

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

MEETING MINUTES

SEPTEMBER 24, 2014

AGENDA

- 1. BSC Historic Core
14-090ARB-MPR
(Approved 4 – 0)** **48-52 S. High Street
Minor Project Review**
- 2. BSC Historic Residential District – Streng Residence
14-092ARB-MPR
(Approved 4 – 0)** **75 Franklin Street
Minor Project Review**
- 3. BSC Historic Core District – Shamrock Barber Shop
14-093ARB-MPR
(Approved 3 – 0)** **86 S. High Street
Minor Project Review**
- 4. Zoning Code Amendment-Bridge Street District
13-095ADMC** **Zoning Code Amendment**

Robert Schisler called the meeting to order at 6:31 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Board members present were David Rinaldi, Neil Mathias, and Thomas Munhall. Bob Dyas was absent. City representatives were Jennifer Rauch, Marie Downie, Devayani Puranik, and Laurie Wright.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Rinaldi moved, Mr. Schisler seconded, to accept the documents into the record. The vote was as follows: Mr. Munhall, yes; Mr. Mathias, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; and Mr. Schisler, yes. (Approved 4 – 0)

- 1. BSC Historic Core
14-090ARB-MPR** **48-52 S. High Street
Minor Project Review**

Jennifer Rauch said this application is for architectural modifications to the building and trim colors and awning replacement for an existing commercial building on the east side of South High Street, between Spring Hill and Eberly Hill. She said this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.170 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Ms. Rauch presented the existing site layout and site photos, including the existing conditions for the site with the new standing seam metal roof. She said the proposal includes an update to the building facades with a new color scheme and awnings. She said the proposed paint color for the main structure and the majority of the trim of the building is Benjamin Moore "White Dove", the storefront windows and the door trim will be painted Sherman Williams "Analytic Gray", and the doors will be painted Valspar "Vintage Frame". She indicated this is a neutral palette with the lighter building, which the *Guidelines* permit. She said the applicant is proposing to replace the existing awnings located above the entrances and extend the awning along the façade above the storefront windows. She explained the original proposal included standing seam metal awnings and as part of the ART review, they recommended the applicant use canvas awnings as the *Guidelines* specify, which the applicant agreed. She said additional correspondence was included in the Board's materials regarding a desire by one of the building tenant's

for the Board to consider the use of metal awnings. She said per the *Guidelines*, each window or door is recommended to have its own awning, rather than a single full-width awning covering the entire façade. She said as a condition, ART recommends the applicant revise the materials to include these details.

Ms. Rauch said approval is recommended with one condition:

- 1) The applicant provide additional dimensions to ensure the awnings meet the design intent of the *Guidelines* that each window or door has its own awning, rather than a single full-width awning covering an entire façade.

John Leff, 1697 Berkshire Road, Columbus, Ohio 43221, said he was one of the owners of the building. He explained the applicant used an old picture when determining the proposal for the building. He said they originally proposed the standing seam to complement the roof replacement, but agreed to install the canvas awnings.

David Rinaldi asked if there was any imagery that shows the building had a metal awning at one time. Mr. Leff said there was not.

Neil Mathias inquired about the *Guidelines* only speaking to the use of canvas awnings and not to something that seems a little bit more solid. He said he supposed in the 1800s, they were not doing canvas awnings on a metal frame.

Ms. Rauch said the *Guidelines* do not give time periods, it just states awnings traditionally provide cover with canvas or similar heavy fabric, which could be rolled up and retracted. She said this coincides with the materials and request by Mr. Taylor that standing seam would be more durable and hold up better to the elements.

Mr. Rinaldi said the distinction is between a porch roof, which would be standing seam metal and would be appropriate and an awning, which does have more of a temporary nature to it.

Mr. Munhall said he would like some more discussion on this but does not want to stop the proposal being approved if the applicant is happy as is. Mr. Leff said the building needs a lot of work so they are fine at this time using canvas awnings.

Mr. Munhall said awnings provide very little weather protection; it is more of a decoration.

Mr. Rinaldi said this building was on the National Register and by adding standing seam metal, you are changing the character of the building and that should not be done. He concluded canvas is appropriate. Ms. Rauch said ART concurred with Mr. Rinaldi's assessment.

Mr. Mathias asked if a 1850s building would have canvas awnings. Mr. Schisler said one of our prior ARB members showed photos of this building as a grocery store and the store owners would pull the awnings back in the evening. He concluded they did have a form of a canvas that was retractable on some of the buildings.

Mr. Mathias asked if there was going to be a discussion on trim being painted the same as the body color on part of it but then part of it is a contrasting color.

Ms. Rauch said it was her understanding that the applicant wanted the storefront window to stand out, hence the contrasting color for trim. She said the *Guidelines* do not speak to whether all the trim has to be contrasting or not. She said on 113 South High Street the applicant was approved to paint the body and the trim the same color.

Mr. Leff said the first floor tenant had an old picture of the building shortly after the turn of the century, which is how they came up with that look.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Munhall moved, Mr. Rinaldi seconded, to approve this request for a Minor Project Review for architectural modifications to the building and trim colors and awning replacement for an existing commercial building with one condition:

- 1) The applicant provide additional dimensions to ensure the awnings meet the design intent of the *Guidelines* that each window or door has its own awning, rather than a sign full-width awning covering an entire façade.

Mr. Leff has agreed to this condition. The vote was as follows: Mr. Mathias, yes; Mr. Schisler, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; and Mr. Munhall, yes. (Approved 4 – 0)

2. BSC Historic Residential District – Streng Residence 14-092ARB-MPR

75 Franklin Street Minor Project Review

Jennifer Rauch said this application is for architectural modifications to increase the height of an attached three-car garage for an existing residence on the west side of Franklin Street approximately 480 feet south of the intersection with Bridge Street. She said this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.170 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Ms. Rauch said the home has frontage on Franklin Street with the three-car garage to the rear with access provided on the south side of their lot. She presented the existing house from the Franklin Street side, which is brick with white trim with an asphalt shingle roof, and the existing three-car garage shown with white siding and doors, also with an asphalt shingle roof.

Ms. Rauch said the applicant is proposing to increase the height of the roof to be more compatible with today's standards and to be able to fit their vehicles inside. She showed the existing condition, keeping the same arrangement, matching the pitch of the existing home roof, just creating more height. She said they are removing a window and vent on the existing side elevation of the house and Building Standards has verified this is not required for fire egress. She explained the applicant would be using the same building materials: white siding, white trim, and asphalt shingles but proposed new garage doors.

Ms. Rauch said approval is recommended with no conditions.

Mr. Schisler inquired about the room behind the window to be removed. Heidi Bolyard, Simplified Living Architecture and Design, answered it was finished storage space.

Mr. Schisler asked if the space will be connected to the garage. Ms. Bolyard said the applicant has no basement in the residence so the intent is to put attic trusses above for storage in a section of the garage.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Rinaldi moved, Mr. Munhall seconded, to approve this request for a Minor Project Review. The vote was as follows: Mr. Mathias, yes; Mr. Schisler, yes; Mr. Munhall, yes; and Mr. Rinaldi, yes. (Approved 4 – 0)

**3. BSC Historic Core District – Shamrock Barber Shop
14-093ARB-MPR**

**86 S. High Street
Minor Project Review**

Mr. Schisler recused himself due to a possible conflict of interest and Mr. Munhall acted as Chair for this application.

Jennifer Rauch said this application is for the installation of a new 6-square-foot projecting sign for an existing commercial building on the west side of South High Street, between Eberly Hill and Pinney Hill Lane. She said this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.066(G) and 153.170 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Ms. Rauch said the main building fronts South High Street and the parking access is to the rear. She presented the existing conditions in the front, including the current projecting sign, which is four square feet hanging from a metal bracket. She said the applicant is proposing to replace that sign with a six-square-foot sign, which meets Code. She said there were two conditions as part of ART's recommendation: 1) the proposed green color for the border and shamrock complement the existing awning color, which the applicant has confirmed; and 2) the applicant provide detailed dimensions demonstrating that the size of the shamrock meets the secondary image requirements and the height requirements of eight feet above the sidewalk. She concluded ART is recommending approval with those two conditions to be met at the time of the sign permit submission.

David Rinaldi asked if the intent was to complement or match the awnings, which is subjective. Ms. Rauch said she was not sure it was a spot on "match" so used the verbiage to "complement".

Mr. Rinaldi said he doubted the colors would be identical in nature but stating complement in the condition leaves the interpretation wide open.

Neil Mathias asked if the intent was to match the existing awning. Mr. Rinaldi asked that the condition be modified to reflect "match as close as possible".

Thomas Munhall asked if the width of the sign was unchanged. Ms. Rauch confirmed the sign is getting taller.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Munhall moved, Mr. Rinaldi seconded, to approve this request for a Minor Project Review based on the modified conditions. The vote was as follows: Mr. Mathias, yes, Mr. Rinaldi, yes; and Mr. Munhall, yes. (Approved 3 – 0)

**4. Zoning Code Amendment-Bridge Street District
13-095ADMC**

Zoning Code Amendment

Jennifer Rauch said this application is for potential amendments to the Bridge Street District Zoning Code. She said this is a request for informal review and discussion prior to a future recommendation to City Council regarding proposed Zoning Code amendments under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.232 and 153.234.

Ms. Rauch said Rachel Ray had provided a cover memo that outlined the progress of Planning regarding the proposed amendments. She said modifications were made to the review and approval process that was approved and effective in December 2013, mostly as it related to the Planning and Zoning Commission. She said in July 2014, the Commission started reviewing the Code to ensure the requirements are meeting the intent. She said the Commission has been through the Code and will have a final review in October. She said the Commission's final recommendation is scheduled for October 29,

2014. She indicated the intent is to review ARB's comments and concerns, and return in October for a recommendation prior to the Code proceeding to the Commission for a final recommendation.

Ms. Rauch reviewed the major highlights and stated she was prepared to address any comments or concerns. She asked how the Board wanted to proceed with the review, as the Commission review is conducted on a page-by-page basis.

Robert Schisler said he read the Code as a 'black and white' document and was curious about Planning and Zoning Commission's experience with the request and approval of Waivers.

Ms. Rauch said the waiver process is the opportunity to address a specific item that a proposed development does not meet within the Code; whereas the applicant demonstrates the reason a proposal cannot meet Code. She added the waiver process is an opportunity for the 'gray'. She explained the Commission has suggested the Code should include requirements but allow an applicant to come forward and request a Waiver, as needed. She said these regulations were written for a reason but if an applicant can make a compelling argument for why a requirement cannot be met then the Board has the opportunity to grant a Waiver. She said the findings for approving a Waiver are based on the proposal meeting the review criteria.

Mr. Schisler said some areas in the Code signify "if approved by the City Engineer" or "if approved by Planning", etc. but then there are others that are more finite and clear.

Mr. Rinaldi said he had the opposite reaction reading through the Code as he found it to have so much 'gray'. He said as a designer starting a project it would be difficult to know if the project is on the right track. He said wording such as "as deemed appropriate" leaves the members wondering if they are doing the right thing.

Mr. Schisler said there is a lot of 'gray' and then you get to a table that shows stringent dimensions, but then it can flip back to "meeting the intent of the character".

Ms. Rauch said there have not been a significant number of projects but there are examples of Waivers that have been approved. She explained the Waiver is the highest tier of deviation from the Code and an Administrative Departure is the lower tier.

Neil Mathias said his special interest project was sandwich board signs. He asked if there was the opportunity for the Board to make recommendations regarding penalties for violations to the sandwich board provisions. He said businesses are openly violating sign height, location, and not bringing the signs in at the end of the day. He asked if Code Enforcement regulation needs to be part of this Code document or if it needs to be somewhere else that the daily violations could mean confiscation and fines.

Mr. Schisler reported the City went through today and talked to everybody about their signs that were in violation.

Ms. Rauch said Code Enforcement regulations would not be something that would be included in this document, as the Code Enforcement process is already in place. She said this becomes an ongoing issue because a number of violations fall beyond the hours that the inspectors work. She indicated the only way Code Enforcement is aware of violations outside of the work day/work week is if somebody calls and reports it.

Mr. Schisler said Code specifies the sandwich board sign must be within six feet of the main entrance, which is difficult for some of the buildings. Ms. Rauch acknowledged it was difficult to have a rule that fits every situation. Mr. Schisler said sometimes the signs are leaning against the wall. Ms. Rauch explained

the intent for the space location requirement was to keep the sign in front of the particular business, as sometimes they tend to move down the street to a major intersection.

Mr. Mathias said his recommendation is clarification or revision of the Code section because businesses are using it as a third sign type instead of the two permitted, and this third sign does not meet the requirements. He emphasized the intent of the sandwich board signs are to be temporary in nature for "specials" etc. He understands the Board cannot dictate the content of the sign but the way it is being utilized is as a third sign for their business. He said it goes against the walkability of the neighborhood because pedestrians have to walk around the sign, and the sidewalks in the Historic District are already narrow in width.

Mr. Schisler said the intent is to advertise today's special, etc. Mr. Mathias agreed that was the intent of the Code, but businesses are using it as the third sign. He said he did not think plastic signs should be allowed and suggested that be included as part of the modification to the Code language. He said the sign could be a neutral frame.

Mr. Schisler said he did not have a problem with a plastic frame as long as the chalkboard or marker board is included for the language to be written on.

Mr. Munhall said the issue with all these things is the Code would need to be changed to make it impossible for the business to follow or it has to bother a lot of people. He said if nobody is calling the City except for a few, then it is not enforced, whereas if there are 20 people calling all the time, the signs would be changed and they would be taken in every night. He said that is part of the problem with enforcing anything; unless there is community involvement caring about a particular issue.

Ms. Rauch said ensuring businesses comply with the sign provisions is a citywide challenge. She said the reason the sign material was not limited within the existing Code is because a number of small business owners have indicated this sign is a 'make or break' for them and dictating what that sign must look like is a big deal to the small business owner. She said Planning is trying to be sensitive to aesthetics and also make sure the business owners are happy as well. She said the concern is a number of existing businesses have a sign permit approved with a certain sandwich board sign material and a change to the material with an amendment would not apply to the existing sign. She said the sign type would change over time.

Mr. Mathias said it is interesting that we have such high standards on building materials, sign type, etc. but the Code allows an unattractive, plastic sign along the street.

Mr. Munhall said the same could be said about awnings, which look faded and tattered in four years. He said if it is an important enough issue to our group we should make a recommendation to change the language.

Mr. Schisler read from the Code "sandwich board signs may include chalkboard or white board", therefore the business owner cannot paint a permanent third sign and is to be changed regularly.

Ms. Rauch said she would take the Board's comments back for internal discussion. She said Planning has a sign consultant reviewing the sign provisions of the Code to provide guidance with regard to construction and design.

David Rinaldi inquired about the new allowance for a single one-square-foot window sign or logo at each public entrance. He read that a permit is not required as long as the sign has no more than one color. He asked if this meant businesses were allowed to put up any color as long as it was a single color. (153.065 H). He said a permit is not necessary if the business adheres to this Code but asked if a hot pink sign would be appropriate.

Mr. Mathias recommended there be a set of approved colors. Mr. Rinaldi suggested the language be changed to state a “neutral” color. Ms. Rauch suggested the window sign match the business’ permanent sign or be a neutral color.

Mr. Mathias noted for specific buildings, the Code had language that stated “as Planning and Zoning Commission approves” and it should probably state “the approved reviewing body”.

Ms. Rauch liked the suggestion but would review because in some instances, the PZC may be the only Board authorized to make the determination.

Mr. Rinaldi said the lighting provisions added to the Code are fine. He said the Code never mentions a photometric plan has to be submitted, which is what the Code intends but it is not said. He said requiring the photometric plan will make sense to understand illumination across the site.

Ms. Rauch said the Commission discussed that as well and requested similar changes.

Mr. Rinaldi brought up bike racks in the Historic District and asked that 153.065, page 12 of 18 be discussed. Mr. Mathias said it did seem very heavy on requiring bike racks.

Mr. Rinaldi said he thought that was great since walkability is encouraged and by extension, bicycling; the City has a great network of trails and bike paths. He said it makes sense to provide locations for bike racks. He mentioned the added comment about “evaluate special provisions or district appropriate site conditions” to be discussed. He asked if the appearance of bike racks is important.

Mr. Schisler said the location of bike racks becomes the bigger issue. Mr. Rinaldi said there are not a lot of places to put bike racks because sidewalks cannot be blocked.

Mr. Schisler said a lot of businesses do not have parking in the back or it is hard to find how to get to the bike racks.

Mr. Rinaldi said to incorporate bike racks into public parking would make the most sense.

Mr. Schisler suggested dead spots on the street as an option where the City could install bike racks. Ms. Rauch said the City has done that before.

Mr. Rinaldi asked if appearance was an issue besides location. He said the standard ones used are not historical looking and asked if special language to tie into the Historic District would be useful.

Mr. Rinaldi said light posts have been designed to have historical character and maybe there are bike racks that look like a “hitching post” or are historical in context. He said the cyclists probably did not have to worry about bikes being stolen in the 1800s.

Mr. Rinaldi inquired about the parking provision with the setback. He said eliminating this provision was noted to allow parking within setbacks to facilitate coordinated site design. He asked if it would apply more in the Historic District more than others.

Ms. Rauch said in the Zoning Code there are provisions for parking to encroach a building setback.

Mr. Rinaldi inquired about the change regarding fiber cement siding from a primary to a secondary building material.

Ms. Rauch said this modification was made as part of the Scioto River Neighborhood District discussion at City Council and then overall for Bridge Street District projects. She said City Council had concerns about

the percentage permitted for fiber cement siding as a primary building material and requested the Code be changed to only permit it as a secondary material.

Ms. Rauch said Mark Ford, Ford and Associates, gave a presentation to the Planning and Zoning Commission on fiber cement siding products not advocating for or against but provided information. She said as part of that meeting, the Commission recommended keep fiber cement siding as a secondary material, but allow an applicant to come forward and demonstrate the need for a Waiver on a case-by-case basis.

Mr. Mathias said whether it is fiber cement or wood siding, it seems it would be an appropriate material for the Historic District and to limit the primary materials to a stone or brick appears excessive to him. He said there are a number of fully wood-sided buildings in the Historic District.

Mr. Schisler agreed.

Ms. Rauch clarified the Code does not say the use is prohibited, but the amount of which a material is permitted with the Waiver opportunity. She explained if an applicant came forward and requested their building be predominantly fiber cement siding when it is 50 percent of the elevations, it would be up to the Board to make that determination. She said knowing now what the pros and cons are about this product, there are details to look at when reviewing the proposal and making the determination.

Mr. Rinaldi said he could see a good argument for its use in the Historic District to increase the percentage of the material permitted but understands limiting the amount in the Scioto River Neighborhood District. Ms. Rauch said the scale of the Scioto Neighborhood District buildings is much larger.

Mr. Mathias said he would like to see an annotation that addresses this recommendation where it says "except where historically appropriate" such as in the Historic Core. He said there are a number of 'gray' areas and applicants can request a Waiver, but a developer is looking at the Code that requires stone and brick, when alternate materials may be more appropriate for the Historic District.

Ms. Rauch said she would review this modification.

Mr. Rinaldi said there was a whole section on variety and thought it was pretty well covered. Mr. Schisler said the language was for all districts, whereas the Historic District is very unique and covers a very small area.

Mr. Rinaldi noted the whole section on walkability and said he did not see the specifics on the cross walks regarding how they are to be designed and configured, etc. in that section. He said all the language is crossed out and did not seem to be it picked up in the walkability section. Ms. Rauch said she would see what happened to that section.

Mr. Rinaldi said there are two paragraph 'f's under section 153.059. He said there is a paragraph on service stations and another on parking structures both labeled subparagraph 'f'.

Mr. Rinaldi concluded he had covered most of his concerns and on the whole, these amendments were well thought out.

Ms. Rauch said if the Board has any additional comments, to send them to her via email and they can be incorporated in Planning's discussion and be presented the next time.

Communications

[There were none.]

Mr. Schisler adjourned the meeting at 7:35 p.m.

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