Council that a business only have to apply one time as long as the sign remains the same. She said the original compliance date was August 1st, then it was pushed back to October 1st, and then based on Council discussion, businesses will not be required to be in compliance until January 1st. She said we will continue to work with businesses to get them into compliance until that time.

Ms. Rauch said the other issue Mr. Mathias had was regarding the design of sandwich signs which was another part of the Council discussion. She said City Council and the Planning and Zoning Commission are in the process of reviewing the Bridge Street District Code. She said the Architectural Review Board will also have the opportunity in the coming months to review the Bridge Street District and identify any issues they see or items that should be revised as this review process moves forward. She suggested the Board review the Bridge Street District and the applications they have reviewed prior to our review of the Code as a group.

Mr. Schisler adjourned the meeting at 6:58 p.m.

As approved by the Architectural Review Board on September 25, 2013.



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

JULY 24, 2013

AGENDA

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>1. BSC Historic Core – Sisters Sweet Shoppe
13-060ARB-MPR
(Approved 5 – 0.)</p> | <p>45 North High Street
Architectural and Site Modifications</p> |
| <p>2. BSC Historic Residential District
13-065ARB-MPR
(Approved 5 – 0.)</p> | <p>137 South Riverview Street
Architectural and Site Modifications</p> |
| <p>3. BSC Historic Core District – Harbor Yoga
13-066ARB-MPR
(Approved 5 – 0.)</p> | <p>36 N. High Street
Sign Modification</p> |
| <p>4. BSC Historic Core District
13-067ARB-MSP
(Master Sign Plan Approved 5 – 0.)
(Minor Project Review Approved 5 – 0.)</p> | <p>48 South High Street
Sign Modification</p> |
| <p>5. BSC Historic Core District – Blankets and Booties
13-068ARB-MPR
(Postponed)</p> | <p>82 South High Street
Architectural Modification</p> |
| <p>6. BSC Historic Core District – Advantage Bank
13-070ARB-MPR/MSP
(Master Sign Plan Tabled 5 – 0.)</p> | <p>12 Darby Street
Sign and Architectural Modifications</p> |

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 were Claudia Husak, Jonathan Lee, and Flora Rogers.

Motion and Vote

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

Motion and Vote

Mr. Schisler moved, Mr. Rinaldi seconded, to approve the June 26, 2013 meeting minutes as presented. The vote was as follows: Mr. Dyas, yes; Mr. Mathias, yes; Mr. Munhall, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; and Mr. Schisler, yes. (Approved 5 – 0.)

Communications

Mr. Schisler briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Architectural Review Board. He swore in those wishing to speak in regards to an application on the agenda tonight.

**1. BSC Historic Core – Sisters Sweet Shoppe
13-060ARB-MPR**

**45 North High Street
Architectural and Site Modifications**

Mr. Lee presented this request for review and approval of architectural and site modifications for an existing retail business located at 45 North High Street. He said the business is located between North High Street and Darby Street with entrances on both streets. He said the site is zoned BSC Historic Core. He highlighted the existing site features and stated the applicant is proposing to the site and the building. He stated the original proposal reviewed by the Administrative Review Team included awnings on the west and south elevations, and at the entranceway along North High Street. He said the originally proposed canvas awnings were a rounded style with scalloped edges, which did not match the building. Mr. Lee stated the proposal also included brick pavers on either side of the entranceway along North High Street. He said the Administrative Review Team reviewed this case and made a recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board with three conditions:

- 1) The awning style be modified to a sloped design with a flat edge, in lieu of the proposed rounded awning with a scalloped edge, subject to approval by Planning;
- 2) The proposed awning located along the front elevation be removed; and
- 3) The proposed brick pavers be extended to connect with the existing brick sidewalk and the applicant use the brick detail that coordinates with the existing brick sidewalk, subject to approval by Engineering.

Mr. Lee said the applicant revised the proposal before the Board tonight based on these conditions. He said the applicant has removed the awning along North High Street and changed the awning style to a traditional shed awning design with a flat edge on the west and south elevations. He said the brick pavers have been extended to the public sidewalk along North High Street and will match the sidewalk pavers. He said with this revised submittal, the applicant is proposed to remove the existing projecting sign and replace it with an awning sign on the rear (west) elevation. He said the proposal also includes painting the window trim along North High Street and the entrance doors red to match the canvas awnings. He said red planter boxes will also be added to the front porch along North High Street and the patio located to the rear along Darby Street will be covered with a tile paver. He said the proposed awning sign along Darby Street meets Code, and the applicant has revised the application to meet the conditions imposed by the Administrative Review Team. He said the proposal meets the applicable review criteria and approval is recommended with addition of a condition stating the existing projecting sign along Darby Street be removed.

Robert Dyas verified the canvas awning was red, as it printed out orange. Mr. Lee confirmed it was Jockey Red by Sunbrella.

Mr. Dyas asked how the proposed pavers would transition between the public sidewalk and the existing entrance way along North High Street. Larry Burchfield (Cedarbrook Nurseries, Glick Road, Powell) said the pavers will taper to eliminate a trip hazard.

David Rinaldi verified the locations of the red trim and doors. He asked whether the red trim was only on the windows along the North High Street elevation. Mr. Burchfield said yes.

Mr. Dyas asked if the trim would be incorporated along the south windows facing Tucci's. Mr. Lee said no, it was not part of the applicant's proposal.

Mr. Schisler stated in the pictures they received there is green trim on the front elevation. He asked if there is green trim elsewhere on the building and if the intent is to have green, red, white trim with the

existing siding colors. Claudia Husak confirmed the red trim is proposed in addition to the existing color scheme.

Mr. Mathias said the building has green gutters and green trim on the front elevation along the North High Street. Ms. Husak said he was correct.

Mr. Dyas said he did not agree with painting the doors and the trim red, given the existing building has a green and white color scheme. He said he was supportive of the red awnings.

Mr. Mathias said he liked the red door, but the color scheme on the back would be different than the front and would not look cohesive.

Mr. Schisler said the applicant could keep the windows green and paint the door green or red, then the design would seem a little more cohesive.

Mr. Dyas stated Mr. Munhall was right, it is a distinct difference in the structure from the historic schoolhouse out front and the additions along the alley in the back. He said he could support the red door but not the red window trim.

Mr. Mathias said he thought with the door painted red the window trims might be out of character. Mr. Dyas agreed.

Mr. Mathias asked if it would be inappropriate to ask the applicant to match the green on the rest of the building.

Ms. Husak said a condition could state the applicant be allowed to only paint the front door red and keep the existing color scheme for the window trim. Mr. Schisler agreed a condition should be added.

Mr. Burchfield agreed to the condition.

Mr. Mathias asked for clarification regarding the location of the tiles on the rear patio. Mr. Burchfield said the tiles are located under the awning on the rear of the building.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Dyas moved to approve this Minor Project Review application for site and architectural modifications because it meets the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.062, 153.065 and 153.170, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*, with five conditions:

1. The awning style be modified to a sloped design with a flat edge, in lieu of the proposed rounded awning with a scalloped edge, subject to approval by Planning;
2. The proposed awning located along the front elevation be removed;
3. The proposed brick pavers be extended to connect with the existing brick sidewalk and the applicant use the brick detail that coordinates with the existing brick sidewalk, subject to approval by Engineering;
4. The existing projecting sign on the rear be removed prior to the installation of the awning;
5. The applicant be permitted to only paint the front door red and keep the existing color scheme for the window trim.

*Larry Burchfield, representing the applicant, agreed to the above conditions.

Mr. Munhall seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Mr. Schisler, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Mathias, yes; and Mr. Munhall, yes, and Mr. Dyas, yes. (Approved 5 – 0.)

**2. BSC Historic Residential District
13-065ARB-MPR**

**137 South Riverview Street
Architectural and Site Modifications**

Ms. Husak presented the request for architectural and site modifications to a single-family house located at 137 South Riverview Street zoned Bridge Street Historic Residential District. She outlined the existing site conditions and identified the cedar shake house has an asphalt shingled roof with a detached garage and fenced in yard. She said the Board approved significant modifications to the house and garage in 2010, which was never constructed. She said the applicant is proposing to modify the previous proposal and incorporate a 432-square-foot addition to the rear of the existing house. She said the addition is one-story and will match the cedar shake siding and the asphalt roof on the existing house. She stated the Administrative Review Team reviewed this application and recommended approval to the Architectural Review Board with one condition requiring the applicant to a 300-pound asphalt shingle to meet Code.

Mr. Mathias asked about the design of the proposed doors and windows along the addition, because a mixed of style exist on the house.

Mr. Brian Zingleman, representing the applicant, stated the proposal does not include mullions on the new doors and windows. He said the house contains a variety of window and door styles with different mullion arrangements. He said the proposed window and door style was selected to create access and visibility to the rear yard, and to keep the design as simple and open as possible. He said this style does match one set of windows on the house.

Mr. Rinaldi stated the overall scale and design looks fine.

Mr. Schisler said the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* state the intent of an addition is to complement the existing structure and not try to match.

Mr. Dyas said he preferred this proposal to the previously approved addition. He said it follows the *Guidelines* and does not overpower the existing structure.

Mr. Zingleman said the geometry atypical because the design works around an existing patio built over the cistern and the applicant would like these to remain.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Munhall moved to approve this Minor Project Review application for site and architectural modifications because it meets the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.063(B) and 153.170, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*, with one condition:

1. The applicant be required to provide an asphalt shingle which meets the 300lb requirement.

*Brian Zingleman agreed to the above condition.

Mr. Dyas seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Mathias, yes; Mr. Schisler, yes; Mr. Dyas, yes; and Mr. Munhall, yes. (Approved 5 – 0.)

**3. BSC Historic Core District – Harbor Yoga
13-066ARB-MPR**

**36 N. High Street
Sign Modification**

Mr. Lee introduced this case for the installation of a new sign for a yoga studio located at 36 N. High Street. He said the site is located on the east side of North High Street, just north of the intersection

with Wing Hill, and is zoned Bridge Street Historic Core District. He said the applicant is proposing to install a window decal that consists of two colors with logo shown in the blue and the text in black. He said the Administrative Review Team reviewed the proposal and recommends approval, as it meets the review criteria and Code.

Mr. Schisler asked if the sign incorporates the white background or if it will be translucent. Ms. Angie O'Brien said it would incorporate the white background because it will be placed on the window and would be more legible. She said the anchor and lotus flower are two blue colors with the black text.

Mr. Schisler said the sign would have four colors, if the white is incorporated, which exceeded the number of colors permitted. Ms. O'Brien stated the curtain is white and could be closed to achieve the same effect.

Mr. Munhall asked if there were recessed lights under the overhang. Ms. O'Brien said there was one in the middle.

Mr. Mathias asked if there was a preexisting decal on the left window and whether anything has been done to try and remove it. Ms. O'Brien said when they moved in they tried a number of different products. She said they have asked the landlord to replace the windows.

Mr. Rinaldi asked is there any concern raised by the ART regarding the lettering style. Ms. Husak said the ART did not discuss it.

Mr. Rinaldi said he recalled requirements regarding the use of 19th century lettering styles. Ms. Husak stated *Design Guidelines* include a list of font, which we would find a compatible style.

Mr. Munhall asked for a condition to eliminate the white background and limit the sign to three colors.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Munhall moved to approve this Minor Project Review application for sign modifications, because it meets the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.065(H) and 153.170, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*, with one condition:

1. The applicant work with Planning to eliminate the white background to ensure the sign background is transparent and the overall sign does not exceed three colors.

Angie O'Brien agreed to the above condition.

Mr. Rinaldi seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Mr. Dyas, yes; Mr. Mathias, yes; Mr. Schisler, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; and Mr. Munhall, yes. (Approved 5 – 0.)

4. BSC Historic Core District 13-067ARB-MSP

48 South High Street Sign Modification

Ms. Husak introduced this request for a master sign plan and a minor project to install two signs of the same type, where the Code would require two different signs types. She said the site is located at 48 South High Street and includes an existing multiple tenant building with frontage on High Street and Spring Hill. She said the Board recently approved a sign for the Winan's store located on the southern end of the building. Ms. Husak indicated tenants are also located on the second floor. She stated the application was proposed for the applicant's law offices located at the northern end of the building.

Ms. Husak outlined the proposal for two window signs of the same sign type within the windows facing South High Street. She said Code would permit two signs of two different signs, such as a wall sign and a window sign or a projecting sign and a window sign or a different combination. She said the tenant space has two windows and the applicant is proposing to place a window decal in each window. She said based on the request, it has been determined master sign plan approval is needed from the Board. She stated all other Code requirements are met with this proposal. She indicated the Administrative Review Team has reviewed the request and recommended approval of both application components to the Board.

Mr. Schisler asked if the signs are separated to meet the size requirement or do they truly wish to be on separate windows. Ms. Husak responded it was the latter.

Mr. Schisler said he would prefer to see the more traditional design for a law office with the names underneath in one window. Mr. Munhall agreed.

Mr. Schisler said he would locate it in the window nearest to the door.

Mr. Munhall asked if the Board was approving an increase in sign size. Ms. Husak responded the master sign plan approval would be granting an increase in sign area.

Mr. Rinaldi said he would support the signs in the two windows. Mr. Dyas agreed given they were two matching bay windows.

Mr. Munhall asked if the applicant would be opposed to putting the signs in one window closest to the door.

Mr. Joel Campbell, the applicant, said he felt it would look awkward with signs in only one window and a blank window next to it. He said Winan's has a similar design with signs along the bottom, but they only have one window. He said they would like to keep the signs as proposed.

Mr. Campbell asked if they would be a permitted a sign at the rear of the building off the parking lot. Mr. Schisler said that would be permitted, regardless of the approval of the window signs along the front.

Ms. Husak stated if the applicant wanted another sign, such a projecting or wall sign they would have to submit and gain approval from the Board for an amended master sign plan to allow any additional sign. She said it would not require a variance process.

Mr. Munhall and Mr. Rinaldi said they were supportive of the two window signs as proposed.

Mr. Schisler said the signs were period appropriate and looked nice. Mr. Dyas agreed.

Ms. Husak clarified the Master Sign Plan is Motion #1 to allow the two signs of the same type.

Motion and Vote #1

Mr. Rinaldi moved to approve this Master Sign Plan application, because it meets the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.065(H) and 153.170, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Mr. Schisler seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Mr. Dyas, yes; Mr. Munhall, yes; Mr. Mathias, yes; Mr. Schisler, yes; and Mr. Rinaldi, yes. (Approved 5 – 0.)

Motion and Vote #2

Mr. Munhall moved to approve this Minor Project Review for sign modifications, because it meets the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.065(H) and 153.170, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Mr. Dyas seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Mathias, yes; Mr. Schisler, yes; Mr. Dyas, yes; and Mr. Munhall, yes. (Approved 5 – 0.)

**5. BSC Historic Core District – Blankets and Booties
13-068ARB-MPR**

**82 South High Street
Architectural Modification**

This case postponed prior to the meeting.

**6. BSC Historic Core District – Advantage Bank
13-070ARB-MPR/MSP**

**12 Darby Street
Sign and Architectural Modifications**

Ms. Husak requested the application be tabled due to the submission and review of inaccurate information.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Schisler moved to table this request, Mr. Rinaldi seconded. The vote was as follows, Mr. Dyas, yes; Mr. Munhall, yes; Mr. Mathias, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; and Mr. Schisler, yes. (Tabled 5 – 0.)

Mr. Schisler adjourned the meeting at 7:20 p.m.

As approved by the Architectural Review Board on September 25, 2013.