

MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, April 25, 2018

AGENDA

- 1. BSD HC – Tackett Bakery & Office Addition
18-027INF** **30 – 32 S. High Street
Informal Review (Discussion Only)**
- 2. BSD HC – Office Building
17-110ARB-MPR** **113 S. High Street
Waivers (Approved 5 – 0)
Fee-in-Lieu (Approved 5 – 0)
Minor Project Review (Approved 5 – 0)**
- 3. BSD HC – Daso Custom Cabinetry – Signs
18-022ARB-MSP** **13 S. High Street
Master Sign Plan (Approved 5 – 0)**
- 4. PUD, Coffman Homestead – Sign
18-024ARB-AFDP** **6659 Coffman Road
Amended Final Development Plan (Recommended for Approval 5 – 0)**
- 5. BSD HS – Midwest Gas - Sign
18-025ARB-MSP** **58 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: Jeffrey Leonhard, Shannon Stenberg, Gary Alexander, and Andrew Keeler. City representatives were: Vice Mayor, Chris Amorose Groomes, Claudia Husak, Lori Burchett, JM Rayburn, Sierra Saumenig, Richard Hansen, Matt Earman, and Laurie Wright.

Administrative Business

The Chair welcomed the newest Board Member, Andrew Keeler, who would be sworn in by the Vice Mayor, Chris Amorose Groomes. She performed the Oath of Office for the new appointment of Andrew Keeler and the reappointment of Gary Alexander.

Claudia Husak said the Vice Mayor will also provide some opening remarks and on behalf of the Planning Staff, she thanked everyone on the Board for their service and dedication serving on the Architectural Review Board (ARB). She said there will be on-going training for the Board throughout the year and the next session is scheduled for August 16th.



Ms. Amorose Groomes said City Council appreciates their service. She noted the Board receives a lot of information but they are in fantastic hands with the Planning Staff. She said Council expects the Board Members to give the utmost respect to one another, applicants, and staff but that does not mean members have to agree. She said Council is asking for their best opinions, independent thoughts, and they value the critique of the cases that will come before this Board. She thanked the Board and encouraged the Board to take the charge of the highest possible standard that can be upheld for the balance of our community. She said the Board Members are the gatekeepers of our Historic District, which is the most coveted place in our community. She said there is a tremendous amount of responsibility and it is a vitally important portion of our community and to our citizens. She thanked them again for their efforts and Council looks forward to great things coming to Council from the ARB. She said if the Board ever needs assistance or guidance, or has questions, not to hesitate to contact her as she is the Administrative Chair and the Liaison for the Boards and Commissions. She asked them to please reach out to Council because they stand at the ready to help the Board do an excellent job.

The Chair thanked the Vice Mayor, Mr. Keeler for coming on board, and Mr. Alexander for continuing his service. He said next on the agenda was the election of officers but he would hold that until after all the cases were heard but the Administrative Business will be reported in the order it was published on the agenda.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Leonhard moved, Mr. Alexander seconded, to elect David Rinaldi as the 2018-2019 Chair. The vote was as follows: Ms. Stenberg, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Leonhard, yes; (Approved 5 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Rinaldi moved, Mr. Leonhard seconded, to elect Shannon Stenberg as the 2018-2019 Vice Chair. The vote was as follows: Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; Mr. Leonhard, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

Motion and Vote

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

Motion and Vote

Mr. Leonhard moved, Mr. Keeler seconded, to approve the meeting minutes from March 28, 2018, as presented. The vote was as follows: Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; and Mr. Leonhard, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

The Chair asked to address cases three through five first, and then cases one and two. He briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Architectural Review Board. He swore in anyone planning to address the Board during this meeting.

**1. BSD HC – Tackett Bakery & Office Addition
18-027INF**

**30 – 32 S. High Street
Informal Review**

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following proposal is a request for modifications to two existing historic commercial buildings, an addition, and associated site improvements for a site on the east side of South High Street, approximately 50 feet north of the intersection with Spring Hill Lane. He said this is a request for an informal review and feedback for a future application within the Bridge Street District under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Lori Burchett explained the process whereas the applicant requested an Informal Review, which would be followed by a Minor Project Review, reviewed by the ART, with a final approval provided by the ARB and then upon approval, the applicants can file for a building, site, and/or sign permits; building permits are required for construction to commence.

Ms. Burchett presented an aerial view of the site as well as front and rear photographs of the existing conditions. She said the two historic structures located at 30 and 32 S. High Street are proposed to be renovated to accommodate an office (30 S. High St.) and bakery (32 S. High St.). She reported both structures are currently listed on the National Register of Historic Places as part of the Historic District. She stated the City's third-party, historic preservation consultant was hired to provide a review and she reported the property was listed on the National Register in 1979 for significant contributions to the areas of architecture, commerce, and exploration/settlement from 1880 to 1925. She also had found the properties are part of the Ohio Historic Inventory and are considered contributing to the City of Dublin's Local Historic District per the Historic and Cultural Assessment conducted in 2017.

Ms. Burchett said the building on 30 S. High Street contains one of the few remaining log structures in Dublin and it is visible from the attic, and an 1856 map indicated a drugstore was on this site. She said the structure rests on a stone foundation with cement asbestos shingle siding with a lean-to addition at the rear and a large shed dormer on the west side. She noted an exterior concrete block chimney is on the south side of the building. She said other character-defining features the consultant noted were: the limestone foundation (probably from local stone), the log structure, the saltbox profile of the building, and the side entry.

Ms. Burchett said the structure at 32 S. High Street was a former store and is an example of mid-late 19th century vernacular commercial architecture consisting of a gable end facing the street; vertical board and batten siding on the sides; and shiplap siding on the façade. She said the structure rests on a stone foundation and at some point in time, a modern addition was built at the rear and the storefront windows were altered. Additionally, she said, the property has two outbuildings: a small, wood-frame, shed-roof privy and a rectangular, wood-frame, gable-roof storage building. She reported the consultant noted other character-defining features that include: the limestone foundation (probably from local stone), the horizontal wood siding, the center door flanked by storefront windows with knee walls, and the seam-metal gable roof hidden behind a false parapet storefront.

Ms. Burchett said the applicant is proposing modifications to the two historic structures and associated site improvements at 30 and 32 S. High Street to allow for office and bakery uses, respectively. The modifications include the creation of a paved, 12-space parking lot to the rear and will be shared among the two parcels along with two, on-street parking spaces. Based on the proposed uses, she stated, Code requires 22 parking spaces to support the office and bakery uses. She noted a Parking Plan will be required to allow for the parking reduction. She restated the two parcels have frontage on the east side of S. High Street and are accessed from S. Blacksmith Lane at the rear and includes a dumpster in the southeastern corner. The applicant has provided an increased paved area, she said, to allow for vehicles passing along Blacksmith Lane and will continue to work with Engineering on this detail.

Ms. Burchett said the proposed improvements to 30 S. High Street specifically, she said, include an addition of 85 square feet onto the rear of the structure, while the improvements to 32 S. High Street specifically include an additional 583 square feet, as well as a deck in the rear.

Ms. Burchett said the proposed modifications to 30 S. High Street include the removal of an existing addition; construction of a new, two-story addition located to the rear of the building; relocation of the building entrance from High Street to the north side of the building to allow for ADA accessibility; and the addition of a roof and columns over the new entrance. Proposed building materials include wood siding, clad wood windows and a shingle roof, she said.

Ms. Burchett said the proposed modifications to 32 S. High Street include replacing the exterior siding and roof with like-for-like materials (board and batten and standing seam metal roof); storefront window replacement and the addition of awnings along the front elevation with a refurbished front door; installation of new, larger windows and the conversion of a window to an ADA accessible door along the southern elevation; addition of a new chimney along the southern elevation; and a 200-square-foot building addition to the rear with a deck.

Ms. Burchett presented the side elevations of both structures with the proposed additions on the rear of each building that showed the difference in size between the two additions. The consultant, she reported, had concerns with using a side entrance to 30 S. High Street as a front entrance would be more historically appropriate. She presented graphics to further show context of mass and scale; the additions fit within Code in terms of the building's footprint and the building height. She said the applicant is proposing to demolish the existing addition to the rear of 30 S. High Street as well as the two outbuildings and relocating an existing dry-laid stone wall on site to accommodate the new paved parking area. She said the consultant recognized the outbuildings provide historic context for the site, but they are difficult to maintain. Ms. Burchett said the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* outline several considerations regarding the maintenance of historic structures within the district including the preservation of distinctive and defining characteristics, replacement of deteriorated historic features, and preservation of the historic character and changes that have been acquired significance over time; the consultant recommends against removing the existing rear addition of 30 S. High Street for that very reason.

Ms. Burchett noted the consultant had stated that she was supportive of the storefront windows at 32 S. High Street but not necessarily the glazing pattern or the addition of the chimney on the southern elevation as this tends to provide a false sense of history. She further noted that if the applicant has any further details on perhaps the existence of a fireplace in that location, that could sway her decision and would want as many historic details used as possible.

Ms. Burchett presented the proposed floor plans for the office building at 30 S. High Street and the bakery with a small office area at 32 S. High Street.

Ms. Burchett presented discussion questions that had been provided for the Board's consideration and review as well as to provide feedback to the applicant:

1. Does the Board support the demolition of the rear addition, two outbuildings, and the relocation of the historic stone wall?
2. Does the proposal maintain the historic integrity of the existing structures?
3. Are the proposed building additions historically appropriate and does the proposed character fit with the surrounding buildings?
4. Is the Board supportive of the parking reduction?
5. Are there other considerations by the Board?

Jeff Leonhard asked if the third-party consultant visited the properties because there is no door on the front of the structure at 30 S. High Street and there is a fire chimney existing on the side of the structure at 32 S. High Street. Ms. Burchett answered it is her understanding that through the consultant's research, most of the buildings in the area had front entrances and if there is a chimney there, the size is the issue. She added the consultant visits the site as part of her review.

Gary Alexander said there is a brick flew but it is way back and that front corner is extremely visible because the adjacent building sits back. In fact, the window locations are changing on that elevation.

Mr. Leonhard said there may have been a front door at 30 S. High at some point in time but it clearly has not been there in a while. Ms. Burchett emphasized that the consultant's review includes thorough research.

Mr. Alexander said he questions the consultant's assessment as well in terms of the additions to the rear of the building on 30 S. High because it looks like that shed has two components to it; there is an original shed and then there is a shed that projects out slightly beyond that. He asked if that was accurate. Ms. Burchett indicated that the third-party consultant's review is just one part of this review.

The Chair invited the applicant to add to the presentation.

Dan Morgan, 946 Mt. Pleasant Avenue, Columbus, Ohio, said he is the architect for the project. He indicated that early on, when the properties were purchased, they received approval to do some exploratory evaluations and clean up the two main structures. He said they first thought they had found a window at 30 S. High but once they peeled off the many layers of particle board and wallpaper, they found that a window was actually a door on the High Street façade so they decided to use the door but on the side as the entry. He reported there is an existing chimney, in a more modern material, in between the two structures that has no connection but would serve 30 S. High. He said a porch was a later addition. He referred to the third-party review, which states the covered porch is appropriate given its scale, massing, form, and the standing seam metal roof for the building at 30 S. High and the district on page 3 – the last sentence of the second paragraph. He provided more critique of the third-party review for 32 S. High Street. He noted the consultant said the project is seeking to do two additions to 32 S. High Street but at that site there is an existing building and about 10 – 15 years after it was built, there is another addition, which either brought it up to High Street, as it may have been set back, similar to 34 S. High, the law office. He said there was another addition completed in the 50's or 60's, which is the block foundation that comes up out of grade to the very rear so they are merely seeking to do a third addition to the building to increase some seating room so it is just one addition.

Mr. Morgan walked through the floor plans, beginning with the proposed bakery. He said the kitchen takes up most of the space and to be a viable business, they need room for customers. He said they had considered a large deck off the rear of the site but since this is Central Ohio, it would only be comfortable for patrons about two months out of the year. Then they considered enclosing it and using some sliding doors on the back that could be opened up for two to three months of the year to provide a larger space for wedding or baby showers, perhaps or small corporate events. They also needed a room for an office with restrooms and a mechanical room below it for staff. At the 30 S. High Street site, he said, the addition is held together by a shoestring, not a usable space, and just slightly better than a mud floor. He said the head height, building materials, and methods were not up to standards. He said the building itself, being 20 feet by 16 feet (roughly) with eight-inch walls is not much usable space for any type of business. That prompted asking for removal of the original addition and providing a larger addition (story and a half) in its place. He said 30 S. High is 1.5 stories and not two stories tall. The attic room will have a vaulted ceiling making use of the shed dormer.

Mr. Alexander said when he reviewed 32 S. High, the structure appeared to have three siding conditions, board and batten, board-on-board, and then the beveled side. He asked the applicant if he was proposing to re-side everything. Mr. Morgan answered affirmatively for the structure at 32 S. High. He said the sidings on the original buildings are deteriorated and they plan to replace with wood. He said they plan to keep the board and batten going down the side of the main structure and switching to a horizontal siding with a slightly less reveal for the contemporary addition to the rear.

Mr. Alexander asked if corrugated siding was used on the north side. Mr. Morgan answered they believe that was there as the previous owners started some demolition, whether exploratory or maliciously, he does not know, and there are materials there more or less inherited but the corrugated siding is not intended to remain.

David Rinaldi said he was glad someone had a plan for these properties as they have been in jeopardy for a long time. Mr. Leonhard agreed.

Mr. Morgan asked for some general thoughts on the site plan from the Board such as the amount of parking. Mr. Leonhard said, the fact that Code requires 22 and the applicant wants to reduce that number, he is fine with that. He said he lives right behind there and there's a lot of traffic on Blacksmith Lane so the less number of parking spaces back there the better.

The Chair indicated there would be a lot more Board discussion later but wanted to allow the public to speak in regards to this case.

Tom Holton, 5957 Roundstone Place, said he was speaking on behalf of the Historical Society. He said the last inventory was done in 1980 and the property at 30 S. High Street was a rental property, referred to as the "Weber" property.

Mr. Holton said when the applicant comes back to answer questions, he would like to know how the applicant plans to expose the log structure so visitors to the office can see the original structure. He said he was inside the structure with the owner and has seen a significant amount of it but it has been several months. He stated it is a remarkable site and it would be very useful for the log structure to be exposed. He wanted to know how the stone wall will be relocated from its current location right between the two properties; it is not easy to do and not often done but that should be addressed somehow. He noted there is a fire hydrant in the back, almost to Blacksmith Lane and former Chief Bostic would be very upset if that was disturbed. He wanted to know how the applicant would work around that or relocate it. In terms of the parking, he indicated, the homeowners in the back will certainly be interested in how the stormwater will be managed. He stated there is a fairly substantial berm on the east side of Blacksmith Lane but it can be breached with heavy rains as it has recently.

Mr. Holton questioned the chimney on 32 S. High Street. He said that building was originally built as a grocery store and lasted until the late 60's or so, then it became multiple uses including an antique store. He said the large display windows indicate that they were for the owner to display his wares for the people walking by. He noted the consultant said the windows were replaced but he has never heard any indication of the windows being altered. He said he has never seen a photograph of that place in an earlier stage but as an original building they needed the greatest amount of light possible for a shotgun type of building and grocery. He indicated it makes sense that those windows were large in the first place. He reported there are interior photos of that building as a grocery and it is long and well lighted in the front but dark in the back. Regarding a fireplace, he said there was no fireplace as they had a pot belly stove for heat so the chimney is not historically correct so the consultant is right in that sense. For the local residents that could not be here this evening, in particular, Mr. Rudy, he was asked to request consideration of the residents and the traffic on Blacksmith Lane from the Board.

Mr. Alexander asked Mr. Holton for clarity on his last statement. He said when you are asking the Board to consider the residents in terms of traffic, if that meant they prefer more parking. Mr. Holton clarified to consider additional customers who might be coming to and from the establishment. He said the local residents are very much in favor of this project, anything to upgrade the property but it is likely to increase traffic on Blacksmith Lane and Spring Hill Lane but it is one more thing for the Board to consider as more and more projects are anticipated for this district.

Shannon Stenberg said for the structure that is being considered for demolition, which the consultant had deemed contributing, she wanted to know Mr. Holton's thoughts on the demolition proposed. Mr. Holton said he was in favor of the demolition of the non-historic addition behind 32 S. High Street. He said he spoke to Mr. Tackett about it when they walked around the site because it is in terrible condition. He said the outhouse back should be demolished. He said the lean-to portion on 30 S. High on the left, is again an add-on so it could also be demolished. He clarified there are two additions to 30 S. High - a portion on the back where it is narrow and then another to the original cabin.

The Chair asked if there was anyone else from the public that wanted to speak on this case. [Hearing none.] He opened the discussion up for the Board.

Mr. Leonhard said he agreed; improving that structure is needed and parking is a challenge to address because the Zoning Code requires 22 spaces. He indicated there is not room for 22 spaces, and the majority of the traffic on Blacksmith is not people parking in the lots, but people cutting through to avoid the main intersection. He said the businesses will need parking spaces and he does not anticipate that to cause any more meaningful traffic than rush hour does. He said he lives on Blacksmith Lane and the traffic is bad during rush hour, especially on Fridays.

Mr. Rinaldi reported he had walked the site and the structure on 32 S. High Street and the smaller addition on 30 S. High Street are in terrible shape.

Mr. Alexander said he had an issue with the demolition at 30 S. High Street because there is a small lean-to, which was added to the original to set the first addition. He said he can understand the small lean-to but asked what happens when that is removed. He noted the applicant is proposing to build an addition that is big and overwhelming to the historic structure so he has an issue with the nature of that addition proposed that removing that lean-to allows. He suggested there are other ways to get floor space on two levels without jamming the proposed addition right up to the back of the historic building. He added it is import to understand the original historic structure and how it changed over time because not only does it reflect how the building changed but also how the environment changed as well. He said it is not unusual to reframe structures from the inside; it is very common because most of the older structures are not built to current codes. He said when structural changes are made by reframing from the inside, the roof is supported. He said he does not see an issue with the first addition on the 30 S. High building. He suggested there are other ways to connect to that addition, no matter how large the new addition is back there. Additionally, he noted, that shed creates space so the original building is not being overwhelmed and the cottage character of the building is retained. He stated he is definitely not in support of removing everything on the back of 30 S. High Street.

Mr. Rinaldi asked Mr. Alexander if he would consider more of a single-story link through that first addition. Mr. Alexander said the stair could be placed in the addition. He said the architect created breathing space with the other project on S. High Street and that can be done with this historic structure as well. He said it may take rethinking the programming and the intended uses but he thinks it creates a problem where the addition is too big, relative to the rest of the house.

Mr. Rinaldi asked Mr. Alexander for his thoughts on the other structure because there is a substantial addition proposed for there as well. Mr. Alexander answered he would like to see the material there re-used because the volume is the same; the space they want to create is a linear volume just like that. He said repairs and patches of existing materials can be seen throughout the district and the original material is still visible. He said it is unfortunate to tear something down and just rebuild with all new materials in that space.

Mr. Rinaldi asked if there were any issues with the proposed demolitions of the ancillary structures (outhouse). Ms. Stenberg said she does not have any problems with demolishing the outbuildings. She added she would like to see the addition on the rear of 30 S. High Street stepped down slightly. She said

she is more concerned about the siding and making sure the historic siding is incorporated in the structure itself whether interior or to show the character of the original, if it is salvageable. She indicates she likes the proposed structure for 32 S. High Street flows; and the appropriate way the demolition looked.

Mr. Morgan said there is no demolition planned for 32 S. High Street; the main structure is 2x4 walls and 4x4 walls. He said they are rebuilding the structure from the inside out to maintain the integrity. Mr. Alexander said the presentation suggested the rear portion was coming off. Mr. Morgan said that was not coming off.

Mr. Rinaldi clarified that the only main building demolition from the whole project is at 30 S. High Street with two additions proposed (the first lean-to plus the small lean-to). Mr. Morgan agreed. He said the intent is to take it back to its original structure and expose the logs on the inside of the building and maintain the insulation on the outside of the log structure. He explained they are creating a hole in the passageway where the window is.

Mr. Keeler asked to clarify demolition sections. Mr. Morgan said the intent on 30 S. High Street is to peel off the two additions, peeling it back to the original log structure and constructing one, story and a half addition, matching the footprint and turning it so it steps in and fits an appropriate scale. He said there is a connection on the attic story just wide enough for a person to walk through to get to the attic level of the addition so they are stepping it in on the side. He said the experience is to walk from the original building to a new building. He said the aesthetic will be fairly sleek and clean on the inside letting the more minimal modern materials play off the older logs to get a sense of texture. He said they found the logs of this cabin were repurposed to build this log cabin originally. The logs have more holes and joints where one would not expect to see them so they want to demonstrate that with this project.

Mr. Keeler asked Mr. Alexander if he had a problem with that demolition. Mr. Alexander answered he did but what he is comfortable with is removing the second addition, which is where the two windows are in 30 S. High because he can understand the low, head-height issues and he can also see the siding changes. He said the shed behind that is the first addition, and it should stay because it gets the addition further off the roof of the original structure and completely changes the scale of the cottage character or cabin. He said there are other issues about it as it is not a sensitive way to deal with a historic structure.

Mr. Rinaldi indicated he was partially in agreement.

Mr. Morgan said the original shed was the wrong way to do an addition. He said there is no differentiation between the original and what was added because of the way the asbestos siding was installed.

Mr. Alexander noted with vernacular buildings in this district, there are a lot of things that are not higher architecture and that is why they are trying to maintain the tradition and the character that is there and that is the ARB's role. He emphasized these buildings were not designed by architects.

Mr. Rinaldi restated he agreed with some of Mr. Alexander's comments. He said the later shed addition on 30 S. High is one that should go. He said he could be swayed either way on the original addition but the big issue Mr. Alexander brought up was – to give those buildings some space so it does not feel like a new building is being crammed in there. He said the ARB ran into this with a residential addition not too long ago and giving it space helped a lot for the original building to read.

Mr. Rinaldi emphasized the applicant should keep the original window patterns, window lites, and the number of lites. Mr. Morgan presented a photograph that demonstrated divided lites in those initial storefronts. He referred to the pictures of the windows provided on the back of the third party review. He noted the mullion between the transom and the main window are different on both sides so that

indicates there was a repair done. He said to this day, it has been cobbled together worse than it was initially so there is room for judgement about which style is historically appropriate given this was built and modified at various times. He argued the photograph is significant evidence that what they are proposing is similar to what there once was. Mr. Rinaldi said he certainly does not know but his guess is that photograph is somewhere between original and where it is today because he cannot say for sure it is from the 1800s. He said in the 1900s it was typical for a business to have the wide open glass.

Technical issues occurred and the members had to only refer to their tablets as information could no longer be shown on the screens.

Mr. Alexander said, on the second point of architectural character, he would keep the original window openings wherever possible. He said if there is evidence of the door on High Street, then he would not have an issue. Mr. Morgan said they discussed with staff that they would be add a limestone or brick step down from the structure's floor onto High Street like many of the older structures have. He said they would be asking for permission for that as the right-of-way starts at the face of the building. Mr. Morgan said they proposed more windows to gain more natural light into the space. Mr. Alexander said that exposure, when one is driving north on High Street is so important because the adjacent building at the south is set back and not only does the applicant have the front to deal with but also the exposure on that side.

Mr. Rinaldi added the fireplace chimney comment was appropriate because unless there is some evidence there was a fireplace in that location it would not be appropriate. He said the proposed design presented the inclusion of a chimney on the exterior. Mr. Alexander said that does not preclude the applicant from having a fireplace on inside. He said the issues is how it is exposed on the outside. He said functionally, there are other ways that can be handled. Ms. Stenberg agreed. She said for 32 S. High Street she would prefer to keep the single pane window as it was as the grocery store. Mr. Rinaldi added, for the proposed use, it would be appropriate as well.

Mr. Rinaldi stated he did not want to minimize the importance of the stone wall that runs right down the property line between the two properties. He said he understands something has to be done to create the parking lot. He asked if the applicant intended to maintain the eastern portion of the wall and relocate it to the north to create an L-shape. Mr. Morgan answered they are engaged with their civil engineers over the stormwater to make the grading work with the parking lot, which includes an accessible ramp up the south side of the lot. He indicated they might have to raise the grade of the parking lot a foot back toward Blacksmith Lane. He said they propose to repurpose a portion of the stacked stone wall to help camouflage the grade elevation. Mr. Rinaldi stated the ARB would like to see the stone wall addressed in a sensitive way, and retained as much as possible. He understands to make the plan work, at least a portion of the wall needs to be moved.

Ms. Stenberg indicated she would like to see the plan that describing the means and methods to repurpose the originals stones.

Mr. Rinaldi emphasized the applicant needs to more clearly distinguish the old from the new on 30 S. High. Mr. Alexander said the addition on the south building is fine and he likes the historic detail with the railing system distinguishing the new from the old.

Mr. Alexander expressed concerns with the raised dormer in the center of the north building. He said by trying to mimic the original, it appears suspect. He said it is an important artifact to the building and didn't agree with duplicating it. He suggested a design solution that is complementary but trying to be exactly like it in the dormer area. He said he would be more comfortable with a different approach. Mr. Rinaldi agreed.

Mr. Rinaldi said the side door works pretty well with the covered entrance provided.

Mr. Keeler said he would be very interested in preserving the exterior finishes. He indicated it is hard to tell from the drawings what is being proposed on the south wall of 32 S. High Street. Mr. Morgan said the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* are pretty specific on what the material needs to be. He said board and batten will be used on the south side of 32 S. High Street.

Mr. Keeler asked if the applicant will be reusing as much material as possible. Mr. Morgan answered affirmatively, if it is possible. He explained the board and batten extends to the bottom and six to eight inches of it is below grade where soil and mulch have been stacked up against causing it to splinter. He said they want to upgrade the skin to keep the weather and rodents out.

Mr. Rinaldi asked the members if they have an issue with the reduced parking as 22 spaces are required and the applicant is proposing 12 spaces. Ms. Husak said 12 spaces can fit in the parking lot and there are two available on-street parking spaces.

Mr. Alexander requested the potential occupancy number anticipated. Mr. Morgan answered they are at ±25 for the restaurant and they plan on eight people for the office building. He said he anticipates these to be success businesses but does not anticipate flocks of people. Mr. Alexander indicated this is the first retail tenant he can recall wanting less parking than is required. He said if the neighbors are supportive, he would not be oppose it. Mr. Leonhard said this is a walkable area and that is what people want. Mr. Morgan said this will be more of a neighborhood café for local residents and business people to walk to. Mr. Rinaldi said there will be a lot of parking coming online with the parking garages. Ms. Husak said parking is calculated in the Code based on more sit down/lingering type of use. Mr. Morgan said their parking was calculated based on gross area to which Ms. Husak affirmed. Mr. Leonhard asked about a parking Waiver and Ms. Husak said it would be the Board's prerogative to allow that Waiver when this comes back for a formal review. Mr. Rinaldi said he thought the applicant provided a sufficient number of parking spaces and he is comfortable with the proposal.

The Chair asked the Board if they had any further comments. Ms. Husak asked the applicant if he received all the feedback he needed. Mr. Morgan answered affirmatively.

Mr. Rinaldi said he was excited to see this project move forward and for the structures to be saved. Ms. Stenberg said it is a great project.

Ms. Husak requested a break in order to restart the equipment for the next presentation. The Chair agreed to the break for staff and asked that the Board elect the Chair and Vice Chair while they waited for the technical difficulties to be resolved. This is recorded at the beginning of the minutes.

Ms. Husak suggested she continue on with the Communications portion of the meeting while the equipment was still being dealt with. Those comments can be found at the end of these minutes.

**2. BSD HC – Office Building
17-110ARB-MPR**

**113 S. High Street
Minor Project Review**

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following proposal is a request for retention of an existing historic structure and construction of a new two-story, 3,300-square-foot office building and associated site improvements. He said the site is zoned Bridge Street District Historic South and is west of South High Street, approximately 100 feet south of the intersection with Pinneyhill Lane. He said this is a request for a review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.066 and 153.170, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Lori Burchett could not present anything on the screens as there were still technical difficulties that could not be resolved. Ms. Husak said the Planning Report contained the information Ms. Burchett would be

covering, and asked the Board to refer to that document. She said there were paper copies available if anyone from the public needed the information to review.

Ms. Burchett said the ARB had reviewed and approved the demolition of the existing detached building at the previous meeting with a condition that the project be approved before the removal of the accessory structure. She said this site contains a historic structure, which will be maintained and the proposed building located to the rear with a parking lot behind, which is accessed from Mill Lane. She added the applicant is requesting a Parking Plan to allow for 10 parking spaces where 11 are required, including three on-street parking spaces. She said the request is appropriate the low volume use proposed. She said should a new use replace this use in the future required parking would need to be met for that particular use.

Ms. Burchett reported the applicant has reduced the overall gross floor area from 4000 square feet to 3,300 square feet, while the footprint, itself, has increased approximately 100 square feet. She said the applicant has addressed the building mass by incorporating recesses and projections along multiple facades.

Ms. Burchett said the proposed open space would be required to be 85 square feet, however, after review with the applicants by the ART and Staff, it was recommended that the applicant pay a Fee-in-Lieu of the open space and maintain a landscaped area, which is more typical of the open spaces in between buildings. She added it would be appropriate to have the applicant pay that fee and it is an option within the Zoning Code given the relatively small amount that is required.

Ms. Burchett reported the applicant provided renderings that show the proposed building looking northeast and northwest. She described the architectural design as contemporary with a farmhouse cottage aesthetic. She said the character is most similar to simple, rectangular, commercial buildings as described in the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*. She added the building is proposed to be one and one-half stories with a gable roof line and dormers at the east and west elevations.

Ms. Burchett said the rhythm of the openings in the proposed building is consistent with that of nearby buildings and the cottage-commercial building.

Ms. Burchett continued with the proposed concepts. She said the materials include shiplap, cedar wood siding in dark gray and a split-faced concrete masonry base with horizontal wood accents. She noted that split-faced concrete masonry is not a permitted material; the ART recommends a condition that the applicant use an approved material. She said the applicant or their representative can describe how the materials are being utilized in this design in further detail. She concluded, in regards to scale and proportion, the building has a scale consistent with existing structures to the east and south, and the cross-gable design breaks the building into smaller masses with gable ends oriented in all four directions. She said the proposed building is a one and one-half story, cross-gable with the half story located within the roof structure. She added the existing historic building is 14 feet, 4 inches in height and the proposed building is 19 feet, 2 inches and is approximately 42 inches taller than the roof peak of the existing historic building. Hopefully, she said, this will give the Board a sense of the massing.

Ms. Burchett said the applicant is requesting four Waivers and they are as follows:

1. Roof Pitch - Required: >3:12; Requested: Pitch on the east building entry is 0.5:12.
2. Entrance and Pedestrianways - Required: principal entrances at pedestrian scale; Requested: northeast entrance and northwest entrance to not address South High Street and Mill Lane, respectively.

3. Articulation of Stories on Street Façades - Required: Façades shall be designed to follow the stories of the building with fenestration organized along and occupying each floor. Requested: To allow for gabled portion of the west elevation to feature a large window, which spans the first and second stories.
4. Street Façade Transparency - Required: 25%; Requested: to allow 10% on the west elevation.

Ms. Burchett reported the ART approved one Administrative Departure to allow for the non-street façade transparency to be 14 percent where 15 percent is required on the south elevation which faces Mill Lane.

Ms. Burchett stated the ART reviewed the Waivers against the applicable review criteria and found it to be consistent. She said Staff has reviewed the application against the Minor Project Review Criteria and found the applicable criteria has been met or met with a condition. She said Staff has reviewed this application against the Board Order Standards of Review and the applicable criteria had all been met as well as Alterations to Buildings, Structure, and Site and Additions to Existing Buildings, Structure, and Site.

Ms. Burchett said the ART is recommending approval of four Waivers and the Fee-In-Lieu of Open Space. She said the ART is also recommending approval of the Minor Project Review with a Parking Plan allowing for 10 parking spaces when 11 are required, along with the following four conditions:

- 1) That the applicant replaces the proposed split-face block on the lower portion of the proposed building with brick or stone;
- 2) That the applicant pay a Fee-in-Lieu of Open Space prior to the building permit approval;
- 3) That the applicant provides required bicycle parking on site; and
- 4) Should any archeological resources be identified during excavation, the applicant shall make a reasonable effort to record, protect, and preserve these resources.

Ms. Burchett pointed out there are three separate motions/votes as part of this review. She said the Waivers should be considered first, followed by the Fee-In-Lieu of Open Space, and then the Minor Project Review with the Parking Plan and four conditions.

Ms. Burchett reported during the ART, the applicant indicated bicycle parking is provided on site but they would continue to work with Staff to ensure it is in the best location, particularly with any removal of the Open Space.

Ms. Burchett said the applicant's representative is present to answer any questions. The Chair invited the applicant to add to the presentation.

Dan Morgan, Behal, Sampson, Dietz Architects, explained they have proposed two shed dormers at the height of 19.2 feet and at the main gable they are 16.10 feet. He reported they worked with the civil engineer to get it as low as possible.

David Rinaldi asked how this height compares to the outbuilding and the Gem Law building. Mr. Morgan said there is a substantial grade change. He said their building is higher and further back to the alley so these two buildings are not right next to each other.

Mr. Morgan noted, for the south perspective and the west perspective given that the building is right in the middle of their lot, they do not want the building to appear higher than it actually is.

Mr. Rinaldi asked about materials and confirmed that black stain was proposed.

Mr. Morgan indicated the goal was to mimic the texture and look of the existing barn structure located in the public park at the south end of High Street where there is. He said rather than letting the cedar siding fade naturally over time with streaks and striations, they thought it would be better to use this opaque stain to ensure the siding color met their goals.

Gary Alexander inquired about the glazing at the entry door. Mr. Morgan affirmed the door would have a frame. He added the larger panel to the left of the door will be glazed. Mr. Alexander said he really liked how the applicant took the window module and transitioned it. He said the façade will have nine feet of glass.

The Chair called for public comment.

Tom Holton, 5957 Roundstone Place, representing the Historical Society, commended the applicant as they have worked long and hard on this project to meet the requirements. He said they involved him many times for which they did not have to and he thanked them. He said he has never been real happy with that large glass window proposed on the west side because he did not think it looked right on a barn-style structure but he could not find a better solution per his limited ability. He reported the applicant also worked closely with the neighborhood association on Franklin Street. He said he was concerned about the reflection of the setting sun on the west side and wants to see the reflection minimized as much as possible because it could be a significant glare for the houses on Franklin Street. He suggested maybe adding a treatment on the glass and asked the Board to consider that.

The Chair called for the Board's discussion as the rest of the public had left. He applauded the applicant for listening to the Board, working so hard, and taking the extra effort to engage the community in these decisions.

Jeff Leonhard referred to the first condition - That the applicant replaces the proposed split-face block on the lower portion of the proposed building with brick or stone. Mr. Morgan said they are trying to push this building low into the grade and their finished floor is only about four inches above grade. He said they are considering a thin material so the minimum amount of foundation block material will be exposed above the planting beds. He said the chimney stone they are using, is a man-made product, and not meant to go to grade. He said they are considering ±eight inches of exposure to not bring too much attention to the foundation block, similar to other buildings built in the 50s and 60s. He added they will bring plantings up close to the building to help manage the moisture. Mr. Leonhard wanted to know if using brick or stone was feasible. Mr. Morgan said that would be an additional material to their palette.

Mr. Morgan said he wanted to speak to Mr. Holton's comment about the window on the west elevation because that was a large part of our conversations with our neighbors on Franklin Street. He indicated initially the window was much larger.

Mr. Rinaldi restated the building is recessed back from the building to the north and asked if he had any concerns about reflection or glare. Mr. Morgan answered he did not.

Mr. Rinaldi commented on the loss of the big tree. Mr. Morgan stated that tree has been maintained and there are signs that it is failing. He said there might be five years left or so. He said they are proposing to plant a fair amount of new trees and still working with staff to get that finalized.

The Chair called for a motion to approve the Waivers if the Board was supportive.

Mr. Morgan said he thought they put in their application that they wanted to put on a new roof on the existing building. Ms. Burchett said that would be considered a like-for-like substitution.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Alexander moved, Mr. Leonhard seconded, to approve the request for four Waivers:

1. §153.062(D)(2)(b)(4) Building Types – Pitch Measure Required: A pitch greater than 3:12 on roofs of dormers, porches, balconies, or other minor roofs; Requested: Pitch of 5:12 for the east building entry.
2. §153.062(F)(3)(a) Building Types – Entrances and Pedestrianways Required: All principal entrances are to be at a pedestrian scale, effectively address the street, and be given prominence on the façade through the use of architectural features; Requested: Northeast and northwest entrances do not address South High Street and Mill Lane, respectively.
3. §153.062(G) Building Types – Articulation of Stories on Street Façades Required: Façades shall be designed to follow the stories of the building with fenestration organized along and occupying each floor. Story heights are set to limit areas of the façade without fenestration; Requested: To allow for the gabled portion of the west elevation to feature a large window which spans the first and second stories.
4. §153.062(O)(9)(d)(1) Building Types – Street Façade Transparency Required: Minimum of 25% ground story, street facing transparency; Requested: 10% on the west elevation (Mill Lane).

The vote was as follows: Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Mr. Leonhard, yes; and Mr. Alexander, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Keeler moved, Ms. Stenberg seconded, to approve the request for a Fee-in-Lieu of Open Space. The vote was as follows: Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Leonhard, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; and Mr. Keeler, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Keeler moved, Mr. Leonhard seconded, to approve the request for a Parking Plan to allow 10 parking spaces where 11 would be required and the Minor Project Review with four conditions:

- 1) That the applicant replaces the proposed split-face block on the lower portion of the proposed building with brick or stone;
- 2) That the applicant pays a Fee-in-Lieu of Open Space, prior to building permit approval;
- 3) That the applicant provides required bicycle parking on site; and
- 4) That for any archeological resources identified during excavation, the applicant shall make a reasonable effort to record, protect, and preserve those resources.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Leonhard, yes; and Mr. Keeler, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

**3. BSD HC – Daso Custom Cabinetry – Signs
18-022ARB-MSP**

**13 S. High Street
Master Sign Plan**

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following proposal is a request for the installation of two, eight-square-foot wall signs and one, six-square-foot projecting sign for an existing tenant space zoned Bridge Street District Historic Core. He said the site is west of South High Street, approximately 125 feet southwest of

the intersection with Bridge Street. He said this is a request for a review and approval of a Master Sign Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.066 and 153.170 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Ms. Burchett explained the Master Sign Plan process, which is designed to give some flexibility to sign regulations based on cohesive sign design. She said they are first reviewed by the Administrative Review Team (ART) with final approval by the ARB, when located in the district. Upon approval from the ARB, she said applicants can file for building, site, and/or sign permits. She stated that building permits are required for construction to begin.

Ms. Burchett presented an aerial view of the site and noted the existing tenant space located west of S. High Street in the Town Center development, which was originally developed as a Planned District. She said the PUD provided for consistent signs across the development. She reported in 2012, the site was rezoned to BSD-Historic Core and tenants are permitted signs based on the BSD Code.

Ms. Burchett presented the existing tenant space that has a primary entrance on S. High Street with a secondary entrance on the south elevation providing access to a public parking lot. She stated the sign allowances:

- Number of signs permitted:
 - Two building mounted sign of different types
 - One additional building mounted sign for tenant spaces with access to a public parking lot
- Wall signs permitted: 8 square feet in area at a height within the first story
- Projecting signs permitted: 8 square feet in area at a height of less than 15 feet with an 8-foot-clear area below the sign to the grade.
 - Must be located within 6 feet of the entrance, whereas 10 feet is being proposed.

Ms. Burchett presented the proposed signs that include two wall-mounted signs and one projecting sign made of a 1.5-inch thick High Density Urethane (HDU). She said the letters will be V-carved into the sign and the signs will consist of three colors – black for the background, gold for the lettering, and yellow for the border on the edge of routed corners. She said the wall signs are proposed at eight square feet in area and the projecting sign at six square feet in size.

Ms. Burchett presented a graphic representing the sign locations. She pointed out the wall-mounted sign on the east elevation (front) will be installed with the top of the sign at 14 feet, 4 inches. The wall-mounted sign on the south elevation (side) will be installed with the top of the sign at 12 feet, 5 inches and both wall-mounted signs will be centered above the entrances. She said the projecting sign is proposed to be extend three feet from the face of the building with the bottom of the projecting sign to be 10 feet, 5 inches above the sidewalk. The projecting sign is proposed to be approximately 10 horizontal feet from the main entrance of the building, which does not meet Code, but it was the previously approved location, which appears to be appropriate and the applicant would like to use the existing bracket.

Ms. Burchett reported staff and the ART reviewed this proposal against the BSD Sign Design Guidelines and determined the application has met the intent for the BSD Sign Design Guidelines established by Council in 2015 for the BSD and Historic Dublin. She added the applicant has worked to blend the previously approved PUD with the intent of the BSD to allow for wayfinding for pedestrian and vehicular traffic alike.

Lastly, Ms. Burchett said the MSP is requested to permit the projecting sign located on the east elevation (S. High Street) to be located greater than six feet from the entrance.

Ms. Burchett said the proposal has been reviewed against the Architectural Review Board Standards and approval is recommended to the ARB for the Master Sign Plan with no conditions.

The Chair asked the applicant if they wanted to add anything to the presentation.

Joe Tanoury, 8000 Walton Parkway, New Albany, Ohio, said staff has been great helping them navigate through the nuances of the Bridge Street District but there was previous zoning, which made this challenging. He said he was available for questions.

The Chair asked if there was anyone from the public that wanted to speak in regards to this case. [Hearing none.]

Mr. Rinaldi asked if this proposal could have been presented as a sign application with a Waiver for the six feet requirement but ten feet requested for the distance to the entrance. Ms. Burchett said the MSP is the only mechanism to request a deviation to happen.

The Chair asked for any other questions or comments from the Board. [There were none.]

Motion and Vote

Ms. Stenberg moved, Mr. Leonhard seconded, to approve the request for a Master Sign Plan with no conditions. The vote was as follows: Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Mr. Leonhard, yes; and Ms. Stenberg, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

4. PUD, Coffman Homestead – Sign 18-024ARB-AFDP

6659 Coffman Road Amended Final Development Plan

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following proposal is a request for the installation of a new projecting sign for the existing Historic Coffman Homestead site, which is west of Emerald Parkway, approximately 400 feet north of the intersection of Post Road. He said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission of an Amended Final Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.150 and 153.172, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

JM Rayburn said the applicant is Matt Earman, Director of Parks and Recreation for the City of Dublin, who wants to install a new sign to replace the existing sign for the existing Historic Coffman Homestead Site. He presented an aerial view of the site. He reported that staff went back and forth as to how to best lay out the procedure for review as it is a tricky one because this property is one of the 12 properties listed on Appendix G, which are properties of historic significance outside of the Historic District as well as being listed on the Ohio Historical Inventory. Per the Code, this property falls within the jurisdiction of the ARB. He said concurrently, Code requires site modifications, including signs for sites zoned PUD to be approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC). He stated the Code also requires the ARB to provide a recommendation to the PZC.

Mr. Rayburn presented the existing sign and site plan and said the existing sign is located within the right-of-way, and this is an opportunity to move it out of the right-of-way with the replacement sign. He reported that when the text and Code were reviewed, they realized the regulations call for the sign to be moved within eight feet from the right-of-way, which would be 15 feet west of where the sign is located today. It was determined that to be in compliance with the Code, it would impede on wayfinding and would not be a good location to mark where the homestead was actually located. He said that even though the new sign would not be in compliance it would be most appropriate to have it located in the open lawn area of the Homestead, just west of where it is located today, which he pointed out on the screen for context.

Mr. Rayburn presented the proposed projecting sign and described it as a 7.5-square-foot sign as a carved, high density urethane (HDU) sign with two colors, which meets the material and color requirements in the Code. He said the background is a Sherwin Williams color of brown and the letters and border that will be recessed are a Sherwin Williams color of tan. The text was presented as "DUBLIN HISTORICAL SOCIETY" in small letters under the curved top portion of the sign with text "The Coffman Homestead" in large letters in the square center of the sign and the text "Est. 1867" will be placed in the bottom curve of the sign. He said the sign will be hung from a cedar post at eight feet in height, with the top of the sign approximately seven feet from grade. Additionally, he said, the Code requires the base of ground signs to be landscaped at least three feet beyond all faces of the sign or supporting structures so the applicant will be required to submit a landscape plan with the sign permit.

Mr. Rayburn said the proposal was reviewed against the Architectural Review Board Standards and was found to meet those criteria with condition as well as Alterations to Buildings, Structures, and Sites. Therefore, he said, approval is recommended to the Planning and Zoning Commission to allow the sign on the right-of-way line with the following condition:

- 1) That the applicant include a landscape plan for the sign as part of sign permitting.

Mr. Rayburn stated Mr. Earman, the applicant, was present to take any questions the Board may have.

The Chair asked the applicant if he had anything to add to the presentation and he responded he did not. The Chair then asked if there was anyone from the public that wanted to speak in regard to this application. [Hearing none.] He opened the discussion up to the Board but they had no concerns or questions.

David Rinaldi stated he thought this proposal was a good solution.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Alexander moved, Mr. Leonhard seconded, to recommend approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a requested Amended Final Development Plan to allow the sign on the right-of-way line with one condition:

- 1) That the applicant include a landscape plan for the sign as part of the sign permit.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Stenberg, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Leonhard, yes; and Mr. Alexander, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

Claudia Husak said this application will be forwarded to the Planning and Zoning Commission with the ARB's recommendation of approval for their meeting on May 17, 2018.

5. BSD HS – Midwest Gas - Sign 18-025ARB-MSP

58 S. High Street Master Sign Plan

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following proposal is a request for the installation of a three-square-foot sign for an existing tenant space zoned Bridge Street District Historic South. He said the site is east of South High Street, approximately 50 feet northeast of the intersection of Eberly Hill Lane. He said this is a request for a review and approval for a Master Sign Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.066 and 153.170, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Richard Hansen restated this is for a three-square-foot sign for an existing tenant space, located within a required setback zoned Bridge Street District Historic South.

Mr. Hansen stated the process for Master Sign Plans. He said a MSP allows for flexibility in sign regulations based on a cohesive overall sign design. He said these plans are reviewed by the Administrative Review Team (ART) who then gives the ARB a recommendation; the ARB reviews the plans for final approval. Upon approval, he said applicants can file for a permit, which is required to begin the construction process.

Mr. Hansen presented an aerial view of the site and photographs of the existing site conditions. He reported this sign was originally approved by the ARB in 1995 against staff suggestion. He pointed out that the sign is located in the right-of-way. He stated that after a review by the Law Director's Office when this application has come through again, it was determined that the existing sign is non-conforming and therefore, any modifications or expansions would need to meet the Code provisions we have in place at this time. He said staff has conditioned that the sign be moved to the east side of the sidewalk and out of the public right-of-way.

Mr. Hansen reported there is currently no set of requirements for MSPs so staff reviewed this proposal against the BSD Code for the Historic South District. He presented the BSD Historic South ground sign allowances as follows:

- Maximum size of 8 square feet;
- Maximum height of 6 feet; and
- Minimum setback of 8 feet from the street right-of-way or any property line

Mr. Hansen noted the size of the proposed sign meets Code but ART recommended a condition that the applicant confirm the height of the sign does not exceed six feet in height and that the sign be moved three feet from the edge of the public right-of-way. He reminded the Board the MSP is necessary to allow for the deviation in location in this instance.

Mr. Hansen presented the proposed sign. He pointed out the proposed sign is meant to match the existing sign in all elements of design and materials. He noted the photo of the sign has a blue tint to it but the existing sign is black and white, which are permitted colors. He said the proposed material for the sign is a Medium Density Overlay Plywood (MDO), which is not a permitted material. He said Staff has conditioned the applicant use a permitted wood material for the sign background and lettering, which are as follows: High Density Urethane (HDU), cedar, redwood, treated lumber, or equivalent material.

During the ART review, Mr. Hansen said the applicant stated the MDO material was of an equivalent standard to the recommended materials; would match the design of the existing panel; and would have less warping and maintenance over time. He had added that the existing sign consists of MDO and has lasted over 10 years. While the ART agreed it would be good to match the existing sign, he said they decided the final determination on materials should be made by the ARB.

Mr. Hansen reported the ART has determined the proposed sign has met the intent of the BSD Sign Design Guidelines as it enhances the pedestrian experience.

Mr. Hansen said in review of the intent of a MSP as defined in the Code, the applicant has requested a greater degree in flexibility and the ART was supportive and is recommending approval to the ARB.

Mr. Hansen said the application has been reviewed against the Architectural Review Board Standards and the Alterations to Buildings, Structure, and Site and found to have met the criteria or met the criteria with a condition. Therefore, he said the ART is recommending approval to the ARB with three conditions:

- 1) That the applicant relocate the sign to approximately three feet to the east side of the sidewalk to ensure the sign post, arm, and panels do not extend into the sidewalk;

- 2) That the applicant use a permitted wood material for the sign background and lettering (HDU, cedar, redwood, treated lumber, or equivalent material); and
- 3) That the applicant verify the height of the sign so it does not exceed the six-foot height requirement.

Mr. Hansen concluded his presentation and said the applicant's representative is present to answer any questions the Board may have.

The Chair invited the applicant to add to the presentation.

Steve Moore, Moore Signs, Westerville, Ohio, said he has been there for 18 years and in custom sign work for 28 years. He said he has been before the City representing several clients with signs and was before ARB for the existing sign for Tickets Galore, which he believed was in 2007. He indicated he understood signs are not permitted in the right-of-way, which seems to be the same all over the state of Ohio. He said they agreed with the sign relocation to the proposed location, but he would like to ask the ARB the same question he asked of the ART regarding the material. He said MDO is Medium Density Overlay, which is a treated plywood, and he asked what the aversion was to the use of MDO for a sign panel in the Historic District. He reported the ART had stated the material list in the Code was made several years ago and there is a possibility that the list may be reviewed shortly. He presented sample materials and asked the Board if they could distinguish between the HDU and plywood.

Mr. Moore said the issue with HDU in this panel situation is that it is susceptible to breaking with sway, warping when not supported by a post or a stringer behind it, which he believes is better than redwood or cedar. He said he believes HDU is unstable for this kind of application. He stated plywood is a more stable material at this thickness. He indicated he would not use redwood or cedar for any hanging projecting sign. He reported he has made a couple of sandblast signs in the Historic District over the years and the smaller size was stable but they still prefer to use plywood. He said that would match the existing sign, which is one of the issues that the owner of the building and the tenant Ticket Galore wants achieved for material, design, shape, and size. He said he will ensure the sign height does not exceed six feet when it is moved to the new location.

The Chair asked if there was anyone from the public that wanted to speak in regards to this case. [Hearing none.] He turned the discussion over to the Board.

Jeff Leonhard said the proposed sign should match the existing sign and using two different materials would not achieve that. He said it is unfortunate for the applicant that they cannot just hang another sign but now have to uproot that sign and move it across the sidewalk and possibly replace two signs if the Board does not approve that material.

Gary Alexander said, with respect to the applicant's experience, he has heard similar reservations to the use of plywood in applications like that as it can swell from moisture but will return to its shape. In terms of stability, he said, his experience is different with redwood signs because he is in a historic building and they have had a very elaborate, sandblasted redwood sign for 25 years and it has been fine. He said his experience is a different and would defer to the standards.

Mr. Leonhard said the existing sign is MDO and has not had any damage. He is supportive of the proposed material.

Mr. Moore said MDO plywood is a marine-grade plywood and it does not swell when it gets wet. He said it is true that it will delaminate over years of time if it is not taken care of and any material that is not taken care of will degrade. He suggested the Board's experience with plywood was probably not a MDO plywood. He said the sign is treated with a significantly higher grade of paint. He indicated the paint is

not available at Home Depot, Lowe's, or Sherwin Williams. He said the sign is pre-primed, primed again and the edges are sealed and painted twice. He said the sign that is there for the other tenant has been there since 2007 (10 years) and there are no issues. He said the MDO performance is proven. He said he agreed that redwood signs, if they are the right thickness, and treated correctly, then they stay in a stable condition.

Mr. Rinaldi asked if there were any cost implications between the two. Mr. Moore answered it is triple the cost for HDU and cedar and much more for redwood.

Mr. Keeler inquired about the life expectancy of the sign that is there now. Mr. Moore answered four or five more years. He said when that sign starts to look bad, he is sure the owner would recognize that and have it redone. He said he has looked at it and it is weatherworn after 10 years but still in pretty good shape.

With the MSP, Ms. Stenberg asked if the Board allows the MDO product in this instance, when/if the applicant comes back to replace the existing sign, will that need to go through the same process. Ms. Husak said if the applicant changes the material and they wanted to change the Tickets Galore sign, they would have to return to the ARB because it is not a permitted material.

Mr. Rinaldi said he is hearing only the sign material is the issue. Ms. Stenberg affirmed she is fine with conditions 1 and 3 but for 2, she would like to keep with the permitted materials that are currently listed in the Code.

Mr. Leonhard clarified the applicant would then have to replace the Tickets Galore sign to which Mr. Rinaldi answered affirmatively.

Mr. Rinaldi restated he would defer to what materials are already in the Code, as he is not a sign expert.

Mr. Leonhard noted that in Condition 2, it states "treated lumber" and asked why the MDO would not be considered treated lumber. Ms. Burchett answered treated lumber is a solid wood product and this is a pressed material.

Mr. Leonhard asked how often the Code gets updated. He indicated quality plywood is used elsewhere and it is silly to spend time debating an additional sign with the same sign and different letters on the front. He said if they look different after the applicant creates this new sign using HDU, it would be unfortunate if there were two signs that were different that were supposed to look the same. Mr. Rinaldi responded the applicant made the case they do look the same with the sample materials he brought in.

Mr. Moore said he cannot make that sign out of HDU and hang it under the other one without making them look different. Mr. Alexander asked what the difference in width would be. Mr. Moore answered it would have to be 1.5 inches thick or it will come apart with the swinging action.

Mr. Leonhard asked for confirmation that the HDU was much lighter than the MDO. Mr. Moore emphasized it is lighter but the action is going to snap it apart at that thickness. Mr. Alexander asked for the thickness of the current sign. Mr. Moore answered 3/4-inch thick. Mr. Alexander said he is sensitive to the thickness issue because it will be noticeable when one passes by.

Mr. Moore indicated another issue is the fasteners and the hardware that goes between the two signs when trying to transition from one thickness to another. He said he does not even know how he would accomplish that without making some kind of custom hardware.

Mr. Rinaldi said he would consider eliminating Condition 2 and accepting the MDO material. Mr. Alexander said he could support that as long as the Board is not giving carte blanche for other signs. Ms. Stenberg

added if that is the only way to keep it exactly the same thickness and exactly the same look, she would support it.

Ms. Husak suggested eliminating this condition with the motion.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Leonhard moved, Mr. Rinaldi seconded, to approve the request for a Master Sign Plan with the following amended two conditions:

- 1) That the applicant relocate the sign to approximately three feet to the east side of the sidewalk to ensure the sign post, arm and panels do not extend into the sidewalk; and
- 2) That the applicant verify the height of the sign does not exceed six feet.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Stenberg, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Mr. Leonhard, yes; and Mr. Rinaldi, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

Communications

Claudia Husak indicated staff is looking for a date for a Joint Work Session with the PZC to review the Bridge Street Code process changes will be considered. She asked if May 9 or May 22 would be a possibility for this Board. The Board agreed May 9 was their preference.

Ms. Husak said Communications team has requested a photograph of the full Board and newly elected officers to update the website and she asked them to stay for a picture at the end of the meeting.

Ms. Husak said Planning and IT have been working together on ensuring the iPads are all up-to-date. She said the older ones will be collected and replaced with newer technology in the next month or so. She said the City will push all the applications to the devices that the Board will need and no additional iTunes accounts will be needed. She said the hope is this be more manageable.

Ms. Husak said she inadvertently forgot to mention Sierra Saumenig, Planning's graduate student serving as a Planning Assistant. She said she is graduating this month with her graduate's degree and we are all proud and happy for her. She reported she has been with Planning for a year and has completed a tremendous amount of work and a lot of what funneled through the ARB were brought in part by her.

With no further communications to share, the Chair adjourned the meeting at 8:57 pm.

As approved by the Architectural Review Board on June 27, 2017.