



MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, May 23, 2018

AGENDA

- 1. BSD HTN – Condado Patio
18-032ARB/MPR** **104 N. High Street
Minor Project Review (Approved 5 - 0)**
- 2. BSD HC – Tackett Bakery & Office Addition
18-027INF** **30 – 32 S. High Street
Site Visit - Discussion Only**
- 3. Historic District Tour** **Discussion Only**

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: Jennifer Rauch, Lori Burchett, Sierra Saumenig, and Richard Hansen.

Administrative Business

Motion and Vote

Ms. Stenberg moved, Mr. Alexander 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)

The Chair 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 HTN – Condado Patio
18-032ARB/MPR** **104 N. High Street
Minor Project Review**

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following proposal is a request for a 525-square-foot patio and associated site improvements for a new tenant space in Bridge Park West zoned Bridge Street District Historic Transition Neighborhood. He said the site is on the east side of North High Street, approximately 600 feet north of North Street. 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*."

Jennifer Rauch stated the application is for a Minor Project Review for a tenant space located in the center of the building within the Bridge Park West development, which was approved in 2015 for the buildings and site improvements. Ms. Rauch presented a rendering showing the tenant space location within the existing building and the existing columns and fenced area along the building frontage where



the patio was proposed. She explained the layout of the proposed patio in relation to the existing right-of-way and the Required Build Zone (RBZ). She stated the RBZ for the building is 0-20 and a patio within this area is permitted per Code.

Ms. Rauch explained the grade change across the site and the proximity of the patio to the public garage entrance. She noted the area at the northern end of the tenant space is at-grade and provides an accessible route to the main entrance, but as the site goes south, the grade changes requiring steps for access. She stated the patio is proposed in front of the middle portion of the building extending to the northern end of the building. She said the existing fence and columns would be retained and new fencing and gates would be added at the existing openings to fully enclose the patio. She presented a detailed patio layout showing the seating locations and highlighted the northern seating area, which the ART had recommended to be removed to eliminate any potential conflicts and accessibility with seating, the main entrance of the tenant space, and the parking garage.

Jeff Leonhard asked if a gate was proposed at the northern end of the patio, adjacent to the garage entrance. Tom Linzell, M+A Architects, representing the applicant, answered originally the northern area was entirely enclosed but that had been revised because it was too crowded.

Ms. Rauch reviewed the additional details of the proposed patio that included catenary lights hanging above; patio furniture that included wood tables and wood and metal stools; and the replacement of the storefront windows with garage doors. She stated the original proposal included a model of a garage door with thicker mullions and the ART recommended the applicant use a different model with thinner mullions to more closely match the approved storefront window design. She stated the ART also recommended the mullions be painted dark bronze instead of the lighter window trim color. She said the ART also recommended a condition to ensure the reflectivity of the glass would match the approved storefront glass.

Ms. Rauch said approval is recommended for the Minor Project Review with three conditions:

- 1) That the applicant use Overhead Door 521 in a dark finish, subject to Planning's approval prior to building permitting;
- 2) That the applicant eliminate the patio seating north of the northern entrance to the tenant space; and
- 3) That the glass in the garage doors match the reflectiveness of the existing windows.

Mr. Leonhard asked if the original proposal for the garage doors was to be painted to match the trim. Mr. Linzell affirmed that was the original intent but stated the ART recommended the dark bronze and the tenant felt that color would still fit with their brand.

Gary Alexander asked for the color of the door and the window trim. Mr. Linzell stated it is the same beige color as shown in the photographs.

Mr. Alexander stated the garage mullions should match the window trim and entrance door color to be consistent. He asked why the dark bronze was recommended. Ms. Rauch stated the ART recommended the use of the darker color due to the change in the mullion pattern from the approved storefront windows.

Mr. Alexander indicated it appears the intent was to have a center division with the storefront windows. Mr. Linzell agreed. Mr. Alexander confirmed the center division would be retained with the proposed garage doors to which Mr. Linzell also agreed.

The Chair asked if the applicant had any additions to the presentation.

Mr. Linzell said the signs will be completed at a later date. Mr. Alexander asked if awnings would be incorporated. Mr. Linzell stated there were no awnings, only building signs. Mr. Rinaldi confirmed the signs would be handled as part of the approved Master Sign Plan. Ms. Rauch agreed.

Mr. Leonhard and Andrew Keeler asked if the applicant agreed with the recommendation to use a garage door with the thinner mullions. Mr. Linzell answered he agreed and the thinner mullions were now preferred.

Shannon Stenberg asked the applicant if he was agreeable to the reduced seating. Mr. Linzell stated the tenant wanted as many seats as possible. Mr. Leonhard expressed concerns about that northern area appearing empty with the elimination of the seating. Mr. Alexander stated he agreed with the ART's recommendation based on the limited space inside the building. He said he agreed with the concerns about congestion in the area, if those seats were to remain.

Mr. Leonhard confirmed the northern end was the accessible area. He suggested incorporating benches within the northern area so the space was not left open. Mr. Linzell stated benches would work in this area.

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

Mr. Alexander stated the ARB disapproved site lighting for a different tenant based on staff concerns. Ms. Rauch said the concerns were based on the proximity to the West Plaza landing and the intensity of those lights. She said staff does not have the same concerns for this proposal, because the proposed lighting is minimal in comparison.

Mr. Rinaldi asked for the Board's thoughts on the proposed garage doors. He stated he was supportive of the thinner mullions and the glazing recommendations, but thought the mullions should match the color of the trim and doors. Mr. Alexander and Mr. Keeler agreed the color should match. Mr. Rinaldi asked for condition one to be modified to reflect the Board's discussion.

The Chair confirmed there were no concerns regarding the proposed lighting. [There were none.]

Mr. Rinaldi asked for comments from the Board regarding the proposed patio seating. Mr. Leonhard said his concern was eliminating the seating at the northern end and making it feel too open.

Mr. Keeler asked if there were any concerns from a Fire or Building Code perspective regarding the northern seating area. Ms. Rauch said representatives from Building Standards and the Washington Township Fire, who are part of the ART, had no specific Code concerns and the recommendation was based on the practical maneuverability within that area.

Mr. Rinaldi indicated he understood the northern tables would be served through the front door and he had concerns about the congestion in that area. Mr. Alexander expressed concerns about the crowdedness of the area and how accessibility would work in a practical sense. Therefore, he stated he agreed with the ART's recommendation.

Ms. Stenberg said she was supportive of putting benches along the fence instead of formal seating. Mr. Alexander agreed that was a good use of the space as it also allows for a waiting area.

Mr. Rinaldi asked if there were comments about the proposed furniture. Ms. Stenberg said she was supportive of what was proposed.

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

Mr. Leonhard asked for condition two to be modified to reflect the Board's discussion and allow the applicant some flexible seating. Ms. Rauch reviewed all the changes to the proposed conditions.

Mr. Linzell agreed to the amended conditions.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Alexander moved, Mr. Leonhard seconded, to approve the Minor Project Review with three conditions:

- 1) That the applicant use Overhead Door 521 painted to match the existing window trim, subject to Planning's approval prior to building permitting;
- 2) That the applicant eliminate the patio seating north of the northern entrance to the tenant space, but would allow soft seating or benches along the fence as a waiting area, subject to staff approval; and
- 3) That the glass in the garage doors match the reflectiveness of the existing windows.

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

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

**30 – 32 S. High Street
Site Visit**

The Board Members and several members of the public conducted a site visit to 30-32 S. High Street where they walked through the two existing buildings and the site to better understand the proposed projects. No determination was made during this visit.

3. Historic District Tour

Staff led the Board Members on a tour through the Historic District that highlighted existing and new developments.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:40 pm.

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