

OHIO HISTORIC INVENTORY


THIS IS A FACSIMILE OF THE FORM PRODUCED BY:

OHIO HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE
567 East Hudson St.
Columbus, Ohio 43211-1030
614/297-2470-fax 614-297-2496



OHIO
HISTORICAL
SOCIETY

SINCE 1885

1.No. FRA-8803-1		2.County Franklin		4.Present Name(s)		<input type="checkbox"/> CODED <input type="checkbox"/> CODED		FRA- 8803-1 FRANKLIN DR. HENRY KARRER OFFICE 114 S. HIGH ST.
3.Location of Negatives City of Dublin				5.Historic or Other Name(s) Dr. Henry Karrer Office				
Roll No. 1		Picture No.(s) 23						
6.Specific Address or Location 114 South High Street				16. Thematic Association(s) commerce		28. No. of Stories 1 1/2		FRANKLIN DR. HENRY KARRER OFFICE 114 S. HIGH ST.
6a. Lot, Section or VMD Number				17. Date(s) or Period 1948		17b. Alteration Date(s)		
7.City or Village If Rural, Township & Vicinity Dublin				18. Style or Design <input type="checkbox"/> High Style <input type="checkbox"/> Elements		29. Basement? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		
8. Site Plan with North Arrow 				18a. Style of Addition or Elements(s)		30. Foundation Material stone		
9. U.T.M. Reference Quadrangle Name NW Columbus 17 319890 4440400 Zone Easting Northing				19. Architect or Engineer		31. Wall Construction wood frame		
10. <input type="checkbox"/> Site <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Building <input type="checkbox"/> Structure <input type="checkbox"/> Object				19a. Design Sources		32. Roof Type & Material gable/asph. shingle		
11. On National Register? Yes				20. Contractor or Builder		33. No. of Bays Front 3 Side 1		
12. N.R. Potential?				21. Building Type or Plan		34. Exterior Wall Material(s) stone/shingle		
13. Part of Estab. Hist. Dist? Yes				22. Original Use, if apparent doctor's office		35. Plan Shape rect.		
14. District Potential?				23. Present Use commercial		36. Changes <input type="checkbox"/> Addition <input type="checkbox"/> Altered (Explain In #42) <input type="checkbox"/> Moved		
15. Name of Established District (N.R. or Local) Dublin Historic District				24. Ownership <input type="checkbox"/> Public <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Private		37. Window Types <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 6 over 6 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 over 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 over 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Other		
15. Name of Established District (N.R. or Local) Dublin Historic District				25. Owner's Name & Address, if known		38. Building Dimensions		
15. Name of Established District (N.R. or Local) Dublin Historic District				26. Property Acreage		39. Endangered? No By What?		
15. Name of Established District (N.R. or Local) Dublin Historic District				27. Other Surveys in Which Included		40. Chimney Placement end/exterior		
42. Further Description of Important Interior and Exterior Features (Continue on reverse if necessary) Mid-20th century building with 6/6, 8/8 sash as well as picture windows on the front and side; entrance with sidelights and stone and shingle exterior materials.				46. Prepared by N. Recchie		41. Distance from and Frontage on Road		
43. History and Significance (Continue on reverse if necessary) This building was built in 1948 by Adam Hirth for Dr. Henry Karrer for use as his office. Dr. Karrer lived at 224 South High Street. His first office was across the street at 35 South High Street.				47. Organization BDR&C		48. Date Recorded in Field 3/03		
44. Description of Environment and Outbuildings (See #52) Although much later than other properties on the street, it fits in scale and materials. There is a small yard and a brick sidewalk across the front.				49. Revised by		50. Date Revised		
45. Sources of Information Shanache Historical Magazine, Dublin High School, Vol.IV, Summer, 1989; Dublin Historical Society				50b. Reviewed by				

Parcel 273-000066 **Address** 114 S High St **OHI** FRA-8803-1

Year Built: 1948	Map No: 128	Photo No: 2044-2046 (7/11/16)
Theme: Commerce	Historic Use: Commercial	Present Use: Commercial
Style: Colonial Revival	Foundation: Stone	Wall Type: Frame
Roof Type: Cross gable/asphalt shingle	Exterior Wall: Faux stone/clapboard	Symmetry: No
Stories: 1.5	Front Bays: 3	Side Bays: 3
Porch: Shed roof over front door	Chimney: 1, Exterior, off ridge near northwest corner	Windows: 8-over-8, 6-over-6, Wood sashes

Description: The one-and-one-half-story former Doctor’s office has a rectilinear footprint, resting on a stone foundation. The exterior walls are clad in faux stone. The cross gable roof is sheathed in asphalt shingles and features a front-gable dormer on the façade slope. The façade roof slope extends to shelter the front door. The wood paneled door is flanked by sidelights. North of the door is a boxed-bay window with a copper roof and clapboard siding. The window itself has a fixed center light flanked by operable sashes. Remaining windows on the building are multi-light double-hung sashes.

Setting: The property is located on the east side of S High St in the old village core of Dublin. The front lawn is landscaped with stone-lined floral beds and ornamental trees.

Condition: Good

Integrity:	Location: Y	Design: Y	Setting: Y	Materials: Y
	Workmanship: Y	Feeling: Y	Association: Y	

Integrity Notes: The building has excellent integrity.

Historical Significance: The building is contributing the City of Dublin’s local Historic Dublin district, and is recommended contributing to the recommended Dublin High Street Historic District, boundary increase, which is more inclusive of historic resources in the original village.

District: Yes	Local Historic Dublin district	Contributing Status: Recommended contributing
National Register:	Recommended Dublin High Street Historic District, boundary increase	Property Name: Dr. Harry Karrer Office



114 S High St, looking east



114 S High St, looking southeast



BOARD ORDER

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, November 16, 2022 | 6:30 pm

The Architectural Review Board took the following action at this meeting:

3. 114 S. High Street, 22-156MPR

Minor Project Review

Proposal: Deck modifications and window replacements to a building on a 0.20-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic South.

Location: ±85 feet southeast of the intersection of Pinneyhill Lane with S. High Street.

Request: Review and approval of a Minor Project under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.176 and the *Historic Design Guidelines*.

Applicants: Jeff Baur, Brandon Dubinsky, and Moises Gutierrez, JBM Development, LLC and Steven Gagliardi, Berardi + Partners, Inc.

Planning Contact: Taylor Mullinax, Planner I

Contact Information: 614.410.4632, tmullinax@dublin.oh.us

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/22-156

MOTION: Mr. Jewell moved and Ms. Damaser seconded, to approve the Minor Project with four (4) amended conditions:

- 1) That the applicant revise window 2 from a six-over-six window to an eight-over-eight window and provide a window elevation from Jeld-Wen, subject to Staff approval, prior to the revision of the existing building permit;
- 2) That the applicant ensure that window dimensions (overall, muntins, and glass area) for windows 1, 2, and 11 match the existing windows, subject to Staff approval, prior to revising the existing building permit. If the window manufacturer cannot provide matching window frame dimensions, then the applicant is required to seek a new manufacturer or custom fabrication that can provide exact replacements or use interior/exterior storm windows;
- 3) That the applicant provides updated dimensions for all existing and proposed windows to show like-for-like replacement sizes, prior to installation, subject to Staff approval; and
- 4) That the applicant works with Engineering to provide erosion and sedimentation control measures to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

VOTE: 4 – 0

RESULT: The Minor Project was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Gary Alexander	Yes
Sean Cotter	Yes
Martha Cooper	Absent
Michael Jewell	Yes
Hilary Damaser	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Taylor Mullinax, Planner I



~~Mr. Jewell – Trash pick-up shall not be impacting the dentist office business between 7:30 am – 8 am.
Ms. Damaser – Rumpke can determine pick-up times and that is a problem. The revision the applicant applied has beautified an enclosure.~~

~~Mr. Jewell – He restated this is not the best solution.~~

~~Mr. Alexander – If Mr. Jewell wants to use the trash concern to vote down a project, it seems like pretty steep ground. He said he liked the enclosure there because there is the option to get Rumpke to come into the driveway, leaving the containers enclosed. Technically, the 40 N. High driveway is partially on this property. He asked if there was a shared easement with 40 N. High Street.~~

~~Mr. Jewell – He was surprised to hear the occupants at 40 N. High taking trash all the way down to Blacksmith Lane if Rumpke will pick it up there.~~

~~Mr. Lombardi – The Bakery tenant is not going to want trash cans out front and will deter customers. From a common sense standpoint, the trash will be taken care of and not be a problem for anyone.~~

~~Mr. Jewell – Okay.~~

~~Mr. Cotter – He said he appreciated the applicant's presentation. Last time the applicant was provided a condition of approval to find a solution to the windows and vertical elements and yet the applicant did not bring something to the Board today to move forward. The applicant was to soften the massing with the revision of vertical elements. The Board was looking for a compromise. The *Guidelines* speak to new construction fitting the surrounding area. Some eclectic elements could be appropriate but something also needs to tie into the other buildings, with perhaps symmetry, and the inside of the windows. This design is not connecting to the surrounding area elements/characteristics. Verticality continues to make the structure appear too massive. This is an important location at the middle of N. High Street. The Board is expecting some continuity. He saw the applicant's reasons for the design but was taken aback when he did not see an effort on the part of the applicant to meet expectations of trying to soften the appearance to lessen the massing. No compromise was made to bridge with the elements already present in the area.~~

~~Mr. Jewell – Not adding muntins within the windows was a missed opportunity.~~

~~Mr. Alexander – He has spent a lot of years studying and teaching architecture. Any time a reference is made, someone else can interpret the reference in a different way. The City's *Guidelines* deal with more literal relationships. The applicant is making connections but they are more oblique. The applicant referenced the timber-frame of barns but that is a feature always apparent on the inside of the structure. The applicant's architectural approach is extremely valuable because it is about communicating ideas, and he applauds that. He was hoping the applicant could find a middle ground. The literal connections are what people notice in the District. Staff made design recommendations to meet the *Guidelines* because the applicant's plans did not change.~~

~~Ms. Damaser – She asked for a justification for why the vertical elements should stay.~~

~~Mr. Lei – It is important to have rhythm on a façade.~~

~~The Chair – The Board has made the recommendations clear.~~

~~Ms. Damaser moved and Mr. Jewell seconded, to table the Final Development Plan.~~

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

~~[Motion passed 4 – 0]~~

~~The Chair – Short break~~

3. 114 S. High Street, 22-156MPR, Minor Project Review

The Chair stated this application was a request for deck modifications and window replacements to a building on a 0.20-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic South. The site is located ±85 feet southeast of the intersection of Pinneyhill Lane with S. High Street.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Mullinax presented an aerial view of the site that is surrounded by businesses to the north, south, and west, and single-family homes to the east. The existing 1,605-square-foot, commercial building was built in 1948 in the Colonial Revival style and was the office of Dr. Harry Karrer. The building was recommended contributing as noted in the 2017 Historic and Cultural Assessment. Since 2016, a couple of Master Sign Plans have been approved by the ARB for various tenants. Earlier this year, basement excavation and restoration of the rear elevation was approved administratively by Staff. The building permit remains open for this on-going work due to proposed exterior modifications, which require ADA access to the commercial building.

Existing conditions of the site [2 photographs], revealed the site is still under construction due to the basement excavation and restoration. The southeast view showed the location of the proposed deck. The northeast view showed the existing ground story windows proposed to be replaced. The existing conditions and an interior perspective were shown of the three ground level windows visible from S. High Street. Windows 1 and 2 were along the west elevation. Window 11 is along the north elevation.

The proposed site plan highlighted the proposed exterior modifications: replace all ground level windows; modify and increase the size of an approved 468-square-foot deck to 490 square feet to accommodate an improved ADA ramp design; and provide an 18-inch off-set of the deck from the rear elevation as conditioned by the ARB in October. The lot coverage slightly increased with the deck revisions, but both lot coverage and setbacks continue to be met.

Graphics of the west and north elevations showed the revised deck/ramp design that included an off-set revision to distinguish between the historic structure and new construction. Windows 1, 2, and 11 on the ground level are proposed to be replaced. The applicant received a condition of approval by the ARB to consider storm windows or to present window repairs at the October meeting. The applicant has since indicated that replacement is necessary due to the extent of deterioration. Staff is supportive of the window replacements except windows 1, 2, and 11. Staff is concerned that replacing the windows will negatively affect the character of the building, since exact window size dimensions were not provided during plan review. Graphics of the east and south elevations showed part of the revised deck and ground level windows 3 through 10 to be replaced. Staff was informed the existing window dimensions were noted incorrectly on the plans; correct dimensions are to ensure like-for-like replacements.

Materials for the deck were previously approved by the ARB, but the proposed Jeld-Wen, AuraLast pine windows with simulated divided lites and clear glazing have yet to be approved. The interior/exterior framing and muntins will be painted white to match the building trim as previously approved by ARB; and window hardware will also be white.

The application was reviewed against the Minor Project Review Criteria. Staff recommended approval of the Minor Project with a total of four (4) conditions:

- 1) That the applicant revise window 2 from a six-over-six window to an eight-over-eight window and provide a window elevation from Jeld-Wen, subject to Staff approval, prior to the revision of the existing building permit;
- 2) That the applicant ensure that window dimensions (overall, muntins, and glass area) for windows 1, 2, and 11 match the existing windows, subject to Staff approval, prior to revising the existing building permit. If the window manufacturer cannot provide matching window frame dimensions,

then the applicant is required to seek a new manufacturer or custom fabrication that can provide exact replacements or use interior/exterior storm windows.

- 3) That the applicant provides updated dimensions for all existing and proposed windows to show like-for-like replacement sizes, prior to installation, subject to Staff review and approval; and
- 4) That the applicant works with Engineering to provide erosion and sedimentation control measures to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

Applicant Presentation

Jeff Baur, JBM Development, LLC, 114 S. High Street, Dublin, OH, thanked Staff. He has no intention of expanding or contracting the window openings; the wrong dimensions were a clerical error only.

Public Comment

There were no public comments received.

Board Discussion

Ms. Damaser – She asked the applicant about the erosion and sedimentation control plan.

Mr. Baur – City inspectors have been on-site almost daily and today was the first time he had heard of the needed erosion and sedimentation control plan but planned to comply.

The Chair – He asked the applicant if he was comfortable with the conditions.

Mr. Baur – He requested clarification on three windows (1, 2 & 11) as the other eight windows are ready to be replaced like-for-like.

The Chair – The concern was the content of two paragraphs where the applicant stated “if they do not fit quite right, we will shim and add trim”. There should not be trim added to make them fit. Further, most historic storm windows are on the outside.

Ms. Taylor – She clarified condition two: The proposed muntins and overall dimensions are required to match the existing window dimensions, and Staff has not received the existing dimensions for proper comparison.

Mr. Baur – He assured the Board, that with Staff’s guidance, he will provide what is needed.

Mr. Jewell moved and Ms. Damaser seconded, to approve the Minor Project with four (4) amended conditions:

- 1) That the applicant revise window 2 from a six-over-six window to an eight-over-eight window and provide a window elevation from Jeld-Wen, subject to Staff approval, prior to the revision of the existing building permit;
- 2) That the applicant ensure that window dimensions (overall, muntins, and glass area) for windows 1, 2, and 11 match the existing windows, subject to Staff approval, prior to revising the existing building permit. If the window manufacturer cannot provide matching window frame dimensions, then the applicant is required to seek a new manufacturer or custom fabrication that can provide exact replacements or use interior/exterior storm windows;
- 3) That the applicant provides updated dimensions for all existing and proposed windows to show like-for-like replacement sizes, prior to installation, subject to Staff approval; and

- 4) That the applicant works with Engineering to provide erosion and sedimentation control measures to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

Vote: Mr. Cotter, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Damaser, yes; and Mr. Jewell, yes.
[Approved 4 – 0]

Presentation by City Engineering

~~Brian Gable discussed the Utility Relocation Project: Franklin Street extends from Bridge Street to North Street through the school property and will be reconstructed from Bridge Street to Sells Alley, adjacent to La Chatelaine and the Dublin Community Church. A traffic signal will be installed at Bridge Street and Franklin Street creating a four-way with pedestrian crossings at each segment. The pedestrian signal at Bridge Street and Darby Street will be removed. The overhead/aerial utility lines will be buried.~~

~~Site coordination with Dublin City Schools was required for the historic property owners very close to the site as the City will realign the bus driveway and modifications will be made to the pedestrian paths within the school site. The Darby Street Parking Lot will be impacted where many utility items will be located underground. A short retaining wall and landscaping will be added. J Liu's exit to Bridge Street will be lost, but a new drive across from the school's driveway made of brick pavers will be gained. One parking space will be eliminated. Temporary grading will impact the Dublin Community Church. Minor adjustments will be made to Olde Dublin Town Center II's sidewalk.~~

~~A rendering of the proposed streetscape was presented. Driveways will be made of pavers so they are not mistaken for streets and to make drivers aware there could be pedestrians present. Street trees, brick sidewalks, permeable pavers, parking bays, granite curbs, street lights, and other aesthetic features will be included in the streetscape, which match the streetscape at the Columbus Metropolitan Library - Dublin Branch. Utility screening is modelled after the S. High Street Utility Burial Project. Utility-type equipment will be relocated to centralize them and greater landscape screening will be used. Grasses will be planted in front of AEP's doors on the electrical boxes to still allow access; AEP considers grasses, no matter how tall they grow, to be traversable.~~

~~For the timeline, City Council accepted the bid on November 14, 2022. The utility relocations are on-going. Materials are being gathered and will move forward in January 2023. Construction will likely begin in February/March 2023 with the south side of Bridge Street. Once that is substantially completed by Sells Alley, the project will move on the north side of Franklin Street with the extension itself. The third part will be to finish up the landscaping there, with all to be completed by November 2023, barring any material issues that are plaguing the construction industry right now. Landscaping for the Darby Lot will be Administratively Approved by Staff by the end of November 2022 but comments/feedback from the ARB are welcome.~~

~~Mr. Cotter – He asked about the budget for the project. He said it looked good.~~

~~Mr. Gable – The construction budget this year was \$2.17 million.~~

~~Mr. Jewell – It is going to look great! He liked the project plans.~~

~~The Chair – We usually defer to Ms. Holt when it comes to landscape so none of us will have any input on that part of the project.~~

~~Ms. Damaser – It looked really good and will be a great improvement to the area.~~

~~Mr. Alexander – He asked if there was anything this Board could do.~~

~~Mr. Gable – They do their best to work through the Planning Department. They are on the ARB agenda for February for a Minor Project Review for one of the properties within the location of this project.~~



BOARD ORDER

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, October 26, 2022 | 6:30 pm

The Architectural Review Board took the following action at this meeting:

**2. 114 S. High Street
22-138MPR**

Minor Project Review

Proposal: Exterior modifications for a commercial building on a 0.20-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic South.

Location: ±85 feet southeast of the intersection of Pinneyhill Lane with S. High Street.

Request: Review and approval of a Minor Project under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.176 and the *Historic Design Guidelines*.

Applicants: Jeff Baur, JBM Development, LLC; and Steven Gagliardi, Berardi + Partners, Inc.

Planning Contact: Taylor Mullinax, Planner I

Contact Information: 614.410.4632, tmullinax@dublin.oh.us

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/22-138

MOTION: Ms. Cooper moved and Mr. Jewell seconded, to approve the Minor Project with nine (9) conditions:

- 1) That the applicant revise the proposed six-over-six and four-over-six windows to be like-for-like replacements consistent with the existing windows on the front façade, and provide dimensions for all existing windows to ensure window openings are not enlarged, as applicable, subject to Staff approval, prior to revising existing building permits;
- 2) That the applicant submit glazing specifications for all windows without window film, as applicable, for Staff approval, prior to revising existing building permits;
- 3) That the applicant revise the size of the deck to create an 18-inch offset with the rear of the building, for Staff approval, prior to revising existing building permits;
- 4) That the applicant revise the proposed steel man door on the north elevation to a wood door painted to coordinate with the approved siding or trim colors, subject to Staff approval, prior to revising building permits;
- 5) That the applicant submit a future Minor Project Review application to the ARB for all landscaping, mechanical unit screening, and the underside of the deck screening within three months of this meeting date, and installed no later than three months from approval of that application;
- 6) That the applicant revise the sign to provide ½-inch dimensional lettering and logo, subject to Staff approval, prior to sign permit submittal;



Architectural Review Board
Meeting Minutes of October 26, 2022
Page 5 of 11

Ms. Cooper – The dormer area above the garage takes away from the front view and makes the garage end seem extreme.

Mr. Johnson – That could be minimized by creating multiple small dormers.

Mr. Alexander – The flat roof on the back and those created by shed dormers will require Waivers by not meeting roof-pitch requirements of which he would not support. The house is so massive and the shed dormer over the garage creates a massive wall, it does not pull back from the façade. The house next door does not have living space up that high. All the non-compliant roofs result in a massive structure. He would have trouble supporting all of the Waivers that would be needed. The mid-level of this design aligns with the upper level of the house next door, creating a level above the adjoining property.

Mr. Jewell – He would not support what is coming off the back side.

(Q3) Does the Board support the conceptual architectural character and details of the home, including roof lines and window placement?

Mr. Alexander – Mr. Cotter had touched on this earlier about the character not fitting in with the residential section of the district.

Ms. Damaser – Upon first look, she saw a Tudor Style home, which seems out of place. She suggested the Tudor Style be minimized.

Ms. Cooper – Agreed.

The Chair – The *Historic Design Guidelines* are clear. Houses in the District are vernacular, which are simplistic in massing and material use. The house next door and across the street have a simple design; this is not. This design does not meet the Zoning Code for all those reasons.

Mr. Cotter – He inquired about the placement of the windows.

Mr. Johnson – The windows were driven by the interior plan, room by room.

Mr. Jewell – Getting the design to fit better in the neighborhood should include a plan for the windows, of a pattern and consistency.

The Chair – When the house next door was reviewed and approved, the Board had stated that was a perfect size for the lot after the split. This house could be larger than that house, but needs to meet all the characteristic design elements. He asked if any other members of the team had additional questions for the Board, for clarity. He suggested the applicant consider putting the bedrooms on the entry level.

Ms. Cooper – The front entry creates a castle-esque approach to the structure. That would not be found in the Historic District; more of a front porch aesthetic would be preferred.

The Chair summarized the points:

- The Board would support the Waiver for the garage.
- The rationale for the Waivers for side yard setbacks have not been provided.
- There are questions about the site layout as to its effect on the neighbor.
- The Board has concerns with the mass and scale of the home and the response to the topography.
- The home design needs to slope down with the hill.
- As of now, the Board would not support the Waivers needed for the roof pitch variations.
- The Board is concerned with the character and the details. Simplification would be more appropriate. A vernacular design would reflect more of the homes in the community. Use fewer materials, especially on the front.

NEW CASE

2. 114 S. High Street, 22-138MPR, Minor Project Review

Architectural Review Board
Meeting Minutes of October 26, 2022
Page 6 of 11

The Chair stated this application was a request for exterior modifications for a commercial building on a 0.20-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic South. The site is located ±85 feet southeast of the intersection of Pinneyhill Lane with S. High Street.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Mullinax presented an aerial view of the site that is surrounded by businesses to the north, south, and west, and single-family homes to the east. The existing 1,605-square-foot, commercial building was built in 1948 in the Colonial Revival style and was the office of Dr. Harry Karrer. The building is recommended contributing to the Historic District as mentioned in the 2017 Historic and Cultural Assessment. Since 2016, a couple of Master Sign Plans have been approved by the ARB for various tenants. Earlier this year, basement excavation and restoration of the rear elevation was approved administratively by Staff. The building permit remains open for this on-going work due to proposed exterior modifications, which require ADA access to the commercial building.

Existing conditions of the site [3 photographs], revealed the site is still under construction due to the basement excavation and restoration. The southeast view showed the location of the proposed deck. The northeast view showed the existing ground story windows proposed to be replaced. The conditions of the existing ground sign and landscaping at the base were included.

The proposed site plan met the permitted lot coverage and setbacks and include: a 468-square-foot deck addition and ADA ramp along the north elevation with the ramp to connect to the existing sidewalk that runs east/west; the roof and the door on the north elevation will be replaced; the HVAC units will be relocated to the south elevation with new HVAC units to be added; new paint for the wood siding and trim; a new sign panel will be added on the existing ground sign pole; and windows are to be replaced. Additional documentation is needed to determine the extent of the window deterioration and if complete window replacements are necessary, or if window repairs, and/or storm windows may be a more appropriate solution.

The proposed materials include: wood siding paint color SW Colonial Revival Gray, and Classical White for the trim; Jeld-Wen, AuraLast pine windows; Certainteed Landmark Pro dimensional asphalt shingles in Georgetown Gray; TimberTech composite material for the deck with a black aluminum railing; and a Pella steel door was proposed to replace the door near the deck but a wood door is required.

The applicant proposed a 5.5-square-foot sign panel for an existing ground sign pole, which will be painted Colonial Revival Gray to match the proposed paint color for the building. The location of the ground sign pole will not change as it was previously approved with a Master Sign Plan to be less than the required 8 feet from the right-of-way. The existing evergreen landscaping at the sign base will remain. Graphics on the sign panel are not Code compliant as proposed. The applicant proposed 4 sign colors: white, orange, black and the logo whereas Code permits a maximum of 3 sign colors. Staff requested additional details: lettering/logo dimensionality which are required to provide a ½-inch relief; the sign panel material; and color details.

Note, conditions are proposed for the Board's consideration for the applicant to continue to work with Staff to ensure the sign meets the Zoning Code and *Historic Design Guidelines*.

The application was reviewed against the Minor Project Review Criteria. Staff recommended approval of the Minor Project with nine (9) conditions:

- 1) That the applicant revise the proposed six-over-six and four-over-six windows to be like-for-like replacements consistent with the existing windows on the front façade, and provide dimensions for

Architectural Review Board
Meeting Minutes of October 26, 2022
Page 7 of 11

- all existing windows to ensure window openings are not enlarged, subject to Staff review and approval prior to revision of existing building permit;
- 2) That the applicant submit glazing specifications for all windows without window film for Staff review and approval prior to revision of existing building permit;
 - 3) That the applicant revise the size of the deck to create an 18-inch offset with the rear of the building prior to revising building permits, subject to Staff review and approval;
 - 4) That the applicant revise the proposed steel man door on the north elevation to a wood door and paint the door to coordinate with the approved siding or trim colors, subject to Staff review and approval prior to revising building permits;
 - 5) That the applicant submit a future MPR application for all landscaping, mechanical unit screening, and deck underside screening within three months of this meeting date, and that all plantings and screening are installed no later than three months from approval of that application;
 - 6) That the applicant revise the sign such that "JBM" is black to meet the maximum permitted number of colors, subject to Staff review and approval prior to applying for a sign permit;
 - 7) That the applicant revise the sign to provide ½-inch dimensional lettering and logo, subject to Staff review and approval prior to applying for a sign permit;
 - 8) That the applicant revise the sign plan to indicate sign panel material, material of the text and logo, and color specifications of all elements, subject to Staff review and approval prior to applying for a sign permit; and
 - 9) That the applicant revise the sign front setback noted on all applicable plan sheets to reflect the existing approved setback.

Questions for Staff

Mr. Cotter – He asked what was just the logo.

Ms. Mullinax – She clarified the name is separate from the logo.

Mr. Alexander – On the company's literature, the letters and graphic appeared as one.

Applicant Presentation

Jeff Baur, JBM Development, LLC, 114 S. High Street, Dublin, OH, stated all of the parties are Dublin residents and they love it here. Our business is a real estate company and plan to have headquarters here. We are currently renting space above the Dublin Barber Shop. We purchased the building at 114 S. High Street one year ago. The only reason we are here submitting the building plans for approval is because ADA access became an issue. We did not want to do a ramp in front as that is the coolest area of their building. We found a way to enter at the side door and then wanted a deck. It was determined at that point an ARB review was necessary. Due to construction, we were not able to get into the building for close to 90 days. The excavation of the basement turned into more of a challenge than anticipated due to the bedrock found. The genesis of being here was the deck. We basically agree with everything Staff has presented except for one minor issue. We are fine bringing in 18 inches of the deck from the rear but still struggling with the 18 inches from the sidewalk. There is a substantial grade problem there. The architect produced a new design to take the ramp completely off the deck and have a switchback off the deck using

Architectural Review Board
Meeting Minutes of October 26, 2022
Page 8 of 11

the same railing with a safer concrete ramp rather than the Timber tech material. He respected the submission dates and understands that he cannot present new information. He was ready to share the new design, which allows the deck to be 18 inches lower and provide proper screening. He plans to provide the window reports that were requested this morning. The windows on the second level were all replaced in 2020. He did not know if the ARB reviewed an application to replace the Jeld-Wen wood windows. The applicant did not own the building at the time. The replacement windows selected for this project are the exact same windows purchased in 2020.

Board Discussion

Mr. Alexander – He recalled the submission in 2020 but could not recall if window replacement was part of that project.

Mr. Baur - Double-hung, wood windows were purchased and more expensive than they would like but are exactly what is there. He said they want to replace the windows as they have deteriorated beyond repair.

Mr. Alexander – He walked the site and asked if all of the windows on the rear were gone.

Mr. Baur – He attested to same.

Mr. Alexander – Preserving windows at the lower level is not an option now. Windows are a significant issue in the Historic District. The Board asks that they review any window destruction/replacements before action is taken. It is odd here because some will be kept at the upper level and ones at the lower level have already been removed. All the windows were subsequently discussed.

Mr. Baur – He questioned next steps.

Mr. Alexander – He asked if Staff could review the windows so the applicant could move forward instead of waiting until December as the November agenda is already full.

Ms. Mullinax – The applicant will need to bring back landscaping plans to the Board for approval, anyway. Preferably in January in time for spring planting. The windows could be submitted with that Minor Project Review application.

Mr. Alexander – The building can be sealed up temporarily. The Board is not making this business non-operational by asking for the proper next steps.

Ms. Holt – Tonight we learned the back wall had to be removed along with the windows. This was not what was anticipated.

Ms. Cooper – She asked to see the windows before they were removed for excavation.

Ms. Mullinax – She did not have those pictures to provide this evening.

Mr. Alexander – He clarified Staff approved the windows below because they did not believe they were original to the house so the Board would not have to review and approve.

Ms. Holt – Based on recollection, at the time of the Administrative Approval, there were two man doors, the understanding was those openings would be enlarged for the basement to be excavated down another couple of feet to create the ceiling height the applicant was after.

Mr. Baur – They never misled anyone. None of the materials in the back were original. The original house had a two-car garage. The entire back of the house and the stone we are being asked to be put back was not original to the house, either. It was stone veneer and not added in 1948. The basement level windows have been approved in order to meet Code and for us to occupy our building. Those 4 windows and the one man door we can find pictures for and those have been ordered.

The Chair – The Board is not going to ask the applicant to do something different, there.

Ms. Damaser – None of the basement windows will be changed. Those are considered done. She asked if the applicant could live with the other existing windows for three months until he can return to the Board.

Mr. Baur – Technically, there is wood and glass there but he is spending more than \$100,000 on renovations and there is water coming in. He received an email at 10:30 am this morning that windows were even going to be an issue. The windows are rotted. The windows upstairs look so good.

Architectural Review Board
Meeting Minutes of October 26, 2022
Page 9 of 11

Mr. Alexander – At the site visit, the windows from the outside looked pretty good but he did not enter the building. The Board should have approved the windows at the lower level and need to follow due diligence and require what we have required of other applicants. The Board should see evidence of these windows.

Mr. Baur – He had some photos with him that he shared at the dais but he was not prepared to have an extensive discussion with the Board about windows this evening.

The Chair – Some of the windows appear to date back to when the building was first built. Staff looked for permits on the auditor's website showing windows being changed. Some of the earlier assumptions may not have been accurate.

Mr. Baur – If he could come back next month, he would not have such pain and frustration with this discussion but being told to wait until December or possibly January because the November agenda is full is a problem. Windows are leaking and yet new drywall, paint, and floors are ready.

Brandon Dominski, JBM Development, but resides 2250 Muirfield Court, Dublin, said he had an original, 1948 floor plan for the south elevation that clearly shows a different set of windows than what Staff shows on the south elevation. **Conversation at dais not recorded.**

The Chair – They were looking at the original blueprint of the building, shared by one of the applicants:

- North/side elevation – There is a grouping of three windows on the original drawing, subdivided in a similar way. It is possible that is an original window.
- West elevation/front – On the first floor, there is a bay window, subdivided the same way as now so potentially that is an original window. On the right of the front door, opening in the same location. Three windows could potentially be original.
- South/side elevation – The window furthest to the west and the window furthest to the east there are openings where there are windows are in these drawings, which could be original. The three windows in the middle are probably not original, they are not shown on the drawings.

From the photographs the Board has seen so far, only one of those windows is not operable, which is not unusual. That is not always a reason to replace the window. Only one of the windows shown to the Board were terribly deteriorated.

Mr. Cotter – He asked if the process could be completed in a shorter period.

Ms. Holt – She suggested conditions could be modified.

Ms. Damaser – Plans will need to be verified and submitted.

The Chair – He verified the Board needs to review further documentation. Staff needs time to write a report and actually review what the applicant submits.

Mr. Baur – There is one window falling out and completely deteriorated; the window could be boarded up, if necessary, for the applicant to occupy the space before approval.

Ms. Holt – Staff will know for certain in a couple of days if the November docket is full. It would be a quick turnaround time given the meeting was moved up to the 16th, due to Thanksgiving.

Ms. Mullinax – She shared the amended conditions.

Ms. Holt – Clarified the conditions for the applicant.

Ms. Damaser – The condition re: the sign colors were discussed. She asked if text can be included in a logo.

Ms. Mullinax – Her experience has not included seeing text/business name as part of a logo/image.

Ms. Damaser – Some companies make the name part of their logo.

Mr. Alexander – On all the drawings, the text and logo appeared to be one; he could be a little flexible.

Ms. Damaser – She asked if logo was defined in the Code. She thought the sign design was cohesive.

Mr. Baur – They had the exact same questions the Board was raising. He provided his business card; the logo had not been changed. He noted the sign for the pop-up shop across the street had multiple colors approved.

Mr. Cotter – He considered the logo as containing the company name.

Ms. Damaser – She noted the State of Ohio. The text around the outside is all part of the logo.

Architectural Review Board
Meeting Minutes of October 26, 2022
Page 10 of 11

Mr. Jewell – He was fine having the text be part of the logo.
The Chair – He requested that condition be deleted from the record.
Mr. Baur – He expressed his appreciation for getting on the November agenda.

Ms. Cooper moved and Mr. Jewell seconded, to approve the Minor Project with nine (9) amended conditions:

- 1) That the applicant revise the proposed six-over-six and four-over-six windows to be like-for-like replacements consistent with the existing windows on the front façade, and provide dimensions for all existing windows to ensure window openings are not enlarged, as applicable, subject to Staff approval, prior to revising existing building permits;
- 2) That the applicant submit glazing specifications for all windows without window film, as applicable, for Staff approval, prior to revising existing building permits;
- 3) That the applicant revise the size of the deck to create an 18-inch offset with the rear of the building, for Staff approval, prior to revising existing building permits;
- 4) That the applicant revise the proposed steel man door on the north elevation to a wood door painted to coordinate with the approved siding or trim colors, subject to Staff approval, prior to revising building permits;
- 5) That the applicant submit a future Minor Project Review application to the ARB for all landscaping, mechanical unit screening, and the underside of the deck screening within three months of this meeting date, and installed no later than three months from approval of that application;
- 6) That the applicant revise the sign to provide ½-inch dimensional lettering and logo, subject to Staff approval, prior to sign permit submittal;
- 7) That the applicant revise the sign plan to indicate sign panel material, material of the text and logo, and color specifications of all elements, subject to Staff approval, prior to sign permit submittal;
- 8) That the applicant revise the sign front setback noted on all applicable plan sheets to reflect the existing approved setback; and
- 9) That the applicant provide additional documentation for the deterioration of the windows including a letter from the window contractor describing the condition of and removal of the existing windows, installation of the new windows, pictures, and descriptions for all windows to be replaced. The applicant shall present window repairs and/or utilizes the use of interior or exterior storm windows. All information is to be presented with the next Minor Project Review application within three months.

Vote: Ms. Damaser, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Jewell, yes; and Ms. Cooper, yes.
[Approved 5 – 0]

Communications

- Ms. Holt stated the City of Dublin and McBride Dale Clarion are among recipients of the 2022 State Historic Preservation Office Awards for the production and implementation of the revised Dublin Historic Code and *Dublin Historic Design Guidelines*.

Architectural Review Board
Meeting Minutes of October 26, 2022
Page 11 of 11

- Mr. Alexander stated he may have misspoken earlier when he referred to a past case as he may have noted the wrong case.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 8:31 p.m.

DocuSigned by:

Gary Alexander

8949DEEC04F0435

Chair, Architectural Review Board

DocuSigned by:

Laurie Wright

8949DEEC04F0435

Administrative Assistant II, Recorder



MEETING MINUTES

Administrative Review Team

Thursday, April 18, 2019 | 2:00 pm

ART Members and Designees: Vince Papsidero, Planning Director (Chair); Colleen Gilger, Director of Economic Development; Brad Fagrell, Director of Building Standards; Shawn Krawetzki, Landscape Architect; Aaron Stanford, Senior Civil Engineer; and Mike Altomare, Fire Marshal.

Other Staff: Logan Stang, Planner II; Nicki Martin, Planner I; and Laurie Wright, Administrative Support II.

Applicants: Cara Herring and Jordan Sandvig, representatives for the applicant (Case 2).

Mr. Papsidero called the meeting to order at 2:04 pm. He asked if there were any amendments to the meeting minutes from April 4, 2019. [There were none.] The minutes were approved as presented.

RECOMMENDATION

**1. Office Building
19-026ARB-MSP**

**114 South High Street
Master Sign Plan**

Nichole Martin said this application is a proposal for a Master Sign Plan for an existing, multi-tenant office building on a 0.20-acre site zoned Bridge Street District Historic South. The site is south of Pinneyhill Lane, approximately 100 feet southeast of the intersection with S. High Street. Because this is in the Historic District, the Administrative Review Team (ART) will make a recommendation to the Architectural Review Board (ARB) as they will be the final reviewing body.

Ms. Martin presented an aerial view of the site and a photograph of the existing conditions of this site containing a cottage-type, commercial building. She said the applicant is just adding tenant panels (a total of three added) to the existing sign on a five-foot, five-inch wooden post. The right-of-way is to the back side of the sidewalk so part of this MSP is to request a closer distance to the right-of-way than is permitted given the existing conditions.

Ms. Martin presented the proposed sign plan and said the sign area is eight square feet consisting of four panels in a High Density Urethane (HDU) material painted the Sherwin Williams color - High Reflective White. This is a double-sided sign that has one larger panel on top at 18 inches and the three panels below are each four inches in height with black text in an Antique Olive Medium font.

Ms. Martin said the application has been reviewed against the BSD Sign Design Guidelines, the MSP criteria and determined it meets the criteria. She said approval is recommended for the Master Sign Plan without conditions.

Shawn Krawetzki asked about the landscape issue that he stated at the previous meeting. Ms. Martin thought the applicant intends on trimming the landscaping under the sign so it does not impede on the added sign panels. She asked if a condition should be added to which the ART agreed as the following:

- 1) That Staff be able to administratively approve alternate landscaping at the base of the sign to ensure the sign is fully visible.



~~Ms. Bryan stated that she also does not believe eight inches is significant, but her concern is with setting a precedent that would result in future similar requests.~~

~~Ms. Stenberg concurred. The proposed sign is very attractive; however, the Master Sign Plan already requests a deviation from the three-color limitation. The proposed sign will have four colors.~~

~~Mr. Keeler stated that if there is a concern with setting a precedent, Mr. Alexander's suggestion would meet the Code requirement without sacrificing a very attractive sign.~~

~~Mr. Alexander moved, Ms. Bryan seconded, to approve a Master Sign Plan permitting an existing wall sign in excess of the Code allowance, a new ground sign with one additional color and less than the minimum distance from the right-of-way as permitted by Code, with the following condition:~~

- ~~1) That the overall height of the sign post be lowered to six (6) feet.~~

~~Vote on the motion: Ms. Stenberg, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Ms. Bryan, yes; Mr. Bailey, yes.~~

~~(Motion passed 5 – 0)~~

2. Office Building, 114 South High Street, 19-026MSP, Master Sign Plan

Ms. Stenberg stated that this is a proposal for a Master Sign Plan for a ground sign for an existing, multi-tenant office building on a 0.20-acre site zoned Bridge Street District Historic South.

Case Presentation

Ms. Martin stated that this is a request for review and approval of a Master Sign Plan for an existing tenant space. The ART has reviewed the request and recommends ARB approval. The Board is the final determining body. The site, located on the east side of South High Street, contains a cottage-style commercial building. There is an existing six-square-foot ground sign on the site. With the proposed Master Sign Plan, ARB is asked to review and approve a framework for the three future tenant panels at the bottom of the ground sign. This would provide established sign standards for those future tenants, enabling them to apply for a sign permit versus coming before the ARB with a sign request. The applicant is proposing that the signs have all-white backgrounds, black text, and a font selected from the Historic Dublin Design Guidelines. The sign will be a double-sided HDU panel, which is a Code-permitted material. The sign will be located in its existing location, which is approximately five (5) feet, three (3) inches from the right-of-way. The Code requires that ground signs be located a minimum of eight (8) feet from the right-of-way. However, that regulation is for a typical suburban setting. Because the Historic District is not that, staff recommends approval of a sign less than eight (8) feet from the right-of-way. The proposed sign standards have been reviewed for consistency with the Sign Design Guidelines for the Bridge Street District, the Master Sign Plan Code intent, as well as the Code criteria for the Architectural Review Board. The ART recommends approval with one condition:

- 1) That staff be able to administratively approve alternate landscaping at the base of the sign to ensure the sign is fully visible.

The applicant is present to respond to any questions.
There were no public comments or questions for the applicant.

Board discussion:

Ms. Bryan stated that the Nationwide Insurance sign is quite large. Will that sign continue to be the same size and the other signs be smaller panels beneath it?

Ms. Martin responded affirmatively. Currently, there are two sign panels: one for the main tenant, currently Nationwide Insurance, and a smaller panel for another tenant. With this proposal, two additional tenant sign panels would be added. The total square footage for the four signs would increase from six square feet to eight square feet.

Ms. Bryan inquired what the color requirements would be.

Ms. Martin responded that this proposal limits the smaller sign panels to have a white background with black text. The tenant with the larger sign panel could come before ARB in the future with a more specific color proposal.

There were no further questions.

Mr. Keeler moved, Mr. Alexander seconded, to approve a Master Sign Plan to permit the existing location of the ground sign, which is less than the minimum distance from the right-of-way as permitted by Code with one condition:

- 1) That staff be able to administratively approve alternate landscaping at the base of the sign to ensure the sign is fully visible.

Vote on the motion: Mr. Bailey, yes; Ms. Bryan, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes;
Ms. Stenberg, yes.
(Motion passed 5 – 0)

COMMUNICATIONS:

~~Ms. Rauch reported future meetings of interest:~~

- ~~• The Community Development Committee will meet 1:00-4:00 p.m., May 8, to review the draft Historic District Code and Guidelines. If the Committee has no revisions, the draft documents will proceed to public review and ARB and PZC review (potentially a joint meeting) before proceeding to City Council for adoption.~~
- ~~• Update re. concern raised at the 03-20-19 ARB meeting concerning the installation of board and batten materials at the Town Center I Building at Bridge and High Street. Staff has talked with the construction manager and determined that they have installed what they understood to be approved by the City. The construction manager explained the additional battens cover the open seams of the hardipanel that was used. Some additional windows are being replaced, and paint finish, window detailing and gutters are on schedule for completion. The Board was concerned that matching materials were not being used, but the details of the Board's approval do not clearly reflect that direction. Better clarification will be ensured in any future such Board directions.~~

Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns. [Hearing none.] He called for a vote. (Recommended for Approval 6 – 0) The Master Sign Plan was forwarded to the Architectural Review Board with a recommendation of approval with the one condition.

DRAFT



RECORD OF DETERMINATION

Administrative Review Team

Thursday, April 18, 2018

The Administrative Review Team made the following determination at this meeting:

- 1. Office Building 19-026ARB-MSP** **114 South High Street Master Sign Plan**
- Proposal: A Master Sign Plan for an existing, multi-tenant office building on a 0.20-acre site zoned Bridge Street District Historic South.
- Location: East of South High Street, approximately 150-feet northeast of the intersection with John Wright Lane.
- Request: Review and recommendation of approval for a Master Sign Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.065(H) and 153.066, and the Bridge Street District Sign Guidelines and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.
- Applicant: Allan D. Staub, Property Owner
- Planning Contact: Nicole M. Martin, AICP, Planner I
- Contact Information: 614.410.4635, nmartin@dublin.oh.us
- Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/19-026

REQUEST: Recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board for a Master Sign Plan with the following condition:

- 1) That Staff be able to administratively approve alternate landscaping at the base of the sign to ensure the sign is fully visible.

Determination: This application was forwarded to the Architectural Review Board with a recommendation of approval.

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Vince A. Papsidero, FAICP
Director of Planning





ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

BOARD ORDER

FEBRUARY 24, 2016

The Architectural Review Board took the following action at this meeting:

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. BSD HC – Nationwide – Sign
16-012ARB-MSP | 114 South High Street
Master Sign Plan |
| Proposal: | Installation of a new ground sign for an existing building on the east side of South High Street approximately 90 feet south of the intersection with Pinney Hill Lane. |
| Request: | Review and approval of a Master Sign Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.065 and 153.170 and the <i>Historic Dublin Design Guidelines</i> . |
| Applicant: | Jim Dooley, Morrison Sign Company. |
| Planning Contact: | Nick Martin, Planning Assistant; (614) 410-4635, nmartin@dublin.oh.us |

MOTION: Mr. Munhall moved, Ms. Stenberg seconded, to approve a request for a Master Sign Plan with no conditions.

VOTE: 5 - 0

RESULT: This request for a Master Sign Plan was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

David Rinaldi	Yes
Thomas Munhall	Yes
Everett Musser	Yes
Jane Fox	Yes
Shannon Stenberg	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Jennifer M. Rauch, AICP, Planning Manager



Planning

5800 Shier Rings Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236

phone 614.410.4600

fax 614.410.4747

www.dublinohiousa.gov

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

MEETING MINUTES

FEBRUARY 24, 2016

AGENDA

- 1. BSD HC – Nationwide – Sign
16-012ARB-MSP**

**114 South High Street
Master Sign Plan (Approved 5 – 0)**

Presentations

- 1. Transportation Updates in the BSD by Mandy Bishop**
2. Review Procedures and Discussion by Stephen Smith, Jr.

The Chair, David Rinaldi, called the meeting to order at 6:32 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Board members present were: Jane Fox, Thomas Munhall, Everett Musser, and Shannon Stenberg. City representatives were: Jennifer Rauch, Tammy Noble, JM Rayburn, Mandy Bishop, Stephen Smith, Jr., and Laurie Wright.

Administrative Business

Motion and Vote

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

Motion and Vote

Mr. Rinaldi moved, Mr. Munhall seconded, to accept the January 27, 2016, meeting minutes as presented. The vote was as follows: Mr. Musser, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; Mr. Munhall, yes; and Mr. Rinaldi, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

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

- 1. BSD HC – Nationwide – Sign
16-012ARB-MSP**

**114 South High Street
Master Sign Plan (Approved 5 – 0)**

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following application is a request for a new ground sign for an existing building on the east side of South High Street approximately 90 feet south of the intersection with Pinney Hill Lane. He said this is a request for review and approval of a Master Sign Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.065, 153.170, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*."

Jennifer Rauch presented the aerial view of the site as well as the existing sign with a tan background color and contrasting copy. She said a matching tenant panel hangs below. She reported the applicant submitted two proposals for a Minor Project reviewed by the ART. She said one met all of the Code

requirements, but the applicant and the ART determined the second proposal was preferred. She said the second met all the requirements with the exception of the required number of permitted colors; therefore, the ART recommended the application be reviewed by the ARB as a Master Sign Plan. She stated the applicant was updating their sign to include Nationwide's new logo but it would be the same size and shape as the existing sign and installed on the existing pole. She said the ART recommended approval to the ARB of a Master Sign Plan with no conditions.

David Rinaldi confirmed the only issue that required a MSP were the four colors.

Jane Fox asked if the applicant had requested the maximum size permitted by the Code. Ms. Rauch said 8 square feet is permitted and the applicant's proposed sign is 6 square feet.

Ms. Fox asked if there were any photographs of the adjacent properties to get context for this sign. Ms. Rauch answered not for this case as the applicant was replacing the existing sign but she agreed Staff would provide photographs in the future.

The Chair asked if there was anyone from the public that wanted to comment on this application.

Tom Holton, 5957 Roundstone Place, Dublin, asked if there was external lighting for this sign. Ms. Rauch said no lighting was proposed with this application and did not believe there was any existing lighting.

The Chair asked if there was any further questions or concerns. [Hearing none.]

Motion and Vote

Mr. Munhall moved, Ms. Stenberg seconded, to approve a request for a Master Sign Plan. The vote was as follows: Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Musser, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; and Mr. Munhall, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

Presentations

1. Transportation Updates in the BSD by Mandy Bishop

~~Jennifer Rauch introduced Mandy Bishop, GDP Group, as the consultant for the BSD transportation related projects.~~

~~Mandy Bishop said she has been working on the BSD public infrastructure delivery, design, and managing the design and construction for approximately two years. She said the biggest project underway is the SR 161/Riverside Drive roundabout. She presented the intersection with the realignment. She said Riverside Drive is very close to the Scioto River and the City's goal is to open up parkway and provide access to the river. She said as a signal-controlled intersection and the limits of left turns, the project will restore all those movements, open up that parkway, and accommodate a 25% increase in traffic well into the future. She explained in the final condition, the roundabout will be one lane one-way southbound and the outer most lane will become a barrier and a biking/pedestrian path will connect to a stairway that goes down into the Kiwanis Park for a full connection. She reported tens of thousands of cubic earth have been moved this summer and granite curb is beginning to be installed as the road starts to take shape.~~

~~Ms. Bishop said AT&T paid the City to manage the installation of Dublin duct bank. She said the aerial river crossing wires were removed, planning for the upcoming pedestrian bridge.~~

~~Ms. Bishop presented how the maintenance of traffic looks like now with one lane in each through August of 2016. She said the project schedule states a completion date of October 15, 2016, but the contractor is expected to request an extension due to a weather delay so the new date will be November 6, 2016.~~