



MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, April 23, 2025

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Cotter, Chair, called the April 23, 2025 Architectural Review Board (ARB) meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. in Council Chamber, 5555 Perimeter Drive. He welcomed everyone and stated that the livestream video of the meeting can also be accessed at the City's website. Public comments on the cases are welcome from both in-person meeting attendees and those viewing at the City's website. He reviewed the meeting procedures for meeting attendees.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. Cotter led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Board members present:	Sean Cotter, Martha Cooper, Hilary Damaser, Michael Jewell
Board members absent:	Lisa Patt-McDaniel
Staff members present:	Sarah Holt, Rati Singh

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Cotter moved, Ms. Cooper seconded acceptance of the documents into the record and approval of the January 29, 2025 meeting minutes.

Vote: Ms. Damaser, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Mr. Jewell, yes.
[Motion carried 4-0]

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 #25-023INF
16 N. High Street
Informal Review

Request for review and non-binding feedback for building and site modifications. The 0.26-acre site is zoned HD-HC, Historic Core District and is located at 16 N. High Street.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Singh stated that this is a request for an informal review of site and building modifications. The 0.26 site is located at the northeast corner of North High Street and Eastwood Street and is zoned Historic District, Historic Core (HD-HC) with HD-HC to the north, south and west of the property. Historic Residential is on the east side across Blacksmith Lane. The site consists of two buildings, both of which are listed on the National Register of Historic Places. 16 N. High Street was built around 1843 and was originally built as a single-family home with a rectangular footprint and a two-story core. There are two gable wall dormers on the façade and the building uses limestone and standing seam metal roof. There are no modifications proposed to the building located at 22 N. High Street. [Photos of existing conditions shared.] The Board provided non-binding feedback in 2023 for a three-story mixed-use addition and demolition of the existing outbuilding and shed. A Concept Plan was approved in 2024 followed by an Informal Review of massing and form. Tonight, the applicant is requesting informal review of the proposed site improvements and modifications to accommodate a restaurant use. The applicant proposes to remove vehicular access from N. High Street and create a pedestrian path between 16 and 22 N. High Street. Also included is the resurface and restripe of the surface parking lot, which includes the addition of one area parking space as well as cleaning and enclosing the openings of the existing outbuilding that faces Blacksmith Lane. There is an addition of a dumpster enclosure behind 16 N. High Street. There are additional modifications proposed, including the removal of an unapproved HVAC unit, additional seating, umbrellas and planters to the front patio and the installation of a screen to the exhaust hood. Also proposed is bicycle parking between the buildings. Based on calculations, Code would require 20 parking spaces including one ADA space for the current use. The applicant is providing three onsite parking spaces including the ADA space and the rest will be offsite. Code says that if parking is provided offsite, it requires the public parking to be located within 600 feet.

The following discussion questions have been provided to guide the Board's discussion:

- 1) Would the Board support an off-site Parking Plan?
- 2) Does the Board support the site improvements (pedestrian walkway, enclosing the outbuilding's openings, location of bike parking, and the location and the size of the dumpster) as shown?
- 3) Does the Board support the proposed screening for the exhaust hood, or recommend any alternatives?
- 4) Other considerations by the Board.

Mr. Cotter asked how the City is looking at parking holistically. Ms. Holt stated that the Transportation and Mobility Department has been working on a curbside management project. She has worked with them on that. A comprehensive survey of parking spaces has been done so that the City has exact numbers. As part of that survey, they were able to monitor when each space and structure was used throughout the day. The data shows there is ample parking within the Historic District. That information can be included once this moves to the Minor Project Review stage.

Ms. Damaser asked if ARB could receive a report on the curbside management project. Ms. Holt committed to adding that to the OnBoard library.

Ms. Cotter stated that pedestrian and vehicle interaction must be well thought out. Ms. Holt agreed.

Ms. Cooper asked for the time frame during which parking was studied. Ms. Holt stated that counts were taken at every hour of every day over a period of 18 months. It was not a single point in time.

Applicant Presentation

Eliza Ho, Tim Lai Architect, 400 W. Rich Street, Suite 233, Columbus, stated that this project was brought to the board in 2023 as a much larger proposal with a mixed use building at the back of the site. At this time, the property owner wants to really focus on renovation of the front building. The concept the owner is trying to bring to Historic Dublin is fast casual Asian-style cuisine. The building footprint is small at only 1,600 square feet. The owner envisions that most of the business will be takeout. The patio on the east side will have tables and chairs. When they come back with an application for Minor Project Review (MPR), they will present renderings that show the seating layout. The owner has been working to rectify things that were not done properly. The Board has recognized the desire for Historic Dublin to be very walkable and by turning the existing driveway into a walkway, they are trying to address that.

Board Questions

Mr. Cotter asked about the trash enclosure placement. Ms. Ho stated that they envisioned that the trash truck would come from Blacksmith Lane, and this would be the most convenient location. The owner contacted the refuse collection company, and the frequency of pickup is once per week.

Ms. Cooper asked about moving the dumpster location closer to the existing garage. Perhaps that would be better visually from Blacksmith Lane and still accessible for the truck. She stated that she realizes there are mature trees there but that seems like a more concealed location. Ms. Ho stated they would have to study more that further and speak to the trash company. If there are other possible locations, they would definitely consider them. Mr. Jewell stated that there is a significant grade change on the lot. He also noted that the existing trees there are not being removed.

Mr. Cotter summarized by suggesting the applicant conceal the dumpster more if possible.

Ms. Damaser referenced the pocket park behind the garage and the pedestrian path and asked if there are plans to make it more obvious. Ms. Ho stated that in the first phase of the project, the intent is to keep it as is including the existing topography.

Mr. Cotter referenced the garage and asked why they chose to enclose rather than demolish the structure. Ms. Ho stated that in the first phase of the project, the goal is not to alter but stabilize the back of the site. Once the restaurant is established and successful, there will be additional improvements in Phase 2.

Ms. Damaser thanked the applicant for including the stabilization in this phase.

In response to questions as to whether the structure will be secured as well as stabilized, Ms. Ho answered affirmatively.

Mr. Cotter summarized that the Board is in support of the enclosure of the fan.

Ms. Cooper sought confirmation that the air conditioning unit will be moved. Ms. Ho stated that it will be relocated.

Board Discussion

Mr. Cotter referenced the discussion questions for Board feedback. Consensus was support for an off-site parking plan.

Mr. Jewell stated that the dumpster could be relocated in Phase 2.

Mr. Cotter stated that the Board is happy with the pedestrian walkway and the removal of the air conditioning unit.

As the case was an Informal Review requesting Board input only, no Board action was taken.

Public Comment

There was no public comment on the case.

Case #24-130MPR

48 S. High Street

Minor Project Review

Request for review and approval of Minor Project Review to allow for facade modifications to a Landmark Building. The 0.25-acre site is zoned HD-HS, Historic South District and is located at 48 S. High Street.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Singh stated that this is a request for a MPR at 48 South High Street for façade improvements. The 0.25-acre site is located at the southeast corner at the intersection of South High Street and Spring Hill Lane. It is zoned Historic District—Historic South and is surrounded by Historic South to the west and south, Historic Core to the north, and Historic Residential to the east. The applicant requested an informal review earlier this year, at which the Board provided non-binding feedback, including recommending that the design be vernacular and simple in approach and the applicant consider working with a preservation architect. The applicant has worked with a preservation architect and has modified the design to ensure that it aligns with historic photos. The property consists of two adjacent buildings located at 48 and 50 South High Street. The structures were added to the National Register of Historic Places in 1979. Currently, access to the first floor of 48 South High Street is via the rear of the building (Blacksmith Lane). There is no access to the first floor of the building from South High Street. The proposal will enable the first-floor pedestrian access from South High Street. Ms. Singh displayed historic photos of the site showing that the main entrance originally faced North High Street. The proposed improvements include removing the two bay windows and reestablishing an earlier door location as well as a new storefront window where an older window once existed. Following feedback received at the informal review, the applicant has simplified the architectural features in comparison to previously proposed historical elements. The applicant is proposing cedar shake shingles above the window and door. Staff recommends that a smooth MDF panel should be installed above those so that it does not look like an add-on. This is included as a condition of approval. The applicant plans to adjust the location of the awnings so that all three are in the same line from the bottom. The existing door awning is pre-



RECORD OF ACTION

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, July 24, 2024 | 6:30 pm

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

**1. 16-22 N. High Street
24-091INF**

Informal Review

Proposal: Informal review and feedback prior to the Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) application for the construction of a new mixed-use building in the Historic District.

Location: Approximately 70 feet northeast of the intersection of North High Street and East Bridge Street.

Request: Informal review and feedback for a mixed-use addition.

Applicants: Joe Tripicone, Tripicone + Associates

Planning Contact: Rati Singh, Assoc. AIA, Planner I

Contact Information: 614.410.4533, rsingh@dublin.oh.us

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/24-091

RESULT: The Board concurred that progress had been made on the massing and form of the proposed mixed-use infill building at the rear of the lot. The next step is submission of Preliminary Development Plan.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Lisa Patt-McDaniel	Yes
Sean Cotter	Yes
Martha Cooper	Yes
Michael Jewell	Yes
Hilary Damaser	Absent

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Signed by:

Rati Singh

70CC202EC2BC4C5...
Rati Singh, Assoc. AIA, Planner I





MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, July 24, 2024

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Cotter, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and welcomed everyone to the July 24, 2024 Architectural Review Board. He stated that the meeting is held in the 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 at the City's website. He reviewed the meeting procedures.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. Cotter led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

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

Board members absent: Hilary Damaser

Staff members present: Sarah Holt, Bassem Bitar, Rati Singh, Taylor Mullinax, Michael Hiatt

~~ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES~~

~~Mr. Cotter moved, Mr. Jewell seconded acceptance of the documents into the record and approval of the June 26, 2024 meeting minutes.~~

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

~~[Motion carried 4-0]~~

~~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 #24-091INF – Informal Review - 16-22 N. High Street, Informal Review**

Informal review and feedback prior to the Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) application for the construction of a new mixed-use building in the Historic District. The 0.26-acre site is zoned HD-HC, Historic Core District, and is located approximately 70 feet northeast of the intersection of North High Street and East Bridge Street.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Singh stated that this is a request for an Informal Review of the proposed construction of a new mixed-use building at 16-22 N. High Street. Per the Historic Code, any development over 3,000 SF involves a 3-step process; the Informal Review is an optional step. At any stage of the process, the applicant may request an Informal Review for the purpose of obtaining additional feedback from the Board. Tonight, the applicant is requesting an additional Informal Review prior to submitting a Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) application. No determination is required with an Informal Review. The 0.26-acre site is zoned HD-HC, Historic Core District, and is located approximately 70 feet northeast of the intersection of North High Street and East Bridge Street. Historic Core is located to the north and south of this site; Historic Residential is located to the east, across N. Blacksmith Lane.). The lot contains two structures: 16 N. High Street and 22 N. High Street, and a concrete drive between the buildings. A surface parking lot to the rear (east) of the property is accessible from N. Blacksmith Lane. There is an attached existing dirt-floor shed at the rear of 22 N. High Street and an unusable, dilapidated outbuilding facing N. Blacksmith Lane.

In February 2024, the Board approved a Demolition for an existing shed and outbuilding and approved the Concept Plan (CP) for construction of a two-story, mixed-use building at the rear of the site with five conditions, which are listed in the staff report. Both 22 N. High Street and 16 N. High Street are listed individually in the National Register of Historic Places as Dr. Llewellyn McKittrick's office and house, respectively. 22 N. High Street was built circa 1900. The Queen Anne-style building has a rectilinear footprint, a hipped-roof core, and a cross-gable over a bay window on the front façade. The structure has original wood siding and a standing seam metal roof. The structure's historic use was a doctor's office, and the current use is commercial. 16 N. High Street was built in 1843. The stone building has a rectilinear footprint with a two-story core and a one-story frame addition spanning the width of the rear elevation. The side-gable roof is sheathed in standing seam metal and pierced by two gable wall dormers on the façade. Two doors serve as separate business entries on the façade. Most windows are two-over-two wood sashes, except in the dormers, which are one-over-one. The structure's historic use was a single-family home, and currently, the property is vacant. Both structures have distinct architectural styles, forms and materials.

Ms. Singh stated that the applicant proposes constructing a three-story mixed-use building at the rear, northeast corner of the site with vehicular access from N. Blacksmith Lane. The CP was approved with conditions earlier this year. At the CP review, the Board and staff expressed concerns about the form and monotony of the façade. The applicant was required to address the form and massing at the PDP and establish a pedestrian connection between this building and N. Blacksmith Lane. The applicant proposes two massing studies for the Board and requests feedback. The proposed massing studies display a reduced mass on the second floor and different options (A and B) for roof variations. The applicant has removed the symmetrical double gables and lowered the height of the second floor, which previously made it look like a 2.5-story building. As the Board supported the flat roof, the proposed roof forms now combine flat roofs with different gable styles. A colonnaded terrace wraps around the building's south side, and a terrace on the north side helps balance the overall structure. A pedestrian connection is proposed along the south facade. This will establish the future pedestrian corridor between N. High Street and N. Blacksmith Lane, further promoting a walkable environment within the District. With the CP approval, the building height at the rear of the building was 20 feet at the front gable. The applicant has provided additional information on the building height after this meeting packet was published. The approximate

building height facing N. High Street is 25 feet. At the rear, the proposed height is 32-35 feet, which is measured from the finished floor level to the middle of the ridge. A waiver will be required with the PDP if the height exceeds 30 feet. Therefore, staff would request the Board to provide feedback on the proposed building height in addition to the massing studies.

Tonight, there are two massing studies, A and B, on which the applicant is seeking feedback relative to the conditions of approval. The following discussion questions are provided for the Board's consideration:

- 1) Does the Board support either of the proposed Massing Studies?
- 2) Does the Board support the reduced scale, mass, and form of the front façade?
- 3) Does the Board support the proposed street edge at N. Blacksmith Lane?
- 4) Does the Board support the colonnaded building edge on the south façade and the established pedestrian corridor character?
- 5) Any other considerations by the Board?

Questions for Staff

Ms. Cooper inquired what the adjusted heights are in each of the massing studies.

Ms. Singh responded that information was submitted after the packets were published. The front height is approximately 25 feet and the rear height is between 32 and 35 feet on both massing studies.

Applicant Presentation

Anne Adams, 3989 Broadway, Grove City and Joe Trepicone, architect, 600 Stone Hedge Parkway, Dublin, were present.

Mr. Trepicone stated that even though the Concept Plan was approved, they did not receive solid positive feedback on the architectural massing; therefore, they knew the plan could be improved. They decided to revise the CP, incorporating all of the Board's earlier comments. They removed a floor from the top of the building and, even though it's not typical for Dublin, they included a flat roof. They have provided exterior spaces, including a pocket park, patio and a walkway that connects Blacksmith Lane to High Street. He pointed out that there is a 12-foot grade change from High Street to Blacksmith Lane, so there is a significant difference between the height of the front and rear of the building. In his measurements, he used the worst case scenario, which would be the highest point on the High Street side and the lowest point on the Blacksmith Lane side. That is the reason for the height discrepancy.

Questions for the Applicant

Mr. Cotter stated that the applicant has incorporated many of the changes the Board had suggested at the previous meeting. He appreciates the changes made.

Ms. Adams stated that they attempted to connect the interior to the exterior space in a way that would provide restaurant patrons the opportunity to enjoy both.

Mr. Jewell referred to the roof difference between Massing Study A and Massing Study B. Did they lose or gain anything with the difference made? Is it exposed on the interior?

Mr. Trepicone stated that, personally, he prefers the straight gable end of Massing Study A. The difference reflects their attempt to lower the roof height by 3-4 feet. They did not want to risk having the project disapproved because it was a couple of feet too high.

Ms. Cooper stated that she also prefers Massing Study A. She noted that although she was not present at the previous hearing, the minutes reflected the need to address the trash collection and access. The intent was that the greenspace be expanded between the historic portion and the new construction.

Ms. Adams responded that they met with the City Engineer. Per his direction, they have located the trash so that the trash collector can drive straight in, grab the trash, and back straight out. They have expanded the proposed greenspace.

Mr. Trepicone stated that the Board's decision to allow elimination of the awkwardly situated parking spaces with difficult access allowed them to be replaced with a pocket park.

Ms. Adams stated that where the shed is currently located, there will be greenspace, which will extend all the way to the walkway between the two buildings. The dumpster is in the location shown on the drawing and will be enclosed for aesthetic purposes. The Engineer has indicated that the access on Blacksmith Lane could be curved to allow ease of access for the trash truck.

Ms. Holt reminded the Board that this review is of the building massing only. Trash, parking and other issues will be addressed with the PDP.

Ms. Patt-McDaniel stated that she believes the roof in Massing Study A better reflects the front of the building and is reminiscent of what already exists. The flat roof does not. She believes achieving architectural flow and connection is more important than reducing the height.

Mr. Cotter inquired if the pedestrian path would be a 3-foot wide, paved pathway.

Mr. Trepicone responded that the path would be 36-38 inches in width. On the south side of the property, a stone dry-laid wall extends over the property line. To achieve the required 23-foot length for the pathway, they will need to use a small amount of that property width.

Mr. Cotter stated that he slightly prefers Option B, but believes either option would be acceptable.

Board Discussion

Mr. Cotter inquired if Board members had any feedback/comments to share related to the Discussion Questions provided.

Board members indicated that they had no objection to the revised massing options. The majority of members expressed a preference for Massing Study A.

Ms. Cooper noted that a pathway width of 36 inches is the minimum required for ADA accessibility. Mr. Trepicone acknowledged the comment.

Mr. Cotter stated that Option A has a consensus, and he has no objection to it. Board members indicated that they had no objections to the reduced scale, mass, and form of the front façade.

Mr. Cotter stated that a waiver will be needed for a height greater than 30 feet, so efforts should be made to keep the height as low as possible. Board members had no objection to the height being a little above 30 feet. Board members indicated support for the proposed mixed-use infill building at the rear of the lot. They also were supportive of the proposed colonnaded building edge on the south façade and the established pedestrian corridor character. Mr. Cotter stated that the trash

enclosure, pocket park and parking will be addressed at the next step, the Preliminary Development Plan (PDP).

Public Comment

No public comments on the case were received.

As the case was an Informal Review, no action was taken.

- **~~Case #24-067MPR - 110 S. Riverview Street, Minor Project Review~~**

~~Proposal for exterior modifications to an existing home in Historic Dublin. The 0.32-acre site is zoned HD-HR, Historic Residential District and is located southeast of the intersection of South Riverview Street and Pinney Hill Lane.~~

Staff Presentation

~~Ms. Mullinax stated that this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project for exterior improvements at 110 S. Riverview Street. The 0.32-acre site is located southeast of the intersection of Pinney Hill Lane and S. Riverview Street with approximately 89 feet of frontage on S. Riverview Street and the Scioto River. The site topography significantly drops moving east from S. Riverview Street towards the Scioto River. Mature trees are located within the floodplain to the rear of the property. The property is zoned HD-HR, Historic Residential District. Residences to the north, south, and west lie within the same zoning classification. On the site is an existing home with an attached 2-car, front-loaded garage. This is a request for the following exterior site improvements: additional residential parking and a driveway expansion, new deck stairs and railings, hardscaping, and fencing. Waivers to the maximum permitted lot coverage and permitted driveway material are requested. Unfortunately, some of the proposed improvements were constructed without ARB approval. If an item is not approved by the Board or the Board requests modifications, the applicant is required to remove or make the necessary adjustments per a condition of approval. There is no street parking in front of this residence on the east side of S. Riverview Street. An existing storm sewer outlet and headwall are located on the north side of the home behind the wood fence. There are limestone steps and loose limestone rock in the rear yard. Railing is proposed on the decks that are east-facing toward the Scioto River.~~

~~Ms. Mullinax reviewed the recent development history of the site. In May 2021, the Board approved demolition of a residential duplex and construction of a 3,000-square-foot single-family home. In July 2021, staff administratively approved a lot split for 110-112 S. Riverview to split the parcel into two parcels. In January 2022, staff administratively approved a 250 SF lower deck extension to the rear of the home. On the front and sides of the residence, the proposed hardscape improvements include walking paths, steps, landscape borders and a stone mailbox. A fence enclosure will be added north of the garage area, and a driveway expansion is adjacent to the existing concrete driveway. She pointed out the constructed versus non-constructed improvements. A proposed maximum lot coverage of 47.7% includes the improvements. The applicant is requesting approval of a waiver to exceed the 45% maximum lot coverage to allow an additional 374 SF of hardscape, which is necessary for another improvement. The driveway expansion does not meet several Code requirements, including the maximum lot coverage and the maximum permitted pavement at the right-of-way. There is a 3-foot setback from the side lot line for driveway pavement. Gravel is not a permitted driveway pavement material. ARB approval of a waiver to permit gravel as a driveway~~

Parcel 273-000053 **Address** 16 N High St **OHI** FRA-2519-1

Year Built: 1843	Map No: 116	Photo No: 1746-1747 (7/9/16)
Theme: Domestic	Historic Use: Single family house	Present Use: Commercial
Style: Vernacular	Foundation: Stone	Wall Type: Stone
Roof Type: Side gable/standing seam metal	Exterior Wall: Stone	Symmetry: Yes
Stories: 2	Front Bays: 4	Side Bays: 2
Porch: Patio encircled by mortared stone wall	Chimney: 2, Interior, on ridge near the north and south gable ends	Windows: 1-over-1 and 2-over-2 Wood sashes

Description: The stone building has a rectilinear footprint with a two-story core, and a one-story addition spanning the width of the rear elevation. The side-gable roof is sheathed in standing seam metal and pierced by two gable wall dormers on the façade. Two doors serve as separate business entries on the façade. The majority of windows are two-over-two wood sashes, except in the dormers, which are one-over-one.

Setting: The building is located on the east side of N High St in the old village center of Dublin. A patio in front of the building is encircled by a mortared stone wall. Neighboring buildings are from the mid-nineteenth to mid-twentieth centuries.

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 property was listed in the NRHP in 1978 as part of the Washington Township MRA nomination. It is also within the City of Dublin's local Historic Dublin district. The property 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
National Register: Washington Township
 MRA/Recommended Dublin High Street Historic District, boundary increase

Contributing Status: Recommended contributing
Property Name: Dr. McKittrick House/
 Zenus Hutchinson House



16 N High St, looking northeast



16 N High St, looking southeast

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 2519-1		2. County FRA		4. Present Name(s) ☒ CODED ☐ CODED	
3. Location of Negatives City of Dublin		5. Historic or Other Name(s) Hutchinson-McKittrick Residence			
Roll No. Picture No.(s) 2 20					
6. Specific Address or Location 16 N. High Street		16. Thematic Association(s) commercial		28. No. of Stories 1 1/2	
6a. Lot, Section or VMD Number		17. Date(s) or Period 1843		29. Basement? ☒ Yes ☐ No	
7. City or Village If Rural, Township & Vicinity Dublin		18. Style or Design vernacular ☐ High Style ☐ Elements		30. Foundation Material stone	
8. Site Plan with North Arrow BRIDGE ST HIGH ST RIVERVIEW SCIO TO RIVER		18a. Style of Addition or Elements(s)		31. Wall Construction stone ashlar	
		19. Architect or Engineer		32. Roof Type & Material gable/st. seam metal	
		19a. Design Sources		33. No. of Bays Front 4 Side 2	
		20. Contractor or Builder		34. Exterior Wall Material(s)	
		21. Building Type or Plan		35. Plan Shape rect.	
9. U.T.M. Reference Quadrangle Name NW Columbus 17 320820 4440760 Zone Easting Northing		22. Original Use, if apparent residence		36. Changes ☒ Addition ☐ Altered ☐ Moved (Explain in #42)	
10. ☐ Site ☒ Building ☐ Structure ☐ Object		23. Present Use commercial		37. Window Types ☐ 6 over 6 ☐ 4 over 4 ☒ 2 over 2 ☐ Other	
11. On National Register? Yes		12. N.R. Potential?		38. Building Dimensions	
13. Part of Estab. Hist. Dist? Yes		14. District Potential?		39. Endangered? By What? No	
15. Name of Established District (N.R. or Local) Dublin H.D. (local)		25. Owner's Name & Address, if known		40. Chimney Placement 2 end interior	
		26. Property Acreage		41. Distance from and Frontage on Road 15' 40'	
		27. Other Surveys in Which Included National Register 4/79			
42. Further Description of Important Interior and Exterior Features (Continue on reverse if necessary) This home originally consisted of a 1-1/2 story stone structure with ashlar stone walls. The gable dormers, rear addition and second doorway are later additions.					
43. History and Significance (Continue on reverse if necessary) The builder, Zenas Hutchinson, occupied and ran the tavern across the street from approximately 1835-1855. He also served as mayor of Dublin. Dr. McKittrick lived here in the early 20th century and built his office next door.					
44. Description of Environment and Outbuildings (See #52) Located close to the street with a small front yard and stone wall in front.					
45. Sources of Information OHI 9/76; Dublin Historical Society; deed records					
				46. Prepared by N. Recchie	
				47. Organization BDR&C	
				48. Date Recorded in Field 9/76	
				49. Revised by N. Recchie	
				50. Date Revised 5/03	
				50b. Reviewed by	



PHOTO

FRA -
2519-1

FRANKLIN

HUTCHINSON-MCKITTRICK RES.

16 N. High St.

Parcel 273-000053 **Address** 22 N High St **OHI** FRA-2544-1

Year Built: Ca.1900	Map No: 116	Photo No: 1748-1750 (7/9/16)
Theme: Commercial	Historic Use: Commercial	Present Use: Commercial
Style: Queen Anne	Foundation: Coursed stone	Wall Type: Frame
Roof Type: Hipped/standing seam metal	Exterior Wall: Shiplap and wood shingles	Symmetry: None
Stories: 1	Front Bays: 2	Side Bays: 6
Porch: Recessed porch with turned post and decorative frieze	Chimney: 1, Interior, off ridge on north slope	Windows: 1-over-1 and 6-over-1 Wood sashes

Description: The Queen Anne-style building has a rectilinear footprint, with a hipped-roof core expanded by a cross-gable over a canted bay window on the façade, and by a flat-roof component on the east elevation. The roof is sheathed in standing seam metal and is pierced by a brick chimney. The exterior walls are clad in shiplap siding, with decorative woodwork including frieze panels, cornice molding, and imbricated shingles. Two entrances are within a recessed porch on the façade. Both are wood paneled doors with transom lights. The porch itself has wood posts, decorative brackets/frieze, and a wrought iron railing. Windows are wood sashes, both one-over-one and six-over-one lights are present.

Setting: The building is located on the east side of N High St in the old village center of Dublin. The building is built into a slight hill, with the façade flush to the sidewalk. Neighboring buildings are from the mid-nineteenth to mid-twentieth centuries.

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 property was listed in the NRHP in 1978 as part of the Washington Township MRA nomination. It is also recommended contributing to the City of Dublin's local Historic Dublin district. The property 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
National Register: Washington Township
MRA/Recommended Dublin High
Street Historic District, boundary
increase

Contributing Status: Recommended contributing
Property Name: Dr. McKittrick's Office



22 N High St, looking southeast



22 N High St, looking northeast

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 2544-1		2.County FRA		4.Present Name(s) Tickets Galore		☒ CODED ☐ CODED		FRA-2544-1
3.Location of Negatives City of Dublin				5.Historic or Other Name(s) Dr. McKittrick's Office				
Roll No. 2		Picture No.(s) 21						
6.Specific Address or Location 22 N. High Street				16. Thematic Association(s) commercial		28. No. of Stories 1		FRANKLIN Dr. McKittrick's Office
6a. Lot, Section or VMD Number				17. Date(s) or Period c. 1900		29. Basement? ☒ Yes ☐ No		
7.City or Village If Rural, Township & Vicinity Dublin				18. Style or Design vernacular ☐ High Style ☐ Elements		30. Foundation Material coursed stone		
8. Site Plan with North Arrow 				18a. Style of Addition or Elements(s)		31. Wall Construction wood frame		
				19. Architect or Engineer		32. Roof Type & Material gable/st.seam metal		
				19a. Design Sources		33. No. of Bays Front 2 Side 5		
9. U.T.M. Reference Quadrangle Name NW Columbus 17 319850 4440780 Zone Easting Northing				22. Original Use, if apparent commercial		34. Exterior Wall Material(s) variety wood siding		
10. ☐ Site ☒ Building ☐ Structure ☐ Object				23. Present Use commercial		35. Plan Shape rect.		
11. On National Register? Yes		12. N.R. Potential?		24. Ownership ☐ Public ☒ Private		36. Changes ☒ Addition ☐ Altered ☐ Moved (Explain in #42)		
13. Part of Estab. Hist. Dist? Yes		14. District Potential?		25. Owner's Name & Address, if known		37. Window Types ☐ 6 over 6 ☐ 4 over 4 ☐ 2 over 2 ☒ Other		
15. Name of Established District (N.R. or Local) Dublin H.D. (local)				26. Property Acreage		38. Building Dimensions		
15. Name of Established District (N.R. or Local) Dublin H.D. (local)				27. Other Surveys in Which Included National Register 4/79		39. Endangered? No By What?		
42.Further Description of Important Interior and Exterior Features(Continue on reverse if necessary) Rectangular structure with projecting bay and small porch in ell; and spool-turned trim around windows, in spandrels and on porch. A rear wing and attached garage are later additions, as the original building was nearly square. One-over-one windows with several six-over-one windows in the rear part of the building.				43. History and Significance (Continue on reverse if necessary) This structure was built by Dr. Lewellyn McKittrick for his office in 1891. He lived in the house next door. In 1919, he sold both the house and office to Dr. Harry Whitaker.		40. Chimney Placement off center/roof		
44. Description of Environment and Outbuildings (See #52) Located close to the sidewalk in the center of Dublin's historic district.				45. Sources of Information OHI 8/76; Ruth Hanover, Dublin Historical Society; Shanachie Historical Magazine, Vol.II, Spring 1985,		41. Distance from and Frontage on Road		
						46. Prepared by Bassett/Recchie		
						47. Organization BDR&C		
						48. Date Recorded in Field 8/76		
						49. Revised by N.Recchie		
						50. Date Revised 4/03		
						50b. Reviewed by		



PHOTO

22 N. High



MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, February 21, 2024

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Alexander, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and welcomed everyone to the February 21, 2024 Architectural Review Board. He stated that the meeting could 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.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. Alexander led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Board members present: Sean Cotter, Hilary Damaser, Gary Alexander

Board members absent: Martha Cooper, Michael Jewell

Staff members present: Sarah Holt, Bassem Bitar, Rati Singh, Taylor Mullinax, Jane Peuser, Javon Henderson, James Condo, JM Rayburn

~~ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS & APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES~~

~~Mr. Cotter moved, Ms. Damaser seconded acceptance of the documents into the record and approval of the 01-24-2024 ARB minutes as amended.~~

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

~~[Motion carried 3-0]~~

~~Mr. Alexander 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 23-116DEMO - 119 S. High Street, Demolition~~

~~Request for demolition of an existing outbuilding located within Historic Dublin. The 0.18-acre lot is zoned HD-HS, Historic South District and is located approximately 95 feet northwest of the intersection of South High Street and John Wright Lane.~~

~~Mr. Cotter moved, Ms. Damaser seconded approval of the Minor Project with no conditions.~~

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

~~[Motion carried 3-0]~~

~~Staff indicated that the next two cases would be heard together as they are associated with the same project.~~

- **Case 23-136-DEMO - 16-22 N. High Street, Demolition**

Request for review and approval of Demolition of two background structures on an existing site in the Historic District. The 0.26-acre site is zoned HD-HC, Historic Core District, and is located approximately 65 feet northeast of the intersection of N. High Street and E. Bridge Street.

- **Case 23-135ARB-CP - 16-22 N. High Street, Concept Plan**

Request for review and approval of Concept Plan proposal for a 2-story mixed-use building in the Historic District. The 0.26-acre site is zoned HD-HC, Historic Core District, and is located approximately 65 feet northeast of the intersection of N. High Street and E. Bridge Street.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Singh stated that this is a request for review of two related applications. The first request is for the demolition of two existing background structures at 16 and 22 N. High Street, and the second request is for review and approval of a Concept Plan for the site. The site contains two structures: 16 N. High Street and 22 N. High Street with a concrete drive between the buildings. A surface parking lot to the rear (east) of the property is accessible from N. Blacksmith Lane. There is an attached existing dirt floor shed at the rear of 22 N. High Street and an unusable, dilapidated outbuilding facing N. Blacksmith Lane. Both 22 N. High Street and 16 N. High Street are listed in the National Register of Historic Places as Dr. Llewellyn McKittrick's office and house, respectively. 22 N. High Street was built circa 1900. The Queen Anne-style building has a rectilinear footprint, a hipped-roof core, and a cross-gable over a bay window on the front façade. The structure has original wood siding and a standing seam metal roof. The structure's historic use was a doctor's office, and the current use is commercial. 16 N. High Street was built in 1843. The stone building has a rectilinear footprint with a two-story core and a one-story frame addition spanning the width of the rear elevation. The vacant building has a side gable roof sheathed in standing seam metal and pierced by two gable wall dormers on the façade.

Ms. Singh stated that there have been several Minor Review Project applications for improvements on this site. Most recently, the Board provided non-binding feedback for an Informal Review proposal on November 15, 2023. The Board expressed concerns about the massing, siting and the proposed materials. Since then, staff and the applicant have worked together and attempted to address those concerns. A massing study was provided in the meeting packet. Ms. Singh reviewed the existing site conditions. The two buildings, 16 N. High Street and 22 N. High Street, face N. High Street and have a total existing footprint of approximately 2,500 square feet. There is a drop in grade from the west to the east of the site. The rear of the site is wooded, with an 800 square-foot, 4-car garage built into the slope and an approximately 164 square-foot shed attached to the rear of 22 N. High Street.

Ms. Singh stated that the first request is for approval of the proposed demolition of both the outbuildings, the dirt-floor shed and the unusable garage, on the site. Staff is supportive of the demolition of both outbuildings as neither structure contains architectural, historical or archaeological features and they are in poor condition. Removing these structures would improve the quality of the Historic District.

The second request is for approval of a Concept Plan for construction of a two-story, mixed-use building at the rear of the site. The conceptual plan remains largely the same as was presented at the Informal Review. The applicant is proposing a $\pm 5,300$ square foot building at the rear of the site, with $\pm 1,900$ square feet on the first floor devoted to a restaurant fronting N. High Street. The second floor features $\pm 1,900$ square feet of office space. Using the site topography, a live-work unit is proposed on the lowest level facing N. Blacksmith Lane. The new addition will change the commercial use to mixed use and align with the Future Land Use plan. Multiple primary uses are permitted by Code within the district. In addition, a landscaped pocket park is proposed between 16 and 22 N. High Street to act as pedestrian corridor from N. High Street. The proposal meets all the development and setback requirements, and $\pm 80\%$ lot coverage is proposed where 85% is permitted. The proposed site has numerous access points. The applicant proposes to replace the asphalt driveway from N. High Street with a pocket plaza. An ADA accessible connection from the N. High Street sidewalk to the main entrance of the new building would be included. Staff recommends establishing another pedestrian connection from the pocket plaza to the rear of the site. Based on the existing and proposed uses, 30 parking spaces are required. The applicant is suggesting the addition of three parking spaces at the rear of 16 N. High Street, two parking spaces at the rear of 22 N. High Street and three on-street parking spaces. The applicant is proposing to use the parking garage at N. High Street to meet the remaining parking space requirement. The parking space calculation is based on 16 N. High Street being used as office space. The building currently is vacant, so if that use should change in the future, the Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) should include a comprehensive parking plan. Staff also recommends using the two parking spaces at the rear of N. High Street as an extension to the pocket park. This would not only create purposeful public space but also enhance pedestrian movement within the site.

Ms. Singh stated that the building's facade facing N. High Street has been reduced from three stories to two stories, making it more proportional in scale with the surrounding properties. This change establishes a pedestrian-friendly environment on N. High Street. Despite the building height and scale reduction, staff remains concerned with the building architecture. The symmetrical double gables create a feeling of row housing and do not respond to the intended use of the building, although they do break up the building mass. Staff recommends architectural changes, including incorporating elements that are reflective of the intended use. The window organization creates a monotonous façade, contrary to guidance in Section 5 of the Historic Design Guidelines. Both 16 N. High Street and 22 N. High Street have distinct architectural styles, forms and materials, and this would be a great opportunity to incorporate some existing iconic features on the site. The consultant's report states that, "Throughout the Historic District, there are slight asymmetries in structures that create charm and interest, and this may be an opportunity to replicate the character." Along N. Blacksmith Lane, the applicant has addressed the height, scale, and character by eliminating the third floor and responding to the Historic Design Guidelines to mimic the grade change. At the lowest level, the applicant proposes an apartment for live-work use and has eliminated the second garage, reduced the curb cuts and numerous access points. Staff had recommended office space and relocating the apartment to the uppermost level for better light,

ventilation, and views, creating a mixed-use corridor along Blacksmith Lane. The apartment at the lower level is the applicant's personal choice. Staff recommends architectural changes on the façade to respond to the proposed restaurant use, creating more light and views for the proposed restaurant. The deck at the topmost floor and the first-floor roofing could be modified, allowing for a larger deck. Additionally, staff recommends breaking up the repetitive front gable roof and creating architecturally responsive patterns.

Mr. Henderson displayed some conceptual images of the proposed building, using the City's ArcGIS modelling tool. Images included a view from the sidewalk on N. High Street in front of Tucci's restaurant, a view from the corner of N. High and West Bridge Street, and a view of the proposed building from the parking lot on the site. Also shown was a video walk-through of the site.

Ms. Singh stated that based on the Board's previous feedback, the number and colors of building materials have been reduced. The applicant now proposes clapboard siding and limestone walls. The building is clad with limestone under the water table, which will wrap around the building to fully clad the lowest rear story in limestone.

Staff has reviewed the demolition proposal and determined that, as required, it meets two of the three demolition criteria. Additionally, the Concept Plan meets the applicable criteria or meets it with conditions. Therefore, staff recommends approval of the demolition of the background buildings with one condition and approval of the Concept Plan with five conditions, as identified in the staff report.

Board Questions for Staff

Mr. Alexander clarified that if ARB approves the Concept Plan, only a two-story mass in the identified location is being approved at this time. The conditions could significantly change the proposed building design. Without those changes, the Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) likely would not be approved. The expectation is that there will be significant changes. He noted that when the shed is razed, a site restoration plan and a drawing of the proposed restoration of the 22 N. High Street rear elevation, including identification of the proposed materials, will be necessary. He inquired if a waiver would be needed for the parking requirements.

Ms. Singh responded affirmatively. The waiver request will be provided with the Proposed Parking Plan for consideration.

Applicant Presentation

Joe Trepicone, Trepicone + Associates Architects, 600 Stonehenge Parkway, Dublin, stated the wall on the north side has been addressed. It is required to be a one-hour fire-rated wall. There are also windows proposed for that façade, which are recessed in a light well. The windows are required to be five feet from the property lines and comprise a certain percentage of the total wall area. He noted that the GIS view is deceiving. It shows the finished floor elevation at the existing grade. City Code requires them to slope the property away from their building 2% for the first 10 feet. That would not be possible if they maintained the existing finished floor elevation at the existing grade, because the grade drops significantly from west to east. He anticipates 1.5 feet of fill dirt will be required in front of their building to raise the building 1.5 feet. They like the suggestion of replacing the shed outbuilding with greenspace. That will enable them to meet the lot coverage requirements and add a couple of additional feet to the driveway width and a

pedestrian walkway through the site. They cannot reduce the square footage of the building further. The additional greenspace will offset any additional impervious surface.

Ann Adams, Coldwell Banker Realty, 916 N. Hamilton Road, Gahanna, stated that they will be meeting with staff next week to discuss recommended changes to the façade. The windows and doors need to be changed to meet the Historic Dublin Code requirements.

Mr. Trepicone noted that they have no objection to the use of either brick or stone. He noted that after working with staff on completion of 3-story massing studies, it became apparent that the project had to be two stories, not three. Subsequently, it was necessary to change the use from residential to office on the upper level. Beneath that would be the restaurant and on the lower level, the live-work unit and garage.

Ms. Adams requested clarification of the previous comment about limitations of the Concept Plan approval.

Mr. Alexander clarified that the conditions recommended for the Concept Plan approval reflect a significant level of changes, not in size, but in form, fenestrations, etc. He referred to the restaurant use and noted that staff has recommended more windows on the back elevation. Where would the kitchen be located? Typically, kitchens are considered a "back of the house" function.

Mr. Trepicone responded that the location of the kitchen is anticipated on the north façade, as there will be no large windows on the north side. Different types of restaurants have different needs, however, and they anticipate identifying an interested restaurant tenant and working with them on designing the space. He noted that the restaurant occupancy would be limited because there is a single point of entry.

Public Comment

David Venne, 56 S. Riverview Street, Dublin, stated that he is concerned about the potential impact of this development along with the N. Riverview residential project and the COhatch development. He would anticipate it to impact N. Blacksmith Lane, as it is part of the pedestrian thoroughfare from Bridge Street to the bridge. South Blacksmith Lane is currently a disaster due to the level of pedestrian activity.

Mr. Alexander stated that the Traffic Impact Study (TIS) should not consider only this subject site but the traffic implications to the connecting streets.

Ms. Holt responded that the TIS is a comprehensive study, looking at more than a couple of City blocks and different modes of transportation.

Ms. Damaser inquired when completion of the TIS is anticipated.

Mr. Bitar stated that completion of the initial traffic and parking study is anticipated in April. The study will provide basic information regarding the traffic flow. The actual street design will occur later.

Board Discussion

Mr. Cotter referred to the massing images and noted that the front of the building looks as though it might be two structures. He inquired the purpose of that design.

Mr. Trepicone responded that it was an attempt to break up the façade. However, they also have an alternative design, which would read as one structure. There are opportunities to rotate a gable

end and create a hip roof or a gable in the other direction. Although there still would be two sections, it would look like one structure. Their goal is to work with staff and identify what will work best for this site. They recognize that this is an important historic site in Dublin.

Mr. Cotter stated that it would be important to have it look more historic. He inquired the purpose of the balcony on the rear façade.

Mr. Trepicone stated that they anticipate there being a very attractive view to the east. Staff recommended that the balcony be made bigger.

Mr. Alexander stated that one of the issues with the proposed building is the inherent conflict. Is the center dominant or are the gables dominant? There is an awkward tension on both the front and rear elevations. The fenestration columns on the rear elevation do not align.

[Discussion of opportunities to reduce the massing and design tension continued.]

Ms. Damaser stated that the structure has a "row house" feel. It needs a more vernacular feel.

Mr. Cotter suggested that larger windows on the restaurant level would add a view of the river to the restaurant patrons.

Board members had no objection to the proposed demolition of the outbuildings.

Mr. Alexander cautioned against removing the shed building behind 22 N. High Street until the applicant has confirmed a project.

Ms. Adams responded that the intent is not to remove the shed until a project has been approved.

Mr. Cotter stated that the trash receptacle needs to be appropriately located and screened.

Mr. Cotter moved, Ms. Damaser seconded approval of the Demolition with the following condition:

- 1) Should the applicant choose to demolish the shed and outbuilding prior to approval of the Final Development Plan (FDP), a Site Restoration Plan shall be submitted and approved by staff prior to demolition.

and

approval of the Concept Plan with the following conditions:

- 1) At Preliminary Development Plan (PDP), the Applicant shall address form, windows, and door openings in both size and location to better address the intent of the Guidelines.
- 2) At PDP, the applicant shall explore a pedestrian connection from Blacksmith Lane to the proposed pocket park; a location for bike racks shall be considered.
- 3) At PDP, the applicant shall consider expanding the pocket park towards the north property line, in lieu of the proposed parking spaces which would create maneuverability concerns.
- 4) At PDP, the applicant shall address Building Standards comments, noting that building form and use arrangement may be affected.
- 5) At PDP, the applicant shall provide a site plan showing all existing sanitary laterals and provide a Water Service Plan to Dublin and the City of Columbus Division of Water for review.

Vote: Mr. Cotter, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Damaser, yes.


[Motion carried 3-0.]

Plan update, Phase 2, which includes the Historic District Special Area Plan. Consultant Greg Dale will be present.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:00 p.m.


Chair, Architectural Review Board


Assistant Clerk of Council



RECORD OF ACTION

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, February 21, 2024 | 6:30 pm

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

3. 16 – 22 N. High Street 23-136ARB-DEMO

Demolition/Background

Proposal: Request for approval of a demolition of two Background structures at an existing site.
Location: 65 feet northeast of the intersection of N. High Street and E. Bridge Street.
Request: Review and approval of Demolition under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.176 and the *Historic Design Guidelines*.
Applicants: Joe Trepicone, Trepicone + Associates
Planning Contact: Rati Singh, Assoc. AIA, Planner I
Contact Information: 614.410.4533, rsingh@dublin.oh.us
Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/23-136

MOTION: Mr. Cotter moved, Ms. Damaser seconded approval of the Demolition with the following condition:

- 1) Should the applicant choose to demolish the shed and outbuilding prior to approval of the Final Development Plan (FDP), a Site Restoration Plan shall be submitted and approved by staff prior to demolition.


VOTE: 3 – 0

RESULT: The Board approved the request to demolish two Background structures.

RECORDED VOTES:

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

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:

70CC202EC26C4C5...
Rati Singh, Assoc. AIA, Planner I





RECORD OF ACTION

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, February 21, 2024 | 6:30 pm

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

4. 16 – 22 N. High Street 23-135ARB-CP

Concept Plan

Proposal: Proposal of a 2-story mixed-use building in the Historic District.
 Location: 65 feet northeast of the intersection of N. High Street and E. Bridge Street.
 Request: Request for review and approval of a Concept Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.176 and the *Historic Design Guidelines*.
 Applicants: Joe Trepicone, Trepicone + Associates
 Planning Contact: Rati Singh, Assoc. AIA, Planner I
 Contact Information: 614.410.4533, rsingh@dublin.oh.us
 Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/23-135

MOTION: Mr. Cotter moved, Ms. Damaser seconded approval of the Concept Plan with the following conditions:

- 1) At Preliminary Development Plan (PDP), the applicant shall address form, windows, and door openings in both size and location to better address the intent of the Guidelines.
- 2) At PDP, the applicant shall explore a pedestrian connection from Blacksmith Lane to the proposed pocket park; a location for bike racks shall be considered.
- 3) At PDP, the applicant shall consider expanding the pocket park towards the north property line, in lieu of the proposed parking spaces which would create maneuverability concerns.
- 4) At PDP, the applicant shall address Building Standards comments, noting that building form and use arrangement may be affected.
- 5) At PDP, the applicant shall provide a site plan showing all existing sanitary laterals and provide a Water Service Plan to Dublin and the City of Columbus Division of Water for review.


VOTE: 3 – 0

RESULT: The Board approved the Concept Plan for the development of as mixed-use building.

RECORDED VOTES:

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

STAFF CERTIFICATION


 Rati Singh, Assoc. AIA, Planner I





RECORD OF ACTION

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, November 15, 2023 | 6:30 pm

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

MOTION: Mr. Jewell moved, Ms. Cooper seconded, to accept the documents into the record and approve the minutes from the meeting on October 25, 2023.

VOTE: 5 – 0

RESULT: The documents were accepted and the minutes approved from the October 25, 2023, meeting.

RECORDED VOTES:

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

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:

Sarah Holt

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





RECORD OF ACTION

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, November 15, 2023 | 6:30 pm

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

**2. 16-22 N. High Street
23-109INF**

Informal Review

Proposal: Informal review and feedback on for a proposed 3-story mixed-use building in the Historic District.
Location: 65 Feet northeast of the intersection of N. High Street and E. Bridge Street.
Request: Informal review and feedback of a future development application.
Applicant: Joe Trepicone, Trepicone & Associates Architects
Planning Contact: Rati Singh, Assoc. AIA, Planner I
Contact Information: 614.410.4533, rsingh@dublin.oh.us
Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/23-109

RESULT: Nonbinding feedback provided.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:

Rati Singh

70CC202EC2BC4C5...
Rati Singh, Assoc. AIA, Planner I



CONSENT CASE

~~4. Bergwall Residence at 181 S. High Street, 22-118MPR, Minor Project Review~~

~~The Chair stated this application was a request for the installation of a paver patio and walkway at an existing, single-family home on a 0.47-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic Residential. The site is located northwest of the intersection of S. High Street with Waterford Drive.~~

~~Ms. Mullinax stated the application had been reviewed against the Minor Project Review Criteria and Staff recommended approval of the Minor Project with three (3) conditions as stated in the Planning Report. Timothy and Deborah Bergwall, property owners at 181 S. High Street confirmed they agreed to the conditions as stated in the report.~~

~~Mr. Jewell moved and Mr. Cotter seconded, to approve the Minor Project with three (3) conditions by consent:~~

- ~~1) That the applicant apply for and obtain a Certificate of Zoning Plan Approval (CZPA), prior to constructing the Minor Project, subject to Staff review and approval;~~
- ~~2) That after approval of the CZPA, the applicant applies for a right-of-way permit, prior to any work in the public right-of-way and construction of the front walkway, subject to Staff review and approval; and~~
- ~~3) That the applicant applies for applicable building permits through Building Standards.~~

~~Vote: Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Ms. Damaser, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; and Mr. Jewell, yes.
[Approved by Consent 5 — 0]~~

NEW CASES

2. Rolls Realty - Sign at 22 N. High Street, 22-090MPR, Minor Project Review

The Chair stated this application was a request for the installation of ±4-square-foot projecting sign and a window sign for a building with an existing bracket on a 0.26-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic Core. The site is located southeast of the intersection of N. High Street with Wing Hill Lane.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Peuser – She presented an aerial view of the 0.26-acre lot that is shared with another structure at 16 N. High Street. The site is surrounded by commercial properties to the north, south, and west, and residential properties to the east. The existing condition of the structure built circa the 1900's for a doctor's office was presented [photograph].

In 2012, the ARB approved exterior paint modifications.

The proposed projecting sign [graphic] is 4.09 square feet in size, with a height of 19 inches and width at 31 inches. The proposed sign material is ½ deep-routed High-Density-Urethane (HDU) to mimic a wood grain and will be installed on an existing bracket. The sign will hang above the sidewalk along N. High Street at the corner of the front façade; the bottom of the sign to grade is 8 feet, 8 inches and reaches a

height of 9 feet, eight inches, well below the maximum height permitted at 15 feet. The proposed sign contains four colors (white, black, blue, plus the Rolls Realty logo.) As a condition of approval, Staff recommends the blue outline be changed to black for compliance.

The applicant also proposed a white vinyl window sign to display the tenant's phone number above the sidewalk; the letters are four inches tall. The applicant did not include the exact dimensions proposed for the vinyl window sign, which are required as a condition of approval, prior to applying for a sign permit.

The applicant originally also requested a rear parking sign to be located on N. Blacksmith Lane along the accessory structure. However, the Transportation and Mobility Department has reviewed this request and determined that the gravel area in which the sign is proposed to be displayed directly adjacent to the accessory structure [photograph] would encroach on the public right-of-way on N. Blacksmith Lane, which would not be permitted and will need to be removed from the application.

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

- 1) That the applicant revise the projecting sign to replace the proposed blue outline with black, subject to Staff approval;
- 2) That the applicant provide full dimensions of the window sign, prior to the submission of a permit, to be approved by Staff;
- 3) That the applicant remove the additional sign along Blacksmith Lane from the application; and
- 4) That the applicant apply for and successfully obtain approval for Permanent Sign Permits through Building Standards, prior to installation of the signs.

Applicant Presentation

Jessica Pierce, Lehner Signs, 2983 Switzer Road, requested clarification on parking.

Ms. Pueser – Visited the site with Staff from the Transportation and Mobility Department. The right-of-way along N. Blacksmith Lane extends onto the gravel that is right in front of the accessory structure in the back of 22 N. High Street. Parking is not permitted there as vehicles cannot encroach on a public right-of-way. She recalled a lot in the back of 22 N. High that seemed to be private property/private parking.

Ms. Pierce – Her client has not responded to her question of where they believe their parking is supposed to be. There is an existing parking sign on the shed in question. From Google, the gravel lot appears to be for surrounding tenants but would like clarification. She had not yet visited the site and asked if there was existing, designated parking for this property.

Ms. Holt – She suggested Staff could review that with the applicant later this week. She clarified that is not part of the application being reviewed at the moment.

Mr. Alexander – The Planning Report is clear, that gravel area is not supposed to be used for parking.

Ms. Pierce – The client recognized that.

Mr. Alexander – The applicant would need to come back for a parking sign application to be reviewed. He assumed the client is leasing the building. He suggested Ms. Pierce ask the owner where the parking should be.

Mr. Cotter moved and Ms. Cooper seconded, to approve the Minor Project with four (4) conditions:

- 1) That the applicant revise the projecting sign to replace the proposed blue outline with black, subject to Staff approval;
- 2) That the applicant provide full dimensions of the window sign, prior to the submission of a permit, to be approved by Staff;
- 3) That the applicant remove the additional sign along Blacksmith Lane from the application; and
- 4) That the applicant apply for and successfully obtain approval for Permanent Sign Permits through Building Standards, prior to installation of the signs.

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

3. ~~Ciminello Residence at 158 S. High Street, 22-106MPR, Minor Project Review~~

~~The Chair stated this application was a request for the installation of a patio, walkway, and walls at an existing, single-family home on a 0.39-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic Residential. The site is located ±210 feet northeast of the intersection of S. High Street with Waterford Drive.~~

Staff Presentation

~~Mr. Will presented an aerial view of the site that included the new ±3,000-square-foot home, presently under construction that was approved in June 2020.~~

~~The application under review this evening focuses on the proposed and installed hardscape improvements: stone retaining walls, a paver patio, and stone stairs for the side/north elevation of the home; and a gravel path with a paver border for the rear/east elevation of the home. These hardscape improvements to the side and rear of the home [photograph images] were installed prior to this ARB review and approval. The applicant has removed the request for a low stone wall flanked by columns for the front/west elevation on either side of the path leading to the entry that would run parallel to S. High Street.~~

~~The proposed and installed materials included: Natural Dublin Stone for walls, stones, stairs, cobblestone for walkway borders, Unilock Bristol Valley Pavers in a fossil color for the paver patio, and Gold Dust gravel as fill for the walkway. Mortar slightly recessed will be used for retaining walls to appear more like dry-stacked walls.~~

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

- ~~1) That the finished limestone coping is not added to the proposed stone columns or wall along S. High Street;~~
- ~~2) That mortar is not added to the stone wall or columns along S. High Street;~~
- ~~3) That the applicant revise the design of the stone wall to integrate vertically stacked stones atop the horizontal stacked stones, keeping with the distinctive Dublin design; and~~



MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, June 23, 2021

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Alexander, Chair, called the June 23, 2021, virtual meeting of the Architectural Review Board to order at 6:30 p.m., noting this is the last virtual meeting of the City of Dublin Architectural Review Board. Beginning in July, the Board will resume in-person meetings. Over the last year, we have greatly appreciated the Ohio Legislature's actions to address the pandemic, including the ability for public entities to conduct virtual meetings. Tonight, the meeting can be accessed via the live-stream on the City's website. We welcome public comments on cases. In order to submit any questions or comments during the meeting, please use the form under the streaming video on the City's website. Questions and comments will be relayed to the Board by the meeting moderator.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Chair led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Board Members present: Mr. Alexander, Mr. Cotter, Ms. Kramb, and Ms. Cooper.
 Board Member absent: Mr. Kownacki
 Staff present: Ms. Martin, Mr. Ridge, and Ms. Holt

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

~~Mr. Cotter moved, Ms. Cooper seconded, to accept the documents into the record and to approve the Board Minutes, as submitted, from the Special Meeting on May 19, 2021.~~

~~Vote: Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; and Mr. Cotter, yes.~~

~~[Motion carried 4-0]~~

STAFF INTRODUCTIONS

~~The Chair gave Ms. Martin the floor to introduce Planning's newest Staff Member, Sarah Holt.~~

~~Ms. Martin stated the first filled vacancy out of several in Planning is Sarah Holt, hired as a certified Senior Planner. She comes to Dublin most recently as the Director of Planning from Greenville, South Carolina. She has worked in several states including Colorado, New Mexico, and California. She has been involved with academic research as well as experience with preservation.~~

~~Ms. Holt provided additional background. She assisted with several military installations, has served on a preservation commission and at one point, had her own renovation and preservation company.~~

CASE PROCEDURES

~~The Chair stated that the Architectural Review Board is responsible for review of construction, modifications or alterations to any site in the Review District or area subject to Architectural Board Review under the provision of Zoning Code §153.170. The Board has the decision-making responsibility on these cases. Anyone who intends to address the Board on any of these cases will be sworn in. The agenda order is typically determined at the beginning of the meeting by the Chair. There is one case eligible for the Consent~~



BOARD ORDER

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, November 20, 2019 | 6:30 pm

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

**2. Gardenia Market – Sign at 16 N. High Street
19-095ARB-MPR**

Minor Project Review

Proposal: Installation of one wall sign and one ground sign for an existing tenant space on a 0.26-acre site zoned Bridge Street District Historic Core.
Location: East of North High Street, approximately 125-feet north of the intersection with Bridge Street.
Request: Review and approval of the Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.
Applicant: Marvic Titus, Realtor
Planning Contact: Zach Hounshell, Planner I
Contact Information: 614.410.4652, zhounshell@dublin.oh.us
Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/19-095

MOTION: Mr. Bailey moved, Mr. Keeler seconded, to approve the Minor Project with four conditions:

- 1) That the applicant adjust the wall sign to meet sign size and height requirements, prior to sign permit submittal;
- 2) That the applicant revise the wall sign thickness to ensure it meets Bridge Street Sign Code; and
- 3) That the applicant revise the projecting sign and wall sign designs to include dimensionally routing of letters, logos, and borders at a minimum 0.5-inch depth subject to Staff approval.
- 4) That the applicant revise the sign design to reduce the total height of the primary copy to ensure adequate negative space, subject to staff approval.

VOTE: 5 – 0

RESULT: The Minor Project was conditionally approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Shannon Stenberg	Yes
Gary Alexander	Yes
Andrew Keeler	Yes
Kathleen Bryan	Yes
Robert Bailey	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Zach Hounshell, Planner I



~~Agenda this evening: Case 4 – Psychic Readings by Lisa – Sign at 16 N. High Street. He asked if any member of the Board wished to pull the case from the Consent Agenda. [Hearing none.]~~

4. Psychic Readings by Lisa - Sign at 16 N. High Street, 21-054MPR, Minor Project Review

The Chair stated this application is a request for the installation of a wall sign and a projecting sign for a tenant space within a historic building on a 0.26-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic Core. The site is east of N. High Street, ±125 feet north of the intersection with Bridge Street. Mr. Rayburn from Staff and the applicant, Ms. George are here this evening to answer any questions. [Hearing none.]

Ms. Kramb moved, Mr. Cotter seconded, to approve the Minor Project by consent with four conditions:

- 1) That the applicant apply for and successfully obtain approval of a Permanent Sign Permit through Building Standards, prior to installation;
- 2) That all text on both the wall sign and projecting sign be metallic gold in color;
- 3) That the projecting sign be located between the primary entrance to the tenant space and the first window, immediately south of the primary entrance and within 6 feet of the primary entrance, subject to Staff approval; and
- 4) That the applicant remove all temporary signs, prior to the installation of the new permanent signs.

Vote: Ms. Cooper, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; and Ms. Kramb, yes.
[Motion carried 4-0]

The Chair swore in staff and applicants who planned to address the Board on any of the cases to be reviewed during this meeting.

~~INFORMAL REVIEW CASES~~

~~1. 72 – 84 N. High Street, 20-091INF, Informal Review~~

~~The Chair stated this application is a request for an Informal Review and feedback for redevelopment of a mixed-use site (former Oscar's site) zoned Historic District, Historic Core. The site is located northeast of the intersection of N. High Street with North Street.~~

~~Staff Presentation~~

~~Mr. Ridge presented an aerial view of the site that contains a number of parcels. He reviewed the history for this case, as follows:~~

~~February 2021 – Informal Review~~

~~The Architectural Review Board (ARB) reviewed and provided non-binding feedback on a proposal for the construction of a mixed-use building including residential units, an event center, restaurant space, retail space, 80 parking spaces and associated open space. Feedback included a general concern regarding massing, scale and height and interest was shown for saving a portion of the building (former Oscar's site).~~

~~May 2021 – Site Tour~~

~~The Board members toured the buildings inside and out at 72-84 N. High Street. They were informed of the general conditions of the buildings, along with construction and design.~~

~~Today, June 23, 2021 – Informal Review~~



BOARD ORDER

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, September 25, 2019 | 6:30 pm

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

**6. 16-22 N. High Street
19-078ARB-MPR**

Minor Project Review

Proposal: Exterior and site modifications for two existing commercial buildings on a 0.26-acre site zoned Bridge Street District Historic Core.
Location: Northeast of the intersection of N. High Street and Bridge Street.
Request: Review and approval of a Minor Project under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.066 and 153.170, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.
Applicant: Heidi Bolyard, Simplified Living Architecture and Design
Planning Contacts: Zachary C. Hounshell, Planner I
Contact Information: 614.410.4652, zhounshell@dublin.oh.us
Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/19-078

MOTION: Ms. Bryan moved, Mr. Keeler seconded, to approve the Minor Project with 10 conditions:

- 1) That the applicant update the umbrellas to be a UV-resistant material;
- 2) That the applicant update the lattice to a more durable material such as metal or cedar, subject to Staff approval;
- 3) That the applicant update the pathway with a brick paver matching the existing brick sidewalk, subject to Staff approval;
- 4) That the applicant update their plans to clarify the window patterns and mullions are like-for-like in style and character, subject to staff approval;
- 5) That the applicant provides standing seam metal roof specifications that match the existing standing seam metal roof, subject to Staff approval;
- 6) That the elevations be updated to reflect the changes to the color palette, including windows painted Kestel White, and the doors and roof in charcoal gray that coordinates with the overall color palette, subject to staff approval;
- 7) That the pillars of the stone patio wall be retained, while the connecting wall may be removed;
- 8) That the trellis be placed a minimum of one foot away from the existing structures;
- 9) That the applicant use planters instead of the gate; and



**6. 16-22 N. High Street
19-078ARB-MPR**

Minor Project Review

- 10) That the applicant work with staff to finalize the design of the window boxes and the plant materials.

VOTE: 5 – 0

RESULT: The Minor Project was conditionally approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Shannon Stenberg	Yes
Gary Alexander	Yes
Andrew Keeler	Yes
Kathleen Bryan	Yes
Robert Bailey	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION



Zachary C. Hounshell, Planner I





MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, October 28, 2020

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Bryan called the October 28, 2020 meeting of the Architectural Review Board to order at 6:30 p.m. and provided the following opening comments: Welcome to a virtual meeting of the City of Dublin Architectural Review Board. The Ohio Legislature passed several emergency laws to address the pandemic, including the ability for public entities to have virtual meetings. We appreciate this ability to maintain our continuity of government. For the present time, we are holding our meetings online and live streaming those meetings on YouTube. You can access the live-stream on the City's website. The meeting procedure for each case this evening will begin with staff presentation followed by Public Comment prior to Board review and discussion. To submit any questions or comments during the meeting, please use the form under the streaming video on the City's website. These questions and comments will be relayed to the Board by the meeting moderator. We want to accommodate public participation and comment to the greatest extent possible and welcome your comments on cases. Please use a valid name and address when submitting your comments, and please refrain from making any inappropriate comments."

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Ms. Bryan led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Board Members present: Mr. Alexander, Mr. Cotter, Mr. Kownacki, Ms. Bryan and Ms. Kramb
Staff present: Ms. Rauch, Ms. Martin, Mr. Boggs, Mr. Ridge, Mr. Hounshell

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Kownacki moved, Ms. Kramb seconded to accept the documents into the record and approve the September 23, 2020 meeting minutes.

Vote on the motion: Mr. Cotter, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Bryan, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Kownacki, yes.

[Motion carried 5-0]

Ms. Bryan stated that the Architectural Review Board is responsible for review of construction, modification or alteration to any site in the Review District or area subject to Architectural Board Review under the provision of Zoning Code Section 153.177. 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 during the meeting.

CONSENT CASES

Mr. Kownacki stated that he has no objections. He would recommend that the mechanicals be kept away from the street view.

Ms. Bryan indicated that she was supportive of the location, as well.

2) *Does the Board support the proposed mass and scale of the addition?*

Board members expressed support of the proposed mass and scale.

3) *Does the Board support the proposed character including the conceptual building materials and landscaping?*

Ms. Kramb stated that the existing bushes will be removed. When the application returns for Board review, she would like to see the final landscaping plan and how the additional mechanicals will be screened. Currently, the large AEP power box is not screened, but it would be good if that could be screened somewhat, as well.

Mr. Barnum stated all the existing landscape is on City property and maintained by the City. There is a large volume of pedestrian traffic on that sidewalk, so it is in his best interest that the landscaping be attractive. They have worked in partnership with the City and added flowers within the area. Whatever he plants in the future would, as well, be on City property.

Mr. Alexander stated that he sees no need for a trellis. It would be difficult to maintain the painted surface behind if there are mature plantings on the trellis.

Mr. Barnum stated that the trellis element was added by the architect; he would prefer not to have it.

Mr. Alexander stated that adding two more vertical landscaping elements should be satisfactory. Board members were supportive of that suggestion.

Ms. Kramb stated that screening the electrical box is more important.

Mr. Barnum stated that those are City utilities, but he would be willing to partner with the City on the screening needs.

5. Gardenia Market at 16-22 N. High Street, 20-164ARB-MPR, Minor Project Review

Ms. Bryan stated that this is a request for the approval of the installation of a lattice fence and overhead lighting for an existing tenant space zoned Bridge Street District Historic Core, northeast of the intersection of N. High Street with West Bridge Street.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Hounshell stated that this is a request for review and approval for a Minor Project Review of the property at 16 and 22 N. High Street, which are located on the same parcel. In September 2019, the Architectural Review Board conditionally approved site modifications and exterior modifications to both 16-22 N. High Street. The improvements approved included a roof replacement, façade improvements, window replacements, and a new brick-paved path between the buildings leading into a courtyard space to the rear of 16 N. High Street. With the approved site plan, a condition applied to the proposed lattice fencing on the site that required the applicant to update the lattice to a more durable material such as metal or cedar wood. In 2019, the Architectural Review Board

(ARB) approved an application for site and building improvements for both buildings on the site. The building improvements that have been made include roof replacement, window and door replacements and new exterior paint. These improvements were included in the Façade Improvement Grant that was awarded to the applicant to complete the building improvements. The applicant had previously indicated their hope to apply for a second grant to help cover the remaining site improvements; however, the Façade Improvement Grant has since been suspended due to COVID restrictions. In July 2020, Code Enforcement was notified of additional site improvements not approved by the ARB that had been located on the site, including a food trailer stationed and stored on site; outdoor dining spaces; additional lighting and sandwich board signs; and a lattice screening fence. The applicant has come into compliance with most of the items of concern but is requesting authorization for the existing string lighting and lattice fence to remain on the site. The string lighting is in the alley between 16 and 22 North High Street. It is identical in design to the alley lighting that was proposed in September 2019. The sole difference is that this lighting has interchangeable colors. Approval is also requested for the existing six-foot tall lattice fence, which is made of 4-ft. by 8-ft. wooden lattice panels connected to 4-inch by 4-inch wood posts. The fence height is six feet with a two-foot gap below the lattice panels. The fence is located three feet from the southern property line, which meets the setback requirements for this building type. The Historic Dublin Design Guidelines specifically addresses fences within the Historic District and states that fences are appropriate in the District as long as the design and materials are appropriate for the District. It also states that any wooden fence shall use paint or a stain for wood, rather than leaving it natural. In terms of materials and designs, lattice fences are not specified within the text of the Guidelines. Typically, traditional fencing is recommended; however, there are exceptions, should the Board find them appropriate. Staff has included four conditions for approval, based on the Dublin Design Guidelines.

Applicant Presentation

Eric Ward, property owner, 16-22 N. High Street, Dublin, stated that they have no additional presentation and have no objections to the proposed conditions, other than the staining of the fence. It was their understanding that Code does not require the fence be stained. They prefer the unfinished look, and staining would be an additional cost. The lighting is identical to that which they requested last year, except that the colors are adjustable through remote control.

Mr. Hounshell responded that the Code does not require the fence to be stained; it is recommended in the Historic Dublin Design Guidelines. It is the Board's purview to determine if they agree with that recommendation.

Board Questions

Ms. Kramb inquired if a fence was approved or had been installed without approval. It is her understanding that a fence must be metal or cedar.

Mr. Hounshell responded that at the ARB's September 25, 2019 review, the Board approved a lattice fence as a decorative feature around the proposed courtyard patio; the current location was not approved. Staff has been working with the applicant in an attempt to bring the fence into compliance; because they were unable to do so, this request was submitted for the Board's review and consideration.

Ms. Bryan clarified that the lattice fence was installed without Board request or approval. The lattice fencing approved was for something entirely different. She does not agree that the Historic Dublin Design Guidelines are only suggestions; they provide significant guidance.

Mr. Kramb stated that there is a practical reason that the wood must be stained or painted -- it will last longer. Otherwise, it will look unsightly within two years.

Mr. Ward noted that treated lumber is intended not to need paint or staining for a certain length of time.

Mr. Kramb responded that in time, it would fade, stain and require painting.

Ms. Bryan inquired if the lights are colored and twinkling.

Marvic Titus, business owner, 16 N. High Street, Dublin, responded that there is ability to make the lights twinkle, as well as change the colors.

Ms. Bryan stated that it was her understanding that the earlier application requested white lights.

Ms. Titus responded that no color of lighting was specified.

Ms. Bryan stated that, therefore, the Board has neither approved or disapproved colored lights.

Public Comment

Michael Maloof, 6308 Wyler Ct , Dublin, OH 43016:

"I would like to ask that they complete the fence all the way to intersect with my building at 16 E. Bridge St. The activities they have going on have created issues and complaints from the tenants that people are parking on our property and walking to the rear of this property. They also cut across the property to get to the back instead of walking around to the front or rear of their building. They have also complained that the restaurant has been using the dumpster. I think if they continued the fence to close off the property it would help."

Mr. Ward responded that the owner of that property gave them permission to use his dumpster. Initially, it was a friendly agreement. The food truck, which has been removed, was the cause of most of the problems.

Ms. Titus noted that part of the problem, as well, was the fact that they had to close their alley. That alley, which is their private property and not public access, had previously been used by Domino Pizza customers picking up pizza and by Domino Pizza employees to "hang out" during their breaks. Because of certain undesirable activities of those individuals, it was necessary for them to send a letter to the store owner regarding the issues.

Board Discussion

Ms. Kramb stated that the existing lattice fence is not appropriate. ARB would not approve a lattice fence anywhere in the Historic District. Perhaps they could utilize a landscaping fence/screening to achieve their purpose.

Mr. Alexander expressed agreement. He credits staff with attempting to identify a compromise, but the Board would not approve this fence. The appearance, function and appropriateness are issues. Lattice panels are inexpensive and easy to use, but it will not reflect well on this business and its owners, nor on the community. There may be other fencing options that are less flimsy.

Ms. Kramb stated that the Board is not opposed to fencing; metal fencing has been approved in the Historic District. However, there are no lattice fences anywhere within the area.

Mr. Cotter stated that the existing fence would deteriorate within a short period of time; they are not sturdy. Typically, lattice fencing is decorative only.

Mr. Kownacki stated that he agrees with other members' comments. This site is within the Historic District, and this location has both positives and negatives, including the cost of a sturdy fence. A lattice fence would not be appropriate in any historic neighborhood, not just in Dublin.

Ms. Bryan stated that the lattice fence is not appropriate within the Dublin Historic District. She is sympathetic with the applicants in regard to the economics of the situation. However, the Board would never approve this fence in this District.

Ms. Titus noted that the fencing is at the rear of the property; it is not located in the public's view. In addition, it is made of a wood material.

Mr. Ward stated that the fence was installed for a purpose. The pizza shop delivery drivers are smoking pot, are not respectful, and shine vehicle headlights into their property at all hours. They were trying to address the issue by creating a simple screen. A wrought iron fence would not accomplish that purpose. They are open to suggestions for addressing this problem between the properties. Another neighbor has requested that the fence be extended.

Ms. Kramb stated that the Board is not opposed to a fence here, only the material. She understands the need for the fence, but perhaps a landscaping screen could achieve their purpose.

Ms. Bryan stated that the Board agrees that there is a good reason for a fence here, but not a lattice fence. Although the existing fence will be disapproved and needs to be removed, staff will work with the applicant on identifying an alternative type of fence.

Mr. Cotter moved, Mr. Alexander seconded approval of the Minor Project Review with the following four conditions:

- 1) The applicant modify the south side of the fence to match the finished quality of the north side of the fence, subject to staff approval;
- 2) The applicant stain or paint the fencing, subject to staff approval;
- 3) The applicant finish and secure the bottom of the existing lattice with the addition of a 2-inch by 4-inch wooden support, similar to the top of the fence; and,
- 4) The applicant submit for a Certificate of Zoning Plan Approval for the fence within 90 days of ARB approval.

Vote: Mr. Kownacki, no; Ms. Kramb, no; Mr. Cotter, no; Mr. Alexander, no; Ms. Bryan, no.

~~6. Bergwall Residence at 181 S. High Street, 20-156INF, Informal Review~~

~~Ms. Bryan stated that this is a request for feedback on the proposed addition and exterior modifications for an existing single-family home on a 0.47-acre site zoned Bridge Street District Historic Residential, northwest of the intersection of S. High Street with Waterford Drive.~~

~~Staff Presentation~~

~~Ms. Martin stated that this is a request for informal review and feedback for exterior modifications and additions to an existing single-family home located at 181 S. High Street. The 0.47-acre site is~~

~~Ms. Bergwall stated that, initially, they had contemplated demolition. Would that be the Board's preference?~~

~~Ms. Bryan responded that it is not the Board's preference; however, it would be dependent upon the architectural style selected. Mr. Taylor and Ms. Martin are very experienced and will be able to provide assistance.~~

~~Mr. Taylor stated that the existing structure is solid, particularly the cement block wall between the house and the garage. The asymmetrical issues of the front façade are important to address with the design. However, the Colonial Revival style is a broad genre of architecture that will allow them to address the applicant's desires and the symmetry issues.~~

~~Ms. Krumb noted that if they should prefer the contemporary style or to replicate what exists, there is a good example of how that can be nicely done. She would recommend looking at the circa 1980s contemporary, two-story at 4180 MacDuff Way, which recently was remodeled quite attractively with a large addition.~~

LEGAL TRAINING

~~Legal training was provided by Thaddeus Boggs, Assistant Law Director, regarding the Board's role, including: legislative versus quasi-judicial actions; ex parte communications; creating an appropriate record for potential appeals; open meetings; and Ohio public records and ethics laws. The planning and zoning process, of which ARB is a component, regulates private properties. Therefore, property owners must have procedural due process. This discussion will clarify the responsibilities and process.~~

COMMUNICATIONS

- ~~• The next regular meeting of the ARB is scheduled for November 18, 2020.~~
- ~~• There will be a joint Council, PZC, ARB and BZA meeting at 6:00 p.m. on December 14, 2020.~~

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:40 p.m.

Kathleen Bryan
Chair, Architectural Review Board

Judith K. Beal
Deputy Clerk of Council

~~Mr. Keeler stated that he has only one comment. The existing block foundation is exposed. The preference would be to face with a veneer. Although it is not a requirement, it would improve the appearance.~~

~~Mr. Keeler moved, Ms. Bryan seconded to approve the Minor Project with no conditions.~~

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

~~(Approved 5—0)~~

2. Gardenia Market – Sign at 16 N. High Street, 19-095ARB-MPR, Minor Project Review

Ms. Stenberg stated that this application is a proposal for the installation of one wall sign and one projecting sign for an existing tenant space on a 0.26-acre site zoned Bridge Street District Historic Core.

Case Presentation

Mr. Hounshell stated this is a request for two signs for Gardenia Market. If approved tonight, the applicant will be able to file for sign permits with the City Building Department. The site is located at 16 North High Street, just south of 22 North High Street, which is located on the same parcel. These Minor Projects were also before the Board in September. In regard to previous sign approvals for the site:

- 2007: 6 sq. ft. projecting sign (subsequently removed)
- 2009: 2 wall signs (subsequently removed)
- 2011: 2 multi-tenant wall signs at front and rear of building. Only the second story tenant signage remains, which is 1 sq. foot.

The applicant is proposing to use the existing sign bracket

The signs were originally located at the rear of 22 N High with a previous tenant. The first sign is a projecting sign. The sign will be 21.88-inches in height by 27.88-inches in width. The panel will be mounted on the repurposed HDU sign. Both the HDU sign and bracket are being repurposed for this application. The second sign is a wall sign, which will be 18 inches in height by 84 inches in width, totaling 10.5 square feet. The maximum allowable wall sign square footage in the Historic District is 8 square feet, so the applicant must adjust the sign design to meet this zoning requirement. The sign panels are proposed to be made of 3mm aluminum composite. Because the wall sign span is longer than 3 feet, Code requires the depth of the sign to be increased to 4mm to reduce potential rippling effects. Staff is waiting to verify the height of the signs from grade. The sign backgrounds will be black; the logo, "Gardenia" will have white lettering; the word "Market" and crown on the logo on the projecting sign will be PMS 132 gold. The minimum height for a projecting sign is 8 feet from the bottom of the sign to grade; the minimum height for a wall sign is 15 feet from grade. Staff recommends revising the sign plan to include dimensional lettering and a dimensional logo to be consistent with previous sign applications in the area. The application has been reviewed against the appropriate criteria, and staff recommends approval with three conditions.

Applicant Comments

Marvic Titus, Royal Elite Investments, 7049 Riverside Drive, Dublin, stated that they have nothing to add. They have attempted to make their application consistent with Code.

Eric Ward, Royal Elite Investments, 7049 Riverside Drive, Dublin, stated that the Code requirement is 8 feet from the bottom of the sign. They measured the distance from the existing sign; the height to the bottom of the sign is 6 ft. 10 inches to 7 feet. The bracket, which will be re-purposed, is already in place. There might be a similar height issue with the sign for 22 N. High Street. Will it be necessary to raise this sign, or could an exception be obtained?

Ms. Stenberg inquired if the applicant would need to return to request a waiver.

Ms. Martin responded that, typically, deviations to Sign Code requirements require a separate Master Sign Plan application, and the Board does have the authority to allow deviations from the Sign Code. Staff was not aware prior to this meeting that the application would not meet that requirement. A height of 8 feet will allow pedestrian traffic beneath the projecting sign.

Mr. Ward indicated that the position of the sign bracket may be a problem for the one sign only. The other sign is 8 ft. 6 inches from grade.

Mr. Keeler stated that the simplest solution would be to raise the bracket one foot for the projecting sign. Perhaps the previous sign on that bracket was a different size.

Mr. Hounshell stated that one of the recommended conditions is that prior to applying for a sign permit application, staff would need to verify the actual height with the applicant to ensure compliance with the Code.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Board Discussion

Mr. Alexander stated that an aluminum panel is being used, so there is a need for three dimensionality. Routing would require a different material. If the sign material were to be changed, would the applicant need to return to the Board for approval, or would that be acceptable, as long as an approved material is selected?

Ms. Martin responded that the applicant can substitute with another material that is on the approved list.

Mr. Bailey, referring to the wall sign, stated that if the sign will be three dimensional, from a graphic design aspect, the name "Gardenia" is too large and too close to the border. The letters need to be reduced by a couple font sizes.

Mr. Hounshell responded that staff's preliminary comments with the applicant addressed that issue. The applicant discussed the issue with the sign company, and decided to retain the same size lettering.

Ms. Martin noted that the Board could add that condition.

Ms. Titus stated that the Code did not provide any guidance regarding three dimensional requirements. However, she did discuss the issue with the sign company. They indicated that contour cuts were involved, and they would attempt to address the size issue.

Mr. Bailey stated that if the sign will be three dimensional, the letters cannot be cut that close.

Ms. Stenberg requested that a condition be added to require staff approval of the lettering, so that the application would not need to return to the Board for approval of the letter size.

Staff added an additional condition per the Board's direction.

Mr. Bailey moved to approve the Minor Project Review with the following four conditions:

- 1) The applicant adjust the wall sign to meet sign size and height requirements, prior to sign permit submittal;
- 2) The applicant revise the wall sign thickness to ensure it meets Bridge Street Sign Code; and,
- 3) The applicant revise the projecting sign and wall sign designs to include dimensional routing of letters, logos, and borders at a minimum .5-inch depth, subject to staff approval.
- 4) The applicant revise the sign design to reduce the total height of the primary copy to ensure adequate negative space, subject to staff approval.

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

~~3- HER Realtors – Sign at 22 N. High Street, 19-104ARB-MPR, Minor Project Review~~

~~Ms. Stenberg stated that this application is a proposal for the installation of one projecting sign for an existing tenant space on a 0.26-acre site zoned Bridge Street District Historic Core.~~

Case Presentation

~~Mr. Hounshell stated that this application is a Minor Project Review request for a new projecting sign for an existing building on a .26-acre parcel located in the BSD-HC, Bridge Street District – Historic Core District, 125 feet northeast of the intersection of North High Street and Bridge Street. The site contains two structures on a single .26-acre parcel. 22 North High Street is the most northern building of the two buildings on the site. The Board conditionally approved a Minor Project for both 16-22 North High Street in September 2019. The Minor Project included exterior improvements to both buildings, site improvements for a new brick pathway between the buildings and a courtyard to the rear of the property. The Board approved two projecting signs for the building in 2012. The signs have since been removed, but the bracket of the previous projecting sign on the North High Street façade is still hanging, which will be utilized for the new sign. The applicant is proposing a new 5.59-square-foot projecting sign for the front tenant space of 22 North High Street. 22 North High Street is a multi-tenant building, which allows each tenant to have up to two different building-mounted signs. The sign will be constructed of 1.5-inch Cedar wood with white acrylic “HER” lettering raised .25-inches from the sign; all other lettering and~~

~~makes it an issue.~~

~~Ms. Bryan moved, Ms. Stenberg seconded to approve the Minor Project with the following four conditions:~~

- ~~1) The applicant update the plans to eliminate the front door sidelights and to reduce the shed porch roof to be limited to only above the front door, and the depth of the porch be reduced, subject to staff approval.~~
- ~~2) The applicant revise the design to eliminate the HardiShingles on all elevations and continue the predominate façade material in lieu.~~
- ~~3) The applicant update the proposed color palette to colors other than a white body and black accents, subject to staff approval.~~
- ~~4) The applicant provide details for window trim and sills, columns, and board and batten siding, subject to staff approval.~~

~~Vote: Ms. Bryan, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Bailey, no.
(Motion approved 3-1 with one recusal.)~~

6. 16-22 N. High Street, 19-078ARB-MPR, Minor Project Review

Ms. Stenberg stated that this is a proposal for exterior and site modifications for two existing commercial buildings on a 0.26-acre site zoned Bridge Street District Historic Core.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Hounshell stated that this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review for 16 and 22 N. High Street. He clarified that signs are not included in this application. The Architectural Review Board (ARB) is the final reviewing body for this application. Upon approval from the ARB, the applicant may apply for building permits. The .26 acre site is located northeast of the intersection of North High Street and Bridge Street within the Bridge Street District – Historic Core District. The project is unique in that both buildings are located on the same parcel. In regard to the four surrounding buildings, two are considered contributing to the Historic District, another was built in 1962 and the other was built circa 1900.

Site:

16 North High Street was built in 1843 as a single-family house, which later was converted to commercial use. The stone building has a rectilinear footprint with a 1.5-story core, and a one-story addition spanning the width of the rear (east) elevation. A mortared stone wall encircles the patio at the front of the building. The stone wall was part of the original structure encircling a courtyard. In 2010, the Board approved its replacement with a patio. 22 North High Street is a commercial building that was built for commercial use circa 1900. The Queen Anne-style building has a rectilinear footprint.

Proposal:

The applicant is proposing many different minor changes to the site. The largest change is the proposed brick-paved path and courtyard where the existing private alley is located. With this improvement, the curbcut would be removed and the alley would be closed to vehicular access.

The proposed gate would be closed during the night. The existing gravel alley between the two structures is proposed to be renovated to create a brick-paved path. The new 8-ft. wide brick or stamped concrete path will match the existing sidewalk along North High Street. Vehicular access to the area will be eliminated by installing a 3.5-ft. tall ornamental iron fence with gate that is 6 feet wide. The pedestrian path is proposed to serve as an inviting space, with bistro-style tables placed sporadically throughout the area. Additionally, a portion of the north mortared wall on 16 N. High Street would be removed. Due to the later information that the mortared wall was part of the historic structure, the Board may want to consider that factor. Mr. Hounshell reviewed the materials to be used with this project. The applicant is proposing to repaint the entirety of 22 North High Street, and portions of 16 North High Street. The applicant is proposing to paint the siding a medium gray (Felted Wool; SW9171), the trim a light warm gray (Kestrel White; SW7516), and the doors a dark gray (Urbane Bronze; SW 7048). In addition to the painting, the numerous spots of rotting siding will be repaired. The stone on the watertable of 22 North High Street will be tuck-pointed. The existing roofs of both structures are in disrepair. The applicant is proposing to install a new metal roof on both buildings to replace the current standing-seam flat metal roofs. The applicant is proposing a ribbed metal roof panel, which will be a Charcoal Grey color to closely match the door color of Urbane Bronze. Staff will require that the new roofs be brought to the same specifications of the current standing-seam metal roofs. The applicant has proposed two new half-lite storm doors to replace the existing storm doors of 16 North High Street. The replacements will match the style of the existing doors on 22 North High Street, and will be painted Urbane Bronze. The applicant is proposing the replacement of windows on all elevations of both buildings. 16 N High Street has a majority of 2-over-2 windows, with 1-over-1 in the dormers. 22 N High Street has a mix of 1-over-1 and 6-over-1 windows. 1-over-1 windows are located on the west (front) façade. The applicant is proposing 1-over-1 Marvin brand wood windows, aluminum clad colored Bahama Brown. Staff recommends any replacement of the front façade windows be like-for-like with the existing storefront windows (2-over-2 style remains on front façade of 16 N High). During review of the proposal, staff recognized that the window clad color did not match the paint choices of the current proposal. Staff suggests that the Board consider whether the color should remain Bahama Brown or be adjusted to match the Urbane Bronze door color. The applicant is proposing six new window plant boxes for the windows. The specifics of which windows the plant boxes will be installed on were not provided. The Cedar wood window plant boxes will be painted Kestrel White. Staff has reviewed the application against the appropriate criteria and recommends approval with the following five conditions:

- 1) The applicant update the umbrellas to be a UV-resistant material;
- 2) The applicant update the lattice to a more durable material such as metal or cedar, subject to staff approval;
- 3) The applicant update the pathway to be a brick paver matching the existing brick sidewalk, subject to staff approval;
- 4) The applicant update their plans to clarify the window patterns and mullions be like-for-like in style and character; and,
- 5) The applicant provide standing-seam metal roof specifications that match the existing standing-seam metal roof, subject to staff approval.

Applicant Presentation

Eric Ward, Royal Elite Investments, 7049 Riverside Drive, Dublin, stated they have made one color change. They have attempted to lighten the colors, specifically the Urbane Bronze color. Currently,

the 16 N. High Street windows have dark trim. They are interested in a color similar to Kestrel White.

Ms. Rauch stated that they would remain with the same color palette, but using that color for a different application. Because it is one of the three proposed colors, that could be added as a condition. She suggested clarification on the proposal.

Mr. Ward responded that their request is to use the Felted Wool color for the walls and Kestrel White for the trim. The roof would be Charcoal Grey. The Urbane Bronze color would not be used at all.

Ms. Bryan inquired what color would be used on the doors.

Mr. Ward responded that the doors would be Charcoal Grey, to match the roofs.

Mr. Alexander inquired if the window cladding would match the door.

Mr. Ward responded that the window cladding would be Kestrel White. Both buildings will be entirely painted and both roofs will be entirely replaced.

Ms. Stenberg noted that with the requested elimination of colors, the revised color palette would be the Felted Wool, Kestrel White and Charcoal Gray.

Mr. Ward clarified that they would be replacing like with like on both doors and windows.

Ms. Rauch noted that Condition #4 already indicates that.

Ms. Bryan suggested that "subject to staff approval" be added to that condition.

Mr. Ward stated that currently, there is a hodge podge of windows. When the windows eventually are replaced, the intent is to make them a consistent combination, not what currently exists.

Mr. Alexander inquired if the windows are original.

Mr. Ward responded that some are, some are not. The building in front was built in the late 1800s; the back section was added later.

Ms. Stenberg inquired if the windows would not be changed, but only painted at this time.

Mr. Ward responded that is correct.

Mr. Alexander stated that even though the addition to the original structure is older, the windows in that addition would also be required to be "like for like." Although they do not match the windows in the front elevation, the windows in the addition have historical value, as well.

Mr. Keeler noted that would not apply to vinyl windows.

Mr. Alexander concurred.

Mr. Ward stated that their desire is to have consistency on the elevations.

Mr. Keeler inquired if all the windows on both buildings would be painted the same color.

Mr. Ward responded that all of the windows would be painted Kestrel White. He noted that on the south elevation of 22 N. High, two different windows are used on the same elevation. He would assume that was not the case originally.

Mr. Alexander responded that it may have been, because there is also a change in the siding. If the windows were original when those sections of the building were constructed, they need to be matched. Vinyl windows are obviously a replacement and do not need to be matched.

Ms. Stenberg inquired if the window details would be approved by staff.

Mr. Hounshell responded that is correct.

Ms. Stenberg clarified that what the Board is considering tonight are paint colors. New windows would require a future application.

Ms. Bryan suggested that a condition be added regarding the paint colors.

Mr. Hounshell inquired the Board's direction concerning removal of the northern part of the patio wall on 16 N. High Street. The purpose of the removal was to allow access between 16 N. High Street and the path.

Mr. Alexander requested clarification of the location on the site plan.

Mr. Hounshell stated that the northern portion of the front patio for 16 N. High Street is being removed. His understanding, however, is that it was part of the original structure. In 2010, the owner replaced the concrete patio, but they did not touch the mortar wall. Staff has not discussed this issue with the applicants, as it just became known in the last couple of days.

Ms. Bryan inquired if the wall is part of the historic structure.

Ms. Martin responded affirmatively. Initially, staff believed it was part of the 2010 addition. However, after closer review, it is obviously much older. The assumption is that it is original. If staff had been aware of that earlier, it would have been a condition that removal of the wall not be approved with this application. However, it is up to the Board's discretion.

Mr. Ward stated that they have an older photograph of the building showing a front porch and no wall, so it was not part of the original structure.

Ms. Martin responded that if the wall was not original, it was added much earlier than 2010.

Mr. Ward responded that would be correct. However, removal of the wall is critical to the intended operations. Otherwise, guests would have to walk out to the public sidewalk and around. There is no rear or side-door access for them.

Mr. Alexander inquired if there would be a similar situation on 22 N. High Street. Guests would exit the porch via the steps, enter through the gate and walk around.

Mr. Ward clarified that the intended use of 22 N. High is office. There is an existing tenant. The building is not suitable for retail or restaurant. Even if it were to be retail, no use of the courtyard is anticipated.

Ms. Stenberg stated that a photographic record from 1976 shows the stone wall existed at that time.

Mr. Keeler inquired if their rationale for removal of the wall is to improve the flow of pedestrian traffic.

Marvic Titus, Royal Elite Investments, 7049 Riverside Drive, Dublin, responded that the intent is to put tables in the courtyard, and this the only access for waiters serving those tables.

Mr. Ward stated that there is a unique opportunity to make the shared drive between the two buildings more than a gravel driveway.

Ms. Stenberg stated that she finds it difficult to approve removal of the wall.

Mr. Keeler stated that it would be helpful to know when the wall was added. When he purchased his home, it had porch posts that had been added in the 1980s. The ARB at that time considered that, although not historic, the posts told a story about the house. Later, he discovered the original posts in the barn, and ARB approved replacing the existing porch posts with the original posts. Unless the wall is 75-100 years old, his inclination would be to approve removal.

Ms. Stenberg noted that, according to the 1976 photographic record, it is at least 45 years old.

Mr. Alexander inquired the width between the two piers.

Mr. Ward responded that it is approximately 4.5 - 5 feet. The length of the wall is approximately 6 feet.

Mr. Alexander stated that one option would be to retain the piers and remove the portion between. There is acknowledgement of the past wall and provision of the desired access.

Ms. Rauch responded that a condition could be added to that effect.

Ms. Stenberg responded that would be a fair compromise.

Ms. Bryan inquired the applicant's response to that suggestion.

Mr. Ward responded that retaining both columns would be a reasonable solution. That was his intention.

Ms. Bryan inquired if it is possible to acquire some data on that wall.

Ms. Stenberg suggested that the condition could be based on the further review. Apparently, the wall was built sometime between the 1880s and 1976. Even if it were built as recently as the 1950s, that would make it 75 years old. We have identified our historic structures as anything more than 50 years old. This wall is at least 45 years old and most likely, older. That would make it officially a historic structure.

Mr. Ward stated that their proposal is not to remove the entire stone wall, just a 3-4 ft. section.

Mr. Keeler stated that if the wall were added after the 1920s, he would have no objection to their removing a minimal portion of the wall.

Ms. Stenberg concurred.

Mr. Alexander stated that he is concerned about the trellis. That material is not rigid, and should not be applied to the building. It is not wise to have plants growing up the side of a building. It is becoming more common to see trellises placed about one foot from the building. Putting plants against a building will trap moisture and can lead to insect infestation. In addition, there are enzymes or materials in the feet of most climbing plants that will deteriorate the structure. If a trellis were added, he would recommend that it be placed at least one foot away from the walls of the structure. The window boxes present a similar issue. How will they be attached? There are some window boxes with a wrought iron system with specific areas to be secured, and the window boxes lift out of the structure.

Ms. Titus responded that she would prefer to use artificial plants, which require no time spent on maintenance.

Mr. Ward responded that there are many window boxes along the street. They are willing to work with staff on the preferred design.

Mr. Alexander stated that he has not seen a previous window box proposal since joining the Board.

Ms. Bryan responded that she has concerns about artificial plants, which typically look like artificial plants. She would recommend that a condition be added that the applicant work with staff regarding that item.

Ms. Stenberg responded that is particularly so with a historic property.

Ms. Rauch inquired if the Board is also requiring a more substantial material than is proposed for the trellis.

Mr. Alexander responded that the lattice would have to be. Staff has provided a condition that requires a durable material be used.

Mr. Alexander inquired if the proposal is that a public right-of-way be dedicated for private use, would that be a zoning issue?

Mr. Ward responded that is not public right-of-way.

Ms. Rauch stated that it is not a public right-of-way. They had some discussions concerning the gate. Is the gate the most appropriate way to address this? Staff suggested bollards, but the applicant preferred to use a gate. However, her understanding is that the gate will be open during the day and closed at night.

Mr. Ward responded that the gate will be open, but there will be no vehicular traffic there.

Ms. Rauch stated that because the curb cut will continue to exist, motorists could potentially believe they could drive through there.

Ms. Bryan stated that is a concern. People unfamiliar with the neighborhood could think they are permitted to drive through there.

Mr. Ward stated that they considered removing the curb cut, but then people will park there. The City puts emphasis on the creation of spaces that draw people in. With the current curb cut, that will occur. The alley will be lit and have landscaping. It will draw people in, but not vehicles.

Mr. Bailey stated that if it is going to be only a walkway, there is no need for a curb cut. If he saw the current curb cut, he would likely pull in there. Was the reason they did not want to remove the curb cut to avoid a parking space being added at that location?

Mr. Ward responded affirmatively. He wanted to make it a walkway.

Mr. Keeler suggested that planters be placed across the apron to prevent vehicles entering the alley. It would retain the open feel.

Ms. Rauch responded that the planters could not be placed at the apron, but they could be used in lieu of the gate. The right-of-way line is the edge of the sidewalk adjacent to the building. Planters would not be permitted in the public right-of-way. The sidewalk and the curb cut are in the right-of-way.

Mr. Keeler stated that the planters are temporary.

Ms. Rauch stated that she is not certain that Engineering would be amenable to that suggestion.

Mr. Keeler stated that planters create a certain feel. A gate is a quaint, unique idea. He would suggest either moving the gate back or eliminating it. Two or three temporary planters in the public right-of-way would prohibit vehicle access, but could also be removed.

Mr. Ward responded that they have no objection to using planters versus the gate. It meets their purpose of keeping that area semi-private.

Mr. Keeler stated that his personal preference is for the darker window trim. He would prefer that the door and windows match.

Mr. Ward stated that they are attempting to lighten the buildings and change the feel slightly, to freshen that corner of Old Dublin.

Ms. Bryan moved, Mr. Keeler seconded to approve the Minor Project with ten conditions:

- 1) The applicant update the umbrellas to be a UV- resistant material.
- 2) The applicant update the lattice to a more durable material such as metal or cedar, subject to staff approval.
- 3) The applicant update the pathway to be a brick paver matching the existing brick sidewalk, subject to staff approval.
- 4) The applicant update their plans to clarify the window patterns and mullions be like-for-like in style and character, subject to staff approval.
- 5) The applicant provide standing-seam metal roof specifications that match the existing standing-seam metal roof, subject to staff approval.
- 6) The elevations be updated to reflect the changes to the color palette, including windows painted Kestrel White, and the doors and roof painted a charcoal gray color that coordinates with the overall color palette, subject to staff approval.
- 7) The pillars of the stone patio wall be retained, while the connecting wall may be removed.
- 8) The trellis be placed a minimum of one (1) foot from the existing structures.
- 9) The applicant use planters instead of the gate.
- 10) The applicant work with staff to finalize the design of the window boxes and the plant materials.

Vote: Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Ms. Keeler, yes; Mr. Bailey, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes.
(Motion approved 5-0.)

There were no additional questions or comments.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:45 p.m.



CITY OF DUBLIN.

Land Use and
Long Range Planning
5800 Shier-Rings Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236

Phone/ TDD: 614-410-4600
Fax: 614-410-4747
Web Site: www.dublin.oh.us

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

BOARD ORDER

JANUARY 26, 2011

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

1. 16 North High Street Multi-Tenant Sign Plan 16 North High Street
11-002ARB Architectural Review Board

Proposal: A multi-tenant sign for an existing retail building located within the Historic Business district, approximately 100 feet north of the intersection of West Bridge Street and North High Street.

Request: Review and approval of sign modifications under the provisions of Code Section 153.070 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Applicant: Mark Greiwe, Cruise One Dublin.

Planning Contact: Alexis Dunfee, Planning Assistant
Eugenia M. Martin, ASLA, Landscape Architect

Contact Information: (614) 410-4600, adunfee@dublin.oh.us; emartin@dublin.oh.us

MOTION: Robert Schisler made a motion, seconded by Carl Karrer, to approve this Sign Plan application because the proposed primary identification wall sign and the secondary identification rear wall sign meet the requirements of the Zoning Code as well as the *Historic Dublin Design Guideline*, with two conditions:

- 1) The mounting brackets for the wall signs be concealed; and
- 2) The one-square-foot wall sign be used as the primary identification sign on the front of the building.

VOTE: 5 – 0.

RESULT: This Sign Plan application was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

William Souders	Yes
Tom Currie	Yes
Robert Schisler	Yes
Carl Karrer	Yes
Denise Franz King	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION


Eugenia M. Martin, ASLA
Landscape Architect

Ms. Martin said Planning would check with the utility companies regarding their regulations on the placement and location of meters.

Mr. Souders briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Architectural Review Board. He swore in those interested in speaking in regards to the cases on the agenda, including the applicant, Mark Greiwe and City representatives.

**1. 16 North High Street Multi-Tenant Sign Plan
11-002ARB**

**16 North High Street
Sign Modifications**

Eugenia Martin presented this request for review and approval of a multi-tenant sign plan for an existing building located at 16 North High Street. She presented photographs of the two existing five-square-foot wall signs which are constructed of 1 ½-inch thick HDU and attached to the building with hidden stainless steel screws and nylon anchors. Ms. Martin said the background of the existing signs are sandblasted and painted Sherwin Williams Rookwood Red. She said the border and the text are painted Sherwin Williams Moderate White.

Primary Identification Sign

Ms. Martin said the applicant is proposing the addition of a one-square-foot sign panel to be located below the southern existing five-square-foot wall sign. She said the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* permit signs to be a maximum of six-square feet in size. She said the additional sign panel will be constructed similar to the existing wall sign in material, finish, and colors. She said the font proposed is Caston Bold. She said the method of the attachment was not indicated on the plans and will need to be concealed.

Ms. Martin said the applicant is also proposing a multi-tenant projection sign with two different potential locations. She said the multi-tenant projection sign is in addition to the existing wall signs. She said both options consist of double-sided six-square-foot sign faces, painted Rookwood Red. She said the 6.75-inches by 30 inches aluminum tenant panels are white with maroon colored text.

Ms. Martin explained Code permits one wall sign per building or use, or one ground sign, but not a combination of both. She said the addition of the multi-tenant projection sign with the current wall sign is not permitted by Code. She said the approval of the multi-tenant projection sign would require the removal of both existing wall signs on the front façade of the building.

Ms. Martin explained the proposed ground-mounted projection sign is not permitted by Code as all ground signs are to be located eight feet from the right-of-way. She said a variance would be required from the Board of Zoning Appeals if it was sanctioned by the Board.

Ms. Martin said Planning recommends approval of the one-square-foot wall sign panel, as it is more consistent with the existing wall signs, the structure and overall sign design.

Secondary Identification Sign

Ms. Martin said the applicant is also proposing a secondary identification sign at the rear of the structure. She explained the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* permit a second sign for any business or use which has a secondary entrance off of the rear of the building from a parking

area. Ms. Martin said a two-panel multi-tenant wall sign is proposed to be located on the north side of the rear entrance. She said the total sign size is 2.8-square feet and each tenant panel is approximately 1.4-square feet in size. She said the background is proposed to be painted Rookwood Red and the text and border would be painted Moderate White. Ms. Martin said the proposed secondary identification wall sign meets the *Guideline* requirements. She said based upon Planning's analysis of the general review standards, this proposal can be met with the following conditions:

- 1) The mounting brackets for the wall signs be concealed; and
- 2) The one-square-foot wall sign be used as the primary identification sign on the front of the building.

Robert Schisler asked where the true entrance for Cruise One was located.

Mark Greiwe, the applicant and part owner of Cruise One of Dublin said they had two entrances. He said their customers can access their second floor office either through the front entrance to Our CupCakery, or from the rear of the building if the other business was closed.

William Souders reviewed the three options proposed and asked if the applicant had a preferred option.

Mr. Greiwe said he would like to have both the wall sign panel and the multi-tenant projection sign, but he read the Code after he submitted his application and he now understood that a ground sign was not permitted in combination with a wall sign. He presented photographs he collected and had previously submitted of signs in the District. He said it appeared the Code was written for a single occupant and if there was a post sign, a wall sign was not needed for one door, entrance, or use. He said this building had three uses, and to have one post sign and three doors without signs would be very confusing for a customer or pedestrian in Historic Dublin to find their businesses.

Mr. Greiwe said the proposed wall sign panel could have hidden stainless steel anchors into the stone or they could just hang it from the existing sign and conceal the attachments if that was an option, which he preferred. He said they would use hidden stainless steel anchors on the rear wooden sign.

Mr. Souders said of the signs Mr. Greiwe presented, he recalled during his time as a Board Member only approving two of the signs and neither one was what they had approved. He said 'Nationwide' was approved, but the bottom sign panel and the sign on the door were not approved. He said how the other signs got there was before his time as a Board member. He asked which of the three options for the front sign was preferred by the applicant. He said the rear sign was not an issue.

Mr. Greiwe said there was only one option which permitted the customers to know what door to use. He said to take down the two existing wall signs and put up one multi-tenant projection sign in addition to small window signs was not a good option for any of the business owners. He said they preferred the proposal for the multi-tenant projection sign be omitted and the 5-inch by 30-

inch, one-square foot wall sign panel on the front and the multi-tenant sign panel on the rear of the building be approved. He said they were not going to remove signs already on the building.

Mr. Schisler said he had no issue with the signs preferred by Mr. Greiwe.

Mr. Souders verified Mr. Greiwe preferred Option 1, the addition of the one-square foot panel. Mr. Souders thanked Mr. Greiwe for gathering the photographs of signs in the District. Mr. Greiwe said he did it to get ideas for his signs.

Tom Currie asked if the proposed way finding signs would identify businesses. Ms. Martin said she did not think specific businesses would be identified. She said she was not sure what the way finding signs would include.

Ms. King asked why the rear sign only listed two of the three businesses. Mr. Greiwe explained for Our Cupcakery birthday parties, customers park in the back and go up to the second floor meeting room. He said Java Jan customers use the front door and come to the counter.

Linda Kick said she agreed with Mr. Greiwe the majority of Java Jan's customers generally use her front door. She said Java Jan was involved in the consideration of sign options available. Ms. Kick asked for an explanation and clarification as to why different buildings in the Historic District had different signs.

Ms. Martin said Bri-Hi Square as well as Town Center I and II are in a Planned Unit Development District which meant they had a development text written specifically for those parcels and developments. She said the development text allows them to make modifications to the Code, like to the signs requirements, such as number and type to permit both wall signs and projecting/blade signs. She said the Town Center I text addresses signs for second floor offices with access internal to the building. She said Planning recognizes the Sign Code could use some modifications in order to address some of these concerns, especially in a walkable district. She said consultant Greg Dale, with McBride, Dale, Clarion Associates, has been contracted to help address this.

Ms. Kick pointed said she did not understand how Code can be written for certain businesses and not others. She said it seemed like it was discriminating against certain businesses when they are not allowed the same opportunity to have as many signs just because a new building was built across the street and a sign package was made just for them. She asked why a sign package could not be made for this building.

Jennifer Rauch said by rezoning a property to a Planned Unit Development, more signs could be permitted. She said a rezoning in the District would need to be reviewed by the Architectural Board as well as the Planning and Zoning Commission and approved by City Council. She explained since the Historic District was a standard district, it was bound by limited rules, whereas the intent of a planned district was to provide more flexibility. She said it was unfortunate in the District certain developments have greater sign options than other businesses.

Ms. Kick suggested from a business owner's perspective, she would like to see this issue brought to the top of the pile rather than the bottom because they hear every day that customers did not see their signs. She said for revitalization of the area, which is a Council goal, it be something looked at sooner than later.

Ms. King recalled at a previous ARB meeting, the Board discussed projecting signs and wall signs. She said the issue needed to be addressed, because there was a safety issue from the standpoint of finding a building in an emergency. She said many times street numbers cannot be found on the buildings. She said when driving in traffic and watching for pedestrians, projecting signs would be helpful to find a business. She said she was very cognizant of sign pollution, but there has to be some equity, as well.

Ms. Rauch said Planning definitely agreed and could sympathize with the applicant. She said they would like to be in a more proactive state so signs are tasteful and match the building but also provide pedestrian and vehicular visibility.

Motion and Vote

Robert Schisler made a motion, seconded by Carl Karrer, to approve this Sign Plan application because the proposed primary identification wall sign and the secondary identification rear wall sign meet the requirements of the Zoning Code as well as the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*, with two conditions:

- 1) The mounting brackets for the wall signs be concealed; and
- 2) The one-square-foot wall sign be used as the primary identification sign on the front of the building.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Souders, yes; Mr. Schisler, yes; Ms. King, yes; Mr. Currie, yes; and Mr. Karrer, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)



CITY OF DUBLIN.

Land Use and
Long Range Planning
5800 Shier-Rings Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236

Phone/ TDD: 614-410-4600
Fax: 614-410-4747
Web Site: www.dublin.oh.us

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

BOARD ORDER

DECEMBER 16, 2009

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

1. **Our Cupcakery / Java Jan** **16 North High Street**
09-101ARB **Sign Modifications**

Proposal: Two wall signs for two new businesses located at 16 North High Street. The 0.27 acre site is located on the east side of North High Street, north of the intersection with West Bridge Street, in the Historic District.

Request: Review and approval of sign modifications under the provisions of the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Applicant: Linda Kick, Owner of Our CupCakery; Janet Antauer, Owner of Java Jan

Planning Contact: Eugenia M. Martin ASLA, Landscape Architect

Contact Information: (614) 410-4650, emartin@dublin.oh.us

MOTION: William Souders made a motion, seconded by Tom Currie, to approve this Architectural Review Board application with five conditions:

- 1) That the wall signs be located adjacent to each of the respective business entrances and located six inches below the door header and six inches from the door jamb, to the nearest mortar joint;
- 2) That the attachment of the signs be in the mortar joints and be concealed;
- 3) That the existing decorative bracket above the north door be removed and the mortar joints be repaired;
- 4) That the applicant use the proposed alternative light fixture in lieu of the existing gooseneck fixture in its existing location; and
- 5) That a sign permit be obtained for each sign prior to installation.

*Linda Kick, agreed to the above conditions.


VOTE: 4 – 0.

RESULT: This Architectural Review Board application was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

William Souders	Yes
Tom Currie	Yes
Robert Schisler	Yes
Carl Karrer	Absent
Denise Franz King	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION


Eugenia M. Martin, ASLA
Landscape Architect

11-002ARB

Sign Modifications
CruiseOne Tours and Travel
16 North High Street

Tom Currie asked the next steps to select an artist for the Karrer Barn – Art in Public Places project and the Board's role in the process. Ms. Martin indicated she would contact Sara Ott for an update. William Souders said at the last Council meeting, it was indicated the process would be slowed and the design process would begin in 2010 as opposed to being fully implemented by the 2010 Bicentennial.

Mr. Souders briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Board. He swore in those who intended to speak in regards to any of the cases on the Agenda, including the applicants, their representatives, and City representatives.

**1. Our Cupcakery / Java Jan
09-101ARB**

**16 North High Street
Sign Modifications**

Eugenia Martin presented this request for review and approval of sign modifications for two businesses. She said the sign modifications are proposed to be on the North High Street façade of the building. She explained the signs are proposed to be located in the blank area between the two business entry doors and the existing gooseneck light would be relocated to highlight both signs. Ms. Martin said the bottom of the signs would be eight feet, six inches from grade, which meets Code. She said the signs are both five-square feet in size and made of 1 ½-inch thick high-density urethane. Ms. Martin explained the signs will be attached to the building with stainless steel screws and nylon anchors located in the mortar joints.

Ms. Martin said the 'Our Cupcakery' sign was previously approved in February 2007 for the applicant's former location at 119 South High Street. She said the font is Caslon 550 Italic and the tag line is Palatino. She said the 'Java Jan' sign font is Commercial Script and the 'Gourmet Coffee' text is Lucida Sans. Ms. Martin said the background of the signs would be sandblasted away, leaving a raised text and border and. She said the background would be painted Rookwood Red while the text and border would be painted Immoderate White. Ms. Martin said the applicant is proposing to use the existing 21 ½-inch tall gooseneck light fixture, but has provided an alternate 10¼-inch tall fixture with a similar warehouse shade but with a lantern style mounting.

Ms. Martin said the proposed location for the signs was selected due to a conflict with an existing gutter. She said the design of the building, with two separate entrances, architecturally calls for each sign to be located above the doors and Planning recommends the signs be relocated to that location. She said the relocated light fixture would block the views of the signs and Planning recommends the applicant use the alternative light fixture. Ms. Martin said the applicant indicated the electric supply to the light fixture would be on the exterior of the building through a stone-colored conduit. She said Planning recommends all electric be run internally to the building to not alter the architectural character of the structure.

Ms. Martin said the proposed signs have been reviewed by Planning for compliance with the preservation and character of the Historic District, the Historic Dublin Design Guidelines, and the Zoning Code. She said size, scale and design compatibility have great impact on the building and the District and Planning recommends approval with the following six conditions:

- 1) The location of the wall signs be above the respective business entrance into the building and that the downspout above the south door be adjusted to accommodate a sign and light fixture;
- 2) The attachment of the signs be in the mortar joints;
- 3) The existing decorative bracket above the north door be removed and the mortar joints be repaired;
- 4) The applicant use the proposed alternative light fixture in lieu of reusing the existing gooseneck fixture and that each sign be individually illuminated;
- 5) The power supply to the light fixtures be located on the interior of the building, the existing gooseneck light fixture and junction box removed, and the area repaired; and
- 6) A sign permit be obtained for each sign prior to installation.

Robert Schisler asked if the stainless steel screws would be placed through the sign faces or would there be a bracket on the back of the signs. Ms. Martin said Planning recommends they be placed on the back of the sign.

Linda Kick, the applicant, said the challenge was the downspout which needs to be at a 45-degree angle if the southern sign is moved further to the right. She said there was only six inches to move the downspout over so it does not block the window.

Mr. Souders asked if the downspout emptied out onto the sidewalk. Ms. Kick said the downspout went to the far end of the building into another downspout and then another downspout. Mr. Souders suggested the downspout be put straight down between the doors since the light was being moved.

Mr. Schisler asked if there was an eight-foot Code restriction for wall-mounted signs, or could they be lower. He said if the signs were lowered, it would make it easier to deal with the gutter. Ms. Martin agreed the wall sign could be brought down so that the bottom is even with the top of the header above the door.

Mr. Souders confirmed the Code did not state that a wall mounted sign had to be eight feet; it just had to be a minimum of four feet. He suggested the sign be put to the left and right sides of the doors, down lower, below the header. Mr. Souders said the bottom of the sign would be around five feet. Ms. Kick asked if the bottom should start at about five feet. Mr. Souders said the top was more critical and it needed to be right below the wood header at the nearest mortar joint.

Denise Franz King said from the standpoint of a customer, some of the signs in the Historic District have ended up being too high. She said when you are looking at the shop, sometimes the signs are missed and the lower height would address the visibility, which then promotes business health as well as being architecturally in accord with the Guidelines.

Mr. Currie asked if they were going to use the existing light. Ms. Kick agreed to not move the existing lamp between the doors and stated the existing light fixture was broken after only six months. She asked if there was an objection to replace it with the proposed alternate light fixture. Mr. Souders, Mr. Currie, and Mr. Schisler agreed to the alternate light fixture being used.

Motion and Vote

William Souders made a motion, seconded by Tom Currie, to approve this Architectural Review Board application with five conditions:

- 1) That the wall signs be located adjacent to each of the respective business entrances and located six inches below the door header and six inches from the door jamb, to the nearest mortar joint;
- 2) That the attachment of the signs be in the mortar joints and be concealed;
- 3) That the existing decorative bracket above the north door be removed and the mortar joints be repaired;
- 4) That the applicant use the proposed alternative light fixture in lieu of the existing gooseneck fixture in its existing location; and
- 5) That a sign permit be obtained for each sign prior to installation.

Ms. Kick agreed to the five conditions.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Currie, yes; Ms. King, yes; Mr. Schisler, yes; and Mr. Souders, yes. (Approved 4 – 0.)

2. Donatos Pizza 09-103ARB


6-12 South High Street Sign Modifications

Eugenia Martin presented this request for review and approval of sign modifications for an existing restaurant. Ms. Martin said the proposed sign modifications are located on the South High Street elevation and the East Bridge Street elevation. She said the signs will remain in the same location and the applicant proposed to use two new double-faced projecting signs which compliment the signs across the street at Town Center I. She said the decorative mounting brackets would be reused and the bottom of the signs would be 8-foot, 2-inches from grade. She said the signs are 3-inch thick redwood panels that will have the background carved away, leaving a raised text and border. Ms. Martin said the sign background will be painted Emerald Green and the border, text, and graphic will be painted Metallic Gold. She said the proposed font is Insignia, which has art deco and western style influences that are identified in the Historic Dublin Design Guidelines as appropriate font styles for the District.

Ms. Martin said the existing signs are illuminated by two box-like fixtures with florescent bulbs. She said a condition of the 1991 approval for the illumination of the signs was the lights were not to exceed 40-watts. She believed the condition was meant to include the lumen level, which would be equivalent to approximately 575 lumens. She said the proposed lights would be replaced with comparable lumen level LED lighting and the fixture painted to match the sign.

Ms. Martin said the two proposed signs were reviewed for compliance with preservation and character of the Historic District, the Historic Dublin Design Guidelines, and the Zoning Code. She said the size, scale, and design compatibility have great impact on the building and the District. She said it is Planning's analysis that the proposed application meets the Guidelines with two conditions:

- 1) The comparable wattage of the LED light fixtures not exceed 40-watts; and
- 2) That a sign permit be obtained prior to installation.



CITY OF DUBLIN, OHIO

Land Use and Use and
Long Range Planning Planning
5800 Shier-Rings Road 35 Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236 16-1236
Phone/ TDD: 614-410-4600 10-4600
Fax: 614-410-4747 10-4747
Web Site: www.dublin.oh.us in.oh.us

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

BOARD ORDER

November 28, 2007

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

**1. Your Marketing Corner
07-122ARB**

**16 North High Street
Sign**

Proposal: A six-square-foot projection sign, located on the east side of North High Street, approximately 60 feet north of Bridge Street.
Request: Review and approval of the sign under the provisions of the *Historic District Guidelines*.
Applicant: James Hartley, Signcom, Inc.
Planning Contacts: Diane Alecusan, Planning Assistant and Abby Scott, Planner.
Contact Information: (614) 410-4600
dalecusan@dublin.oh.us and ascott@dublin.oh.us.

MOTION: Tom Holton made a motion, seconded by Tom Currie to approve this application with the following four conditions:

- 1) That anchor bolts for the sign be attached at the mortar joints rather than the stone face of the building in order to preserve the original building façade;
- 2) The two proposed paint colors be matte finish to blend with the building;
- 3) That a white softer than Super White be used on the sign face, subject to staff approval; and
- 4) That the sign be made of a 1½-inch thick HDU foam material.

* Mr. Crommes, Sign Com, Inc., agreed to the above conditions


VOTE: 4 – 0.

RESULT: This sign application was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Thomas Holton	Yes
Clayton Bryan	Yes
William Souders	Yes
Tom Currie	Yes
Linda Kick	Absent

Staff Certification


Abby Scott
Planner

11-002ARB
Sign Modifications
CruiseOne Tours and Travel
16 North High Street

Communications

Mr. Gunderman reported that the Planning and Zoning Commission will be hearing the Bridge and High Streets Development this month and that the Board will review it after that meeting.

Mr. Holton explained the duties and responsibilities of the Architectural Review Board. He swore in those who intended to speak in regards to the cases on the agenda.

**1. Your Marketing Corner
07-122ARB**

**16 North High Street
Sign**

Diane Alecusan presented this case, a request for review and approval of a proposed six-square-foot projection sign. She said Planning has reviewed this application based on the *Historic Dublin Design Guideline #15*, and is recommending approval with the two conditions listed in the Planning Report.

The Board was in agreement with the details of the sign proposed with the exception of color and thickness.

Clayton Bryan asked that a softer white be used on the sign face instead of the proposed Super White subject to staff approval, since the building was a buff color and the sign was smooth-finished. Mr. Bryan also noted that other Historic Dublin signs were more off-white.

Mr. Currie noted that the proposed sign was wider than the bracket which seemed inappropriate. Mr. Souders agreed. Mr. Holton concluded that the Board recommends a 1½-inch high density polyurethane (HDU) foam be used instead of the two-inch thick foam proposed because of the sign proportion to the bracket.

Mr. Crommes, Sign Com, Inc., agreed to the following four conditions:

- 1) That anchor bolts for the sign be attached at the mortar joints rather than the stone face of the building in order to preserve the original building façade;
- 2) The two proposed paint colors be matte finish to blend with the building;
- 3) That a white softer than Super White be used on the sign face, subject to staff approval; and
- 4) That the sign be made of a 1½-inch thick HDU foam material.

Mr. Currie made the motion to approve this application with the four conditions listed above, and Mr. Holton seconded. The vote was as follows: Mr. Bryan, yes; Mr. Souders, yes; Mr. Currie, yes; and Mr. Holton, yes. (Approved 4 – 0.)

**2. Bailey Residence
07-116ARB**

**55 South Riverview Street
Site Modifications**

Gary Gunderman presented this case for a request to add a black steel ornamental fence with pointed finials for a single-family residence. He said the *Historic Dublin Design Guideline #13* states that fences should be a traditional style and material. He said Planning's opinion and recommendation is that the fence and proposed site plan be approved, but that the fence design be modified to eliminate the pointed finials because they do not meet the Dublin Zoning Code.

11-002ARB
Sign Modifications
CruiseOne Tours and Travel
16 North High Street