

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

MEETING MINUTES

AUGUST 27, 2014

AGENDA

1. **BSC Historic Core District – Howard Hanna Realcom Realty** **37 W. Bridge Street**
14-082ARB-MPR **Sign**
(Approved 5 – 0)
2. **BSC Public District – Dublin Community Preschool** **81 ½ W. Bridge Street**
14-085ARB-MPR **Sign**
(Approved 5 – 0)

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, David Rinaldi, Neil Mathias, and Thomas Munhall. City representatives were Steve Langworthy, Jennifer Rauch, Katie Ashbaugh, Logan Stang, and Flora Rogers.

Motion and Vote

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

Motion and Vote

Mr. Dyas moved, Mr. Munhall seconded, to accept both the June 25 and July 23, 2014, meeting minutes as presented. The vote was as follows: Mr. Mathias, yes; Mr. Schisler, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Munhall, yes; and Mr. Dyas, 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 the applications on the agenda tonight.

1. **BSC Historic Core District – Howard Hanna Realcom Realty** **37 W. Bridge Street**
14-082ARB-MPR **Sign**

Katie Ashbaugh said this application is for a new 7.83-square-foot wall sign for an existing commercial building on the south side of West Bridge Street, between Franklin Street and Mill Lane.

Ms. Ashbaugh presented the existing conditions of the site. She said the structure is on the National Register of Historic Places, constructed in 1944 to house the Dublin and Perry Township Fire Department. She explained in the 1980s, it was sold and converted to be used as a commercial building. She pointed out the two arch garage door openings that are now two store-front windows, each with a doorway. She said the proposed sign for the site is cedar plank with cove routed edges in a dark green background with gold text. She reported it meets the Code requirements for a wall sign size, location, and number of colors permitted. She said it also meets the height requirement with the condition:

- 1) The proposed wall sign height should be decreased from 16 feet to 15 feet prior to the submission of a sign permit.

Ms. Ashbaugh said when the application was first submitted, there were two existing window signs on the north elevation, bringing the total number of signs to four, which exceeded Code. She said they did not have permits for the signs on two windows; one of the conditions of the ART's recommendation for approval was to remove these window signs. She reported the applicant removed the two window signs prior to this meeting and submitted photos as proof. She said there is an existing ground sign at the northwest corner of this site and it reads "37 Bridge Street Firehouse", which brings the total number of signs now, to two, which is permitted.

Ms. Ashbaugh confirmed the application meets the criteria for a Minor Project Review and the Architectural Review Criteria with the aforementioned condition about the height. She stated the ART is recommending approval. She asked if there were any questions with regards to this application.

Robert Schisler asked if there were any sketches to the elevations on the location of the sign. He thought it was close to the line and was not opposed to 16 feet to make it more architecturally appropriate, if to provide better symmetry.

Steve Lenker, Howard Hanna Realcom Realty, said they are in agreement with all of the conditions. He said the original intent was to fit the sign between the small architectural piece at about 12.8 feet at the bottom of the sign and if they could do that, he believes it would look better than what was submitted.

Mr. Schisler prefers it to be centered in between that line and the gable. Mr. Lenker agreed the sign would look better if it was centered between the two.

Steve Langworthy said, unfortunately another applicant representative previously agreed to move it to the 15 feet, therefore, the ART did not need an application for a Master Sign Plan, therefore, no Master Sign Plan was submitted. He explained that in order to get it approved at 16 feet, the applicant would need to get another application for a Master Sign Plan to bring forward.

Mr. Dyas said the drawing shows it centered with 12 feet, 8 inches to the bottom, which makes it 14 feet, 8 inches to the top.

Mr. Schisler said, upon reviewing the location of the louver on this elevation, it appears higher in the elevation. He said he assumed the applicant would center the sign but wanted confirmation of where the sign would be installed on the elevation.

Neil Mathias said the louver appears to be in the center of the gable on the picture but in the sketch provided to the Board, it appears a third or a quarter of the way up. Bob Dyas confirmed the sketch was slightly off but the sign would be appropriately placed.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Dyas moved, Mr. Munhall seconded, to approve this request for a Minor Project Review for a new 7.83-square-foot wall sign for an existing commercial building with one condition:

- 1) The proposed wall sign height should be decreased from 16 feet to 15 feet prior to the submission of a sign permit.

Steve Lenker, applicant, agreed to the condition. The vote was as follows: Mr. Schisler, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Mathias, yes; Mr. Munhall, yes; and Mr. Dyas, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

**2. BSC Public District – Dublin Community Preschool
14-085ARB-MPR**

**81 ½ W. Bridge Street
Sign**

Logan Stang said this application is for a new 7.9-square-foot wall sign for an existing preschool on the south side of West Bridge Street at the intersection with Franklin Street, across from Indian Run Elementary School.

Mr. Stang said the preschool is attached to the Dublin Community Church. He said the original church was constructed in 1877 and in 1995, the church was approved for a two-story, 16,000-square-foot addition on the south side of the property.

Mr. Stang stated the proposal is for removal of an existing wall sign and installation of a proposed 7.95-square-foot wall sign. He presented a map that showed the location of the existing and the proposed sign, marked with a red X on the map, on the north side of the playground wall, which fronts West Bridge Street. He presented a slide that showed the existing sign that sits roughly four feet, six inches from grade and has been located here for over two decades. He said the proposed sign shown will sit centered in the same location at a height of four feet, six inches as well. He reported the sign meets all zoning requirements with the exception of one, which is the location. He said Code states the location must be on a portion of wall associated with the tenant space with storefront. He added tenant space is defined as a designated area within a building, dedicated to an individual tenant. He said with the approval of the Master Sign Plan, this location would be permitted and the regulation would be met.

Mr. Stang said the sign material will be high-density urethane with the border and text raised from the background that has a wood-grain texture. He said the applicant is proposing two colors for the sign - the background in Emerald Green, and the border and text in white. He reported the proposal meets all Architectural Review Board standards; therefore, the ART is recommending approval with no conditions for both the Master Sign Plan and the Minor Project Review.

Mr. Stang asked if there were any questions or concerns.

Neil Mathias asked if the fence wall was not considered part of the tenant space, even though they use it as part of their space, and therefore, the reason for not meeting the current location.

Jennifer Rauch said that was correct.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Rinaldi moved, Mr. Munhall seconded, to approve this request for a Master Sign Plan that would permit a wall sign location outside the permitted Code requirements with no conditions and to approve a Minor Project Review for a new 7.9-square-foot wall sign for an existing preschool with no conditions. The vote was as follows: Mr. Dyas, yes; Mr. Mathias, yes; Mr. Schisler, yes; Mr. Munhall, yes; and Mr. Rinaldi, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

Communications

Jennifer Rauch said there is a three-day Placemakers Workshop, if anyone was interested. She said the workshop includes lecture sessions and tours and the link was provided in the newsletter. Steve Langworthy said the members can attend portions of the workshop offered at different pricing levels.

Ms. Rauch said the Bridge Street Code is currently being reviewed for revision in phases while going through the development review process through the Planning and Zoning Commission. She said for the September ARB meeting, the Code will be brought forward for this Board to review and feedback on sections applicable to the ARB, which will ultimately go through Dublin City Council.

Neil Mathias asked to recuse himself on the discussion with Crawford Hoying for personal conflicts. Mr. Mathias left the room.

3. Bridge Park West – Mixed-Use Redevelopment Project – 94 & 100 North High Street

Jennifer Rauch took the opportunity to recap and discuss the Special Meeting held on August 13, 2014, for a walking tour of the Bridge Park West Mixed-Use redevelopment project site within the Historic District. She said she had a couple of slides and the applicant is present to provide a brief overview of what was seen and the applicant's takeaways from the tour.

Ms. Rauch said architectural concepts such as height, massing, site considerations, and how it all fits together will be discussed. She will also highlight the next steps.

Ms. Rauch said the applicant provided informal plans to the Board in May and received feedback related to the proposed architecture and site. She said members of staff meet with the applicant on a weekly basis, who are preparing for a Basic Plan Review submission. She said the site visit was beneficial to see this proposal in context of the existing character of the site.

Gerry Bird, OHM Advisors, 101 North Mill Street, Suite 200, Gahanna, Ohio, said they spent about an hour walking the site, starting in the lower zone where the 100 building is visible and then the 94 building. He said this footprint is smaller than the outer boundaries of both of those buildings as shown on the exhibit. He said the tour went through the 94 building and up the bridge across the rock outcrop and then onward to the High Street area, looking at the context of it down High Street.

Mr. Bird said several modifications have been made since the initial plans were reviewed in May. He said they have removed one floor of the building from a height standpoint. He explained the building is seven stories maximum and they are about 10 foot, eight inches floor to floor, and to provide further context, an office building is about 13 feet, 4 inches. He said the applicant is envisioning the building on High Street would have a scale similar to the scale of other buildings on High Street to maintain that rhythm. He said a drone was flown up the river corridor to show the impact of the building. He pointed out that even at 50 feet above the bridge level, the building is comparable to the buildings at Bridge and High Streets.

Mr. Bird said initially they broke up the building into three pieces and connected them with glass that would reflect the sky and plantings in front. He noted the views that would be seen while driving by this building and explained that some of the concepts have been continued. He referred to a slide that showed the site plan and the significant changes the applicant has made along High Street. He pointed out the connections to a parking deck wrapped by two buildings that served five units. Mr. Bird said their goal was to update the Board this evening but also to have a dialogue and gain feedback. He concluded that the applicant's façade design keeps the same character that exists in Dublin but for the rest of the building, the architecture transitions from historic to a more contemporary approach while being honest through material use and scale.

Robert Schisler asked about the access. Ms. Rauch said as part of the review with Engineering, the Code allows engineering to approve access on principle frontage streets.

Mr. Schisler asked under this design, if that drive aisle was for the whole parking garage other than the five spaces up above. Mr. Bird said there is still access down below, on the backside, and envisioned that the lower floors would use that lower access. He said the High Street access would largely serve the commercial space on High Street and probably one floor or so of residential.

Mr. Schisler asked about the massing and if the buildings would drop at the roofline to follow the grade, which Mr. Bird confirmed.

Mr. Bird explained they have broken it horizontally with the garage entrance along with another gap that lines up nicely with the green space.

Mr. Schisler thought it would be a lot better for massing if it followed the grade with different heights or rooflines. Mr. Bird said breaking the building into pieces allows that to happen.

Thomas Munhall said he did not go on the tour. He asked if anyone had any new thoughts or comments for the view from the east.

Mr. Dyas asked how many Waivers the applicant might request. Mr. Bird responded they would need a Waiver for building height.

Ms. Rauch said the Waivers do not change much from the original version because the same site parameters are in place for the block length and width.

Mr. Schisler said based on Code, access on High Street is not permitted. Ms. Rauch said there is not an opportunity to set up a block to the north part to provide access because of the topography and the proximity to the creek.

Mr. Schisler said he likes the character, now that the applicant has broken up the building more and is addressing the corner. He is concerned about the character transition from High Street, along the south elevation where it meets the North Riverview Street side. He said he is less concerned about the elevation on High Street and more concerned about how it fits with the drastic character change to the back. He said architecture can change from one style to another, but they need to look like they belong there. He suggested whether the design is historic or modern, it needs to look like it all belongs on the block.

Mr. Munhall suggested the view from Rock Crest is a very important elevation. He explained that after the presentation given by a consultant, Jonathan Barnes, he expressed to him that as representatives of Dublin, if they did something modern on High Street, it would not be well received. He said he understood the consultant's point but if building in 2014, it should be representative of 2014 but also represent the local architecture at the time. He said he believes it would be too risky to go modern on the High Street side.

Mr. Schisler said what the applicant is showing could be classified as modern, but it is contextual. He said it will not be built to totally negate the historical aspects. He said the transition is important because that will transition into the library and other development projects. He said right now the design seems like a front and a back and not a cohesive set of buildings.

Mr. Munhall said landscaping will play a part on that southwest transition part, which is a high exposure area of the building.

Mr. Bird said the northwest corner is important as you go southbound, but with the tree cover, you are only going to see the edge. Mr. Munhall said that would be a lower exposure. Mr. Bird said it is not any less important. Mr. Bird said this feedback was very helpful to guide them so they could tailor their plans to what the Board thinks is appropriate.

Mr. Schisler said he was not opposed to the transitions, but it all still has to look like it belongs in the same neighborhood. He said currently the proposal looks like it could be downtown Columbus.

Mr. Bird said he wanted this dialogue. He said pitched roofs are an important characteristic of Historic Dublin no matter what it is made of or how it is articulated. He said breaking the building along North High Street into smaller pieces fits the scale of High Street. He said the tool kit consists of brick, stone,

fiber cement siding, and glass. He asked if you have detail on the front, should some scale element go around integrating the elevations.

Mr. Munhall said he thinks the traditional front elevation and modern rear elevation works, using similar materials.

Mr. Munhall asked the Board members if they had any issues with the front becoming more modern or historic/traditional in nature.

Mr. Schisler proposed international style but he just wants this project done well. He said to use more traditional material in the architectural design but the architectural design does not have to look historic.

Mr. Dyas said he likes the direction this proposal is going. He said he is most concerned about the southeast corner, how to transition the two sides, and is interested in seeing the applicant's south elevation. He indicated he liked the broken up elevation along High Street.

David Rinaldi agreed the direction is fine and appreciates the design is being broken up. He said he appreciated the walking tour to see it from the pedestrian scale. He agreed that using traditional materials like brick or stone and wrapping it around to use it in a more modern way is very key. He said he is interested in seeing site plans and elevation numbers rather than seeing what it is at 50 feet above the bridge.

Mr. Bird said this discussion was helpful and the applicant will come back with refinements and pointed out some ideas and further directions they are considering. He said they plan to follow the City's streetscape model. Mr. Bird summarized what he heard the Board say this evening.

Mr. Schisler said the difficult part is that they want to see the back of all those parts and not just parking garages. Mr. Bird said the beauty of this proposal is that you do not see the garages.

Ms. Rauch said the next steps will be to continue to work through refinements to get a Basic Plan Review, which is a scaled concept level drawing with Code review and Waivers outlined.

Mr. Schisler said he assumed the Fire Marshal is fine with the proposal thus far. Mr. Langworthy said the Fire Marshal has the opportunity to provide input through the ART meetings.

Mr. Schisler adjourned the meeting at 7:30 p.m.

As approved by the Architectural Review Board on October 22, 2014.