



MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, April 22, 2020

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Bryan, Chair, called the April 22, 2020 meeting of the Architectural Review Board to order at 6:30 p.m. and provided the following opening comments: "Welcome to the first virtual meeting of the City of Dublin Architectural Review Board. We are living in extraordinary times. Both the State of Ohio and the City of Dublin have declared states of emergency. The Ohio Legislature passed several emergency laws to address the pandemic, including the ability for public entities to have virtual meetings. We appreciate this ability to maintain our continuity of government. For the duration of the Stay at Home Order, we will be holding our meetings online and live streaming those meetings on YouTube. You can access the live-stream on the City's website. In order to submit any questions or comments during the meeting, please use the form under the streaming video on the City's website. These questions and comments will be relayed to the Board by the meeting moderator. We want to accommodate public participation and comment to the greatest extent possible. We welcome your comments on cases, but please refrain from making any inappropriate comments. This is not a perfect system, but we will do our best in these difficult times. We appreciate your patience."

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Ms. Bryan led the Pledge of Allegiance.

OATH OF OFFICE

Mayor Amorose Groomes administered the Oaths of Office to the Architectural Review Board (ARB) re-appointee Kathleen Bryan and appointee Sean Cotter.

ROLL CALL

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

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS

Mr. Kownacki moved, Ms. Kramb seconded to accept the documents into the record.
Vote on the motion: Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Bryan, yes; Mr. Kownacki, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes.
(Motion carried 5-0)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Kramb moved, Mr. Alexander seconded to approve the February 26, 2020 meeting minutes.
Vote on the motion: Ms. Bryan, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Mr. Kownacki, yes.

(Motion carried 5-0)

Ms. Bryan stated that the Architectural Review Board is responsible for review of construction, modification or alteration to any site in the Review District or area subject to Architectural Board Review under the provision of Zoning Code Section 153.177. The Board has the decision-making responsibility on these cases. The Chair swore in any staff or members of the public who planned to address the Board on any of the cases during the meeting.

CASES:

1. North High Brewing, 56 N. High Street, 20-044 MSP, Master Sign Plan

Ms. Bryan stated that this is a proposal for the installation of a ±15-square-foot wall sign on the north elevation and a ±5-square-foot, externally illuminated wall sign facing N. High Street for an existing tenant space. The site is southeast of the intersection of N. High Street and North Street and zoned Bridge Street District Historic Core.

Case Presentation

Mr. Ridge stated that is a request for review and approval of a Master Sign Plan (MSP) for N. High Brewing, which is located within the Historic Dublin. The 0.27-acre parcel is located on the southeast corner of N. High Street and North Street. Mr. Ridge showed images of the sign locations, which are the same locations of the former Brazenhead signs, both of which met Code requirements.

Proposed Signs

1. Wall Sign 1 (West Façade – North High Street)

The proposed wall sign on the west façade, facing North High Street, is 2 feet in height by 2.5 feet in width for a total size of 5 square feet. The proposed sign is constructed of a routed 1.5-inch thick High Density Urethane (HDU) panel with a cedar-style background. The raised border and copy are painted black and the background is white, meeting the three-color maximum required by Code. The sign is proposed to be externally illuminated by two existing white gooseneck lighting fixtures. Because the proposed sign is situated off center and too close to the window trim, staff recommends that the sign be centered above and between the two windows in a manner that allows for a consistent border around the sign, and that it be illuminated with a single gooseneck fixture, also centered above and between the windows.

2. Wall Sign 2 (North Façade – North Street)

The proposed wall sign on the north façade, facing North Street, is 3.5 feet in height by 4 feet, 4 inches in width with a total size of 15.16 square feet. The height of the sign is approximately 14 feet from grade to the top of the sign, meeting the maximum 15 feet height limit, as required by Code. The approximately 15-square-foot sign is nearly twice as large as the Code permits. ARB has not previously approved a sign on a contributing structure larger than the Code permitted maximum of eight square feet. This sign also is constructed of a routed 1.5-inch thick High Density Urethane (HDU) panel with a cedar-style background. The raised border and copy are painted black with a white background, meeting the three-color maximum required by Code. Staff recommends that the sign size be reduced to meet the Code required maximum of 8 square

feet. The Master Sign Plan (MSP) has been reviewed against all applicable criteria, and staff recommends approval with five conditions.

Board Questions for the Presenter

Mr. Kownacki inquired if the applicant has proposed any reduction in size for the sign on the north façade.

Mr. Ridge responded that staff has not received a revised proposal that would meet the Code requirement.

Mr. Cotter inquired the reason for the recommended centering of the sign on the west façade.

Mr. Ridge responded that it was for aesthetic reasons, to achieve an even border space around the sign.

Mr. Alexander inquired if both of these specific sign locations were previously approved by the ARB for the Brazenhead signs.

Mr. Ridge responded that these same sign locations were approved for the Brazenhead signs in 1999 and 2000.

Applicant Presentation

Oliver Holtsberry, DaNite Sign Co., 1640 Harmon Avenue, Columbus, Ohio stated that both signs are in the same location as the Brazenhead signs were previously located. The existing gooseneck lighting will remain in place for both signs. The HDU signs will have .5 inch, raised lettering. For the N. High Brewing logo to fit and still be visible on the sign on the north façade, it is necessary for the sign to be slightly bigger than 8 square feet.

Board Questions for the Applicant

Mr. Kownacki inquired if there would be any objection to potentially moving the sign on the west façade to be centered under the windows rather than the proposed location to the right.

Mr. Holtsberry responded that the proposed location is centered between the two existing gooseneck lights, which will be used to illuminate the sign.

Mr. Kownacki inquired if they could center the sign if the one gooseneck light were removed, per staff's recommendation.

Mr. Holtsberry responded that he could make that suggestion to his client. There may be an expense involved with removing it and repairing the surface. He is concerned that it might lose visibility if it is tucked under the roofline.

Ms. Bryan stated that she has reviewed an image of the original Brazenhead sign. Because that sign was longer and narrower, it was actually centered in that location. She does not like the appearance of the proposed sign.

Mr. Alexander stated that staff's recommendation is correct, because the eye follows the lines of the window. Another option that would provide more visibility would be to make the sign slightly narrower and shift it to the right so that it falls beneath the two types of trim and have one gooseneck light. It is unfortunate that the wood repair work has already been done. If that had been delayed, moving the gooseneck lights could have been addressed with the repairs.

Mr. Cotter requested clarification of the second location he is suggesting.

Mr. Alexander stated that he has no objection to staff's recommendation. A second suggestion, however, is to move it into the natural space to the right, which would also be more complementary to the architectural elements of the structure.

Mr. Cotter concurred with the second suggestion. The first location under the eaves is more challenging with the gooseneck lighting.

Mr. Holtsberry inquired if the sign would remain the same height on the building as proposed, but would be shifted to the right and between the two pieces of trim.

Mr. Alexander responded that the same height would be fine, although it would be preferable if the sign were shifted up slightly so that it did not touch the white trim at any point; the red siding would show evenly on all four sides of the sign.

Mr. Kownacki stated that either of the two suggestions would be preferable, particularly on a façade that faces the main street in Historic Dublin.

Mr. Holtsberry stated that they originally proposed a post and panel sign that would have been in line with the fence, but staff indicated it was too close to the driveway. The proposal was revised to what is shown here.

Ms. Kramb stated that she has no objection to either suggestion. If the sign is shifted to the left, as staff suggested, the one gooseneck light centered on the windows is sufficient to illuminate the sign. The second light could be removed to avoid the expense of repositioning it. Shifting the sign to the right and shifting both lights would be acceptable, as well. Either way, the sign needs to be centered -- under the windows or in the space to the right.

Ms. Bryan inquired the Board's views on the second sign.

Ms. Kramb responded that she concurred with staff's recommendation that the sign meet Code requirements.

Board members expressed consensus that the sign size should be consistent with Code requirements.

Mr. Holtsberry responded that to reduce the size to 8-square feet, the logo at the top would need to be eliminated.

Mr. Alexander stated that an alternative would be replace the rectangular shape with a shape similar to the Brazenhead sign, which had a curved top. As proposed, much of the sign area consists of blank space. If the overall area were reduced, it would be possible to retain the text size close to what is proposed. However, in his view, it is preferable that signs not be located on chimneys, particularly on a historic structure. Unfortunately, that location was previously approved. Their first proposal for a post and panel sign would have been more appropriate for the nature of this building. That option would provide visibility on this corner. Some exceptions permitting that type of sign have occurred. He believes a similar sign was approved for a Bridge Street business approximately a year ago.

Mr. Kownacki inquired if it was a "New England" type of sign.

Mr. Alexander responded that the sign consisted of a post and an arm from which the sign was extended. That option would provide visibility on this corner with something more appropriate than what is essentially a small billboard.

Mr. Ridge stated that the sign to which he is referring was for the Studio on Bridge hair salon. The applicant's first proposal was a lollipop style, which was not consistent with the Historic District Design Guidelines.

Mr. Holtsberry responded that he believes his client would prefer the suggested alternative of changing the shape and eliminating the logo and unnecessary space to reduce the size to eight square feet. He does not believe they would prefer the projecting sign, due to the minimal amount of traffic on that street. It would be more important to provide visibility to southbound traffic on High Street.

Mr. Alexander stated that he would have no objection to that alternative. He concurs with staff's recommendations.

Public Comment

There were no public comments.

The applicant stated that he would speak to his client to confirm which alternative they would prefer for the sign on the west façade – either centering it under the windows or shifting it to the right. They will be able to reduce the size of the sign on the north façade to eight square feet. He is hopeful those revisions could be submitted to and approved by staff within the next few days.

Mr. Alexander stated that the language of Condition #2 should be revised to provide the ability for those modifications to the sign on the west facade.

Mr. Holtsberry stated that the applicant has no objection to the revised conditions.

Ms. Kownacki moved, Mr. Cotter seconded to approve the Master Sign Plan with the following five (5) conditions:

- 1) The size of the north facing sign be reduced to the Code-required maximum of 8 square feet.
- 2) The west facing sign be relocated to be centered above and between the windows, or centered to the right of the windows, subject to staff approval.
- 3) The west sign be illuminated using only one gooseneck light fixture, centered over the sign, subject to staff approval.
- 4) The building be repaired in any area impacted due to sign replacement or due to removal of the gooseneck light fixture.
- 5) The applicant provide the total height of the west sign from established grade to the top of the sign at a height no greater than 15 feet, subject to staff approval, prior to submitting for sign permits.

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

(Motion carried 5-0)

COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Rauch stated that in the packet for the cancelled March 18 meeting, updates of the revised ARB Code Amendment and Historic Dublin Design Guidelines were included to provide opportunity for the Board to begin their review. Supplemental items updating the recommended paint colors and alternative materials in the Historic District currently are being finalized for the Board's consideration, as well. The process for compiling these revisions to the ARB Code, Historic District Design Guidelines and Historic District boundary adjustments has been extensive, beginning in 2018, and including several stakeholder and public input opportunities, as well as previous ARB and

PZC reviews. Given the present COVID-19 situation, the continuing review process will be adjusted to best facilitate remote review and include the public. In the interim, ARB is requested to review the last update to ensure their desired changes are included.

Ms. Martin noted that the revised documents also are available at the City website for public review and comments.

Ms. Bryan noted that until these revisions are completed and approved by City Council, the Board's reviews and approvals will be based upon the current Bridge Street District guidelines, which are much more liberal than what is desired in the Historic District. It is important that the three new ARB members review and provide their input as soon as possible in order that the update can continue toward final approval. From her perspective, this is a "living document," and should be updated frequently. Perhaps it could be approved with the condition that it be updated as needed. At this time, there are a number of properties in Historic Dublin for sale. Prospective buyers looking at the current Code and Guidelines will see opportunity for a higher density and a more liberal Building Code than the update will permit, so there is an urgency to complete this update.

Mr. Cotter stated that, as a new member, initially, he has read through the entire document. One item, in particular, caught his eye – hotels, about which there was extensive discussion.

Ms. Bryan stated that use was discussed and revised to permit a much smaller facility -- a boutique hotel. When there is opportunity, it will be helpful for the ARB members to participate in a walking tour of the Historic District.

Ms. Rauch stated that, if desired, a special ARB meeting could be scheduled for the purpose of completing the review. It would also provide the new members helpful history on the discussions to date.

Ms. Bryan stated that it would be beneficial to consider adding the opportunity for periodic updates to incorporate any new data. One question is how much of the already existing national preservation data should be included in the City's Code.

Ms. Krumb stated that, while the Historic Dublin Design Guidelines can be considered a living document and, as such, be updated accordingly, the Code cannot. It is essential to know what we want when we approve the Code, as a Code is not something that is changed often.

Ms. Bryan stated that it is the Code revision that concerns her. The revision needs to be completed, as applicants are citing the current Code.

Ms. Rauch responded that staff believes the Code revision is ready for the Board's final review and approval. However, the topic would need to be advertised before discussion.

Ms. Bryan stated that there is no reference to the Historic District in the Community Plan. Although that document is also a little outdated, it is curious that there is no mention of the District.

Ms. Rauch stated that currently, that area is included in the Bridge Park Area Plan, but it will need to be identified as a separate area in the Community Plan. Part of the charge of the Historic Dublin Vision Task Force is to revisit, reevaluate and make recommendations for revitalization of the Historic District as a separate area. Given the collaborative nature of the Task Force meetings, that effort is currently on hold. It is not possible to conduct visioning and charettes in a remote meeting format. To date, four Task Force meetings have occurred, including the Heritage Ohio visit and subsequent public input meeting. Because the timeframe originally established reflected Council's intent to expedite the process, it should proceed quickly once regular meetings can resume.

Ms. Bryan requested the Board members to review the Code revision, in particular, and note any

changes they may consider important to include. If there is opportunity to add that discussion to the next meeting agenda, she would recommend it be scheduled.

Mr. Alexander stated that there are several pending projects awaiting review. Originally, three projects were scheduled for tonight's agenda. Were some cases delayed to the next meeting?

Ms. Martin stated that the applicants decided not to move forward on two of the three projects in their originally proposed formats. The desire was to revise and submit the 123 S. High Street projects in a different format. In view of the projects currently in queue, a heavier May agenda is anticipated, including two commercial projects.

Ms. Bryan congratulated Ms. Rauch on her selection as the new Planning Director.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:25 p.m.

Kathleen Bryan

Chair, Architectural Review Board

Judith K. Beal

Deputy Clerk of Council