



Planning

5800 Shier Rings Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236

phone 614.410.4600

fax 614.410.4747

www.dublinohiousa.gov

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

MEETING MINUTES

APRIL 27, 2016

AGENDA

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. BSD P – Dublin Community Church
16-026ARB-MPR | 81 W. Bridge Street
Minor Project Review (Approved 5 – 0) |
| 2. BSD HC - Harvest Pizza
16-027ARB-MPR | 45 N. High Street
Minor Project Review (Approved 5 – 0) |
| 3. BSD HC - Berkshire Hathaway - Sign
16-029ARB-MSP | 109½ S. High Street
Master Sign Plan (Approved 5 – 0) |

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

Administrative Business

The Chair introduced Mayor, Greg Peterson to perform the Oath of Office for Mr. David Rinaldi and Ms. Shannon Stenberg as they had been re-appointed by City Council.

Mayor Peterson expressed appreciation for the service this Board provides to the community on behalf of City Council and the City. He performed the Oath of Office for David Rinaldi and then for Shannon Stenberg.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Rinaldi moved, Ms. Stenberg seconded, to re-elect Thomas Munhall as the 2016 – 2017 Vice Chair. The vote was as follows: Mr. Musser, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Munhall, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; and Mr. Rinaldi, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Munhall moved, Mr. Musser seconded, to re-elect David Rinaldi as the 2016 – 2017 Chair. The vote was as follows: Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Musser, yes; and Mr. Munhall, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

Motion and Vote

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

Motion and Vote

Mr. Musser moved, Ms. Fox seconded, to accept the February 24th meeting minutes and the March 30th meeting minutes as presented. The vote was as follows: Ms. Stenberg, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Munhall, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; and Mr. Musser, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

The Chair briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Architectural Review Board [the minutes reflect the order of the published agenda.] He swore in anyone planning to address the Board on this application.

1. BSD P – Dublin Community Church 16-026ARB-MPR

81 W. Bridge Street Minor Project Review

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following application is a request for exterior modifications to an existing door of Dublin Community Church located on the southwest corner of the intersection with West Bridge Street and Franklin Street. 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*.

Katie Dodaro presented an aerial view of the site. She described the existing brick building as a Gothic Revival Church from the 19th century with features such as gothic-arched side windows, shutters, and the main entrance. She said there is a wood bell tower that has a metal roof and there is a 16,000-square-foot addition at the southwest corner of the building, which was added in 1997 that included a sanctuary and parking. She presented a picture of the existing main entrance doors as well as the secondary entrance to the church off the eastern portion of the existing parking lot. She noted the ARB approved an awning over the secondary entrance in 2012, which has been installed. She presented the other existing doors on the site comprised of black metal framing and glass doors. She presented the proposed metal and glass automatic doors that are framed in dark bronze tubelite with two glass panels on top and two metal panels on the bottom. She said the application also includes the installation of a carbon steel bollard in the same dark bronze to operate the automatic doors.

Ms. Dodaro said this proposal meets all Minor Project Review criteria. She said approval is recommended with one condition:

- 1) That the door framing and bollard color match the existing black metal doors on the building.

David Rinaldi said the condition refers to black metal doors, which is the appearance of dark anodized bronze. He requested that the condition be amended to state the proposed doors will match the existing doors.

Mr. Rinaldi asked why the lower half of the glass doors will have solid metal panels. He invited the applicant to come forward to explain.

Barb Anderson, 8952 Tartan Fields Drive, Dublin, Ohio, 43017, said she is a member of the Dublin Community Church on the volunteer staff, and she volunteers in the food pantry, which is housed at the church, and she is on the Food Pantry Board. She said initially, the building and ground director thought the metal panels would protect the doors from the food pantry carts but has since decided it would not look great and it does not match the rest of the existing doors. She confirmed they are now requesting all glass doors with a matching color. She said the applicant has determined the doors will be protected as they will be automatic doors. She said they are fine doing glass doors the same color of metal as the preschool doors.

Mr. Rinaldi indicated the elevation would look better and a lot less drastic without the solid metal panel and requested that be added as a condition.

Tom Holton, 5957 Roundstone Place, said he also volunteers at the food pantry and asked where the automatic door bollard would be placed. Mr. Rinaldi answered the bollard would be placed away from the door towards the parking lot. Mr. Holton said he was concerned about the traffic in that area.

Tom Munhall said there was a depiction of the bollard in the materials - out where the moveable planter is located. He said it is six inches from the blue planters.

Mr. Rinaldi suggested adding a condition for Staff to approve the placement, which is outside of the traffic pattern. He requested the applicant also provide a sketch in relation to the door and the bollard.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Munhall moved, Mr. Rinaldi seconded, to approve a request for a Minor Project Review with three conditions:

- 1) That the door frame and bollard color match the existing metal doors on the building;
- 2) That the doors be all glass (top and bottom) instead of the proposed metal bottom panels; and
- 3) That the proposed bollard be located to the right of the door and revised drawing showing the dimensions be provided, subject to Staff approval.

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

2. BSD HC - Harvest Pizza 16-027ARB-MPR

45 N. High Street Minor Project Review

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following application is a request for exterior modifications to the roof, a parking plan review, and the installation of a new awning sign and projecting sign for an existing business on the west side of North High Street approximately 100 feet south of the intersection with North Street. He said this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.066(G) and 153.170 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Logan Stang presented an aerial view of the site and noted it was previously occupied by Sisters Sweet Shoppe. He stated there are three components to this application: 1) modifications to the structure for a parapet wall and installation of a fence, both for screening purposes; 2) review of a parking plan as the proposed use cannot provide enough on-site parking spaces; and 3) review of two proposed signs - one is on North High Street and the other is on Darby Street.

Mr. Stang presented the proposed Site Plan. He said the proposal includes the addition of HVAC units on the north side of the property. He noted that two units and a grease interceptor currently exist behind an evergreen screen and the applicant intends to add three units to this location while adding screening material. He pointed out the additional HVAC units proposed for the recessed portion of the building. He explained the proposal has these units being screened by a fence that will match the same material and color as the existing building. Due to the location of the units and need for maintenance access, he said the fence is being proposed on the property line, which will require a Waiver to the side yard setback.

Mr. Stang presented the proposed screening. He said the modifications to the building include the installation of two exhaust vents for the kitchen and construction of a parapet wall to screen those vents.

He pointed out the proposed wall that will match the same materials and colors of the existing building. He said the existing roof structure will provide screening on the sides of the exhaust vents due to the gables. He pointed out the proposed fence screening the ground units and its relationship to the existing structure.

Mr. Stang presented pictures of the existing building looking both west and east. He explained the images show the location of the parapet wall and fence, which will both be located in between the existing gables, in the recessed portion of the building. He noted there is existing landscaping on the northwest side of the building that will further screen the units from the entrance off Darby Street.

Tom Munhall inquired about the view of the parapet from the sky. Mr. Stang explained there will just be a single wall that will run along the edge of the building on the roof but the remaining roof structure will remain the same so the parapet will not connect back to the roof line; the sides will not be enclosed.

Everett Musser asked how this wall on the north side would be supported. Mr. Stang answered it would be attached to the existing structure. Mr. Musser questioned the absence of supports back into the existing roof. Mr. Stang explained there will be supports but it will not be fully closed off.

Mr. Munhall asked if the bottom portion of the roof fence will connect in some way to the roof. Mr. Stang confirmed that statement and said it will screen only two exhaust fans, which are required to be screened to the height of the vents.

Jane Fox said when one is looking straight at the building from N. High Street, the gables and a wall will be visible.

Mr. Stang presented the Parking Plan and said restaurant use requires 10 parking spaces for every 1,000-square-foot of building area resulting in 42 spaces being required. He stated the site provides a total of 5 spaces including one ADA accessible space off of Darby Street. Given the context of Historic Dublin, he said it is not uncommon for properties to be unable to provide on-site parking. He said this property was approved for a variance to provide 5 spaces when 11 were required back when Sisters Sweet Shoppe occupied the building. He reported this request was made prior to Bridge Street District zoning with the parking plan acting as a variance under the new zoning. He said the applicant has provided four parking agreements that account for 24 spaces. He pointed out the location of these spaces that make employee parking a more desirable use with the remaining amount of spaces being supplemented by public parking. He noted the public parking lots located within the Code-required distance of 600 feet from the property. He said these existing parking lots provide over 100 spaces for the area and with the addition of a public parking garage currently under construction and potential for more development; there should be more than enough spaces provided for this and other associated uses. He said the Code also requires that the applicant provide one bicycle space for every 10 vehicular spaces; the applicant has acknowledged he will provide the spaces and will provide details of the bicycle rack and proposed location, subject to Staff approval.

Mr. Stang presented the existing and proposed ground sign on N. High Street. He said the applicant is choosing to use the exact dimensions of the existing sign for their proposed sign. He described the sign with "Harvest Pizzeria" text on top of an orange moon; the background will be white with orange trim wrapping the edges of the sign face. He said the sign will be made from wood and will have a routed background with the Harvest text protruding from the sign face for more dimensionality.

Mr. Stang presented the existing and proposed awning sign installed over the main entrance that faces Darby Street. He explained the applicant will use the existing awning in terms of dimensions, location, and color. He said the sign consists of the "Harvest Pizzeria" text and an orange moon in the center with text reading "Pizzas and Salads" on the left side and "Burgers and Sandwiches" on the right side. He said the dimensions will mirror the existing Sisters Sweet Shoppe sign. He indicated the applicant has ensured

that the details will meet all applicable sign standards and is required to provide sign drawings containing all details prior to filing for a sign permit to ensure the regulations are met.

Mr. Stang said a Waiver is required to reduce the side yard setback:

- 1) §153.062(O)(10)(2) – Buildable Area – minimum 3 feet (required) – 0 feet (requested)

Mr. Stang said all Minor Project Review criteria is met with the approval of the Waiver, the parking plan, and the conditions proposed.

Mr. Stang said approval is recommended for a Minor Project Review with two conditions:

- 1) That the applicant provide revised sign drawings with all relevant sign details prior to filing for a sign permit, subject to Staff approval; and
- 2) That the applicant provide the bicycle rack detail and proposed location, subject to Staff approval.

Mr. Musser asked to view the Site Plan again.

Mr. Munhall pointed out how the front of the building juts in and out and noted the ground level units. He inquired about the use of a fence versus landscaping to screen those ground units.

The Chair invited public comment.

Tom Holton, 5957 Roundstone Place, inquired about the noise level since the adjacent building is in such close proximity. He asked if the screen will mitigate the extra sound.

Mr. Stang said the wall is one foot taller than the proposed units as required that will help deflect some of the sound. He said there are a number of existing units on that side that are screened by the evergreen shrubs where the fence will act more of a barrier to block more of the sound.

The Chair asked if there were any further questions or concerns on the sign portion of this proposal.

Mr. Munhall said he would support the signs.

The Chair asked the members to address the screening.

Mr. Rinaldi said he did not have an issue with the zero lot line with the ground fence.

Mr. Munhall asked if the property owner to the north was aware of the proposal. Jennifer Rauch stated that every property within 150 feet receives a Notice.

Chris Crader, 311 East Columbus Street, Columbus, Ohio, said this is a worst case scenario. He said the last thing he wants to do is install more condensers than he needs to so they are hoping to whittle this down once all the engineering data is received. He said the applicant has met with the property owner to the north and he proposed a possible lease on his ground to turn that into a patio but they have yet to come to terms on that. He said the applicant is not entertaining the patio discussion at this time but may possibly next year. He indicated the business is tentatively opening in August or so. He said if the adjacent property owner is willing to discuss using that entire patch of ground between the two buildings as a patio it shows a good sign that he is not too concerned about noise from condensers.

Mr. Musser requested to view the screening on the north for the exhaust fans on the roof. He indicated that is going to collect a lot of snow and asked how the applicant plans to deal with that. He said he is concerned about drifting snow affecting the exhaust fans.

Joe Sullivan, Sullivan, Bruck, Architects, 8 S. Grant Street, Columbus, Ohio, said they were the architects for the original building so it made sense for Mr. Crader to contact them for relatively minor exterior modifications. He explained the parapet is held up off of the roof to alleviate snow trapping there; it would at least drain underneath. He said the exhaust fans are two feet away from the fence and are open on the sides. He said metal will be laid down on the roof and tied back at the top so it is a triangular frame that supports this vertical wall on the north façade; water will not be trapped there.

Mr. Munhall said screening is required per Code. He asked the applicant if they would consider more decorative vents if they did not have to have screening. Mr. Crader said he would like to avoid screening.

Mr. Munhall said he is an accountant and not an architect but thought adding screening between these two gables will draw more attention to it and would appear unnatural. He said from an aesthetic standpoint, he asked for alternatives to the fence proposed for screening and would support a Waiver to eliminate a parapet on the roof.

Mr. Crader indicated a brushed metal finish could be used for the vents, matching the color of the shingles, so they are not obtrusive.

Mr. Rinaldi said it would be a matter of finish.

Mr. Sullivan said the location of the exhaust fans between the gables on the north side is back off the street. He agreed that adding a parapet for screening draws more attention than if the exhaust fans were just painted to match the roof shingles.

Mr. Musser agreed with that assessment.

Mr. Munhall said he does not want to see just a standard vent placed there, though. He asked if there were decorative vents or painting schemes that could be used.

Mr. Sullivan said it is not a simple little bathroom vent; it is venting the kitchen exhaust so the vents stick up about three feet.

Ms. Rauch said the vents are 35 inches in diameter.

Mr. Sullivan said painting them out will draw less attention. He said any time you have to attach something through a roof, and put a screen that is subject to wind and other issues, it only creates potential problems down the road. He said the applicant understands the Code for screening but in this circumstance, the area is so narrow between the buildings and it is pushed back so the existing gables protect it very effectively. He agreed the paint color should match the medium-gray shingled roof. He indicated darker colors tend to recede.

Mr. Rinaldi said after walking the site, he thought the screen would do more harm than good. With the potential for a patio, he asked if this will be a concern for the future.

Mr. Crader said it is the applicant's preference from a patio standpoint; their ovens in their current locations can only handle so much volume. He said they would rather have a small courtyard style patio with maybe 20 seats versus this large bustling patio of 40-plus seats. He said they would rather have a patio on land they own than to have a separate land lease with the neighbor to the north.

Ms. Fox asked where he might put the small patio.

Mr. Rinaldi asked if there will be issues with the vents. Mr. Crader said there will be food grease but they will have them serviced regularly.

Mr. Holton asked everyone to think about the vents for the Dublin Village Tavern; almost everybody has been to the DVT. He said when you are parked behind the DVT, there is a clean structure, which happens to be the screen for their kitchen vents. He said nobody knows it is there. He said it is right in the parking lot and you can almost reach over it with your hand. He said it was installed when they added the extension to the building. He said they could not go up so they went back and then up about a half of a story. He said that is how good the screening can be. He said it is not even really noisy. He said when you talk about screening, and walking by, and you see a fence, you do not give it another thought or what the purpose of it is. He concluded screening is necessary and it can be done very well.

Mr. Musser asked if there was a flat roof at the Dublin Village Tavern.

Mr. Munhall said you might park there behind the DVT but people will rarely be strolling by there and there are bushes on the other side.

Mr. Rinaldi said the intent is to screen the equipment but consider the existing conditions of the adjacent building.

Ms. Rauch presented the Tucci's elevation for reference.

Mr. Munhall inquired about the detail of the vents.

Mr. Crader said there is one, 11-foot hood and there is one pizza oven that will have an 8-inch, fireproof duct with a 12-inch swirl fan on top. Mr. Munhall asked how far apart they are. Mr. Crader said they are closer to the gables on the east and west side of the building than they are to the center and the one on the west is larger.

Mr. Rinaldi said the point here is it has to be screened, but his only comment is "Is it adequately screened with adjacent structures and the existing building itself with those gables or do we want to go with what is proposed?" He said he did not want to over complicate this and make it more of an issue than it needs to be.

Ms. Fox indicated when she first saw the proposed screening, she thought it really detracted from the profile of the building itself; the gables are attractive. She said if there is natural screening and the goal is to make this as attractive as possible, then she would opt for painting it out because it would only be visible via a walk-by glance. She said a fence would not fit the architectural style of that building.

Mr. Musser agreed.

Mr. Crader suggested a condition whereas he would have their hood installer bring specific paint samples to Staff so they can match it with the shingles in place.

Mr. Stang said another Waiver would be required then to waive the rooftop screening requirements in addition to the conditions.

Mr. Munhall said he does not like screening unless it is appropriate because there is nothing else to do. He said hopefully for the units on the ground it will be one less unit than what exists. He asked why the applicant is not proposing natural screening there.

Mr. Rinaldi said there does not appear to be enough room to landscape and still stay within their property and have room for maintenance.

Mr. Sullivan agreed there is not a lot of space and the fence is only 4 feet high. He said this is more appropriate for a fence because one would expect to see fencing between properties more than you would expect one on a roof.

Mr. Rinaldi asked if there were any further questions or concerns with regard to this case.

Ms. Fox requested that in the future, Staff provides photographs of neighboring buildings for context in case some of them do not have an opportunity to do a true site visit.

Mr. Rinaldi indicated an on-site visit for this proposal was necessary to really understand the geometry in relation to the buildings.

Ms. Rauch said an expanded area can be illustrated in photographs in the future.

Motion and Vote

Ms. Stenberg moved, Mr. Musser seconded, to approve a request for two Waivers:

1. §153.062(O)(10)(2) – Buildable Area: minimum 3 feet (required) – 0 feet (requested)
2. §153.065(E)(3)(b) – Rooftop Screening of Mechanical Units: no screening (requested)

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

Motion and Vote

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

- 1) That the applicant provide revised sign drawings with all relevant sign details prior to filing for a sign permit, subject to Staff approval;
- 2) That the applicant provide the bicycle rack detail and proposed location, subject to Staff approval; and
- 3) That upon approval of a Waiver for rooftop screening that the applicant paint the exhaust vents to match the existing roof color.

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

3. BSD HC - Berkshire Hathaway - Sign 16-029ARB-MSP

109½ S. High Street Master Sign Plan

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following application is a request for the installation of two new projecting signs for an existing carriage house south of Pinney Hill Lane at the intersection with Mill Lane. He said this is a request for review and approval of a Master Sign Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.066(G) and 153.170 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

JM Rayburn presented the aerial view of the site and noted the existing carriage house is located to the rear of an existing 1842, two-story, historic structure at 109½ S. High Street, zoned in the BSD Historic Core District.

Mr. Rayburn explained the applicant has requested a Master Sign Plan, which is necessary to allow for a coordinated and appropriate sign proposal given the structure's scale and location.

Mr. Rayburn reported the Architectural Review Board approved a new projecting sign and directory sign plaque for the primary structure for GEM Law in January of this year. He said the approved sign panels are an Amber Slate (CW-685) background with Capitol White (CW-10) copy and edge detail. He reported the Administrative Review Team (ART) reviewed a proposal for a projecting sign and a wall mounted sign for the existing carriage house on April 14th. He said the applicant has included three color scheme options for consideration. He stated the ART recommended approval of the color scheme that coordinates with the primary structure's approved signs with the Amber Slate background and Capitol White lettering. He said the proposed projecting signs are identical in size and meet the Code requirements for size, height, and location.

Due to the location of the carriage house along Pinney Lane and Mill Lane, Mr. Rayburn reported the ART determined two projecting signs are more appropriate for the accessory structure due to the access and visibility. He presented the two new proposed projecting signs – one on the northern elevation mounted west of the entrance and one for the western elevation centered above the garage doors. He said the ART also recommended the applicant consider a mounting arm for the projecting signs that is more appropriate to the scale of the structure and height of the proposed signs. He indicated the applicant is showing a metal mounting arm appropriate to the scale of the structure. He added a cut sheet will be required prior to submission of a sign permit. He concluded no sign illumination is proposed.

Mr. Rayburn presented the criteria for a Master Sign Plan. He said the ART has reviewed this application based on the intent and purpose outlined in the Code for a Master Sign Plan, as follows:

- a) To allow a greater degree of flexibility and creativity in sign design and display;
- b) To ensure sign work is in a coordinated fashion to meet the general intent of signs in the District;
and
- c) Not intended to permit larger signs, more visible signs, or additional signs than permitted, without any consideration for unique sign design and display.

Mr. Rayburn said approval is recommended for the Master Sign Plan with three conditions:

- 1) That the applicant select the color scheme, Amber Slate (CW-685) with Capitol White (CW-10), coordinated with the primary historic structure;
- 2) That the plans be updated prior to sign permitting to show dimensioned sign location and mounting height meeting Code and updated to show approved sign type and mounting bracket;
and
- 3) That the applicant provide a cut sheet detail of the approved mounting bracket prior to sign permitting.

Mr. Rayburn said the applicant was also present to answer any questions.

Jane Fox asked if the colors are going to be the same as what is on the sign for the primary structure on the front. She noted there is parking in between the primary structure and the carriage house.

Jennifer Rauch confirmed the proposed colors would match the main building's signs. She described Amber Slate as a dark charcoal color. She said they can have two signs but they are supposed to be two different signs per Code and the original proposal included one projecting sign and one wall sign. She reported the ART determined it would be better to have two projecting signs, which requires a MSP.

Ms. Fox inquired about the style of the bracket. Ms. Rauch explained the ART agreed the bracket used on the main building is out of scale for this proposed projecting sign and the metal bracket was proposed.

Tom Munhall asked if there were any clearance issues. Ms. Rauch said the applicant provided dimensions and they are meeting the eight-foot clearance from grade.

Everett Musser asked for clarification on the signs they are being asked to approve. Ms. Rauch explained the applicant proposed a sign initially that was painted in their corporate colors. She said the ART had a concern with the tone of those colors against the red building, as the corporate colors are more in the purple family. She said the ARB was provided all the different color options but they do not seem to be accurate on the screen.

Mr. Munhall asked if the applicant has any issues with the ART's choice of colors since they are not the corporate colors. She said the applicant agreed to the ART's choice during their review.

Sam Calhoun, 3780 Rushmore Drive, Arlington, replied his druthers would be the national colors but he is okay with what was suggested.

Jane Fox said it is tough because the true colors are not represented here. She said the ARB would be most concerned because it is a historic building and in a historic area. She said we try coordinate the building and sign colors to ensure the overall design fits together. She said she likes that the front building sign matches the back building sign.

Mr. Calhoun restated he is fine either way.

The Chair asked if there were any further comments. [Hearing none.]

Motion and Vote

Mr. Rinaldi moved, Mr. Musser seconded, to approve a request for a Master Sign Plan with three conditions:

- 1) That the applicant select the color scheme, Amber Slate (CW-685) with Capitol White (CW-10), coordinated with the primary historic structure;
- 2) That the plans be updated prior to sign permitting to show dimensioned sign location and mounting height meeting Code and updated to show approved sign type and mounting bracket; and
- 3) That the applicant provide a cut sheet detail of the approved mounting bracket prior to sign permitting.

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 said training will be forthcoming from Greg Dale in June, which will include all the Boards and Commissions together. She said additional training for all the Chairs and Vice Chairs is proposed earlier that same day.

Ms. Rauch noted some of the Board Members were at City Council to hear the discussion regarding the review process for the library and the parking garage, and the master plan for the public parks on the east and west side of the Scioto River. She said Council's discussion involved who should review these projects and who should retain the rights to approve them as they move through the process. She said City Council has determined they will review and retain approval of both projects given the complexity of the projects and the number of entities involved, such as the schools, library and City. She said Council wants to ensure ARB is engaged and provides informal feedback about the projects as they move through the process.

Ms. Fox emphasized she wanted the ARB to have the opportunity to partner in the discussion. Mr. Munhall said the Board can attend any City Council meeting and speak during public comment and Council might weigh comments received from the various Boards and Commissions more heavily.

Ms. Fox inquired about the status of the Code Amendment for demolitions and Code Enforcements' participation. Ms. Rauch said all the information from the last meeting is being reviewed to tie in with the historic inventory to be completed by the consultant. She said the parameters need to be determined so the contributing/non-contributing portion can be incorporated from the beginning.

Ms. Fox said her concern is the economic hardship component of demolition proposals; some criteria and questions should be in place for the Board to be better prepared.

David Rinaldi suggested some stop-gap measures be in place before there is a Code overhaul. He asked if there is something we can tighten up for our requirements as demolition requests come forward. He said Stephen Smith, Jr. said yes but we do not know where he might be going with that.

Ms. Rauch said as Staff is approached about possible demolitions, they are requesting additional information for review to help with analysis until the Code is amended.

Ms. Fox indicated that having prepared questions for applicants seeking economic hardship is not necessarily a Code amendment but would allow the Board to be better prepared and informed.

Mr. Munhall said he thought the ARB will be more prepared now than they were with the prior cases at least for the initial request and then they are going to ask more aggressively for a lot more information even though the applicant can say no.

Ms. Rauch agreed the ARB is a more prepared, knows what questions to ask, and has a greater understanding of the Code.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 7:57 pm.

As approved by the Architectural Review Board on May 25, 2016.