



MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, March 22, 2017

AGENDA

- 1. BSD HC – Mixed-Use Development (Former Biddies site) 76 – 82 S. High Street**
17-008ARB-SPR Site Plan Review (Approved 3 – 1)
- 2. BSD HC – IMS Sign 82 S. High Street**
17-010ARB-MPR Minor Project Review (Approved 4 – 0)

The Chair, David Rinaldi, called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Board members present were: Jane Fox, Thomas Munhall, and Everett Musser. Shannon Stenberg was absent. City representatives were: Jennifer Rauch, JM Rayburn, Lori Burchett, Alan Perkins, Mike Altomare, Jeff Tyler, and Laurie Wright.

Administrative Business

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 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 HC – Mixed-Use Development (Former Biddies site) 76 – 82 S. High Street**
17-008ARB-SPR Site Plan Review

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following application is a request for a mixed-use building with associated parking and site improvements on the east side of South High Street, approximately 35 feet southeast of the intersection with Eberly Hill Lane. He said this is a request for a review and approval for a Site Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Lori Burchett stated this Site Plan Review was tabled at the February meeting to obtain additional information. She provided an overview of the review process.



Ms. Burchett presented photographs of the site and the surrounding properties for context. She reported that the Site Plan was reviewed at the last meeting but to reorient the Board she stated what happened between the Basic Plan and this Site Plan Review. She said the applicant has changed the orientation of the building; it is now oriented towards Eberly Hill Lane and steps down towards Blacksmith Lane to address some of the conditions from the Basic Plan Review. She added this better incorporates the building into the existing grade change and the existing neighborhood. The current proposed building is located east and south of the existing historic buildings, oriented along Eberly Hill Lane with access to the site proposed from Blacksmith Lane.

Ms. Burchett reported Staff has had additional conversations with Engineering, Fire, and Building Standards to discuss questions about stormwater, retaining wall design, separation requirements, and fire access on Blacksmith Lane. She stated Engineering indicated that the stormwater will be improved with the development with the addition of on-site retention and the retaining wall design and height is necessary to function properly. Building Standards, she said, reviewed the proposed changes to the west elevation and are satisfied that the proposed changes will meet the separation requirements. She confirmed that fire access can be met because the applicant provided Auto Turn data and this has been reviewed to the satisfaction of Fire. However she said, Fire has reviewed Blacksmith Lane and determined that the current condition is non-conforming and will provide adequate access, as it exists. As such, she reported Fire requested the applicant pave as much of Blacksmith Lane as appropriate, through the extent of their property to bring the roadway closer to current standards and this is addressed as a condition of approval.

Ms. Burchett stated the applicant made changes to the proposed building based on feedback and recommendations provided by the Board at their previous meeting that included height, massing, scale, and access on Blacksmith Lane. She presented the revised southern elevation, which demonstrated the upper story porch on the rear of the structure was removed and a porch on the easternmost portion of the building was added. Additionally, she said the height of the easternmost section has been reduced to 35-feet at the highest point of that building section. She reported the applicant made modifications to address a number of the previous conditions related to the stone wall along Blacksmith Lane, the relocation of the transformer, and the relocation of the bike racks.

Ms. Burchett presented the north elevation, which faces Eberly Hill Lane to show how the eastern portion has been stepped down as the building approaches Blacksmith Lane and an entrance to the porch was added with a shed dormer.

Ms. Burchett presented the structure as it would be viewed from Blacksmith Lane. She explained a Waiver will be required to allow for a flat roof type. She said the easternmost portion of the roof over the second story residential portion of the building is proposed as a flat roof to provide an accessible balcony on the upper story. She added the revised building includes an upper slope of the gambrel roof for the entrance dormer and the applicant is proposing the pitch to be 2:12 where a pitch greater than 3:12 is required for minor roofs.

Ms. Burchett presented the revised west elevation. In order to address comments regarding fire rating for the Building Code, she reported the applicant reduced the total number of openings. She noted the proposed elevation showed two dormers centered on the upper half-story and a shutter feature to the left of the door to mimic the window opening on the opposite side.

Ms. Burchett presented revised renderings in color that the applicant provided at the request of the Board that included: 1) the corner where Blacksmith Lane meets Eberly Hill Lane to further demonstrate where the balcony/porch area was added to the upper story to reduce the height as the structure approaches Blacksmith Lane; 2) view from High Street to show (former) Biddies at the front with Eberly Hill Lane and the structure stepping down in the rear; and 3) view from Blacksmith Lane to show how far back that

porch area is and where the roofline starts and also identifies the shed dormer, which will require a Waiver for the pitch, due to functionality for the shed dormer to work as an entrance.

Ms. Burchett stated Staff and the ART has reviewed all Waivers against review criteria, Architectural Review Board Standards, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* and found the proposal has met the criteria or will be met with conditions. Therefore, she said approval is recommended for all four motions:

1. Parking Plan to approve a reduction of required parking from 22 to 20 parking spaces
2. Fee-in-lieu of Open Space
3. 13 Waivers
4. Site Plan with 8 Conditions

The Chair invited the applicant to add to Ms. Burchett's presentation.

David Meleca, 144 E. State Street, reiterated that they listened to the Board's comments and made changes as requested, specifically addressing: 1) height on Blacksmith Lane by bringing that down to a two-story; 2) stepping the massing along Eberly Hill Lane; 3) removed the stacked porches by moving it and rotating it around the building; and 4) perspective on High Street now shows the structure subordinate to the existing building by recessing and stepping it down.

Mr. Rinaldi inquired about the elevator. Mr. Meleca said they adjusted the gambrel roof to mitigate that as much as possible so they actually raised the roof a little bit and covered the mass of the elevator.

The Chair invited the public to speak with regard to this case.

Steve Rudy, 129 S. Riverview Street, said the renderings were beautiful and he appreciates the reduction of the height of the east elevation. He indicated the City of Dublin desires substantial urbanization of the Historic District but this intent is in direct conflict with: the Bridge Street District vision; the ARB, which is responsible for protecting the scale and character of the district; and the century-long balance (coexistence) between residents and businesses. He said the Historic District has always been a mixed-use neighborhood. Despite heavy input from the residents, he said the City has decided to toss those overboard to enable walkable urbanism here and not just intended for the BSD. He suggested that to preserve our historic inventory, the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* should be followed and not the National Trust for Historic Properties.

Mr. Rudy said the applicant, Mr. Coratola, has always wanted to be a good neighbor; it is the City that pushed him to reorient this structure after the January meeting, so what we are getting is walkable urbanism instead of a good neighbor. He asked the Board to come to an agreement with the applicant on the previous iteration of this proposal.

Elaina Bowers, 83 S. High Street, Unit A, said this is a beautiful structure but she wanted to state how special downtown Dublin has always been to her. She indicated she is lucky to live here for 26 years and grow up here, and is compassionate about the growth and development across the river and down the neighborhood from her. She said it has been incredible to see the evolution of Dublin but the historic downtown is a gem. She recalled visiting downtown with her parents by visiting the library, using the paths, going to get ice cream, etc. and when she went away to college and came back to visit, her and her friends wanted to come downtown for drinks and dinner as it is such a cool experience to come back to their heartland. She said she was able to move away from downtown Columbus and find her own little gem in Dublin off of Mill Lane, behind Starbucks. She explained it is a small lofted home that is actually considered a carriage house, built in 1850, and previously used for horses. The original wood remains as well as the original siding, the barn door and windows, and ladder. She said this is really special because someone wanted to keep it unique and it still tells a story. The point is she noted is every property in downtown Dublin has history and a story to tell. She emphasized it is important to keep the feel of

Historic Dublin and keeping the stories alive to be retold over and over. She said she is a millennial and loves change and what is developing over the river is awesome but when she thinks of downtown Dublin, she will always think of it as a historic gem that it is. She said she believes this structure will take away from that feel and once the window is opened for this, that downtown Dublin could be turned into something it is not supposed to be. She concluded the Board should remember the residents that have followed the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* to invest in these homes and businesses.

Tom Holton, 5957 Roundstone Place, said it is ironic that the Board looking at these renderings at the same time the City is proposing changes to the district Code, with a Core 2, which will not even allow a design like this. He said the Board may approve this project and then in a few months not allow projects like this to stand. He said he is glad to see this rendering because if they had seen it in meetings past, we may not even be at this point. He indicated the drawings show the criterion is not met as the proposed structure was designed to be compatible with the surrounding historic structures without competing with its character. He said this is the exact opposite and the materials proposed are in direct contrast with the district and the structure's architecture does not reflect the era of 1820 – 1890. He concluded he is opposed to this project for the Historic District as proposed.

Mr. Holton expressed his concern about excavation because of the potential damage to the surrounding existing properties. He said Eberly Hill Lane is quite steep and it will require significant excavation. He asked how the stormwater will be captured and retained on site. He noted the applicant was asked to pave Blacksmith Lane but he was concerned about the rest of Blacksmith Lane and how it would be affected by water runoff to the north and south of this site. Lastly, he inquired about lighting for the parking lot and how it would affect the surrounding existing residents to the east of the site.

The Chair asked if anyone else from the public wanted to speak with regard to this application. [There were none]. He closed the public comment portion of the meeting.

Tom Munhall inquired about the roof height. He asked if there is an issue with having a flat roof versus having to go to a higher peak. Mr. Meleca said the roof could continue up as a full roof form but aesthetically it currently seems to be in the appropriate proportions for massing and keeping the height to a minimum. Mr. Munhall said he does not like a flat roof and there are not many in the district. He added he would also like the siding direction changed on the dormers.

Jane Fox said she wanted to be fair to the applicants as they tried so very hard to make adjustments here and there but it is difficult to feel good about the site plan because the footprint is too large for the Historic District's accessory or additional structure behind (former) Biddies. She said the constant theme has been height, massing, stair stepping, open space for vistas, and soul and character to what is already present in the district. As compared to new construction north of SR 161, she said this proposal would probably blend in with much of the new development. She continued the problem for the ARB is they are in the heart and soul of what is remaining of the historic core. She added the most well-preserved buildings are south of SR 161. Wavering to allow a building of this size and height she said, literally opens the door to many more of these projects coming in. She indicated there has been a slow creep of more modern infill that will change the character drastically in the Historic District. She emphasized she has not changed her feelings in the last three meetings; whatever goes in the Historic Core must be subordinate to, characteristic of, broken up in mass, lower in height, allowing more open vistas, more landscape opportunity, less pressure on parking, and to not create more problems for the district beyond what exists. She said she could pick each element apart and twist it to try and make it work but this is still too large a mass of a building and not characteristic to the adjacent properties.

Everett Musser said the Board clearly gave the applicant a challenge to change certain things at the last meeting: reduce the height (which they did); make the building appear more like separate buildings (which they did by stair-stepping them down); and providing renderings that impressed him to further

demonstrate the rest of the changes. He concluded the applicant complied with what the ARB asked of them and when the building is finally built, it will be an excellent neighbor to everyone in the community.

David Rinaldi said he appreciated that the applicant listened to the Board including reducing the height along Blacksmith Lane. To go back to the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*, he noted it states successful design of new buildings in the existing context requires a lot of creativity and he affirmed the Board has seen that. He added most successful designs are contemporary in character. He stated this structure is contextual with the Historic District - buildings in this district are also closely spaced or have abutting walls, which gives the appearance of several structures. He confirmed that the amount of openings were reduced on the west elevation for fire Code but asked why the dormers do not center over the windows below. Mr. Meleca answered it was a Code reason and explained it.

Mr. Rinaldi inquired about the roof transition at the balcony on the east elevation that could be an awkward condition, potentially. Mr. Meleca explained it becomes a faux form.

Mr. Rinaldi confirmed that the stormwater is being retained under the site and not running off so that will be an improvement, to which Mr. Meleca answered affirmatively.

Ms. Fox inquired about the square footage of the building because she found conflicting numbers on the plans. Jennifer Rauch answered 8,800 square feet.

Ms. Fox requested the overall feelings of the other members about this proposal because she feels she is on the opposite end of the spectrum. She explained she asked because she wants to be fair to future applicants with regard to what the Board expects in the Historic District.

Mr. Munhall said he thought they have done that and perhaps Ms. Fox's view of Historic Dublin is the single-story small house but they were built way after Historic Dublin was built and most in the last 60 years. He noted there are older homes but he is just going with the guidelines that state 2.5 stories is permitted. He said the Board has said to the applicant that they understand they want to develop this property but the ARB has standards and we have to marry those two things and that is what they have been doing the last three meetings he thought. He said we need people like Ms. Fox on the Board to provide that certain perspective.

Mr. Rinaldi said it is a tough balance to do what is needed for a viable property as well as appease the Board and residents. Like Mr. Munhall stated, this will not be allowable when the Code revisions come through but that is indifferent to this; this has to be reviewed under the current Code.

Mr. Munhall noted the building revisions are not final.

Ms. Fox asked if there could be planters on the retaining wall to allow for vines to come down to cover it. Mr. Meleca said planters are not currently shown in the plans but adding planter boxes to that top railing should not be an issue.

Ms. Fox said her biggest concern has been fire accessibility and traffic as well as the close proximity of the buildings to each other.

Mike Altomare, Fire Marshall, said the applicant provided the turning radius requested. He said the conditions on Blacksmith Lane are existing and the Fire Department is using that as is and what the applicant is proposing will make that better by making it wider so there is more accessibility. He said what they have requested, the applicant has been able to accomplish to a certain degree. He clarified that Fire requested a 20-foot width (which is not existing now) but the applicant will provide as much as possible, which is in the 16 – 18-foot range.

Jeff Tyler, Chief Building Official and Director of Building Standards, said they have been working with the applicant on the proximity of the proposed building to the existing. He explained the Commercial Code does not state there is one particular way to go about it and the applicant has chosen to place an imaginary lot line between the two buildings and with that line they are able to meet separation distances that are standard.

Since excavation is necessary, Ms. Fox asked Mr. Tyler if it would be advisable to ask for a geotechnical soil analysis to determine whether limestone will be hit and then have to come up with some method to not disturb the surrounding historic properties and old houses adjacent to this property. Mr. Tyler answered, Chapter 33 of the Building Code requires that there be a protection of neighboring structures through the construction phase. He confirmed geotechnical reports would be something Building Standards would check at the permitting phase to ensure those issues are taken care of. He said their review would be based off of the owner's engineer that he is working with as to how the excavation would occur as it is not a decision for Building Standards. He restated that his reviews are to make sure the applicant is in compliance and it is the owner's responsibility to come up with an engineering means and method to excavate without damaging the neighborhood, no matter what they find below ground.

Mr. Musser said he is fine with the proposal and does not have any further questions.

Ms. Fox emphasized that the stone materials used should be as close to resembling the character through shape and color of dry-laid stone walls found in Dublin as possible and avoid introducing a faux stone that looks like it could be old stone but is not. Mr. Meleca said that is their goal as well. He indicated there are many different types of stone in the district. He asked if there is one she is expecting him to match or if there is a veritable palette from which to choose.

Mr. Musser agreed there are a number of different stones around but the choice can be selective. He said the stone introduced last week was fine. Mr. Meleca confirmed the product would come in a range of colors like the sample and said it may be possible to get the same material with less variation in it. The Board determined that the current proposed stone would be fine for all the stone elements as long as the darkest stone piece is not used.

Mr. Munhall again asked if horizontal siding could be used on the dormers instead of angled siding to which Mr. Meleca answered affirmatively.

Mr. Munhall asked if all the Board members were fine with the roof line. Ms. Fox said she would not like to see the height raised and appreciates that the applicant dropped the eave heights on both ends and is fine with the roof as proposed. Mr. Musser said he is fine with the rooflines.

Ms. Fox inquired about landscaping in relation to parking. She said they have discussed the issue of new infill being suburban commercial islands and curbing but that is not characteristic of the Historic District. She asked if the ART had made any suggestions because they had requested a softening of landscaping for the Library project to be more characteristic of the Historic District.

Ms. Rauch answered that could be done but Code requires islands and curbing. She suggested that the request could be that the materials used could be more characteristic of the district. Ms. Fox suggested that the landscaping butting up against residential landscapes should be a melded feel so when one walks down those old alleys, the historical character is felt. She explained she did not want to see rows of the same materials being used similar to what is used for commercial properties. Mr. Meleca said there is not a lot of landscape opportunity but window boxes may be considered along that edge. Ms. Fox concluded she wanted the landscaping to have an old feel and not like an office park.

The Chair confirmed the modified conditions met the requests of the Board and if there was any further discussion to be had [There was none.] Ms. Burchett recapped each of the four motions.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Munhall moved, Mr. Musser seconded, to approve the request for a Parking Plan to allow the reduction of the required parking from 22 parking spaces to 20. The vote was as follows: Ms. Fox, no; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Musser, yes; and Mr. Munhall, yes. (Approved 3 – 1)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Munhall moved, Mr. Musser seconded, to approve a request for a Fee-in-Lieu of the provisions of Open Space because this site is in proximity of other Public Open Spaces like plazas. The vote was as follows: Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Ms. Fox, no; Mr. Musser, yes; and Mr. Munhall, yes. (Approved 3 – 1)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Musser moved, Mr. Munhall seconded, to approve a request for 13 Waivers:

1. Building Type – §153.062(D)(2)(a) Pitched Roof Type: Roof Structure. Hipped and gable roofs (permitted), in addition to roofs with combinations of hips and gables. (2 Waivers requested for Gambrel and Flat Roofs)
2. Building Type – §153.062(D)(2)(b)(4) Pitch Measure: Unless determined to be architecturally appropriate to the style of the building, a pitch greater than 3:12 (required) on roofs of dormers, porches, balconies, or other minor roofs.
3. Building Type – §153.062(D)(2)(h) Roof Type: Gambrel and Mansard Roofs. Gambrel and mansard roofs are permitted only for single family detached buildings, unless otherwise determined to be architecturally appropriate by the required reviewing body for other building types.
4. Building Type – §153.062(D)(3)(a) Flat Roof Types: Flat roofs are permitted in all districts except Historic Core, unless otherwise determined by the required reviewing body to be architecturally appropriate.
5. Building Type – §153.062(O)(9)(d)(6) Permitted Types: Pitched roof; other types permitted with approval. Pitched roof with flat area and gambrel roof proposed.
6. Historic Mixed-Use Building Type – §153.062(O)(9) Parking within a building is not permitted; two, two car garages (requested)
7. Historic Mixed-Use Building Type – §153.062(O)(9) Ground Story Street Façade Transparency: 40% (required); Eberly Hill (North): 21% (proposed) and S. Blacksmith Lane (East): 15% (proposed).
8. Historic Mixed-Use Building Type – §153.062(O)(9) Upper Story Street Façade Transparency: 20% (required); Eberly Hill (North): 17% (proposed) and S. Blacksmith Lane (East): 15% (proposed).
9. Historic Mixed-Use Building Type – §153.062(O)(9) Ground Story Non-Street Facing Transparency: 15% (required); Parking lot (South): 8% (proposed) and West Elevation: 12% (proposed).
10. Building Type – §153.062(O)(9)(d)(3) Street Facades: Number of Entrances Required – 1 per 40 feet of façade for buildings over 60 feet minimum (required); Eberly Hill: 3 (required), 1 entrance (provided).

1. BSD HC – Mixed-Use Development (Former Biddies site)
17-008ARB-SPR

76 – 82 S. High Street
Site Plan Review

11. Building Type – §153.062(O)(9)(d)(5) Façade Materials: Permitted Primary Materials – Stone, Brick, Wood Siding (required); Fiber Cement Siding (requested)
12. Site Development Standards §153.065(E)(1)(b) Wall Height: No fence or wall located between the principal structure on a lot and the side or rear property line shall exceed six feet in height (required); retaining wall is approximately 12 feet in height as measured from established grade at the parking area (proposed).
13. Site Development Standards – §153.065(D)(7) – Foundation Planting: Building foundation landscaping is required along all sides of a building not otherwise occupied by entrances, sidewalk, parking or loading areas, or similar areas. Foundation landscaping is not required for portions of the front or corner side building façades located within 10 feet of the front property line and where a streetscape or patio is provided.

The front building façade is 5 feet from the front property line and no foundation planting is required in this location. Foundation planting is required along the corner side (east) and rear facade (south) and a portion of the side façade (west) of the building. The minimum dimension of the landscape bed depth is not met along the southern elevation (requested).

The vote was as follows: Ms. Fox, no; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Musser, yes; and Mr. Munhall, yes. (Approved 3 – 1)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Musser moved, Mr. Munhall seconded, to approve a request for a Site Plan Review with 11 conditions as amended:

- 1) That additional shrubs of a similar mix as currently shown, be provided along the northerly street wall along Blacksmith Lane to meet Code;
- 2) That the applicant ensures all light fixtures and site photometrics meet Code, and any outstanding information be provided as part of the building permitting;
- 3) That the applicant file an application to combine the two lots, prior to issuance of the building permit;
- 4) That all sign details shall be approved by the Architectural Review Board, prior to the installation of signs;
- 5) That the construction of the proposed development is subject to the approval of the demolition request;
- 6) That if a change of use should occur to include a different mix of uses for the existing or proposed buildings that require additional parking provisions, the applicant would be required to gain approval of a modified Parking Plan from the Architectural Review Board;
- 7) That the applicant will continue to work with staff to ensure that the landscaping requirements are met;

**1. BSD HC – Mixed-Use Development (Former Biddies site)
17-008ARB-SPR**

**76 – 82 S. High Street
Site Plan Review**

- 8) That the applicant work with staff to expand the pavement of Blacksmith Lane through their property to a width appropriate to the site, and to the satisfaction of the Washington Township Fire Department;
- 9) That the applicant work with staff to select a stone, for all of the stone, that minimizes the variation in color and better keeps with the surrounding stone character similar to the stone proposed without the darker colors, subject to staff approval;
- 10) That the street wall be a dry-laid stacked stone wall; and
- 11) That the applicant change the angled siding to horizontal siding on the dormers.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Ms. Fox, no; Mr. Munhall, yes; and Mr. Musser, yes. (Approved 3 – 1)

**2. BSD HC – IMS Sign
17-010ARB-MPR**

**82 S. High 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 east side of S. High Street, approximately 80 feet south of the intersection with Eberly Hill Lane. He said this is a request for a review and approval for a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Codes §153.066(G) and §153.170 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

JM Rayburn presented an aerial view of the site and a graphic showing the 1.5 story building within the context of the adjacent properties as well as the proposed location for the IMS sign to be mounted on the building, which stands for Integrated Marketing Solutions. He explained the front faces S. High Street and there is an accessory structure in the rear with parking access from the rear alley. He reported the Ohio Historical Inventory states that the building was constructed in the 1850s along with a number of little cottages in Dublin. He added the building is on the National Register of Historic Places. He noted there is a lean-to addition on the south side of the building with another lean-to addition to the rear. The original use for the structure he said was residential and has since been converted into commercial use.

Mr. Rayburn said the eight-square-foot proposed sign is not illuminated with a one-inch thick blockboard with routing and three colors. The sign he described as rectangular in shape with rounded corners and the letters sizes and style is easy to read. He indicated the size and location of the sign is intended for viewing by pedestrians rather than drivers.

Mr. Rayburn stated the proposed sign meets Code for size, color, and design but the height of the sign needs to be verified as a condition of approval prior to submission for a sign permit. However, he said the blockboard does not meet Code for permitted materials so the applicant has been asked to select HDU, cedar, or redwood, or some other sort of treated lumber as a second condition of approval because the way blockboard is glued, it is not suitable for outdoor use. He reported that the way the letters would be adhered to the sign was a concern for durability so Staff recommended the applicant route the letters as well as the border.

Jane Fox asked if the sign met the criteria in the Bridge Street Code. Mr. Rayburn answered the proposal was reviewed against the Bridge Street Code, Bridge Street Sign Design Guidelines, *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*, and ARB guidelines for a Minor Project Review.

David Rinaldi remarked that the old *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* were more restrictive and the BSD Code allows for more variety.

Mr. Rayburn said this proposal was presented to the ART twice and after the applicant heard the recommendations at the first review, they made the appropriate changes requested.

The Chair noted the applicant, Jill Cullinan, 82 S. High Street, has agreed to the three conditions.

Motion and Vote

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

- 1) That the applicant provide revised drawings indicating the exact height of the sign not to exceed 15 feet, subject to staff approval;
- 2) That the applicant use one of the primary wood materials (HDU, cedar, redwood or treated lumber) in lieu of the proposed blockboard materiality; and
- 3) That the applicant incorporate a routed sign design for the lettering and border in lieu of the applied lettering.

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

Communications

Jennifer Rauch said the applications for the library and parking garage were scheduled to be on City Council's agenda on March 20th but they were tabled to review the public comments provided. She said the date for which those applications will move forward has not yet been determined.

Ms. Rauch said there have been some questions about the (former) Biddies site and modifications that have been made and she confirmed there has been like-for-like replacement of materials and colors, etc.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 8:13 pm.

As approved by the Architectural Review Board on April 26, 2017.