



## MEETING MINUTES

### Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, December 14, 2022

#### CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Alexander, Chair, called the December 14, 2022, meeting of the City of Dublin Architectural Review Board (ARB) to order at 6:31 p.m.

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Chair led the Pledge of Allegiance.

#### ROLL CALL

Board Members present: Mr. Alexander, Mr. Cotter, Mr. Jewell, Ms. Cooper, and Ms. Damaser  
Staff present: Ms. Holt and Ms. Mullinax

#### ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Jewell moved, Ms. Damaser seconded, to accept the documents into the record and to approve the minutes from November 16, 2022.

Vote: Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Ms. Damaser, yes; and Mr. Jewell, yes.  
[Motion Carried 5 - 0]

#### CASE PROCEDURES

The Chair stated the Architectural Review Board is responsible for the review of construction, modifications or alterations to any site in the area subject to the Architectural Board Review (ARB) under the provision of Zoning Code §153.170. This Board has the final decision-making responsibility on cases under their purview. Anyone who intends to address the Board on any of the cases this evening will be sworn in. There were no cases eligible for the Consent Agenda. The agenda order is typically determined at the beginning of the meeting by the Chair, but the cases in the minutes will still follow the order of the published agenda. The procedures of the meeting were stated and included that anyone who addresses the Board will need to provide their full name and address for the record.

The Chair swore in anyone planning to address the Board on any of the cases to be reviewed.

#### NEW CASES

##### 1. Development at 36 - 38 N. High Street, 22-132FDP, Final Development Plan

The Chair stated this application was a request for the construction of a two-story, mixed-use building and a two-story, residential building on a 0.25-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic Core. The site is located northeast of the intersection of N. High Street with Wing Hill Lane.

Architectural Review Board  
Meeting Minutes of December 14, 2022  
Page 2 of 11

### **Staff Presentation**

Ms. Holt stated the applicant has requested a Waiver and a Final Development Plan with architectural changes for approval this evening. She presented an aerial view of the site and the buildings that were previously approved for demolition were identified as well as the location of the historic wall and privy (separate application). This development was informally reviewed October 2021; in March 2022, a Concept Plan and Demolition Request were reviewed; in July 2022, a Preliminary Development Plan was approved with conditions, Waivers for a Juliet balcony and foundation plantings on Wing Hill Lane were approved, and a Parking Plan was tabled for consideration after a revision could be proposed. In November 2022, the Final Development Plan was reviewed again for the architectural changes, which was once again tabled, but the Parking Plan and a Waiver were approved.

Existing conditions at both the front and back of buildings were presented, which included a view of the historic wall, steps, and privy. More photographic context along N. High Street and Wing Hill Lane were shown.

The proposed site plan was shown and highlighted the updates to the projects since the Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) as follows:

- 85% lot coverage
- 4 on-site spaces for mixed-use
- 4 tuck-under spaces for residential
- Public ADA space on N. High Street
- Bike parking was moved to the central parking court
- Trash for the mixed-use building is now attached to the building

The proposed characteristics and the details of the mixed-use building have changed since the PDP as follows:

- Traditional, double-hung windows
- Sills and lintels added
- Stepped water table was straightened and a limestone cap was added
- Gable vent detail on the north building
- Horizontal siding on the north portion
- Traditional wood window and door trim
- New circular gable vent (on both gable ends)
- Azek skirt board (subject of Waiver)
- Gabled building has awnings on the first floor
- Traditional window and door trim on south portion
- Limestone details: sills project and lintels are flush
- Thin brick was replaced with full-depth brick
- The doors at the Juliet balcony are now double doors and open inward
- Integration of existing historic stone wall system and foundation
- Brick and horizontal siding on different sections
- Rear access door with transom (changed from the awning feature)
- Northwest window changed to sit atop skirt board
- Rear deck access
- Trash enclosure is attached to the building on one side, has stone on two sides, and painted cedar doors on the fourth side

Architectural Review Board  
Meeting Minutes of December 14, 2022  
Page 3 of 11

Materials for the mixed-use building are similar as reviewed at the PDP:

- Rusticated limestone veneer for water tables with an 8-inch limestone cap
- Full-depth brick in Belden Yukon Blend for south portion of the building
- Smooth limestone sills and lintels
- "Bunglehouse Blue" horizontal wood siding
- "Urbane Bronze" wood trim
- "Alloy Steel" Sunbrella fabric for the north portion awning
- "Bronze" aluminium-clad, Marvin Signature Ultimate windows and commercial doors
- "Gunsmith Grey" standing-seam, metal roof
- Full cut-off Progress up/down cylinder lights in a black, powder-coated finish

The characteristics and details of the residential building have not changed since the approval of the PDP:

- Horizontal siding
- Balconies
- Recessed entries
- Stepped limestone water table on the sides but level on the front and back elevations
- Vertical wood details for organized window groupings

Materials for the residential building are similar as reviewed at the PDP:

- The limestone water table, standing seam metal roof, and aluminum-clad, double-hung and sliding-configured windows from Marvin Signature are the same as the mixed-use building but with an "Ebony" finish
- Horizontal siding
- "Roycroft Adobe" Trustile residential front doors with sidelights
- Tuck-under garages now have single C.H.I. overhead, steel-overlay, carriage doors with a custom paint finish in "Pavestone" on the north side and "Grapy" on the south side to aid maneuverability
- "Iron Ore" vertical siding pieces for organized window groupings
- "Bronze" Madrax Opal bike racks
- Full cut-off Progress up/down cylinder lights in a black, powder-coated finish
- Full cut-off NLS Lighting angled wall sconces in a black, powder-coated finish for the garages.

Staff recommended approval of a Waiver for the Azek Material to be used on the skirt board portion of the mixed-use building. It is a synthetic material that looks like wood, but resistant to rot and insects. Exterior Building Material Standards, 153.174(J)(1)(a & b)

The Final Development Plan was reviewed against the applicable criteria. Staff recommended approval with four (4) conditions:

- 1) Prior to obtaining a demolition permit for the existing buildings, the applicant shall obtain approval from the Architectural Review Board for the reconstruction of the shared wall at 40 N. High Street.
- 2) The applicant shall continue to work with staff to lessen parking lot grades.
- 3) A revised photometric plan shall be provided to staff for approval prior to building permit: 1) plan shall confirm that light trespass is no greater than 1 footcandle 10 feet outside each property line; 2) ensure that the northwest and northeast corners of the site do not have hot spots; 3) consider

Architectural Review Board  
Meeting Minutes of December 14, 2022  
Page 4 of 11

removal of one light from the north corner of the mixed-use building; and 4) ensure all lit areas have corresponding footcandle measurements.

- 4) The Wing Hill Lane landscape installation shall ensure that the proposed sandstone blocks are no taller than six inches from grade.

### **Questions for Staff**

Mr. Cotter – He inquired about the slope of the parking and if there would be a discussion on how to soften the grade or if there was a recommendation being made.

Ms. Holt – The recommendation was addressed in the second condition of approval. Staff does not govern private parking lot grades, but some of the grades currently shown are a little steeper than Staff is comfortable with.

Ms. Cooper – She asked how it would affect surface water drainage; a steeper grade prevents ponding.

Ms. Holt – A 2% grade is adequate to prevent ponding, and the grade currently shown is up to 13%.

Mr. Alexander – There is a French drain at the parking lot low point, where the water would collect.

### **Applicant Presentation**

John Flemming, Lai Architects, 401 W. Town Street, Columbus, OH, stated they reacted to the feedback received from the Board the last time and hoped that the proposal this evening was amenable. They accept all the conditions of approval and are confident in making it all work. They can massage grading for the best maneuverability and drainage. The proposed Azek material will appear just like wood.

### **Public Comment**

No public comment has been received.

### **Board Discussion**

The Chair asked the members for their feedback on the latest proposal.

Mr. Cotter – He was fine with the Waiver for the new material. The applicant has taken into consideration the changes to the Final Development Plan the Board discussed at the last meeting.

Ms. Damaser – She agreed with Mr. Cotter and found the applicant to be very responsive to the Board's comments from last week.

Mr. Alexander agreed.

Ms. Cooper and Mr. Jewell also agreed.

Mr. Jewell moved and Ms. Cooper seconded, to approve the following Waiver:

1. §153.174(J)(1)(a & b) Exterior Building Material Standards Required: Stone, manufactured stone, full depth brick, brick veneer, wood siding, glass, and fiber cement siding  
Requested: Azek Material for skirt board, north side of mixed-use building

Vote: Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Ms. Damaser, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; and Mr. Jewell, yes.  
[Motion Carried 5 - 0]

Architectural Review Board  
Meeting Minutes of December 14, 2022  
Page 5 of 11

Ms. Damaser moved and Ms. Cooper seconded, to approve the Final Development Plan with four (4) conditions:

- 1) Prior to obtaining a demolition permit for the existing buildings, the applicant shall obtain approval from the Architectural Review Board for the reconstruction of the shared wall at 40 N. High Street.
- 2) The applicant shall continue to work with staff to lessen parking lot grades.
- 3) A revised photometric plan shall be provided to staff for approval prior to building permit: 1) plan shall confirm that light trespass is no greater than 1 footcandle 10 feet outside each property line; 2) ensure that the northwest and northeast corners of the site do not have hot spots; 3) consider removal of one light from the north corner of the mixed-use building; and 4) ensure all lit areas have corresponding footcandle measurements.
- 4) The Wing Hill Lane landscape installation shall ensure that the proposed sandstone blocks are no taller than six inches from grade.

Vote: Mr. Jewell, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; and Ms. Damaser, yes.  
[Motion Carried 5 - 0]

## **2. Tucci's at 35 N. High Street, 22-155FDP, Final Development Plan**

The Chair stated this application was a request for the construction of three building additions at an existing restaurant on a 0.23-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic Core. The site is south of the library off of N. High Street, Wing Hill Lane, and Darby Street, all sharing the same zoning.

### **Staff Presentation**

Ms. Holt stated the requests this evening were for a Waiver for the increase of the establishment size and Waivers for roof pitches for the wine room and kitchen/mechanical expansion along with the Final Development Plan (FDP) with four options for consideration:

1. Option B-Base\_ a patio enclosure on the east side, wine room on the north, & a dumpster enclosure on the southwest corner.
2. Option C-1\_ adds an outdoor dining patio on the east side.
3. Option C-2\_ adds kitchen/mechanical room and dumpster enclosure on the southwest corner in lieu of the previously proposed dumpster enclosure.
4. Option C-3\_ all options together.

At the Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) in July 2022, a Parking Plan, a Waiver for the use of a Hardie Plank material, and a Waiver for the roof pitch of the patio enclosure were all approved. The applicant was asked to bring forward options to the FDP.

The site zoning history was restated for importance:

In 2012, the Bridge Street District zoning was adopted, which encompassed this use/site and allowed existing, non-conforming buildings to remain as fully legal. In 2021, Historic District – Historic Core had own zoning approved, and the same provisions carried over.

Architectural Review Board  
Meeting Minutes of December 14, 2022  
Page 6 of 11

Now, the formal opinion from the Law Office is that further expansion beyond existing size of this eating/drinking establishment requires a Waiver.

The gross square footage for the project has been established at 7,861.35 square feet, based on accurate measurements and agreement of Staff, including the previously-approved, but not constructed, square footage for a wine room and all of the existing patio. Existing conditions of the site from each street and public walkway [7 photographs] were shown as well as [2 renderings] for context.

The [8 exhibits] for all the options were shown and explained. Six additional slides were shown to provide the elevations with colors, alternatives, common materials and alternatives, color swatches, lighting, and additional project details.

The request for the Establishment Size Waiver Use Specific Standards, 153.172(C)(3)(d)(1) was examined. The base square footage is just under 7,900 square feet. To select Option C-1 there would be an increase of 3.6%, Option C-2 increases size by 3.4%, and Option C-3 would increase the base square footage by 8%, bringing the gross square footage to 8,496. This is an increase of 635 square feet.

As a result of Staff's analysis, critical criteria have not been met and recommended disapproval of the Established Size Waiver.

Staff recommended approval of the Roof Pitch Waiver Design Standards 153.174(B)(4)(c)(1) for the Wine Room.

Staff recommended disapproval of the Roof Pitch Waiver for the Kitchen/Mechanical Room, which is moot without approval of the Established Size Waiver.

The application was reviewed against the Final Development Review Criteria. Staff recommended approval of the Final Development Plan – Exhibit B with eight (8) conditions:

- 1) The applicant shall execute a right-of-way encroachment agreement with the City of Dublin for the existing encroachment and required foundation plantings into the Wing Hill Lane right-of-way prior to a certificate of occupancy, or by June 1, 2023, whichever is earlier, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.
- 2) The applicant shall remove all easement references, adjacent to the encroachment on the south property line, on all applicable plan sheets, prior to building permit application.
- 3) The applicant shall work with Building Standards to ensure that the fire separation distances are appropriately maintained with consideration of fire-resistance ratings and opening limitations for the exterior walls as applicable, particularly on the north and south elevations, prior to building permit issuance. Any significant change of architectural design shall be required to return to Architectural Review Board for approval.
- 4) The applicant shall continue to work with City of Dublin and City of Columbus regarding city water service work, to the satisfaction of the Dublin City Engineer and City of Columbus designee.
- 5) The applicant shall update the elevations to show all Hardie Plank siding in a smooth finish at building permit application.

Architectural Review Board  
Meeting Minutes of December 14, 2022  
Page 7 of 11

- 6) The lighting plan shall show a Wdige fixture at the staff entrance behind the trash enclosure to enhance safety, and the photometric plan shall be updated to reflect the Base exhibit and new fixture at building permit application.
- 7) The applicant obtain approval for all enclosed patio furnishings prior to any Certificate of Occupancy.
- 8) The applicant shall obtain approval for a Master Sign Plan prior to installation of any signs or signature features.

### Questions for Staff

Mr. Alexander – If this eating establishment proposal was brand new for a vacant site, the maximum square footage would be 3,500 square feet with lot coverage of 85%.

Ms. Damaser – 7,900 square feet is the current size that includes the unenclosed patio.

Ms. Cooper – She asked if 7,900 includes the square footage from the right-of-way easement area.

Ms. Holt – She thought the easement was included since it was part of the establishment but deferred to the applicant to confirm.

Mr. Alexander – A Variance was granted for pavement and the building, which brought the total lot coverage to 90%.

Mr. Cotter – He requested clarification about the City-owned easement that the building is allowed to currently encroach and the situation, which could stay the same forever.

Ms. Holt – The encroachment easement needs to be approved by City Council.

Mr. Cotter – He asked if the City could sell this area to the landowner.

Mr. Boggs – His recollection of earlier discussions that the transfer of right-of-way had been discussed and evaluated by Engineering and potentially the applicant but through Engineering's evaluation, they determined the City should retain ownership of that easement while allowing this encroachment. Part of the encroachment agreement includes the understanding the City has ownership so if that area is needed for right-of-way purposes, the City can recover it.

Mr. Cotter – The risk then is on the owner.

### Applicant Presentation

Craig Barnum, CLB Restaurants, 35 N. High Street, stated this process has taken a year and they have made a number of changes to the original proposal. Skylights were discussed in the last meeting, which the Board was not supportive. The design group he has hired, Design Collective, thought it would be important to have natural light for the patio space to provide more of an outdoor feel. The height of skylights off the roof possibly being visible from down the street was a concern for the Board. The height has been reduced to six inches. He did not have to have the outdoor patio space. When weather is favorable, and all the sides and windows are open, to have diners on the outside of the structure would provide tremendous energy to the streetscape. There would be just seven, two-top tables but that would not make or break the project, if the Board was not supportive. The addition to the back is not something he has to have but it is on his wish list. The existing kitchen was relatively small when they utilized the tent from Germany. There is a lack of storage and food preparation space. Additional kitchen space would be important to the operation but does not create a make or break situation. The proposed renderings reflect a world-class structure and would be unique to the district. Since June 6, when the tent was disassembled and moved out, residents inquired nightly about the absence of the structure. As exciting as the tent was, the windows could not be opened and it had a vinyl roof, which made it a 6 out of 10 and this new proposal will be a 10 out of 10 that the district will enjoy. There will be a significant amount of landscaping inside of

Architectural Review Board  
Meeting Minutes of December 14, 2022  
Page 8 of 11

the structure that will include: live trees, plants, and flowers to provide the feel of an atrium. Landscaping that might be lacking on the outside of the building will be made up on the inside.

Michael Lusk, Lusk Architecture, 6570 Riverside Drive, appreciated the combined efforts of working with Staff that have made this a much better project from where they started.

### **Questions for the Applicant**

Mr. Jewell – He asked if the current kitchen space would be remodelled.

Mr. Barnum – The current kitchen would expand to the east to allow for food preparation while not adding a lot more equipment, as they also need more storage room. They cater larger parties and it is a challenge to execute for parties of 20 and 30 guests from the line on a busy night. The restaurant opened in December 1998; it is an old home falling apart. The electric and plumbing have been updated and there are still issues they face. This is a major expansion. The applicant would like to clean everything up because they are probably going to have to close for a period since the whole face of the building needs to be removed, leaving the restaurant un-operational. Fine dining establishments display kitchens as part of the energy, but the current kitchen was not built as a display kitchen, so they are dealing with the hand they were dealt.

Mr. Lusk – Fire suppression is also being added to the building, which will take space from part of this kitchen. With non-compliant dumpsters, they are now required to provide a dumpster enclosure, which will face west, leaving an indent from the existing building out to the dumpster. By adding on to the kitchen, there would be a wall across there. Currently, there are two, ugly garage doors back there. and the kitchen addition would go a long way towards improvement. Hedges and other plantings have been added to the base building proposal to hide that area, which to him is a security issue, hence the added lighting but would not be as aesthetically pleasing without the kitchen addition. The gray area highlighted in the plan just becomes an open area. The clarity was stated to ensure each scenario was understood.

Mr. Alexander – He asked if the entire building was being sprinkled.

Mr. Lusk – Yes, over 5,000 square feet and? 100 occupants is the fire suppression requirement. He addressed the 10-foot fire separations of this type of building so there are no fire requirements for the exterior walls. The structure is more than 20 feet from other buildings.

### **Public Comment**

There were no public comments received.

### **Board Discussion**

The Chair – He asked the members if there were any issues with the proposed skylights and there were none.

Mr. Cotter – The proposed building would be much larger than every other building that is an eating and drinking establishment, and he would be against adding more square footage than what the previously approved and permitted by Variance. Additional square footage could be found in other ways.

Ms. Cooper – She agreed with Mr. Cotter's statement. She was reluctant to grant the Waiver needed to exceed the square footage.

Mr. Jewell – The amount of square footage already granted was generous. There is still 82 square feet to work with.

Ms. Damaser – She agreed with nothing further to add.



Architectural Review Board  
Meeting Minutes of December 14, 2022  
Page 9 of 11

Mr. Alexander – He was not supportive of the additional square footage requested as it is significantly larger than what the Code permits. The applicant has the option to reduce the dining room to fill in the gray area Mr. Lusk spoke about earlier, as it appeared like a missing tooth. There is more flexibility than presented; some of the pieces could be moved around to address some of the applicant's needs.

Ms. Damaser – She suggested moving around the interior, also.

Mr. Lusk – The applicant agreed to leave the interior the way it is.

The Chair – The Board Members agree on Option B-base, Exhibit B.

Mr. Cotter – He was concerned about the encroachment/easement issue that hangs out there.

Mr. Lusk – The applicant is open to anything the City decides. The direction regarding the encroachment came from Engineering. The applicant has completed the survey work requested and are in coordination with Engineering.

Ms. Cooper – The City chose to retain ownership and to continue to allow the encroachment.

Mr. Boggs – That was his understanding. An Encroachment Agreement will be signed before occupancy.

The Chair – The burden has been placed on the applicant to get that resolved, not this Board.

Ms. Cooper – Currently, there is an encroachment without an agreement.

Mr. Boggs – The perception was to have this clearly documented for the future.

Ms. Cooper – She asked if the final, newly-adjusted, agreed upon number for the current structure included the encroachment into the City's property that was considered part of the current structure.

Mr. Lusk – The structure was included as the base today and included as the future, netting out at zero.

Ms. Cooper – She clarified that factor was already included in the calculations. There will be no construction in that area. The encroachment agreement is just to document that encroachment is permitted.

Mr. Barnum – That has been the case for 25 years. It is a walkway the servers use to access food or get to the patio.

Ms. Cooper – She asked if some plantings are needed on that side.

Ms. Holt – Yes, there are. That is being taken into account with the proposed encroachment area.

The Chair – The reason Staff wrote this for the building permit was because this was brought up in 2005 to be resolved.

Mr. Jewell – Once resolved, this will never be an issue for any new property owner.

Ms. Cooper moved and Mr. Jewell seconded, to approve the Roof Pitch Waiver for the Wine Room:

153.174(B)(4)(c)(1) Required: Minimum of 6:12 roof pitch to maximum of 12:12 pitch.

Requested: ¼: 12 in selected at the wine room

Vote: Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Damaser, yes; Mr. Jewell, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; and Mr. Cotter, yes.  
[Motion Carried 5 - 0]

The Chair – He asked what motion should be next and a brief discussion ensued.

Ms. Holt – The Board had a discussion about the Establishment Size Waiver but not a vote.

The Chair – He determined the members should vote on the size increase motion next and Ms. Holt agreed.

The Chair – He asked if the motion could be made "to disapprove" granting a Waiver to increase the establishment size.

Mr. Boggs – He clarified the motion is usually made in the affirmative "to approve" the Establishment Size Waiver. Those who are in favor vote yes and those opposed vote no. Making the motion does not commit the member to vote in support of the Waiver.

Mr. Cotter moved and Ms. Cooper seconded, to approve the Established Size Waiver:

Architectural Review Board  
Meeting Minutes of December 14, 2022  
Page 10 of 11

Required: Eating and drinking facilities shall be no more than 3, 500 SF in the Historic Core. Requested: Various size increases ranging from Option C-1 at 3.6%, Option C-2 at 3.4%, and Option C-3 at 8%, bringing the gross square footage to 8,496.

Vote: Ms. Damaser, no; Mr. Jewell, no; Mr. Alexander, no; Ms. Cooper, no; and Mr. Cotter, no.  
[Motion Failed 0 – 5]

Mr. Jewell moved and Ms. Damaser seconded, to approve the Roof Pitch Waiver for the Kitchen/Mechanical Room:

Required: Minimum of 6:12 roof pitch to maximum of 12:12 pitch. Requested: ¼: 12 in selected at the kitchen/mechanical addition.

Vote: Ms. Cooper, no; Mr. Cotter, no; Mr. Alexander, no; Ms. Damaser, no; and Mr. Jewell, no.  
[Motion Failed 0 – 5]

The Chair – It is time to vote on the FDP with the eight conditions. He asked Staff if all eight (8) conditions still apply and Ms. Holt responded affirmatively. He asked the applicant if he agreed with all eight (8) conditions and they responded affirmatively.

Mr. Jewell moved and Mr. Cotter seconded, to approve the Final Development Plan – Exhibit B with eight (8) conditions:

- 1) The applicant shall execute a right-of-way encroachment agreement with the City of Dublin for the existing encroachment and required foundation plantings into the Wing Hill Lane right-of-way prior to a certificate of occupancy, or by June 1, 2023, whichever is earlier, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.
- 2) The applicant shall remove all easement references, adjacent to the encroachment on the south property line, on all applicable plan sheets, prior to building permit application.
- 3) The applicant shall work with Building Standards to ensure that the fire separation distances are appropriately maintained with consideration of fire-resistance ratings and opening limitations for the exterior walls as applicable, particularly on the north and south elevations, prior to building permit issuance. Any significant change of architectural design shall be required to return to Architectural Review Board for approval.
- 4) The applicant shall continue to work with City of Dublin and City of Columbus regarding city water service work, to the satisfaction of the Dublin City Engineer and City of Columbus designee.
- 5) The applicant shall update the elevations to show all Hardie Plank siding in a smooth finish at building permit application.
- 6) The lighting plan shall show a Wdge fixture at the staff entrance behind the trash enclosure to enhance safety, and the photometric plan shall be updated to reflect the Base exhibit and new fixture at building permit application.
- 7) The applicant obtain approval for all enclosed patio furnishings prior to any Certificate of Occupancy.

Architectural Review Board  
Meeting Minutes of December 14, 2022  
Page 11 of 11

- 8) The applicant shall obtain approval for a Master Sign Plan prior to installation of any signs or signature features.

Vote: Ms. Cooper, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Damaser, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; and Mr. Jewell, yes.

[Motion Carried 5 – 0]

The Chair – He affirmed the Final Development Plan was approved.

### **Approval of Meeting Dates 2023 – 2024**

The Chair – Meeting minutes were distributed at the last meeting, and he asked if everyone had an opportunity to review the proposed dates.

Ms. Cooper – She did not but upon review during the meeting, she had a concern with the March 29, 2023, meeting date as it did not fall on the fourth Wednesday of the month.

Mr. Alexander – Frequently dates are adjusted for different holidays and usually the March meeting is scheduled around Spring Break.

The Chair – He determined per a straw poll which date worked out the best, and March 15 was selected. Four out of the five members could attend on that date. Two members will miss the February 2023 meeting but that meeting had already been approved the year prior and published.

Mr. Cotter moved, Ms. Damaser seconded, to adopt the proposed meeting dates from March 2023 – February 2024 with an adjustment to the March date – a change from March 29 to March 15, 2023, to achieve quorum.

Vote: Mr. Jewell, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Ms. Damaser, yes; and Mr. Cotter, yes.

[Motion Carried 5 – 0]

### **Communications**

- Ms. Holt explained she shared information on roofing materials in the Board's packet that she thought would be interesting reading. She noted the dramatic change to the roof at the Congregational Church in Colorado Springs, CO. It showed what a difference roofing materials can make.
- As the last meeting of the year, Ms. Holt thanked all the members for their dedication and hard work. The Historic District is such an important part of the City. Staff and the residents are so appreciative of what the Board has accomplished.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 7:55 p.m. A photograph was taken immediately following to be included in the year-end report that is required by Code.

DocuSigned by:

*Gary Alexander*

8949DEECD4F0435...

Gary J. Alexander

Chair, Architectural Review Board

DocuSigned by:

*Laurie Wright*

8949DEECD4F0435...

Recorder