

## ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

### MEETING MINUTES

JUNE 24, 2015

#### AGENDA

- 1. BSD Historic Core District – The Sisters Sweet Shoppe – Signs 55 West Bridge Street  
15-056ARB-MPR  
Minor Project Review (Approved 3 – 0)  
Master Sign Plan Review (Approved 3 – 0)**
- 2. Bridge Street District Sign Guidelines  
15-040ADM  
Administrative Request  
(Discussion)**
- 3. Annual Items of Interest  
Administrative Request  
(Discussion)**

David Rinaldi called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Board members present were: Neil Mathias and Jane Fox. Thomas Munhall and Everett Musser were absent. City representatives were Jennifer Rauch, Rachel Ray, Nicki Martin, Joanne Shelly, Katie Dodaro, Lia Yakumithis, and Laurie Wright.

#### Motion and Vote

Mr. Mathias moved, Mr. Rinaldi seconded, to accept the documents into the record. The vote was as follows: Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; and Mr. Mathias, yes. (Approved 3 – 0)

#### Motion and Vote

Mr. Rinaldi moved, Mr. Mathias seconded, to accept the May 27, 2015, meeting minutes as presented. The vote was as follows: Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Mathias, yes; and Mr. Rinaldi, yes. (Approved 3 – 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. He said the Brand Road case originally slated for this evening was postponed prior to the meeting.

- 1. BSD Historic Core District – The Sisters Sweet Shoppe – Signs 55 West Bridge Street  
15-056ARB-MPR  
Minor Project Review/Master Sign Plan Review**

The Chair said this is a request for installation of new signs and architectural modifications for an existing multiple-tenant building located on the south side of West Bridge Street, east of the intersection with Franklin Street. The proposal includes a new 7.5-square-foot projecting sign, two new 2.25-square-foot window signs, six new transom-window signs, a new awning with an awning sign, and a new exterior paint scheme. He said this is a request for review and approval for a Minor Project Review and Master Sign Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.065, 153.066, and 153.170 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Nicki Martin said The Sisters Sweet Shoppe is moving from North High Street to the Bridge Street location and presented an aerial view of the site, outlining Town Center II, next to La Chatelaine. She presented

the building and pointed out the north elevation that is the front façade and the east elevation that accesses the parking lot to the rear.

Ms. Martin explained the **Minor Project Review** portion of this application includes the following:

North Elevation

- Awning cover
- Exterior Paint
  - Primary entrance
  - Ground-story windows below transoms

East Elevation

- Exterior Paint
  - Secondary entrance

Ms. Martin said the applicant is proposing the same teal color on both doors as well as the ground-story windows below the transoms.

Ms. Martin explained the **Master Sign Plan** portion of this application includes the following:

North Elevation

- Projecting sign
- Window sign
- Awning sign

(Only two signs are permitted without MSP)

East Elevation

- Projecting sign
- Window signs (3)

(Only one sign is permitted without MSP)

Ms. Martin said the awning on the north façade will be a replacement cover in a Sunbrella Aquamarine color and the exterior paint will be in a coordinating shade of teal on the primary and secondary entrances as well as the lower ground-story windows.

Ms. Martin stated the proposed projecting sign on the north elevation meets Code and the ART recommended approval of this sign farther than six feet from the entrance because it is architecturally integrated. Additionally, she said the ART requested the sign be dimensionally routed to provide architectural detail consistent with the Historic District as well as with the style of the building.

Ms. Martin presented the proposed window sign on the north elevation that meets the intent of the Code. However, she said the ART recommended the sign be reduced to 20% of the window area, which would be permitted by Code.

Ms. Martin presented the proposed awning sign design, which represents the store products and does not provide any business identification. She added the proposed awning sign is not consistent with the other awnings in the Town Center II development. She noted that La Chatelaine was not permitted to have signs on their awnings during a past ARB application review. She said the ART recommended removal of the awning sign in favor of window signs on the lower portion of the ground-story windows to coordinate with the proposed signs on the east elevation.

Ms. Martin presented the proposed projecting sign on the east elevation, which is visible from the public right-of-way along West Bridge Street as well as the public parking lot to the rear of the building. She

said it meets the intent for visibility for multiple locations. She reported the ART recommended approval with the same conditions that the projecting sign to be permitted farther than six feet from the entrance and be dimensionally routed.

Ms. Martin presented the proposed window sign on the east elevation at the same size as the primary entrance. However, she said the ART recommended the sign be reduced to meet the provision in the Code for a business identification sign that are permitted to be one-square-foot in size and one low-chroma color.

Ms. Martin presented the two proposed transom window signs displaying products that are for sale in the store. She pointed out they are architecturally integrated and meet the window area requirement. She reported the ART believes this meets the threshold for creativity and integration, therefore, recommended approval as part of the Master Sign Plan.

Ms. Martin said the ART is recommending approval of the Minor Project Review with one condition:

- 1) The applicant provide a paint sample for the door and window trim to Planning within 30 days of approval of this application.

Ms. Martin said the ART is recommending approval of the Master Sign Plan Review to permit the two additional signs located in the transom windows on the east elevation, two additional window signs, and the two projecting signs to exceed the requirement to be located within six feet of the entrance with six conditions:

- 1) A paint sample for the projecting sign is provided along with an updated Master Sign Plan package, prior to sign permitting, subject to approval by Planning;
- 2) The awning sign be eliminated to meet the permitted number of signs on the primary facade of the building;
- 3) The window sign on the north elevation be reduced in size to 20% of the window area;
- 4) The window sign on the north elevation be reduced in size to one-square-foot with one low-chroma color to meet the provision for a business identification sign;
- 5) The projecting signs are dimensionally routed and the mounting hardware is consistent with existing mounting fixtures used for the multi-tenant building; and
- 6) The two additional window signs on the north elevation meet the Code requirements for window sign area.

Ms. Martin concluded by stating the proposal with the conditions provided as well as the Master Sign Plan provision, meets the Architectural Review Board criteria with respect to character, color scheme, and sign design. She invited the Board's questions.

Jane Fox inquired about the awning sign and said it is a permitted sign type. She asked if the disapproval of La Chatelaine's awning affected this recommendation.

Ms. Martin replied from a consistency perspective that it did affect the recommendation. She said this proposal is part of a Master Sign Plan where several signs are being requested and ART wanted the sign package to be consistent on both facades of the building. She added consistency with other existing signs in the Historic District currently was also a consideration.

Neil Mathias requested background information regarding the La Chatelaine proposal. He asked if their awning was a solid color or a striped awning and the reason that awning was declined, specifically.

Ms. Martin said when La Chatelaine was reviewed by the ARB it was in a Planned Unit Development, which was the zoning prior to the Bridge Street District. She said the requirements were different. She

said the proposal included striped awnings with the vertical portion of the awning a solid black color with white lettering stating the products available for sale. She said those awning signs were not approved by the ARB.

Jennifer Rauch invited the applicant to provide their perspective regarding the proposed awning sign.

Laura Krpata, 318 E. Fulton Street, Apt. A, Columbus, Ohio 43215, said she represents the applicant. She said Kurt Dehner is the owner of The Sisters Sweet Shoppe at both locations and their current location has the same lettering on their existing awning. She said the owner is open to making an adjustment to window graphics instead of awning graphics but would request the graphics be placed in a different location than the lower portion of the windows because they would not be visible with the benches placed out front.

Ms. Krpata said they are proposing the placement at the top of the front windows and also adding a holding box around them to provide more definition and better proportion given the square window versus the transom-size windows on the east elevation.

Ms. Rauch indicated the discussion at the ART included the history of La Chatelaine's application, which preceded the more recent desires to allow for sign creativity. She said the ART's biggest concern was the consistency amongst both elevations while acquiring the best results. She said originally the ART suggested eliminating the sign altogether but made a compromise to accommodate what the applicant desired.

Ms. Fox reported she visited the site and the immediate area. She believes the awning lettering is the best choice. She said we have to look at this now that we are in the Bridge Street District. She indicated from a pedestrian viewpoint, upon arriving at that corner, there is a tree that blocks the view of the building. She said when the buildings are viewed in context, La Chatelaine projects forward, closer to the street. She said they have a ground sign that effectively designates the building. She said this building is setback about three or four feet. She said the building on the east side comes forward with a big porch and their sign is on the wall. She said not only is the tree in the corner blocking the view but there is a banner in front with two big Kiwanis frog signs on it, which is the first thing that catches your eye. She said that banner is always going to be very visible in front of their store. She said there is also a park bench in front of their store so signage needs to be fair to the business owner so his shop is noticeable, and for the streetscape, people will know what he has to sell. She said there is a lot of street clutter on West Bridge Street: a planter, a park bench, and a tree. She said the branches of the tree effectively cover the top half of their building. She said for the pedestrian, they would have to be in front of that building to see what they are selling. She said it cannot be seen driving by in a car, either. She reiterated the applicant should be allowed to have the front awning sign because it is within character of the Historic District and was permitted for this applicant at the other location. She said it will be a fresh little spot that says "Cookies", "Candies", and "Ice Cream". She added at the window level, nobody would ever see it. She believes this building will recede and nobody will know that it is there if this is not permitted.

Ms. Fox said she loves the transom window signs on the east side but expressed concerns about their visibility. She said the painting has started but she would like to see the combinations of paint colors because she is uncertain how they will coordinate with the green on the building facade.

Ms. Rauch presented the color samples. Ms. Martin said the PMS number for the paint on the main building was not provided.

David Rinaldi asked if it was the intent for the trim color and the awning to match. Ms. Rauch said they do not match but they are fairly close; the awning is darker.

Ms. Krpata said they intentionally chose a slightly darker awning color to coordinate better with the deep hunter green on the building façade.

Ms. Fox said the teal is really bright and when she just saw that sample against the green, it seemed a little strong but without looking at the whole package, it is hard to tell what it is all going to look like.

Ms. Rauch said that was the ART's concern as well and that is why conditions were added.

Mr. Mathias indicated he did not have a concern with text on the awning as long as it was a consistent color. He said as long as the awning is one color, it is appropriate. He stated the front window sign needs to be within the 20% rule as consistent across the Historic District. He said his biggest concern was with the projecting sign on the east elevation. He said it is a patio, not another streetscape, and if the intent is for signage for the parking lot, then it should be placed at the far south end. He said he was fine with the window signs mimicking the same words on the awning within the transoms.

Ms. Krpata said there are several trees on the south side so they are concerned about visibility in that location.

Mr. Mathias reiterated it is not appropriate to give two signs to the West Bridge Street frontage. He said Jeni's on the corner has two frontages with one projecting sign on the corner. He suggested moving the projecting sign to the northeast corner.

Kurt Dehner, 55 N. High Street, Dublin, Ohio 43017 said he does not disagree necessarily with what is being said but they really want a sign for the people to see from the parking lot. He said they may not use it now but the sidewalk is used as a cut-through. He said the vegetation is so thick a projecting sign will not be visible until the pedestrian is part of the way up the sidewalk. He said it would be seen before arriving at their patio but it would not be visible from the parking lot. He indicated if it is moved back farther, it will not be visible at all from the rear.

Mr. Mathias said he would be willing to approve the awning sign without the projecting sign on the east elevation.

Mr. Dehner suggested putting the sign above the door, over the north column, above the coach light. He said he did not have an objection to moving the projecting sign if it would satisfy the ARB's objection and if he gets his awning sign.

Mr. Rinaldi asked if the ART had a discussion about this. Ms. Rauch said the locations were not discussed. Ms. Fox pointed out the emergency light is centered right above the door.

Ms. Rauch said either side of the door would be appropriate, Code states it must be within six feet of the door.

Mr. Rinaldi said the big improvement would be to have the projecting sign moved above the door on the east elevation. He said he likes the lettering on the awning on the north elevation and on the transoms on the east elevation. He indicated it was very classy looking. He suggested having that lettering on the north façade window on the bottom for consistency.

Mr. Mathias said he does not have a problem permitting the awning sign because the Code has been changed and updated since the La Chatelaine application.

Ms. Fox noted that La Chatelaine could always come back for new signs.

Mr. Mathias said he is not in love with the sea foam color and overall color scheme. He said he was not sure how that fits in with the architectural character of the Historic District.

Mr. Dehner asked how orange and yellow at Jeni's could then be compatible with the Historic District.

Mr. Matias replied on a sign it is but on their building it is not. He pointed out that Jeni's has an orange sign for their logo but their building is not painted to match. He questioned whether it fits within Historic Dublin where there are approved color schemes that must be subdued and simple in nature. He asked the rest of the Board for their opinion on the colors proposed.

Ms. Fox said she agrees the lettering should match, but was not sure if the sign logo color looked right. She said she would like to see these colors combined; she does not want to see a bright teal or turquoise color stand out in front of a forest green color if it does not complement it. She reiterated she liked the awning and the transoms for a fresh look that will bring more interest to this business that is recessed.

Mr. Rinaldi inquired about the projecting sign's background color. Mr. Dehner said it has a gray-washed stain on it, with the grain of the wood showing through.

Mr. Dehner said the colors were not dramatically different than what was being presented on the screen. He said there is no doubt they are not using hunter green or beige. He said they are trying to reinforce their logo and who they are. He said they are giving a little life to a muted building. He said even by moving this short distance within the District, he is concerned about losing his current customers as well as attracting new ones. He concluded he thought the colors were compatible.

Ms. Fox said the colors in the Historic District have to play in context with its surrounding environments as we begin to allow a little more variety and creativity. She indicated she was not particular about what the color is, but whether or not the colors complement what is there, what is next to it, around it, so it does not stand out as if you were not thinking about it. She said she would support the color combination the applicant is requesting if the City reviews it against the existing building colors and next to the colors on the adjacent properties. She said there is a balance between what the applicant wants for their logo, awnings, and signs but also that the community gets a really pleasant experience as they pass by.

Mr. Mathias asked his fellow Board Members about allowing for a creative color on the door but not on the window trim on both the north and east sides. He said he is trying to give the applicant the logo pop and tie it to the business but leave the rest more within the historic character.

Mr. Dehner said that was their original design. Ms. Krpata said they wanted to frame the view into the store because part of the rebranding is to be open to their audience so the front of the house is also the back of the house, dipping their candies and making their cookies in front of their customers.

Mr. Rinaldi said he wanted to see consistent treatment around the building.

Mr. Mathias reiterated he would support a brighter color for the door but wants the awning color complementary to the color of the siding; the awning should fit with the architecture and colors of the building. He said the sample appears really bright.

Ms. Fox agreed the bright color did not work for her. She said bright color could be used on the umbrellas on the patio, and would do without the bright color for the window trim.

Ms. Rauch presented the modified conditions.

The Chair asked the applicant if he agreed to the conditions to which he replied affirmatively.

Mr. Mathias said he needed to see a larger sample of the awning with a sample of the paint color before he could vote yes on this application. He said we could have a condition whereby Planning has to approve the colors with those samples.

Mr. Dehner agreed to work with Planning on the colors. Ms. Fox said she had confidence that Planning could decide on the colors. Ms. Rauch said Planning could look at all the samples together to make sure they coordinate. Ms. Rauch said she would change the condition to state the entire color palette will be reviewed.

Ms. Rauch reiterated that two motions and votes that were being requested this evening.

### **Motion and Vote**

Ms. Fox moved, Mr. Mathias seconded, to approve the Minor Project Review with two conditions:

- 1) The applicant provide the entire color palette for review and approval by Planning within 30 days of approval of this application.
- 2) The ground-story window trim on the north elevation be painted to match the existing window trim and not in the color scheme proposed.

Kurt Dehner said he agreed to the revised conditions. The vote was as follows: Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Mathias, yes; and Ms. Fox, yes. (Approved 3 – 0)

Mr. Rinaldi moved, Mr. Mathias seconded, to approve a request for a Master Sign Plan Review with five conditions:

- 1) A paint sample for the projecting sign is provided along with an updated Master Sign Plan package, prior to sign permitting, subject to approval by Planning.
- 2) The window sign on the north elevation be reduced in size to 20% of the window area.
- 3) The window sign on the east elevation be reduced in size to one-square-foot and one low-chroma color to meet the provision for a business identification sign.
- 4) The projecting signs be dimensionally routed and the mounting hardware be consistent with existing mounting fixtures used for the multi-tenant building.
- 5) The projecting sign on the east elevation be located above the door on either side of the entrance.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Mathias, yes; and Mr. Rinaldi, yes. (Approved 3 – 0)

## **2. Bridge Street District Sign Guidelines 15-040ADM**

### **Administrative Request**

The Chair said this is a request to create a guide intended to help applicants understand and apply the sign requirements in the Bridge Street District and provide direction for sign design and placement in a pedestrian-oriented environment. He said this request is for informal review and feedback on this future request for review and recommendation of approval to City Council for Bridge Street District Sign Guidelines.

Rachel Ray said the document is intended for a few different audiences: Applicants; Board Members; and Staff. She stated the distinction between the Zoning Code and this guide is that the guide is just

suggestions and guidance (planned to be adopted by City Council by resolution so there is some “force” behind them) and the regulations of the Code will govern the signs.

Ms. Ray said Staff is looking for sign designs that are appropriate to an urban environment. She said she provided three discussion questions for the Board:

- 1) Do the BSD Sign Guidelines achieve their stated objectives? Should the objectives be modified?
- 2) Are there other Character Principles that should be addressed in the sign guidelines?
- 3) Do the BSD Sign Guidelines appropriately address signs in the Historic District?

Ms. Ray provided a brief history. She said the BSD provisions of the Zoning Code were adopted March 25, 2012. Soon after, she said PZC, CC, and Staff had discussions about the recent signs being approved in the BSD in terms of sign quality, creative design, and whether they met the original design intent. In the meantime, she said Planning contracted with a sign design consultant for services to review signs when it was felt the applicant should be pushed a little further with their sign designs. She said the sign consultants also provided recommendations for the recent Zoning Code amendments. She noted City Council adopted the most recent BSD Code amendments on December 8, 2014, and they requested Planning prepare sign guidelines to demonstrate desirable sign qualities.

Ms. Ray presented the objectives of the Sign Guidelines:

- Encourage excellence in sign design, both as a communication tool and as an art form.
- Allow and encourage creative and unique sign designs while preventing cluttered and unattractive streetscapes.
- Provide basic parameters for creative signs that may be as varied and unique as the businesses they represent.
- Provide guidance for designing signs in the Historic District, as well as signs associated with buildings that were constructed prior to the enactment of the Bridge Street District zoning regulations.
- Outline the contents of Master Sign Plans, which are intended to allow greater flexibility and creativity in sign design and display where signs are used as a placemaking tool.

Ms. Ray referred to her **first discussion question** as she approached the Table of Contents:

- 1) Do the BSD Sign Guidelines achieve their stated objectives? Should the objectives be modified?

Ms. Ray explained that the Table of Contents presents the outline of the document:

1. Purpose & Intent

*Ms. Ray noted that this guide was presented to the PZC on June 18<sup>th</sup> for their initial thoughts and they requested language and perhaps descriptive words that reflect the feelings one should get from viewing signs in the Bridge Street District.*

2. Process

3. Applicability

4. Character

*Ms. Ray explained the Historic District was intentionally not called out separately because many of the character principles listed below should apply throughout the Bridge Street District, including the Historic District, but she welcomes the Architectural Review Board’s thoughts on this topic.*

5. Quality

6. Requirements

7. Master Sign Plans

Ms. Ray presented five **Character Principles** that were identified along with examples for each:

1. **Architectural Integration**  
All signs shall be designed to fully integrate with the building architecture and overall site design, and to enhance the pedestrian experience in the Bridge Street District to create memorable places for people to enjoy.
2. **Illumination**  
The illumination of signs is strongly encouraged to help add a sense of liveliness and activity to the Bridge Street District. Well-designed signs use lighting as an accent rather than a distraction designed to compete for attention in a busy urban streetscape.
3. **Colors & Secondary Images**  
Colorful signs can add character and interest to buildings and the overall streetscape throughout the Bridge Street District; however, in no case shall the use of color and supporting graphics distract from the creation of attractive signs with simple, easy to understand messages.
4. **Graphic Design & Composition**  
Unique, interesting signs that contribute to a memorable, pedestrian-oriented environment generally demonstrate strong adherence to accepted graphic design principles. Signs should be designed thoughtfully, with consideration for aesthetically pleasing composition.
5. **Dimensionality**  
Signs should be constructed to stand the test of time, designed to be weather and fade-resistant. High quality signs are also designed to appear substantial, with three-dimensional elements that give the sign presence without appearing overly heavy. Quality signs also conceal structural elements that are not integral to the sign's overall design.

Ms. Ray referred to her **second discussion question**:

- 2) Are there other Character Principles that should be addressed in the sign guidelines?

Ms. Ray presented the requirements section. She said these pages are laid out similar to the building type requirements in the Bridge Street Code on a two-page spread dedicated to each of the many different types of signs. She said the left page includes a graphic depiction of how to measure the dimensional requirements for signs, such as sign height and area. She explained some of the text on these pages includes a summary that should match the actual Code requirements. She said the right page has positive sign examples and a description of what is desirable about those illustrative signs. She said on the flip side, there are examples on the same page of what is *not* desired in terms of sign design and elements that should be avoided. She indicated all the examples of the signs "to avoid" are extreme to make the point clear.

Ms. Ray said the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* include a couple of pages that include some of the zoning requirements that are now out of date, but they also have very specific character recommendations, mainly intended to maintain the historic look and feel of this area all the way down to font selection. She said a lot of the fonts technically recommended here are very calligraphic and historic. She said Staff's recommendation to the Board is to eliminate some of these recommendations to maintain these antiquated design requirements, although they are still an option for applicants who would like to use them. She said Planning would like the Board's thoughts on whether Staff can push the envelope a little bit more, recognizing the character principles and the desire to continue to incorporate each site's architectural context within the sign design. She said the intent with the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*, which are also in the process of being updated, is to reference this guide rather than two separate documents referencing signs.

Ms. Ray referred to her **third discussion question**:

- 3) Do the BSD Sign Guidelines appropriately address signs in the Historic District?

Ms. Ray concluded her presentation by opening up discussion with the Board.

Neil Mathias began with the first discussion question regarding objectives. He suggested that enforcement, or what the process is, could be a worthwhile area in terms of if there are fines involved for having illegal sandwich board signs, or the consequences of not following Code. He said when someone obtains a permit they will go through the process and have this give and take discussion with the Board to get the sign approved. He asked what happens in the District when people are putting out sandwich board signs that are not in compliance. He said it should be noted where complaints can be made or information to let people know that if they do not bring in their sandwich board signs at night there would be fines.

Jane Fox said she liked the draft guidelines. She referred to the first discussion question by stating she thought that the guidelines do achieve their objectives, but some of the objectives could be modified. She said she did some research and referred to [planning.org](http://planning.org) and a few other websites that provided her with some resources. She noted one of the things that popped out the most and suggested should be added is that “signs should adorn and enhance distinctive buildings in the Bridge Street District and should be placed to respect and compliment the architectural character and elements of the built structure, landscape, and natural environment.” She said it is important to design each sign in context with its surroundings. She said the word “context” needs to be added as a character principle, because so often we look at individual signs in a vacuum, and what happens is, a sign might look great on the front of a particular building, but when you look at that building next to another building, sometimes we find there is not a good balance.

Ms. Fox referred to her notes and read some suggested text: “signs must respect the scale and proportion of buildings and contribute to the ambiance of a place.” She noted not only should the signs be proportionate but they should enhance the space in which they are located. She read “the goal and end result is a visually appealing environment that attracts customers, maintains a healthy economic climate while complimenting the existing built environment and the natural features of the BSD”. She said the BSD in many ways, is a very complex built environment; it has natural vistas, a lot of strong structure, historic features, is pedestrian friendly, etc. She said the character principle of context relates to the fact that signs and their environment are really one and the same, in a sense, given their prominence on the street. She suggested that a stronger discussion of context be added to the guide. She reiterated that yes, the guidelines meet their stated objectives but she offered to work with Staff to make certain areas clearer and more specific as she did not want to take up the Board’s time this evening.

Ms. Ray said she would be happy to work with Ms. Fox on this guide.

Dave Rinaldi said this was a great place to begin for sign examples, as this is the same thing that has been going on with the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*. He stated pictures are worth 1,000 words. He indicated having examples of what to do and what not to do are great to have for the guide. He said we could debate which pictures are appropriate or not appropriate, but the overall document is very helpful.

Ms. Ray said there are some images in the guide that would not meet the Code and would have to go through the Master Sign Plan Review process. She reported that the PZC talked a lot about how they would love to see some of these signs and wants Staff to make clear in this document that applicants should not be afraid to bring forward sign designs that are outside of the box; the PZC recommended a section that shows some of the most interesting signs we could find, and to tell applicants to bring one of

those signs forward, because the PZC would love to have a conversation about how it could work in the BSD.

Mr. Rinaldi said the guide is very creative. He said if a person did not read the entire guide and just went directly to illumination for example, it may not be appropriate to the Historic District specifically. Possible options were discussed.

Mr. Mathias suggested that any photos included in the guide that are of Dublin signs be approved signs. He said the Winan's sandwich board sign for example is too tall and not allowed by Code, so if the reader just looked at the picture they may end up buying a sandwich board sign that was too large for their business as opposed to reading it was included as an example for a chalkboard sign that has a temporary and changing nature, which is recommended, and not an example of permitted sandwich board sign size.

Ms. Ray agreed to switch out that picture.

Mr. Rinaldi affirmed this would be on the website as well and where the images could be enlarged. He referred to the Master Sign Plan images, which were not legible in print.

Ms. Ray said the document will be primarily available online for applicants to access from the City's website and enlarge as much as necessary so that the images are visible; however, she said she intends to include models of approved Master Sign Plans as attachments or appendices to show applicants examples of what the City would like to see from a submittal standpoint.

Ms. Fox believes the Historic District is going to transition itself in many ways. She said it has a unique sense of place in contrast to other areas of the BSD. She said some regulations should protect historic areas (such as landmarks and public vistas). She said the installation of signs should not damage historic structures or detract from the historic character or unique natural features of the landscape. She said the BSD is a complex built environment containing sensitive natural historic landscapes (Indian Run Falls, the Scioto River valley, springs, quarries, stone walls, cemeteries) as well as distinct public spaces (Dublin Community Church, scenic roadways, the bridge over the river, south river views). She said the identity and economy of the community is related to the natural features. She said some of these regulations should ensure that these public amenities are protected. She said she understood the guidelines have to be inherently flexible, but they need to be strong enough so the reader understands so that when each person that sits on the ARB reviews sign proposals, they are basing their opinion from the guide as opposed to expressing a personal opinion. She said the guideline provides the values we are trying to protect.

Ms. Ray agreed that was a great suggestion to ensure the Historic District is appropriately called out in the intent section, as well as referencing suggestions for sign placement to avoid interfering with or damaging historic structures.

Ms. Fox said the positioning of the sign should not compete or obscure significant features of a historic building. She said the placement should always respect the architectural elements in a way that they do not overshadow or overpower those structures and sign installation should avoid any irreversible damage. She suggested adding installation information to the architectural integration character principle.

Ms. Fox said she thought the signs that are not allowed were missing from the guide, such as roof signs, animated signs, video signs, projected images, etc.

Ms. Ray said prohibited signs were discussed at the PZC meeting. She said they liked to consider the changeable copy signs that would not be permitted in the Historic District. She said currently the Code does not permit those signs, but if an applicant brings something innovative forward, it could be

discussed for consideration as part of a Master Sign Plan. She said even though certain signs would not be permitted in the Historic District, a reference could be made to them.

Ms. Fox requested more specificity. She inquired about icon signs that were not mentioned in these guidelines, such as a teapot-shaped sign in front of the tea house. She asked if things like that would be mentioned that they are permitted or in the Code.

Ms. Ray said it would require a Master Sign Plan Review. She said Code does not recognize three-dimensional types of signs as they are tough to regulate across the board; however, images showing that they are encouraged could be provided in the document.

Mr. Rinaldi said the Code has changed so signs in the two-dimensional shape of a tea pot, a dog bone, or a house, for example, are permitted.

Jennifer Rauch asked the Board if they would be opposed to a historic structure having a more modern sign.

Mr. Mathias said he loves the contrast of the Jeni's Ice Cream sign on the traditional building, with the juxtaposition of the pop of color on a neutral building. Again, he said we do not want the whole building to be orange and yellow, but an orange and yellow sign is great. He indicated he would like to see more of those subtle pops of color that do not change the character of the building.

Mr. Rinaldi asked if the adherence to the fonts had been enforced. Ms. Rauch said it had been enforced strictly for a number of years.

Ms. Fox believes the ARB can get away from the little wood signs with bracket, but it has to be in context. She said if it is a historic building, it makes a little bit of a difference. She indicated there should be discretion in this part of the District; she is not sure she wants to see a neon sign on an entirely historic building.

Mr. Mathias suggested that language should be stronger for examples of signs that are not appropriate. He provided the example of sandwich board signs where it states "avoid" and it should state "it is not appropriate" or that "it is prohibited" rather than to mean it is simply "not encouraged." He recommended not leaving gray areas that are open for interpretation.

Mr. Mathias inquired about the process for obtaining an approved sandwich board sign in the Historic District, and asked that the language be clearer.

Ms. Ray said requiring a change in the process for sandwich board signs would be a Code change; however, the existing process can be made clearer in the guidelines.

Mr. Rinaldi inquired about sandwich board signs only being permitted in the Historic District. He said those signs can be attractive and are very typical of urban environments.

Ms. Ray said the PZC questioned that also. And at the moment, she said no Code amendment is being pursued to allow them elsewhere; however, an applicant could make a request for sandwich board signs as part of a Master Sign Plan.

Mr. Mathias said it has been discussed how it is difficult to regulate the content of sandwich board signs and our intent is not for it to serve as a third or fourth sign for a business. He noted that was addressed in the sign guide language. He asked if there was a way to require that the content has to be changed within a certain timeframe.

Ms. Ray indicated that would be a Code amendment but she would explore that suggestion for this guide with Legal, or at least make the intent clearer in the guidelines.

Ms. Fox asked if menus posted outside of restaurants were allowed in the Code.

Ms. Ray said it is in the Code as a “directory sign” and they do not require a permit.

Mr. Rinaldi asked if wayfinding signs on a pedestrian scale have been addressed.

Ms. Ray reported the City is working with a consultant on a wayfinding plan to look at everything from highway oriented wayfinding signs all the way down to pedestrian-scale kiosks. She stated that City Council gave positive feedback on the first level of auto-oriented wayfinding signs this past Monday.

Ms. Rauch referred the Board to the City’s website for more information about the wayfinding signs.

Mr. Mathias asked if there were pending Code changes or if a review was in process.

Ms. Ray confirmed there are no Code changes pending at this time.

Ms. Ray concluded that she would bring this forward in July or August once all the comments are incorporated as the next step in the process. She thanked the Board members for a good discussion and insightful comments.

### **3. Annual Items of Interest**

### **Administrative Request**

The Chair said this is a request to create an Annual Items of Interest list that will be forwarded to City Council for approval. He said this is a request for discussion prior to a formal request for review and recommendation of approval to City Council for Annual Items of Interest.

Jennifer Rauch said she wanted to review the ideas expressed at the May 27<sup>th</sup> meeting that she had consolidated into a draft of annual items of interest list. She suggested the Board review the topics and work with Staff to develop the tasks and desired outcomes. She said once a final list is created and formally recommended by the Board, it will be forwarded onto City Council for approval. She said this would allow City Council to prioritize and provide input and guidance on the topics the Board and Staff should focus on.

Ms. Rauch presented her list of potential items of interest:

- **APPENDIX G OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES OUTSIDE THE DISTRICT**

**Objective:** Review Appendix G within the City of Dublin Zoning Code. Investigate whether additional properties should be added to the list and the steps needed to undertake this revision.

- **INVENTORY OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES IN THE DISTRICT**

**Objective:** Update the Ohio Historic Inventory for historic properties within the City. Determine if properties and the information on the inventory should be removed, added, or updated.

- **DEMOLITION BY NEGLECT**

**Objective:** Research demolition by neglect and the impacts on a community. Investigate and implement best practices regarding regulations and policy decisions to reduce the likelihood of Dublin’s historic properties being demolished because of neglect. Inventory historic properties to determine if any fit the determined description and take steps to remedy.

- COMMUNITY EDUCATION

**Objective:** Investigate educational opportunities to promote the Historic District, such as increased distribution of the revised *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* to property owners, mailer/newsletter, collaboration with the schools, and educational sessions.

Neil Mathias asked for additional information regarding how the properties were put on Appendix G originally. Mr. Mathias asked about the enforceability of the provisions and how properties are added and removed from the list. Ms. Rauch said the Code outlines procedures for the maintenance of Appendix G and generally reviewed the requirements.

David Rinaldi said it would be a big step under the purview of this body.

Ms. Fox said the City might consider an incentive to preserve these historic properties, based on their significance to the community. She said with no incentive, we see people buy these properties that we put strict regulations on and then the property owners do not do anything. She said after a time they come to ARB to request the structures be demolished because they have been neglected. She said maybe we need to consider a more proactive manner and encourage investment that results from an incentive from the City and enhances the Historic District at the same time. Ms. Fox suggested a marketing plan that helps historic property owners by providing incentives but also create a sense of pride. She said the property could be listed in a brochure of historic homes or be part of a tour of historic homes, etc.

Mr. Rinaldi asked if that could be addressed in the *Guidelines* by providing potential resources. He added education could be tied to the wayfinding. He said there could be a story to tell, why the building is significant, why the area is significant, what happened here, etc. He noted there are a lot of school children around Jeni's in the spring that learn things about Historic Dublin. Mr. Rinaldi suggested including historic properties that are not even under this body's review.

Joanne Shelly said the City is talking to Dublin Arts Council (DAC) about updating the art in public places map and combining it with our Dublin Bike map so the art is integrated with the bike paths. She said historic places could be a great add. She said as people bike around town, they could learn what they are seeing or receive directions for seeing something else.

Ms. Rauch said the Board could discuss and identify ways to educate the public whether it is through wayfinding, a mailer, or collaboration with the schools.

Ms. Fox said we need to address and somehow handle art work within the Historic District. She noted this because the art work at the Karrer Barn was such a controversy.

Ms. Fox asked if it would be important to identify the different zoning districts within the Historic District Transition in these *Guidelines*. Ms. Rauch agreed this could be made clearer.

Ms. Rauch referred to the second item regarding updating the Ohio Historic inventory, which has not been completed in a number of years. She said in some instances, structures have been demolished.

Mr. Mathias inquired about an inventory for landmark trees. He said he has a tree in his backyard that has a tag with a number on it but he has not been able to find out what that number means. Ms. Rauch confirmed the landmark trees in the City were tagged and identified on maps and later converted to a GIS layer.

Mr. Mathias asked if this could be an education component where residents can be instructed where to find this information and what it means. Ms. Rauch agreed it could be incorporated into the *Guidelines*.

Ms. Fox asked if the *Dublin Historic Design Guidelines* address the responsibilities of the ARB in the beginning of the document. Ms. Rauch said a general overview is provided, but Code outlines the specific duties of the Board.

Ms. Rauch asked if there were other projects outside of the *Guidelines* update the Board was interested in investigating.

Mr. Mathias suggested further discussion on sandwich board sign appropriateness and enforcement of resources for the annual item list.

Ms. Fox stated she was interested in understanding what information was learned regarding the stone walls along Dublin Road related to the bike path. She said the walls are continuing to come down.

Ms. Rauch said the area adjacent to the edge of the pavement must be set back a safe distance, but also must account for the path, grading, and tree lawn. She said the location of the stone wall and the amount of space needed to fit these features is limited, and the safety of the path users was the first priority. She said in a number of locations the wall had to be removed to accommodate this.

Ms. Fox emphasized if the historic walls are removed we should stockpile the rock for repairs. She strongly suggested that whenever a historical element is going to be destroyed, it should to be identified, inventoried, and preserved, if possible. She said there should be a good reason why it is not preserved and not because a contractor says he does not want to save it. Ms. Fox said there are great places to use the old wall stones. She said the stone may not be in the very best condition but it has a patina that is irreplaceable. She said this is a strong discussion happening in neighborhoods regarding the removal of the walls.

Ms. Rauch agreed the stone walls are a distinctive feature of our community.

Mr. Mathias asked if Engineering was going to reconstruct the walls as part of the bike path plan. Ms. Rauch said the intention is for new walls to be built but the issue with reusing that existing stone is how it was constructed originally and ultimately the condition of the material once it is taken down. She said it is a costly, difficult, and time consuming process to use the same wall stone to reconstruct the wall as it was before. She said she recognized it is a priceless amenity because it is a historical element but the City also has an obligation to be fiscally responsible.

Ms. Rauch said it was her understanding the City made the stone available to the property owners to use. Ms. Fox said if the property owners wanted it, they would have had to remove it themselves. She said the problem is those owners do not know when the wall is coming down. Ms. Rauch said she can raise that concern with the Engineering.

## **Communications**

Ms. Rauch confirmed with the Board that they were willing to schedule a special meeting on either July 8 or July 15. She said she would email the dates to the complete Board to determine availability and schedule it based on this information.

Mr. Rinaldi adjourned the meeting at 8:24 p.m.

As approved by the Architectural Review Board on Tuesday, August 4, 2015.