



MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, December 16, 2020

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Bryan called the December 16, 2020 virtual meeting of the Architectural Review Board to order at 6:30 p.m., noting that due to the current pandemic, public meetings are being held online and live streamed on YouTube.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Ms. Bryan led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

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

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Kramb moved, Mr. Alexander seconded to accept the documents into the record and approve the November 28, 2020 meeting minutes.

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

CONSENT CASES

Ms. Bryan noted that no cases are eligible for the Consent Agenda. Additionally, Cases 3 and 4 are being deferred to a future meeting.

CASES

1. Begley Residence at 6199 Dublin Road, 20-202ARB-INF, Informal Review

A request for informal review and feedback for an addition and exterior modifications to a single-family residence and new detached garage on a 1.32-acre site located west of Dublin Road, ±350 feet south of the intersection with Waterford Drive.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Ridge stated that this is a request for an informal review and non-binding feedback on proposed additions and exterior modifications to an existing single-family home and a new detached garage located at 6199 Dublin Road. The 1.32-acre site is located on the west side of Dublin Road just south of Waterford Drive. The site is located at the southern tip of the Historic District and is zoned R-2, which is Limited Suburban Residential. That zoning has different development standards and regulations than the Historic Residential or Historic South Districts. [Slide images of surrounding development shown for context.] Immediately east of the site is a large, vacant area of land with an existing agricultural structure. The proposed site has significant grade change from east to west and contains a significant number of mature trees, as well as a stream that runs through the rear of the property.

Proposal

The applicant is proposing an addition and exterior modifications to the existing home and a new detached garage to the south of the home. On the northern portion of the home will be an expansion of the living space. The home will maintain its central location on the site. Driveway modifications are proposed. The proposed site layout retains vehicular access to the south of the primary structure.

Modifications of the elevations will be as follows. On the south side will be an expanded porch, standing seam overhang and replacement of the single-door entry with a double-door entry. The two-story mass in the center will remain largely unchanged, other than having new windows. The proposed single-story addition will be on the north side of the home and will be connected to the two-story mass via a hyphen connection. That hyphen will be sheathed in a standing seam metal roofing, as will be the porch. The double door entry on the addition will lead to an at-grade patio. Barn door shutters on the entry are proposed. The addition to the north side of the home will include a large amount of fenestration and a new balcony. The addition will be clad in the same materials as the existing home. On the west elevation, the rear of the home, the balcony space will be expanded and covered. The porch will be expanded on the east elevation, which faces Dublin Road.

The detached garage will be located forward of the primary structure. Per Code, accessory structures are required to be sited to the side or rear of the structure. Therefore, approval of a variance by the Board of Zoning Appeals will be necessary. The single-story, side-gable, three-car garage will be integrated into the hillside. It will be approximately 16 feet in height and have vertical siding, three 8-panel doors, and a standing seam metal roof. The driveway accesses the existing attached garage and the proposed detached, three-car garage immediately south of the home. The circular shape and island of the existing driveway is proposed to be removed, and the driveway will be realigned and straightened. The new driveway will be widened to approximately 29 feet when approaching the detached garage, allowing for ample maneuverability for vehicles.

Review questions have been provided for the Board's discussion, including:

- 1) Does the Board support the proposed site layout, including the detached garage?
- 2) Does the Board support the proposed mass and scale of the additions?
- 3) Does the Board support the conceptual architectural character and details of the home?

Applicant Presentation

John Begley, 6199 Dublin Road, Dublin, stated that they have spent much time going over the Code and Guidelines and believe they have met the requirements, other than the siting of the garage. However, if they were to move the garage back at all, it would cover the historic rock staircase that extends from the driveway to the first floor of the house. It is a significant historical element. If they were to locate the garage anywhere else, they would be obstructing views for the property south of theirs. As proposed, the proposed garage would not be visible from the street. It could be seen only from their driveway. In

regard to the addition to the home on the north side, the proposed structure also is proposed slightly forward of the existing structure so as not to obstruct the view from the window of the original property.

Board Questions

Mr. Alexander stated that it appears that the windows in the original structure that are divided into three sections will be replaced by windows divided into four sections. Will the applicant also be replacing the windows in the two-story bay?

Lori Begley, 6199 Dublin Road, Dublin responded that they would not. They would retain what exists.

Mr. Cotter inquired if this is categorized as a contributing or non-contributing property.

Mr. Ridge responded that in 2017, the Historic and Cultural Assessment determined that the structure was contributing to the City of Dublin's local Historic Dublin due to its age, character and style.

Mr. Cotter inquired if there is an element that should be preserved, or is the determination based only on the age, style and massing.

Ms. Martin responded that as part of the assessment, the property was evaluated against and met the integrity markers, and the condition is listed as "good." In addition, this is an architectural style not seen elsewhere in Historic Dublin, primarily because of the larger parcel of land and newer home.

Mr. Cotter responded that he was interested in ensuring that whatever feature determined that the home be designated "contributing" remained in place.

Mr. Begley stated that when the historical significance of their property was assessed several years ago, the structure itself was determined non-contributing, but the setting -- in particular, the rock walls and rock staircase, were determined to be historically significant. Their proposal preserves those features.

Public Comment

No public comments were received on this application.

Board Discussion

Discussion Question #1: Does the Board support the proposed site layout including the detached garage?

Board members had no objection to the detached garage and the proposed site plan.

Ms. Krumb stated that the roof of the garage may be visible from the street, so when the application returns it would be helpful if a view from the east that includes the garage be provided. If only the roof can be seen, it may be sufficient to provide landscape screening.

Ms. Begley noted that she provided a photograph that depicts that view.

[Staff displayed the photograph, which showed pine trees screening the street view of the garage site.]

Ms. Krumb stated that the trees were sufficient.

Question #2: Does the Board support the proposed mass and scale of the additions?

Board members had no objection to the proposed mass and scale.

Question #3: Does the Board support the conceptual architectural character and details of the home?

Mr. Cotter stated that the proposed addition on the north side with barn doors and the manner in which it "steps down" to the front yard is inconsistent with the existing character of the structure.

Mr. Alexander agreed that the barn doors are not consistent with the style of the house. The other details proposed are consistent with the existing aesthetics of the house. The crossbuck pattern on the doors is not seen elsewhere in the District. He would recommend the sliding patio doors be eliminated, as they also create an issue with scale. The appearance is that of four doors on that elevation. That is a large mass and detracts from the large window on the original structure. One pair of doors would be appropriate. However, the applicant has done a great job differentiating the front door from this door. He has no issue with the patio in the proposed location.

Ms. Krumb agreed stated that the sliding barn doors on the addition were the only issue she identified; she liked everything else proposed. When the application returns, it would be helpful to have details on the replacement windows. It can be difficult to find new windows that match the old.

Mr. Kownacki and Ms. Bryan agreed that the barn doors and "step down" to the yard are jarring. Otherwise, they liked what was proposed.

Ms. Begley stated that they were under the impression that the addition could be more contemporary, hence the barn doors, which would match the existing and new garage doors. The Board has previously approved barn doors for both additions and barns within the Historic District.

Mr. Alexander responded that the reason the Board objects to that feature is that it does not match the character of the existing structure.

Ms. Krumb stated that it is architecturally incompatible with the rest of the structure. If the doors were eliminated, she would have no objection to the proposal.

Mr. Alexander stated that with the proposed doors, there appear to be four such units across the façade; it is too massive. Eliminating the doors will solve the scale issue and the stylistic incongruity.

Ms. Begley inquired if the barn doors were eliminated, would the sliding doors be satisfactory.

Ms. Krumb responded that the sliding doors would continue to pose a scale issue. The existing double door is fine.

Ms. Begley noted that this addition is their bedroom, and the desire was to have sliding doors without the need for curtains.

Ms. Krumb responded that they would need to identify a solution on the inside of the structure.

Mr. Alexander suggested that the doors be placed on the inside, which would avoid the need for any other window treatments.

Mr. Begley inquired if his understanding of the Code is incorrect. This is an addition. Does the Code support the Board's level of concern about the details for an addition?

Ms. Bryan responded that it does. The Historic District Design Guidelines and the architectural integrity are considered.

Mr. Begley noted that Part D(2) of the pertinent Code section states that "contemporary design for additions to existing properties shall not be discouraged."

Mr. Alexander responded that he would argue that the proposed barn door is not a contemporary door. An architect, two architectural historians and a Board have stated that the doors are not stylistically compatible.

Mr. Begley responded that he disagrees but would take another look at it. He appreciates their opinion on it.

Ms. Bryan cautioned that should he return with an application that proposes the same doors, likely, it would be disapproved.

Mr. and Ms. Begley thanked the Board for their input.

2. Bechert Residence at 156 S. High Street, 20-155INF, Informal Review

A request for a second informal review and feedback, based on feedback obtained at the October 28, 2020 ARB meeting, for a new two-story, single-family residence on a 0.24-acre site zoned Bridge Street District, Historic Residential, located east of S. High Street, ±100 feet south of the intersection with John Wright Lane.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Ridge stated that this is a request for a second informal review for the proposed construction of a new two-story, single-family home located at 156 S. High Street in the Historic District. The 0.24-acre site is located southeast of the intersection of S. High Street and John Wright Lane, south of Pinneyhill Lane. [Photos shown to provide context of the site.] In October 2020, the Board reviewed and provided informal feedback on the proposal to construct a new two-story, single-family residence. Although the Board was generally supportive of a two-story home, the Board expressed concerns regarding the total height of the home and recommended that the applicant refer to nearby homes for comparable heights. The Board also expressed concern with the variety of architectural details on the elevations. The Board recommended that the applicant simplify the elevations where possible, and align window sizes and locations. The Board was generally supportive of the site layout, and appreciated the open rear yard. In 2019, the Board had approved a new single-family residence for the site, but the previous applicant elected not to pursue construction of the home. The Board Order for that proposal has since expired. The applicant has made updates to address the Board comments and is seeking additional feedback prior to finalizing the design including exterior material and finishes. In detail, the applicant has:

- Eliminated the stone wall along the S. High Street frontage;
- Eliminated ganged second story windows on west elevation (S. High Street);
- Removed shutters on west (S. High Street), north, and south elevations;
- Eliminated all roof finials, gable vents, and in select instances, gable end material changes;
- Raised stone water table on hyphen connector (north elevation) to match the garage;
- Raised stairwell window on the north elevation of the main mass of the home;
- Modified rear deck railing with a more traditional design.

Proposal

The primary structure is situated toward the west property line, set back 15 feet from S. High Street per the minimum front yard setback. A large deck is proposed at the rear and a porch on the front of the home. A large open space will be retained in the rear yard. The proposed lot coverage remains the same. A number of modifications have been made in response to the Board's previous input. Final details will be required with a Minor Project Review application. The west façade is typified by its front gable form, overlapping rooflines, and prominent front porch. The roof of the porch is sheathed in a metal standing seam material, while the rest of the roof appears to be sheathed in asphalt shingle. Single two-over-two windows are proposed on the first and second stories. This design eliminates the ganged second story windows, first story transoms, and shutters. The oval bullseye window located in the second story above the arched front entry is retained. The applicant has eliminated the decorative finials on the roof. A decorative pendant light is proposed on the underside of the arched entry. The first story is clad in a mix of stone and cedar shake siding; the second story is clad in a shake shingle material with diagonal pattern shingles in the gable ends. Generally, the first story incorporates a stone water table with shake siding above. However, the material transition on the forward front gable form does not incorporate a consistent water table; instead, the entire first story is stone, which changes to shake siding at the second floor. The north elevation contains two prominent side gable forms. From west to east, the elevation contains: a deep front porch with a diamond-paned glass window; a box bay window on the

gable form closest to S. High Street; an overhang which covers a pedestrian entry just west of the three car garage; a large box bay window and wall of windows on the second side gable form. A large raised deck is provided at the rear of the home. The applicant has worked to simplify the window arrangement on the north elevation. Similar to the west elevation, the transom window and shutters have been eliminated. Additionally, the stairwell window has been raised in line with the other second story windows. The design retains the stone water table along the elevation, with shake siding on the majority of the elevation with the exception of the easternmost side gable, which appears to be clad in a vertical board and batten. The applicant has raised the stone water table on the lower level of the hyphen connector to match the height of stone base created by the garage. The south elevation contains two prominent side gable forms. This elevation also contains a stone water table, which jogs up and down carrying the stone to the rear of the home where the applicant is proposing a two-story chimney clad in stone. The majority of this elevation is clad in shake siding, with the easternmost gable form clad in vertical board and batten to match the north elevation. The applicant has eliminated the application of gable end vents and finials to simplify the appearance of the elevation. The most prominent feature is a copula located atop the eastern side gable form. The applicant has indicated that the cupola is a functional feature that brings light into the home. The east elevation contains a combination side and front gable, which forms the rear portion of the home. The rear of the home is clad in a combination of vertical board and batten and shake siding. The front gable contains a series of three single, two-over-two windows with transom. The stone clad chimney is visible from this elevation, and rises above the roofline of the front gable form. The copula is visible from this elevation and artificially increases the height and massing of the rear elevation. Both box bay windows on the north elevation are visible from the rear yard, protruding out from the home. The roof on the rear portion of the home is sheathed in a metal standing seam material. The following discussion questions are provided to facilitate the Board's review:

- 1) Does the Board support the proposed height of the home?
- 2) Does the Board support the revised architectural details of the home?
- 3) Does the Board support the conceptual exterior materials and material transitions?

Applicant Presentation

Greg Bechert, 156 S. High Street, Dublin, stated that this is probably one of the most narrow lots in Historic Dublin, which has resulted in some challenges. Their goal was to maintain first-floor living, but also be able to have a couple of bedrooms for guests, which is the purpose of the second story. Due to the limited lot width, the additional bedrooms could not be added to the first level. They had measured the height incorrectly before, but believes they have provided the correct height to the midpoint of the eaves. The primary purpose of the cupola is for aesthetics and to provide some natural lighting for the kitchen and dining area, over which it is located.

Tim Walton Carr, T. Walton Carr Architects, 125 S. Knox Street Westerville Ohio 4308, stated that at the previous review, the Board expressed concern regarding the height in terms of how it relates to the neighboring houses. The height of the first gable on the front elevation is 24 feet from finished grade. The eave itself is 18 feet, 8 inches above grade. On the north elevation, the average height between the ridge and the eave is 25 feet, 6 inches. The house directly across the street at 167 S. High has an eave height of 17 feet, 6 inches. [Mr. Carr provided heights of surrounding homes for comparison purposes.]

Board Discussion

- 1) *Does the Board support the proposed height of the home?*

Ms. Bryan stated that her intent would be to consider not just the actual height but also the visual impact of the height from the street. For many of the houses on that street, the walk leads down to the house. This house is sited slightly higher than some of the others.

Ms. Krumb stated that to her, the issue is the visual impact. She looks at the highest point on the roof, typically, the crest of the gable. Actual eave height matters less to her. Because this is a narrow lot, and the home takes up most of the lot, it seems taller. The pitch of the roof on the structure is steep. It still appears too tall to her. She likes the rendering in the consultant report, which is 1.5 stories. She would have no object to that. This house is too vertical; with the pitch of the two front gables and of the roof, the structure appears too high.

Mr. Alexander stated his reservations are similar to those expressed by Ms. Krumb. What makes this house seem taller than everything in the surroundings is the large gables at the front. The vertical wall does not stop at the eave line. He believes the pitch of the roof could be reduced, and the second story, which is projecting forward, could be pushed back and built on the one-story volume. The mass could be reduced at the street front and still have second-story bedrooms that are sited further to the rear. At the previous review, he noted two issues – the height, and whether it was a vernacular structure. For him, the most challenging issue is the height, and he could not support what is currently proposed.

Mr. Cotter stated that the structure presents as a large mass sitting at the street, which draws the eye all the way to the top. The height of the proposed structure appears to overshadow the house next to it. Although the pitch of the roof has been reduced slightly, it is still quite steep.

Mr. Kownacki stated that he agrees with the concerns that have been expressed regarding the height. However, he appreciates that the design has been simplified, such as removal of the finials; the revised design is much "cleaner."

Ms. Bryan stated that this will look like "the house on the hill." It will look out of place with the surrounding homes. She understands the challenges with the lot configuration; however, some suggestions have been made that would reduce the impression of height.

2) Does the Board support the revised architectural details of the home?

Ms. Krumb stated that the design has been simplified, but it could be simplified more, particularly the front entryway and porch. She does not like the cupola for aesthetic reasons, as well as the fact it increases the height. She would recommend they find a way to add a window or a skylight, but not the cupola.

Mr. Alexander stated that the architecture has been improved. However, the oval window in the front elevation is out of place in the District. He understands the desire to add an accent there, but a simpler element should be identified. The line of the foundation needs to be consistent. The cupola seems an attempt to be reminiscent of a "former schoolhouse." Perhaps a pair of shed dormers facing east could provide light from above. Many shed dormers have been approved in the District.

Mr. Cotter stated that he likes the simplified design, such as the changes in the front windows and the deck. The cupola does not look appropriate. If a need for natural light is the primary reason, there are other ways to achieve that. However, the design is moving in the right direction.

Mr. Kownacki stated that he agrees with the comments and suggestions made and has nothing new to suggest.

Ms. Bryan stated that she agrees with the concerns about the height and cupola. However, there are many positive architectural features; the design is moving in the right direction.

3) *Does the Board support the conceptual exterior materials and material transitions?*

Ms. Krumb stated that the simplified materials are appropriate, including the change in the deck material. There should be one or two cladding materials per elevation; three are too many.

Mr. Alexander stated that he already commented on the foundation alignment. He has no objection to the materials.

Mr. Cotter, Kownacki and Ms. Bryan stated that they have no objections to the materials.

Ms. Bryan summarized that to proceed to the next step, the primary issues are the height from the street, the oval window and the cupola.

Mr. Carr requested more specific guidance for addressing the height issue.

Ms. Krumb responded that it is not a number. It is the impression of height in comparison to the surrounding roofs. The face of that front wall is essentially against the street.

Mr. Carr stated that the home could be sited five-six feet further back on the lot.

Mr. Alexander stated that he agrees with the consultant that double gable on the front façade makes the mass appear greater. He would suggest replacing the double gable with a narrower, single gable to reduce the impression of height. The front eave height is not an issue; it is the mass of the façade.

Public Comment

Ken Klare, 8474 Invergordon Ct, Dublin, Ohio:

"I am excited by the façade drawing for 156 S. High St. I wanted to offer my congratulations and support. Upon further investigation and considering the comments made, I hope you do not mind my two-cents. The design submitted by T. Walton Carr was refreshing, well developed, simple, and considerate of its context and needs of today. I respect preservation design consultant's comments, but question if they rise to the level for denial. Many seemed textbook requirements and are being enforced without an overall consideration of this project's need for a "today" expression. For example, I have struggled with the concept of the deck. This is a 3,000 square foot house with an attached garage being built and respectful of 2020. It is not going to mimic the culture and economy of the early 1900's. New buildings should not 'harm' but complement existing fabric. This is best accomplished via scale, massing, materials, and elements of the existing vernacular. Apparently, the ARB did not think this important to allow that intrusive library. A good design strikes a balance. Use care to avoid sanitizing design or doing paper architecture. It is the quirks and contrasts that make a project unique, but which also can be additive to the context. Beware of mediocrity or uniformly applying our 'safe' knowns. Ironically, early buildings did exhibit differences and nuances – partly intentional but also responsive to function. Historical properties also include many early additions and alterations – giving life to the neighborhood. Fenestration did not always align, nor were windows the same size- giving priority to function. I think the design does that same thing. Would we have seen that large bay window, deck, or garage doors? No, but that does not make them inappropriate. They are true to function as of 'today'. Historical infills work best when they can meld, blend, and fit within its context – physical and in use.

The consultant raised concern over extra do-dads that might not be historically appropriate. Perhaps true, but how harmful...and at what cost (i.e. lack of details makes a mass appear even larger)? They suggest the diamond shaped glazing did not exist during this historical period, which of course is not true and should not matter if it does or does not occur elsewhere in our district. Those (100 years ago) who

had money or the desire to show-off or “splurge” added such special glazing, oval windows, or ridge finials. It holds true today as well. Perhaps the consultants have gone too far in attempting to implement the ‘book’. Character is enriched with diversity, especially over time. We should welcome progress, especially if it is respectful of the historical aspects sought to protect.

For me, the original design works and would be a welcome asset to the streetscape and District. I acknowledge the disdain for shutters, the paired windows, and small add-ons, but I also respect and recognize the need for variety, expression, and going forward with ‘baby steps’. The revised façade lacks the character of the original proposal. The reality for most folks is that the overall character appeal keeps us fresh and outweighs any loss of historical accuracy. The details, nuances, material mixtures, the front porch, and excellent gable design and proportions more than compensate for using the double windows and shutters. I miss the original gable treatments. Although the revised design may exhibit the simplicity the consultant desires, it is really boring and feels inappropriate because of its mass. It would not be inappropriate to move the north bay to the front and include a gable vent. The plainness of the proposed façade does not mesh with the rather refined entry porch treatment, and the characteristic frontage wall should be a must! I prefer the rear windows of the original design. Raising the front gable’s ridge to align with the cross ridge is definitely a mistake. The changed fenestration on the connector south elevation is more pleasing. Of the three major masses on the south elevation, does one really think the chimney looks better on the eastern piece versus on one of the gable ends? Regarding the change to the larger north bay, the narrower width does work slightly better, but I prefer the original less static ganging of 1-2-1. Consider making the small top windows horizontal by lowering to align with eave and increase the height of the bay’s roof. Most people would concur with the gable adornment originally proposed, including the slot vents. Raising that lower window next to the smaller bay only makes sense if it also works on the interior. If it was a landing window, then I think that should be expressed on the exterior – but not celebrated with like size, type or shutters. Is the consultant being too stringent and lacking flexibility? Again, this is a contemporary house being fit on a small lot in 2020. Stables and out houses have been replaced with garages and indoor plumbing. Modern chimney flu caps replace ceramic pots. Isn’t it a prime function of the ARB to avert harm or detriment to the existing historical nature and character? I don’t believe Mr. Carr’s design would do that, and additionally, there were many positives to his original proposal. The initial design offered an excellent porch and entry and an overall balance of interest and simplicity. Yet, it was detailed enough to make a showy presence (something done now and in the past), as well as an inviting setback and a frontage wall attribute. The troublesome things include: the cupola height; the cupola (replace with chimney); the deck (perhaps separate the garage – either connect with infill deck or incorporate a rooftop deck); the rear chimney; and the High Street access drive (remove it). Consider moving the chimney to the south elevation of the frontage mass in place of the cupola, or provide some flanking windows on the existing plan. Consider a small, simple door hood for the rear door. There is so much glass on the north vs the south. Unless steel is used, the deck beam span seems shallow and excessive without more support. Show more detail. I like the horizontal cable or perhaps a solid wall with stone piers better than wood vertical pickets spaced 4” on-center. Thanks for allowing me to share my thoughts.”

5. Getaway Brewing Company, 20-197ARB-MSP, Master Sign Plan

A request for approval of an amendment to a previously approved Master Sign Plan for one new, building-mounted sign for an existing tenant located within Bridge Park West – Building Z1, within the Bridge Park West development, east of N. High Street, ±300 feet north of the intersection with Rock Cress Parkway, and zoned Bridge Street District, Historic Transition Neighborhood.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Martin stated that this is a request for an amendment to a previously approved Master Sign Plan for one new building-mounted sign for an existing tenant located within Bridge Park West – Building Z1. The site is located east of N. High Street, ±350 feet north of the intersection with Rock Cress Parkway within the BSD-HTN: Bridge Street District – Historic Transition Neighborhood. 104 N. High Street is a tenant space located within Bridge Park West – Building Z1. Getaway Brewing Company was approved for site modifications on June 3, 2020 that included an enclosed patio and an uncovered patio for the tenant space. A Master Sign Plan (MSP) for Bridge Park West was approved in 2018, and signs that meet the Bridge Park West MSP requirements are permitted to submit directly to Building Standards for a permanent sign permit. The Bridge Park West MSP includes provisions for a variety of sign types, and the classification for the proposed sign is a Pedestrian Art Sign. The Master Sign Plan includes unique provisions to measure the area of the Pedestrian Art Sign. The measurement is the accumulative total of all three exterior facing sides. This measurement results in artificially increasing the total sign area. Each side of this sign is eight square feet in size, consistent with the size permitted throughout Bridge Park Dublin. However, due to its three-dimensional nature, those eight square feet are multiplied by three, resulting in a total sign size of 24 square feet, which is one square foot less than the maximum of 25 square feet. The applicant is requesting a deviation from the existing MSP requirements to permit rotation of the Pedestrian Art Sign. The sign is proposed to be a rotating globe design, consistent with the Getaway brand. Constructed of aluminum, the globe will be a rotating element. The cabinet for the sign is fixed. The proposed sign color is teal. The sign meets all of the MSP requirements; however, the Board is asked to consider whether the rotating nature of the sign is appropriate. Staff has reviewed the application against the criteria and recommends approval with no conditions.

Applicant Comments

Collin Castore, Seventh Son Brewing Company, Seventh Son Brewing Co., 1101 N. Fourth St., Columbus, Ohio, stated that they are excited that the project is progressing and anticipate opening this site in March 2021. The sign design is consistent with their mid-century travel theme. The sign is a unique and interesting feature, which they anticipate will get attention.

Board Questions

Ms. Krumb inquired if the diameter of the rotating globe is 4 feet. The written description provided on page two of the sign plan states, the “Getaway” sign inside the globe is 36 inches. The description above the image indicates “48 inches.”

Mr. Castore confirmed that the mass of the globe is four feet. The globe sits within a frame.

Ms. Krumb inquired if, because of the frame, the globe would extend 4.5 feet (54.25 inches) from the wall of the building.

Mr. Castore confirmed that is correct.

Mr. Cotter stated that the Master Sign Plan specifically states that signs should not rotate.

Ms. Martin responded that some of the Master Sign Plan language was copied from the standard City Sign Code, which prohibits rotating and moving signs. The intent of that Code is to prohibit inflatables or tossing features that do not align with the aesthetics the City desires to preserve. When that regulation was written, a Pedestrian Art Sign was not contemplated.

Ms. Krumb recalled that when those sign regulations were created, the intent also was to prohibit neon, text movement signs.

Ms. Bryan inquired if, because the Master Sign Plan specifically calls out moving signs, a variance would be necessary.

Ms. Martin confirmed that is correct, and this review process is that variance consideration.

Ms. Kramb inquired if the globe would spin continuously, or be turned on/off.
Mr. Castore responded that there is a control switch, but the speed is only one rotation per minute.

Mr. Kownacki stated that the material provided indicates that there is a condition recommended; the presentation indicated otherwise. Has the condition already been met?

Ms. Martin responded that the issue has been resolved; the condition no longer is necessary.

Mr. Alexander stated that no construction drawings were provided, and this sign has potential safety issues. Stress is created on the sign frame and the side of the building by the moving element. When the sign permit application is submitted, will fabrication, engineering drawings be provided that show how this element will be anchored?

Mr. Castore responded that there have already been a couple of reviews with the City, and that condition was part of the review.

Ms. Martin stated that their permit approval would include the review and approval of a structural engineer.

Public Comments

No public comments were received on the application.

Board Discussion

Mr. Kownacki stated that due to its location on a new building, there is no historic element of the structure to review. Because the sign is located 10 feet above grade, the size impact is less.

Mr. Cotter responded that he likes the sign and has no objections.

Mr. Alexander stated that, other than the moving condition, the sign meets the Code requirements. He relies on staff's knowledge and recommendation related to the moving condition. He agrees that the size of the building and height of the sign reduces the visual mass of the sign. He has no objection.

Ms. Kramb stated that the sign meets Code. The intent of the moving regulation was to prohibit a different type of sign. In addition, the movement of this feature will be very slow.

Ms. Bryan stated that another benefit is that the sign will be located on an open corner. She has no objection to the sign.

Mr. Kownacki moved, Mr. Cotter seconded approval of the Master Sign Plan with no conditions.

Vote: Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Ms. Bryan, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Kownacki, yes.
[Motion approved 5-0.]

COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Martin reported the following:

- Following the ARB's approval, the final draft of the Architectural Review Board Zoning Code Amendment has now been scheduled for review and recommendation by the Planning and Zoning Commission.
- The final draft of the revised Historic District Design Guidelines is anticipated for consideration at the ARB's January meeting.
- The 2020 ARB Annual Report will be provided for review/approval in first quarter 2021.

Ms. Bryan thanked staff for their very helpful support the past year. She is honored to serve on the Architectural Review Board.

The next regular meeting of the ARB is scheduled for January 27, 2021.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:12 p.m.

Kathleen Bryan
Chair, Architectural Review Board

Judith K. Beal
Assistant Clerk of Council