



MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, July 22, 2020

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Bryan, Chair, called the July 22, 2020 meeting of the Architectural Review Board to order at 6:30 p.m. and provided the following opening comments: "Welcome to a virtual meeting of the City of Dublin Architectural Review Board. 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 present time, we are holding our meetings online and live streaming those meetings on YouTube. You can access the live-stream on the City's website. The meeting procedure for each case this evening will begin with staff presentation followed by an opportunity for the applicant to make a presentation. The Board will then have the opportunity to ask clarifying questions prior to hearing public comment. Finally, the Board will deliberate on each case based on the information introduced. 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, please use a valid name and address when submitting your comments, and please refrain from making any inappropriate comments."

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Ms. Bryan led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

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

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Kramb moved, Mr. Cotter seconded to accept the documents into the record.

Vote on the motion: Mr. Kownacki, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Bryan, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes.
[Motion carried 5-0]

Mr. Kownacki moved, Ms. Kramb seconded approval of the June 24, 2020 meeting minutes.

Vote on the motion: Mr. Cotter, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Bryan, yes; Mr. Kownacki, yes; Mr. Alexander, 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 staff and applicants who planned to address the Board on any of the cases during the meeting.

CASES:

1. JK Orthodontist - Sign at 5 W. Bridge Street, 20-108MSP, Master Sign Plan

Ms. Bryan stated that this is an application for the installation of a 6-square-foot projecting sign and retention of two existing window signs and one directory sign for a tenant space at 5 W. Bridge Street, southwest of the intersection of Bridge Street and High Street, and zoned Bridge Street District Historic Core.

Case Presentation

Mr. Hounshell stated that this is a request for review and approval of a Master Sign Plan that includes one new projecting sign, two existing window signs, and one existing directory sign for an existing building located within Historic Dublin. 5 W. Bridge Street is located within the Old Dublin Town Center I development located at the southwest corner of the intersection of S. High Street and W. Bridge Street. Prior to the establishment of the Bridge Street District (BSD) Code, Old Dublin Town Center I was approved as a Planned District with a sign package that included the existing projecting sign, which is located along W. Bridge Street; two window signs, which are located on W. Bridge Street and S. High Street; and one directory sign at the rear of the building located next to the entrance for the orthodontist office. Since the BSD Code was adopted in 2012, the BSD sign code supersedes the original sign package for this building. Similar to the Jeni's Splendid Ice Cream application approved in 2013, new sign applications for building tenants must meet the requirements of the BSD Sign Code. Because they are a second-story tenant in a multi-tenant building, they are not permitted to have any wall-mounted signs along W. Bridge Street or S. High Street. Because their entrance is located to the rear of the building, any wall-mounted signage is required to be located adjacent to the entrance of the building. Therefore, a Master Sign Plan (MSP) was the only available option for this tenant to retain the existing location of the directory sign.

Proposal

The applicant is proposing a new projecting sign in the same location as the existing projecting sign located on the W. Bridge Street frontage to the north. The existing sign is located above the Jeni's Splendid Ice Cream projecting sign. The applicant is also including the two existing window signs and existing directory sign with this application, but will not be modifying them. The applicant is proposing an approximately 6-square-foot projecting sign to replace an existing projecting sign for the tenant. The sign is 29.5 inches in width and 29.5 inches in height. The height of the projecting sign is 18 feet from grade to the top of the sign and located within the second-story. The sign material is proposed to be 1.5-inch thick High Density Urethane (HDU) with a Burgundy background, Gold Leaf copy and inner border, and a White border and White and Gold Leaf image in the center of the sign. Planning has conditioned that the applicant revise the sign plan to provide .5-inch relief for the border and copy of the sign via routing to add dimensionality to the proposed sign. The applicant is proposing to hang the sign from the existing black bracket. Staff has reviewed the application against all the applicable criteria and recommends approval with one condition.

Applicant Presentation

Dr. James Karpac, JK Orthodontics, 5 W. Bridge St., Dublin, OH, stated that when he signed the original lease with Pat Grabill in 2000, signage containing primarily his name was appropriate. Today, the brand is more important than the name. Looking forward to the future sale of his business, he has been advised to update his signage. He is willing to conform to the City's color requirements, but has noticed that the Jeni's sign is an orange color. He would like to add some color to his sign, as well. He has been told that he should remove or lower his sign by 10 feet, because it is too close to the Jeni's sign. However, his sign has been in this same location since the day his business opened. The current sign can be seen from both sides of the intersection. If he is required to lower the existing sign 10 feet, it will be visible only on one side of the intersection. In that case, it would be necessary for him request two signs, one on each side; he prefers not

to do that. His lease expires in January. It is essential for him to have the necessary signage for his business, or he will be unable to sell it.

Public Comment

No public comments were received.

Board Questions for the Applicant

Mr. Kownacki inquired if Dr.. Karpak had any concerns with the recommended condition.

Dr.. Karpak requested clarification of the .5-inch routing requirement.

Mr. Hounshell responded that the requirement is consistent for all sign applications. Essentially, the requirement is that a .5 routing be added to the text to provide dimensionality.

Danelle McGinty, FastSigns, 654 Brooksedge Blvd., Westerville, OH, requested clarification of the requirement related to the letters, teeth and groove.

Mr. Hounshell responded that the relief would be added to the letters and the border, excluding the teeth. However, staff would work with them on those details.

Board Discussion

The members had no issues with the request.

Ms. Kramb stated that this is not a new application. He already has a sign in the requested location; he is requesting permission only to change the look of it. It would not be fair to tell him he can no longer hang his sign in exactly the same location.

Mr. Alexander moved, Mr. Kownacki seconded to approve the Master Sign Plan with the following condition:

- 1) That the applicant revise the Master Sign Plan to provide 0.5-inch relief for the border and copy of the sign via routing to add dimensionality to the proposed sign, subject to staff approval.

Vote on the motion: Mr. Cotter, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Bryan, yes; Mr. Kownacki, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes.
[Motion carried 5-0]

2. Domino's Pizza – Sign at 8 E. Bridge Street, 20-112MPR, Minor Project Review

Ms. Bryan stated that this is a request to install two new 5.5-square-foot projecting signs and one 4-square-foot replacement ground sign for an existing restaurant located on a 0.13-acre site on the northeast corner of the intersection of North High Street and West Bridge Street and zoned Bridge Street District Historic Core.

Case Presentation

Ms. Martin stated that this a request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review for two new projecting signs and a replacement ground sign at a site located at the northeast corner of the intersection of North High Street and West Bridge Street in Historic Dublin. The site is presently developed with a single-story, single-tenant building with frontages on both High Street and Bridge Street. The applicant is making some maintenance modifications, and as part of that update, they are requesting new signs. [Photos of the single existing signage shown.] Records do not indicate when the sign was installed, so the assumption is that it has been in place for a lengthy period of time.

Proposal

The applicant is proposing three new signs for the site. The applicant is proposing two new projecting signs for the building; one will be located on the south façade, facing West Bridge Street, while the other will be located on the west façade, facing North High Street. The signs, which are the same, are 5.5 square feet and constructed of a routed HDU material with 0.5-inch raised border and copy. The signs consist of three colors to match the ground sign, and are affixed to the building using a 43-inch, black, classic sign bracket. The signs are illuminated using down lighting, which is attached to the bracket. The west-facing sign is located so as to provide a minimum of 8 feet of clearance between the bottom of the sign and the sidewalk, while the south-facing sign provides 9 feet of clearance. A proposed ground sign is to replace an existing sign of a similar design. The new sign is located at the southwest corner of the site, immediately behind the existing stone wall where the current sign is located. The sign face is a dimensionally routed, 4 square feet and is supported by a six-foot tall treated wood post with an aluminum yardarm to hold the sign. All signs will consist of three colors: blue, white and red, which align with the company brand standards. Each sign meets all applicable Code requirements. Staff has reviewed the application against the applicable criteria and recommends approval with no conditions.

Applicant Presentation

Michael Cox, Danite Sign Company, 1640 Harmon Avenue, Columbus Ohio stated that staff's report was complete. He has nothing further to add.

Public Comment

No public comments were received.

Board Questions for the Applicant

Ms. Krumb inquired if Domino's owns this building, or would they be leasing both sections for their use. Will there be a second tenant in the space where a baseball card shop once was located?

Mr. Cox responded that Domino's is renovating the entire space and will be using both spaces. He believes the intent is to have a small dining area in the space where the second tenant once was located.

Ms. Krumb requested confirmation that Domino's would be occupying the entire building.

Mr. Cox responded affirmatively.

Ms. Krumb noted that her concern was if a future tenant would be requesting a sign be changed to accommodate their business.

Ms. Martin confirmed that there would be only one tenant for the building.

Mr. Kownacki moved, Mr. Alexander seconded approval of the Minor Project Review with no conditions.

Vote on the motion: Ms. Krumb, yes; Ms. Bryan, yes; Mr. Kownacki, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; [Motion carried 5-0]

3. 143 S. High Street, 20-068INF, Informal Review

Ms. Bryan stated that this is a second request for an Informal Review and non-binding feedback for revisions to a proposal for the construction of a one and a half story, ±4,000-square-foot residence with a three-car attached garage located on a 0.25-acre site on the southwest corner of the intersection of S. High Street and John Wright Lane, zoned Bridge Street District Historic Residential.

Case Presentation

Ms. Martin stated that this is a request for a second Informal Review. The Board previously provided input on an Informal Review on June 3, 2020. The applicant is seeking feedback on the revisions and refinements

that have been made to the site layout and architectural details based on input from that previous meeting. The site is currently developed with a single-story residence and detached garage. The surrounding site context is primarily residential with the Dublin Chamber of Commerce located immediately to the north. The existing structure was built in 1890. In June, the Board provided non-binding feedback, expressing support for demolition of existing structure; appreciation of the simple vernacular architectural character; consideration for encroachments into required setbacks; concern with total lot coverage and building footprint; and encouraged reducing the mass and scale of the home along John Wright Lane. The applicant has made revisions accordingly. As this proposal is at the formative stage, staff has requested review of the project by the City's Historic Preservation Consultant, Christine Trebellas with Preservation Designs.

Revisions to the Plan

The site layout remains largely the same with the front door along S. High Street and vehicular access along John Wright Lane. However, the access point on John Wright Lane, on the north end of the lot, has been shifted to the east approximately 20 feet, per the request of the City Engineer, to provide greater separation between the intersection of Mill Lane and John Wright Lane. Additionally, the applicant has modified the proposed setbacks along the north and south sides of the property. The north setback has been increased from four feet to five feet, and the encroachment of the at-grade patio in the south setback has been eliminated. The applicant has also reduced the total lot coverage from 62% to approximately 56%. The lot coverage has been distributed across pervious and impervious surfaces. The impervious surfaces are approximately 48% of the site, and the pervious surfaces are approximately 8%. The applicant has also selected the proposed building materials, on which they are seeking input. The primary building material is Olen Valley Split Veneer Stone in a limestone finish. Additionally, a white LP SmartSide Shake Shingle is proposed, and an LP SmartSide Board and Batten in Medium Gray is proposed. Other materials proposed are a standing seam metal roof in a Slate Gray or Weathered Zinc color and Wood Clad Windows in a Charcoal or Espresso color. The Board has previously provided feedback regarding the combination of materials and regarding primarily white buildings with dark brown or black windows. [Showed images of the building facades initially proposed in June versus the revised facades with this second proposal.] On the S. High Street façade, the gabled L portion will be clad in the Limestone Veneer with a brick stoop. The north elevation facing John Wright Lane will be clad in a variety of materials. The Historic Preservation Consultant has recommended simplifying the complex nature of the materials. This elevation incorporates five different materials, including Limestone Veneer, horizontal siding, shake siding, vertical board and batten, and a brick foundation. The consultant noted that it is more historically appropriate for homes that are primarily stone to have a stone foundation and chimneys, although also noted that a brick foundation may be appropriate for the attached garage, as garages are typically later additions to the homes. It is important to note that on the south elevation, the applicant has reduced the mass and scale by reducing the footprint of the home by 171 square feet and by reducing the footprint of the garage and shifting it to the south. Additionally, the mass connecting the central side gable to the garage has been revised to a connector with a low-pitched roof below the eaves line. On the west elevation, containing the driveway and garage, the pedestrian entrance to the garage has been eliminated. The consultant noted that if the upper occupied space within the garage was reduced or eliminated, that would further reduce the garage mass. The material selections of the south elevation have been refined, as well as the reduced scale of the hyphen connector between the primary residence and the garage. The consultant pointed out that in the inner section of the brick chimney, the gable L stone masonry and the lean-to addition, there was opportunity for simplification the intersection of those three materials.

The staff has proposed the following questions for the Board's review:

- 1) Does the Board support the proposed site layout and lot coverage realizing the need for a Waiver to lot coverage?
- 2) Does the Board support the proposed mass and scale of the revised design in relation to the surrounding development pattern?

- 3) Does the Board support the conceptual architectural details including materials and color palette?
- 4) Other considerations by the Board.

Board Questions for Staff

Mr. Cotter requested clarification of the role of the Historic Preservation Consultant.

Ms. Martin responded that Ms. Trebellas is a planner, an architect and has historic preservation experience. Staff relies upon her expertise and recommendations regarding architectural forms and materials.

Mr. Alexander stated in the past, the Board has approved the use of Hardie Siding, which is a cement-based product that has been approved as an alternative building material. The LP Smart Siding is a resin-based product. Has the Board previously approved the use of that as an alternative material?

Ms. Martin responded that she is not aware that it has been previously approved for another project.

Applicant Presentation

Lance Schneier, 5455 Muirfield Ct., Dublin, Ohio stated they have spent the past seven weeks since the June meeting incorporating the Engineering staff's and the Board's feedback into a revised plan. Mr. Taylor, his architect will discuss the general concepts.

Rich Taylor, architect, 48 S. High Street, Dublin, OH, stated the previous conceptual drawing did not specify any exterior materials, pending the Board's input. They have now made some preliminary decisions on the materials and noted those on the elevation drawings. They are proposing three primary wall materials, including the full thickness limestone, an LP shake and an LP board and batten siding. In regard to Mr. Alexander's question about the LP product, LP is really a wood-based product held together with resin. What he prefers about it is that the LP product acts like wood; it can be cut and shaped and is not a toxic material, as is the Hardie Plank. In addition, the LP product has some flexibility during installation that the Hardie product does not have. Mr. Taylor described the materials, including colors, that are proposed. A number of changes have been made to the design and position of the home on the property, reducing the footprint by 171 square feet. Significant areas of the development have been changed from impervious materials to pervious materials. The total lot coverage now is 48.1%, which is under the 50% Code limitation for single-family homes. Specifically, the walks at the front and side of the home will now be pea gravel put in place by a geo grid. The driveway apron and approach will remain concrete, as will the center of the parking pad. However, the parking pad will have an approximately 18-inch-wide border of permeable pavers set on a drain gravel base. The outdoor living area on the southern side has been moved completely out of the setback, and they are planning to use a permeable paver product for that area, probably the same or similar to what will be used around the driveway, for consistency. At this point in the design process, they are looking at a permeable paver system that is able to handle the driveway traffic. It also incorporates an underground drainage system, which will allow them to collect and direct stormwater to prevent excessive runoff. Reducing the overall footprint reduced the width slightly, and they are proposing to use that reduction to move the house further south and away from John Wright Lane. Part of that reduction has been achieved by reducing the length of the garage by approximately 4 feet. They have also changed the design of the mudroom area between the main body of the house and the garage to provide visual separation. This was accomplished by sliding the mudroom to the south, behind the front wall of the garage. The pitched roof has also been removed from the mudroom area and been replaced with a nearly flat metal roof that is below the eave line of both the house and garage. On the north and south elevations, the color and details of the garage have been changed to differentiate it even more from the main house. These changes disengage the massing of the garage from the main house, enhancing the separation between the two and increases the subordination of the garage to the main house, as requested by the ARB. In regard to the consultant's comment about the space over the garage, they want to keep that space as storage area. This house is located on rock, and it will likely be impossible to excavate that to create basement space under the house.

If they are able to achieve any basement space, it will be small and able to accommodate only the mechanicals. Finally, they have met with the City Engineer and have addressed the concerns about the location of the driveway relative to the other nearby access points. They are looking forward to proceeding to formal submission of a plan.

Board Questions

Ms. Bryan requested clarification of the different percentages given for pervious and impervious surfaces.

Ms. Martin responded that the Code limits the lot coverage in the Historic Residential District to a total of 50%, which includes impervious and hard surfaces. Any area that is developed with a structure or surface is counted in the total lot coverage.

Ms. Bryan stated that, based on that definition, this project would be over 50%.

Ms. Martin responded affirmatively.

Mr. Schneier stated that the applicable section is Section 153.063 (B)(2)(d), which states that for this district, the combined square footage of all principal and accessory structures and impervious surfaces shall not exceed 50%. That upper limit does not count pervious surfaces; therefore, there is opportunity for pervious surfaces above that 50%. Per his research, that is consistent with how new home construction has been treated.

Ms. Martin responded that the Code defines lot coverage as the part or percentage of the lot occupied with impervious or semi-pervious surfaces. It defines semi-pervious surfaces as a material that allows for the absorption of water into the ground or plant material, such as pervious pavers, permeable asphalt and concrete or gravel. A semi-pervious surface would be a surface that is completely pervious but has the qualities of a hard surface.

Mr. Schneier stated that is the approach they are taking, which is that the hard surfaces, as defined in the Code, are slightly below 50%. They also have impervious surfaces, which are permeable surfaces. When they file their formal application, they will ensure that they do fit the definition of semi-permeable. However, their proposal is below the 50% lot coverage requirement for buildings, appurtenances, ancillary buildings and hard surfaces, as those are defined.

Mr. Cotter inquired what section of the Code provides these definitions.

Ms. Martin responded that it is in the General Definitions section of the Code.

Ms. Bryan requested clarification. Staff has indicated that the applicant would need a waiver because they exceed the required lot coverage. The applicant has indicated that they are under the 50% limit.

Mr. Taylor stated that the issue appears to be the definition of pervious versus impervious. They have indicated that they have a lot percentage of impervious and hard surfaces of 48%; they are calculating everything that water drains through as pervious. However, staff is saying that a hard surface that allows water to drain through is considered semi-permeable and, therefore, does not count as pervious. There is a difference in how the permeable paver system that they are proposing is being defined.

Ms. Bryan stated that, as she understands it, because this is a permeable paver system that contains a drainage component, the applicant is indicating that it should not be considered in the 50%, although a different type of paver would be considered in the 50% calculation.

Ms. Krumb stated there is an 18-inch gravel apron along the driveway, through which water will drain. She is fine with not counting that as lot coverage. If staff is counting that gravel as the 2% that exceeds the limit, she is in favor of granting the waiver. It is important that the actual hard surfaces, such as asphalt, cement and the building are under 50%. In a case, for instance, where the landscaping includes pea gravel, it is not counted as a hard surface. If the gravel in this case is being calculated as hard surface, she would be supportive of granting a waiver for that.

Mr. Alexander stated that the issue he would have with that is, if this is the same standard that staff has used for other projects, he is not in favor of changing the standard for this applicant. In some communities,

when permeable pavement is used, only a minimal credit is given against lot coverage. There is still runoff with it, although there is a difference in the rate of runoff. In addition, it is a material that requires significant maintenance over the years to be successful; it clogs. Therefore, most communities do not count it as completely permeable; they do give some credit for it. The Code states that a need for a waiver is caused by unique site conditions or circumstances outside the control of the owner, including easements and right-of-way. There is no unique circumstance on this site that would justify granting a waiver.

Public Comment

The following public comment was received:

Karen Adolph, 119 S. High St., Dublin, OH (father owns):

"Hi, I am emailing to express concern for the proposed home on High Street. My dad owns the brick house at 119 S. High that has recently been rented for a salon, and we have concerns about the space in the back where we are assuming will be the 3-car garage. Is it possible to see the layout of the property with the blueprint of the home? Thank you for your help."

Board Discussion

Ms. Bryan stated that the Board has been asked to provide feedback on the following three questions:

- 1) Does the Board support the proposed site layout and lot coverage realizing the need for a waiver for lot coverage?
- 2) Does the Board support the proposed mass and scale of the revised design in relation to the surrounding development pattern?
- 3) Does the Board support the conceptual architectural details including materials and color palette?
- 4) Other considerations by the Board.

Following discussion, the Board provided the following feedback and recommendations:

- Consensus that the proposed lot coverage remains too high and must be reduced to meet Code. Two suggestions for doing so: (1) Retain attached garage and eliminate upper storage level, or (2) Detach garage, locate to the west on the lot, and retain upper storage level.
- Recommended that the foundation be all stone; that stone, rather than brick, be used for the chimney; and the total number of architectural materials for the elevations be reduced from four to three.
- Requested that Legal staff provide clarity regarding the interpretation of pervious and impervious surfaces.
- Requested that staff provide information regarding the percentage of lot coverages for four comparison homes on side streets (two newer home/additions on Pinneylane; two on Eberly Hill); the Chamber of Commerce to the north; and the residences immediately west of this site.

Mr. Schneier stated that, while this site is in the Historic Residential District, it is a transitional site, as the Chamber across the street is in a different district. They modeled this home after the homes on S. Riverview in regard to lot coverage and impervious/pervious/semi-permeable surface. This home was intentionally designed to fit within the area and meet all the parameters. For that reason, they do not believe a waiver is required. The size of their proposed home is completely consistent with other homes on .25-acre corner lots. In comparison, the other homes are adjacent to residential lots; this one is adjacent to a commercial lot. However, they are flexible and will continue to work on the identified issues.

COMMUNICATIONS

- A Special ARB meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, July 29 at 6:30 p.m. for review of a revised draft of the revised ARB Code Amendment and Historic Dublin Design Guidelines.

- In addition to the Wednesday, August 26 regular meeting, the consensus of the Board was to schedule an additional meeting on Wednesday, August 12, to accommodate the additional caseload.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:02 p.m.

Kathleen Bryan
Chair, Architectural Review Board

Judith K. Beal
Deputy Clerk of Council