

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

MEETING MINUTES

AUGUST 26, 2015

AGENDA

- 1. Bryan Residence** **84 S. Riverview Street**
15-074ARB/MPR **Minor Project Review (Approved 4 – 0)**
- 2. Bridge Street District Sign Guidelines**
15-040ADM **Administrative Request (Approval Recommended 4 – 0)**
- 3. Historic Dublin Design Guidelines Update**
15-076ADM **Administrative Request (Discussion)**

David Rinaldi called the meeting to order at 6:32 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Board members present were: Jane Fox, Thomas Munhall, and Everett Musser. City representatives were: Jennifer Rauch, Rachel Ray, and Laurie Wright.

Motion and Vote

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

The Chair asked if there were any comments or edit requests for the meeting minutes from August 4, 2015. Mr. Rinaldi asked for clarification about the way the motion and vote were written for the case 15-055ARB. Ms. Rauch said it was written consistently with previous examples, but she understood the confusion and agreed to revise it. Mr. Rinaldi said the square footage in Ms. Kittrel's presentation on page 4, second paragraph, was incorrect. He said the minutes stated 22,695 when it should be ±2,600.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Rinaldi moved, Ms. Fox seconded, to accept the August 4, 2015, meeting minutes as amended. The vote was as follows: Mr. Musser, yes; Mr. Munhall, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; and Mr. Rinaldi, yes. (Approved 4 – 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. Bryan Residence** **84 S. Riverview Street**
15-074ARB/MPR **Minor Project Review**

The Chair said this is a request for construction of a new 336-square-foot deck with new stairs and railing for an existing single-family home in the Historic District on the east side of South Riverview Street between Eberly Hill and Pinney Hill Lanes. He said this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.066(G) and 153.170, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Jennifer Rauch presented the aerial view of the parcel. She noted the house is in the western portion of the property, the garage is along the southern boundary, and the parcel backs up to the Scioto River with a steep 40-foot grade change.

Ms. Rauch reported the applicant has been before the ARB for different modifications over the years. She presented the existing 204-square-foot deck layout and noted the sliding glass door. She said the applicant is requesting to expand the deck to 337 square feet, replace the deck material, and add new railings with panels. She said the footprint of the deck will remain the same but a new set of stairs is added for better access. She presented the rear elevation, noting the new railing and glass panels, replacing the sliding glass door with a single French door and a window to match the other windows on the house.

Ms. Rauch said this application was reviewed and recommended for approval by the ART with no conditions.

The Chair asked if there were any questions or concerns. [Hearing none.]

Motion and Vote

Mr. Rinaldi moved, Mr. Musser seconded, to approve the Minor Project Review with no conditions. The vote was as follows: Mr. Munhall, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Musser, yes; and Mr. Rinaldi, yes. (Approved 4 – 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 is a request for review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Rachel Ray said the purpose of the Bridge Street District (BSD) Sign Guidelines is to help illustrate what the City is trying to achieve with the sign requirements in the Bridge Street District. She said historically, the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* have provided guidance for the design of signs in the Historic District. She said knowing how unique of an area the BSD is as a whole, and particularly the Historic District, and the desire to have some unique, interesting, and creative signs, the intent is to illustrate what the City considers to be unique, interesting, and creative when it comes to sign design. She said that was a result of discussions had during the creation of the zoning regulations for the BSD, discussions with the City Council, the Planning and Zoning Commission, and the ARB, as well as evaluating some of the signs that have gone through the review process. She stated the Code outlines clearly what types of signs are permitted, in addition to size, number, etc. but the design intent is missing since it is very difficult to codify. She reported that when the regulations were recently updated in December 2014, Staff worked with a sign design consultant who indicated that most communities create guidelines to show what they want to see and conversely what they do not want to see rather than try to regulate for creativity. She said once Council adopted the most recent version of the amendments to the BSD Code in December 2014, the process to create the sign guidelines was moved forward. She said the Guidelines were first reviewed by the Architectural Review Board and the Planning and Zoning Commission in June 2015, and they each provided valuable feedback. She thanked the ARB for their comments and said a better document is the result.

Ms. Ray said a sixth Character Principle: Context has been added since the June 24th ARB meeting. She said she wanted to underscore the importance of sign context when it comes to creating a sign design; it is not just about the applicant's building and tenant space, it is more about how it fits within the whole streetscape. She said the historic aspects of the building also must be taken into consideration.

Ms. Ray referred to the first two pages of the document that were added as a recommendation from the PZC so that if an applicant ignores the rest of the document, what we are trying to achieve is found at a glance on these first two pages. She pointed out that references to the Historic District were added throughout the document. She noted that the requirements for signs in the Historic District are different from the rest of the BSD. She explained the cover photo was changed and the content order was modified to make the document more user-friendly.

Ms. Ray referred back to the intent of the Guidelines and stated this has been discussed for the BSD as well as signs in the Historic District but going back to the point the ARB made in June, the materials, design, and placement is critically important in the Historic District for signs, perhaps even more so than the rest of the BSD and made sure that was highlighted in the Guidelines.

Ms. Ray presented the **Objectives** of the Sign Guidelines:

- Maintain the City's standards of quality and character.
- 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 presented the **Table of Contents** and went through each of the eight sections: 1) Purpose and Intent; 2) Applicability; 3) Process; 4) Master Sign Plans; 5) Requirements Summary; 6) Quality and Character; 7) Sign Character Principles; and 8) Sign Type Requirements.

Ms. Ray presented six **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.

6. Context

Well-designed signs enhance the streetscape throughout the BSD and avoid distracting, damaging, and/or detracting from the highly pedestrian-oriented streets in this part of the city. Context is particularly important in the Historic District, where there is an established character with a strong sense of architectural identity.

Ms. Ray presented the **Requirements** sections that are set up like the building type requirements in the BSD zoning regulations. She pointed out how the layout is designed to help an applicant who may just be interested in designing a wall sign, for example, and allow them to quickly locate that information. She said the guide presents the requirements for the Historic District vs. the rest of the BSD. She noted examples of signs that are recommended and what to avoid are provided for each type of sign.

Ms. Ray said that the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* have specific requirements for font, as well as recommendations for more traditional sign elements. She recalled that at the June ARB meeting, the Board members agreed to move away from these sign design considerations to allow greater flexibility to add varied character to the Historic District while recognizing and respecting its historic nature. She said the updated *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* should have a reference to the BSD Sign Guidelines so applicants know where to look for guidance on sign design.

Ms. Ray said Planning seeks a recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission at tonight's meeting. She indicated if the ARB has additional comments, those could be forwarded to the PZC as well.

Ms. Ray confirmed height, width, and square footage requirements are all in the Code. She said these guidelines are meant to address "how" the sign requirements should be met, and encourage the "design" aspect.

David Rinaldi requested consistency in the wording to eliminate any questions an applicant may have with regards to the requirements, particularly for "display signs," vs. "temporary signs." He also noted that some of the labeling for the height requirements on the ground sign exhibit was a little confusing.

Ms. Ray indicated there is more detail in the Code. She said this guide is intended to show that when it comes to measuring area, we look at the dimension of the cabinet/blade and the distance from grade. She offered to make the labels clearer.

Mr. Munhall asked why the ARB makes a recommendation to the PZC on the Guidelines. Ms. Ray answered this will ultimately go to City Council for their final approval by resolution. She said typically, the ARB makes recommendations to the PZC for rezoning and Zoning Code Amendments so Staff thought this was in line with those other policy requests.

Jane Fox stated the Guidelines look great and she liked the changes. She offered to share some of her small editorial comments. She questioned the area highlighted as being the Historic District on page 8, since the boundaries appeared to be slightly off. Ms. Ray said she would review for accuracy.

Ms. Fox said she loved the reference to the website on page 10 but asked if that font could be bold. She said she liked the sign exhibit on page 11 and asked if it could be larger or more prominent since it will be critical for applicants to see and understand what their submittals should include.

Ms. Ray noted that font sizes and visibility of some of the graphics were discussed at the June meeting, which she forgot to mention during the presentation. She indicated some of the text may be difficult to read in paper format, but the intent is not to print many of these Guidelines, but rather that the Guidelines will be available to everyone online, so readers can zoom in as much as they want.

Ms. Fox suggested “Master Sign Plans must be submitted in the following circumstances” under Purpose and Intent on page 12 should be bold. She said she thought the font was small on page 14 in the bars on the left of items 1 – 7. She suggested that wording be added to the first paragraph on page 17 such as “lighting should enhance and not violate or detract from the natural environment or vistas of Dublin’s view sheds” so that when future Board members look at this character principle of illumination they understand the intent. Ms. Ray agreed.

Ms. Fox suggested adding “invite pedestrian interest and contribute to street ambiance” at the end of the first paragraph on page 19. Ms. Ray said she thought that was a great addition.

Ms. Ray indicated the PZC will have some additional comments as well so Staff will incorporate all of the changes into the final document to be presented to Council.

Ms. Fox commended Ms. Ray on the addition of the Context Character Principle and suggested the addition of “iconic public amenities” to clarify a description of a view shed. She also suggested adding “The designer should take into consideration adjacent storefronts and the visual impact the sign brings to the context of the streetscape” to the Context section.

Mr. Musser asked if Staff is aware of any other suburban district that has sign guidelines like this. Ms. Ray replied a lot of other communities have sign guidelines, especially those with historic districts. She said through her research, she did not find anything that served as a similar example with the same elements to serve as a “best practice” example. She asked him if there was something missing that he thought should be included.

Mr. Musser said he wondered if we have any proprietary license on this document in case other communities borrow it. Ms. Ray said she did not believe so, but if other communities point to Dublin as a good example, it certainly will not be the first time.

Ms. Fox added this is an excellent piece of work.

Mr. Rinaldi agreed with Ms. Fox. He stated he loved all the changes, liked the opening pages, and the examples are great and very creative.

Mr. Rinaldi said as he went through the types of signs, he did not find “Display” signs discussed. He said they are addressed in the Zoning Code but he is concerned that Display signs will be misused as another permanent sign.

Ms. Ray said she did not spend a lot of time on temporary signs in the Sign Guidelines since those provisions are clear in the Code but recognized this has the potential to be an issue.

Mr. Rinaldi read from the Code that states “the text may be changed” and not that it *has* to be changed.

Ms. Ray reported that Council just talked about this very topic in their roundtable at their meeting on Monday night. She said Council was concerned whether the regulations are achieving what we set out to achieve. She indicated there might be another opportunity to change what is appropriate for the zoning regulations for signs in the near future.

Mr. Munhall said he would be supportive of eliminating white boards as sandwich board signs.

Mr. Rinaldi reported that Powell just banned all sandwich board signs.

Ms. Ray said she hoped the examples in the Guidelines are positive examples for what we expect to see (no white boards).

Ms. Fox said this is another reason why a walking tour of Historic Dublin would be beneficial; the streetscape could be assessed for clutter, taking planters and benches into consideration.

Ms. Ray asked for a recommendation of approval with the condition that the amendments discussed at tonight’s meeting are incorporated into the final version presented to City Council.

Motion and Vote

Ms. Fox moved, Mr. Rinaldi seconded, to recommend approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the Bridge Street District Sign Guidelines with one condition:

- 1) That the amendments discussed at the August 27th Architectural Review Board meeting are incorporated in the final document presented to City Council.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Musser, yes; Mr. Munhall, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; and Ms. Fox, yes. (Approved 4 – 0).

3. Historic Dublin Design Guidelines Update 15-076ADM

Administrative Request

The Chair said the following presentation is an update to the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*. He said this is a request for an informal review and feedback on this future request for review and recommendation of approval for the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Jennifer Rauch said Staff selected a layout that was similar to the BSD Sign Guidelines so the documents are complementary. She indicated Staff will continue to refine the proposed document and wanted to ensure everything that has been discussed up until this point was included to the Board’s satisfaction. She said the intent from the beginning was to make the Guidelines more useful.

Ms. Rauch said the purpose of the Guidelines is to help people understand the difference between preserving an existing structure with recommendations versus additions, alterations, or new construction. She indicated more images and graphics will be added as this moves forward as well as additional content and recommendations. She asked the Board for feedback on the major headings and any suggestion for additional content.

Thomas Munhall inquired about the building types. He asked if a ranch was considered historical architecture and if a page on that was necessary.

Ms. Rauch said there is a difference between building types and building styles. She said Staff considered how far that should be broken down. She suggested adding more clarification because they overlap in some instances.

Mr. Rinaldi said he thought that section was well represented. He said the definition of historic properties can be a little blurry. He asked if 50 years was considered historic. He indicated he liked the focus on preservation.

Mr. Munhall stated the document is awesome but there will be more that can be added.

Mr. Rinaldi said he liked the map where specific examples were identified. He indicated that would be helpful to someone interested in restoration as well as the curious reader.

Everett Musser asked if every building had been identified as a particular building type and asked if there were others that were not noted. Ms. Rauch said from research of the inventory, it appeared every building within the district was included, but she would ensure this was accurate.

Jane Fox referred to the old *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* format; it is an easier manual for understanding. She said this new format has more text and is less illustrative. She said when comparing the two documents to figure out gutter types or different pieces and parts or window styles, she said she prefers the original format better.

Ms. Rauch said the updated Guidelines do not yet include all of the graphics found in the original but the intent is to add the graphics.

Ms. Fox said she liked the old Guidelines because each of the pieces in the contents seem to be more clearly represented and brought out more of each of the unique historic pieces of architecture in a more demonstrative way, especially in the preservation of existing structures. She reiterated that without breaking up the text with illustrations that it might not be as user-friendly. She said there is a lot in the old Guidelines that can be eliminated, especially the recommendations of font. She indicated she liked the simple illustrations in the original.

Mr. Musser asked for the date of the old document. Ms. Fox answered 1999.

Ms. Fox said she also liked the old Guidelines because it was like a history book including old pictures and created sacredness to these places. She said many of the images in the new document are of new structures in a historic district, not historic structures.

Ms. Rauch said these suggestions would be incorporated as the Guidelines continue to develop.

Mr. Munhall said one of the topics the ARB discussed was whether it was preservation of existing buildings or construction of new buildings, which are two different things.

Ms. Rauch suggested delineating the different pieces, even in the table of contents, such as preservation, addition, new construction, etc. to make it clearer to readers to know exactly what section to refer to but also ensure great examples were included. She said pictures can be used to illustrate those points.

Ms. Fox restated that if the reader wanted to understand recommendations on particular aspects like roofs, gutters, and downspouts the format needs to be modified. She said she liked how the original Guidelines talked about working with the ARB. She questioned the layout for the background and intent and how it all works. She agreed the Community Plan should be first because it is over all but asked how the BSD Area Plan relates to the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*; she indicated it is more like a promotion for it rather than how it relates to the Guidelines. She suggested the ARB should be second

because we are the ones to deal with these Guidelines all the time. She added how the Community Plan and the ARB review all fits within that BSD vision. Ms. Rauch offered to modify this section.

Mr. Munhall confirmed the ARB does not govern all of the BSD.

Ms. Fox asked if the Guidelines were only for Historic Dublin. Ms. Rauch said not only Historic Dublin but also the outlying historic properties.

Ms. Fox said the Guidelines are the manual for the ARB. She said ideally, it would be as clear cut as the Sign Guidelines. She said she liked the history because it shows where we came from and why we want to preserve what is there. She said this piece is as important as the memory piece. She said if the past is not considered when making decisions on future applications, the history will not make that much difference if there is nothing to refer to the way it was. She said even if those buildings do not exist anymore, the spirit of those buildings and what they meant to this community matters. She said the ARB has to educate the public about the importance of preservation and that is why she likes the old pictures included, to remind us of our past.

Mr. Rinaldi noted how the ARB discusses how the stone walls are an iconic feature in Dublin. He wanted to know why they are here, why they are laid out the way they are, and why there is a vertical stone top course versus a horizontal course, etc. He indicated through his research online that the walls defined property lines and kept livestock confined like a fence, etc. He stated this information should be included in the Guidelines.

Mr. Munhall added stones were plentiful so that when a field was to be split amongst family members, the stones were used. He said when he tried to plant bushes in his yard, there were 200 stones. He said there is a high quantity of stones along the Scioto River.

Ms. Fox noted the shield hanging in the Council Chambers shows stone walls. She said some of the stone walls date back to the Civil War.

Ms. Fox asked how the ARB can assist with all of the changes proposed for the Guidelines.

Ms. Rauch said Staff will take the ARB's comments and keep working on this, which could then lead to a work session with the ARB.

Ms. Fox asked when this application might go to City Council. Ms. Rauch said she hoped this would be complete by the end of the year.

Mr. Rinaldi said he did not share Ms. Fox's views about the format; he said he was supportive of the new format but content and more pictures are more important. He said if it was in black and white, people under a certain age would not even want to look at it. He understands it is information about the Historic District but suggested it be more modern looking and relates to people today.

Mr. Munhall stated it is important to ensure this document is linked to the other documents. Mr. Musser asked if the intent was for the Guidelines to reside online; he suggested it be as interactive as possible. Ms. Rauch agreed.

Ms. Fox asked if there is a way to help people that live in the Historic District to preserve properties and submit applications and materials to the Board. She said the process itself can be expensive. She suggested approaching the City.

Mr. Munhall said the problem with involving government is it removes the third party and independence.

Ms. Rauch said we try to accommodate all of the residents, including ones that do not have access to a design professional.

Ms. Fox asked if there was an answer from Engineering about the stone walls. Ms. Rauch answered nothing in addition to what has already been discussed. Ms. Fox asked if the ARB can make a formal request to the City inviting a formal discussion because the ARB has concerns about the destruction of the stone walls and the lack of preservation of the stone. Mr. Munhall asked if City Council is who should be contacted.

Ms. Rauch said City Council approved the Dublin Road bike path project Ms. Fox is referring and she suggested this concern be part of the Annual Items of Interest.

Mr. Munhall said Ms. Fox could always bring this topic up at a City Council meeting. Ms. Rauch suggested Ms. Fox would benefit more from speaking with Engineering directly. She said this is a bigger policy question and how the ARB is engaged when those projects are going on and ensuring someone is consulted before it happens.

Ms. Fox stated she definitely wanted to see the stone walls as an Annual Item of Interest. Ms. Rauch agreed this is important to Dublin's history.

Communications

Ms. Rauch said concerns have been raised regarding follow-up discussions from the last meeting for 5051 Brand Road. She assured the Board this discussion would be held at a later date given the impending legal action and BZA appeal in October. She asked the Board to refrain from the discussion of this case until the appeal is heard and if they had any questions or concerns in the meantime to speak with the City's legal counsel.

She updated the Board regarding the pending Code Enforcement action for the Cullen Art Glass property, as they had expressed concerns before about the maintenance of the property.

She said in the past, we have conducted walking tours of the Historic District and asked if the Board Members were interested in participating again. She said it was not mandatory and it could be conducted in early October to include the new Planning Director.

Jane Fox said she was interested to see the results of the cases they have heard, especially with the Bridge Street District. She said it would provide an opportunity to hear others' perspectives.

David Rinaldi asked if the Walking Tour would require a special meeting and if it could be timed so the incoming Board Members could participate, also.

Ms. Rauch said she would propose some dates to get a meeting scheduled.

Ms. Rauch said there have been several changes in the Planning Department. She said Steve Langworthy has been moved onto special projects for the department and a new Planning Director has been hired, Vince Papsidero, who starts August 31, 2015. She explained Vince was formerly with the City of Columbus. She said Gary Gunderman, Planning Manager, has retired and Rachel Ray has left Planning to join Economic Development as an Economic Development Administrator.

Everett Musser inquired about the list of historic homes that are outside of the Historic District. Ms. Rauch said the list resides in the Zoning Code but offered to provide it to him.

Ms. Rauch said updating Appendix G has been considered for one of the Annual Items of Interest. She said she wants to encourage people to invest in their historic properties but also to ensure there are resources to help property owners. She said not everyone can afford to make the necessary improvements and she would like to discuss ideas to develop a program in conjunction with updating Appendix G.

Ms. Fox asked if the ARB could have a workshop to discuss the Annual Items for the ARB. She said they could identify what is important to start working on and provide more interaction between the City and the ARB.

Ms. Rauch agreed and suggested a work session after a regular meeting. She said this has been conducted before and minutes do not have to be recorded.

Mr. Rinaldi adjourned the meeting at 7:44 p.m.

As approved by the Architectural Review Board on September 23, 2015.