Parcel 273-000092 Address 63 S High St OHI FRA-2548-1

Year Built:	Ca.1840	Map No:	128	Photo No:	2070-2074 (7/12/16)
Theme:	Domestic	Historic Use:	Single family house	Present Use:	Single family house
Style:	Greek Revival	Foundation:	Stone	Wall Type:	Stone
Roof Type:	Front gable/standing seam metal	Exterior Wall:	Stone	Symmetry:	Yes
Stories:	1.5	Front Bays:	3	Side Bays:	2
Porch:	Stone and concrete stoop at façade entrance	Chimney:	1, Interior, off ridge near center of house	Windows:	1-over-1, 2-over-2 and 6-over-6 Wood sashes

Description: The one-story Greek Revival-style house is of stone masonry construction. The front-gable roof is sheathed in standing seam metal and features cornice returns in the gable ends. The front door is centered on the façade and includes a paneled surround with multi-light sidelights and transom. The majority of windows present are two-over-two wood sashes, but paired one-over-ones are on the second story façade gable, and six-over-six windows are on the side elevations. West of the house is a gable-roofed detached garage.

Setting: The building is located on the northwest corner of S High St and Eberly Hill Ln in the old village center of Dublin. North or the house is a modern shopping complex, and west is an alley, Mill Ln.

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 a contributing resource to the Dublin High Street Historic District. It is also contributing to the City of Dublin's local Historic Dublin district. The property is recommended to remain a contributing resource to the recommended Dublin High Street Historic District, boundary increase.

District:	Yes	Contributing Status:	Recommended contributing
National Register:	Local Historic Dublin district Recommended Dublin High Street Historic District, boundary increase	Property Name:	Tuller/Richards Residence



63 S High St, looking northwest



63 S High St, looking southwest

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

FRA - 2548-1

FRANKLIN

TULLER RICHARDS RES.

63 S. HIGH ST.

1.No.	2.County	4.Present Name(s)	
FRA 2548-1	FRA		☑ CODED ☐ CODED
3.Location of Negatives: City of Dublin		5.Historic or Other Name(s): Tuller/Richards Residence	
Roll No. 1	Picture No.(s) 11		

6.Specific Address or Location: 63 S. High Street

6a. Lot, Section or VMD Number:

7.City or Village / If Rural, Township & Vicinity: Dublin

8. Site Plan with North Arrow



9. U.T.M. Reference
Quadrangle Name: NW Columbus
17 (Zone) 319800 (Easting) 4440640 (Northing)

10. ☐ Site ☒ Building ☐ Structure ☐ Object

11. On National Register?	Yes	12. N.R. Potential?	
13. Part of Estab. Hist. Dist?	Yes	14. District Potential?	

15. Name of Established District (N.R. or Local): Dublin H. D. (local)

16. Thematic Association(s): architecture/19th c.

17. Date(s) or Period: c.1836 | 17b. Alteration Date(s):

18. Style or Design: Greek Revival ☐ High Style ☒ Elements

18a. Style of Addition or Elements(s):

19. Architect or Engineer:

19a. Design Sources:

20. Contractor or Builder:

21. Building Type or Plan:

22. Original Use, if apparent: residence

23. Present Use: residence

24. Ownership: ☐ Public ☒ Private

25. Owner's Name & Address, if known:

26. Property Acreage:

27. Other Surveys in Which Included: National Register 4/79

28. No. of Stories: 1 1/2

29. Basement? ☐ Yes ☒ No

30. Foundation Material: stone

31. Wall Construction: stone

32. Roof Type & Material: gable/st.seam metal

33. No. of Bays: Front 3 Side 3

34. Exterior Wall Material(s): stone

35. Plan Shape: rect.

36. Changes: ☐ Addition ☐ Altered ☐ Moved (Explain In #42)

37. Window Types: ☐ 6 over 6 ☐ 4 over 4 ☒ 2 over 2 ☐ Other

38. Building Dimensions:

39. Endangered? No
By What?

40. Chimney Placement: center/ridge

41. Distance from and Frontage on Road:

42.Further Description of Important Interior and Exterior Features(Continue on reverse if necessary)
Simple gabled cottage with some Greek Revival elements including the recessed entrance with transoms and sidelights and the simple box cornice with returns. Other features include two-over-two windows; and several rear windows have six-over-six sash.



PHOTO

43. History and Significance (Continue on reverse if necessary)
Built by Horace Tuller and remained in the same family for several generations. Polly Richards, great-granddaughter of the builder moved here in 1908 and continued to live here for many years. She worked at Jeffrey Mfg.Co. in Columbus for 30 years(over)

44. Description of Environment and Outbuildings (See #52)
Located on a landscaped lot with a brick sidewalk in front and a concrete block garage at the rear.

45. Sources of Information
OHI 8/76; Aley Richards, descendent of Horace Tuller; 1872 Franklin County Atlas; Shanachie Historical

46. Prepared by: Simmons/Recchie

47. Organization: BDR&C

48. Date Recorded in Field: 8/76

49. Revised by: N.Recchie | 50. Date Revised: 3/03

50b. Reviewed by:

51. Condition of Property

- [ ] Excellent
- [ ] Good/Fair
- [ ] Deteriorated
- [ ] Ruin
- [ ] Destroyed/Burned

Date _____

52. Historic Outbuildings and Dependencies

Barn Type(s)

- [ ] Corn Crib or Shed
- [ ] Summer Kitchen
- [ ] Silo
- [ ] Smoke House
- [ ] Spring House
- [ ] Ice House
- [ ] Designed landscape features
- [ ] Privy
- [ ] Garage

53. Affiliated OAI Site Number(s)

Archaeological Feature:

Observed

- [ ] Well
- [ ] Privy
- [ ] Cistern
- [ ] Foundation
- [ ] Structural Rubble
- [ ] Formal Trash Dump
- [ ] Other -

Expected on Basis of Archival Research

- [ ] Well
- [ ] Privy
- [ ] Cistern
- [ ] Foundation
- [ ] Structural Rubble
- [ ] Formal Trash Dump
- [ ] Other -

54. Farmstead Plan

42. (Cont'd)

43. (Cont'd)

after her husband Alva Richards died in 1928. This home is typical of early stone buildings in the Dublin area.

44. (Cont'd)

DocuSign Envelope ID: C036E95B-0BE9-4652-BFC5-49A9252EB728

RECORD OF ACTION

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, October 25, 2023 | 6:30 pm

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

1. Trevor Furbay Sign at 63 S. High Street
23-090ARB-MPR **Minor Project Review**

Proposal:	Installation of an approximately 1.5-square-foot sign to an existing sign located in Historic Dublin.
Location:	Northwest of the intersection of South High Street and Eberly Hill Lane.
Request:	Review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.176 and the *Historic Design Guidelines*.
Applicants:	Amy Fox and Trevor Furbay.
Planning Contacts:	Daniel Klein, Planning Assistant Sarah Tresouthick Holt, AICP, ASLA, Senior Planner
Contact Information:	614.410.4696, dklein@dublin.oh.us 614.410.4662, sholt@dublin.oh.us
Case Information:	www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/23-071

MOTION: Mr. Damaser moved, Mr. Cotter seconded, to approve the Minor Project Review.

VOTE: 5 – 0

RESULT: The Minor Project Review was approved with no conditions.

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

DRAFT

MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, October 25, 2023

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Alexander, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and welcomed everyone to the October 25, 2023 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, Martha Cooper, Gary Alexander, Michael Jewell
Staff members present: Sarah Holt, Daniel Klein, Brian Gable, Shawn Krawetzki

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Cotter moved, Ms. Cooper seconded acceptance of the documents into the record and approval of the 09-27-23 ARB minutes and 08-30-23 joint work session minutes.

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

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.

CASES

- **Case 23-090 - Trevor Furbay Sign, 63 S. High Street, Minor Project Review**

A request to install an approximately 1.5-square-foot sign beneath an existing sign on a 0.26-acre site located northwest of the intersection of South High Street and Eberly Hill Lane, zoned HD-HS, Historic South District.

Case Presentation

DRAFT

Mr. Klein stated that this is a request for review and approval of the installation of one hanging sign to an existing ground sign at 63 S. High Street. The .26-acre site is zoned HD-HS, Historic South District and contains an existing 1.5-story structure and detached one-story garage. The applicant is proposing to install a 1.5 square foot hanging sign to the existing ground sign. The previously approved ground sign is located 2 feet from the right-of-way, which is less than the minimum setback of 8 feet from the right-of-way. With the existing building footprint located approximately 6 feet from the right-of-way, it would be impossible for a ground sign to meet the setback requirement, and in July 2022, the Board approved the sign location. The new sign face will be approximately 6 square feet in size, 3-foot width by 6-inch height and will be double-sided with the same logo on each side. The new sign face will be 2-inch thick red cedar with ½-inch raised letters, matching the dimensions and materials of the existing ground sign. The lettering will be in Pure White, SW 7005, on a Naval, SW 6244, background, also matching the colors of the existing ground sign. The logo will read "Collections For Women". The sign meets all Code Sign requirements described in Section 153.173(M). All conditions for the Minor Review are either met or not applicable. Staff recommends approval of the Minor Project Review with no conditions.

Applicant Presentation

The applicant provided no additional presentation.

Public Comment

No public comments were received on the case.

Commission Questions/Discussion

There were no questions or discussion.

Ms. Damaser moved, Mr. Cotter seconded approval of the Minor Project.
Vote: Mr. Jewell, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Ms. Damaser, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes. [Motion carried 5-0.]

Presentations

- **South High Street Utility Burial Project**

Staff Presentation

Brian Gable stated that he has been asked to provide an overview on phase 2 of the South High Street Burial Project, which is similar to phase 1. The area for the phase 2 portion of the project is bounded to the north by E. Bridge Street, to the south by Short Street, to the west by S. High Street and to the east by S. Riverview Street. Although the homes within that area that abut S. Riverview Street will be impacted, S. Riverview Street itself will not be included in the project. Portions of several zoning districts lie within this project area, including the HD-Historic Core, HD-Historic South and HD-Historic Residential. The underground utility extension area involves S. High Street, Short Street, Pinney Hill Lane and Blacksmith Lane, ending on Blacksmith Lane just south of Bridge Street. The least intrusive approach will be taken so as to have as little impact as possible on the mature trees and landscaping and the historical walls in that area. He described the easements that will be requested for phase 2 and the ground-mounted facilities. He reviewed

DocuSign Envelope ID: 60E446EA-74E4-4952-82EA-A00915C2A2AD

BOARD ORDER

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, April 26, 2023 | 6:30 pm

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

3. Trevor Furbay, Sign at 63 S. High Street
23-033MPR **Minor Project Review**

Proposal:	Installation of a ±6-square-foot ground sign on a 0.26-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic South.
Location:	Northwest of the intersection of S. High Street with Eberly Hill Lane.
Request:	Review and approval of a Minor Project under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.176 and the *Historic Design Guidelines*.
Applicant:	Amy Fox, Trevor Furbay
Planning Contacts:	Daniel Klein, Planning Assistant and Sarah Tresouthick Holt, AICP, ASLA, Senior Planner
Contact Information:	614.410.4696, dklein@dublin.oh.us and 614.410.4662, sholt@dublin.oh.us
Case Information:	www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/23-033

MOTION: Ms. Damaser moved, Ms. Cooper seconded, to approve the Minor Project for the installation of a ground sign and exterior modifications to the building without conditions.

VOTE: 5 – 0

RESULT: The Minor Project was approved for the ground sign and exterior modifications to the building.

RECORDED VOTES:

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

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:
Sarah T. Holt
89A2805342A848D...

Sarah Tresouthick Holt, AICP, ASLA
Senior Planner

Construction and design of a cemetery to preserve a historic grave site. The 0.13-acre site is zoned ID-1, Research Office District and is located northeast of the roundabout of Shier Rings Road and University Boulevard.

Case Presentation

Ms. Holt stated that this a request for review and approval of site improvements, as described in the staff report, at a historic cemetery site, which is an Appendix G property. Staff has reviewed the application against the applicable criteria and recommends approval with one condition, to which the applicant has agreed.

Public Comment

Gene Bostic, former Washington Township Trustee, stated that this project is in Washington Township, and the township is very interested in this project. This cemetery predates the township, which was formed in 1810. At their meeting last evening, the Township trustees expressed a desire to partner with the City of Dublin in a joint effort to make the site beautiful.

Mr. Alexander inquired if the Township trustees have been involved in the project planning.
Ms. Holt responded that Councilmember Kramb has been working with Washington Township on this effort, so there appears to have been City and Township collaboration.

Mr. Jewell moved, Mr. Cotter seconded approval of the Minor Project at Brown Harris Cemetery with one condition:

1) Continue to work with staff to install one bike rack of appropriate style and color within the access easement for the project, to be shown at Certificate of Zoning Plan Approval (CZPA).

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

3. Trevor Furbay, Sign at 63 S. High Street, 23-033MPR, Minor Project Review

Installation of a ±6-square-foot ground sign on a 0.26-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic South. The site is located northwest of the intersection of S. High Street with Eberly Hill Lane.

Case Presentation

Mr. Klein stated that this is a request for the review and approval of one ground sign and painting of the front door and window trim at 63 S. High Street, as described in the staff report. Staff has reviewed the application against the applicable criteria and recommends approval with no conditions.

Public Comment

There were no public comments.

Ms. Damaser moved, Ms. Cooper seconded approval of the Minor Project for exterior site modifications at 63 S. High Street with no conditions.

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

4. 83 S. High Street, 23-013MPR, Minor Project Review

Remodel and addition to an existing, two-story building on a 0.15-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic South. The site is located southwest of the intersection of Eberly Hill Lane with S. High Street.

Case Presentation

Ms. Holt stated that this site is located within the Historic South District. This district extends north and east of this site; the area to the west is zoned Historic Residential. The site lies just north of Pinneyhill Lane and South High Street; Mill Lane lies rear of the property. This project was reviewed informally by the ARB twice previously. The building has been used as a business, and a shared parking lot is located between the house and garage; the parking lot extends to Pinneyhill Lane. The cross access easement was removed in 2017. The owners intend to convert the structure to their private residence, while using the carriage house in its current form as a home office. This is the Giles Weaver house, built ca. 1830. The house was found by the Historic Cultural Assessment to be contributing on the basis of location, design, setting, feeling, and association, and the condition was noted as good. She noted that the walls are clad in clapboard siding, and the roof is zinc-colored standing seam metal in a saltbox form. The new paint color will match what exists. The existing rear porch will be removed to accommodate the new addition. The carriage house, which was constructed in approximately 1940, is proposed as a future home office. No changes to that structure are proposed other than removal of the arbor and patio, which are located within the Mill Lane right-of-way. Ms. Holt described the proposed elevation changes, materials and colors. Staff has reviewed the application against the applicable criteria and recommends approval of three (3) waivers and approval of the Minor Project with five (5) conditions.

1) The visible addition foundation shall be clad in stone or manufactured stone to match the existing structure's foundation, to be approved by staff prior to building permit.
2) The proposed front façade lighting shall be revised to fixtures that are less ornate and more vernacular in character, to be approved by staff prior to building permit. Any additional lighting shall be approved by staff prior to building permit.
3) The proposed roof color shall closely match the original zinc color of the structure, to be demonstrated at building permit.
4) The applicant shall provide detailed plans for any modification to utilities at the building permit stage, to the satisfaction of staff.
5) A comprehensive redevelopment study shall be conducted at building permit, such that no other parcels are adversely affected (not necessarily limited to stormwater, parking, and access) by this development, in which any necessary improvements are incorporated to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

DocuSign Envelope ID: FCCF5DAC-FA0A-466B-8AC1-D04AF0C3AB01

BOARD ACTION

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, July 27, 2022 | 6:30 pm

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

2. Dublin Pop-Up Business - Mural at 63 S. High Street
22-008MPR **Minor Project Review**

Proposal:	Installation of a ±154-square-foot mural on an existing garage used for retail on a 0.26-acre lot zoned Historic District, Historic South.
Location:	Northwest of the intersection of S. High Street with Eberly Hill Lane.
Request:	Review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.176 and the *Historic Design Guidelines*.
Applicants:	Emily Goliver, Management Analyst and Kendel Blake, Management Analyst, City of Dublin
Planning Contact:	Sarah T. Holt, AICP, ASLA, Senior Planner
Contact Information:	614.410.4662, sholt@dublin.oh.us
Case Information:	www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/22-008

MOTION: Ms. Cooper moved and Ms. Damaser seconded, to approve the Minor Project Review without conditions.

VOTE: 5 – 0

RESULT: The Minor Project Review was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

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

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:
Sarah T. Holt
89A2805342A848D...

Sarah Tresouthick Holt, AICP, ASLA
Senior Planner

The Chair – Landscape reflects a development pattern in a community and landscape archaeology. The applicant's point is understood.
Ms. Schmidt – This comes down to timing. The first arborist's review states two years ago these trees could come down. Right now, we have the opportunity to complete the entire landscaping project, giving new trees the best chance to survive in a healthy way. She was willing to wait, if just the two trees were an issue but is being cognizant of the full landscape master plan and wanted to make the most of that investment.
The Chair – The members are aware of the benefits of planting in the fall but there is a process the Board has to follow.

Ms. Cooper moved and Mr. Jewell seconded, to approve the Minor Project Review with seven (7) conditions:

1) That the applicant provide further documentation for their proposed stormwater management outlets prior to submitting for a Certificate of Zoning Plan Approval (CZPA), subject to City Engineer review and approval;

2) That the applicant apply for a right-of-way permit, coordinate, and obtain approval from, City of Dublin Engineering to construct sections of the walkway entries in the public right-of-way on Pinneyhill Lane and S. Riverview Street;

3) That the applicant provide additional review and a Level 3 Assessment Report, prior to the removal of either Landmark Maple Tree, specifically pertaining to the identified hazard zones and likelihood of failure, subject to Staff review and approval;

4) That if Staff and the applicant do not agree on the recommendations per the Level 3 Assessment Report that the applicant comes back to the ARB for review and approval;

5) That coping is not added to any existing or proposed stone columns or walls;

6) That the applicant apply for and obtain a Certificate of Zoning Plan Approval (CZPA), prior to construction; and

7) That the removal of existing stone,prior to grading or if historic features are discovered, documentation of those features via plans and photographic records shall be made and placed with either the Dublin Branch of the Columbus Library System or the Dublin Historical Society.

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

2. Dublin Pop-Up Business - Mural at 63 S. High Street, 22-108MPR, Minor Project Review

The Chair stated this application was a request for the installation of a ±154-square-foot mural on an existing garage used for retail on a 0.26-acre lot zoned Historic District, Historic South. The site is located northwest of the intersection of S. High Street with Eberly Hill Lane.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Holt – This application is part two for the Dublin Pop-Up Business concerning a request for a mural whereas last month the request was for signage. This is for a historic, one-and-a-half story home with a

detached garage [aerial view]. The site is surrounded by commercial properties to the north, east, and south; and residential properties are all to the west.

In February 2022, the Historic District Taskforce proposed an initiative to improve S. High Street vitality, which resulted in a leasing opportunity at the site for rotating vendors/artists that could promote vitality and pedestrian circulation. On July 1, 2022, the City of Dublin signed a 1-year lease for Pop-up shops to be open on certain days and times during the week. On July 27, 2022, the ARB approved a Master Sign Plan for a ground sign.

Tonight, the review is for an application requesting a mural to be primarily on the west façade of the garage that was built much later than the house, facing the open lawn. The mural size is proposed at 7 feet high and 22 feet wide, equalling 154 square feet. The design consists of fairy wings, a tiny fairy door, shamrocks, and flowers to match the flowers used in the planter boxes on the home for a unified and Dublin-appropriate appearance and color. The design is such that people can stand between the fairy wings, take photos, and post the photos to social media. The mural extends ±four square feet on the southern façade of the garage to entice visitors around the corner to view the main part of the mural, which is on a pedestrian scale. The purpose is to encourage visual interest with interactive elements that align with the *Historic Design Guidelines*.

This application has been reviewed against the Minor Project Review Criteria, which it met. Therefore, Staff supports the Minor Project without conditions.

Applicant Presentation

Kendel Blake, Management Analyst, City of Dublin, 5200 Emerald Parkway – Pop-Up Dublin is a rotating retail and art experience. To date, 77 vendors have applied to participate. There have been 7 successful markets thus far, with another going on currently. The calendar runs through December 17, 2022, but City Council will have the ability to extend the market through the full length of the lease to June, 2023, based on the success. The key component that make Pop-Up Dublin is the community engagement aspect to this significant, historical, home. The mural that Ms. Holt presented will help activate the property and encourage pedestrian traffic along S. High Street. The mural design is intended to combine the features of the home by incorporating the flowers planted in the window boxes, and include Irish elements such as fairy wings, shamrocks, and a small fairy door to represent Dublin. The Fairy Trail Tour brings so much pedestrian traffic and energy to Historic Dublin of which this venue could capture, as well. The flower choices continue to pay homage to Polly Lee Richards, who was the long-time owner of this property. As the weather turns colder with the seasons, the flower boxes will be changed and coordinated with the City's plantings throughout Historic Dublin. Staff went door-to-door to speak with the adjacent neighbors to the west of the home in the sightline of the proposed mural space. Of the residents who were home, there was excitement about the mural and were pleased to see Polly Richard's love of Geraniums come through on the design. Dublin Jerome's High School student, Cecelia Martina, designed the mural and will paint it, should the Board approve the design. She is present and available to answer any questions.

Ms. Damaser – She asked how the mural would be maintained after the lease is over, and if the City were to decide not to continue with this initiative of Pop-Up Dublin.
Ms. Blake – The neighbors were asked if a mural would be acceptable before the City signed the lease and if it was the request of the residents, the City would paint the garage back to white, to match the existing color and conditions of the garage.

Ms. Cooper – Asked if there was a requirement that if the use was returned to a residential use, that the mural be concealed or painted over in an appropriate color to the Historic District.

Ms. Holt - There was not.

Public Comment

No public comments were received.

Board Discussion

The Chair – This Board approved a mural for the Toy Emporium in Historic Dublin.
Mr. Jewell – That mural turned out very well for that space connected to the toy store.
Ms. Cooper – She agreed and added that mural was in the heart of the commercial area, whereas, this is in a residential area.
Mr. Alexander – He asked what happens to the mural if the site is sold after the lease is up.
Ms. Damaser – She asked if the new owner would need to have approval from the ARB to paint over the mural.
Ms. Holt – The answer is no as Staff would guide the new owner to choose a white color that is within the pre-approved paint colors in the *Historic District Guidelines*. The only reason to gain approval from the Board is if the new owner wanted to deviate from that list of pre-approved paint colors.
Ms. Cooper – She asked if a mural is appropriate for a residential property and what if that owner wanted to change the design to something less Dublin-esque.
The Chair – If the color was to be changed, the new owner would seek the approval of Staff. If the subject were to be changed, it would require this Board's approval. This is a cement block wall of a garage and not an example of historic architecture or a historic structure. A mural on a residence has not yet been requested and signage issues could come into play.
Ms. Cooper – She was in support of this mural but was concerned about the extension to other residential structures.
Ms. Holt – If the new property owner wants the City to repaint this to cover the mural they would.
Mr. Alexander – There is not anything in the Code that states a mural is not permitted on a residential structure. Additionally, he did not believe this would cause an unusual precedent.
The Chair – If other applicants come forward with murals, the Board can decide if it is inappropriate.
Mr. Jewell – The applicant/City Staff has to go back to City Council for review to see if the lease can be renewed and what should happen with the mural could be decided at that point.
The Chair – The applicant/City Staff has stated that as long as the City has the lease, the City will maintain it, even if they do not continue to run the program.
Ms. Cooper – Her concern was mural advertising in the Historic District.
Mr. Cotter –If it became advertising, it would then need to adhere to sign regulations, therefore, he did not see a risk.
Ms. Cooper – The mural by the toy shop was added to an unusable space, dead zone on a main street to create interest in which this mural would do also.

The Board Members agreed a mural or two in the district would not be an issue in order to tell a story and in this case, on a non-historic, attached garage.

Polly Lee Richards, the artist, chose super bright colors so the mural could be Instagram-able, gaining the social media presence. She thought this was a great addition to bring people over to that section of Dublin and to visit the Dublin Pop-Up, revitalizing the Historic District. She does large-scale chalk murals, also.

Ms. Cooper moved and Ms. Damaser seconded, to approve the Minor Project Review without conditions.
Vote: Mr. Jewell, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Ms. Damaser, yes; and Ms. Cooper, yes.
[Approved 5 – 0]

DocuSign Envelope ID: 06DA8942-D12D-46F0-A3B9-62B2015AC99A

BOARD ACTION

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, July 27, 2022 | 6:30 pm

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

1. Dublin Pop-Up Business - Signs at 63 S. High Street
22-102MSP **Master Sign Plan**

Proposal:	Installation of a ground sign for an existing tenant space zoned Historic District, Historic South.
Location:	Northwest of the intersection of S. High Street with Eberly Hill Lane.
Request:	Review and approval of a Master Sign Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.176 and the *Historic Design Guidelines*.
Applicants:	Emily Goliver, Management Analyst and Kendel Blake, Management Analyst, City of Dublin
Planning Contact:	Madison Richard, Planning Technician
Contact Information:	614.410.4654, mrichard@dublin.oh.us
Case Information:	www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/22-102

MOTION: Ms. Damaser moved and Ms. Cooper seconded, to approve the Master Sign Plan with five (5) conditions:

1) That the applicant change the color of the removable vendors portion of the sign to incorporate only black lettering;

2) That the applicant continue to work with Staff to ensure the landscaping is appropriately scaled to properly screen the exposed sign foundation;

3) That the applicant apply for and successfully obtain approval of Permanent Sign Permits through Building Standards, prior to installation;

4) That the applicant remove the sign upon conclusion of the lease and associated pop-up shops; and

5) That if the City opts to renew the lease past one year, applicant will return to ARB with a revised sign that better addresses the Historic District Sign Code including High Density Urethane (HDU) routed letters, minimized colors, and mounted on a permanent frame and base.

VOTE: 4 – 0

RESULT: The Master Sign Plan was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

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

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:
Madison Richard
21D0A602D9EB4FB...
Madison Richard, Planning Technician

City of Dublin
OHIO, USA

MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, July 27, 2022

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Alexander, Chair, called the June 22, 2022, meeting of the City of Dublin Architectural Review Board (ARB) to order at 6:32 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Chair led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

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

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Cotter moved, Ms. Cooper seconded, to accept the documents into the record and to approve the meeting minutes from June 22, 2022.
Vote: Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Damaser, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; and Mr. Cotter, yes.
[Motion carried 4-0]

CASE PROCEDURES

The Chair stated the Architectural Review Board is responsible for review of construction, modifications or alterations to any site in the area subject to Architectural Board Review under the provision of Zoning Code §153.170. This Board has the final decision-making responsibility on cases under their purview. Anyone who intends to address the Board on any of the cases this evening will be sworn in. The agenda order is typically determined at the beginning of the meeting by the Chair, who also stated the procedures of the meeting. The cases in the minutes follow the order of the published agenda. Anyone who addresses the Board will need to provide their full name and address for the record.

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

NEW CASES

1. **Dublin Pop-Up Business - Signs at 63 S. High Street, 22-102MSP, Master Sign Plan**

The Chair stated this application was a request for the installation of a ground sign for an existing tenant space zoned Historic District, Historic South. The site is northwest of the intersection of S. High Street with Eberly Hill Lane.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Richard – The 0.26-acre site includes a historic one-and-a-half story home with a detached garage and is surrounded by commercial properties to the north, east, and south, and residential properties to the west. [Aerial view]

In February 2022, the Historic District Taskforce put forth an initiative to improve S. High Street vitality. The intent was to incorporate rotating vendors and artists to promote vitality and pedestrian circulation in the area and the leasing opportunity on this site to do so was presented to City Council.

On July 1, 2022, the City of Dublin signed a lease for one year to allow for Pop-up shops that would be open from 4 – 8 PM on Wednesdays and 1 – 8 PM on Saturdays. These hours of operation would align with the hours of Designated Outdoor Refreshment Area (DORA) to encourage walkability of the area.

The location of the ground sign [aerial graphic] will be located east of the existing building, perpendicular to the front façade. The sign is oriented for both pedestrian and vehicular interaction. A single ground sign being proposed will be located 2 feet from the S. High Street right-of-way. With the existing building footprint currently located approximately 6 feet from the right-of-way, it would be impossible for a proposed ground sign to meet the setback requirement of eight feet. The existing house in the Historic District has long been known for its cream-colored stone and a red front door and red window trim [photograph]. The red color is carried over to the sign to create a unified look between the existing building and sign. The sign is at a pedestrian scale, encouraging visual interest and interactive elements that align with the *Historic Design Guidelines.*

The proposed ground sign is 6 square feet in size, measuring 3 feet in height and 2 feet in width, which meets the maximum permitted size per the Code of 8 square feet for ground signs. The wood-framed sign contains a total of six colors (black, white, red, light green, dark green, and a logo) with durable, high-quality vinyl letters in "Gothic" font. The middle section of the sign, will feature specific vendors based on the day, which will be consistent in color and details that can be easily removed and replaced. Staff recommended a condition to change the vendor names on the sign to black. The sign measured from grade to the top of the sign is 3 feet, 6 inches due to the foundation posts meeting the maximum allowed height of 6 feet per Code. A condition has been recommended that the applicant continue to work with Staff to ensure the landscaping is appropriately scaled to properly screen the exposed sign posts. The applicant considered incorporating red flowers similar to those within the planter boxes to further unify the building architecture and the sign. The ground sign will not be illuminated.

Results of Staff's analysis of sign options at the street level are as follows [table]:

- The ground sign is permanent, temporary sandwich board sign only up during the hours of operation.
- Neither the proposed ground sign nor a sandwich board sign would be able to meet the setback requirement.
- Both signs would interact with pedestrian and vehicular traffic.
- Both signs are limited in both material and color; however, approval of the Master Sign Plan from the Architectural Review Board could permit better materials/colors for the ground sign.

The application was reviewed against the Master Sign Plan Review Criteria and all criteria are met. Therefore, Staff recommended approval of the Master Sign Plan with four (4) conditions:

1) That the applicant change the color of the removable vendors portion of the sign to incorporate only black lettering;

2) That the applicant continue to work with Staff to ensure the landscaping is appropriately scaled to properly screen the exposed sign foundation;

3) That the applicant apply for and successfully obtain approval of Permanent Sign Permits through Building Standards, prior to installation; and

4) That the applicant remove the sign upon conclusion of the lease and associated pop-up shops.

Board Questions for Staff

Mr. Cotter – He asked for clarification. He asked if the permanent sign would be free standing or posts buried in the ground.
Ms. Richard – She answered the posts would be buried.

Mr. Alexander – He confirmed the approval was for one year.

Applicant Presentation

Emily Goliver, 6555 Shier Rings Road, Management Analyst, City of Dublin, stated Kendel Blake was also in attendance as a Management Analyst, City of Dublin. They have been working on Pop-Up Dublin for several months, which is the result of Council action and one we are implementing the recommendations from the Historic District Task Force. This is a rotating retail and art experience through December 2022 but could be extended through the full year of the lease, based on success. At the core of pop-up Dublin is Community Engagement.

Themed dates have been planned as follows: August 3 & 6 are Irish themed to coincide with the DIF; October 1 is Harvest themed and the official kick-off of fall; October 22 is for Sustainability theme to promote sustainably sourced and eco-friendly products; December 14 & 17 Holiday themed for holiday shopping; December 7 & 10 – Kids only/no parents to purchase holiday gifts for their loved ones with the help of volunteers and volunteers will be in the garage to handle the gift wrapping.

Feedback has been positive and are looking to add special days to be open on that Thursday and Friday as well. There are 52 approved vendors signed up so far. This initiative will encourage pedestrian traffic along S. High Street; the goal is to prove that retail can thrive in that area. Some of the pop-up dates will feature acoustic music to increase the draw south of Bridge Street. Pop-up Dublin is the result of heavy involvement and partnership with: Visit Dublin Ohio; the Historic Business Association; Crawford Hoying Development Partners; and the Dublin Arts Council, who have been crucial with getting Pop-Up Dublin off the ground. Time has been spent with the neighbors regarding this project. Coast Wine sent out some unsolicited advertising for the City due to the value this will bring to their business, right next door. Residents are excited and glad the City is using this home while maintaining its historical value.

Through this experience, Ms. Goliver learned about the history of this property and about Mrs. Richards and her tomato plants in the back and the red geraniums she placed in her window boxes around her house. Staff has planted red geraniums amongst others to bring that piece of history back. Anyone who grew up in Historic Dublin knows the house by its red trim.

Questions for the Applicant
Mr. Cotter – Autumn and winter days can get darker earlier and he inquired about lighting.
Ms. Goliver – Discussions were focused on the temporary nature of the sign but lighting could be explored.

Mr. Cotter – He inquired about the number of colors. He understood the reason for the colors of red, black, white, and green. The limit per Code is three colors and that is enforced to any other applicant.
Ms. Goliver – They pushed for the red, which is not normally seen in the City, but wanted to pay homage to the historic aspect of the home and site details. She offered to remove the red around the sign.
Mr. Cotter – He asked if the green needed to stay as it represents Dublin.
Ms. Goliver – Green was important as it represents the City of Dublin but also keeps the initiative of being consistent with the City's brand. She said they could make revisions to the colors.
Mr. Cotter – He wanted the number of colors to be decreased, if at all possible as the Board tries to enforce the Code, as it is written.
Ms. Goliver – This was the applicants' first ARB application and were not as versed with the Code so they did not know the logo counted as a color. They will make any changes requested by the Board.

Mr. Alexander – He questioned the time frame for making changes since the Pop-up opens Saturday and wanted to know if the sign had been fabricated.
Ms. Goliver – A sign will not be prepared in time for the opening on Saturday. The City of Dublin has its own sign shop. Next week is a little busy due to the Dublin Irish Festival but after the sign should be fabricated and installed quickly since they do both.

Public Comment

No public comments were received.

Board Discussion

The Chair stated the Board has granted some flexibility in the past for a term of one year based on the circumstances. It appears this request is similar but sign does not conform to Code. He asked the members if they felt strongly the sign should only contain three colors.

Mr. Cotter – He requested a condition where a non-conforming sign could only be up one year and be specific as to why the Board is permitting it to be installed and why it will need to be taken down.
Ms. Cooper – She asked the applicant if the colors would be limited to four.
Ms. Damaser – He liked the red border because it brought out the history of the house. She understood the green for Dublin's brand, having the four colors and the artistry makes sense. The setbacks not being conforming are made up for the fact the sign needs to be in that location.

The Chair asked the applicant if she had reviewed the other four conditions.
Ms. Goliver – She was comfortable with the conditions. They have determined that if the lease is extended for this purpose, they would return to request a permanent sign that complies with the Code.

Ms. Damaser moved and Ms. Cooper seconded, to approve the Master Sign Plan with five (5) conditions:

1) That the applicant change the color of the removable vendors portion of the sign to incorporate only black lettering;

2) That the applicant continue to work with Staff to ensure the landscaping is appropriately scaled to properly screen the exposed sign foundation;

3) That the applicant apply for and successfully obtain approval of Permanent Sign Permits through Building Standards, prior to installation;

4) That the applicant remove the sign upon conclusion of the lease and associated pop-up shops; and

5) That if the City opts to renew the lease past one year, applicant will return to ARB with a revised sign that better addresses the Historic District Sign Code including High Density Urethane (HDU) routed letters, minimized colors, and mounted on a permanent frame and base.

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

~~2. Development at 36-38 N. High Street, 22-085PDP, Preliminary Development Plan~~

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

~~Staff Presentation~~

~~Ms. Holt – This application includes three separate requests: a Preliminary Development Plan; a Parking Plan; and Waivers. An aerial view showed the location of the site that includes the wall, privy, and stair system, which is surrounded by the same zoning on three sides; the fourth is Historic Residential.~~

~~The development history started with an Informal Review in October, 2021 with a key goal to retain views to preserved historic wall, stair, and privy. Building height and massing were discussed at length. At the ARB meeting on March 22, 2022, the Board approved the Concept Plan with a Demolition request with a condition that the demolition be held off until the Final Development Plan was fully approved. The Concept Plan had conditions of approval, which have all be met with this current application.~~

~~The existing conditions of both the front and back of the buildings along with the historic wall, steps, and privy were all shown as well as the detail along N. High Street and Wing Hill Lane [photographs]. The proposed site plan included: the stone wall and privy preserved; the 6,024-square-foot, 2-story mixed-use building; the 3,750-square-foot, 2-story, 2-unit residential building; parking throughout the site; bike parking in the northeast corner; five-foot sidewalks for Wing Hill Lane and N. Blacksmith Lane; and trash locations on the north side of the property. Renderings revealed the character of the mixed-use building on N. High Street from both north and south directions and drawings noted the details. The proposed materials for the mixed-use building are as follows: Rusticated limestone veneer for foundation/water tables; Brick in Belden Yukon Blend for the south portion of the building; smooth limestone cladding for window details and vertical elements; Horizontal wood siding in Sage Green Light for the north portion; Standing seam metal roof in Gunsmith Grey; and Aluminum-clad wood windows and doors from Marvin, or similar. Renderings and detailed drawings of the residential building were presented. The proposed materials for that building are as follows: the limestone for the water table is the same the mixed-use; building with Horizontal siding; Grapy and Pavestone; Accents in Roycroft Adobe and Randolph Gray; body color in Roycroft Adobe; Standing seam metal roof again in Gunsmith Gray; and Aluminum-clad wood windows from Marvin or similar.~~

Ms. Alutto stated that a reasonable timeframe following the Memorial Tournament seems appropriate so they aren't trying to take it down during the Tournament to meet that deadline.

Ms. Amorose Groomes moved to direct the City Manager to draft legislation providing an extension of the Executive Order until immediately following the Memorial Tournament.
Ms. Alutto seconded.

Vote on the motion: Mr. Reiner, yes; Vice Mayor De Rosa, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mayor Fox, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes.

- Tax Reclassification of Positions

Mr. Robison stated that the organizational structure of the Taxation division was reviewed and, as a result of that review, staff proposed combining two vacant permanent part-time positions, Accounting Specialist and Accounting Assistant, into one full-time Accounting Specialist position. After re-evaluating the nature of these positions relative to the present and future needs of Taxation with Human Resources, staff believes this change will generate interest by more qualified candidates. The annual budgetary impact from this change would be a slight savings to the City and no budgetary amendments would be needed for 2022. This position already exists in the Non-Union Compensation Plan and is approved for utilization in the Taxation division. Staff recommends that City Council approve the reclassification of these two permanent part-time positions into one full-time position.

Mayor Fox moved to approve the reclassification of the two permanent part-time positions into one full-time position in the tax division.
Ms. Alutto seconded.

Vote on the motion: Ms. Alutto, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Vice Mayor De Rosa, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Mayor Fox, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes.

STAFF COMMENTS

Mr. McDaniel stated that the property located at 63 South High Street (Richard's Property) has presented a lease opportunity to the City that he wanted to present to Council for feedback. This property has a home that is 600 square feet and a two car detached garage behind the home. He presented the question to Council as to whether or not the City should lease 63 South High Street for the purpose of beta testing Pop-up Shops, which would incorporate rotating vendors and artists and promote vitality and pedestrian circulation to this area. South High Street Vitality was a recommendation that was brought forward from the Historic District Task Force. He defined pop-up shops and encouraged Council to do their own research. If Council would like to pursue the opportunity, Mr. McDaniel shared the following next steps:

- Lease the Richard's property for one year to test pop up shop;
- Pop ups include farmer's market type vendors not in competition with adjacent merchants;
- Dublin Arts Council can provide artist as vendors and/or other displays;
- Room for four vendors at a time: two in house, two in garage;
- Back yard provides additional space for vendor, music and/or other small venue attraction;
- Promotes pedestrian circulation in the district; and
- Would help to assess if such uses can be viable in the south part of the district and/or elsewhere.

He estimates that the total cost would be $50,000 for the year. The lease option is $3,250 per month which includes utility cost. He reviewed the other potential costs such as staff time and minor ADA modifications. The source of this funding would be from the Economic Development Incentive account. This is not intended to be a revenue generating beta test. The purpose is to test the viability of this type of use in the District.

Ms. Alutto asked if there has been interest in pop-ups. Mr. McDaniel stated that the Historic District Task Force brought this forward as a possibility to increase pedestrian circulation. He has been researching this for a few years. He thinks it could generate interest to see what is there if vendors are rotated.
Ms. Kramb stated that she is not supportive of this. It seems commercial that needs to be marketed. She doesn't see how the City can be involved in a commercial space.
Mr. McDaniel stated that he sees it differently.
Mr. Keeler stated that Council has discussed how to get activity down the South section of High Street. Mr. Keeler stated that you don't know if you don't try. It is a semi-small investment.
Mayor Fox stated that this is a vendor incubator space. We need to incentivize retail if that is what we want. Many of the farmer's market vendors want to have somewhere to go instead of only one day a week. This could fill a little void on South High. She is supportive of this.
Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that she doesn't disagree with the concept but she is not sure this location lends itself to this activity. Her only concern is the buiding itself and the constraints of the space.
Mayor Fox stated that it is a historical and interesting little space.
Vice Mayor De Rosa asked if people pay to participate in the farmer's market. She would be supportive of this concept as long as half way through the lease period we assess to see how it is working. What would we like to see happen? We need to assess what we have learned and maybe we can pass it along to someone to continue it. Mr. McDaniel stated he doesn't see going beyond a one-year lease. The hope would be a coordinated effort to promote the vibrancy of the District.
Ms. Alutto stated that she would be supportive with those metrics to look forward to.

The consensus of Council was to move forward with the opportunity and learn all we can.

~~COUNCIL REPORTS~~

- **~~Committees~~**

Administrative Committee: Vice Mayor De Rosa shared that a meeting was held on February 1. She shared the following points:

- Council-resident engagement work continues and CPI will be bringing a work plan back to Council for consideration ~~and feedback~~.
- ~~Council member liaison role to boards and commissions was discussed~~. A full written report will come before Council on February 28 for Council's consideration. ~~After Council's review, the Council Rules will be revised to incorporate this liaison role and will be before Council at the March 7~~ meeting.
- Council retreat is fast approaching.
- Board and Commission interviews/appointments will be coming.

Community Development Committee: The next meeting is February 22, 2022.

Finance Committee: The next meeting is in March.

~~Public Services Committee~~: The next meeting is February 16.

~~COUNCIL ROUNDTABLE~~

Ms. Amorose Groomes ~~reported that she attended the National Association of Regional Councils Conference in Washinton D.C. The $10 billion in ARPA funds are now available for eligible use as determined for broadband infrastructure~~. It is worth trying ~~to garner some of those dollars. One of her takeaways was the difficulties in~~ navigating the federal and state regulations on funding opportunities. ~~The bi-partisan infrastructure is no longer a bill, it is a law, so she encouraged her fellow members to~~ get ready to participate in those things. ~~There was a great deal of conversation in two~~