



MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, November 15, 2017

AGENDA

- 1. BSD HTN – The Avenue – Outdoor Speakers**
17-106CU **94 North High Street**
Conditional Use (Approved 4 – 0)
- 2. BSD HC – Redwood Financial Group**
17-110ARB-BPR **113 S. High Street**
Informal Review (Discussion only)

The Vice Chair, Shannon Stenberg, called the meeting to order at 6:32 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance as the Chair, David Rinaldi had not arrived yet. Other Board members present were: Everett Musser, and Gary Alexander. Jeffrey Leonhard was absent and David Rinaldi arrived late. City representatives were: Jennifer Rauch, Nichole Martin, and Laurie Wright.

Administrative Business

Motion and Vote

Mr. Musser moved, Mr. Alexander seconded, to accept the documents into the record. The vote was as follows: Ms. Stenberg, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; and Mr. Musser, yes. (Approved 3 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Ms. Musser moved, Ms. Stenberg seconded, to approve the 2018/2019 proposed meeting dates. The vote was as follows: Ms. Stenberg, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; and Mr. Musser, yes. (Approved 3 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Musser moved, Mr. Alexander seconded, to approve the meeting minutes from September 27 as presented. The vote was as follows: Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; and Mr. Musser, yes. (Approved 3 – 0)

The Vice Chair briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Architectural Review Board [the minutes reflect the order of the published agenda.] She swore in anyone planning to address the Board during this meeting.



**1. BSD HTN – The Avenue – Outdoor Speakers
17-106CU**

**94 North High Street
Conditional Use**

The Vice Chair, Shannon Stenberg, said the following application is a proposal for the Conditional Use of outdoor speakers in a patio and exterior entrance space for a 6,000-square-foot restaurant in Historic Dublin. She said the site is east of North High Street, approximately 400 feet north of the intersection with North Street. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for approval of a Conditional Use under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.236.

Nichole Martin presented an aerial view of Building Z1, where this tenant is located, just north of the Riverside Crossing West Plaza, which will be the western terminus of the (future) Pedestrian Bridge. She noted the front door of The Avenue is off of North High Street and the patio space is on the southern elevation of the tenant space, on Riverside Crossing Park - West Plaza. She reiterated the ARB is the recommending body this evening to the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC). She reported the Administrative Review Team (ART) previously reviewed this application and has made a recommendation to the Board this evening of approval with three conditions.

Ms. Martin presented the floor plan and pointed out the request for seven outdoor speakers located within the patio area along with two speakers for the front entry. She explained the Conditional Use in the BSD is a use specific standard for outdoor seating and dining, and as such, speakers are only permitted in conjunction with outdoor seating and dining; therefore, the two speakers at the entry need to be removed. She added that no live music is requested with this application and any requests in the future would require an additional Conditional Use application. She said the hours of operation of the patio typically extend about one hour past the hours of operation of the restaurant:

Monday – Thursday, 10:00am – 11:00pm
Friday and Saturday, 10:00am – 12:30am
Sunday, 10:00am – 10:00pm

Ms. Martin said a condition of approval has been placed on this application that states the operation of the patio speakers are only to exceed past one hour of operation.

Ms. Martin referenced Chapter 132.03 – Offenses toward disturbing the public, which is the regulating component that Code Enforcement would use to enforce sound that is dissipating from the patio. She presented a graphic depicting a 50-foot buffer around the patio space. She said the intent of this graphic is to demonstrate the outer limits at which any noise could be plainly audible.

Ms. Martin indicated there will be a future building – Z2 to the south along North High Street, part of this same development; it is anticipated that at some point that building will also have a patio and would probably request speakers as well. She said concerns have been voiced about noise across the patio space and ultimately the ART determined that the use of outdoor speakers be prohibited during City sanctioned special events or programming in the Riverside Crossing Park – West Plaza.

Ms. Martin said this application was reviewed against the Conditional Use criteria and all criteria were met with a condition.

Ms. Martin concluded approval is recommended to the Architectural Review Board for a Conditional Use with three conditions:

- 1) That the use of the outdoor speakers be limited to the tenant’s hours of operation, not to exceed one hour past closing;
- 2) That the speakers only be permitted for the patio and therefore, be removed at the entry on North High Street; and

- 3) That the use of outdoor speakers be prohibited during City sanctioned special events or programming in the Riverside Crossing Park – West Plaza.

The Chair, David Rinaldi, apologized for being late. He asked if the applicant had anything to add to the presentation.

Gary Alexander asked why the applicant requested speakers in two locations.

Wayne Schick, Sr. Vice President for Cameron Mitchell Restaurants, 390 W. Nationwide Blvd, said the applicant is fine with eliminating the speakers from the entry. He said it is something the applicant typically does so as guests are approaching the restaurant, they start to set the environment for what is to be expected inside, which is usually jazz music.

The Chair asked if there were any comments from the public.

Steve Rudy, 129 S. Riverview Street, asked staff if street life noise was part of the noise ordinance to which Ms. Martin said she would research the answer and get back to him.

Mr. Rinaldi called for further public comment. [Hearing none.] He opened the Board discussion portion of the meeting. [There was none.]

Motion and Vote

Ms. Stenberg moved, Mr. Alexander seconded, to recommend approval of the request for a Conditional Use with three conditions:

- 1) That the use of the outdoor speakers be limited to the tenant's hours of operation, not to exceed one hour past closing;
- 2) That the speakers only be permitted for the patio and therefore, be removed at the entry on North High Street; and
- 3) That the use of outdoor speakers be prohibited during City sanctioned special events or programming in the Riverside Crossing Park – West Plaza.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Musser, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; and Ms. Stenberg, yes. (Approved 4 – 0)

2. BSD HC – Redwood Financial Group 17-110ARB-BPR

113 S. High Street Informal Review

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following application is a proposal to demolish an existing detached accessory structure and construct a new 4,000-square-foot office building behind an existing historic structure with associated site improvements. He said the site is west of South High Street, approximately 100 feet south of the intersection with Pinneyhill Lane. He said this is a request for an informal review of a Basic Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066 and §153.070, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Jennifer Rauch presented an aerial view of the site as well as the existing site for contextual purposes and comparison to 109 S. High Street and 119 S. High Street. The existing structures along S. High Street as well as the accessory structure in the rear were presented. She described the main structure as a 1.5-story building, 1,100 square feet in size, and the accessory structure/garage in the rear off a gravel drive.

Ms. Rauch said the application includes retaining the existing main structure and to construct a 2-story, 4,000-square-foot office building to the rear of the existing structure and construct an 11-space parking lot after the accessory structure is demolished while utilizing the same access point off Mill Lane. She presented the proposed site plan and noted the open space and the three on-street parking spaces on Mill Lane.

Ms. Rauch presented the following discussion questions:

1. Does the Board support the demolition of the existing accessory structure?
2. Is the overall proposed building and arrangement appropriate with the surrounding established context in regards to height and massing?
3. Is the Board supportive of the proposed architectural form and conceptual character of the building as it compares to the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*?
4. Is the overall open space arrangement appropriate within the established character of the Historic District?
5. Are there other considerations by the Board?

The Chair invited the applicant to provide an additional presentation.

Dan Morgan, architect for the project, Behal, Sampson, Dietz Architecture, 990 W. Third Avenue, Columbus, Ohio, presented model drawings. He indicated the mass of the building is a little skewed because the original building on the site provides the footprint of 1,100 square feet. He said the applicant is working within the constraints of the current Zoning Code. The three models were shown to demonstrate massing and the merit of the images is to show the eye-level view so the overall massing is not perceived as overpowering. He pointed out the little pocket park between this site and the one at 109 S. High Street. He said more detailed drawings would be provided as they move forward.

Shannon Stenberg asked who the tenant is going to be. Mr. Morgan said currently it is the existing owners so the office or professional use will stay the same, which also drives the parking calculations.

Gary Alexander asked how the square footage was determined. Mr. Morgan answered from a basic building standpoint, they considered what they are permitted to do on this site and wanted to stay below the lot coverage limit to allow for landscaping. From there, he explained, they considered the basic office size for professional services and the circulation up to the second floor.

The Chair called for public comment.

Chris Riegle, 665 Covered Bridge Drive, Delaware, Ohio, said he has lived here his entire life and remembers when there used to be a 76 Gas Station on the corner. He said development has become a hot bed of social and cultural activity. He said putting in a monstrous office building is the exact opposite of what is intended for the area. He said this is a lot larger than indicated and is $\pm 45\%$ taller. He said the drawings are meant to make this proposal look unimposing but it will be large.

Hal Mueller, 141 Franklin Street, said from his driveway, he has a direct line of site to the backside of this building. He said he is wondering how the mass will be perceived by the neighboring homeowners behind this property. He said he is concerned about the impact the traffic will have on John Wright Lane, which is really just wide enough for one car. He emphasized his concern about the mass of the building and how it will be perceived from the back side.

Bill Levering, 94 Franklin Street, said he speaks for most of his neighbors who are opposed to this proposal due to a multitude of things. He said it would change the nature of the neighborhood, it will no longer be considered Old Dublin, there will be increased traffic, limited parking, and the number of employees and clients that will be coming here is a concern. He said if a taller building is permitted, the next time a project comes forward, he is not certain the height could be restricted.

Steve Rudy, 129 S. Riverview Street, indicated upon first look, he thought the amount of glass on traditional forms should have been proposed for the new library. He said he is concerned that the amount of glass proposed hardens the appearance. He said the Historic District has to look like a historic district and at the end of the day, residents want to see a softer look, without a lot of hard edges. On a positive note, he said, he likes this better than the Cortolla project proposed earlier in the year, where the mass was too much running down the hill; this is actually positioned pretty close to where it ought to be, leaving the parking in the rear, which maximizes separation of uses. He said he hopes the applicant will not use this amount of glass in the end. He indicated the trend seems to be buildings getting taller and taller in Historic Dublin and he hopes the Board considers the size of structures around this property. He asked if the floor to floor height could be decreased but still allow for the square footage needed. He said he is concerned about buildings getting connected in the near future. He concluded the more humility that can be built in, the better.

Tom Holton, 5957 Roundstone Place, said the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* are pretty clear and referenced construction on page 72. He said this will be the first new construction of a secondary structure in the Historic District and asked the Board to consider other buildings modified, made to look like a historic building and subordinate to the primary structure. He complimented the owner for calling the Historic Society about "stuff" he had found in the walls when the building was first purchased; they recovered books and miscellaneous items as they were sensitive to the history of the building and the families that occupied it. As for the accessory structure, he said he cannot say it is historic because it was not specifically addressed in the Historic and Cultural Assessment but it is still part of the overlay and contributes historic character to the district. By itself, he said, it is a concrete block garage but he is concerned if this is torn down, other accessory structures will come down as well. He asked the Commission to consider these structures while they may not have value now, they may in the future in context with everything else. He asked that the Commission to also encourage the applicant to scale down this project, including keeping the ceiling height down to better fit the character of the neighborhood.

Sue Wines, 100 Franklin Street, which is directly behind 113 S. High Street, said she is having a hard time hearing most of the speakers but her feelings are the same for those that think the neighborhood should be preserved. She said traffic is currently an issue and additional traffic will be a hazard.

Arlene Mueller, 141 Franklin Street, said she is opposed to the proposal because of the height and neighbors would be looking directly at the structure.

Kelly Burke, one of the tenants at 113 S. High Street, said he does not want the neighbors to be upset. He said they are here to get suggestions from the neighbors and Board as they like the area and are not set on the architecture at this point. He said he respects where the neighbors are coming from but the applicant is playing by the rules and not everybody is going to be happy with everything. He said they would like to keep the tree referenced earlier and actually had it trimmed this year and the arborist thinks it has about 5 – 10 years left of its life cycle. He said building a structure around a 5-year tree is not really feasible. For the building's design, they are still in the very conceptual stage because they do not know what the structure can even look like. He said their architect has worked on a couple of houses on Riverview so he has a good feel for what will fit in. He noted they are permitted to have two primary structures. He said the garage cannot be used to store anything because it floods and in the winter it becomes an ice rink inside. He indicated that if he lived in this neighborhood and the garage was in his neighbor's yard, he would want it torn down as it is an eyesore and since it is useless, they do not plan to

put money into it to fix it. He explained that the drawing perspectives were shown from a person's height and they are not trying to misconstrue anything here.

The Chair called for further public comment. [Hearing none.] He opened the Board discussion.

Gary Alexander noted the Planning Report compares this project to the proposed changes in the Zoning Code and it seemed like this proposal is close to complying with many of those changes because the permitted footprint would be 1,800 square feet, in one part of the structure they are closer than the permitted setback but in another part they are at least at that distance; they are doing better than the minimum requirement for lot coverage. Ms. Rauch answered that was correct. She said there is the Code piece of this and then there is the *Guidelines* part to consider. She reported that was a big discussion at City Council Monday night and how the two regulations come to jive because they currently do not.

Mr. Alexander said he thinks the issue is the height of the structure. He said this is being referred to as an accessory structure and as such, should be subordinate to the main structure but unfortunately, this is behind one of the shortest structures along High Street. He asked the applicant to consider lowering the building. He said that is why he asked if this space will be leased or if it is for specific tenants. He said the tenants might be open to a space below grade to bring the mass down so the issues of height would be less problematic.

Mr. Morgan noted that was a good thought. He said there is a pit of about a three to four foot drop and that is probably why the garage is wet all the time. He said they are proposing to keep the building slightly lower on the grade level but they also need to keep in mind accessibility. He suggested some controlled down slope and slight retainage.

Mr. Alexander indicated that in German Village, the front of structures are preserved and pristine but there are no restrictions in the back so they have these strange conditions in German Village where there are huge additions and structures in the back because they are so concerned with maintaining the front but they do not consider what the result is. He said he would hate to see that here.

Mr. Morgan said they are really working on the perception from the back. He said currently they are straddling between a 1.5-story building and a 2-story one. He said a 2-story building with a 2,000-square-foot footprint would be too massive. Addressing Mr. Alexander's earlier comments, he said if they brought the footprint down, they could reduce parking and pull the building further back. The building being more modern and streamlined has more of a backdrop and is important in historic preservation that new architecture in historic districts stand apart from the historic district as projects of their own time. He said they would like a more modest setback and backdrop.

Everett Musser said he would like to see less sloping on the roofs and it would be helpful in the conceptual stage to provide people figures in the graphics to demonstrate a better sense of scale. He said he is concerned about the height of the gables on the west side.

Shannon Stenberg indicated she is also concerned about the overall roof height, not just the mid-point of the 20 feet. She explained that compared to the front of the building, it overtakes it. She pointed out there was a view from Mill Lane coming north, where one can see past it and see the structure behind.

Mr. Rinaldi said it is not an accessory structure but believes it should be subordinate to the historic structure and how that is accomplished, he is not sure. Obviously, height is a concern, he said, as being heard from the residents and this Board. He suggested a 1.5-story structure would help this proposal.

Ms. Stenberg said overall, the site placement was appropriate and the orientation to the street and the other building was nicely put.

Mr. Musser said he has no problem with the conceptual site layout at this point.

Mr. Alexander said he does not think the applicant can make the parking work if the plan was turned over so he believes this is a logical site placement. He said the proposal is comparable to the end of the alley where the property has the parking lot; very similar to the position of this and that also has a taller roof in the back, although it is not this tall but certainly similar to a pattern that exists here. He pointed out that the park space is a nice amenity to the streetscape.

Mr. Rinaldi agreed. He also did not think the parking could be re-worked but he wished the buildings could be a little bit further apart but there may be site constraints in that regard. He suggested a smaller overall mass will make it more comfortable.

Mr. Rinaldi referred back to Ms. Rauch's list of questions.

Ms. Stenberg said she thought Mr. Holton's point was valid that if the City starts demolishing the accessory structures, fabric and identity of the overall area is going to be lost; however, we have to be mindful it is necessary for the City to continue to grow and develop. She said if there was a way to incorporate this accessory structure that would be preferable but it sounds like it is already has pitfalls.

Mr. Rinaldi said he is not concerned with the structure itself but he likes the scale of the structure and that is what contributes to the overall fabric of this area. He indicated that is part of why he struggles with the mass of the proposed new building, which will now compete with the primary structure. From an architectural standpoint, he said he has no problem with supporting a demolition.

Ms. Stenberg said the overall lot coverage is reasonable at the 75% maximum and they fit within the *Guidelines* so it is fair.

Mr. Alexander said he wanted to comment on the photographs included with this proposal because it appears in some of the photographs, the applicant was trying to establish a vernacular modernism, which is an appropriate response in the Historic District where the new construction is clearly a new building but still has a relationship with the old. If the volume is this large, he said, he is concerned with large expanses of glass versus a rhythmic pattern of openings where you lose some opportunity to make some connection. He indicated that other new buildings in the community have attempted to bridge the gap between the vernacular traditions of most of the homes in the area and contemporary building. He applauded the applicant's efforts but asked them to consider scale issues and how to tie with the older structures.

Mr. Musser asked Ms. Rauch if the Zoning Code under consideration is only 3,600 square feet and 4,000 square feet is requested, to which she answered affirmatively. He encouraged consideration of this difference.

Ms. Stenberg said, aside from all the glass, overall, the concept photographs showed materials that were very respectful.

Mr. Rinaldi said he does not have any concerns with the overall form but materials and window patterns will be a concern; he encouraged the applicant to keep with traditional materials as that is very important to tie back to the Historic District.

Mr. Musser indicated the challenge for the applicant will be when they come back with what the building will look like.

Mr. Morgan said right now they are showing the required parking for a building of this size. He asked if he could request a Parking Waiver for the reduction of parking, which would allow them to pull the building farther away. He asked if that is something the client could consider.

Mr. Musser asked what kind of activity, in terms of clients coming and going and how long they are there as well as the employees, which has an impact on what the applicant is asking.

Mark Farnham, 113 S. High Street, the other tenant, said there is just the two of them and an assistant right now in the front building. The back building will be for financial advisors and clients who might meet with them once or twice a year. He said per person, their client base is 200. He estimates four or five appointments a week for each person so they will not be generating a lot of traffic.

Mr. Musser asked how many clients are expected to be there at one time.

Mr. Farnham estimated with everyone there, including the assistant, the total would be 10. He said in the future, they are bringing on another advisor and that is why they are building out. He reported the other advisor has 120 households, so the most people in that back building is going to be 12 – 14 at most, if all of them have clients in the building at once and those are probably three families so three cars except for theirs; 1 assistant, and 3 advisors, for a total of 7 cars. He said the spots out front are most always available.

Ms. Stenberg asked the applicant if they are anticipating more than one additional advisor coming into the group, which may require additional spaces in the future. Mr. Farnham said the buildout for the lower level will have four offices and a common area for a couple of assistants. He said it would have to be a perfect storm for all of us to have clients in the building at once; he does not anticipate more than four or five cars.

Mr. Musser affirmed that by the applicant meeting the Zoning Code, he would have more parking spaces than he is going to need. Mr. Farnham said there are no restaurants in the area and nobody walks to the tavern or anything.

Ms. Stenberg asked the applicant if they plan to lease space to other businesses as well. Mr. Farnham answered the front space would be a professional office if they leased it back, yes. He said in the future, they hope to grow with a couple more advisors.

Mr. Rinaldi reiterated that parking could be reduced per the size of the building.

Ms. Rauch said staff recommends the applicant meet parking so there is not a problem or a perceived problem if they do not have enough parking. She explained as part of the Parking Plan, all of those details would be included.

Mr. Musser said when considering a Parking Plan, we have to be mindful of the activity planned now for this particular owner, but also for the future should the building be sold to someone else who may have a different kind of activity that may require more parking.

Ms. Rauch reported Engineering had concerns about spaces #1 and #6 and the maneuverability needed as there may not be enough stacking space.

Allen Staub, said he owns the building right across the street at 114 S. High Street. He said he served on the Architectural Review Board and chaired it as well. He said there is a certain vibe in the Historic District, in terms of the rhythm of the front of the buildings. He indicated there have been people from around the country that come to see how to lay their plans out for their community using our City as an example. He said he does not understand why we would allow an impertinent structure to become the

primary structure and the historic building to become the accessory structure. He said when he sat on the Board, there was a certain spine that said "we want you to come back with plans that reduce the size and height of this building so it flows not only for the residents on High Street but also for the residents behind." He said we do not need to be obnoxious down in the district. He said he sees this plan as a money grab and we are trying to make it affordable to build this structure by having a two-story structure with that size. He said tenants within the building will jam up that back area with traffic and this is an unreasonably large size for the homeowners on that back side to deal with. He said he is not opposed to a structure behind but the one proposed is huge. He said the issue has been meandered around rather than strongly stating the applicant should come back to the Board with this certain type of design and this is what we feel fits in the district. He asked the Board for their thoughts.

The Chair answered "no comments".

Mr. Alexander said he would respond to that last speaker. He said the Board can only comment on what they are given; they were not given a full set of drawings or elevations so it is hard to be too prescriptive. He said there have been comments about making the structure smaller and shorter. Making it smaller than the original structure, he said, is not even recommended in the Zoning Code. He said we may not be stating comments the way he wants or exactly what he wants but the comment about smaller and shorter has been stated.

Kelly Burke said there is a gray area and that is loud and clear from the Board, former Board members, and the neighbors. He indicated there is the judgement part of how the proposal makes you feel and then there is the Zoning Code. He asked how the process works from here. He said they want to work as a team. He requested next steps and if he should just keep guessing at what might work. He stated Dan Morgan is a great architect and gets paid like a great architect. He said he understands this is an informal meeting but he asked for more concrete guidance. He said the height is obvious.

Mr. Rinaldi said the Board has struggled with this for years because they are dealing with the Zoning Code, which is prescriptive as well as the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* for the Historic District, which speaks to many other things that cannot be quantified quite so easily. He said he hopes the applicant received some good guidance from both the Board and the residents, which is that everyone is concerned about the scale and height of this structure.

Mr. Alexander stated he is new to this Board. He said some communities have informal work sessions; as a client, he knows what the applicant is interested in. He said some applicants have met with staff and their role is really important. Ms. Rauch said staff is very collaborative and this applicant has met with staff before and this is how we got to this point. She said the next step would be to take all the comments heard tonight and work with the applicant to work on a plan that is really representing what the collective comments are and then the applicant would return to the ARB.

Mr. Rinaldi added the Board wants the applicant to return with something that will be palatable to the Board as well as the residents as we do not want to waste anyone's time.

Mr. Alexander suggested that after the applicant meets with staff to come up with a plan that works, to then meet with the residents to get their input before returning to the ARB. Ms. Rauch said staff encourages that.

The Chair asked if Mr. Holton had another comment to which he answered affirmatively.

Mr. Holton emphasized the application should be reviewed against the current Zoning Code. He said there has been a lot of reference to the modified Zoning Code that has not been approved yet by City Council. He stated the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* still apply.

Ms. Stenberg said the Board has had many discussions about the relevance of the *Guidelines* versus the Zoning Code and they are considered to be weighted as equal. The gray area, she explained, comes in when the two standards conflict moving the Board to work with the applicant to decide what works best for that particular case.

Annual Report

Jennifer Rauch said Staff has prepared a draft Annual Report, which was included in the packets for their review. She said this is an opportunity to document for City Council the Board's activities, cases, decisions, and special projects conducted in 2017. She asked the Board to review the draft report and provide comments to staff for final approval at a future meeting. She said this version needs more graphic work. She said staff wants to ensure everything was captured that the Board considers important.

Mr. Rinaldi said the draft report has summarized most of what this Board has accomplished. Ms. Stenberg said she did not think anything more is needed to be added and it was comprehensive.

Communications

Jennifer Rauch said the Zoning Code and the Rezoning request for the Historic South District was before Council on Monday. She said Council had concerns about the specific requirements related to hours of operation for eating and drinking establishments as they thought it was too limited. She added Council had concerns about approving the Zoning Code without having the *Guideline* changes in tandem.

Ms. Rauch said we are doing a soft roll out of OneDrive so everything will be in both the Drop Box and OneDrive through the end of the year but by January, OneDrive will be used exclusively. She encouraged the Board to download it and relay any issues with its use to either her or Lori Burchett.

Ms. Rauch indicated there may not be a meeting in December as there is a location problem with City Hall getting audio/visual upgrades.

With no further communications to share, the Chair adjourned the meeting at 7:56 pm.

As approved by the Architectural Review Board on January 24, 2018.