



MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, June 26, 2024

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Cotter, Vice Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and welcomed everyone to the June 26, 2024 Architectural Review Board. He stated that the meeting is held in Council Chamber, 5555 Perimeter Drive. Livestream video of the meeting can also be accessed at the City's website. Public comments on the cases are welcome from meeting attendees and from those viewing from the City's website. He reviewed the meeting procedures.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. Cotter led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Board members present: Martha Cooper, Sean Cotter, Hilary Damaser, Michael Jewell, Lisa Patt-McDaniel

Staff members present: Sarah Holt, James Condo

ADJOURNMENT TO EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. Cotter moved, Ms. Cooper seconded to adjourn to Executive Session for the discussion of Personnel Matters concerning the appointment of a public official.

Vote: Ms. Patt-McDaniel, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Mr. Jewell, yes; Ms. Damaser, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes.

[Motion carried 5-0.]

MEETING RECONVENED

The meeting was reconvened at 6:37 p.m.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Ms. Cooper moved, Mr. Jewell seconded the appointment of Mr. Cotter as Chair for a term of one year.

Vote: Ms. Damaser, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Ms. Patt-McDaniel, yes; Mr. Jewell, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes.

[Motion carried 5-0.]

Mr. Jewell moved, Ms. Patt-McDaniel seconded the appointment of Ms. Damaser as Vice-Chair for a term of one year.

Vote: Ms. Cooper, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Ms. Patt-McDaniel, yes; Mr. Jewell, yes; Ms. Damaser, yes.

[Motion carried 5-0.]

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Cotter moved, Ms. Cooper seconded acceptance of the documents into the record and approval of the May 29, 2024 meeting minutes.

Vote: Ms. Cooper, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Ms. Patt-McDaniel, yes; Mr. Jewell, yes; Ms. Damaser, yes.
[Motion carried 5-0]

Mr. Cotter stated that the Architectural Review Board (ARB) is responsible for review of construction, modifications or alterations to any site in the Review District or area subject to ARB under the provision of Zoning Code Section 153.170. The Board has the decision-making responsibility on these cases. The Chair swore in staff and applicants who planned to address the Board on any of the cases on the agenda.

CASE REVIEWS

- **Case #24-072-MPR - 37 W. Bridge Street**

Installation of an approximately 7-square-foot wall sign on an existing building located in Historic Dublin. The 0.22-acre site is zoned HD-HC, Historic Core District and is located southwest of the intersection of West Bridge Street and Mill Lane.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Condo stated that this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project at 37 W. Bridge Street, which is located southwest of the intersection of W. Bridge Street and Mill Lane. Sidewalks are located along both of these street frontages. Vehicular access is provided to the site from surrounding surface lots on Sells Alley and Mill Lane. In June 2021, the ARB approved a Minor Project Review (MPR) for exterior modifications and a patio enclosure. This site features an existing single-story front gable core and a rear two-story flat-roof addition. The original core of the building is of stone masonry construction, with a roof sheathed in slate and a stone foundation. The addition is a concrete block structure. The original structure was constructed in 1944 and housed both the Dublin and Perry Township fire departments. The north façade features a National Register of Historic Places sign marking the structure's historical significance in the Historic District. The site also has an existing ground sign in the northeast corner that marks the specific historical context within the City, reading "37 Bridge Street Firehouse." The structure is listed in good condition according to the 2017 City of Dublin Historic and Cultural Assessment and is shown as a Landmark property. If this application is approved, the current sign would need to be removed or brought into Code compliance.

This is a request for review and approval of an approximately 7-square-foot projecting sign mounted to the east stonewall of the historic firehouse. The sign is for both an insurance company and a new intermittent farm stand within the existing front patio on W. Bridge Street. The farm stand will not affect the structure in any way, and the use is permitted by Code. The size of the primary sign

face will be 2.5'x 2', and the secondary sign beneath it will be 1'x2'. The sign face will be ¾-inch thick PVC with ½-inch raised letters. Lettering will be in Pure White on a Tricorn Black background. It will hang from a custom 2.5'x1' bracket with a black finish mounted to the east stone façade. The main logo will read "DIG: Dean Insurance Group", and the secondary sign panel will read "5,000 Acres: Farm Stand on the Patio," (for a temporary farmers market use). The sign meets all Code Sign requirements described in Section 153.173(M). The Code provides requirements for building-mounted projecting signs, noting that projecting signs must have 8 feet of clearance below when above a sidewalk. Because the proposed sign is projecting over a landscape bed, which is clearly delineated from the public sidewalk, Staff has no concerns related to the sign having only 5.5 feet of clearance at the bottom of the sign. Staff has reviewed the application against the applicable criteria and determined that the criteria are met, met with conditions, or not applicable. Because staff has concerns regarding the proposal to mount the sign to the building by drilling directly into the stonewall, a condition of approval is recommended that the applicant mount the sign bracket in the nearest mortar joints to the approved sign location in order to protect the historical integrity.

Board Questions for Staff

Mr. Jewell inquired if the second sign panel was attached to the sign above and not attached by a bracket.

Mr. Condo responded affirmatively. It is hanging from the other sign, and it is removable. The intent is to remove the sign in conjunction with the removal of the temporary farmers market during off season.

Ms. Damaser inquired if the existing sandwich board sign would be removed with the approval of the proposed projecting signs.

Mr. Condo responded that the sandwich board sign is not compliant with Code, so it would need either to become Code compliant or be removed.

Discussion continued concerning either adding a second condition for removal of the non-compliant, existing sandwich board sign or requesting the applicant's confirmation of agreement to remove said sign with approval and installation of the projecting signs.

Applicant Presentation

Margie Hegg, president, American Sign Studio, 670 Lakeview Plaza Blvd., Worthington, stated the sandwich board was not part of the sign package discussed with DIG insurance. They were surprised at its presence this week. The insurance company owner has been asked, and she has agreed, to remove the sandwich board sign upon approval of this application.

Board Questions for the Applicant

Mr. Cotter inquired if the applicant had any objection to the proposed condition regarding installation of the sign bracket.

Ms. Hegg responded that they had no objection. It is consistent with their usual installation practices.

Board consensus was not to add another condition concerning removal of the noncompliant sandwich board sign, with confirmation from the applicant's representative that said sign would be removed upon installation of the projecting signs.

Ms. Hegg acknowledged the intent and confirmed that removal of the sign would occur.

Ms. Damaser moved, Ms. Cooper seconded approval of the Minor Project with 1 condition:

- 1) That the applicant mount the sign bracket in the closest mortar joints, relative to the approved location rather than drilling directly into the east stone façade in order to preserve the historic fabric of the building.

Vote: Mr. Jewell, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Ms. Patt-McDaniel, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Ms. Damaser, yes.
[Motion carried 5-0.]

DISCUSSION ITEM

- **Case #24-012-ADMC - Historic District Code and Guidelines Update – Phase II**

Proposal for amendments to the Historic District Zoning Code and amendments to the Historic District Guidelines.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Holt stated that Max Merritt, McBride Dale Clarion, consultant, is present to assist with the presentation and provide responses, if needed. Last year, Phase I of a Historic District Code and Guidelines update was reviewed and recommended by the ARB for City Council for approval. Council approved that Code update on December 11, 2023. During that Phase I review, the suggestion was made to increase the types of Administrative Approvals (AAs) and to provide Background Building guidance in the Code and Guidelines. Staff has pursued those additional changes for a subsequent Phase 2 update of the Code and Guidelines. Preliminary draft Code and Guidelines language has been provided to the Board for consideration tonight. This draft language will be revised to incorporate the Board's feedback, and the Board will review a revised draft at their July 24 meeting. The intent is that a final draft will be provided to the Board for adoption at their August meeting.

Ms. Holt stated that at their April 2024 meeting, the Board agreed to expand AAs for certain project types, and draft Code language, 153.176(N) has been prepared, which provides the following:

- Clarification that the Board may delegate various AAs to the Director.
- A clause that provides criteria for "bumping up" an application for review by the ARB. Either staff or the applicant may request an application to be "bumped up."
- A statement that projects not clearly designated for administrative review shall be heard by the Board.
- Clarifications to existing AA reviews.
- Proposal to add the following AAs:
 - Lighting that conforms to the regulations;
 - Residential hardscape less than three feet tall;
 - Commercial landscapes that conform to the regulations and are not associated with other requests;
 - Single signs that conform to the regulations;
 - Background building changes for windows, doors, or roofing;
 - Replacement awnings; new awnings require Board review of a Minor Project;
 - Commercial outdoor furniture;
 - HVAC/equipment screening that does not materially change the architecture.

Also at that April meeting, the Board confirmed Background Building guidance should include maintaining neighborhood setbacks, roof heights, massing, and similar forms and fenestration to ensure compatibility, while allowing more flexibility with specific architectural details. The draft Code includes broad applicability language for Background Buildings, and the Guidelines provide parameters for Background Buildings adjacent to Landmark Buildings and Background Buildings that are surrounded by other Background Buildings, specifically:

- Section 3.3 discusses the importance of general design elements, such as height, setbacks, massing, roof shape, etc., and notes that adjacency to Landmark resources warrants a higher level of evaluation (supported in Section 3.4).
- Section 4.12 notes that Background Buildings may have additions at the rear or side, provided the basic factors (height, setbacks, roof form, etc.) are met.
- Section 5.0 clarifies that Background Buildings focus on height, massing, setbacks, etc. as previously noted.
- Section 6.0 again notes that Section 3.4 is the guiding principal.

Other clarifications have been added, including:

- Adding doors and garage doors into the window section, Code 153.174(D), where these previously were not mentioned, and clarifying these apply to Landmark Buildings.
- Clarifying that commercial landscapes require a Minor Project (MP) approval.
- Explaining that maintenance, repair, or adjustment of historic walls require a MP approval.
- Clarifying that preliminary and final plats in the Architectural Review District require a recommendation from ARB prior to going to the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) and City Council.

Ms. Holt stated that Staff also requests the Board to consider the recent Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA) variance requests for 17 and 27 N. Riverview Street. BZA is not generally aware of Historic Dublin Zoning Code and Guideline requirements that additions cannot be placed in front of historic houses, and it was challenging for them to weigh the ARB's stated support for the variances against the strict interpretation of the Code. It also required the applicant to submit a separate application and attend the meeting of another review Board. Staff has questioned whether BZA is the right body for considering ARB variances. Originally, under the Bridge Street District Code and prior to 2021, ARB had sole purview over Historic District variances, and there were no numeric limits to waivers.

She noted that the following questions have been provided to facilitate the Board's discussion tonight:

- 1) Is the administrative approval language supported by the Board?
- 2) Are the Background Building discussion points (Code and Guidelines) appropriate?
- 3) What are the Board's thoughts about variance review:
 - a. Should this purview stay with BZA?
 - b. Consider a two-tier system of numeric waivers, administered by Architectural Review Board. What would the additional requirements entail?
 - c. Should ARB waivers not have a cap?
- 4) Other considerations by the Board.

Board Questions/Discussion

Ms. Patt-McDaniel inquired if a summary report of the AAs made by staff and the Director is forwarded to the Board.

Ms. Holt responded affirmatively. Quarterly reports are provided to the Board, and the Board is invited to share any questions or concerns with staff concerning those AAs.

Ms. Patt-McDaniel inquired if the approvals of those applications are delayed until the Board has reviewed them.

Ms. Holt responded that they are not delayed. The AAs are provided based on staff's reviews against the Code and Guideline requirements. The Board receives the application materials with a cover memo explaining the reasons for the case's approval. The Board is encouraged to share any concerns or comments with staff, albeit after the fact.

Ms. Damaser stated that the Board's subsequent comments would be for the benefit of future AA projects rather than to retrofit those already approved.

Ms. Holt stated that the current Code permits 11 AA opportunities. Staff is suggesting an increase to 19 AA opportunities. If those opportunities were increased, the case reviewed earlier tonight could have been reviewed and approved administratively. It is easier for all parties, enables the volume of applications to move more efficiently, and allows the Board to focus on the larger projects.

Mr. Jewell noted that applications concerning awning replacements have been added to the list of AAs, per an earlier suggestion by Ms. Cooper.

Ms. Cooper stated that she would be supportive of keeping any applications regarding massing with the Board.

Ms. Holt responded that the item added to AAs would be specifically applications for "replacement" of existing awnings for residential and commercial buildings and uses that conform to all regulations. It is presumed existing awnings have already been approved. New awnings would be reviewed by the Board.

Ms. Damaser stated that clarifying language that the existing awnings must conform to all regulations is important. An application to replace any non-conforming awning should be reviewed by the Board, not staff.

The Board had no objection to the proposed increase in AAs from 11 to 19 project types.

Board members reviewed the proposed amendments to the Background Building language in the Code and Guidelines, which address the height, setbacks, massing, roof shape, fenestration, eaves, and building overhangs, from the perspective of the buildings on Franklin and S. Riverview Streets that are now classified as background.

Mr. Cotter inquired if in addition to windows and doors, language has been added to address replacement of siding materials with like-for-like materials for Background Buildings.

Ms. Holt responded that language has been added to both the draft Code and the Guidelines addressing the preference for replacing with historic materials, as appropriate. For Landmark Buildings, the Code requires the use of historic material. Any proposals that would require Code waivers must be heard by the Board.

Ms. Holt noted that the draft language is a tiered approach. It addresses potential projects on Franklin Street, where all the buildings are now classified as Background Buildings versus S. Riverview, where the Background Buildings exist next to Landmark Buildings.

Mr. Cotter referred to p. 48 of the Guidelines, noting that it is preferable to provide clarity that new buildings adjacent to Landmark Buildings will be subject to a greater degree of expectations.

Mr. Cotter requested that the Board members provide their views on variance reviews. He watched the May BZA meeting and recognized that the Board was attempting to understand why an addition could not be added to the front elevation of the existing building. Because BZA is not familiar with the Historic District Code, it was a challenge for them.

Ms. Patt-McDaniel requested some background on the variance case heard by BZA.

Ms. Holt described the 17 and 27 N. Riverview Street cases, 2 City properties that were auctioned and are now being renovated by the new owner. The applicant was requesting a greater building footprint and lot coverage than permitted by Code. The homes are zoned HR-Historic Residential and are surrounded on 2 sides by HC-Historic Core, which permits a greater building footprint and lot coverage. Due to some easement issues, the applicant requested greater square footage than the ARB is authorized to grant. Consequently, the applicant was required to submit an additional application for a Code variance from the BZA. In anticipation of that, the ARB expressed support for the applicant pursuing the variance from BZA. The applicant was granted the variance from the BZA, but the BZA was not comfortable making the decision without full understanding and independence. BZA did not believe there was sufficient clarity as to the reason the additional variance from BZA was necessary in addition to the waiver the applicant had received for the building footprint and lot coverage from ARB.

Ms. Patt-McDaniel requested clarity concerning the change that staff is proposing.

Ms. Holt responded that, currently, ARB can make waivers of up to 20% of the Code. The change would require additional steps for obtaining an amount in excess of the Code allowance.

Ms. Damaser stated that the question is whether the next step should be with BZA, as it is now, or with ARB. She inquired why there was no cap on the waiver amount that ARB could grant prior to 2021.

Ms. Holt responded that she is not aware of the reason the waiver cap was adopted. However, there was a reason it was implemented, and we do not want to revert the situation to what it was with the previous Code.

Ms. Damaser stated that she does not believe a 20% waiver should always be granted, only if there is a substantial reason. Certainly, she does not believe amounts exceeding 20% should be granted without proving need and justification, but all waivers to the Historic District Code should be granted only by the ARB, not the BZA. The BZA is not more expert in that particular Code than the ARB.

Ms. Cooper expressed agreement. She served on the BZA for 6 years and can vouch for their expertise in reviewing the cases; however, the Historic District is a highly specialized area. She is not convinced a 2-tiered system of numeric waivers is the solution. The extenuating circumstances (such as location of the house on the lot) associated with 17 and 27 N. Riverview were the reason a waiver of a greater amount was deemed justified.

[Discussion continued regarding sample criteria for waiver amounts exceeding 20%.]

Mr. Jewell stated that the need to provide justification for a waiver exceeding 20% would not be dissimilar from the current process for an applicant to submit an application responsive to several criteria in order to seek permission for demolition from the ARB.

Ms. Patt-McDaniel expressed support for keeping the 20% cap. It should not be greater than 20%, because of the potentially negative impact on the Historic District. However, for cases of extenuating

circumstances (staff can provide examples), a request could be submitted for a greater amount. Staff could guide an applicant to make the request only in those cases where the Board might consider a larger amount to be justified.

Mr. Jewell stated that he is supportive of retaining the 20% cap, as that cap has worked well for ARB in the past. He also believes consideration of waivers for greater amounts than 20% should not be within the purview of BZA.

Mr. Cotter summarized the Board's consensus to retain the 20% waiver cap. The Board also might approve amounts greater than 20% (unsure if that should be identified as a waiver or a variance) if certain criteria are met. There must be clarity as to the reasons granting it might be appropriate. He inquired if that change could be incorporated into this Phase 2 Code revision.

Ms. Holt responded affirmatively. Draft language will be provided for the Board to consider at their July 24 meeting.

Mr. Cotter suggested that members forward any additional comments/suggestions to staff for their preparation for the July meeting. A recommendation of approval to Council is anticipated at the August ARB meeting.

Ms. Cooper requested a printed copy of the draft Code language for her review.

COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Holt reminded Board members of the Brown-Harris Cemetery Dedication on Friday, June 28, at 11:00 am. Members of the Brown and Harris families will be present.

Mr. Jewell stated that Board members received an email from City I.T. staff informing them of a software update necessary for City-issued devices running old software. Board members were advised to bring their devices to the City Service desk, so they could be updated. I.T. staff did not indicate how long the update would take.

Ms. Cooper stated that she contacted the I.T. department and was advised that board members should relocate any documents they wish to retain, as their City devices would be "scrubbed."

The next regular ARB meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, July 24, 2024, 6:30 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:50 p.m.



Chair, Architectural Review Board



Assistant Clerk of Council