

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

MEETING MINUTES

MAY 27, 2015

AGENDA

- 1. BSD Historic Core – Terra Art Gallery – Sign 36 – 38 North High Street
15-038ARB-MPR Minor Project Review (Approved 5 – 0)**
- 2. *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines Update***

David Rinaldi called the meeting to order at 6:31 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Board members present were: Neil Mathias, Thomas Munhall, Everett Musser, and Jane Fox. City representatives were Jennifer Rauch, Katie Ashbaugh, Joanne Shelly, and Laurie Wright.

Motion and Vote

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

Motion and Vote

Ms. Fox moved, Mr. Munhall seconded, to accept the April 15, 2015, meeting minutes as presented. The vote was as follows: Mr. Musser, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Mathias, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; and Mr. Munhall, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

Mr. Rinaldi briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Architectural Review Board [the minutes reflect the order of the published agenda.] He swore in anyone planning to address the Board on these applications.

- 1. BSD Historic Core – Terra Art Gallery – Sign 36 – 38 North High Street
15-038ARB-MPR Minor Project Review**

The Chair said this application is to install a new 6.25-square-foot projecting sign for an existing multiple-tenant building on the east side of North High Street, north of the intersection with Wing Hill. He said this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.065, 153.170, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Ms. Rauch recalled an application approved for another tenant within this space, Green Olive Company. She presented a graphic of the site. She explained this application is for the tenant occupying the northern portion of this existing building. She presented the proposed projecting sign and described the sign as being sandblasted with a cream background, routed corners, and black text to hang from a scrolling metal bracket. She stated they share a single entrance and indicated each tenant would place their sign centered above their respective storefront windows. She said Code allows each tenant to have a sign no larger than 8 square feet and they are both under that size requirement.

Ms. Rauch recommended approval with the following condition:

- 1) The applicant submits detailed sign dimensions and information confirming the height requirements are met with the sign permit.

David Rinaldi reported there are signs in the window currently stating “Now Open” so it appears just as one tenant. Ms. Rauch confirmed the tenants each occupy one half of the building.

Jeff Hersey said the two businesses split the building space. He explained they have one entrance and with a common space. He said he is installing a locked door like the other tenant on the inside of the space.

Mr. Mathias said agreed the signs should be centered over the windows as opposed to within six feet of the door.

Jane Fox asked if there will be a problem achieving the eight-foot clearance underneath. Ms. Rauch said it did not appear to be an issue, but the applicant would need to modify the sign size if that issue is identified through the permit process.

Everett Musser asked if the Code allows any identification on the doors and windows. Ms. Rauch said a one-square foot window sign is permitted and does not require board approval, but a larger, permanent window sign would need board approval.

Mr. Musser asked if anything was being contemplated. Mr. Hersey said he was considering something in small white letters but he wants to see what the projecting sign looks like first, as that may be sufficient.

Ms. Rauch confirmed if the applicant wanted to do that, they would need to return to request the Board's approval.

Mr. Rinaldi said we approved the previous sign for the Green Olive Company with an area up to 8 square feet. He suggested that same condition be added to this approval.

Mr. Hersey said they are using the same sign manufacturer.

Ms. Fox confirmed the sign is intended to be double-sided.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Rinaldi motioned, Mr. Munhall seconded, to approve the Minor Project with two conditions:

- 1) The applicant submits detailed sign dimensions and information confirming the height requirements are met with the sign permit; and
- 2) The applicant be permitted to increase the size of the sign but not to exceed a maximum size of 8-square-feet and maintain the current design.

Mr. Hersey agreed.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Musser, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Mathis, yes; Mr. Munhall, yes; and Mr. Rinaldi, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

2. *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines Update*

Katie Ashbaugh said this is a presentation and discussion regarding updates and revisions to the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*. She said tonight's review is for the completion of Phase 1. She said the review includes changes to the Table of Contents and a plan for next steps for the update.

Ms. Ashbaugh stated the project scope was introduced in January 2015 and a more finite version was presented in February. She said over the past few months Staff has been working on document development including the content and format.

Ms. Ashbaugh referred to the sample page layout and went through the proposed revisions and refinements. She said the intent is to make the document easy for navigation electronically. She indicated if the Board approves of this sample layout, it will be continued throughout the book.

Jennifer Rauch said the proposed format will allow for more graphics, illustrations, and pictures. She explained the Table of Contents was changed to better explain the context of the Historic District and the purpose for the *Guidelines*. She said Staff wanted to make clear in the beginning of the book the process and requirements for maintaining, altering, or adding onto an existing structure or constructing new. She said how the Bridge Street District ties together with the Historic District will be noted, along with how the *Guidelines* relate to the Community Plan. She added a comprehensive inventory of historic buildings will be included.

Everett Musser asked if Staff has a listing of the buildings on the Historic Register. Ms. Rauch said it is not included in the *Guidelines* but the properties listed on the Ohio Historic Inventory and the National Register are available.

Ms. Fox confirmed ARB's jurisdiction not only covered the Historic District but also any outlying historic structures that have been identified on Appendix G and it is one of the Board's responsibilities to maintain this inventory in Appendix G. She indicated she sees the *Guidelines* as one of the best educational tools for anyone moving into the Historic District or owning a historic structure will utilize. She said the minutes from January stated the intent of the *Guidelines* was to be a narrative but also truly provide guidance. She said looking at this from the view of someone that wanted to do something in Dublin, she reviewed the Community Plan, the Bridge Street Zoning Code, the *Guidelines*, and the ARB's purpose. She indicated the Community Plan was the larger umbrella that guides development for the ARB and the BSD District. She suggested all of those purposes should be identified and written about in the overview. She said Dublin's Community Plan really looks at maintaining, protecting, and preserving historic structures. She said the ARB is expected to maintain, protect, and preserve that inventory and also allow for economic progress. She emphasized the *Guidelines* need to talk about the Community Plan, the scope of the ARB and the BSD. She said the community can use this as well as the Board members. She emphasized these *Guidelines* should be very definitive, easily understood, and provide a lot more information. She indicated the Dublin Historical Society should be included in the review process.

Mr. Munhall questioned whether the ARB should be reactive or proactive. Ms. Fox said the ARB can and is supposed to be proactive.

Ms. Rauch said the Board should be proactive to provide guidance on how to react to proposals brought before them.

Mr. Munhall said he found this to be a reactive approach. Ms. Rauch said the ARB has had "Items of Interest" in the past, which highlighted projects the Board was interested in pursuing and these items are forwarded to City Council for approval.

She said Appendix G identifies certain properties outside of the Historic District that are under ARB's purview. She said if ARB wants to revisit, modify, or update this list it could be included in a formal request to Council.

Mr. Munhall suggested the stone walls as an example. He said if ARB members notice the walls are deteriorating, they would bring this to Ms. Rauch's attention and then Ms. Rauch would go to Council about it. Ms. Rauch said it would depend on what the ARB is asking to be done.

Mr. Mathias brought up sandwich board signs and the ARB being intentional about talking with Code Enforcement and getting those sandwich boards looked at and reviewed. He said there is a proactive nature or coordination with the City about what is being enforced. He said it is not a matter of sitting back and waiting for applications to come to the ARB and voting yes or no on them. He indicated it is the ARB's job and purpose to bring issues to the forefront whether it is to City Staff's attention or to City Council's attention.

Ms. Fox said the purpose and operation of the ARB is to promote educational, cultural, and economic well-being in the community and prevent the deterioration of the district and its historic sites. She said she lives on Dublin Road and there are two to three houses that have destruction to those historic walls, and there is no reason for that. She said there is work that needs to be done and preservation is our job. She said we should be looking at this topic and talking with the City Staff about them.

She said these walls have been identified as historic. She said they are part of the character of Dublin and should not be allowed to be bulldozed down and not even replaced with the same stone. She said this is happening with the Dublin Road bike path. She explained the neighbors have asked for the walls to be rebuilt with the same stone and they have been told they cannot do it. She said she did not know if the City can or cannot do it. She said it is important we preserve the walls and the ARB is charged to do that and to maintain annually, an inventory of historic properties within the City of Dublin.

Mr. Munhall said that has not come up and been discussed before. He said he thought time should be made at the next meeting where we all do some homework and bring our ideas.

Ms. Rauch said this is a great idea to reinstate.

Mr. Munhall said it might be done on a bigger scale than what was done before.

Ms. Rauch suggested education could be a component. Ms. Fox agreed.

Ms. Rauch suggested the revision of the *Guidelines* could be a good jumping off point to complete and then focus on the others.

Tom Holton, 5557 Roundstone Place, said he could speak from the Historical Society perspective as well as the ARB. He said he noticed the revised *Guidelines* do address a number of character issues, which is great; the character of the Historic District is important. He said when he served on the ARB many years ago they had applicants come before them and state they didn't know about the *Guidelines*. He suggested these *Guidelines* be distributed to someone right away when they move to or start a business in the Historic District.

Mr. Holton pointed out a building that is about to fall down that should have had attention paid to it a long time ago. He said it will have to be demolished because it cannot be preserved. He said that should not happen. In the *Guidelines*, he said it should be noted how to contact enforcement if it is not noted there already. He said neighbors should know who to call if there is a problem or suspect a problem that needs to be corrected instead of waiting for Code Enforcement.

Mr. Holton said the stone walls are a characteristic of Dublin. He said some walls are being demolished by neglect but at the same time the City is building new stone walls at every entrance of the City. He said they are making a concerted effort to make stone walls a signature statement. He said this is an interesting contradiction and wonders why this is happening.

Mr. Munhall inquired about the building Mr. Holton said was in disrepair. Mr. Holton said the property is on the east side of South High Street. He said the owner is an absentee owner and has stated it is just

storage of his business; the owner lives in Worthington. Mr. Holton said neglect draws down surrounding property value.

Mr. Rinaldi inquired about the criteria for approving demolition. He asked what the City does to prevent that sort of thing from happening. Ms. Rauch said it is a Code Enforcement issue. She said if owners do not comply with maintenance or other enforcement issues it becomes a legal issue.

Mr. Munhall said there is not the process to bring the person in and ask them what they plan to do with this building. He said it is obviously a problem situation.

Mr. Mathias said it can be the ARB's place to talk to Jenny, have Jenny talk to Code Enforcement and Legal. He stating that even though one or two letters may have been sent about compliance, there needs to be more attention placed on the importance of this topic. He said that is an issue that ARB can say based on that history, it needs to go to City Council and they need to apply more pressure. He said he recognizes the ARB has limits to its powers but that does not mean they cannot make anything happen.

Mr. Musser asked if there is any program to educate the public regarding the *Guidelines* in the Historic District. Ms. Rauch stated education should become a more apparent part of the *Guidelines*.

Mr. Musser said it would be interesting to go to the schools and see if they have any classes that might be interested in hearing about the *Guidelines*.

Mr. Munhall said he sees more issues from people that have been here for several years, not the new residents asking what the process is and what they need to do to get established.

Mr. Mathias suggested an annual mailer is sent to everyone in the Historic District and it could be as simple as a FAQ card including the top three questions that are asked (sign application, exterior modifications, and sandwich boards) with a link to the Dublin website.

Ms. Fox said because of all the progress and change that is going to happen in the Historic District, she hopes the ARB can be proactive to preserve what is "preservable". She said opportunity takes over sometimes and infill becomes all there is. She gave an example of someone buying property that has a building that has sat vacant forever and decides to tear it down to build something that will sell for five times what that original building on that property was worth. She emphasized that once the historic buildings are torn down, they are gone. She said she is concerned that if the ARB does not protect what is historic, then the ARB will work themselves right out of a job.

Mr. Munhall indicated those parts are in place. He said a building cannot just be demolished and replaced without ARB review and approval. Ms. Rauch added there are stringent criteria in place to aid in the review.

Mr. Munhall said if this is to be a more black and white issue, we need to change the Code to be more stringent. Ms. Rauch said two of the four criteria have to be met to allow for demolition within the Code now. She said it would be a dramatic change but the requirement could be three of the four criteria have to be met, for example.

Ms. Fox said that demolition is not all she is talking about. She emphasized *Guidelines* need to be educational in many ways. She noted that even in the housing styles, only four or five are listed and there are several more not even talked about. She stated she loved the addition of numbers relating to the architectural features but there are many more. She said she does not want someone to think they could not put gingerbread on a house for example because it was not pointed out in the *Guidelines*.

Ms. Fox said sometimes the *Guidelines* can slow people down from doing anything to their properties because they are afraid they are too restricted. She suggested *Guidelines* should give a property owner liberties within certain parameters. She said she has lived in the Historic District for 23 years and she sees people not wanting to do anything because it is too difficult to get the changes approved. She said the ARB needs to come up with a balance that allows change and preservation without being so restrictive they can “only color it one way” or “only add one piece of intricate scrollwork” for examples.

Mr. Munhall said that is what the ARB discussed extensively when this update project first came up in January. He said the question is how to structure rules. He said at the bottom of the lists are annotations. He said this is not the Code. He said the *Guidelines* are to be a colorful and easy to read. He said this document is meant to be open and annotated. He concluded he liked being proactive about this.

Mr. Rinaldi said his biggest plus here was the context between Code and the *Guidelines*. He reiterated the photo examples are fantastic and the map is a great add. He suggested the structures from the Historic Register be noted on the map as well with a symbol. He clarified the river is the eastern border of the Historic District but more specifically, the eastern shore is the boundary line. He said it is possible the ARB will be reviewing historic markers and the pedestrian bridge.

Ms. Rauch recalled the Dublin Pump House at Dublin Springs. She said there was nothing in the *Guidelines* to address that property or other parks in the District. She said we will need to decide what other parks should be incorporated into the *Guidelines*.

Mr. Rinaldi said the backstory at the beginning of the *Guidelines* is great. He said the ARB could suggest informational plaques to for these historic structures that tie into the *Dublin Historic Design Guidelines*.

A couple of the members asked if the ARB was going to get a shot at reviewing the future pedestrian bridge. Ms. Rauch said it is a City project, and the Code allows for projects with public dollars to be reviewed and approved by City Council.

Ms. Fox said everything occurring in the Historic District is part of the ARB's review and should be a good balance in the voice of change.

Mr. Munhall expressed his concern about the timing of issues in terms of what may already be on the Council's agenda. He indicated it is hard to keep up and be proactive with all of these developments.

Ms. Fox pointed out the issue of sustainability. She recalled ARB minutes that talked about the use of rubber shakes instead of cedar shakes and clad wood windows instead of the original wood windows. She said she noticed when Domino's put in new window panes, some are hand-made on one part of the window and regular flat panes were on another. She indicated people do not want to put in cedar shakes or old wood windows anymore; the ARB needs to be able to allow for that.

Ms. Rauch said sustainability is a policy issue.

Mr. Rinaldi said the ARB did not want to make it hard and not allow good ideas brought before us with a more sustainable product that does not deter from the historic character. He said if the structure is listed on the Historic Register, there will be a different and a more stringent set of guidelines.

Ms. Rauch said Staff would encourage the Board to stick with the traditional materials and colors that were there originally. She said that is where we would start but then if that was not economically possible or there is some other idea, then it could be considered.

Mr. Holton recalled an application where rubber shakes were approved for a residential structure because it was almost identical to slate and there was to be zero maintenance.

Mr. Rinaldi agreed some great products have come along and that is why we wanted to keep the *Guidelines* open-ended. He said there will be more products coming forward that could provide a very good look and be durable and recyclable.

Mr. Holton pointed out the cost of maintenance and replacement can be a factor for siding and roofing materials.

Mr. Munhall said the ARB had discussed not naming products and to being open to different material uses so this document can be fluid.

Mr. Musser concluded the *Guidelines* need to be as complete and concise as possible or it will not be user-friendly or easily understood.

Ms. Rauch said delineation should help with that. She said the document content needs to be right first before the website version is explored soon after.

Communications

Neil Mathias asked what the situation was for the stone wall along Dublin Road with the Dublin Road bike path. He said he has witnessed people picking up the stone and putting into the back of their pick-up truck. He said it appears with the planning and utility realignment that they have been given carte blanche to destroy the walls that are there and the stones are just scattered about the yard. He said he would love to see some follow-up on what is happening with that stone.

Jennifer Rauch said her understanding was some of the stone would be available to the property owners, but she does not know the process for one to obtain that stone. She indicated the completion of the path and the removal of the stone walls is a huge concern.

Mr. Mathias said from an economy standpoint and from a historical aspect, we should be maintaining a re-useable product. He said by tearing these historic walls down and replacing it with new is wasted money, wasted City resources, and it is a loss of the original wall.

Ms. Rauch said she would look into this matter. She said reusing the existing stone is very difficult. She said once the wall is taken apart, it is extremely difficult to put it back together and fit it correctly.

Mr. Munhall said at that age of 100 plus years, half of the rocks get broken just taking the walls apart but said rock should definitely be reused whenever possible. He said if not for that same project, for another.

Ms. Fox said these walls are not in as bad of shape as you think. She said she has them and knows they can be reused. She said at the very least, the rocks should be offered to the property owner to be used somewhere on their property.

Ms. Rauch said they may have done that; she does not know at this point.

Mr. Mathias asked about the SR161 Roundabout and the I-270/ US 33 interchange construction detours. He asked if Dublin Road was going to be closed while they work on this project as it had been in the past when they did the more southern section.

Ms. Rauch said her understanding was the bike path was being delayed, but she would report back with additional information.

Mr. Mathias said there has been only one-lane access the last few weeks. Ms. Rauch indicated the City is trying to complete as much as possible before the larger roadway projects get underway. She said the

City made a commitment to these residents to complete this project. She offered to obtain more details from Engineering about the timing as well as the questions posed about the stone walls.

David Rinaldi said there were large window sign adjacent to one of the buildings discussed tonight and he asked if this was permitted. Ms. Rauch said it might be a temporary sign but she would have Code Enforcement check into it.

Ms. Fox asked if a roundtable meeting could be scheduled to discuss the *Guidelines* further.

Ms. Rauch said she would include "Items of Interest" for the next meeting.

Everett Musser said he will not be able to attend the next meeting.

Mr. Rinaldi adjourned the meeting at 7:51 p.m.

As approved by the Architectural Review Board on June 24, 2015.