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

JUNE 25, 2014

AGENDA

1. BSC Historic Core District – Architectural and Sign Modifications
113 South High Street
14-043ARB-MPR **Minor Project Review (Approved 5 – 0)**

Robert Schisler called the meeting to order at 6:29 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Board members present were Bob Dyas, David Rinaldi, Neil Mathias, and Thomas Munhall. City representatives were Steve Langworthy, Jennifer Rauch, Joanne Shelly, Andrew Crozier, Nicki Martin, Katie Ashbaugh, Logan Stang, and Laurie Wright.

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

Motion and Vote
Mr. Rinaldi moved, Mr. Schisler seconded, to accept the May 21, 2014, meeting minutes as presented. The vote was as follows: Mr. Dyas, yes; Mr. Mathias, yes; Mr. Munhall, yes; Mr. Schisler, yes; and Mr. Rinaldi, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

Mr. Schisler 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 District – Architectural and Sign Modifications
113 South High Street
14-043ARB-MPR **Minor Project Review**

Jennifer Rauch said this application is for modifications to building, trim and roof colors and the installation of a new 8-square-foot sign for an existing commercial building on the west side of South High Street, between Pinney Hill and John Wright Lane.

Ms. Rauch said the site contains an existing one-story structure built in the 1870s with white siding, dark trim, and a dark green metal roof. She said the new tenant occupying this space is asking to make some modifications to the exterior and add a new sign. She reported this application was reviewed by the Administrative Review Team who made a recommendation for approval.

Ms. Rauch said the color scheme proposed includes “Porcelain” for the main structure; “Flint” that is a dark gray for the roof and shutters; and “Van Buren Brown” for the front door, all of which are compatible with the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines.* She said the proposed sign is located under the porch awning. She indicated the two previous tenants in this building had signs in this same location. She said the proposal meets Code with an 8-square-foot sign installed to the adjacent main entrance with three colors. She stated the background will be the same color of the main structure that is “Porcelain”, and each of the tenants that occupy this building will have engraved letters to reflect their respective

businesses. She explained the left side of the sign will have letters in the same "Van Buren Brown" color as the front door, and the right side will be in "Commodore Blue". She stated the review criteria are met and approval is recommended with no conditions.

David Rinaldi asked what the trim colors were. Ms. Rauch said it is the same color as the main structure that is "Porcelain". Neil Mathias confirmed the three-color requirement for the sign. She apologized for the way the graphic was appearing on screen as it did not show the colors well. Mr. Mathias inquired about the logo color for the left side of the sign to which Ms. Rauch stated will be "Van Buren Brown".

Robert Schisler said the trim looks gray on the website. He confirmed it was two different businesses on one sign and not a placard for multiple businesses. He said usually, law offices list the names of the attorneys, for an example.

Ms. Rauch said there was a discussion early on with the tenant about having two separate signs but given the size requirement, one sign was recommended.

Bob Dyas confirmed the trim would be the white color. Ms. Rauch said if the Board had a different preference, it could be discussed with the applicant. Mr. Schisler said within that time period, some houses were painted all white and others painted the trim in an accent color.

Motion and Vote
Mr. Munhall moved, Mr. Dyas seconded, to approve this request for a Minor Project Review for modifications to building, trim and roof colors and the installation of a new 8-square-foot sign for an existing commercial building, because the proposal meets the review criteria of minor projects with no conditions. The vote was as follows: Mr. Mathias, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Schisler, yes; Mr. Dyas, yes; and Mr. Munhall, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

Communications
Jennifer Rauch introduced some of the recent new hires: Joanne Shelly, Landscape Architect and Urban Designer; Katie Ashbaugh, Planning Assistant; Nicki Martin, Planning Assistant; Andrew Crozier, Planning Assistant; and Logan Stang, Planning Assistant. She said all the planning assistants were students from The Ohio State program and here to gain an understanding of all the different Boards and what they do.

Training
Jennifer Rauch said the first part of this training is to go through the review process so everyone is familiar with all of the terms of the different processes that come through this Board as well as the development regulations and how these pieces stack up to then make a project. She said she would also review the different building types that are permitted within the Zoning Districts within the Historic District by using a case example of how all these pieces fit.

Ms. Rauch said the first piece is the application process. She said prior to an application being filed a pre-application review is brought at a conceptual level to the ART for initial feedback. She explained this was a mandatory requirement when submitting a Development Plan or a Site Plan. She said if all goes well, then a Basic Plan Review because the first formal submission, showing the conceptual building layouts, general building locations and street locations. She explained the ART takes an initial review and would then forward to proposal with a recommendation and conditions to the ARB for determination. She said the ART would also outline any initial waivers to the Code, such as a building height that exceeds Code.

Ms. Rauch explained the process follows a Basic Development Plan to a Development Plan and a Basic Site Plan to a Site Plan, but an applicant could combine applications. Ms. Rauch said the Development Plan establishes the street network and framework for the blocks. She explained at this level, the Board is not reviewing the individual development requirements. She said the next step would be the Site Plan that is all the final details. She said the application process is meant to be taken in steps, with the Site

Plan being the most specific. She said if a Basic Plan came to you looking one way and the Development Plan and Site Plan looked drastically different then the applicant has to go back and start over. She said the intent is to lay that ground work and build upon it. She indicated both the Development Plan and the Site Plan are reviewed by the ART whom make a recommendation to this Board, and from there the ARB makes a determination. She said the Site Plan applicant includes building materials, exact locations of open space, setbacks, etc.

Ms. Rauch said there are specific time frames in the Code regarding when the applicant submits an application and a decision has to be made. She said 28 days is the typical time frame. She said sometimes a special meeting is needed and there is an opportunity in the Code to get a time extension. She said the goal of the review process is to make it predictable for the applicant.

Ms. Rauch said the Code has built-in flexibility so there are certain things the ART can approve, such as Administrative Departures, which are minor deviations to the strict Code requirements. She said Waivers, which are larger than departures like extra stories or site that do not meeting the block width requirement have to be reviewed and approved by ARB.

Neil Mathias asked if Waivers would be voted upon independently of a Site or Development Plan. Ms. Rauch answered yes, which is similar to the Planning and Zoning Commission's process. She said staff has a way of presenting this in a logical format so that you know what the specific Waivers are and how that fits with the Development or Site Plan. She said typically the Waivers have to be approved first, because a Development or Site Plan approval may be contingent on it.

Robert Schisler asked what happens when there is a condition the City will have to meet. For example, he said if a building is to be constructed that faced an alley but Code does not permit the building to front an alley but the City plans to change that alley to a street. He asked if that would just be a condition. Ms. Rauch replied yes on that example. She explained analysis is required prior to the approval of a Waiver.

Ms. Rauch said parking plans are also discussed as part of the flexible review process. She said the applicant may want less parking or more parking than Code. Currently, she said there is a minimum and maximum limit within the Code for the Bridge Street District, but the rest of the City just has a minimum requirement. She said when transitioning from suburban to urban, we wanted to make sure there is not too much parking as density is increasing. She recalled that parking plan issues came before the Boards more for existing structures. She said to meet the criteria the applicant has to demonstrate why they do or do not need the parking.

Ms. Rauch said Master Sign Plans may also come up as part of the review process. She explained if there is a multiple-unit or multiple-building project the same sign standards outlined in the Code may not be appropriate. She said the Master Sign Plan provides an opportunity for an applicant may request modifications to the types of signs, location, number of signs, or size, and for it to be reviewed on a larger scale.

Ms. Rauch referred to the table of contents within the Bridge Street Code that lists: conventional zoning requirements as General Purpose, Districts Intent, and Uses; form-based elements such as Lots and Blocks, Street Types, Building Types, Neighborhood Standards, and Open Space Types; and conventional specific requirements such as Site Development Standards, Review and Approval, and Definitions.

Ms. Rauch presented a slide that showed the various layers: Zoning Districts and Uses; Street Network and Street Types; Lots and Blocks; and Building Types and Placement and how each builds upon the next to get where a building should get placed. She said the big picture is then drilled down to the specifics.
Ms. Rauch explained the process that is followed with the Developers on how to use the Bridge Street Code: 1) Determine Zoning District; 2) Review permissible uses and use requirements; 3) Examine street requirements, rights-of-way, bike network; 4) Determine lot and block requirements; 5) Determine

permitted building types; 6) Review building type and siting requirements; 7) Review open space dedication and siting requirements; and 8) Review site development requirements (parking, landscaping, signs, etc.).

Ms. Rauch demonstrated a real world example by examining a principal frontage street (the main street that a building is oriented) that helps establish the streetscape and as it develops the blocks it determines how the buildings are located on the street, what happens within that particular area, how curb cuts are accessed, there are maximum block size requirements that is 300 feet for the historic transition area and a perimeter requirement.

Mr. Schisler noted an instance where there cannot be a street because there is a cliff. Ms. Rauch said during the review process this would be discussed to make sure there is proper street frontage and if there is an opportunity for alleys or service streets.

Mr. Schisler pointed out there are still ways to reduce the size of the block. Ms. Rauch indicated the staff and ART would review the proposal to determine if there is another way to meet the Code or provide another access point. She explained the whole point of the street network is to provide connections. Mr. Schisler asked if that would require a request for a Waiver. Ms. Rauch said it would be a Waiver, if the applicant does not meet that requirement

Ms. Rauch said once the block is established and because some of the principle frontage streets have limitations about where curb cuts can happen, an alley may be inserted to get access and provide a curb cut, limiting vehicular parking, and making sure pedestrians have a way through. She said in the Code it is referred to as the mid-block pedestrian way.

Ms. Rauch said the next step would be to determine the different building types: loft building, single family attached, or apartment building and how to mix them on a particular lot. Ms. Rauch used an apartment building for an example and referred to the list of requirements that are found in the Code, specifically noted the front property line and side property line in the required build zone (RBZ). She said in addition to where a building is located, the Code states, of the front property line, the building has to cover a certain percent and in this example it was 75 percent to create a dense urban environment.

Ms. Rauch indicated depending on the building type in the RBZ, some require stoops, landscaping, street walls, etc. She said on-street parking, rear parking and stormwater is included. She reported the Stormwater Manual had been updated with the BSD in mind, requesting more sustainable practices and no large ponds but rain gardens and green roofs could be integrated.

Ms. Rauch explained the open space requirements for the BSD. She went through the different types of open spaces (pocket parks, greenways, neighborhood parks) where the requirements are based on the square footage per the dwelling unit.

David Rinaldi asked for clarification on her example that the developer is developing the whole block but asked what if the developer was just doing one corner of the block. Ms. Rauch said a smaller scale plaza would work or paying a “fee in lieu of” for future development on the block where it can be a part of a comprehensive open space.

Ms. Rauch presented the building types that are permitted in the BSD for the Historic Core: Historic Mixed-Use; Historic Cottage Commercial; Civic Building; and Parking Structure, which each have their own set of requirements. She said the Historic Transition permits additionally: Single-family attached; Apartment Buildings; Loft Buildings, and Podium Apartment with the parking underneath. She explained the Public District is the remainder of this area and only permits two building types but as more projects are envisioned, the intent is to rezone these areas to be included in the Historic Transition District. She said these public properties have to be taken into account for existing conditions.

Ms. Rauch said for the sake of example she chose the loft building type and referred to the Code that shows the requirements on the left and how they correspond to the different areas in the diagram on the right. She said the Code outlines requirements for building siting, how much is it occupying, where is it located, height, how many stories, height of each story, such as the ground story vs the upper stories.

Mr. Mathias asked if there was a process to vary the number of stories a building can have. Ms. Rauch answered some of them account for minimum height and for this example: minimum height is 2 stories; and maximum height is 4.5 stories. She indicated there are instances where if the building is stepped back, more stories can be added, which are approved through the Waiver process.

Mr. Schisler inquired about the Code. Steve Langworthy said the Planning Commission is proposing a change in Code to limit the number of stories and could only be done through a Waiver. He said currently, Code permits it within certain locations within the District but that may go away if it is anything over the building height that is listed in the table.

Ms. Rauch explained that under the height section it regulates the number of stories but also minimum/maximum height of a story to keep the character. Mr. Langworthy explained the intent is for the lower stories to be more flexible, so it could go back and forth between residential, retail, or mixed-use in the future. He said the form of the building is what counts and it less about the uses inside. He said the first floor is made flexible and higher to accommodate a possibility of a mixed-use environment.

Ms. Rauch said there could be flexibility for the ground story. She noted there are facade requirements regarding how much transparency for the ground story and upper stories; number of windows; openness to each floor; building entrances; vertical/horizontal facade divisions; and roof types. She presented a review example for a loft building.

Mr. Mathias asked if there was more or less focus on stories or on overall building height. Ms. Rauch replied stories were the focus as an overall building height is not specified in the Code.

Ms. Rauch explained for the vertical element there needs to be a projection for every 40 feet, and the horizontal division between stories needs to be delineated between the stories. Mr. Langworthy said the expression lines bring more detail to the architectural design. Mr. Langworthy stated the entrances also have to be clearly identified.

Ms. Rauch indicated there are primary and secondary materials outlined in the Code and most of the building types are 80 percent high quality, durable, natural materials of stone, brick or glass, and secondary materials such as Gypsum reinforced fiber cement, metal, exterior architectural metal and EIFS make up the 20 percent.

Ms. Rauch said there are further detailed requirements for windows and sills, shutters, awnings, and canopies.

Ms. Rauch concluded the Board can expect to see a very detailed chart within the Planning Report for each of the larger application regarding how the various requirements are or are not.

Mr. Schisler gave an example in San Francisco where across the river a building that might look taller but anyone at the street level would only see a three-story building.

Mr. Langworthy said as reviewers they are used to seeing prospective shots, site plans, elevation shots, and rarely a view from a pedestrian to further explain perceptions.

Mr. Langworthy explained there will be three different kinds of assistants: 1) detailed Code Review as part of the packet; 2) consulting architects' recommendations to help guide decisions; and 3) benefit

from the ART's detailed Code review and recommendations. He said there could be an instance where the Board sees a particular Code requirement, and the applicant has met that requirement, the Board cannot force them into a Waiver or ask they do something different from the Code. He said the Code states "as architecturally appropriate" so there is some looser language to provide some options for different alternatives as projects come through and not always black and white with strict numbers to fall into. He said it was set up that way to allow flexibility for architectural designs to create diversity.

Mr. Dyas asked if the Board can expect a lot of Waivers. Mr. Langworthy said it has been fairly limited thus far, maybe three or four at one time per case.

Mr. Schisler asked as an architect he could tell the applicant how their design could be but does not say anything unless they open the conversation and wanted to know if that was appropriate.

Mr. Langworthy said the Board is strongly encouraged to have an architect on the Board to provide opinions of areas of expertise and want that applied. He said if the opportunities are there, they should share their opinions, views, etc.

Ms. Rauch agreed with Mr. Langworthy and encouraged the Board to ask questions and share opinions if they are helping the applicant to meet Code. She said the Board can also call her or the case manager prior to the meeting for any questions that may arise such as how something was interpreted or if something is unclear so the Board is more informed to help facilitate the discussion at the meeting and make a decision.

Mr. Langworthy said when they get calls from members, it helps staff ahead of time, where they can build those issues into a presentation because if one member has that question, there may be other members with the same question and staff can do the research ahead of the meeting.

Communications

Ms. Rauch notified the members of two maintenance projects that will be happening on S. High Street in the future: 1) Donatos will be repainting the roof the exact color due to peeling; and 2) 48 S. High Street will be doing roof modifications as well but replacing the same materials and colors.

Mr. Schisler asked if a person owns building, are they allowed to let it deteriorate. Mr. Langworthy reported there are some active property maintenance cases. He said the City Engineer, himself, Code Enforcement, Street Utilities, and Parks and Open Space conduct an annual walk through of the District for maintenance and make notes of what needs to be addressed.

Mr. Langworthy said as the larger projects start to heat up in the Historic District, the Board may be asked to have some additional meetings in order to meet deadlines.

Ms. Rauch reported that an architect will be coming for informal discussions to help interpret not only the Code but from a character standpoint.

Mr. Mathias requested a report or status update on those projects so they were aware of what was going on in the district. Mr. Langworthy replied yes but may wait for that because they have another spring/summer walk-through coming up shortly.

Mr. Schisler adjourned the meeting at 7:31 p.m.

As approved by the Architectural Review Board on August 28, 2014.