



MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, January 29, 2020

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Stenberg, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Ms. Stenberg led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Board Members present: Mr. Alexander, Mr. Keeler, Mr. Bailey, Ms. Stenberg

Board Members absent: Ms. Bryan

Staff present: Ms. Rauch, Ms. Martin and Mr. Hounshell

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS

Mr. Keeler moved, Mr. Bailey seconded to accept the documents into the record.

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

(Approved 4 – 0)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Bailey moved, Mr. Keeler seconded to approve the November 20, 2019 meeting minutes.

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

(Approved 4 – 0)

Ms. Stenberg 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 Section 153.177. The Board has the decision-making responsibility on these cases. The Chair swore in any staff or members of the public who planned to address the Board on any of the cases during the meeting.

CASES:

1. Bridge Street Pizza at 16-18 E. Bridge Street, 19-119INF, Informal Review

Ms. Stenberg stated that this is an application for an Informal Review and feedback for potential future exterior modifications to an existing multi-tenant building. The 0.08-acre site is located north of East Bridge Street, approximately 150 feet east of the intersection with High Street and zoned Bridge Street District Historic Core.

Case Presentation

Mr. Hounshell stated that this is a request for an Informal Review for proposed exterior modifications to an existing multi-tenant building located at 16 and 18 East Bridge Street. The 0.08-acre site, zoned Bridge Street District – Historic Core, is located at the northeast intersection of E. Bridge Street with Blacksmith Lane. The building was built circa 1900. The commercial building has an L-plan footprint, with a one-story shop section on 16 East Bridge Street and a two-story addition to the rear on 18 East Bridge Street. Commercial space is on the first floor and an apartment unit is on the second. The building materials used on the building are stucco, board and batten, vertical board paneling, and shiplap. The building is in good condition, but has poor integrity from material changes and additions. The building has been assessed as a non-contributing historic structure within the Historic Dublin District. Exterior modifications are proposed for the majority of the building. On the east, west and south elevations, the applicant is proposing HardiePanel board and batten siding painted Kingsport Gray for 16 E. Bridge Street. Ohio Tan Limestone Cultured Stone Veneer is proposed for the eastern half of 18 E. Bridge Street on the south facade. Above 16 E. Bridge Street, the applicant is proposing HardiePlank horizontal siding painted Grand Beige above 16 E. Bridge Street on the south facade and on its west facade. HardiePlank and HardiePanel cement fiber siding are secondary materials within the Bridge Street District Code. Should the applicant choose to utilize cement fiber siding for more than 20% of a facade facing a street or adjacent property, the applicant would be required to request a waiver to permit them the additional secondary material amount. On the east facade of 18 E. Bridge Street, the existing stucco and railing will be painted Grand Beige. The applicant is proposing to replace all windows except the existing display windows on 16 and 18 E. Bridge Street. Two-over-two double hung composite wood window replacements painted Fog Mist will replace all the metal casement windows. Staff has provided the following discussion questions for the Board's review of the case:

- 1) Are the material changes appropriate and sensitive to the context within Historic Dublin?
- 2) Does the Board support the change in window material and design?
- 3) Other considerations by the Architectural Review Board.

Applicant Presentation

Mike Maloof, 6308 Wyler Court, Dublin, Ohio stated that they are seeking the Board's direction before investing in drawings that are more detailed.

Public Comment

There were no public comments.

Board Discussion

- *Discussion Question #1: Are the material changes appropriate and sensitive to the context within Historic Dublin?*

Mr. Alexander inquired if the stucco on the east and north facades of 18 E. Bridge Street would be painted, but no changes would be made in the materials.

Mr. Hounshell responded affirmatively. The material would be painted Grand Beige.

Mr. Maloof stated that he would like to change the windows on the north elevation, as well.

Mr. Alexander asked if the north facade is entirely stucco.

Mr. Hounshell responded affirmatively.

Ms. Stenberg inquired if there were any comments on the appropriateness of the four materials, part of which would be a result of grandfathering.

Mr. Keeler inquired what would be the Board's opinion if the board and batten on the westernmost section of the south façade were extended to the top.

Mr. Alexander responded that he also was struggling with the division in materials on that facade, preferring that either all stone veneer or all board and batten would be used.

Mr. Keeler stated that the preference is to have no more than three materials. With the stucco on the other side, there would be four materials. One solution would be that in place of the horizontal siding, take the stone to the front of the building, or use the board and batten siding. However, because the materials are grandfathered, they can remain as is. In regard to the windows, he appreciates Mr. Maloof's willingness to potentially change the windows. Typically, he prefers three-over-threes or four-over-fours, rather than the proposed two-over-twos. Because the window openings are small, however, that might not be possible.

Ms. Stenberg inquired if there was any additional feedback Board members would like to provide.

Mr. Alexander stated that because cultured stone is being added on that façade, the window opening sizes could be changed easily. He is curious as to why that window does not match the others being installed, in the interest of having continuity on that elevation. The Board is not opposed to what is proposed, simply suggesting changes to improve it.

Mr. Maloof responded that one would think the building at the rear was the original, and the building in front was added. However, the photo they have circa 1942 depicts the reverse – the all-block pizza shop building existed earlier. He does not know why the addition in the rear was constructed of two different materials. Regarding the horizontal siding -- he proposed materials he believed to be consistent with the Guidelines. He used a different material for the pizza shop to make it stand out from the rest of the building. Per the building's history, at one time it was a small motel, called the Shamrock Motel, and the doors led to different motel rooms. He did not realize that four materials could be an issue. The construction of the two buildings is different, and stucco and stone were added only to the block building.

The Board had no further feedback to provide the applicant.

Mr. Maloof inquired if Board had any specific recommendations, or would it be acceptable for him to proceed with his plan as proposed.

The Board indicated that they had no objection to his proceeding with the proposed plan.

2. Tucci's Patio at 35 N. High Street, 19-124INF, Informal Review

Ms. Stenberg stated that this is an application for Informal Review and feedback for a potential future application to enclose an outdoor patio area at an existing restaurant. The 0.23-acre site is located northwest of the intersection of N. High Street and Wing Hill Lane and zoned Bridge Street District Historic Core. Upon review and feedback of the Informal Review by the Architectural Review

Board (ARB), the applicant is eligible to file a formal application for review and determination by the ARB.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Rauch stated that this is an Informal Review for a potential future application to enclose the outdoor patio of the existing Tucci's restaurant. The 0.23-acre site is located between High Street and Darby Street, northwest of the intersection of N. High Street and Wing Hill Lane, adjacent to the BriHi site. The one-story restaurant building is located in the western portion of the site with a patio in the eastern portion, along North High Street. Access to the site for minimal parking is located at the rear of the building at the corner of Wing Hill and Darby Street. Right-of-way on Wing Road provides access for trash enclosures for the adjacent BriHi building. Bollards on Wing Hill at its intersection with High Street prevent vehicle entry. The Darby Street parking lot is located northwest of the site. This proposal is for removal of the masonry patio area and construction of a steel, brick, and glass paneled enclosure to allow year-round use of the space. The proposed architectural style includes a gable roof with retractable glass and metal panels to create a solarium style addition. The proposed enclosure would be between 12-15 feet in height and 1,900 square feet in area. The floor plans indicate a reconfigured interior space and modifications to the building entrances. The plans also indicate the inclusion of a series of tables and chairs located outside the proposed enclosure. Site modifications are shown on City property to the north and within the Wing Hill right-of-way to the south. Should a formal application be pursued, the applicant will need to work with the City to understand how these improvements, including the wine cellar expansion, could be accommodated or modified to meet City requirements. Staff has proposed the following questions for the Board's review:

- 1) Does the Board support the construction of a permanent patio enclosure?
- 2) If the Board is supportive of the enclosure, is the Board supportive of the proposed scale, massing, height, and location of the enclosure?
- 3) If the Board is supportive of the enclosure, is the Board supportive of the general architectural design and associated site details for the proposed building?

Applicant Presentation

Craig Barnum, 4446 Tuller Ridge Drive, Dublin, stated that he is the owner of Tucci's. [He provided the Board copies of an architectural rendering of proposed patio enclosure]. The restaurant has been in existence here since January 1988. The dining patio space has been very successful, but from October – March annually, it is necessary to lay off staff, and due to the loss of those 140 seats, sales decrease by 40%. The business is impacted significantly from having its seating capacity reduced from 260 to 120 seats for five-six months of the year. When he was in Detroit this past summer, he visited a restaurant in downtown Detroit, called the Townhouse. That restaurant has this type of structure. Because his visit was during the summer, the sides and roof of the patio enclosure were retracted, and the landscaping inside the space could be seen. He realized the same opportunity existed for Tucci's. The original structure was built in 1953, but where the patio is currently located, there was once a grocery store and post office. Although this restaurant was originally included under the Oscar's and Brazenhead umbrella, in 2010, he succeeded in separating Tucci's to be under the management of his company. At that time, Tucci's evolved from a small wood-fired pizza restaurant into a steak, seafood and wine restaurant. Due to its age, the building is in need of infrastructure remedies. In addition to the patio expansion, the

renovation would include new plumbing and HVAC. It would also include expansion of the wine cellar to the north, partially onto City property. This would enable storage of 5,000 wine bottles in a temperature-controlled area. Currently, he rents a vinyl party tent for 6-7 weeks of the year to cover the timeframes of the Memorial Tournament and his wine-tasting events. During those significant weeks, it is critical that the patio is covered. There are issues when the existing 3,000 sq. ft. patio is full on a very busy night, and a severe storm occurs. There is not space for the 142 patrons on the patio to crowd into the already full restaurant, with plates in hand. If there were a retractable roof, at a push of a button, the area would be protected from the storm. Currently, there is one bar inside the restaurant, from which it is impossible to provide good service to a very busy patio. The proposed renovation would include a second bar in the patio enclosure, as well as a pizza oven and two additional restrooms. The intent is for this renovation to have a "wow" factor. It will be very expensive, but a renovation is critical for this business to be successful. He loves being located on the west side of the river and in Historic Dublin and is excited for the future of that District. He requests the Board's input on materials, building height, etc.

There was no public comment.

Board Discussion

Ms. Stenberg directed the Board's attention to the proposed discussion questions.

- 1) Does the Board support the construction of a permanent patio enclosure?
- 2) If the Board is supportive of the enclosure, is the Board supportive of the proposed scale, massing, height, and location of the enclosure?
- 3) If the Board is supportive of the enclosure, is the Board supportive of the general architectural design and associated site details for the proposed building?

Mr. Keeler stated that he has no objection to a permanent patio enclosure. Is the proposed height 12 or 15 feet and is that measured to the peak of the roof?

Mr. Barnum stated that he is unsure, but he would prefer to have the 15-ft. height, if possible. The 8-ft. ceilings within the front portion of the restaurant are much too low; that part of the restaurant feels claustrophobic. The back of the restaurant has a couple additional feet, so is possibly 10 feet.

Mr. Keeler inquired what is the height of the existing structure.

Ms. Rausch responded that she does not have that information at hand.

Mr. Barnum stated that the building has sections of varying heights; the tallest point to the roof might be 11-12 feet.

Mr. Keeler inquired if the highest point were 12 feet, would that slope down to eight feet on the sides.

Mr. Alexander stated that the slope of the roof would control the height, and the slope is somewhat dictated by the materials and the way in which they are installed.

Mr. Barnum stated that the architect has cited different types and options for roofs.

Mr. Alexander stated that Mr. Barnum's architect might not have been provided the best option for expanding his business in this environment per Dublin City Code. There is another option that has not been explored that would provide the massing needed in context with the surrounding buildings. Because there is a two-story building adjacent to this building, he could build a second

story on his building. The proposed plan does not meet any of the Historic Dublin Design Guidelines. For instance, the Guidelines state that a new addition must be subordinate to the existing structure; this addition clearly would not be subordinate. They also require the use of traditional materials for new construction. The ratio of windows to wall is also an issue -- more solidity than glass is required. In addition, the lot coverage far exceeds the 50% coverage permitted by the zoning. If the Board follows its Guidelines for this area, it is not possible to support this. He has mentioned the need to solve the building's infrastructure problems. If built above the current roof, it will be easier to concentrate the vertical loads or vertical runs. The Board is not denying him the ability to expand his business. However, he believes the proposed plan is the wrong approach on for this site, per City Guidelines.

Mr. Barnum stated that he has been in Old Dublin for 25 years and is aware of the ARB's past strict requirements regarding awning colors, signage, etc. However, Old Dublin is gone. It has been replaced by the Library, the Pedestrian Bridge and the glass structure of the AC Marriott. The new restaurants have no streetscape, open space, greenspace or patios. He has been in Dublin for 25 years and wants to invest in the property, but he is being required to meet Code while new businesses are not.

Ms. Stenberg noted that the ARB did not approve the Library. The new buildings he has referred to are not in the Historic District Core on the west side of the river. There is a specific Code and Design Guidelines for this District, which ARB must enforce. The Board wants to see Tucci's succeed, but it is important to work out a proposal before investing significant money into the plans. A solarium-style structure is not permitted in the Code, so this iteration would be difficult to approve.

Mr. Alexander stated that several months ago, the Board reviewed a similar architectural proposal. Although he was not present for that review, the other Board members were not supportive. In fairness to other applicants, approving this application would be inconsistent.

Ms. Rauch stated that in regard to the lot coverage, the applicant would not be adding additional impervious surface. A past variance was granted for this site to exceed the Code-required lot coverage.

Ms. Stenberg inquired if the Board had any suggestions to offer for improving the proposed plan that would make it acceptable.

Mr. Keeler stated that he likens this to a portable school classroom. Placing a trailer for temporary classroom space next to a school is permitted, but when it is replaced with a permanent structure, there are many standards for the permanent structure. If a proposed structure met the lot coverage requirement, he would consider a solarium concept because the Library is essentially in the same block. Although ARB did not approve the Library structure, it has set a precedent for that specific area. He has been very critical of another applicant's proposal later on this agenda. The reason there is a difference is that this is an existing business to which an addition is proposed. They use a plastic tent part of the year, and it would be replaced with something that is very attractive. It is an improvement over a tent, and Tucci's has been a great steward of Dublin. If the Library were not in place, the situation would be different. However, this is essentially in the same quadrant; therefore, he could support it. Branching out a further distance, he would be opposed

to new buildings that would look like the Library. In this case, it would be a significant improvement, and he likes the direction that is proposed.

Mr. Alexander stated that, in his opinion, the proposed structure scheduled later on the agenda is more consistent with the Code and Guidelines. This application should be held to the same standard. The scale of the adjacent and nearby buildings is not similar to the Library, so he would not make that comparison. The buildings across the street and the adjacent Harvest Pizza shop are quite small. A two-story building would be positioned further back on the site, and would have less impact on Harvest Pizza and the small-scale buildings across the street. Its open space could also remain as open space. Open space is as important as enclosed space.

Mr. Barnum stated that prior to this meeting, he met with every City Council member, and all were supportive. They suggested that the adjacent Wing Hill Alley could be turned into a bricked, common area. His restaurant would be contiguous to that open space, where a stage for his band could be located. There would be open space where the alley currently exists. Later on the agenda, there is an application for a 10,000 sq. ft. restaurant facility. With the new addition, Tucci's would only be a 7,000 sq. ft. restaurant. Of note, this proposed structure does come apart – the windows and roof retract. In the summer, patrons will actually be sitting outside, and with the landscaping and trees within the patio space, it will definitely appear to be outside seating.

Mr. Alexander stated that this site is within the area that must adhere to the Historic Dublin Design Guidelines, which the Board is tasked with enforcing. The new restaurants further down the street have outdoor spaces that are subordinate to the primary structures, and there is open space between the buildings and leading to the Pedestrian Bridge. In these types of cases, the scale must be appropriate and not overwhelm the adjacent buildings.

Mr. Keeler noted that a two-story building, which was suggested, would seem to be a higher scale than the one-story structures across the street and the Harvest Pizza shop.

Mr. Alexander responded that the two-story building would sit further back on the site.

Mr. Barnum stated that from an operational standpoint, a second level is not an option. Servicing an upper level -- carrying food up/down between levels, would be quite difficult.

Mr. Bailey noted that even if a second level were added over the back section of the building, during summer months, customers would prefer the patio, and the vinyl tent would continue to be used.

Mr. Barnum responded that he could continue to use a vinyl tent several months of the year, but that is not an ideal or aesthetic solution. From a business standpoint, terminating staff during the late fall and winter months and rehiring and training new staff for the April through October timeframe is not desirable. Having a permanent structure will make his business more successful.

Mr. Bailey stated that he has no objection to the solarium solution. Although there is a two-story building to the left and a one-story building to the right, the proposed rendering is more reflective of the Library. He believes it is possible to achieve a design that is more in context with Harvest Pizza, for example, that also will achieve what he needs.

Ms. Stenberg stated that the Board is supportive of his finding a solution that will provide what is needed. Mr. Barnum has been in business in Dublin for many years. Although the competition in that area is high, there is great opportunity for Tucci's to continue to provide Dublin great service in the future. It is important to provide what is needed to make this a more feasible business

model. She does not have an issue with the solarium structure during the summer months, as when the windows are retracted, the massing is more in context with the area. During the winter months, it is not. She is confident there is a better design that will achieve what is needed here.

Mr. Alexander suggested that Mr. Barnum work with an architect experienced with Historic Districts, who will understand how to design a structure sensitive to the Code and Guidelines. The proposed structure has been developed from a design used elsewhere that has no relationship to Dublin's Code or the traditional buildings in this district.

Mr. Barnum thanked the Board for their feedback.

3. Property at 48 S. High Street, 19-122ARB-MPR, Minor Project Review

Ms. Stenberg stated that this is an application for the installation of a multi-tenant, projecting sign for existing second-story tenant spaces. The 0.25-acre site is east of S. High Street, southeast of the intersection with Spring Hill Lane and zoned Bridge Street District Historic South.

Case Presentation

Mr. Hounshell stated that this a request for a Minor Project Review for a proposed multi-tenant projecting sign at 48 South High Street for existing second-story tenants. 48-52 South High Street is located southeast of the intersection of South High Street and Spring Hill Lane. 48 South High Street is the northern part of the building with first and second floor tenants. Since 1978, the Board has reviewed several applications for signs and for exterior modifications for 48-52 South High Street. In January 2007, the ARB reviewed and approved an application for a 6-sq. ft. multi-tenant projecting sign for second floor tenants. The existing projecting sign contains three tenant panels, one for each of the tenants located in the second story of the building. The current application is proposed to replace this approved projecting sign.

Sign Details:

The applicant is proposing a new 7.17-sq. ft. multi-tenant projecting sign for the second-story tenants of 48 South High Street. The sign is 36 inches in height and 30 inches in width. The sign panels are proposed to be constructed of 1-inch thick High Density Urethane (HDU) with 0.5-inch CNC routing for the copy and inline border. The background of the sign is proposed to be painted Amber Slate (Benjamin Moore CW 685). The copy and inline border are proposed to be painted Capitol White (Benjamin Moore CW 10). Each tenant will have a separate sign panel, which will be secured to the existing projecting sign on each side. The proposed sign will be located nine feet from the bottom of the sign to grade, which meets the Code requirement of a minimum of eight feet of clearance from sign to grade. The sign will be 12 feet from the top of the sign to grade, which meets the Code maximum of 15 feet.

The application has been reviewed against all applicable criteria and guidelines, and staff recommends approval with no conditions.

There were no public comments.
There was no Board discussion.

Mr. Keeler moved, Mr. Bailey seconded to approve the Minor Project Review with no conditions.

Vote: Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Mr. Bailey, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes.

[Motion carried 4-0.]

4. CoHatch – Dublin at 56 N. High Street, 20-002FDP, Final Development Plan

Ms. Stenberg stated that this is an application for the construction of a 2.5-story, 10,000-sq. ft. commercial building at 25 North Street. The 0.27-acre site is located between the intersections of N. High Street and North Street and N. Blacksmith Lane and North Street and is zoned Bridge Street District Historic Core.

Case Presentation

History:

Ms. Martin stated that this is a request for review and approval of a Final Development Plan (FDP) for a proposal to construct a new commercial building at 25 North Street with associated site improvements on a 0.27-acre parcel within Historic Dublin, containing a historic structure at 56 N. High Street. No changes to the historic building, known as the Brazenhead building, are proposed. A Final Development Plan (FDP) is the final step in the Historic Dublin review process for a new commercial structure over 7,500 square feet. In November 2019, the ARB reviewed and approved a Preliminary Development Plan (PDP). In September, the Board reviewed the Concept Plan, which is the first step in the development process. Prior to that, the Board provided an Informal Review of the proposal. With the PDP, the Board approved the site layout, the mass, scale and height of the building, and the required open spaces. [Images of neighboring structures provided for site context.]

Proposal:

The site plan remains unchanged with this application. The 10,000-sq. ft. office building is proposed to the rear of the Brazenhead building, with an 800-sq.ft. courtyard between the buildings. A brick sidewalk is proposed within the right-of-way along North Street. A staircase within a public access easement will help navigate the grade on the site. A vehicular loading zone is proposed along Blacksmith Lane at the rear of the property. The applicant has revised the exterior materials to a vertical 6-inch cedar wood siding with vertical cedar posts on a majority of the exterior. The cedar is proposed to be finished in silver gray stain (Benjamin Moore, Arborcoat). This revision was in response to the Board's concern about "oil canning" of the fibrous cement siding. The waiver the Board previously approved for fiber cement as a primary building material is no longer required. The base of the building is proposed to be clad with a stone veneer (Creative Mines Farmhouse Ledge, Coyote). The first story and lower level are proposed to have an integrated storefront system. The upper story of the building will have integrated windows. The majority of the trim, including canopies and windows, will be in a charcoal finish. From the rear elevation facing Blacksmith Lane and eventually the future Riverside Crossing Park, the full building height of 2.5 stories would be seen. The structure will have a standing seam metal roof in a charcoal color and three shed dormers. The window layout has been revised, as requested by the Board, to reduce the number of window sizes and to align the windows above one another, although some offsets will remain that relate to the architectural character. Six flange steel columns, painted black, are proposed for the lower level along Blacksmith Lane. The columns will support a canopy, which will have a trailing vine. The applicant has sited the dumpster and transformer at the rear of the building

inside a 7-foot tall board-on-board enclosure to match the building. The number of windows on the interior elevation have been reduced, per the Board's request. A .02 acre (871-square-foot) decomposed granite plaza over a compacted base is proposed. The landscaping details have been revised to be responsive to the Board's earlier concerns. A variety of perennials and ornamental grasses are included. To the east of the Brazenhead building, evergreen screening of the mechanicals on the rear of the building will be provided. The plaza will be edged with Dublin field stone adjacent to a concrete walk along the building. Custom patio furniture and a fire pit are proposed to enhance the outdoor area. The applicant is proposing beer garden style furniture at table, counter, and bar heights and a bar along the northern edge of the plaza with six mesh stools in a green finish. Three tables with bench seating are proposed on the eastern side of the plaza, and five standing counters on the western side of the plaza. The fire pit will be a stacked field stone with complementary curved bench seating to match. Moveable walnut stools, reclaimed from a tree on site, will accent the area. The applicant is proposing gooseneck wall sconces (Restoration Hardware Vintage Barn, Weathered Zinc) for the decorative building lighting. Additional LED lights would be integrated into the canopy to provide functional lighting for entrances. The photometric plan demonstrates that light levels will be 0.0 at 10 feet past the property line. The open space plaza will have string lighting for ambiance.

The application has been reviewed against the applicable criteria and staff recommends approval with two conditions.

Ms. Stenberg swore in the applicants.

Tim Lai, Tim Lai Architects, 401 W. Town Street, Columbus, Ohio, 43215 provided samples of the building materials for the Board's reference. He has no new information, but is available for questions.

Board Discussion

Mr. Alexander inquired the size of the batten strip.

Mr. Lai responded that the revised batten strips would be 3.5-inch x 3.5 inch.

Ms. Stenberg inquired if there were any concerns about a risk of the gravel in the courtyard causing any tripping issues.

Ms. Martin responded that staff did have some concerns and worked with the applicant to ensure a product was selected that would interlock as it settles and result in less spin-off. In addition, the courtyard will be edged, which will help contain the material.

Mr. Keeler stated that as he has expressed previously, he does not support having this design within this historic district.

There was no further discussion.

Mr. Alexander moved, Mr. Bailey seconded to approve the Final Development Plan with two conditions:

- 1) That the applicant work with the City Engineer to provide easement exhibits for the stairs and loading zone prior to issuance of a building permit; and

- 2) That the applicant work with the adjacent property owner at 40 N. High Street to ensure no portion of the historic stonewall along the shared property line is structurally compromised during construction.

Vote: Ms. Stenberg, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Bailey, yes; Mr. Keeler, no.
[Motion carried 3-1.]

5. Architectural Review Board 2019 Annual Report

Ms. Stenberg stated that the annual report is a review of the Board's activities, cases, decisions, and special projects to be forwarded to City Council.

Ms. Rauch stated that the report highlights the projects and cases on which ARB worked in 2019. The number of cases increased significantly in 2019.

Mr. Keeler moved, Ms. Stenberg seconded to recommend approval of the Architectural Review Board 2019 Annual Report to Council.

Vote: Mr. Bailey, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes.
[Motion carried 4-0.]

COMMUNICATIONS

- Ms. Rauch thanked Mr. Keeler for his service on ARB as he departs to begin his elected term on City Council.

Mr. Keeler stated that he has enjoyed his service on the Board and would have preferred to have continued in the role, but it was not possible.

- Ms. Rauch reported that a joint Council-PZC-ARB meeting has been scheduled for Thursday, February 13 at 6:00 p.m. The agenda topic is professional development of the commission and board members. Council Member and PZC member Ms. Fox, Council Member Mr. Keeler, PZC members Mr. Fishman and Mr. Supelak and ARB member Ms. Bryan have formulated a draft proposal on which the members' input is requested. She invited Mr. Keeler to add any comments.

Mr. Keeler encouraged ARB members not to hesitate to ask staff questions about a case. Although Mr. Alexander, with his architectural background, may not have many questions, as a layperson, he often has had. He believes it will be beneficial to make the communication process tighter and more comfortable, so that Board members can make the best decisions.

Ms. Rauch stated that in an attempt to improve the provision of information for the Board, the meeting presentations would be uploaded in the online meeting packet before the meetings. In addition, Assistant Law Director Thad Boggs will be attending future ARB meetings, when the scheduled cases may warrant legal advice. She encouraged Board members to contact staff beforehand with any questions related to an upcoming case, as staff is able to provide a more thorough response if there is time to collect the information.

Mr. Alexander inquired about an anticipated timeframe for completion of the ARB Code amendments and Historic Dublin Design Guidelines update.

Ms. Rauch indicated that the final drafts have been delayed due to her workload; however, completion is anticipated for the February 26 ARB meeting.

