

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

MEETING MINUTES

NOVEMBER 17, 2015

AGENDA

- 1. BSD HC – Dublin Barbershop - Windows**
15-105ARB-MPR **24 South High Street**
Minor Project Review (Approved 5 – 0)
- 2. BSD HTN – Bridge Park West**
15-102ARB-MPR **94-100 North High Street**
Minor Project Review (Approved 5 – 0)
Waivers (Approved 5 – 0)

The Chair, David Rinaldi, called the meeting to order at 6:31 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Board members present were: Jane Fox, Thomas Munhall, Everett Musser, and Shannon Stenberg. City representatives were: Jennifer Rauch, JM Rayburn, Katie Dodaro, and Laurie Wright.

Administrative Business

Motion and Vote

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

Motion and Vote

Mr. Rinaldi moved, Mr. Munhall seconded, to accept the October 21, 2015, meeting minutes as presented. The vote was as follows: Mr. Musser, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; Mr. Munhall, yes; and Mr. Rinaldi, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Rinaldi moved, Ms. Stenberg seconded, to accept the 2016/2017 Architectural Review Board meeting dates. The vote was as follows: Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Musser, yes; Mr. Munhall, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; and Mr. Rinaldi, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

The Chair 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 this application.

- 1. BSD HC – Dublin Barbershop - Windows**
15-105ARB-MPR **24 South High Street**
Minor Project Review

The Chair said the following application is a request for architectural modifications to the windows and shutters of an existing commercial building on the east side of S. High Street, between Bridge Street and Spring Hill. He said this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.062(H) and 153.170, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Katie Dodaro presented the site that is approximately 200 feet away from Bridge Street. She presented the existing conditions that include a six-by-three-foot aluminum window on the first floor and six-over-six double-hung vinyl windows and shutters on the second floor. She said the applicant proposed to replace the first floor windows with vinyl three-by-two grid with 1 3/16-inch SDL grilles with in-glass spacer bars, which is a wider grille layout for a more traditional storefront look and replace the second floor windows with two-over-two, double-hung windows, including 1 3/16-inch SDL grilles and four-inch trim. She said the second story windows will also include vinyl shutters that are 18 inches wide with decorative strap hinges and S-hooks that will be mounted on the casing for an operable look. She said the applicant proposed to replace the windows on both stories with the following scheme:

Material: Vinyl
Color: White interior and dark bronze exterior
SDL Grilles: 1 3/16"
Color: Ivory cream

Ms. Dodaro stated the existing second story shutters are green vinyl with no decorative features. She said the applicant proposed to replace the shutters with the following scheme:

Material: Vinyl
Color: Musket Brown
Decorative Features: Black decorative strap hinges and S-hook accessories
Decorative Features Material: Faux iron finish

Ms. Dodaro reported the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* states the replacement windows should duplicate the appearance of the originals as closely as possible and to use the same material, usually wood and to avoid vinyl and aluminum-clad. She indicated the ART discussed the recommendation in the *Guidelines* and determined the previous changes made to the building over time, including exterior materials and prior window replacement have altered the historic significance of the structure and determined the proposed modifications are appropriate and supported, particularly because the existing window sizes are maintained.

Ms. Dodaro said approval is recommended with no conditions.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Munhall moved, Ms. Stenberg seconded, to approve a request for a Minor Project Review with no conditions. The vote was as follows: Mr. Musser, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; and Mr. Munhall, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

2. BSD HTN – Bridge Park West 15-102ARB-MPR

94-100 North High Street Minor Project Review/ Waivers

The Chair said the following application is a request for modifications and Waiver requests to the approved Bridge Park West development on the east side of North High Street approximately 280 feet north of the intersection with North Street. He said this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code 153.066 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Jennifer Rauch presented the site reviewed through the approval process for the project. She said working through the building permit phase has prompted modifications and Waivers. She explained the proposal includes two motions: 1) Minor Project Review; and 2) seven Site Plan Waivers.

Ms. Rauch presented the approved elevation of the apartment building showing the eyebrow or cornice detail. She said due to constructability, the applicant has requested a change. She presented the

proposed diminished profile and said both proposals meet the Code. She said it is a change of the aesthetics, as well as the mass and depth of the approved detail.

Ms. Rauch presented the approved bio-retention area with a kidney-shaped design intended to be a bio-swale. She said the applicant has discovered significant bedrock, which changed the overall design. She presented the proposed changes to the area, which takes advantage of the rock face wall and the main area becomes an open lawn area. She said the landscape portion and pedestrian access is retained but with better functionality.

Ms. Rauch said there are seven Waivers and explained each:

1. Blank Wall Limitation - 30% maximum permitted, no greater than 15 feet of horizontal distance. The request is for the interior courtyards of the Apartment Building on the 5th story and the Historic Mixed-Use Building on the 4th and 5th story to exceed this requirement.
2. Primary Building Materials – Historic Mixed-Use Building – 80% maximum permitted. The request is for the north and south elevations and the interior courtyard areas for the Historic Mixed-Use buildings to exceed this requirement. The overall design is not significantly impacted.
3. Primary Building Materials – Accessory Structure – 80% maximum permitted. The request is to permit the original brick and stone enclosure to be composite materials with stone columns.
4. Façade Material Transitions – Required to occur at inside corner – The request is to permit the change in materials to occur on the balconies and along the north elevation of the Historic Mixed-Use Building to vary from this requirement.
5. Balcony Dimensions – 6-foot depth and 5-foot width required – The request is to permit additional smaller balcony areas.
6. Parapet Height – 6-foot maximum permitted – The request is to permit an increased parapet height to 8 feet on a portion of the Historic Mixed-Use building to screen exhaust equipment.
7. Street Wall Height – 3-foot maximum permitted – The request is to permit a varied street wall height to accommodate grade changes and ADA compliance.

Thomas Munhall asked about the eyebrow detail changes.

Gary Sebach, OHM Advisors, 101 Mill Run, Gahanna, OH, said the concern was about the three-foot eyebrow staying in place as cantilever concrete. He said the cornice would still be made of concrete but would not extend as previously approved. He stated it was largely a maintenance issue.

Mr. Munhall asked for clarification on the primary building materials. Ms. Rauch explained the original calculation was not correct and once updated, the minimum requirement was not met.

Mr. Munhall inquired about the material proposed for the accessory structure. Mr. Sebach explained the material is a solid composite. He said the design concept is similar to a shadowbox fence.

Mr. Rinaldi asked if the location for the pedestrian bridge landing had been determined. He questioned what this area is going to look like from the bridge.

Shannon Stenberg asked if the composite material was being used anywhere else on the site. Mr. Sebach confirmed this was the only location. He explained this is a solid color material in a cedar/redwood tone that will not fade.

Mr. Rinaldi asked if the generator will be visible behind this shadow fence design. Mr. Sebach said the panels will be staggered so the contents will not be visible.

Mr. Sebach presented several additional elevations and explained the proposed changes. Mr. Munhall indicated the south side is more of a concern for the ARB than the north side as it will be more visual.

Mr. Sebach discussed the proposed modifications regarding the parapet height and the proposed screening solutions. He offered an alternative design from what was shown for the Board's consideration, which included additional wrapping of the parapet to provide an integrated finish. The Board was supportive of this change and requested a condition of approval be added.

Ms. Rauch said approval is recommended for a Minor Project Review with seven Waivers and no conditions.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Munhall moved, Mr. Musser seconded, to approve a request for a Minor Project Review with one condition:

- 1) The applicant provide additional wrapping of the parapet wall to ensure an integrated design, as shown in the meeting.

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

Motion and Vote

Mr. Munhall moved, Mr. Musser seconded, to approve a request for seven Waivers. The vote was as follows: Ms. Stenberg, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Musser, yes; and Mr. Munhall, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

Communications

Jennifer Rauch said there were no communications to relay.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 7:16 pm.

As approved by the Architectural Review Board on December 16, 2015.