



**Planning**

5800 Shier Rings Road  
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236

phone 614.410.4600

fax 614.410.4747

[www.dublinohiousa.gov](http://www.dublinohiousa.gov)

**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD**

**MEETING MINUTES**

**OCTOBER 26, 2016**

**AGENDA**

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>1. BSD HTN – Bridge Street, Building Z2<br/>16-088ARB-BPR</b> | <b>88 North High Street<br/>Basic Plan Review (Discussion Only)</b>          |
| <b>2. BSD HR – Rigsby Residence<br/>16-065ARB-MPR</b>            | <b>64 S. Riverview Street<br/>Minor Project Review (Approved 5 – 0)</b>      |
| <b>3. BSD HC – Mesh Fitness<br/>16-081ARB-MPR</b>                | <b>12 E. Bridge Street<br/>Minor Project Review (Approved 5 – 0)</b>         |
| <b>4. R-2 St. John Lutheran Church<br/>16-083ARB</b>             | <b>6135 Rings Road<br/>Building and Site Modifications (Approved 5 – 0)</b>  |
| <b>5. Holder Wright Earthworks<br/>16-054ARB</b>                 | <b>4729 Bright Road<br/>Building and Site Modifications (Approved 5 – 0)</b> |

The Chair, David Rinaldi, called the meeting to order at 6:30 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, Lia Yakumithis, Matt Earman, Shawn Krawetzki, and Laurie Wright.

**Administrative Business**

**Motion and Vote**

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

**Motion and Vote**

Mr. Musser moved, Mr. Rinaldi seconded, to approve the September 21st meeting minutes. The vote was as follows: Ms. Stenberg, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Munhall, yes; Mr. Musser, 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 during this meeting.

**1. BSD HTN – Bridge Street, Building Z2  
16-088ARB-BPR**

**88 North High Street  
Basic Plan Review**

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following application is a request for the construction of a mixed-use building with associated site improvements along the east side of N. High Street, 180 feet north of the intersection with North Street. He said this is a request for an informal review and feedback of a Basic Plan Review prior to a review by City Council under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066 and §153.070 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Jennifer Rauch presented the block site and explained this was an Informal Review. She highlighted the proposed building location on the proposed site plan. She noted the building is located along the plaza and N. High Street with a patio located to the rear of the building overlooking the future pedestrian bridge and the Scioto River. She said the building is designed to address the significant grade change of 40 feet across the site. She said the lower level of the building is largely underground at N. High Street, but a portion of the level is accessible from the rear along N. Riverview Street. At the N. High Street elevation, she said there are two sets of doors that access the restaurant tenant space and the lobby entrance for the eight residential units. She said the south elevation shows the mechanicals and has secondary access to the restaurant space with pedestrian access along the south property line.

Ms. Rauch stated the site is in a critical location and acts as an integral transition between the new construction of Building Z and the Historic Core buildings within the Historic District to the south. She said the proposed building is located at the west landing of the pedestrian bridge and along the future public plaza.

Ms. Rauch presented the more traditional west elevation and said Code permits the building height at a maximum of 2.5 stories within the Historic Transition Neighborhood when adjacent to Historic Core properties. The proposed building she said is three stories along the front at N. High Street and four stories to the rear. She presented the north elevation and explained it is a transition from traditional to a more contemporary design that is on the east elevation. She said the south elevation would abut the existing Historic Core properties to the south. She noted that the south elevation is not meeting the transparency requirements but is considered the 'back of house'.

Ms. Rauch presented the proposed building materials and explained Code permits stone, brick, and wood siding as primary building materials for historic mixed-use buildings, and the permitted secondary materials include glass, reinforced gypsum, wood siding, fiber cement siding, metal, and architectural metal panels and cladding. Excluding fenestrations, she said the primary material must account for 80% of the façade unless otherwise approved by the required reviewing body. Additionally, she said the Code requires vertical and horizontal façade articulations and 15-40% façade transparency. She noted that the portion of the building along N. High Street and portions of the side elevations wrapping to the north and south depicts brick and fiber cement panels and battens as primary materials. She said the remainder of the building on the north, south, and eastern elevations show the use of aluminum composite panels, Arriscraft limestone, and glass. She pointed out that metal guardrails are shown on the balconies.

Ms. Rauch concluded the proposed design is similar to the design of Building Z in that the N. High Street portion of the building appears traditional and then transitions to a more contemporary look to the rear. She presented three-dimensional images of the proposed building to show the view from the pedestrian bridge to the back corner and then the piece of the building along N. High Street with the plaza in the forefront.

Ms. Rauch presented the discussion questions:

1. Does the ARB support the scale and height of the building given the surrounding development?
2. Does the ARB support the proposed architectural style and building materials?

3. Does the proposal provide an appropriate transition between the two design aesthetics shown on the elevations?
4. Are there other considerations by the Board?

Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, 555 Metro Place, emphasized how the grade changes from west to east, which allowed the applicant outdoor dining space and an entirely private space they refer to as the grotto. He explained that not only were they trying to activate the building along N. High Street and the plaza but also all along the east side so when one comes off the pedestrian bridge there will be something all around the building. He noted there are some existing 2.5 story buildings in the Historic District where the dormers do not actually go anywhere. He said the applicant wanted to have a design that was true to what was behind the windows and works with the scale of the Z1 building. He said they are trying to balance the scale of buildings that are mostly 2 stories in Historic Dublin with the contemporary Z1 building that is 7 stories, after coming across the pedestrian bridge.

Mr. Hunter presented color images and noted the painted brick with bronze storefronts and metal roof. He noted the HardiPanel board and batten that separates what is being done on the first two stories from the half story above. He added how the stone is incorporated as well as a gabled roof to bring in the Historic Dublin charm. He said the flat roof reflects what is being done on the river. He said the patio spaces would be somewhat elevated depending on where one is situated in the building.

The Chair invited public comment. [Hearing none.]

Jane Fox asked Ms. Rauch to show the photographs that illustrate the building site in context with the surroundings, which include some stone walls.

Ms. Fox said the scale of the proposed building is important. She said the ARB is tasked with making sure what is already in Historic Dublin is not imitated. She said this is an iconic corner and should be a 'red carpet' building and does not have to match what is on either side of it; it should have a style of its own that takes advantage of the *Historic District Design Guidelines*. She explained massing should be similar in scale, which is a 1.5– 2.5-story building that appears to have been developed over time. She said a pedestrian scaled mass could stair-step its way down the hill, which almost walks one down to the river. She indicated this block style mass does not invite her to do anything.

Shannon Stenberg said she loved how the applicant tried to incorporate the transition but the west elevation is not quite there. She said she liked the openness and the views to the river. She said the gabled roof was too much and there is a lot of mass on the south side and recommended a smaller scale overall.

Everett Musser said he liked the site layout and the floor plan but has a hard time with the transition between one style and the other; it does not work. He said the west elevation could be much softer and the mass is too large.

Tom Munhall inquired about the heights of Z1 versus Z2. Mr. Hunter indicated the heights have always been about the same.

Mr. Munhall inquired about the floor level of Z1 at street level versus the floor level of Z2. Mr. Hunter said there was a three-foot difference.

Mr. Munhall said all the dormers were not necessary in the front from an aesthetic standpoint. The vertical exposed lighting is too modern he said. He suggested the elevation on High Street be traditional. He indicated he thought since the building really slopes that the additional floor would be found at the lowest level and the applicant would not need such a tall building. He said he understands the applicant

is trying to keep from getting buried by the pedestrian bridge. He encouraged the applicant to consider the scale of the southern properties.

David Rinaldi said the building is in a location that transitions into the Historic Core and it is significant as to how it gets treated. He said it is too massive for that transition and appears taller than the Z1 building even if it is the same height. He said it does not fit well. He indicated he is okay with traditional in the front and modern in the back as that is what happened with Z1 but the transition has to be handled delicately. He concluded he is concerned with the overall height, mass, and scale.

Ms. Fox said the applicant has an opportunity to terrace this building down to create gardens and green space and places one does not expect to be. She said the people in those areas will look down and see the river and stair-step down and see people in gardens and on patios and they could be seen across the bridge. She encouraged the applicant to have this building move people to the outdoors and not just look at it through the glass. She said the grotto on the south side overlooks the parking lot of Oscar's. She suggested the applicant take advantage of the east views to the river, the north views to the bridge, and the building needs to be backed up to allow for some activity on High Street.

Mr. Hunter addressed the massing of 2.5– 3 stories along High Street. He asked if the third floor is going to be an issue going forward. He indicated he is concerned the back will appear too small in relation to the Z1 building. He said that if there are 3 stories on one side and 2 stories on the other there are vertical circulation issues because the dots cannot be connected any more.

Mr. Rinaldi replied there are no three-story buildings on the High Street side of Z1. He said it seems that the tallest piece is right at the transition to the Core, which is problematic for him.

Mr. Munhall asked for additional perspectives that could show the BriHi Square buildings and buildings Z1 and Z2 since Mr. Hunter indicated the proposed building is the same height as the buildings at BriHi Square. He indicated he did not want to say it was too massive because he is unable to put it in perspective.

Mr. Musser asked if the proposed building has to be three stories tall. Mr. Rinaldi said the Code does not permit three stories so we should start there. He inquired of the height limitations for BriHi Square. Ms. Rauch answered those buildings were built before the Bridge Street Code.

Ms. Stenberg asked if there was any board and batten on the Z1 building. Mr. Hunter answered he could not say for certain as there are a lot of façade types.

Ms. Rauch explained that Staff had suggested the applicant use the historic mixed-use building type for the front and a loft building type for the rear portion given the height, material choices, and design. She clarified that in the Historic Transition neighborhood, 2.5 stories is the maximum height, regardless of the building type. She recalled the applicant obtained a Waiver for the rear portion of the Z1 building.

Mr. Hunter restated he was trying to connect the dots between Z1 with 7 stories and building Z2 on a site that falls.

Ms. Fox emphasized that the proposed building should have a look of its own as all the buildings are beginning to look alike. She said she worries that if the ARB allows this height it will work its way up the street and there will not be anything left to preserve in the Historic District. She indicated we need a boundary somewhere, demarking where historic stops and transitions to brand new; the proposed building is that building.

Mr. Musser said he totally agreed.

The Chair asked if there was anything further to discuss. [There was nothing mentioned.]

**2. BSD HR – Rigsby Residence  
16-065ARB-MPR**

**64 S. Riverview Street  
Minor Project Review**

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following application is a request for a proposed driveway and walkway replacement with updates to the existing porch, with associated landscaping for an existing single-family residence on the east side of South Riverview Street at the northeast corner of the intersection with Eberly Hill Lane. He said this is a request for a review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

JM Rayburn presented an aerial view of the site and a context perspective with surrounding structures. He presented the existing building and landscaping and then the proposed site modifications. He explained the applicant is proposing bluestone for the porch and walkways and resurfacing the driveway and include a cobblestone apron at the front and back with a possibility to incorporate a narrow cobblestone divider up the middle of the driveway.

Mr. Rayburn reported Staff reviewed the application against the general review standards of the Zoning Code and *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* as well as the applicable guidelines to alterations to building structures and finds it is consistent. He reported the ART recommended approval with one condition:

- 1) That should the City need to perform construction in the right-of-way, the City would not be required to restore the area with the proposed materials but would instead use standard materials for driveways, landscaping, and the related approaches.

The Chair called for public comment.

Tom Holton, 5957 Roundstone Place, said he loved the walkway proposed but the driveway modification proposed is out of character for the street. He said he likes what they are proposing but it does not fit the character of the neighborhood as all the driveways are very plain made of concrete, asphalt, or gravel. He said the newest house on the street does not even have an upgraded driveway such as this.

Judy Rigsby, 64 S. Riverview Street, said the cobblestone apron portion would only be 6 inches deep to provide interest. She said the home was built in 1995 so it is not a historic home, and they thought they would be adding to the character of the neighborhood and integrate their home better with some of the older homes.

Ms. Fox said she likes the use of true stone instead of fake stone as it salutes the history of Dublin. She said what the applicant is proposing does not stand out on the street as anything really different so she supports the proposal.

**Motion and Vote**

Mr. Musser moved, Ms. Stenberg seconded, to approve a request for a Minor Project Review with the following condition:

- 1) That should the City need to perform construction in the right-of-way, the City would not be required to restore the area with the proposed materials but would instead use standard materials for driveways, landscaping, and the related approaches.

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

**3. BSD HC – Mesh Fitness  
16-081ARB-MPR**

**12 E. Bridge Street  
Minor Project Review**

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following application is a request for the installation of a new wall sign for an existing tenant space on the north side of E. Bridge Street at the northeast corner of the intersection with N. High St. He said this is a request for a review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066(G) and §153.170 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Lia Yakumithis presented an aerial view of the site for the Mesh Fitness membership sales office and noted it shares a building with Domino's. She said the sign that used to be there was green with gold lettering and the Domino's sign is brown with white lettering. She said the proposed sign is blue with white lettering, which are the corporate colors. She said the eight-square-foot wall sign will not be illuminated and will be located directly above the storefront entrance. She said the height was unspecified in the drawings so the applicant was asked to submit the height measurement as a condition for approval.

Ms. Yakumithis said the proposed sign meets all applicable criteria, therefore, the ART recommends approval with one condition:

- 1) That the applicant provide revised drawings indicating the exact height of the sign not to exceed 15 feet, subject to Staff approval.

The Chair invited public comment. [Hearing none.]

Jane Fox clarified that this is a temporary sign, only to be installed until January 2017. She said the sign on the building resides in the main core of Historic Dublin and if this were going to be a long-term sign, she would not be able to support it because it lacks character. She indicated she is concerned that if the ARB supports this proposed sign and another tenant moves in, is this same sign going to be acceptable on that space. Ms. Fox inquired about window signs.

Jennifer Rauch said if the applicant wanted an additional window sign, it would have to be part of the application. Ms. Rauch said the sign is intended as a temporary sign and the applicant's permanent space is going to be in Bridge Park. She said this is their sales office until their tenant space is complete.

Ms. Fox suggested as a new tenant occupies the space, a new sign with more character is requested.

Tom Munhall inquired about the lease agreement and when the tenant plans on leaving.

Kipp Edgington, 12 E. Bridge Street, said the lease was signed for one year and they will vacate the premises at the end of November/early December and are considering sub-leasing the space. He said he has some prospective tenants but he is not certain who it will be at this point.

Ms. Rauch said when a permanent tenant occupies the space they will need to come to the ARB and request a sign that would need to comply with the Bridge Street requirements.

Ms. Rauch suggested a condition be written stating the sign would need to be removed when Mesh Fitness vacates the space.

### **Motion and Vote**

Ms. Stenberg moved, Ms. Fox seconded, to approve a request for a Minor Project Review with two conditions:

- 1) That the applicant provide revised drawings indicating the exact height of the sign not to exceed 15 feet, subject to Staff approval; and
- 2) That the applicant remove their sign upon occupancy of their permanent tenant space.

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

### **4. R-2 St. John Lutheran Church 16-083ARB**

### **6135 Rings Road Building and Site Modifications**

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following application is a request for a building and parking addition to St. John Lutheran Church on the south side of Rings Road, at the southeast corner of the intersection with Avery Road. He said this is a request for a review and approval of an Architectural Review Board application for a designated property located outside of the Historic District and under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.170, Appendix G, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Jennifer Rauch reported this application was reviewed and approved by the Board in 2013. She said the Code requires construction take place within a one-year time frame of that approval or they must gain approval again. She said there are just minor modifications to the original submittal.

Ms. Rauch presented an aerial view of the site and noted the residential area north of the site and the additional property to the south and the east that the church owns. She explained there are two access points on Rings Road at either ends of the church. She said the modifications proposed are to the rear of the existing building and include the enclosure of an existing covered entrance and the construction of a new covered walkway and vehicular drop-off area.

Ms. Rauch said the new drop-off area requires modifications to the existing parking lot including the construction of a new 26-space parking area east of the existing building. A new 24-foot wide drive aisle will be moved closer to the existing building she said and a portion of the existing lawn next to the building will be removed. She explained the new drive aisle will provide access to the proposed covered drop-off area. She said a new, large landscape island will be created to separate the drop-off area from the parking lot and will provide a new staircase to provide pedestrian access to the main parking lot. She said the existing drive aisle along the northern portion of the parking lot will be altered slightly to accommodate the reconfiguration and two of the smaller, existing landscape islands will be modified to accommodate the drive aisle and three parking spaces will be eliminated.

Ms. Rauch said the vestibule and covered drop-off will incorporate design features and materials matching the existing building. She said the vestibule will be constructed of an arch top and an aluminum storefront window system located between the existing brick columns and a new entry door system. She said the proposed covered walkway and drop-off area is steel frame construction painted to match the proposed brick. The proposed columns she said will match the building using brick with a cast stone base and the gabled roof is proposed with asphalt shingles to match the remainder of the existing building. She said a new steel canopy is proposed west of the new enclosed vestibule area and is intended to screen mechanical units.

Ms. Rauch said approval is recommended with two conditions:

- 1) That the mechanical equipment located west of the new addition will need to be screened to meet Code, subject to Planning approval; and
- 2) That the applicant should work with Engineering to ensure the proposed development meets the stormwater management requirements and any floodplain management requirements are satisfied.

The Chair invited public comment. [Hearing none.]

Ms. Rauch pointed out the additional future parking area, which will be visible from Rings Road.

Jane Fox said she loved the design as it was very pretty. She inquired about the handrails.

Rolando Martinez, 1398 Goodale Boulevard, Columbus, Ohio 43212, said he is one of the principals with Berardi. He explained they are trying to incorporate the steel truss element in the railing and it will be painted similarly in a Cherokee Red. He said wrought iron presents maintenance issues, especially in high traffic areas where they will need to put down a lot of salt in the winter.

#### **Motion and Vote**

Ms. Fox moved, Mr. Musser seconded, to approve a request for Building and Site Modifications with two conditions:

- 1) That the mechanical equipment located west of the new addition will need to be screened to meet Code, subject to Planning approval; and
- 2) That the applicant should work with Engineering to ensure the proposed development meets the stormwater management requirements and any floodplain management requirements are satisfied.

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

#### **5. Holder Wright Earthworks 16-054ARB**

#### **4729 Bright Road Building and Site Modifications**

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following application is a request for building and site modifications for the Holder Wright Earthworks site located between Bright Road and Emerald Parkway, east of Riverside Drive. He said this is a request for a review and approval of an Architectural Review Board application for a designated property located outside of the Historic District and under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.170, Appendix G and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Jennifer Rauch presented an aerial view of the site, which is outside of the Historic District but one of the twelve properties on Appendix G that fall under the ARB's purview. She said the 18.8-acre site is surrounded on the north and east sides with single-family residential, the southern side with the last phase of Emerald Parkway, and the north is undeveloped land. She said there is a creek that runs through the middle portion of this site with tree stands as well as additional trees at the perimeter. She noted the earthworks that exist on the site. She reported the single-family house on the property was repurposed and incorporated into the park design.



Ms. Rauch said the proposal includes construction of a restroom facility, parking lot, pathways, pedestrian bridge, and landscaping/mounding. She noted the vehicular entrance at Emerald Parkway, which will continue to be worked out with Engineering. She said the parking area has 34 spaces that lead up to the plaza and restroom facility. She said the restroom facility and the plaza is oriented towards the north providing direct access and visibility to the pedestrian bridge. She indicated the grading up behind this facility is to make it appear as it was buried into the ground to mimic the earthwork design.

Ms. Rauch said the proposed plans incorporate stone veneer instead of the previously proposed concrete masonry units along the exterior entrance wall to the restroom facilities, which matches the seat wall material. She explained a retaining wall extends down from the upper portions of the buildings creating a wing design effect on either side of the building entrance made of a wood-texture-stamped concrete with a stone cap. She said the roof design and surrounding mounding were revised to discourage visitors from climbing up the grade and standing on top of the roof. She said the height of the retaining wall was lowered and plant materials are included in the mounding behind the wall. Additionally, she said a seating wall is located on either side of the building entrance and is incorporated in the retaining wall made of stone veneer with a stone cap to match the columns on the pedestrian bridge.

Ms. Rauch stated the proposed pedestrian access bridge is shown north of the restroom area, connecting to the northern portion of the site. She said the proposed bridge design includes: stone columns at the end of the railing that run across the bridge; railing stained timber with wire mesh integrated into the structure; and a stone column material that matches the stone used in the restroom area.

Ms. Rauch noted the applicant has provided a landscape plan showing a tree removal summary for the site and landscape details for the proposal. Additional detail she said is needed regarding the required replacements, which can be handled with the building permit.

Ms. Rauch said approval is recommended with two conditions finding that all the criteria are met:

- 1) That the applicant continue to work with Engineering on the coordination of any required improvements related to Emerald Parkway and the park entrance drive; and
- 2) That the applicant provide additional detail regarding the required replacements, which can be handled with the building permit.

The Chair invited public comment. [Hearing none.]

Jane Fox asked if the stone was real or applique stone. Ms. Rauch answered it is a stone veneer, which is cast stone. Ms. Fox asked why we are not requesting true stone when Dublin has two quarries. Ms. Rauch said there is not a Code requirement that insists on true stone. Ms. Fox said she would encourage any construction in the Historic District to use real stone. She said in this instance, we are portraying excavation into the earth but the structure is not of the earth, it is concrete. She said this is a reverent site and believes the experience calls for real stone. She indicated she loves the concept that the restroom is buried beneath the earth, which gives the sense there is a hidden element to the site. She said she loves the design on the floor but asked if a medallion or image that speaks to what is in the mound can replace the water fountains and move the water fountains off to each side. She said the proposal currently focuses on the water fountains.

Tom Munhall asked how deep the cuts/impressions are, assuming the concrete is poured and then stamped. Shawn Krawetzki answered the depth will vary but deep enough to catch light and show shadow.

Mr. Munhall stated he liked the softening effects the applicant applied since the original proposal. He indicated he agreed with Ms. Fox's point about moving the fountains and putting something else in its place as the focal point but he would not make it a condition of approval.

Everett Musser asked if using a true stone alternative was due to cost. Mr. Krawetzki said cost is a factor. Mr. Munhall questioned the sustainability of this product over 10, 20, or 30 years. Mr. Krawetzki said he did not anticipate an issue from a maintenance standpoint.

Ms. Fox said she cannot envision the product from just a picture and would need to see the real product sample. Mr. Krawetzki said they inquired about the cast concrete "wood" and the product was not available. She asked if he has actually seen the cast concrete with the wood stamp. Mr. Krawetzki answered he has seen versions of it. He said it would depend on the form and he has not seen this particular company's form.

Ms. Rauch said the applicant provided a lot of images of the product as well as where it has been used before.

Mr. Krawetzki said through the specification process, they will be able to select a product that is more realistic.

Shannon Stenberg inquired about staining of the concrete. Chad Knight, CT Consultants, said the concrete for the drum itself is smooth with a subtle color and the textured walls have a color and then either a surface stain or a hardener is applied to give it depth that gets into the nooks and crannies. He said part of the problem like that is it is very specific so as part of the construction documents we will require a match of the concrete itself.

Ms. Stenberg said safety was an issue discussed at the last meeting and asked if Police had been contacted to see if this is acceptable. Ms. Rauch said staff did not have the Chief formally review these plans. She said the site lines have been improved and the restroom facilities will be locked after dark; a motion sensor light will be triggered if anyone is there. Mr. Knight added if the police officers see either of the two lights on, they can investigate.

Ms. Fox inquired about the rooftop garden area. She asked if the intent was to hide the structure itself as the greenery grows. Mr. Krawetzki said it will grow higher than is shown in the illustrations. Mr. Knight added it will fill out over time.

David Rinaldi said he is really pleased that we live in a community where they take a restroom facility and turn it into a piece of artwork. He indicated this is wonderful and it is only a small part of the park; there are going to be other structures out there.

Mr. Musser said he agreed; he is pleased with the great modifications. Ms. Stenberg agreed.

### **Motion and Vote**

Mr. Musser moved, Mr. Rinaldi seconded, to approve a request for Building and Site Modifications with two conditions:

- 1) That the applicant continue to work with Engineering on the coordination of any required improvements related to Emerald Parkway and the park entrance drive; and
- 2) That the applicant provide additional detail regarding the required replacements, which can be handled with the building permit.

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

**Communications**

Jennifer Rauch asked if everyone was comfortable with the dates proposed for the meetings in 2017/2018.

**Motion and Vote**

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

Ms. Rauch reminded the Board they are meeting with the PZC on November 3, 2016. She said the objective is to gain informal reviews from both the Board and the Commission regarding Phase 1 of the Riverside Park Basic Plan Review.

Jane Fox requested reports from the Stakeholder meetings hosted on a monthly basis by Donna Goss, Development Director.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 8:23 pm.

As approved by the Architectural Review Board on November 16, 2016.