



MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, November 20, 2019

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, Ms. Bryan, Mr. Bailey, Ms. Stenberg

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

Also present: Greg Dale, Consultant, McBride Dale Clarion

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS

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

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

(Approved 5 – 0)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Bryan moved, Mr. Alexander seconded to approve the October 16, 2019 meeting minutes.

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

(Approved 5 – 0)

Ms. Stenberg stated that the Architectural Review Board is responsible for review of construction and modification or alteration to any site in the Review District or area subject to Architectural 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 member of the public who planned to address the Board on any of the cases during the meeting.

CASES:

1. Kne Residence at 55 S. Riverview Street, 19-094ARB-MPR, Minor Project Review

Ms. Stenberg stated that this application is a proposal for final details for a detached garage addition to create a three-car garage for an existing, single-family home on a 0.40-acre site zoned Bridge Street District Historic Residential.

Case Presentation

Mr. Ridge stated that this is a request for review and approval of the final construction and design details for a previously conditionally approved Minor Project request for an addition to an existing detached garage. The subject site is approximately 0.4 acres in size and zoned BSD-HR – Bridge Street District, Historic Residential District. It is located on the southeast corner of Spring Hill and South Blacksmith Lane. The 1.5 car garage shares a drive with the neighbor to the south. The details provided tonight are supplemental. None of the details previously approved are changing. The new details include the following:

- Windows and pedestrian doors will have a three-quarter inch thick and 3.5-inch wide trim.
- The existing and proposed vents will also be adorned with the same trim.
- The overhead garage doors include a one-inch by six-inch door trim with a cap mold of the same size and material.
- Located above the southernmost garage door is a one-inch by six-inch band trim to conceal the horizontal break in the board and batten material.
- The roofline contains a one-inch by four-inch rake trim and a one-inch by six-inch eave fascia.
- The corners of the building will be wrapped in a three-quarter inch thick and 3.5-inch wide corner board.
- The proposed batten is one and three-quarter inches wide and is spaced at 16 inches on center to match the existing board and batten on the 2007 addition to the rear of the home.
- The new dimensional asphalt roof shingle color will be Estate Grey.
- The front façade will contain four lantern light fixtures.
- The east façade will have a new French door and lighting fixtures.

As a reminder, the windows on the north and south elevations will contain existing windows salvaged from the current garage.

The request was reviewed against all applicable review criteria, and staff recommends approval with no conditions.

Applicant Presentation

The applicant provided no additional comments.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Board Discussion

Mr. Alexander requested a clarification to the staff reports, which become part of the legal records of the case. Staff's report identifies the trim as 1 inch x 4 inch, and 1 inch x 6 inch. He assumes what is meant are the nominal dimensions in the presentation. It is not actually inches. If the terminology used is the same as in the presentation, 1x4, it is the industry standard of three-quarters x by 3.5. For clarity purposes, he would recommend the reference to inches be deleted. If the measurement on the drawing is used – 1 x 4, that, per the industry standard, is .75 by 3.5.

Mr. Ridge responded that it would be so noted.

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

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

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

(Approved 5 – 0)

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

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

Case Presentation

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

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

The applicant is proposing to use the existing sign bracket

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

Applicant Comments

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Board Discussion

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Case Presentation

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

borders are white vinyl. Staff recommends the sign design be modified to eliminate the use of acrylic and vinyl, as these materials are only permitted for window signs. The cedar face should incorporate dimensionally routed letters with a minimum of .5 inch routing, which is consistent with recently approved signs throughout the district. The background of the sign will be painted "HER Red PMS 485C." The applicant is proposing to sand and re-paint the existing bracket black. The application has been reviewed against the applicable criteria, and staff recommends approval with one condition.

Applicant Presentation

Tony Kellner, Lehner Signs, Inc., 2983 Switzer Rd, Columbus, OH 43219 stated that they had originally proposed a PVC sign, but subsequently learned the material was not an approved material. The design was revised to a cedar panel with raised acrylic letters for the HER logo. Because HDU, routed signs require a greater length of time to complete and are more costly, they are hopeful the existing design can be approved. If not an approved material, the vinyl used in the background can be replaced with a white, painted outline, and the "Fair Housing and Realtor" logo could be removed. They are hoping to avoid the additional time and expense of an HDU or cedar routed sign. [Samples of the cedar panel and acrylic lettering were shown]

Tim Kellner, Lehner Signs, Inc., 2983 Switzer Rd, Columbus, OH 43219 stated that the acrylic is pigmented, so there would be no issue with fading.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Board Discussion

Mr. Alexander referred to the window and door height reflected in the photo of the building in staff's report. Did staff verify that a sign on that bracket could be 8 feet from grade? If the Board were to approve the request tonight, and then it was discovered the sign could not be located there due to inability to meet the height requirement, it would be necessary for the applicant to return to the Board.

Mr. Hounshell responded that staff did not verify the information provided in the application.

Mr. Kellner responded that they may have the same issue as the 16 N. High Street property and would need to request that the sign be a lower height.

Mr. Alexander stated that in regard to the sign at 16 N. High Street, that bracket can be raised to meet the height requirement. He is doubtful that the bracket at 22 N. High Street can be raised the necessary distance to meet the height requirement. It may be necessary to re-design the sign.

Mr. Kellner stated that it will be possible to remove 6 to 8 inches from the bottom of the sign, if the "Fair Housing and Realtor" logo is eliminated.

Ms. Stenberg stated that she had some concerns about routing, which have been partially answered, except for the registration mark next to "HER." Is that registration mark required?

Mr. Kellner stated that cedar is brittle. Typically, it is routed as a circle, and the registration mark is applied in paint or vinyl.

Ms. Stenberg inquired if routed lettering is used, would staff work with the applicant on the details?
Ms. Martin responded that staff could be flexible with how the mark is detailed.

Mr. Keeler inquired about the acrylic letters.

Ms. Martin responded that for sign faces, the Code permits solar grade acrylics and polycarbonates or equivalent. However, this Code applies to the entire Bridge Street District, not just Historic Dublin. She has not seen a sign in Historic Dublin that has acrylic lettering. The previous applicant revised their sign package to eliminate acrylic letters.

Ms. Bryan stated that according to the Historic Dublin Design Guidelines, there are two issues related to the following requirements:

1. Durable, natural materials consistent with materials used for other signs
2. Avoiding bright colors.

She understands that the HER logo is red, but she is also concerned about deviating from the use of natural materials.

Mr. Alexander stated that permitting it would be unfair to the other applicants who were required to follow the Code, and subsequently spent the time and expense to do so. Because the applicant is able to open the office without a sign in place, the time issue is not critical.

Ms. Stenberg stated that there is historical precedence for maintaining that as a consistent requirement. She would prefer to keep that condition.

Colleen Reynolds, 5151 Brand Road, Dublin stated that she would be opening the HER realty office at this location. Recently, she and her husband conducted a walking tour of that district. Two doors from their location, there are signs that do not have dimensional lettering or routing. If it is in keeping with the Code and acrylic is not restricted, and because other exceptions exist, could an exception also be permitted in this case?

Mr. Alexander stated that since he has served on the Board, only one exception has been made. That sign is close to this location, but will be changing very soon.

Ms. Reynolds stated when she spoke with the shop owner two days ago, she indicated that the City had granted her an additional extension.

Ms. Martin stated that is incorrect.

Mr. Alexander stated that a one-year exception was granted last December. That will expire soon, and compliance with Code will be required.

Ms. Reynolds stated that she also observed that another realtor competitor has a sign with no dimensional letters. She asked about the application of the Code.

Ms. Stenberg responded that it is not restricted in the overall Bridge Street District. However, in the Historic District, applicants are also required to follow the Code and the Historic District Guidelines, which require the use of natural materials.

Mr. Keeler stated that Codes change over time. What she may be seeing is a sign that was approved under a prior Code, which has since been revised.

Ms. Reynolds stated that she was referring to a new tenant, whose sign was approved within the last 24 months.

Ms. Martin stated that she is referring to the Toy Emporium.

Mr. Keeler stated that is the one exception that was made.

Ms. Bryan pointed out that exception has a time duration. The Toy Emporium applicant will need to come back before ARB.

Ms. Bryan moved, Mr. Keeler seconded, to approve the Minor Project Review with the following condition:

- 1) The applicant revise the sign design to eliminate the use of acrylic and vinyl, and to include a solid cedar sign with dimensionally routed letters with a minimum half-inch routing.

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

(Approved 5 – 0)

4. CoHatch – Dublin at 56 N. High Street, 19-099ARB-PDP/WR/Parking Plan Preliminary Development Plan

Ms. Stenberg stated that this application is a proposal for the construction of a new, 10,174-square-foot, 2.5-story commercial building at 25 North Street with associated site improvements to replace an existing commercial building that is proposed to be demolished. The site also contains a historic structure at 56 N. High Street that will remain. The 0.27-acre site is zoned Bridge Street District Historic Core.

Case Presentation

Site

Ms. Martin stated that the 0.27-acre site, which is located at the intersections of N. High Street and North Street, and N. Blacksmith Lane and North Street, currently contains two existing buildings. The historic structure located at 56 North High Street is known as The Brazenhead building. That building will be retained unchanged with no exterior modifications. The building to the rear, located at 25 North Street, is proposed for demolition – that request follows this Preliminary Development Plan request.

Background

This case has previously been before the Board twice, as an Informal Review in March 2019 and as a Concept Plan in September 2019. At the Concept Plan review, the Board requested that the total height of the structure be reduced from 3 stories to 2.5 stories, which this revised application achieves. The Board also recommended revisiting the mass of the Blacksmith Lane elevation. The Board expressed appreciation of the proposed materials. There was discussion regarding lot coverage and landscaping.

The Bridge Park District review process for commercial buildings over 7,500 square feet is a three-step process. The applicant has completed the Concept Plan step. The second step is the Preliminary Development Plan. Upon approval of that plan, the Final Development Plan details would come before the Board for approval. At that stage, all of the materials and details are provided. The Preliminary Plan is intended to finalize the site layout, open space provision, building mass, character and height, and architectural style. Architectural details, materials and landscape plan are provided with the Final Development Plan.

Several waivers are requested, and additional waivers are anticipated with the Final Development Plan. With those details, it will be possible to review any Code deviations. The waivers requested tonight are apparent with the proposed architectural style, and the applicant cannot proceed without obtaining waivers.

A parking plan approval is also requested at this time. If not approved, the site layout would have to be changed significantly.

Proposed Site Plan

The site plan is largely unchanged from the previous submission. A new 10,000 sq. ft. office building and co-working space is proposed to the rear of the existing building. There is a loading zone along Blacksmith Lane; a centrally-located courtyard will provide approximately 850 square feet of open space, meeting the open space requirement. The proposed lot coverage is 85%, which is near the 90% maximum permitted. The applicant has worked with Engineering to provide a pedestrian connection along North Street. It will be partially within the public right-of-way, and a private access easement will be provided over a private staircase due to the grade change.

Architecture Details

The architectural details of the elevations are largely unchanged from the Concept Plan review, except that the height has been reduced by approximately 8 feet. The proposed building is an extended Saltbox form with modified saw-tooth roof. The building varies from 2.5 stories at the rear of the building to one story along North High Street. Vertical batten board siding is proposed with over-sized character and an irregular window pattern. Waivers are requested for the required roof pitches. The rear elevation along Blacksmith Lane has a stone clad base. There are columns on this elevation, which staff recommends be further detailed and made more structurally prominent with the Final Development Plan (FDP). A board-on-board dumpster enclosure is proposed on Blacksmith Lane. Staff recommends the enclosure be revised for the FDP to be of a higher quality material. Staff also recommends the design be modified to incorporate a more symmetrical and traditional window pattern. Although there can be some variation level to level, more consistency in the elevations is desired. The west elevation faces the Brazenhead building and North High Street. This two-story elevation cannot be seen from the intersection of North Street and North High Street. The south elevation, which faces the interior property line, sits 9 feet off the property line. To the highest roof peak, its total height is approximately 48 feet. The applicant has prepared a massing comparison to compare the proposal reviewed by the Board in September to the revised proposal for this review.

The primary mass of the building is pulled away from 54 North High Street. The 2.5-story building with a stone clad base sits along Blacksmith Lane. Moving west, the structure decreases to 1-story in height to mimic the addition to the rear of the historic building. The upper stories are intended to be clad in fiber cement with a board and batten character. An asymmetrical window pattern is proposed. Additionally, staff has previously raised concerns with the use of board and batten siding on large structures. Staff recommends the design be modified to use vertical board wood-style siding in a gray wash or natural finish similar to the original inspirational images.

The proposed character remains generally unchanged. An oversized board and batten material will be used. However, there is a proliferation of board and batten across the District, particularly on large structures. Staff recommends the applicant consider vertical siding in a similar color palette.

Conceptual materials have been provided. A Farmhouse-style stone base with a Hardiboard fiber cement vertical board and batten siding and a metal standing seam roof in a charcoal finish are proposed. Staff recommends significant landscape revisions to the plaza be made with the FDP.

Parking Plan

Today, the site contains approximately seven parking spaces, which are partially located within the right-of-way. The proposed plan provides an on-site loading zone, but no on-site parking. Based on the combination of Eating and Drinking and Office-General uses, 71 parking spaces are required. Currently, Brazenhead is functioning with parking that is far less than what Code requires. The applicant is requesting to use the public parking garage as off-site parking. The Code requires off-site parking be within 600 feet of the site. The garage is located approximately 280 feet from the site. In total, there are 820 public parking spaces located north of W. Bridge Street that are accessible to this site.

Three waivers are requested. The first waiver is for the use of fibrous cement as a primary material. Whether or not the applicant continues to propose a board and batten siding, there will likely be a significant amount of fibrous cement on the building. The Code permits only materials of glass, brick and stone, which need to make up 80% or more of each elevation. The second waiver relates to the roof pitch, both the principal roof pitches, as well as the dormers. Given the modern architectural character of this building, the traditional 6 – 12 roof pitch is not met. The proposed roof pitches do contribute to the architectural diversity of the District. The third waiver is requested for vertical façade divisions. The Code requires that every 30 feet, there be a change in the façade and the plain. Although there is significant variation on the North Street façade, it does not meet the requirement precisely, and the interior property line elevation and the Blacksmith Lane elevation do not meet Code.

The proposal has been reviewed against all applicable criteria and staff recommends approval of the three waivers, parking plan and the Preliminary Development Plan with three conditions.

Applicant Presentation

Matt Davis, 4620 Hickory Rock Drive, Powell, Ohio, 43065, stated that he is the owner and co-founder of Co-Hatch. They have met with staff several times on what has turned out to be a complex project. The architect, Mr. Lai, has created a model of the proposed structure, so that the Board can see what is proposed.

Tim Lai, Tim Lai Architects, 401 W. Town Street, Columbus, Ohio, 43215, provided a model to scale of the proposed structure for the Board's review. The primary purpose of the model to scale is to clarify the massing of the structure. Using the model, Mr. Lai pointed out the details of the proposed building, which has been revised since the Concept Plan Review. Per the Board's previous concerns regarding the height of the facility in relationship to the neighboring residential community, that edge of the roof in question has been lowered by 8 feet. The model shows the relationship of the building to the surrounding structures. The Board had expressed some concerns about the windows. All the windows on the first two floors are either three feet or six feet wide. There were also concerns regarding windows on the basement level of the building. On the south side facing

the property line, there are window reductions due to Building Code limitations. [Description of architectural details continued.]

Public Comment

Alex Walter, 62 N. Riverview Street, Dublin, stated that his residence is located near the site of the proposed building. He has lived in Dublin for 26 years and on this street for four years. Because his father previously served on the Planning and Zoning Commission, he is actively interested in development in his area. The proposed project concerns him, particularly the modern, contemporary design. The best part of this area of Dublin is its historical buildings. Putting this modern building immediately next to the Brazenhead building, which is listed in the Historical Building Registry, is difficult to understand. Another concern is the parking issue. The applicant plans to meet that requirement by using the new Parking Garage. However, people do not use designated parking. In recent years, the residents have experienced many issues related to traffic, including construction vehicles not parking in the designated areas. He observed the previous discussion regarding issues with proposed sign issues. He was pleased to see that the Board required that applicant to adhere to the City's Code. That is what has made Historic Dublin different from development on the other side of the river. The proposed building would fit in the Bridge Street District on the other side of the river. It does not fit with the character of the Historic District. This is a very large building and will be an "eyesore" within the historic part of our City.

Board Discussion

Mr. Keeler stated that at the Concept Plan discussion, the Board expressed concern with the proposed offsite parking in the Garage. There are a limited number of spaces within the garage. With the parking demand created by all the new projects, are any issues anticipated?

Ms. Martin responded that since the Parking Garage was completed, few new structures have been constructed and very few new uses have occupied existing structures. When a use changes, the applicant is required to meet parking requirements or provide a parking plan that demonstrates dedicated parking accommodations. In general, all of the existing buildings have parking agreements with one another, based upon the combination of uses present in the District. None of the properties south of Bridge Street is eligible to use the Parking Garage, and there are over 800 parking spaces north of Bridge Street.

Mr. Keeler stated that he is not in favor of a contemporary design in this location. This is the Historic Core. There are some associated advantages, such as the zero-foot setbacks on the south side. There are also some disadvantages. Personally, he is very protective of the Historic Core. The applicant has done an impressive job with what they have. He likes the design, but not in the Historic Core. In attempting to discuss façade and material issues, he is not able to get past the issue of the building's location, which should not be in the Historic Core.

Mr. Alexander stated staff expressed reservations about the battens; however, the conditions did not address the battens.

Ms. Martin stated that the materials will be finalized with the Final Development Plan.

Mr. Alexander stated that he likes the intent of what is proposed. Although it is a contemporary building, it is very different from the new Library. The proposed building attempts to address the

building traditions in the Historic District and makes gestures to the adjacent buildings. Board and batten is more consistent with traditional materials, and it can harmonize with the stone base, which is another gesture to traditional materials. The massing of the west elevation is broken into a volume that is comparable to the side volume of the Brazenhead. The standing seam roof is another traditional material. The surface of the building attempts to match that of the building on the opposite side of the building. The Library did not attempt to recognize the traditions and massing of the neighborhood; this building does. However, the building uses different compositional strategies that are a more contemporary approach, such as a roof with pitches that are not symmetrical and windows that do not align. He appreciates the attempt that was made to reduce the mass. However, the battens are a concern. The reason that the cement fiber material is approved in the District is it is used to replicate board and batten. It is never used with batten strips this far apart. There are many apartment buildings using broad areas of the material, but the material is so thin that it "oil cans." He is concerned that if the material is only secured three feet on center, it may look cheap. That is not what is desired. He does not have an issue with a more contemporary building in this location. His only concern is the batten pattern and the way the surface is expressed. It is important to show when a building was constructed. This building is not supposed to be a reproduction of an older building.

Ms. Stenberg stated that she really appreciates the effort made to pull back the roof line on the Blacksmith Lane façade and add a dormer effect to help tie it into some of the other buildings. She liked the green canopy, making the building more approachable and less of a solid mass. However, from Blacksmith Lane, the building appears to be over three stories tall, due to the height of the roof peak. Per the elevation specifications, the north elevation is 41 feet tall. She is concerned with that height. The mass is too large for this area. The model provided is helpful; it reveals that in context with the surrounding buildings, this building is too massive. She agrees that the battens are too wide. She does not have an issue with the fact that the building does not appear to be a historic building.

Mr. Davis stated that at the end of the last meeting, the Board indicated that they had no objection to the proposed massing. The two items the Board requested be revised were to lower the rear elevation and change the patio structure. They did both. They are willing to make changes, but prefer to have clear direction. The City requested that he come here and build office space.

Ms. Bryan stated that she has expressed her concerns with the massing from the beginning, and she does not recall agreeing to this massing at the previous review. The houses on the adjacent street will be dwarfed by this building. She appreciates the changes that were made, but continues to have concerns with the massing and the board and batten. She is concerned that the construction will look cheap due to the spacing. As long as it is not extreme, she has no issue with trying to blend in a more contemporary design in a manner that complements the neighborhood.

Mr. Davis stated that the building is one story on the front side and two stories at the rear, due to the grade. They have attempted to address the height. Lowering it further would result in 8-foot ceilings in the interior.

Mr. Bailey stated that his concern is that the view of the town from the pedestrian bridge will be that of this massive building. He likes the design of the building on its own, but he is confused with the lack of consistency in what we are saying is the Historic District, and what is not. Anyone

crossing the bridge will be looking right at this building.

Mr. Keeler stated that the question he asks is if the Library had never been built, would ARB ever be agreeing to something like this? The answer is "no." ARB did not approve that Library and never would have. However, the Library does exist and it sets a precedent. It opens the door to these types of applications. The issue is whether or not ARB will permit them. He is only one vote. If ARB permits this, it will begin to chip away the Historic District; there will others. There is a large office building on South High Street, a Tudor-style building built in the 1970s. That would have been perfect for this use, so will it also end up being a similar use? The resident makes a good point – the Board is a stickler on acrylic signs, but is not a stickler about a contemporary building located here in the Historic Core. That seems very inconsistent to him. The Co-Hatch concept is great and the proposed building is awesome. He would not change a thing. He likes it -- just not here.

Mr. Davis stated that he wants to bring Co-Hatch to this space, if the Board would give him direction on how to make this building traditional. The Board is expressing conflicting direction.

Mr. Keeler stated that three Board members are in favor of the general design. He is not one of those three. It seems that those three Board members are asking only that the batten be changed. If he were to give direction, it would be that the applicant re-create what they did in the City of Worthington. They can argue that they worked with an existing building. Would Worthington have allowed this contemporary building to be built in Old Worthington? They would not. The applicant can build a traditional-looking building because they have done so in other places. If they want his direction, they could take the same basic scale and shape, use industrial-style warehouse windows, 6 over 6, 8 over 8, giving it a warehouse type feel. He does not like windows like this in Old Dublin.

Mr. Davis stated the reason he came to Dublin was to take advantage of a historic building that was available – the Brazenhead. Brazenhead will be converting to another use, which he will be handling. That building will be retained. However, this concept won't work in that space, as it is only 4,500 square feet. He also has to build something behind it that will be integrated with the other building. His goal is to build something that the City wants to have there.

Mr. Alexander stated that if the siding were darker, this proposal would not be substantially different from what was approved for the other office building on High Street. The base is deeper because the site is deeper. The rear elevation is not that dissimilar. The massing has been changed, and the three horizontal bands further break up the mass. This revised design is more creative, which he prefers; however, the applicant's first design had approval from the majority of the Board members.

Ms. Stenberg stated that this design is not that far off and is a more creative approach. Using the stone and adding a green canopy makes it feel part of the landscape. However, the height at this location is an issue. At the last meeting, she had an issue with the building being 40+ feet in height. She understands the applicant's desire not to have 8-foot ceilings within, but the roof height needs to be reduced several feet. ARB required that the previous office building height be reduced.

Mr. Davis stated that the adjacent building height is the same as this.

Ms. Stenberg stated that they may be the same, but she would not have approved that building. That building did not come before the ARB. The current structure on the site, which is proposed for demolition, is not as high as what is being proposed, and she does not want a higher or larger building in that space. She likes many of the changes made, including the courtyard/greenspace between the historical building and the new building. The height is the main issue.

Ms. Bryan stated that she struggles the most with the view from Blacksmith Lane. She does not understand why wider, dissimilar windows are being used. There is no uniformity or symmetry.

Mr. Lai responded that a more random window pattern allows for flexibility in the use of the interior office spaces.

Ms. Bryan stated that this structure is very modern for the Historic District, and she partially agrees with Mr. Keeler on the issue. She also recognizes that it is difficult to maintain this area as the Historic District due to the hodge podge of buildings. The façade facing Blacksmith Lane is a primary issue for her, as the window diversity is very unappealing.

Mr. Lai stated that they are willing to revise the window design. He explained that they are trying to maintain parallel roof pitches.

Mr. Bailey inquired if the windows had panels and a consistent layout, would that resolve part of the issue.

Mr. Keeler stated that at least it would provide more symmetry.

Ms. Stenberg stated that the design needs some adjustments, particularly the massing, before she could approve the plan. The height of the roof needs to be reduced.

Ms. Martin clarified that final materials and window details are not approved with the Preliminary Development Plan. Those details are addressed in the Final Development Plan. However, there does need to be agreement on mass, height and character.

Mr. Bailey moved, Ms. Bryan seconded approval of the following three waivers:

- 1) Waiver to permit fiber cement as an alternate primary building material.
- 2) Waiver to permit alternate roof pitches as depicted in the Preliminary Development Plan.
- 3) Waiver to eliminate the requirement of vertical façade division.

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

Ms. Bryan moved, Mr. Bailey seconded to approve the following parking plan:

- 1) Use of a public parking garage for off-site parking in lieu of the requirement to provide 71 parking spaces on site.

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

Mr. Bailey moved, Mr. Alexander seconded to approve the Preliminary Development Plan with the following three conditions:

- 1) That the applicant work with Engineering to define the loading zone operation prior to submittal of the Final Development Plan;

- 2) That the applicant revise the landscape design to reflect staff's suggestions, and to decrease the square feet of gravel limestone used;
- 3) That the applicant work to refine and revise the window layout prior to submission of the Final Development Plan.

Vote: Mr. Bailey, yes; Ms. Bryan, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Stenberg, no.
(Motion passed 4-1)

5. Property at 25 North Street, 19-103ARB, Architectural Review Board

Ms. Stenberg stated that this is an application for the demolition of an existing 2-story commercial building zoned Bridge Street District Historic Core.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Martin stated that this is a request for demolition of the existing 1.5 story structure at 25 North Street, regarding which the Board just reviewed a Preliminary Development Plan. The 4,500 sq. ft. commercial building is located to the rear of a historic structure on a 0.27-acre parcel within Historic Dublin. The site is located at the intersections of N. High Street and North Street, and N. Blacksmith Lane and North Street. The condition of the structure has deteriorated since its construction in the 1960s. It was last renovated in 1993. The applicant has provided interior photos to document the condition and extensive renovations that would be required, should the building be retained. The Historic and Cultural Assessment conducted by the City in 2017 identified the building as non-contributing. Two of the four demolition criteria must be met. Staff has found that two of the four have been met, and staff recommends approval of the demolition with one condition.

There was no public comment.

Board Discussion

There was no Board discussion.

Ms. Bryan moved, Mr. Keeler seconded to approve the demolition request with the following condition:

- 1) That the order to allow demolition not be issued by the City until the ARB has approved a Final Development Plan for a new structure.

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

6. Historic Dublin – ARB Code Amendments, 19-007ADMN, Administrative Request - Code

Ms. Stenberg stated that this is a request for the review of development standards in the Zoning Code Amendments addressing the Historic Dublin Zoning Districts.

Staff Presentation

Greg Dale, Consultant, McBride Dale Clarion, stated that this is ARB's third review of the draft ARB Code amendments and Historic Dublin Guidelines. The amendments are being made per Council's direction to remove the Historic District from the Bridge Street District. Since ARB's last review, a public meeting and designated office hours were held to receive public input. The Planning and Zoning Commission conducted a review on September 5, 2019. There are a few remaining issues on which ARB input is desired.

1. Uses - Hotel and Multi-Family

Based on the Board's previous direction, staff is recommending that "hotel" be eliminated as a permitted use in the HS, Historic South District, but remain permitted in the HC, Historic Core District, with the addition of Use Specific Standards that target small scale, boutique hotels.

Staff also recommends that "multi-family" be revised to "two-family" as a permitted use in the HS, Historic South District, and in the HC, Historic Core District. The provision would allow for attached row homes while eliminating the opportunity for large-scale condominium projects.

Mr. Alexander inquired if they had looked at how economics are changing in the area and what uses would be compatible with the structures for the purpose of reuse. How does the economic return and value impact what could be located here?

Mr. Keeler stated that it needs to be economically feasible for a prospective buyer to acquire a property here and renovate it to an appropriate use.

Mr. Alexander stated that if the variance process provides sufficient flexibility for a hybrid of uses, it might be fine.

Mr. Keeler stated that it is a prospective buyer's responsibility to do their homework to ensure they do not overpay for the property and understand the requirements and limitations for renovating it to an appropriate use.

Mr. Dale inquired if the concern is if there is sufficient flexibility of uses in these buildings.

Mr. Alexander responded affirmatively. There should be a hybrid of uses for buildings that are not single-use. There is a problem because these small buildings are expensive to renovate and there are limitations on what the uses can be. If the variance process can address this question, however, perhaps it is not an issue.

Ms. Bryan stated that this difficulty is reflected in the recent cases of demolition by neglect.

Ms. Martin stated that in regard to the mixing of uses, there is not a better zoning mechanism than a form-based code, which permits a mix. The exception would be the Residential District, which has a narrow range of uses. An example of a different use renovation would be Co-Hatch.

Mr. Dale agreed that the previous case is a good example of a new, mixed use.

2. Development Standards – Historic Residential District

The Board discussed tailoring the proposed development standards (See Tables 153.173A and 153.173B) for the HR, Historic Residential District to align with the prevailing conditions. The Board's input is requested on the following three issues: building height, lot coverage, and setbacks.

Setbacks

In regard to setbacks, there is an opportunity to consolidate some of the setback requirements in Table 153.173B. Suggested is a minimum front yard setback of 20 feet; a minimum sideyard setback of 3 feet; a minimum total side yard of 12 feet; and a rear yard setback of 15 feet.

Ms. Stenberg stated that she would have no objection to doing so.

Mr. Keeler inquired how those numbers would have impacted some of the recent cases on South High Street, specifically the Dyas properties.

Ms. Martin stated that the applications would have met these requirements.

Mr. Alexander stated that the Board is interested in preventing long houses on deep lots. In many communities, the rear setback is one-quarter of the lot depth or there is a minimum setback of 40 feet.

Mr. Keeler stated that recently, residents have spoken about the need to preserve the back yards. If we allow a smaller setback, we would not be addressing their concerns. At the same time, there are recent cases that would have been able to take advantage of more lot coverage than they did. Residents have stated that they purchased their homes under one set of rules, and now the City is changing its rules. In general, would the proposed numbers make the rules more liberal, not more restrictive?

Ms. Martin stated that the only area where the rear yard setback would be more liberal is on Franklin Street.

Mr. Dale stated that the new Code amendment also will provide the Board ability to impose conditions, based upon context, beyond the standards.

Mr. Alexander stated that, looking at the Franklin Street setback, he is concerned the change could create some problems.

Ms. Martin noted that the building setback would also apply to detached garages.

Mr. Alexander noted that in some cities, there is a separate line item for detached garages.

[Discussion continued regarding setbacks.]

Mr. Dale stated that Ms. Martin has suggested a possible requirement that would tie setbacks proportionally to depth. They will work on drafting that language.

Lot Coverage

Mr. Dale stated that, currently, the lot coverage is 50%. In comparison, the lot coverage of other residential districts in the City is 45%. Staff's recommendation is to leave it as is, however, because the Historic District typically has more intense uses.

Ms. Bryan responded that she would prefer that it be reduced, due to recent issues with large homes being approved on these small lots. They are changing the scale and texture of this neighborhood.

Ms. Stenberg stated that perhaps the requirement should be closer to 40% in the residential district.

Mr. Keeler noted that recent buyers of properties would object to the rules changing after their purchase of a property.

Ms. Bryan responded that there is always the ability to request a waiver.

Mr. Keeler stated that there should be a mandate that realtors disclose that properties within the Historic District may have stricter guidelines.

Ms. Bryan agreed that there is a need to disclose this information. New buyers to the District should be made aware of the restrictions.

Ms. Martin noted that in January 2019, the City sent postcards to every property owner in the Historic District making them aware that their property was located in the Architectural Review District and any exterior, site or paint alterations must be reviewed and approved. ARB meeting dates were provided, as well.

Mr. Bailey stated that versus mandating, educating the realtors would be the best possibility.

Mr. Keeler noted that if realtors know a rule exists, ethically, they are obligated to disclose it. Therefore, if the City provides the information to them, the City is doing its job. They are then relying on the realtors to do their job.

Mr. Alexander stated that in looking at the list of lot coverage variations, a 10% reduction is significant. Many communities base the percentage on lot size, i.e. the percentage increases with a smaller lot size. Reducing the percentage to 40% in this District would be a concern.

Mr. Dale stated that is the reason staff recommended not changing the percent from 50%. It is a baseline standard, which can be adjusted through the process.

Ms. Bryan stated that she would be in favor of setting the baseline lower and allowing the applicant to request more.

Mr. Dale noted that Ms. Martin has suggested a proportional lot coverage. Developing the right formula, however, could be difficult.

Mr. Alexander stated that there are some communities that do this, rather than treating small lots the same as large lots. Setting the percent at 40% may result in more variance requests. In addition, granting a number of variances results in Code changes.

Mr. Bailey stated that he would prefer to make it 45% universal throughout the City, or at a minimum, utilize a sliding scale.

Mr. Keeler stated that he would prefer not to have a more subjective process, relying upon variances. He would prefer to leave the percentage as it is, or to have the lot percentage based upon the lot size. That process would result in fewer waivers being needed.

Ms. Bryan stated that in the draft documents, only two of the 48 residential properties exceeded 50%; the remainder were less.

Mr. Dale noted that the lower percentages correspond with larger lots.

Ms. Bryan stated that the City is beginning to lose the diversity characteristics of the neighborhood because of the larger homes. The smaller homes are looking dwarfed and out of place.

Mr. Dale stated that lot coverage is only one tool for addressing this issue.

[Discussion continued regarding lot coverage.]

Mr. Keeler inquired what other tools could address the issue.

Mr. Dale stated that a sliding scale could be used. They could look at a potential sliding scale for small, medium and large lots with different percentages. Dealing more comprehensively than that with the issue is probably an issue for a future discussion.

Ms. Martin stated that staff would provide a recommendation for lot coverage for ARB's consideration prior to their making a formal recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Building Height

Mr. Dale stated that the current requirement is 35 feet. Staff's analysis indicates that is too tall, given the area context. He noted that in the Historic South District, the maximum height is 24 feet. Perhaps that height would be appropriate for the residential district.

Ms. Martin noted that accumulating accurate data on the existing building heights was difficult, particularly for truly historical buildings. Many of the buildings in the information provided were measured to the peak of the roof. The 24-foot height in the Historical South District is measured to the midpoint of the eaves -- historically, they have measured to the midpoint of the eaves.

Ms. Bryan stated that the method of measuring needs to be specified.

Mr. Keeler stated that, presently, there is not a sufficiently broad sampling on which to make a decision.

Mr. Alexander stated that a 24-foot height requirement would not be particularly onerous.

Ms. Bryan inquired if the current 35-foot requirement was to the midpoint of the eaves.

Mr. Dale responded affirmatively.

Mr. Alexander stated that in most residential communities, the 35-foot measurement is to the peak.

Ms. Stenberg stated that the Board has always interpreted that as being to the peak, although it may have been measured differently for commercial properties.

Ms. Bryan stated that it will be important to be very clear with these new documents.

Mr. Dale stated that when Zoning Codes, in general, establish how to measure height, they refer to measuring it at the midpoint of the gable. Historically, staff has used that definition for calculating height, which is the reason 35 feet has been considered too high.

Board consensus was to change the number to 24 feet.

Ms. Bryan inquired about the possibility of addressing maximum square footage of homes.

Mr. Dale stated that would be one of the other tools to which he referred. It would involve some research and analysis to come up with a good number. Perhaps that possibility could be studied and the Code modified accordingly in the future.

Ms. Bryan requested that staff make a note to consider that possibility for addressing concerns in the Historic Residential area.

Mr. Dale stated that they have received the guidance needed from the ARB and would formulate a final draft for the Board's consideration and recommendation.

Communications

Ms. Bryan inquired if the potential development of the property at 156 and 158 S. High Street was no longer under consideration.

Ms. Martin stated that accordingly to her knowledge, the property owner is in search of other potential buyers interested in custom-built homes.

There were no further communications.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:26 p.m.



Chair, Architectural Review Board



Deputy Clerk of Council