

Parcel 273-000054 **Address** 35 N High St **OHI** N/A

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| Year Built: 1955 | Map No: 116 | Photo No: 1783-1786 (7/10/16) |
| Theme: Commercial | Historic Use: Commercial | Present Use: Commercial |
| Style: Vernacular | Foundation: Concrete Block | Wall Type: Concrete Block |
| Roof Type: Gable/hipped/asphalt shingle | Exterior Wall: Brick/concrete block | Symmetry: No |
| Stories: 1 | Front Bays: 4 | Side Bays: - |
| Porch: Flat roof on southeast corner of south elevation and masonry patio east of building | Chimney: None visible | Windows: Fixed frame display windows and casements |

Description: The one-story restaurant building has an irregular footprint with an L-plan cross-gable core and rear additions. The building is constructed of concrete block, with brick veneer on the façade and south elevation. A flat roof porch extends across the southeast corner of the building. The façade entrance is sheltered within the porch. Windows on the building are fixed single lights and casements.

Setting: The building is located on the west side of N High St within in the old village center of Dublin. The building has a deep set-back and a masonry patio extends between it and the streetside.

Condition: Good

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

Integrity Notes: The building has fair integrity, as the rear addition appears to meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation.

Historical Significance: The building is within the boundaries of the City of Dublin’s local Historic Dublin district, and is recommended contributing to both the local district, and 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:** N/A



35 N High St, looking southwest



35 N High St, looking northeast



BOARD ORDER

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, December 14, 2022 | 6:30 pm

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

2. Tucci's at 35 N. High Street 22-155FDP

Final Development Plan

Proposal: Construction of three building additions at an existing restaurant on a 0.23-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic Core.

Location: Northwest of the intersection of N. High Street with Wing Hill Lane.

Request: Review and approval of a Final Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.176 and the *Historic Design Guidelines*.

Applicants: John Fleming, Lai Architects

Planning Contact: Sarah Tresouthick Holt, AICP, ASLA, Senior Planner

Contact Information: 614.410.4662, sholt@dublin.oh.us

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/22-155

MOTION 1: 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: 5 – 0

RESULT: The Roof Pitch Waiver for the Wine Room was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

| | |
|----------------|-----|
| Gary Alexander | Yes |
| Sean Cotter | Yes |
| Martha Cooper | Yes |
| Michael Jewell | Yes |
| Hilary Damaser | Yes |

MOTION 2: Mr. Cotter moved and Ms. Cooper seconded, to approve the Established Size Waiver:

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: 0 – 5

RESULT: The Established Size Waiver was disapproved.



**2. Tucci’s at 35 N. High Street
22-155FDP**

Final Development Plan

RECORDED VOTES:

| | |
|----------------|----|
| Gary Alexander | No |
| Sean Cotter | No |
| Martha Cooper | No |
| Michael Jewell | No |
| Hilary Damaser | No |

MOTION 3: Mr. Jewell moved and Ms. Damaser seconded, to approve the Roof Pitch Waiver for the Kitchen/Mechanical 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 kitchen/mechanical addition.

VOTE: 0 – 5

RESULT: The Roof Pitch Waiver for the Kitchen/Mechanical Room was disapproved.

RECORDED VOTES:

| | |
|----------------|----|
| Gary Alexander | No |
| Sean Cotter | No |
| Martha Cooper | No |
| Michael Jewell | No |
| Hilary Damaser | No |

MOTION 4: 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.



**2. Tucci's at 35 N. High Street
22-155FDP**

Final Development Plan

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

VOTE: 5 – 0

RESULT: The Final Development Plan - Exhibit B was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

| | |
|----------------|-----|
| Gary Alexander | Yes |
| Sean Cotter | Yes |
| Martha Cooper | Yes |
| Michael Jewell | Yes |
| Hilary Damaser | Yes |

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:

Sarah T. Holt

89A2805342A848D...
Sarah Tresouthick Holt, AICP, ASLA
Senior Planner



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



City of Dublin

Land Use and Long Range Planning

5800 Shier Rings Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236

Phone 614.410.4600
fax 614.410.4747

www.dublinohio.us

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

BOARD ORDER

FEBRUARY 27, 2013

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

1. BSC Historic Core District – Tucci’s Restaurant – Signs
13-011ARB-MPR

35 N. High Street
Minor Project Review

Proposal: Installation of an eight-square-foot ground sign along North High Street, an eight-square-foot wall sign facing North High Street, and an eight-square-foot wall sign facing Darby Street for a restaurant within the Bridge Street District located on the west side of North High Street at the intersection with Wing Hill.

Request: Review and approval of a minor project application under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.066(G), 153.170 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Applicant: Craig Barnum, Tucci’s Restaurant; represented by Larry Lab, Morrison Sign Company

Planning Contacts: Rachel Ray, AICP, Planner II and Jennifer Rauch, AICP, Planner II

Contact Information: (614) 410-4656, rray@dublin.oh.us and (614) 410-4690, jrauch@dublin.oh.us

MOTION: Tasha Bailey made a motion, seconded by Bob Dyas, to approve the following Minor Project Review with two site plan waivers and one condition:

Recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board as submitted, with two site plan waivers:

- 1) The wall sign facing Darby Street be permitted to be located further from the common public entrance than the 6 feet required by Zoning Code Section 153.065(H)(7).
- 2) The ground sign along North High Street be permitted to encroach the minimum setback of 8 feet from the right-of-way required by Zoning Code Section 153.065(H)(7).

And one condition:

- 1) The applicant select appropriate lighting for the wall sign facing Darby Street, subject to Planning approval, prior to approval of a sign permit.

VOTE: 5 – 0.

RESULT: This Minor Project Review application was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

| | |
|-----------------|-----|
| Robert Schisler | Yes |
| Bob Dyas | Yes |
| Tom Currie | Yes |
| Tasha Bailey | Yes |
| William Souders | Yes |



STAFF CERTIFICATION

Jennifer M. Rauch, AICP
Planner II

Prior To Construction
READ ALL PERMIT CONDITIONS
AND/OR NOTES ON APPROVED PLANS