

Parcel 273-000008 **Address** 30 S High St **OHI** FRA-2245-1

Year Built: Ca.1840	Map No: 116	Photo No: 1857-1858 (7/10/16)
Theme: Commercial	Historic Use: Commercial	Present Use: Commercial
Style: Vernacular	Foundation: Stone	Wall Type: Log
Roof Type: Side gable/standing seam metal	Exterior Wall: Asbestos	Symmetry: Yes
Stories: 1.5	Front Bays: 2	Side Bays: 2
Porch: Open concrete porch on north elevation	Chimney: 1, Exterior, off ridge on south elevation	Windows: 2-over-2 wood sashes

Description: The one-and-one-half-story log building has a rectilinear footprint and a saltbox roof form. The roof is sheathed in asphalt shingles and pierced by a shed wall dormer on the façade. The foundation is stone and the exterior walls are clad in asbestos shingles. The primary entrance is accessed by a concrete porch on the north elevation. Windows on the façade first story are two-over-two wood sashes, flanked by fixed shutters. The dormer includes two pairs of single-light windows.

Setting: The building is located on the east side of S High Street in the old village core of Dublin. The building is one in a series of mid-nineteenth to mid-twentieth century commercial buildings.

Condition: Good

Integrity: Location: Y Design: Y Setting: Y Materials: Y
 Workmanship: Y Feeling: Y Association: Y

Integrity Notes: The building has good integrity.

Historical Significance: The building is within the boundaries of the City of Dublin’s local Historic Dublin district and is a contributing resource to the NRHP-listed Dublin High Street Historic District. The property is recommended to remain contributing to the recommended Dublin High Street Historic District, boundary increase, which is more inclusive of historic resources in the original village.

District: Yes Local Historic Dublin district **Contributing Status:** Contributing
National Register: Recommended Dublin High Street Historic District, boundary increase **Property Name:** Weber Log Building



30 S High St, looking southeast



30 S High St, looking northeast

OHIO HISTORIC INVENTORY

THIS IS A FACSIMILE OF THE FORM PRODUCED BY:

OHIO HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE
567 East Hudson St.
Columbus, Ohio 43211-1030
614/297-2470-fax 614-297-2496



OHIO
HISTORICAL
SOCIETY

SINCE 1885

1.No. FRA 2445-1		2.County FRA		4.Present Name(s)		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CODED <input type="checkbox"/> CODED		FRA - 2445-1
3.Location of Negatives City of Dublin				5.Historic or Other Name(s)				
Roll No. 1		Picture No.(s) 5						
6.Specific Address or Location 30 S. High Street				16. Thematic Association(s) commercial		28. No. of Stories 1 1/2		FRANKLIN
6a. Lot, Section or VMD Number				17. Date(s) or Period c. 1840-50		17b. Alteration Date(s)		
7.City or Village If Rural, Township & Vicinity Dublin				18. Style or Design vernacular		<input type="checkbox"/> High Style <input type="checkbox"/> Elements		
8. Site Plan with North Arrow				18a. Style of Addition or Elements(s)		29. Basement? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		
				19. Architect or Engineer		30. Foundation Material stone		
				19a. Design Sources		31. Wall Construction log		
				20. Contractor or Builder		32. Roof Type & Material gable/st.seam metal		
9. U.T.M. Reference Quadrangle Name NW Columbus 17 319850 4440700 Zone Easting Northing				22. Original Use, if apparent commercial		33. No. of Bays Front 2 Side 3		
10. <input type="checkbox"/> Site <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Building <input type="checkbox"/> Structure <input type="checkbox"/> Object				23. Present Use commercial		34. Exterior Wall Material(s) cem. asbestos shing		
11. On National Register? Yes		12. N.R. Potential?		24. Ownership <input type="checkbox"/> Public <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Private		35. Plan Shape rect.		
13. Part of Estab. Hist. Dist? Yes		14. District Potential?		25. Owner's Name & Address, if known		36. Changes <input type="checkbox"/> Addition <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Altered (Explain In #42) <input type="checkbox"/> Moved		
15. Name of Established District (N.R. or Local) Dublin H.D. (local)				26. Property Acreage		37. Window Types <input type="checkbox"/> 6 over 6 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 over 4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2 over 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Other		
15. Name of Established District (N.R. or Local) Dublin H.D. (local)				27. Other Surveys in Which Included National Register 4/79		38. Building Dimensions		
42. Further Description of Important Interior and Exterior Features (Continue on reverse if necessary) Log construction with cement asbestos shingle siding, the log structure is visible in the attic. A lean-to addition is located at the rear and a wall dormer is located on the west side.						39. Endangered? No By What?		
43. History and Significance (Continue on reverse if necessary) One of the few remaining log buildings in Dublin, this building may date from the first half of the 19th century. An 1856 map indicates a drugstore on this site.						40. Chimney Placement ext. end wall		
44. Description of Environment and Outbuildings (See #52) Located close to the street and flanked by commercial buildings. A brick sidewalk is located in front of the building.						41. Distance from and Frontage on Road 15' 25'		
45. Sources of Information OHI 8/76; Mrs. Katie Webster, 1856 and 1872 maps of Dublin						46. Prepared by Core/Recchie		
						47. Organization BDR&C		
						48. Date Recorded in Field 8/76		
						49. Revised by N. Recchie		
						50. Date Revised 3/03		
						50b. Reviewed by		



PHOTO

30 S. HIGH ST.

Parcel 273-000089 **Address** 32 S High St **OHI** FRA-2587-1

Year Built: Ca.1840	Map No: 116	Photo No: 1853-1856 (7/10/16)
Theme: Domestic	Historic Use: Commercial	Present Use: Vacant
Style: Vernacular	Foundation: Stone	Wall Type: Frame
Roof Type: False front/standing seam metal	Exterior Wall: Shiplap/board and batten	Symmetry: Yes
Stories: 1	Front Bays: 3	Side Bays: 3
Porch: Recessed entry	Chimney: 1, Exterior, on southeast corner	Windows: Fixed wood-frame display windows/2-over-2 wood sashes

Description: The one-story commercial building has a rectilinear footprint and a false-front roof form. The gable roof behind the false-front is sheathed in standing seam metal. The façade is clad in shiplap, and the side elevations are in board and batten. The storefront features a central wood-paneled entry door, flanked by wood-frame display windows. Windows on the side elevations are two-over-two wood sashes, flanked by operable shutters.

Setting: The building is located on the east side of S High Street and in the old village core of Dublin. A privy is behind the building.

Condition: Fair

Integrity: Location:	Y	Design:	Y	Setting:	Y	Materials:	Y
Workmanship:	Y	Feeling:	Y	Association:	Y		

Integrity Notes: The building has good integrity.

Historical Significance: The building is within the boundaries of the NRHP-listed Dublin High Street Historic District and the local Historic Dublin district. It recommended contributing to the City of Dublin’s local Historic Dublin district and to the recommended Dublin High Street Historic District, boundary increase, which is more inclusive of historic resources in the original village.

District: Yes Local Historic Dublin district **Contributing Status:** Contributing

National Register: Recommended Dublin High Street Historic District, boundary increase **Property Name:** N/A



32 S High St, looking northeast



32 S High St, looking northwest

OHIO HISTORIC INVENTORY

THIS IS A FACSIMILE OF THE FORM PRODUCED BY:

OHIO HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE
567 East Hudson St.
Columbus, Ohio 43211-1030
614/297-2470-fax 614-297-2496



OHIO
HISTORICAL
SOCIETY

SINCE 1885

1.No. FRA 2587-1		2.County Franklin		4.Present Name(s) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CODED <input type="checkbox"/> CODED	
3.Location of Negatives City of Dublin		5.Historic or Other Name(s) Dublin Post Office			
Roll No. 1	Picture No.(s) 6				
6.Specific Address or Location 32 S. High Street		16. Thematic Association(s) commercial		28. No. of Stories 1 1/2	
6a. Lot, Section or VMD Number		17. Date(s) or Period c. 1840-50	17b. Alteration Date(s)		29. Basement? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
7.City or Village If Rural, Township & Vicinity Dublin		18. Style or Design vernacular <input type="checkbox"/> High Style <input type="checkbox"/> Elements		30. Foundation Material stone	
8. Site Plan with North Arrow 		18a. Style of Addition or Elements(s)		31. Wall Construction frame	
9. U.T.M. Reference Quadrangle Name NW Columbus 17 319830 4440680 Zone Easting Northing		19. Architect or Engineer		32. Roof Type & Material gable/st.seam metal	
10. <input type="checkbox"/> Site <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Building <input type="checkbox"/> Structure <input type="checkbox"/> Object		19a. Design Sources		33. No. of Bays Front 3 Side 3	
11. On National Register? Yes		20. Contractor or Builder		34. Exterior Wall Material(s) board & batten	
12. N.R. Potential?		21. Building Type or Plan		35. Plan Shape rect.	
13. Part of Estab. Hist. Dist? Yes		22. Original Use, if apparent commercial		36. Changes <input type="checkbox"/> Addition <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Altered (Explain in #42) <input type="checkbox"/> Moved	
14. District Potential?		23. Present Use commercial		37. Window Types <input type="checkbox"/> 6 over 6 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 over 4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2 over 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Other	
15. Name of Established District (N.R. or Local) Dublin H.D. (local)		24. Ownership <input type="checkbox"/> Public <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Private		38. Building Dimensions	
16. Name of Established District (N.R. or Local) Dublin H.D. (local)		25. Owner's Name & Address, if known		39. Endangered? By What? No	
17. Other Surveys in Which Included National Register 4/79		26. Property Acreage		40. Chimney Placement ext. end wall	
42. Further Description of Important Interior and Exterior Features (Continue on reverse if necessary) Gabled building with the gable end facing the street; vertical board & batten siding on sides and shiplap siding on the facade. A false front facade covers the gable end. A modern addition has been built at the rear and the storefront windows have been altered.		27. Other Surveys in Which Included National Register 4/79		41. Distance from and Frontage on Road 15' 25'	
43. History and Significance (Continue on reverse if necessary) This buildig was probably built around the same time as 82 S. High and is an example of mid-late 19th century vernacular commercial architecture. It was used as a Post Office from 1937-49 and a grocery store owned by John Herron from 1954-1972. It was the last (over)		44. Description of Environment and Outbuildings (See #52) Located close to the street and flanked by commercial buildings. A brick sidewalk is located in front of the building.		46. Prepared by Bassett/Recchie	
45. Sources of Information OHI 10/76; Mrs. Katie Webster, 1856 and 1872 maps of Dublin; Shanachie Historical Magazine, Vol.II, Spring 1995		47. Organization BDR&C		48. Date Recorded in Field 10/76	
		49. Revised by N. Recchie		50. Date Revised 3/03	
		50b. Reviewed by			

FRA -
2587-1

FRANKLIN

DUBLIN POST OFFICE

32 S. HIGH



PHOTO



BOARD ORDER

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, September 26, 2018 | 6:30 pm

The Architectural Review Board took the following action at this meeting:

- 3. BSD HC – Tackett Bakery and Office** **30-32 S. High Street**
18-062ARB-MPR **Minor Project Review**
- Proposal:** Building additions, renovations, and associated site improvements to two existing historic structures within the Historic District. The properties are zoned Bridge Park District - Historic Core.
- Location:** East of South High Street, approximately 75 feet north of Spring Hill Lane.
- Request:** Review and approval for a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.066 and 153.170, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.
- Applicant:** Sharon Tackett, Bluebird Consulting Group.
- Planning Contact:** Lori Burchett, AICP, Planner II
- Contact Information:** 614.410.4656, lburchett@dublin.oh.us
- Case Information:** www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/18-062

MOTION #1: Mr. Keeler moved, Mr. Leonhard seconded, to approve the five Waivers requested:

- §153.062 – Building Types (O)(9)(a)(2) – Side Yard Setback
Required: Minimum 3-foot side yard setback for Historic Cottage Commercial building types
Requested: Allow for a setback of less than 3-feet for the addition to 30 S. High Street
- §153.062 – Building Types (O)(9) – Maximum Impervious Lot Coverage
Required: A maximum lot coverage of 75% is permitted
Requested: To allow for 87% lot coverage at 32 S. High Street. Maximum Impervious Lot Coverage
- §153.062 – Building Types (O)(9)(d)(1) – Non-Street Façade Transparency
Required: Minimum of 15% non-street facing transparency
Requested: To provide 0% on the south elevation of 30 S. High Street
- §153.062 – Building Types (O)(9)(d)(5) – Primary Materials
Required: Minimum of 80% of façade be of a primary material
Requested: To allow the north elevation at ±60%, south elevation at ±57% for 30 S. High Street
- §153.065 – Site Development Standards (E)(1)(b)(2) – Wall Height
Required: Maximum height of 6 feet for walls between a principal structure and rear property line
Requested: To allow for a retaining wall no greater than 8 feet in height



**3. BSD HC – Tackett Bakery and Office
18-062ARB-MPR**

**30-32 S. High Street
Minor Project Review**

VOTE: 5 – 0

RESULT: The five Waivers were approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

David Rinaldi	Yes
Shannon Stenberg	Yes
Jeffrey Leonhard	Yes
Gary Alexander	Yes
Andrew Keeler	Yes

MOTION #2: Mr. Leonhard moved, Mr. Rinaldi seconded, to approve the Fee-in-Lieu of Open Space:

- 1) Based on the square footage of the proposed use, a total of 29 square feet of publicly accessible open space is required. Code permits a Fee-in-Lieu of Open Space if the open space requirement is less than the minimum required for the smallest open space type. At 29 square feet, this is less than the minimum of 300 square feet required for a pocket plaza. With its relatively minimal dedication requirement, the applicant is requesting approval of a Fee-in-Lieu of Open Space.

VOTE: 5 – 0

RESULT: The Fee-in-Lieu of Open Space was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

David Rinaldi	Yes
Shannon Stenberg	Yes
Jeffrey Leonhard	Yes
Gary Alexander	Yes
Andrew Keeler	Yes

MOTION #3: Ms. Stenberg moved, Mr. Leonhard seconded, to approve a Parking Plan to allow for 14 parking spaces when 24 spaces are required and a Minor Project Review with four conditions:

- 1) That the applicant receives a demolition permit prior to the building permit approval and that demolition does not occur until the building permit is approved;
- 2) That the applicant pay a Fee-in-Lieu of open space, prior to building permit approval;
- 3) That the applicant provides required bicycle parking on site; and
- 4) That should any archeological resources be identified during excavation, aside from the relocation of the existing stone wall, the applicant shall make a reasonable effort to record, protect, and preserve those resources.



**3. BSD HC – Tackett Bakery and Office
18-062ARB-MPR**

**30-32 S. High Street
Minor Project Review**

VOTE: 5 – 0

RESULT: The Parking Plan to allow for 14 parking spaces when 24 spaces are required and a Minor Project Review with four conditions were approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

David Rinaldi	Yes
Shannon Stenberg	Yes
Jeffrey Leonhard	Yes
Gary Alexander	Yes
Andrew Keeler	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION



Jennifer M. Rauch, AICP, Planning Manager



The Chair asked the Board if they had any further comments. [There were none.] The Chair called for a motion since there was no further comments or discussion.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Keeler moved, Mr. Leonhard seconded, to approve the following Waiver:

1. §153.063-A – Minimum Yard Requirements for BSD Historic Residential District – Required: Three-foot, side yard setback; Requested: Encroach one foot into the required side yard setback.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Leonhard, yes; and Mr. Keeler, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

The Chair confirmed the Board has agreed the brackets should be removed but the applicant would like to keep the brackets. Mr. Leonhard asked for clarification on the conditions. He said the Board could make a motion to approve the first three conditions and not the fourth, if the applicant wanted the brackets. The Chair said he had not heard that the Board wanted the brackets and he, himself, is not a fan. Mr. Alexander said he did not want the brackets.

The Chair called for a motion to approve the MPR with the following four conditions:

- 1) That the applicant ensures the HVAC system is at least 3 feet from the property line and screened from the right-of-way and adjacent property to the north;
- 2) That the applicant ensures that the existing stone wall is protected during the construction of the second-story addition;
- 3) That the applicant replaces the board and batten shutters with operable two-panel shutters with louvers to preserve the historical significance and traditional style; and
- 4) That the applicant replaces the overhang brackets with a simple, band board design to separate the first and second stories of the addition.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Keeler moved, Mr. Leonhard seconded, to approve the Minor Project Review with the stated four conditions. The vote was as follows: Mr. Alexander, no; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Ms. Stenberg, no; Mr. Leonhard, yes; and Mr. Keeler, yes. (Approved 3 – 2)

3. BSD HC – Tackett Bakery & Office Addition 18-027ARB-MPR

30 – 32 S. High Street Minor Project Review

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said this application is a proposal for building additions, renovations, and associated site improvements to two existing historic structures within the Historic District. He said the properties are zoned Bridge Street District Historic Core and are on the east side of South High Street, approximately 50 feet north of the intersection with Spring Hill Lane. He said this is a request for a review and approval of a Minor Project under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.066 and 153.170, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Lori Burchett reviewed the Minor Project Review process and reported this application was reviewed recently by the Administrative Review Team on September 20, 2018, with a recommendation of approval to the Board this evening. She explained there are Waivers associated with this project and they are outlined in the presentation.

Ms. Burchett presented an aerial view of the site for context and then photographs of the front facades on the existing structures, which were both listed on the National Historic Register. She presented photographs of the rear of each building. She said the image of 30 S. High Street showed the additions that have been added over time. During the informal review by this Board, she said, the removal of the

addition closest to the original building was discussed, particularly as this addition created the saltbox roof character and it represented the growth of the area over time.

Ms. Burchett presented the proposed site plan and explained it showed the additions off the rear of both buildings with a 12-space parking lot with access from Blacksmith Lane. She said the applicant requested a Parking Plan to allow for 14 total spaces with 2 on-street parking spaces where 24 spaces in total would be required. Due to the nature of the proposed use in both of the buildings, particularly with the bakery with a lot of kitchen space, she indicated, it is anticipated these businesses would produce a low amount of vehicular traffic.

Additionally, Ms. Burchett said the applicant requested a side yard setback Waiver to allow for a setback for the addition of 30 S. High Street property to be less than 3 feet. She noted this was requested to stay somewhat in line with the existing non-conforming building. She explained a Waiver for lot coverage to be permitted at 87% for the 32 S. High Street lot was also requested. Due to the site improvements with the parking lot over both lots, and the construction of an accessible route, she said, lot coverage would be over the maximum 75% required. She said in order to construct the accessible route, a Waiver for wall height was requested. She noted this would allow a wall height of no more than 8 feet in height where 6 feet is required. She indicated this is necessary due to the grade and size of the lot.

Ms. Burchett said, a Fee-in-Lieu of Open Space was requested as part of this application. The open space dedication required would be ± 30 square feet. She said the applicants have the option to request a Fee-in-Lieu of Open Space, if the amount is less than the minimum required for any of the open space types outlined in the Code.

Ms. Burchett presented drawings of the proposed front elevations of both buildings from different vantage points and in context with the surrounding buildings with the previous elevations that were reviewed informally by the ARB in June to highlight the changes for a comparison. She recalled during the previous review, Board members expressed concerns with the addition to the 30 S. High Street building and had recommended scaling down the addition, particularly as it attached to the historic building. She said the applicant requested a Waiver for primary materials on the north and south elevations of the 30 S. High Street addition. With the architectural detailing on these elevations, she reported, the ART was supportive of this request.

Ms. Burchett presented drawings of the proposed rear elevations of both buildings from different vantage points and in context with the surrounding buildings to show the proposed one and a half story addition to the 30 S. High Street building connected via a one-story hyphen. Since the previous review, she reported, the applicant removed the proposed chimney on the 32 S. High Street building and proposed a single-pane, storefront window on the front elevation as recommended by the Board. She said a Waiver was requested for non-street façade transparency to allow for 0% transparency for the addition on the south elevation at 30 S. High Street. She explained this was due to the Building Code requirements that limit windows on elevations that are less than 5 feet from a property line.

Ms. Burchett said Staff and the ART reviewed the applicable review criteria, the Minor Project Review Criteria, and the Architectural Review Board Standards and found the criteria to have been met. She reported the ART approved the following Administrative Departure on September 20, 2018, as the request was within 10% of the requirement:

1. Primary Materials – Zoning Code §153.062 – Building Types (O)(9)(d)(5)

Ms. Burchett said approval was recommended for five Waivers as follows, which she addressed earlier in the presentation:

1. Side Yard Setback §153.062 – Building Types (O)(9)(a)(2)

2. Maximum Impervious Lot Coverage §153.062 – Building Types (O)(9)
3. Non-Street Façade Transparency §153.062 – Building Types (O)(9)(d)(1)
4. Primary Materials §153.062 – Building Types (O)(9)(d)(5)
5. Wall Height §153.065 – Site Development Standards (E)(1)(b)(2)

Ms. Burchett said approval was recommended for a Fee-in-Lieu of Open Space as well as the Minor Project Review with a Parking Plan that allowed for 14 parking spaces where 24 are required with four conditions:

- 1) That the applicant receive a demolition permit prior to building permit approval and that demolition does not occur until the building permit is approved;
- 2) That the applicant pay a fee-in-lieu of open space prior to building permit approval;
- 3) That the applicant provides required bicycle parking on site; and
- 4) Should any archeological resources be identified during excavation, aside from the relocation of the existing stone wall, the applicant shall make a reasonable effort to record, protect, and preserve these resources.

Ms. Burchett concluded the applicant and representative were present to address any questions, as well.

The Chair asked the applicant if they had anything to add to the presentation, to which they declined.

The Chair invited the public to speak.

Nelson Yoder, 5927 Rings Road, Dublin, said he is currently residing at 181 S. High Street in the Historic District while his home on Rings Road is being renovated. He said he extends his support for this project. He said he has lived/worked in Dublin for 40 of his 42 years of age, including time in a historic house out on Rings Road. He said he has known Sherry and Floyd Tackett for about 10 years since Sherry decided to move her \$1 billion business back to Dublin, Ohio. He indicated they are fantastic people, long-term Dublin residents who trusted Dublin with their business but also with their home and now with the new business, as they turn the page. He said as a registered architect and someone who walks up and down High Street early in the morning and late at night and living in the heart of the Historic District, he is absolutely thrilled with what he sees the Tacketts proposed. He said the proposal brings a great business to downtown Dublin and restores some old structures that are in disrepair by bringing them back to life with new vibrancy and improvements. He concluded he could not be happier with what Sherry and Floyd have elected to do in the Historic District. He noted the quality of the proposal and that they are committing to our city so he urged the Board to approve what they have proposed.

Steve Rudy, 129 S. Riverview Street, said his main concern is parking, especially with the incoming parking garage at the other corner of the district. He said he loves the structures in the project but he does not like the logic coming across from the ART with an infill pattern that was too heavy. He said he was hoping this Board will keep the characteristic layout of the district, which is a backyard orientation, with open space separating structures across the alleys. He said he does not like seeing Waivers for Open Space or the rationale for it. He urged the Tacketts to looking into a Parking Plan that would involve parking lot sharing to eliminate the need for the Waiver. He recalled the Tacketts had a plan that left up some of the trees, had room for 20+ parking spaces, blended the lots, allowed more trees to remain, so there would be a protective canopy, keeping the open space, which is a much superior plan that he does not think would affect the current building mass. He said he is happy to see these old structures getting some love.

Tom Holton, 5957 Roundstone Place, asked about the stone walls that will need to be relocated. He said the stone walls are very fragile and may not be able to be protected and preserved. He said once they begin to relocate the stone, they may fall apart so he asked if there was a Plan B. He asked if the

applicant will be required to build a stone wall similar to what is on Dublin Road, if the existing stone wall cannot be stored and reconstructed. He encouraged the Board to ask that question.

Dan Morgan, architect, Behal Sampson Dietz Architects, 946 Mt. Pleasant Avenue, Columbus, Ohio.

Gary Alexander asked the applicant about the shed dormer on the original house. He asked if it had to be reframed, to which the applicant answered affirmatively. Mr. Alexander asked if the size of windows was being changed. Mr. Morgan answered they plan to maintain the size of the windows.

David Rinaldi said he appreciated that the applicant listened to this Board and obviously we have all spent a lot of time with this application and visited the property with the applicant. He said he struggled with the addition and how it attached to the 30 High Street property. He said he sees now the applicant has created a one story. He said he regrets that now the addition is massive, and much more impactful than it once was. He said for the most part, this applicant has listened to the Board and made the connection much better, the chimney was removed, and the windows were addressed on 32 S. High.

Mr. Alexander said he was sympathetic to the size the addition had become because when the adjustment was made, square footage needed to be gained because the loft could not be used. He said he would have liked to have seen the shed remain but understands the realities of taller structure adjacent to that. He stated he is pleased to see the revisions as well. He said he was not concerned with the height because it is now pushed back and may not be as perceivable from the street and it is not leaning on that structure. He said he was concerned with the Waiver request, pre-building permit. He said the shed across the back has been deemed a historic structure. He said he would be okay with the applicant demolishing everything else but left this shed until they got the permit and a 100% commitment. He said if the permit is not obtained and part of the historic structure is demolished, and the project does not go forward, the demolition would have been approved that is part of history and someone else might have chosen to retain it. He said he understands the shed cannot be retained here to make this design work. He said he had an issue with how that one Waiver is written.

Mr. Alexander said, in terms of the parking, he is deferring to Staff. He said a reduction in parking, generally, are occurring because most Zoning Codes are over proportioning parking.

Mr. Rinaldi said the Board has had arguments both ways; there is too much parking and there is enough parking. Jeff Leonhard said parking is needed but having parking behind these structures is going to add to the existing traffic. He said he would rather have a nice parking lot than just a field with occasional patches of gravel like some of the other parking lots back there. He said it is unfortunate the applicant cannot get more parking in there but it seems out of their control.

Shannon Stenberg said, in this particular application, because the City is looking to add bike racks with the initiative for Dublin to be more green and not to have as much parking, along with this applicant being limited to what type of business can go in so traffic is not increased, she supported the Parking Plan.

Andrew Keeler said he liked the direction the applicant was heading.

Ms. Stenberg said the north elevation had been improved. She said she was concerned with the open space to address Mr. Rudy's comment. She said the fact that a Fee-in-Lieu is being proposed in this instance, she said she does not know it can be avoided but she also recognized the importance of having open space, protecting that canopy, and it is not something that the Board looks at, while going forward for every case. She said this is an exception where she is okay with reducing open space.

Mr. Rinaldi asked for Ms. Stenberg to clarify her comment. He said part of that was to get an accessible route. Ms. Burchett said the requirement would be about 30 square feet of open space and how the site

is constructed with the parking lot, the existing buildings, the addition, having it publically accessible and something the public would utilize, it would not feel like a private space. She said if the applicant added 30 square feet of open space, which the ART grappled with, would it really feel accessible to the public.

The Chair asked the Board if they had any further comments. [There were none.] The Chair called for a motion for the five Waivers.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Keeler moved, Mr. Leonhard seconded, to approve the five Waivers requested:

1. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(9)(a)(2) – Side Yard Setback
Required: Minimum 3-foot side yard setback for Historic Cottage Commercial building types
Requested: Allow for a setback of less than 3-feet for the addition to 30 S. High Street
2. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(9) – Maximum Impervious Lot Coverage
Required: A maximum lot coverage of 75% is permitted
Requested: To allow for 87% lot coverage at 32 S. High Street. Maximum Impervious Lot Coverage
3. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(9)(d)(1) – Non-Street Façade Transparency
Required: Minimum of 15% non-street facing transparency
Requested: To provide 0% on the south elevation of 30 S. High Street
4. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(9)(d)(5) – Primary Materials
Required: Minimum of 80% of façade be of a primary material
Requested: To allow the north elevation at $\pm 60\%$, south elevation at $\pm 57\%$ for 30 S. High Street
5. §153.065 – Site Development Standards (E)(1)(b)(2) – Wall Height
Required: Maximum height of 6 feet for walls between a principal structure and rear property line
Requested: To allow for a retaining wall no greater than 8 feet in height

The vote was as follows: Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Leonhard, yes; and Mr. Keeler, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Leonhard moved, Mr. Rinaldi seconded, to approve the Fee-in-Lieu of Open Space:

- 1) Based on the square footage of the proposed use, a total of 29 square feet of publicly accessible open space is required. Code permits a Fee-in-Lieu of Open Space if the open space requirement is less than the minimum required for the smallest open space type. At 29 square feet, this is less than the minimum of 300 square feet required for a pocket plaza. With its relatively minimal dedication requirement, the applicant is requesting approval of a Fee-in-Lieu of Open Space.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Stenberg, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; and Mr. Leonhard, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

Jennifer Rauch asked if the first condition should be reworded, per the point made by Mr. Alexander.

Mr. Morgan said, from a standard constructability standpoint, the applicant would not have the equipment to tear those off and secure the buildings; there would be a big hole in the back of the building. He said he does not believe there will be an issue and the owners were present.

Mr. Rinaldi suggested for Condition #1, demolition does not occur until a building permit is issued. Mr. Leonhard clarified the applicant just wanted approval to demolish the shed. Mr. Alexander asked if that is

the goal to demolition approval or to start some demolitions before the permit. Mr. Alexander answered they want a full project ready to go before they would mobilize it. Mr. Rinaldi suggested tweaking that condition.

Motion and Vote

Ms. Stenberg moved, Mr. Leonhard seconded, to approve a Parking Plan to allow for 14 parking spaces when 24 spaces are required and a Minor Project Review with four conditions:

- 1) That the applicant receives a demolition permit prior to the building permit approval and that demolition does not occur until the building permit is approved;
- 2) That the applicant pay a Fee-in-Lieu of open space, prior to building permit approval;
- 3) That the applicant provides required bicycle parking on site; and
- 4) That should any archeological resources be identified during excavation, aside from the relocation of the existing stone wall, the applicant shall make a reasonable effort to record, protect, and preserve those resources.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Keeler, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Leonhard, yes; and Ms. Stenberg, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

The Chair asked the Board if they had any further comments. [There were none.]

Communications

~~Jennifer Rauch said Staff is working through the update to the *Guidelines* as well as the Code Modifications that have been discussed with this Board. She reported there will be a public meeting held on October 9, 2018, from 6 – 8 pm at the Dublin Community Church to gain input on new construction and for staff to present an overview of the project. She said notices will be sent out this week to every resident, business owner, and tenant, in the District.~~

~~Shannon Stenberg and Gary Alexander stated they will not be present at the October 24, 2018, ARB meeting.~~

~~Ms. Rauch said Lori Burchett is leaving Planning and her last day is Monday, October 1, 2018. She is going back to Seattle, WA for a great job opportunity.~~

Adjournment

~~With no further communications to share, the Chair adjourned the meeting at 7:57 pm.~~

~~As approved by the Architectural Review Board on November 28, 2018.~~



RECORD OF DETERMINATION

Administrative Review Team

Thursday, September 20, 2018

The Administrative Review Team made the following determination at this meeting:

- 4. BSD HC – Tackett Bakery and Office 18-062ARB-MPR** **30-32 S. High Street Minor Project Review**
- Proposal: Building additions, renovations, and associated site improvements to two existing historic structures within the Historic District. The properties are zoned Bridge Park District - Historic Core.
- Location: East of South High Street, approximately 75 feet north of Spring Hill Lane.
- Request: Review and recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board for a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.066 and 153.170, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.
- Applicant: Sharon Tackett, Bluebird Consulting Group.
- Planning Contact: Lori Burchett, AICP, Planner II
- Contact Information: 614.410.4656, lburchett@dublin.oh.us
- Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/18-062

REQUEST #1: Approval for the following Administrative Departure:

- §153.062 – Building Types (O)(9)(d)(5) – Primary Materials
Minimum of 80% of façade be of a primary material
Request: To allow the west elevation of 30 S. High Street at ±78%

Determination: The Administrative Departure was approved.

REQUEST #2: Recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board for five Waivers:

- §153.062 – Building Types (O)(9)(a)(2) – Side Yard Setback
Required: Minimum 3-foot side yard setback for Historic Cottage Commercial building types
Requested: Allow for a setback of less than 3-feet for the addition to 30 S. High Street
- §153.062 – Building Types (O)(9) – Maximum Impervious Lot Coverage
Required: A maximum lot coverage of 75% is permitted
Requested: To allow for 87% lot coverage at 32 S. High Street. Maximum Impervious Lot Coverage
- §153.062 – Building Types (O)(9)(d)(1) – Non-Street Façade Transparency
Required: Minimum of 15% non-street facing transparency
Requested: To provide 0% on the south elevation of 30 S. High Street



**4. BSD HC – Tackett Bakery and Office
18-062ARB-MPR**

**30-32 S. High Street
Minor Project Review**

4. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(9)(d)(5) – Primary Materials
Required: Minimum of 80% of façade be of a primary material
Requested: To allow the north elevation at $\pm 60\%$, south elevation at $\pm 57\%$ for 30 S. High Street
5. §153.065 – Site Development Standards (E)(1)(b)(2) – Wall Height
Required: Maximum height of 6 feet for walls between a principal structure and rear property line
Requested: To allow for a retaining wall no greater than 8 feet in height

Determination: The Waivers were forwarded to the Architectural Review Board with a recommendation of approval.

REQUEST #3: Recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board for the Fee-in-Lieu of Open Space:

- 1) Based on the square footage of the proposed use, a total of 29 square feet of publicly accessible open space is required. Code permits a Fee-in-Lieu of Open Space if the open space requirement is less than the minimum required for the smallest open space type. At 29 square feet, this is less than the minimum of 300 square feet required for a pocket plaza. With its relatively minimal dedication requirement, the applicant is requesting approval of a Fee-in-Lieu of Open Space.

Determination: The Fee-in-Lieu of Open Space was forwarded to the Architectural Review Board with a recommendation of approval.

REQUEST #4: Recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board for a Minor Project Review with a Parking Plan to allow for 14 parking spaces and four conditions:

- 1) That the applicant receives approval of a demolition request, prior to building permit approval;
- 2) That the applicant pay a Fee-in-Lieu of open space, prior to building permit approval;
- 3) That the applicant provides required bicycle parking on site; and
- 4) That should any archeological resources be identified during excavation, aside from the relocation of the existing stone wall, the applicant shall make a reasonable effort to record, protect, and preserve those resources.

Determination: The Minor Project Review with a Parking Plan and four conditions was forwarded to the Architectural Review Board with a recommendation of approval.

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Vince A. Papsidero, FAICP, Planning Director





MEETING MINUTES

Administrative Review Team

Thursday, September 20, 2018 | 2:00 pm

ART Members and Designees: Vince Papsidero, Planning Director (Chair); Donna Goss, Director of Development; Matt Earman, Director of Parks and Recreation; Colleen Gilger, Director of Economic Development; Aaron Stanford, Senior Civil Engineer; Brad Conway, Residential Plans Examiner; Mike Altomare, Fire Marshal; Tim Hosterman, Police Sergeant.

Other Staff: Jennifer Rauch, Planning Manager; Claudia Husak, Senior Planner; Lori Burchett, Planner II; Nichole Martin, Planner I; Mike Kettler, Planning Technician; Richard Hansen, Planning Assistant; Jimmy Hoppel, Planning Assistant; and Laurie Wright, Administrative Support II.

Applicants: Gary Fischer, Fischer & Associates Architects Inc. (Case 1); Andrew Christensen, Property Owner (Case 2); Dan Morgan, Behel Sampson Dietz Architects; and Floyd Tackett, Bluebird Consulting Group (Case 4); James Peltier, EMH&T; Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners; Pete Scott, Meyers + Associates Architecture; and John Woods, MKSK (Cases 5 & 6).

Vince Papsidero called the meeting to order at 2:03 pm. He asked if there were any amendments to the September 6, 2018, meeting minutes. [There were none.] The minutes were approved as presented.

RECOMMENDATIONS

**2. BSD HC – Christensen Property
18-058ARB-MPR**

**56 Franklin Street
Minor Project Review**

~~Richard Hansen said this application is a proposal for exterior modifications, an attached garage addition, a detached garage addition at ±840 square feet in size, and associated site improvements to an existing home within the Historic District. He said the property is zoned Bridge Street District - Historic Residential and is east of Franklin Street, ±400 feet south of the intersection with West Bridge Street. He said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board for a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.066 and 153.170, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.~~

~~Mr. Hansen reminded the ART of the MPR process and that the next step for this case is to be reviewed by the Architectural Review Board (ARB) at their meeting on September 26, 2018.~~

~~Mr. Hansen presented an aerial view of the site. He presented the proposed site plan and noted the proposed additions to the site include a new front porch for the existing house, an attached garage, a mudroom, and a detached garage. He explained the proposed single-car, attached garage would require the removal of an existing fence on the northwest side of the lot and the relocation of the existing driveway in the southwest corner of the lot to the northwest corner. He said the proposed detached three-car, garage is located 10 feet from the side property line, 25 feet from the rear of the property, and has access from Mill Lane. He presented elevations that illustrated that all four of the garage doors would be the same carriage style.~~



- 1) That the applicant ensures the HVAC system is at least three feet from the property line and screened from the right-of-way and adjacent property to the north;
- 2) That the applicant ensures the existing stone wall is protected during the construction of the second-story addition.
- 3) That the applicant replaces the board and batten shutters with operable, two-panel shutters with louvers to preserve the historical significance and traditional style; and
- 4) That the applicant replaces the overhang brackets with a simple, band-board design to separate the first and second stories of the addition.

Mr. Kettler said the applicant was not present but had agreed to all the conditions, prior to the meeting.

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any questions or concerns for this proposal. [Hearing none.] He called for votes on the Waiver and the Minor Project with four conditions to be recommended for approval to the ARB for their meeting on September 26, 2018. The recommendations for approval passed unanimously on both requests.

**4. BSD HC – Tackett Bakery and Office
18-062ARB-MPR**

**30-32 S. High Street
Minor Project Review**

Lori Burchett said this application is a proposal for building additions, renovations, and associated site improvements to two existing historic structures within the Historic District. She said the properties are zoned Bridge Park District - Historic Core and are east of South High Street, ± 75 feet north of Spring Hill Lane. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board for a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.066 and 153.170, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Ms. Burchett briefly covered an overview of the process for both the Minor Project and Waiver Reviews. She said this application includes the following requests for these two properties:

- An Administrative Departure for Primary Materials
- Five Waivers
- A Fee-in-Lieu of Open Space
- A Parking Plan
- Minor Project Review with four conditions

Ms. Burchett presented an aerial view of the site for context and photographs of the existing conditions on the front facades along S. High Street for both buildings as well as the rear views.

Ms. Burchett explained the structure on 30 S. High Street sustained multiple additions over the years, which caused significant discussion amongst the Architectural Review Board members during informal reviews of the proposal. She reported they considered the removal of some additions and how a new addition should appear so it was subordinate in order to meet the intent of the Guidelines. The Board was supportive of the proposed design and the reuse of materials wherever possible.

Ms. Burchett said the structure on 30 S. High Street is listed on the National Register of Historic Places and is one of the few remaining log structures in Dublin; the log cabin is visible from the attic. She reported a map from 1856 indicated a drugstore was on this site at one time. She said the structure rests on a stone foundation with cement, asbestos-shingle siding. She stated a wall dormer is on the west side of the structure and a lean-to addition is located at the rear. She said the removal of two small additions to the

building would be required. She reported the City's third-party consultant contends that "these early exterior alterations, such as the shed-roof front dormer, rear shed-roof addition, and seam-metal roof, contribute to the character of the historic district and represent the growth of the area from early exploration to early 20th-century commerce." The applicant has stated the additions are in significant disrepair and are not salvageable, she said.

Ms. Burchett said the structure on 32 S. High Street is also listed on the National Register of Historic Places. She reported this building dates back to the 1840-50 period and is an example of mid-late 19th century vernacular commercial architecture. She said this structure rests on a stone foundation and consists of shiplap siding on the façade, vertical board and batten siding on the sides; and a gable-end facing the street. She noted the storefront windows have been altered and a modern addition was built at the rear.

Ms. Burchett noted that additional comments from the city's third-party consultant regarding 30 S. High can be found in the Planning Report. She said Staff advised the applicant to adhere to the ARB requests as stated in the previous Informal Reviews. She noted the majority of the Board's questions had focused more on the structure on 30 S. High Street than the one on 32 S. High Street.

Ms. Burchett presented the graphics illustrating the mass and scale from the previous plan to compare to the the mass and scale of what is being proposed. She said the proposed one and a half story addition for 30 S. High Street has a scale consistent with existing structures to the north and the gable roof and dormer design breaks the building into smaller masses and mimics the front of elevation of the historic structure without replicating. She said the proposal for 32 S. High Street includes a 300-square-foot deck addition with a service basement to the rear is lower and smaller in scale than the existing building.

Ms. Burchett reported the applicant has added a 175-square-foot, one-story, hyphen connector to a 1260-square-foot, one and half story addition per the comments received from the ARB. She said the applicant has also addressed the mass by including recesses and projections along portions of multiple façades. She reported the applicant also responded to the Board's feedback by removing the exterior chimney from 32 S. High Street and is proposing a single-pane, storefront window design.

Ms. Burchett noted the architectural design for the proposed addition to 30 S. High Street is simple with wood siding and cantilevered entry accents and the character is most similar to the adjacent simple, rectangular, commercial buildings found in the Historic District. She indicated the typical construction of these building types is a frame with horizontal siding and corner trim; one, one and one-half, or two stories high with a gable roof and ridgeline parallel to the street; mainly of the era of 1820 to 1890, as described in the *Historic District Design Guidelines*.

Ms. Burchett added the north elevation features a projecting canopy detail with prominent dormers and the west elevation has a two windows at the gable end. With the building located within three feet of the property line, she explained, windows are not permitted and a Waiver for reduced transparency will be required. Adversely, she said, the design of the large windows adds to the transparency requirement and creates a residential aesthetic, which is generally more complementary with the commercial vernacular of this portion of the Historic District. She said the proposed materials include lap wood siding in off-white, black frame anodized aluminum windows, black standing seam metal roof, and stone veneer base.

Ms. Burchett said exterior renovations proposed for 32 S. High Street will use like-for-like materials painted to match the existing building. She indicated the applicant is proposing to salvage existing materials as much as possible as recommended by the ARB. She said the applicant is proposing to resurface the existing concrete block foundation with stone veneer to match closely to the stone foundations in the district as well.

She stated the applicant intends to retain the front entrance and add a second side door on the south elevation for accessibility.

Ms. Burchett concluded these improvements will be recognized as products of their own time. She noted the addition to the 30 S. High Street structure is connected through a one-story hyphen with its own design and character. She indicated the materials and design are complementary without being a false historic representation. She said the minor addition to 32 S. High Street utilizes a modern railing design that complements without detracting from the historic building. She stated neither of the proposed additions diminish the integrity of the existing building on the site and will stand as a product of their own time.

Ms. Burchett presented the revised proposed site plan that included the development of the parking area, landscaping, and relocation detail of the stone walls. She said the landscape plan is simple and in character with the existing landscape character of the Historic District. She said a non-historic outhouse and shed will be demolished to create space for the proposed shared, 12-space parking lot at the rear of the lot to service the businesses in these two buildings providing direct access from Blacksmith Lane.

Ms. Burchett said this application was reviewed against the Minor Project Review Criteria, Waiver Review Criteria, and Architectural Review Board Standards.

Ms. Burchett said approval is recommended for the following Administrative Department:

1. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(9)(d)(5) – Primary Materials
Minimum of 80% of façade be of a primary material
Request: To allow the west elevation of 30 S. High Street at ±78%

Ms. Burchett said a recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board for five Waivers is recommended:

1. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(9)(a)(2) – Side Yard Setback
Required: Minimum 3-foot side yard setback for Historic Cottage Commercial building types
Requested: Allow for a setback of less than 3-feet for the addition to 30 S. High Street
2. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(9) – Maximum Impervious Lot Coverage
Required: A maximum lot coverage of 75% is permitted
Requested: To allow for 87% lot coverage at 32 S. High Street. Maximum Impervious Lot Coverage
3. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(9)(d)(1) – Non-Street Façade Transparency
Required: Minimum of 15% non-street facing transparency
Requested: To provide 0% on the south elevation of 30 S. High Street
4. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(9)(d)(5) – Primary Materials
Required: Minimum of 80% of façade be of a primary material
Requested: To allow the north elevation at ±60%, south elevation at ±57% for 30 S. High Street
5. §153.065 – Site Development Standards (E)(1)(b)(2) – Wall Height
Required: Maximum height of 6 feet for walls between a principal structure and rear property line
Requested: To allow for a retaining wall no greater than 8 feet in height

Ms. Burchett said a recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board for the Fee-in-Lieu of Open Space is recommended:

- 1) Based on the square footage of the proposed use, a total of 29 square feet of publicly accessible open space is required. Code permits a Fee-in-Lieu of Open Space if the open space requirement is less than the minimum required for the smallest open space type. At 29 square feet, this is less than the minimum of 300 square feet required for a pocket plaza. With its relatively minimal dedication requirement, the applicant is requesting approval of a Fee-in-Lieu of Open Space.

Ms. Burchett stated the applicant is bringing forward a Parking Plan as 24 parking spaces are required but 14 parking spaces total are being proposed for both uses. She reported Staff reviewed the type of use for the shared parking arrangement and found it compatible for 14 spaces. She noted the new parking garage is being constructed nearby. Historically, she noted, it is hard to provide more parking on a small site.

Ms. Burchett said a recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board for a Minor Project Review is recommended with a Parking Plan and four conditions:

- 1) That the applicant receives approval of a demolition request, prior to building permit approval;
- 2) That the applicant pay a Fee-in-Lieu of open space, prior to building permit approval;
- 3) That the applicant provides required bicycle parking on site; and
- 4) That should any archeological resources be identified during excavation, aside from the relocation of the existing stone wall, the applicant shall make a reasonable effort to record, protect, and preserve those resources.

Ms. Burchett pointed out the existing stone wall and its relocation proposed as a detail along the parking area.

Vince Papsidero asked if the applicant or the applicant's representative had anything to add and they declined as they said Ms. Burchett already did such a great job presenting their case.

Ms. Burchett reported the third-party consultant had expressed concerns about the size of the addition on 30 S. High Street. ART members had noted that since this proposal is such an improvement to the properties and the applicant responded well to the ARB's requests, this will certainly enhance the area.

Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any questions or concerns for this proposal. [Hearing none.] He called for a motion to approve the Administrative Departure. Donna Goss motioned, Colleen Gilger seconded, and the one Administrative Departure was approved, as written.

Mr. Papsidero called for the vote on the five Waivers and were all recommended for approval to the Architectural Review Board.

Mr. Papsidero called for the vote on the recommendation of approval for the Fee-in-Lieu of Open Space and the Parking Plan as part of the Minor Project Review with four conditions to be recommended for approval to the ARB for their meeting on September 26, 2018. The recommendation for approval passed unanimously.



BOARD DISCUSSION

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, June 27, 2018 | 6:30 pm

The Architectural Review Board took the following action at this meeting:

- 1. BSD HC – Tackett Bakery & Office Addition** **30 – 32 S. High Street**
18-027INF **Informal Review**
- Proposal: Modifications to two existing historic commercial buildings, an addition, and associated site improvements on a site zoned Bridge Street District Historic Core.
- Location: East side of South High Street, approximately 50 feet north of the intersection with Spring Hill Lane.
- Request: Informal review and feedback for a future application within the Bridge Street District under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.
- Applicant: Dan Morgan, Behal Sampson Dietz
- Planning Contact: Lori Burchett, AICP, Planner II
- Contact Information: 614.410.4656, lburchett@dublin.oh.us
- Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/18-027

RESULT: The Board informally reviewed the proposal for modifications to two existing structures, additions, and associated site improvements and provided non-binding feedback. The Board was supportive of the proposed uses and several architectural elements. The Board specifically reviewed and commented on the demolition of the small lean-to addition on 30 S. High Street and whether the addition was of appropriate scale and subordinate to the historic building. Some Board members expressed concern with how the proposed addition is at the same roof line as the historic building and overwhelms the historic building. Board members recommended the applicant reduce the mass and provide “breathing room” between the addition and the building. The Board members noted they want to ensure the historical integrity of the existing building is maintained and the Code and Guidelines are met.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

David Rinaldi	Yes
Shannon Stenberg	Absent
Jeffrey Leonhard	Yes
Gary Alexander	Yes
Andrew Keeler	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Lori Burchett, AICP, Planner II





MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, June 27, 2018

AGENDA

- 1. BSD HC – Tackett Bakery & Office Addition** **18-027INF** **30 – 32 S. High Street**
Informal Review (Discussion Only)
- 2. BSD HC – Dublin Town Center Exterior Modifications** **18-034ARB/MPR** **19 W. Bridge Street**
Minor Project Review (Approved 4 – 0)

The Chair, David Rinaldi, called the meeting to order at 6:31 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Board Members present were: Jeffrey Leonhard, Gary Alexander, and Andrew Keeler. Shannon Stenberg was absent. City representatives were: Jennifer Rauch, Lori Burchett, Richard Hansen, and Laurie Wright.

Administrative Business

Motion and Vote

Mr. Alexander moved, Mr. Rinaldi seconded, to accept the documents into the record. The vote was as follows: Mr. Leonhard, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; and Mr. Alexander, yes. (Approved 4 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Keeler moved, Mr. Leonhard seconded, to approve the meeting minutes from April 25 and May 23, 2018, as presented. The vote was as follows: Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; and Mr. Leonhard, yes. (Approved 4 – 0)

The Chair briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Architectural Review Board. He swore in anyone planning to address the Board during this meeting.

- 1. BSD HC – Tackett Bakery & Office Addition** **18-027INF** **30 – 32 S. High Street**
Informal Review

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following proposal is a request for modifications to two existing historic commercial buildings, an addition, and associated site improvements for a site zoned Bridge Street District Historic Core. He said the site is on the east side of South High Street, approximately 50 feet north of the intersection with Spring Hill Lane. He said this is a request for an informal review and feedback for a future application within the Bridge Street District under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.



Lori Burchett said this is a second Informal Review following a site visit at last month's regular meeting. She said the applicant is requesting additional review and direction related to the demolition of the additions to the rear of 30 S. High Street; the proposed architectural details; and the scale of the proposed addition.

Ms. Burchett presented an aerial view of the site as well as photographs of the two properties directly adjacent to each other as viewed from North High Street. The two properties that are being considered, she explained, are shown with 30 N. High Street to the north on the left and 32 N. High Street to the south on the right side. She restated the Board visited the two buildings and site on May 23 and walked through both properties to assess: the condition of the properties; the lean-to addition to the rear of the 30 S. High Street building; the grade changes on the site where the parking lot is proposed; and the stone wall located in the rear of the property. She presented additional photographs that showed the existing conditions of the rear of the properties, which showed the lean-to addition at 30 S. High Street, and is one of the specific considerations requested by the applicant to be discussed this evening.

Ms. Burchett presented an illustration of the proposed site plan that showed the two buildings with additions with a parking area in the rear. She noted the applicant is proposing to relocate the existing stone wall on the current site to allow for the development of the parking lot off of Blacksmith Lane. She presented images of the west and east elevations of the proposed buildings that illustrated the modifications to the 30 S. High Street property that included: the removal of an existing addition; construction of a new two-story addition located to the rear of the building; and the addition of a roof and columns over the side entrance. She said the proposed modifications to 32 S. High Street included: replacement of the exterior siding and roof with like-for-like materials, which includes board and batten and a standing-seam, metal roof; storefront window replacement; the addition of awnings along the front elevation; a refurbished front door; installation of new, larger windows and the conversion of a window to an ADA accessible door along the southern elevation; addition of a new chimney along the southern elevation; and a 200-square-foot building addition to the rear with a deck.

Ms. Burchett presented an illustration of the south and north proposed elevations that generally illustrated the existing portions of each building in context with the new additions. For 32 S. High Street, she pointed out, the existing building and then the addition off of the rear with the deck. For 30 S. High Street, she explained, she added the black line in the graphic to show where 30 S. High Street ends and the rest, is what would be seen of the 32 S. High Street property.

Ms. Burchett reported that the Board informally reviewed the proposal on April 25th and provided non-binding feedback. She said the discussion centered around: the demolition of additions to the rear of 30 S. High Street; whether the window details and placement were appropriate for the historic buildings; the location of the proposed new addition; concerns that the addition to 30 S. High Street needed more separation from the original building and should be scaled down to not overwhelm the original building; the appropriateness of the chimney on the 32 S. High Street building; and whether the raised dormer on the front of the 30 S. High Street structure was duplicating the feature in an unauthentic way.

Ms. Burchett presented images that illustrated the mass and scale of the proposed structures from different vantage points and in context with the surrounding buildings.

Ms. Burchett presented discussion questions that had been provided for the Board's consideration and review as well as to provide additional feedback to the applicant:

1. Does the Board support the demolition of the rear addition?
2. Are the proposed architectural details including the raised dormer, windows, and chimney location historically appropriate?
3. Is the proposed addition at an appropriate scale and subordinate to the historic building?
4. Are there other considerations by the Board?

Ms. Burchett indicated the applicant may request further direction from the Board this evening. She said the applicant and representative are present and could field any questions she may not be able to answer.

The Chair invited the applicant to add to the presentation, if they felt inclined to do so.

Dan Morgan, 946 Mt. Pleasant Avenue, Columbus, Ohio, said he is the architect for the project and thanked the Board for taking time out from the regularly scheduled meeting last month to walk through the properties with them. He emphasized the most important question they are asking this evening is whether the Board supports the demolition of the rear additions on 30 S. High Street.

Mr. Morgan indicated that during the site visit and after subsequent conversations, the possible reuse of the lean-to addition was in question. He explained in order to reuse it, the applicant would need to scrape it down and rebuild it with new modern construction so it would be structurally sound to replicate what was there. He said the applicant prefers to take the building back to its original log structure with the proposed addition off the rear of the building.

The Chair invited the public to speak.

Nicholas Vesha, 38 S. High Street, said he fully supported the beautiful design and looked forward to the applicant being their neighbor. He said this redevelopment will be a great addition to Historic Dublin and he is excited about that.

Tom Holton, 5957 Roundstone Place, said he was speaking on behalf of the Historical Society. He indicated the building at 32 S. High Street would not have had a chimney as they had an internal pot belly stove when this was a grocery store, originally, as demonstrated by photographs. He said it is unknown when the chimney was added or why.

Mr. Holton said, in terms of the lean-to addition, he fully supports Mr. Morgan's perspective. He said having seen it last month, we know it is not in good shape. He indicated it can be difficult to decide exactly what time period defines history in Dublin because everything evolved over so many years. He suggested giving the applicant latitude in this particular case. He explained the building at 30 S. High Street has the log cabin structure inside from one period and then it was added onto later, and then followed by another addition in another period. He said allowing the applicant to take the building back to a workable structure allows the applicant to do something commercially with it, while still making it an attractive feature for the community.

The Chair said the Board discussion may begin and he wanted to start it off with a positive note because he is pleased a project may happen here. He said he is pleased someone is willing to invest in these two properties because they have both been in jeopardy for a long time. He stated Ms. Burchett highlighted the topics that were the sticking points at the first Informal Review a couple of months ago. He suggested revisiting those comments again and have the Board weigh in on this proposal. He asked the Board to discuss the comments on the demolition of the existing additions/lean-to(s) first.

Andrew Keeler clarified that when the portions of the existing structures are referred to as lean-tos, there are two of them to the rear of the property – the smaller one is to the far east end and in a serious state of disrepair, and then there is the section in between the log structure and the newest addition. He asked if both are proposed to be eliminated. The Chair answered that is what the drawings indicate today.

Gary Alexander indicated it is difficult to talk about this because what the ARB is tasked with per the Zoning Code. He said the proposed addition does not meet the standards in the Zoning Code

§153.174(D)(3) under additions so it is hard to approve this as proposed, while not keeping that center addition. He said if that is kept, the argument can be made that the standards are being met. He explained the Code suggests there should be separation between the primary structure and the addition; additions should be clearly distinguishable. He noted there is not separation in the proposal as it would attach one addition right onto another, marrying them, essentially. He said this standard in the Code matches preservation guidelines across the country and is not unique to Dublin, Ohio. He emphasized it is a standard approach to preservation for additions. He suggested that by keeping that lean-to, two things happen – it meets the Code by keeping a piece of history and gives the applicant the opportunity for the separation.

Mr. Alexander recalled, part of the discussion was about the functional issue with the existing stair, which is not compliant. He stated he has not worked with Dublin's Building Department but it has been his experience, that every building department he has worked in, in Central Ohio, when there is a historic structure involved, they have allowed for some leniency in areas of non-compliance. He said if the primary issue is to make a stair that can be accessed from the front, and even if the dormer makes it difficult for headroom to accommodate, the Building Department may be willing to grant a Waiver. He said that has been done in other communities in Central Ohio, some larger, some smaller. He said having a stair that accesses both should not drive the decision because he thinks there are other options. He added the lot is so long and there is no parking behind this structure. He said if the lean-to was kept and shifted back slightly, there is plenty of property to make it work.

Mr. Alexander also indicated there are other opportunities that are not being explored. He suggested that since the grade drops, the floor can be lowered to provide some connection in that area, build more mass and not be concerned with the height. He said this architect did a nice job on another project recently dealing with height issues and was approved.

Mr. Alexander said the accessibility issue could be overcome because there could be a second access area at the lower elevation. He noted the site provides other opportunities and keeping the larger lean-to will not impose a hardship. He agreed that eliminating the smaller lean-to makes sense. He concluded, keeping the larger lean-to solves the ARB problem by meeting the Code, provides the applicant great opportunities in terms of development while meeting the standards of the Zoning Code.

Jeff Leonhard asked for clarification when Mr. Alexander referred to the Code – if he meant Zoning Code or under the Architectural Review Board standards. Mr. Alexander referred Mr. Leonhard to §153.174, Board Order Standards, #3. He said it talks about additions, how there should be separation, subordinate to original structure, should be in the rear, etc.

Mr. Rinaldi added a number of things the developer has done has been done correctly. He said the addition is to the rear and that is one of the most important criteria. He indicated he could be persuaded that the second lean-to should be eliminated but also agreed there is not separation to distinguish the two. He said tying in rooflines is a big flag in the review guidelines and that should not be happening. He said if we have to have a two-story connection, if that could narrow to a passageway, and the new mass is separate behind that, he could be more supportive. He said the design may not be perfect but it needs to be compliant. He emphasized the new addition has to be smaller, inside, and the main mass has to be pulled back so the original structure is highlighted. He repeated he could be persuaded the second lean-to could be eliminated. He said the way the addition is rendered right now and designed, is not appropriate.

Mr. Leonhard stated he is in favor of the proposal and assumes they have paid a lot of money in architectural fees. He said if the Board makes the applicant change the proposal it will cost the applicant more money and more than likely, these buildings will be sitting here until next year when somebody else wants to do something with them. He stated he lives behind these buildings and they are an eyesore. He

said if we make it difficult for the properties to be developed, these buildings will never be used and fall down.

Alex Vesha, 38 S. High Street, said he wanted to address the Board so the Chair swore him in. He said he is the co-owner with his brother on the property next door. Mr. Vesha said he wanted to speak to the idea of building a basement on those properties or digging down. He said he and his brother wanted to do that on their property but it was prohibitively expensive due to the rock, so they did not pursue it. He said he did not think excavating was a reasonable expense to pass on to the applicant for this type of addition and business that is intended to go there. He understands there are issues with following the Code but these structures have been sitting here for a long time and there should be some reasonable accommodation made for this proposal. He stated the applicant's proposal will enhance his building as well as the entire street and neighborhood.

Mr. Alexander clarified he was not suggesting a basement, just lowering the floor level some.

Mr. Keeler said he was in favor of this proposal and agrees with the public that has commented. He said when considering to purchase a structure, the shortcomings need to be understood. He said the expectation cannot be that a property can be adopted to fit the use proposed; there may be hurdles to overcome. He said he understands these properties are an eyesore and he, too wants to see the structures improved but there are certain standards that the ARB needs to apply uniformly, not just for this applicant but those that follow. He stated his main point was that the City has certain standards and this Board needs to uphold them. He said that is an expense a property owner incurs in their exploration of a property; it is the cost of doing business.

Mr. Keeler said he was not in favor of the chimney because it did not appear to be authentic. He said the newest addition/lean-to to the east, is ready to fall apart and needs to be demolished. He said he is conflicted with the small section/addition because it tells a story. He does not believe that leaving that structure in place is going to make it impossible for the applicant to repurpose the property and make it useable. He said he believes the middle structure can be used and worked around.

Mr. Leonhard asked staff what the objection is to the chimney because there is already a chimney there. Ms. Burchett said the Staff and the historic consultant's perspective is the chimney was added later and part of the assessment considers when the chimney was added and if it contributes to the historic integrity of the structure. Mr. Leonhard said he did not understand why the applicant could not have a chimney that was already there. Mr. Alexander explained the proposed chimney is not in the location of the current chimney and it is a different kind of chimney being proposed – a flue, it is smaller, built with brick, and should be installed further back. He said the chimney is not original and it changes the perception of this part of the building.

Mr. Leonhard said the consultant noted there was a front door on 30 S. High Street so that leaves him to question if the consultant even visited the property. Mr. Alexander said we can bet she did a lot more research into the documents than we have. Mr. Alexander asked Mr. Morgan if the front door was original, to which he answered affirmatively.

Mr. Morgan wanted to address the first discussion question. He referred to the rear image of 30 S. High. He pointed to the lower left-hand side. He said they stepped in a second floor to make it a second floor hallway. He argued the addition the Board is deeming significant was never approved by any historic board nor would it be approved. He said it did not step in from the side and slams right in to the rear of the historic building. He restated their proposed addition stepped in approximately two feet from each side of that back portion of the existing building. He said the current addition continues that roofline at an angle where they clad over the change from the log structure to the two-by-four structure. He said it is lined up and skinned over with asbestos siding, blurring the original log structure and space between those two parts of the building.

Mr. Morgan said they are seeking to take it a step further back to what it once was and give it its due. He told Mr. Alexander he respected his opinion as an architect and the ideas of further separating the building and referencing the project they did at 113 S. High. He said those two projects cannot be compared because that is a second building, not an accessory structure or addition. He emphasized that was a second primary building on the same site.

Mr. Morgan explained they are trying to unify the building to have a usable office building but a small log structure on its own. He said keeping the lean-to addition is not viable for a modern day office. He said he can see the merit of a connector with a corridor to another unique free-standing building but that would look like two separate buildings connected by a covered breezeway and that is not what he wants to do here.

Mr. Morgan said in the interest of keeping the district alive and the nature of the district alive, he thinks this proposal is the right way to go. He said he could absolutely look through the details so it could be more distinct. He wanted to point out the proposal shows a separation and agreed he did not want it to look like the same building and there are treatments that could be pushed to emphasize that as they move forward with the design. He said 30 S. High is a one and a half story building, and the addition is also one and a half stories. He said they do a step down to create head height to get through that clearance. He said they walked through that with the existing shed dormer on the second story or that attic story of 30 S. High.

Mr. Morgan said he was not supportive of the idea of asking for leniency from the Chief Building Official on that existing staircase; he does not want to stand by that as it would not stand up in court. He said if it was his house, he would not trust the stairway, if his kids had to go down it in case of a fire.

The Chair asked if the Board had any more comments about the demolition request of the rear addition [Hearing none.] He reminded the applicant one member was not present this evening.

The Chair referred to question #2 - Are the proposed architectural details including the raised dormer, windows, and chimney location historically appropriate?

The Chair said the chimney was a point of discussion on 32 S. High with the Board the first time around and it is still. He said the other detail that is very prominent is the addition of the door on the front of 30 S. High. He said it appears one would be going into a conference room and asked if there was an advantage to having two doors from the outside for the same room. He said history indicated there was a door there. Mr. Rinaldi said personally he could support it. He asked for further comments.

Mr. Alexander said if other things worked out he would be willing to live with all the reservations about that. Mr. Rinaldi said he understood but one of the items the Board considers "is whether there is historical precedent."

Mr. Alexander asked if the dormer is being raised on the front. Mr. Morgan responded the dormer was not being raised.

Mr. Alexander said the fenestration on the windows is being changed on 32 S. High St.

Mr. Keeler asked about the structures being historically appropriate. He recalled asking about siding the last time they met. He emphasized he is in favor of preserving everything that can be. He understands it does not look new. He said it appears there may have been peeling paint at one time; and it was scraped, sanded, primed, and caulked but that is what a renovated old building is supposed to look like. He said he is not in favor of putting a new skin on an old building. He encouraged the applicant to keep

and reuse everything they can. He indicated he loves the new builds around Dublin that look old; they are pristine, but he also appreciates old structures.

Mr. Leonhard indicated lead paint and asbestos will be found on these structures.

Mr. Rinaldi recalled talking about the mullions on 32 S. High. He suggested in keeping with what the building use was, the non-divided lites is the way the window should look and he would not like to see divided lites added.

Mr. Alexander said the front is the most important part to preserving these buildings and preserving the identity.

The Chair referred to question #3 - Is the proposed addition at an appropriate scale and subordinate to the historic building?

Mr. Alexander asked the applicant what kind of input he wanted for the detailing in the back. He indicated there are a lot less reservations with the 32 S. High Street building. Mr. Morgan said detail wise, they have a clear picture of what they need to do. He restated the big question this evening was more about the lean-to additions on 30 S. High Street and whether they will be allowed to demolish both. He said if there is any merit of further architectural studies to deem it appropriate to replace those two shed additions, they would be interested in exploring that or if it is steadfast that the original addition needs to be there. He emphasized that was the feedback they were looking for this evening.

Mr. Morgan said if they are to move forward with this process, they need to get their site engineers going. He concluded they wanted to be open for business by Thanksgiving but sees now that is not happen. He said before they green light their engineers to move forward with an addition, they want to make sure they will have some sort of addition on this building and approximately the area they are showing, with the final elevations going to be we are going to refine that with staff. He said that is the direction they are looking for.

Mr. Morgan said Dublin has very simple architectural details, very simple vernacular type of buildings. He indicated the history of these structures being built by fathers coming home from work, putting the building together with their own two hands, not very ornate or elaborate and that is the kind of details they will be replicating.

Mr. Morgan noted the feedback received last time on the windows, on 32 S. High, and they are on board. He said in terms of the doors, they are discussing whether they put the door back in the middle on the front of 30 S. High, versus leaving it sided over, or maybe the door becomes a window again. He said they are looking for as much versatility in that space as they can in this stage of design.

The Chair asked if there was any detail that should be brought to the attention of the architect.

Mr. Alexander said Mr. Morgan is asking if it is prudent to take an intermediate next step and would the Board be willing to look at other options. He reiterated what he said earlier, which was to keep the middle lean-to so the proposal would adhere to the standards. He said he is sympathetic to wanting to move forward but he would have difficulty considering other schemes and would just fall back in the same position.

Mr. Rinaldi said he is trying to be as sympathetic as he can and there is no doubt the Board wants to support this project. He said the public also wants this to move forward and not see the area deteriorate. He said he has trouble with the proposed big addition on the back of the 30 S. High Street building. He reiterated the applicant can sway him to support the demolition of the existing second addition; he just does not like the way the new addition would be up close against the existing structure. Again, he said,

he would be willing to eliminate the second shed if the proposed new addition was sensitive to the size and separation needed and he does not see that in the design yet. He added the applicant should keep as much of the stone wall in the rear of the property as possible.

Mr. Holton said if the Board decides the first lean-to must remain, if the applicant can still build behind the current structure with a viable project.

Mr. Rinaldi answered there is no issue and yes there is a viable option, which he thought was clearly on the table.

Mr. Leonhard said it might not be a viable option for the applicant, financially, to go through all that. Mr. Alexander added he did not think what he proposed would cost more money - to build the addition a different way, off the lean-to.

Floyd Tackett said for them to get the usable space they want, the stair does not work to go up one building and down another. He said they are not asking for a big building. He said the lean-to is deteriorated; they would need to tear it down and rebuild it the way it was, which was poorly built the first time. He emphasized that did not make sense. He said if it was a nice lean-to, a well-built structure, he would surely keep it but there is nothing to work with. He said it is sitting in the dirt, the floor boards are rotten, and it rests on two-by-fours. He stressed it is an extremely poor design and they do not want to spend more money on something they do not want.

Mr. Leonhard asked when the final vote would occur. Ms. Burchett explained Planning would need to receive a formal application submitted and Staff would review. From the applicant's testimony, the applicant's representative had mentioned that they still need to engage some engineering to do the final design and did not want to invest until they had a clear direction from this Board.

The Chair asked the Board if they had any further comments. [There were none.]

**2. BSD-HC – Dublin Town Center Exterior Modifications
18-034ARB/MPR**

**19-W. Bridge Street
Minor Project Review**

~~The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following proposal is a request for exterior modifications, including window and siding replacement, to an existing commercial building within Historic Dublin zoned Bridge Street District Historic Core. He said the site is southwest of the intersection of West Bridge Street and High Street. He said this is a request for a review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.066 and 153.170, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.~~

~~Lori Burchett explained the Minor Project Review process is intended to address modifications conducted after initial Site and/or Development Plan Review approval. She said the Administrative Review Team (ART) is the final reviewing body with the exception of the Architectural Review Board (ARB) in the Historic District or the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC), if warranted by the proposal and in this instance, the proposal will be forwarded to the ARB for review and approval. She said the ART reviewed and made a recommendation of approval to the ARB on June 21, 2018. She said types of MPR applications (for example) would be: Single-family residences; Commercial <10,000 square feet; Additions <10,000 square feet; Exterior Modifications; Signs (if meeting Code); and Site Modifications.~~

~~Ms. Burchett added that upon the ARB's review and approval of this MPR, the applicant will be eligible to file a Building Permit from the Building Standards Division upon their review that can include: site, building and/or sign permits and meeting additional requirements from Building, Fire, or Landscaping, etc.~~

Ms. Amorose-Groomes said City Council appreciates their service. She noted the Board receives a lot of information but they are in fantastic hands with the Planning Staff. She said Council expects the Board Members to give the utmost respect to one another, applicants, and staff but that does not mean members have to agree. She said Council is asking for their best opinions, independent thoughts, and they value the critique of the cases that will come before this Board. She thanked the Board and encouraged the Board to take the charge of the highest possible standard that can be upheld for the balance of our community. She said the Board Members are the gatekeepers of our Historic District, which is the most coveted place in our community. She said there is a tremendous amount of responsibility and it is a vitally important portion of our community and to our citizens. She thanked them again for their efforts and Council looks forward to great things coming to Council from the ARB. She said if the Board ever needs assistance or guidance, or has questions, not to hesitate to contact her as she is the Administrative Chair and the Liaison for the Boards and Commissions. She asked them to please reach out to Council because they stand at the ready to help the Board do an excellent job.

The Chair thanked the Vice Mayor, Mr. Keeler for coming on board, and Mr. Alexander for continuing his service. He said next on the agenda was the election of officers but he would hold that until after all the cases were heard but the Administrative Business will be reported in the order it was published on the agenda.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Leonhard moved, Mr. Alexander seconded, to elect David Rinaldi as the 2018-2019 Chair. The vote was as follows: Ms. Stenberg, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Leonhard, yes; (Approved 5 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Rinaldi moved, Mr. Leonhard seconded, to elect Shannon Stenberg as the 2018-2019 Vice Chair. The vote was as follows: Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; Mr. Leonhard, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Alexander moved, Ms. Stenberg seconded, to accept the documents into the record. The vote was as follows: Mr. Leonhard, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; and Mr. Alexander, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Leonhard moved, Mr. Keeler seconded, to approve the meeting minutes from March 28, 2018, as presented. The vote was as follows: Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; and Mr. Leonhard, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

The Chair asked to address cases three through five first, and then cases one and two. He briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Architectural Review Board. He swore in anyone planning to address the Board during this meeting.

**1. BSD HC – Tackett Bakery & Office Addition
18-027INF**

**30 – 32 S. High Street
Informal Review**

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following proposal is a request for modifications to two existing historic commercial buildings, an addition, and associated site improvements for a site on the east side of South High Street, approximately 50 feet north of the intersection with Spring Hill Lane. He said this is a request for an informal review and feedback for a future application within the Bridge Street District under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Lori Burchett explained the process whereas the applicant requested an Informal Review, which would be followed by a Minor Project Review, reviewed by the ART, with a final approval provided by the ARB and then upon approval, the applicants can file for a building, site, and/or sign permits; building permits are required for construction to commence.

Ms. Burchett presented an aerial view of the site as well as front and rear photographs of the existing conditions. She said the two historic structures located at 30 and 32 S. High Street are proposed to be renovated to accommodate an office (30 S. High St.) and bakery (32 S. High St.). She reported both structures are currently listed on the National Register of Historic Places as part of the Historic District. She stated the City's third-party, historic preservation consultant was hired to provide a review and she reported the property was listed on the National Register in 1979 for significant contributions to the areas of architecture, commerce, and exploration/settlement from 1880 to 1925. She also had found the properties are part of the Ohio Historic Inventory and are considered contributing to the City of Dublin's Local Historic District per the Historic and Cultural Assessment conducted in 2017.

Ms. Burchett said the building on 30 S. High Street contains one of the few remaining log structures in Dublin and it is visible from the attic, and an 1856 map indicated a drugstore was on this site. She said the structure rests on a stone foundation with cement asbestos shingle siding with a lean-to addition at the rear and a large shed dormer on the west side. She noted an exterior concrete block chimney is on the south side of the building. She said other character-defining features the consultant noted were: the limestone foundation (probably from local stone), the log structure, the saltbox profile of the building, and the side entry.

Ms. Burchett said the structure at 32 S. High Street was a former store and is an example of mid-late 19th century vernacular commercial architecture consisting of a gable end facing the street; vertical board and batten siding on the sides; and shiplap siding on the façade. She said the structure rests on a stone foundation and at some point in time, a modern addition was built at the rear and the storefront windows were altered. Additionally, she said, the property has two outbuildings: a small, wood-frame, shed-roof privy and a rectangular, wood-frame, gable-roof storage building. She reported the consultant noted other character-defining features that include: the limestone foundation (probably from local stone), the horizontal wood siding, the center door flanked by storefront windows with knee walls, and the seam-metal gable roof hidden behind a false parapet storefront.

Ms. Burchett said the applicant is proposing modifications to the two historic structures and associated site improvements at 30 and 32 S. High Street to allow for office and bakery uses, respectively. The modifications include the creation of a paved, 12-space parking lot to the rear and will be shared among the two parcels along with two, on-street parking spaces. Based on the proposed uses, she stated, Code requires 22 parking spaces to support the office and bakery uses. She noted a Parking Plan will be required to allow for the parking reduction. She restated the two parcels have frontage on the east side of S. High Street and are accessed from S. Blacksmith Lane at the rear and includes a dumpster in the southeastern corner. The applicant has provided an increased paved area, she said, to allow for vehicles passing along Blacksmith Lane and will continue to work with Engineering on this detail.

Ms. Burchett said the proposed improvements to 30 S. High Street specifically, she said, include an addition of 85 square feet onto the rear of the structure, while the improvements to 32 S. High Street specifically include an additional 583 square feet, as well as a deck in the rear.

Ms. Burchett said the proposed modifications to 30 S. High Street include the removal of an existing addition; construction of a new, two-story addition located to the rear of the building; relocation of the building entrance from High Street to the north side of the building to allow for ADA accessibility; and the addition of a roof and columns over the new entrance. Proposed building materials include wood siding, clad wood windows and a shingle roof, she said.

Ms. Burchett said the proposed modifications to 32 S. High Street include replacing the exterior siding and roof with like-for-like materials (board and batten and standing seam metal roof); storefront window replacement and the addition of awnings along the front elevation with a refurbished front door; installation of new, larger windows and the conversion of a window to an ADA accessible door along the southern elevation; addition of a new chimney along the southern elevation; and a 200-square-foot building addition to the rear with a deck.

Ms. Burchett presented the side elevations of both structures with the proposed additions on the rear of each building that showed the difference in size between the two additions. The consultant, she reported, had concerns with using a side entrance to 30 S. High Street as a front entrance would be more historically appropriate. She presented graphics to further show context of mass and scale; the additions fit within Code in terms of the building's footprint and the building height. She said the applicant is proposing to demolish the existing addition to the rear of 30 S. High Street as well as the two outbuildings and relocating an existing dry-laid stone wall on site to accommodate the new paved parking area. She said the consultant recognized the outbuildings provide historic context for the site, but they are difficult to maintain. Ms. Burchett said the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* outline several considerations regarding the maintenance of historic structures within the district including the preservation of distinctive and defining characteristics, replacement of deteriorated historic features, and preservation of the historic character and changes that have been acquired significance over time; the consultant recommends against removing the existing rear addition of 30 S. High Street for that very reason.

Ms. Burchett noted the consultant had stated that she was supportive of the storefront windows at 32 S. High Street but not necessarily the glazing pattern or the addition of the chimney on the southern elevation as this tends to provide a false sense of history. She further noted that if the applicant has any further details on perhaps the existence of a fireplace in that location, that could sway her decision and would want as many historic details used as possible.

Ms. Burchett presented the proposed floor plans for the office building at 30 S. High Street and the bakery with a small office area at 32 S. High Street.

Ms. Burchett presented discussion questions that had been provided for the Board's consideration and review as well as to provide feedback to the applicant:

1. Does the Board support the demolition of the rear addition, two outbuildings, and the relocation of the historic stone wall?
2. Does the proposal maintain the historic integrity of the existing structures?
3. Are the proposed building additions historically appropriate and does the proposed character fit with the surrounding buildings?
4. Is the Board supportive of the parking reduction?
5. Are there other considerations by the Board?

Jeff Leonhard asked if the third-party consultant visited the properties because there is no door on the front of the structure at 30 S. High Street and there is a fire chimney existing on the side of the structure at 32 S. High Street. Ms. Burchett answered it is her understanding that through the consultant's research, most of the buildings in the area had front entrances and if there is a chimney there, the size is the issue. She added the consultant visits the site as part of her review.

Gary Alexander said there is a brick flew but it is way back and that front corner is extremely visible because the adjacent building sits back. In fact, the window locations are changing on that elevation.

Mr. Leonhard said there may have been a front door at 30 S. High at some point in time but it clearly has not been there in a while. Ms. Burchett emphasized that the consultant's review includes thorough research.

Mr. Alexander said he questions the consultant's assessment as well in terms of the additions to the rear of the building on 30 S. High because it looks like that shed has two components to it; there is an original shed and then there is a shed that projects out slightly beyond that. He asked if that was accurate. Ms. Burchett indicated that the third-party consultant's review is just one part of this review.

The Chair invited the applicant to add to the presentation.

Dan Morgan, 946 Mt. Pleasant Avenue, Columbus, Ohio, said he is the architect for the project. He indicated that early on, when the properties were purchased, they received approval to do some exploratory evaluations and clean up the two main structures. He said they first thought they had found a window at 30 S. High but once they peeled off the many layers of particle board and wallpaper, they found that a window was actually a door on the High Street façade so they decided to use the door but on the side as the entry. He reported there is an existing chimney, in a more modern material, in between the two structures that has no connection but would serve 30 S. High. He said a porch was a later addition. He referred to the third-party review, which states the covered porch is appropriate given its scale, massing, form, and the standing seam metal roof for the building at 30 S. High and the district on page 3 – the last sentence of the second paragraph. He provided more critique of the third-party review for 32 S. High Street. He noted the consultant said the project is seeking to do two additions to 32 S. High Street but at that site there is an existing building and about 10 – 15 years after it was built, there is another addition, which either brought it up to High Street, as it may have been set back, similar to 34 S. High, the law office. He said there was another addition completed in the 50's or 60's, which is the block foundation that comes up out of grade to the very rear so they are merely seeking to do a third addition to the building to increase some seating room so it is just one addition.

Mr. Morgan walked through the floor plans, beginning with the proposed bakery. He said the kitchen takes up most of the space and to be a viable business, they need room for customers. He said they had considered a large deck off the rear of the site but since this is Central Ohio, it would only be comfortable for patrons about two months out of the year. Then they considered enclosing it and using some sliding doors on the back that could be opened up for two to three months of the year to provide a larger space for wedding or baby showers, perhaps or small corporate events. They also needed a room for an office with restrooms and a mechanical room below it for staff. At the 30 S. High Street site, he said, the addition is held together by a shoestring, not a usable space, and just slightly better than a mud floor. He said the head height, building materials, and methods were not up to standards. He said the building itself, being 20 feet by 16 feet (roughly) with eight-inch walls is not much usable space for any type of business. That prompted asking for removal of the original addition and providing a larger addition (story and a half) in its place. He said 30 S. High is 1.5 stories and not two stories tall. The attic room will have a vaulted ceiling making use of the shed dormer.

Mr. Alexander said when he reviewed 32 S. High, the structure appeared to have three siding conditions, board and batten, board-on-board, and then the beveled side. He asked the applicant if he was proposing to re-side everything. Mr. Morgan answered affirmatively for the structure at 32 S. High. He said the sidings on the original buildings are deteriorated and they plan to replace with wood. He said they plan to keep the board and batten going down the side of the main structure and switching to a horizontal siding with a slightly less reveal for the contemporary addition to the rear.

Mr. Alexander asked if corrugated siding was used on the north side. Mr. Morgan answered they believe that was there as the previous owners started some demolition, whether exploratory or maliciously, he does not know, and there are materials there more or less inherited but the corrugated siding is not intended to remain.

David Rinaldi said he was glad someone had a plan for these properties as they have been in jeopardy for a long time. Mr. Leonhard agreed.

Mr. Morgan asked for some general thoughts on the site plan from the Board such as the amount of parking. Mr. Leonhard said, the fact that Code requires 22 and the applicant wants to reduce that number, he is fine with that. He said he lives right behind there and there's a lot of traffic on Blacksmith Lane so the less number of parking spaces back there the better.

The Chair indicated there would be a lot more Board discussion later but wanted to allow the public to speak in regards to this case.

Tom Holton, 5957 Roundstone Place, said he was speaking on behalf of the Historical Society. He said the last inventory was done in 1980 and the property at 30 S. High Street was a rental property, referred to as the "Weber" property.

Mr. Holton said when the applicant comes back to answer questions, he would like to know how the applicant plans to expose the log structure so visitors to the office can see the original structure. He said he was inside the structure with the owner and has seen a significant amount of it but it has been several months. He stated it is a remarkable site and it would be very useful for the log structure to be exposed. He wanted to know how the stone wall will be relocated from its current location right between the two properties; it is not easy to do and not often done but that should be addressed somehow. He noted there is a fire hydrant in the back, almost to Blacksmith Lane and former Chief Bostic would be very upset if that was disturbed. He wanted to know how the applicant would work around that or relocate it. In terms of the parking, he indicated, the homeowners in the back will certainly be interested in how the stormwater will be managed. He stated there is a fairly substantial berm on the east side of Blacksmith Lane but it can be breached with heavy rains as it has recently.

Mr. Holton questioned the chimney on 32 S. High Street. He said that building was originally built as a grocery store and lasted until the late 60's or so, then it became multiple uses including an antique store. He said the large display windows indicate that they were for the owner to display his wares for the people walking by. He noted the consultant said the windows were replaced but he has never heard any indication of the windows being altered. He said he has never seen a photograph of that place in an earlier stage but as an original building they needed the greatest amount of light possible for a shotgun type of building and grocery. He indicated it makes sense that those windows were large in the first place. He reported there are interior photos of that building as a grocery and it is long and well lighted in the front but dark in the back. Regarding a fireplace, he said there was no fireplace as they had a pot belly stove for heat so the chimney is not historically correct so the consultant is right in that sense. For the local residents that could not be here this evening, in particular, Mr. Rudy, he was asked to request consideration of the residents and the traffic on Blacksmith Lane from the Board.

Mr. Alexander asked Mr. Holton for clarity on his last statement. He said when you are asking the Board to consider the residents in terms of traffic, if that meant they prefer more parking. Mr. Holton clarified to consider additional customers who might be coming to and from the establishment. He said the local residents are very much in favor of this project, anything to upgrade the property but it is likely to increase traffic on Blacksmith Lane and Spring Hill Lane but it is one more thing for the Board to consider as more and more projects are anticipated for this district.

Shannon Stenberg said for the structure that is being considered for demolition, which the consultant had deemed contributing, she wanted to know Mr. Holton's thoughts on the demolition proposed. Mr. Holton said he was in favor of the demolition of the non-historic addition behind 32 S. High Street. He said he spoke to Mr. Tackett about it when they walked around the site because it is in terrible condition. He said the outhouse back should be demolished. He said the lean-to portion on 30 S. High on the left, is again an add-on so it could also be demolished. He clarified there are two additions to 30 S. High - a portion on the back where it is narrow and then another to the original cabin.

The Chair asked if there was anyone else from the public that wanted to speak on this case. [Hearing none.] He opened the discussion up for the Board.

Mr. Leonhard said he agreed; improving that structure is needed and parking is a challenge to address because the Zoning Code requires 22 spaces. He indicated there is not room for 22 spaces, and the majority of the traffic on Blacksmith is not people parking in the lots, but people cutting through to avoid the main intersection. He said the businesses will need parking spaces and he does not anticipate that to cause any more meaningful traffic than rush hour does. He said he lives on Blacksmith Lane and the traffic is bad during rush hour, especially on Fridays.

Mr. Rinaldi reported he had walked the site and the structure on 32 S. High Street and the smaller addition on 30 S. High Street are in terrible shape.

Mr. Alexander said he had an issue with the demolition at 30 S. High Street because there is a small lean-to, which was added to the original to set the first addition. He said he can understand the small lean-to but asked what happens when that is removed. He noted the applicant is proposing to build an addition that is big and overwhelming to the historic structure so he has an issue with the nature of that addition proposed that removing that lean-to allows. He suggested there are other ways to get floor space on two levels without jamming the proposed addition right up to the back of the historic building. He added it is import to understand the original historic structure and how it changed over time because not only does it reflect how the building changed but also how the environment changed as well. He said it is not unusual to reframe structures from the inside; it is very common because most of the older structures are not built to current codes. He said when structural changes are made by reframing from the inside, the roof is supported. He said he does not see an issue with the first addition on the 30 S. High building. He suggested there are other ways to connect to that addition, no matter how large the new addition is back there. Additionally, he noted, that shed creates space so the original building is not being overwhelmed and the cottage character of the building is retained. He stated he is definitely not in support of removing everything on the back of 30 S. High Street.

Mr. Rinaldi asked Mr. Alexander if he would consider more of a single-story link through that first addition. Mr. Alexander said the stair could be placed in the addition. He said the architect created breathing space with the other project on S. High Street and that can be done with this historic structure as well. He said it may take rethinking the programming and the intended uses but he thinks it creates a problem where the addition is too big, relative to the rest of the house.

Mr. Rinaldi asked Mr. Alexander for his thoughts on the other structure because there is a substantial addition proposed for there as well. Mr. Alexander answered he would like to see the material there re-used because the volume is the same; the space they want to create is a linear volume just like that. He said repairs and patches of existing materials can be seen throughout the district and the original material is still visible. He said it is unfortunate to tear something down and just rebuild with all new materials in that space.

Mr. Rinaldi asked if there were any issues with the proposed demolitions of the ancillary structures (outhouse). Ms. Stenberg said she does not have any problems with demolishing the outbuildings. She added she would like to see the addition on the rear of 30 S. High Street stepped down slightly. She said

she is more concerned about the siding and making sure the historic siding is incorporated in the structure itself whether interior or to show the character of the original, if it is salvageable. She indicates she likes the proposed structure for 32 S. High Street flows; and the appropriate way the demolition looked.

Mr. Morgan said there is no demolition planned for 32 S. High Street; the main structure is 2x4 walls and 4x4 walls. He said they are rebuilding the structure from the inside out to maintain the integrity. Mr. Alexander said the presentation suggested the rear portion was coming off. Mr. Morgan said that was not coming off.

Mr. Rinaldi clarified that the only main building demolition from the whole project is at 30 S. High Street with two additions proposed (the first lean-to plus the small lean-to). Mr. Morgan agreed. He said the intent is to take it back to its original structure and expose the logs on the inside of the building and maintain the insulation on the outside of the log structure. He explained they are creating a hole in the passageway where the window is.

Mr. Keeler asked to clarify demolition sections. Mr. Morgan said the intent on 30 S. High Street is to peel off the two additions, peeling it back to the original log structure and constructing one, story and a half addition, matching the footprint and turning it so it steps in and fits an appropriate scale. He said there is a connection on the attic story just wide enough for a person to walk through to get to the attic level of the addition so they are stepping it in on the side. He said the experience is to walk from the original building to a new building. He said the aesthetic will be fairly sleek and clean on the inside letting the more minimal modern materials play off the older logs to get a sense of texture. He said they found the logs of this cabin were repurposed to build this log cabin originally. The logs have more holes and joints where one would not expect to see them so they want to demonstrate that with this project.

Mr. Keeler asked Mr. Alexander if he had a problem with that demolition. Mr. Alexander answered he did but what he is comfortable with is removing the second addition, which is where the two windows are in 30 S. High because he can understand the low, head-height issues and he can also see the siding changes. He said the shed behind that is the first addition, and it should stay because it gets the addition further off the roof of the original structure and completely changes the scale of the cottage character or cabin. He said there are other issues about it as it is not a sensitive way to deal with a historic structure.

Mr. Rinaldi indicated he was partially in agreement.

Mr. Morgan said the original shed was the wrong way to do an addition. He said there is no differentiation between the original and what was added because of the way the asbestos siding was installed.

Mr. Alexander noted with vernacular buildings in this district, there are a lot of things that are not higher architecture and that is why they are trying to maintain the tradition and the character that is there and that is the ARB's role. He emphasized these buildings were not designed by architects.

Mr. Rinaldi restated he agreed with some of Mr. Alexander's comments. He said the later shed addition on 30 S. High is one that should go. He said he could be swayed either way on the original addition but the big issue Mr. Alexander brought up was – to give those buildings some space so it does not feel like a new building is being crammed in there. He said the ARB ran into this with a residential addition not too long ago and giving it space helped a lot for the original building to read.

Mr. Rinaldi emphasized the applicant should keep the original window patterns, window lites, and the number of lites. Mr. Morgan presented a photograph that demonstrated divided lites in those initial storefronts. He referred to the pictures of the windows provided on the back of the third party review. He noted the mullion between the transom and the main window are different on both sides so that

indicates there was a repair done. He said to this day, it has been cobbled together worse than it was initially so there is room for judgement about which style is historically appropriate given this was built and modified at various times. He argued the photograph is significant evidence that what they are proposing is similar to what there once was. Mr. Rinaldi said he certainly does not know but his guess is that photograph is somewhere between original and where it is today because he cannot say for sure it is from the 1800s. He said in the 1900s it was typical for a business to have the wide open glass.

Technical issues occurred and the members had to only refer to their tablets as information could no longer be shown on the screens.

Mr. Alexander said, on the second point of architectural character, he would keep the original window openings wherever possible. He said if there is evidence of the door on High Street, then he would not have an issue. Mr. Morgan said they discussed with staff that they would be add a limestone or brick step down from the structure's floor onto High Street like many of the older structures have. He said they would be asking for permission for that as the right-of-way starts at the face of the building. Mr. Morgan said they proposed more windows to gain more natural light into the space. Mr. Alexander said that exposure, when one is driving north on High Street is so important because the adjacent building at the south is set back and not only does the applicant have the front to deal with but also the exposure on that side.

Mr. Rinaldi added the fireplace chimney comment was appropriate because unless there is some evidence there was a fireplace in that location it would not be appropriate. He said the proposed design presented the inclusion of a chimney on the exterior. Mr. Alexander said that does not preclude the applicant from having a fireplace on inside. He said the issues is how it is exposed on the outside. He said functionally, there are other ways that can be handled. Ms. Stenberg agreed. She said for 32 S. High Street she would prefer to keep the single pane window as it was as the grocery store. Mr. Rinaldi added, for the proposed use, it would be appropriate as well.

Mr. Rinaldi stated he did not want to minimize the importance of the stone wall that runs right down the property line between the two properties. He said he understands something has to be done to create the parking lot. He asked if the applicant intended to maintain the eastern portion of the wall and relocate it to the north to create an L-shape. Mr. Morgan answered they are engaged with their civil engineers over the stormwater to make the grading work with the parking lot, which includes an accessible ramp up the south side of the lot. He indicated they might have to raise the grade of the parking lot a foot back toward Blacksmith Lane. He said they propose to repurpose a portion of the stacked stone wall to help camouflage the grade elevation. Mr. Rinaldi stated the ARB would like to see the stone wall addressed in a sensitive way, and retained as much as possible. He understands to make the plan work, at least a portion of the wall needs to be moved.

Ms. Stenberg indicated she would like to see the plan that describing the means and methods to repurpose the originals stones.

Mr. Rinaldi emphasized the applicant needs to more clearly distinguish the old from the new on 30 S. High. Mr. Alexander said the addition on the south building is fine and he likes the historic detail with the railing system distinguishing the new from the old.

Mr. Alexander expressed concerns with the raised dormer in the center of the north building. He said by trying to mimic the original, it appears suspect. He said it is an important artifact to the building and didn't agree with duplicating it. He suggested a design solution that is complementary but trying to be exactly like it in the dormer area. He said he would be more comfortable with a different approach. Mr. Rinaldi agreed.

Mr. Rinaldi said the side door works pretty well with the covered entrance provided.

Mr. Keeler said he would be very interested in preserving the exterior finishes. He indicated it is hard to tell from the drawings what is being proposed on the south wall of 32 S. High Street. Mr. Morgan said the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* are pretty specific on what the material needs to be. He said board and batten will be used on the south side of 32 S. High Street.

Mr. Keeler asked if the applicant will be reusing as much material as possible. Mr. Morgan answered affirmatively, if it is possible. He explained the board and batten extends to the bottom and six to eight inches of it is below grade where soil and mulch have been stacked up against causing it to splinter. He said they want to upgrade the skin to keep the weather and rodents out.

Mr. Rinaldi asked the members if they have an issue with the reduced parking as 22 spaces are required and the applicant is proposing 12 spaces. Ms. Husak said 12 spaces can fit in the parking lot and there are two available on-street parking spaces.

Mr. Alexander requested the potential occupancy number anticipated. Mr. Morgan answered they are at ±25 for the restaurant and they plan on eight people for the office building. He said he anticipates these to be success businesses but does not anticipate flocks of people. Mr. Alexander indicated this is the first retail tenant he can recall wanting less parking than is required. He said if the neighbors are supportive, he would not be oppose it. Mr. Leonhard said this is a walkable area and that is what people want. Mr. Morgan said this will be more of a neighborhood café for local residents and business people to walk to. Mr. Rinaldi said there will be a lot of parking coming online with the parking garages. Ms. Husak said parking is calculated in the Code based on more sit down/lingering type of use. Mr. Morgan said their parking was calculated based on gross area to which Ms. Husak affirmed. Mr. Leonhard asked about a parking Waiver and Ms. Husak said it would be the Board's prerogative to allow that Waiver when this comes back for a formal review. Mr. Rinaldi said he thought the applicant provided a sufficient number of parking spaces and he is comfortable with the proposal.

The Chair asked the Board if they had any further comments. Ms. Husak asked the applicant if he received all the feedback he needed. Mr. Morgan answered affirmatively.

Mr. Rinaldi said he was excited to see this project move forward and for the structures to be saved. Ms. Stenberg said it is a great project.

Ms. Husak requested a break in order to restart the equipment for the next presentation. The Chair agreed to the break for staff and asked that the Board elect the Chair and Vice Chair while they waited for the technical difficulties to be resolved. This is recorded at the beginning of the minutes.

Ms. Husak suggested she continue on with the Communications portion of the meeting while the equipment was still being dealt with. Those comments can be found at the end of these minutes.

**2. BSD HC – Office Building
17-110ARB-MPR**

**113 S. High Street
Minor Project Review**

~~The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following proposal is a request for retention of an existing historic structure and construction of a new two-story, 3,300-square-foot office building and associated site improvements. He said the site is zoned Bridge Street District Historic South and is west of South High Street, approximately 100 feet south of the intersection with Pinneyhill Lane. He said this is a request for a review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.066 and 153.170, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.~~

~~Lori Burchett could not present anything on the screens as there were still technical difficulties that could not be resolved. Ms. Husak said the Planning Report contained the information Ms. Burchett would be~~



BOARD DISCUSSION

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, April 25, 2018 | 6:30 pm

The Architectural Review Board took the following action at this meeting:

- 1. BSD HC – Tackett Bakery & Office Addition 18-027INF 30 – 32 S. High Street Informal Review**
- Proposal: Modifications to two existing historic commercial buildings, an addition, and associated site improvements.
- Location: East side of South High Street, approximately 50 feet north of the intersection with Spring Hill Lane.
- Request: Informal review and feedback for a future application within the Bridge Street District under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.
- Applicant: Dan Morgan, Behal Sampson Dietz
- Planning Contact: Lori Burchett, AICP, Planner II
- Contact Information: 614.410.4656, lburchett@dublin.oh.us
- Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/18-027

RESULT: The Board conducted an informal review of the proposed ...

MEMBERS PRESENT:

David Rinaldi	Yes
Shannon Stenberg	Yes
Jeffrey Leonhard	Yes
Gary Alexander	Yes
Andrew Keeler	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Lori Burchett, AICP, Planner II



MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, April 25, 2018

AGENDA

- 1. BSD HC – Tackett Bakery & Office Addition
18-027INF** **30 – 32 S. High Street
Informal Review (Discussion Only)**
- 2. BSD HC – Office Building
17-110ARB-MPR** **113 S. High Street
Waivers (Approved 5 – 0)
Fee-in-Lieu (Approved 5 – 0)
Minor Project Review (Approved 5 – 0)**
- 3. BSD HC – Daso Custom Cabinetry – Signs
18-022ARB-MSP** **13 S. High Street
Master Sign Plan (Approved 5 – 0)**
- 4. PUD, Coffman Homestead – Sign
18-024ARB-AFDP** **6659 Coffman Road
Amended Final Development Plan (Recommended for Approval 5 – 0)**
- 5. BSD HS – Midwest Gas - Sign
18-025ARB-MSP** **58 S. High Street
Master Sign Plan (Approved 5 – 0)**

The Chair, David Rinaldi, called the meeting to order at 6:31 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Board Members present were: Jeffrey Leonhard, Shannon Stenberg, Gary Alexander, and Andrew Keeler. City representatives were: Vice Mayor, Chris Amorose Grooms, Claudia Husak, Lori Burchett, JM Rayburn, Sierra Saumenig, Richard Hansen, Matt Earman, and Laurie Wright.

Administrative Business

The Chair welcomed the newest Board Member, Andrew Keeler, who would be sworn in by the Vice Mayor, Chris Amorose Grooms. She performed the Oath of Office for the new appointment of Andrew Keeler and the reappointment of Gary Alexander.

Claudia Husak said the Vice Mayor will also provide some opening remarks and on behalf of the Planning Staff, she thanked everyone on the Board for their service and dedication serving on the Architectural Review Board (ARB). She said there will be on-going training for the Board throughout the year and the next session is scheduled for August 16th.



Ms. Amorose-Groomes said City Council appreciates their service. She noted the Board receives a lot of information but they are in fantastic hands with the Planning Staff. She said Council expects the Board Members to give the utmost respect to one another, applicants, and staff but that does not mean members have to agree. She said Council is asking for their best opinions, independent thoughts, and they value the critique of the cases that will come before this Board. She thanked the Board and encouraged the Board to take the charge of the highest possible standard that can be upheld for the balance of our community. She said the Board Members are the gatekeepers of our Historic District, which is the most coveted place in our community. She said there is a tremendous amount of responsibility and it is a vitally important portion of our community and to our citizens. She thanked them again for their efforts and Council looks forward to great things coming to Council from the ARB. She said if the Board ever needs assistance or guidance, or has questions, not to hesitate to contact her as she is the Administrative Chair and the Liaison for the Boards and Commissions. She asked them to please reach out to Council because they stand at the ready to help the Board do an excellent job.

The Chair thanked the Vice Mayor, Mr. Keeler for coming on board, and Mr. Alexander for continuing his service. He said next on the agenda was the election of officers but he would hold that until after all the cases were heard but the Administrative Business will be reported in the order it was published on the agenda.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Leonhard moved, Mr. Alexander seconded, to elect David Rinaldi as the 2018-2019 Chair. The vote was as follows: Ms. Stenberg, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Leonhard, yes; (Approved 5 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Rinaldi moved, Mr. Leonhard seconded, to elect Shannon Stenberg as the 2018-2019 Vice Chair. The vote was as follows: Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; Mr. Leonhard, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Alexander moved, Ms. Stenberg seconded, to accept the documents into the record. The vote was as follows: Mr. Leonhard, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; and Mr. Alexander, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Leonhard moved, Mr. Keeler seconded, to approve the meeting minutes from March 28, 2018, as presented. The vote was as follows: Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; and Mr. Leonhard, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

The Chair asked to address cases three through five first, and then cases one and two. He briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Architectural Review Board. He swore in anyone planning to address the Board during this meeting.

**1. BSD HC – Tackett Bakery & Office Addition
18-027INF**

**30 – 32 S. High Street
Informal Review**

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following proposal is a request for modifications to two existing historic commercial buildings, an addition, and associated site improvements for a site on the east side of South High Street, approximately 50 feet north of the intersection with Spring Hill Lane. He said this is a request for an informal review and feedback for a future application within the Bridge Street District under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Lori Burchett explained the process whereas the applicant requested an Informal Review, which would be followed by a Minor Project Review, reviewed by the ART, with a final approval provided by the ARB and then upon approval, the applicants can file for a building, site, and/or sign permits; building permits are required for construction to commence.

Ms. Burchett presented an aerial view of the site as well as front and rear photographs of the existing conditions. She said the two historic structures located at 30 and 32 S. High Street are proposed to be renovated to accommodate an office (30 S. High St.) and bakery (32 S. High St.). She reported both structures are currently listed on the National Register of Historic Places as part of the Historic District. She stated the City's third-party, historic preservation consultant was hired to provide a review and she reported the property was listed on the National Register in 1979 for significant contributions to the areas of architecture, commerce, and exploration/settlement from 1880 to 1925. She also had found the properties are part of the Ohio Historic Inventory and are considered contributing to the City of Dublin's Local Historic District per the Historic and Cultural Assessment conducted in 2017.

Ms. Burchett said the building on 30 S. High Street contains one of the few remaining log structures in Dublin and it is visible from the attic, and an 1856 map indicated a drugstore was on this site. She said the structure rests on a stone foundation with cement asbestos shingle siding with a lean-to addition at the rear and a large shed dormer on the west side. She noted an exterior concrete block chimney is on the south side of the building. She said other character-defining features the consultant noted were: the limestone foundation (probably from local stone), the log structure, the saltbox profile of the building, and the side entry.

Ms. Burchett said the structure at 32 S. High Street was a former store and is an example of mid-late 19th century vernacular commercial architecture consisting of a gable end facing the street; vertical board and batten siding on the sides; and shiplap siding on the façade. She said the structure rests on a stone foundation and at some point in time, a modern addition was built at the rear and the storefront windows were altered. Additionally, she said, the property has two outbuildings: a small, wood-frame, shed-roof privy and a rectangular, wood-frame, gable-roof storage building. She reported the consultant noted other character-defining features that include: the limestone foundation (probably from local stone), the horizontal wood siding, the center door flanked by storefront windows with knee walls, and the seam-metal gable roof hidden behind a false parapet storefront.

Ms. Burchett said the applicant is proposing modifications to the two historic structures and associated site improvements at 30 and 32 S. High Street to allow for office and bakery uses, respectively. The modifications include the creation of a paved, 12-space parking lot to the rear and will be shared among the two parcels along with two, on-street parking spaces. Based on the proposed uses, she stated, Code requires 22 parking spaces to support the office and bakery uses. She noted a Parking Plan will be required to allow for the parking reduction. She restated the two parcels have frontage on the east side of S. High Street and are accessed from S. Blacksmith Lane at the rear and includes a dumpster in the southeastern corner. The applicant has provided an increased paved area, she said, to allow for vehicles passing along Blacksmith Lane and will continue to work with Engineering on this detail.

Ms. Burchett said the proposed improvements to 30 S. High Street specifically, she said, include an addition of 85 square feet onto the rear of the structure, while the improvements to 32 S. High Street specifically include an additional 583 square feet, as well as a deck in the rear.

Ms. Burchett said the proposed modifications to 30 S. High Street include the removal of an existing addition; construction of a new, two-story addition located to the rear of the building; relocation of the building entrance from High Street to the north side of the building to allow for ADA accessibility; and the addition of a roof and columns over the new entrance. Proposed building materials include wood siding, clad wood windows and a shingle roof, she said.

Ms. Burchett said the proposed modifications to 32 S. High Street include replacing the exterior siding and roof with like-for-like materials (board and batten and standing seam metal roof); storefront window replacement and the addition of awnings along the front elevation with a refurbished front door; installation of new, larger windows and the conversion of a window to an ADA accessible door along the southern elevation; addition of a new chimney along the southern elevation; and a 200-square-foot building addition to the rear with a deck.

Ms. Burchett presented the side elevations of both structures with the proposed additions on the rear of each building that showed the difference in size between the two additions. The consultant, she reported, had concerns with using a side entrance to 30 S. High Street as a front entrance would be more historically appropriate. She presented graphics to further show context of mass and scale; the additions fit within Code in terms of the building's footprint and the building height. She said the applicant is proposing to demolish the existing addition to the rear of 30 S. High Street as well as the two outbuildings and relocating an existing dry-laid stone wall on site to accommodate the new paved parking area. She said the consultant recognized the outbuildings provide historic context for the site, but they are difficult to maintain. Ms. Burchett said the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* outline several considerations regarding the maintenance of historic structures within the district including the preservation of distinctive and defining characteristics, replacement of deteriorated historic features, and preservation of the historic character and changes that have been acquired significance over time; the consultant recommends against removing the existing rear addition of 30 S. High Street for that very reason.

Ms. Burchett noted the consultant had stated that she was supportive of the storefront windows at 32 S. High Street but not necessarily the glazing pattern or the addition of the chimney on the southern elevation as this tends to provide a false sense of history. She further noted that if the applicant has any further details on perhaps the existence of a fireplace in that location, that could sway her decision and would want as many historic details used as possible.

Ms. Burchett presented the proposed floor plans for the office building at 30 S. High Street and the bakery with a small office area at 32 S. High Street.

Ms. Burchett presented discussion questions that had been provided for the Board's consideration and review as well as to provide feedback to the applicant:

1. Does the Board support the demolition of the rear addition, two outbuildings, and the relocation of the historic stone wall?
2. Does the proposal maintain the historic integrity of the existing structures?
3. Are the proposed building additions historically appropriate and does the proposed character fit with the surrounding buildings?
4. Is the Board supportive of the parking reduction?
5. Are there other considerations by the Board?

Jeff Leonhard asked if the third-party consultant visited the properties because there is no door on the front of the structure at 30 S. High Street and there is a fire chimney existing on the side of the structure at 32 S. High Street. Ms. Burchett answered it is her understanding that through the consultant's research, most of the buildings in the area had front entrances and if there is a chimney there, the size is the issue. She added the consultant visits the site as part of her review.

Gary Alexander said there is a brick flew but it is way back and that front corner is extremely visible because the adjacent building sits back. In fact, the window locations are changing on that elevation.

Mr. Leonhard said there may have been a front door at 30 S. High at some point in time but it clearly has not been there in a while. Ms. Burchett emphasized that the consultant's review includes thorough research.

Mr. Alexander said he questions the consultant's assessment as well in terms of the additions to the rear of the building on 30 S. High because it looks like that shed has two components to it; there is an original shed and then there is a shed that projects out slightly beyond that. He asked if that was accurate. Ms. Burchett indicated that the third-party consultant's review is just one part of this review.

The Chair invited the applicant to add to the presentation.

Dan Morgan, 946 Mt. Pleasant Avenue, Columbus, Ohio, said he is the architect for the project. He indicated that early on, when the properties were purchased, they received approval to do some exploratory evaluations and clean up the two main structures. He said they first thought they had found a window at 30 S. High but once they peeled off the many layers of particle board and wallpaper, they found that a window was actually a door on the High Street façade so they decided to use the door but on the side as the entry. He reported there is an existing chimney, in a more modern material, in between the two structures that has no connection but would serve 30 S. High. He said a porch was a later addition. He referred to the third-party review, which states the covered porch is appropriate given its scale, massing, form, and the standing seam metal roof for the building at 30 S. High and the district on page 3 – the last sentence of the second paragraph. He provided more critique of the third-party review for 32 S. High Street. He noted the consultant said the project is seeking to do two additions to 32 S. High Street but at that site there is an existing building and about 10 – 15 years after it was built, there is another addition, which either brought it up to High Street, as it may have been set back, similar to 34 S. High, the law office. He said there was another addition completed in the 50's or 60's, which is the block foundation that comes up out of grade to the very rear so they are merely seeking to do a third addition to the building to increase some seating room so it is just one addition.

Mr. Morgan walked through the floor plans, beginning with the proposed bakery. He said the kitchen takes up most of the space and to be a viable business, they need room for customers. He said they had considered a large deck off the rear of the site but since this is Central Ohio, it would only be comfortable for patrons about two months out of the year. Then they considered enclosing it and using some sliding doors on the back that could be opened up for two to three months of the year to provide a larger space for wedding or baby showers, perhaps or small corporate events. They also needed a room for an office with restrooms and a mechanical room below it for staff. At the 30 S. High Street site, he said, the addition is held together by a shoestring, not a usable space, and just slightly better than a mud floor. He said the head height, building materials, and methods were not up to standards. He said the building itself, being 20 feet by 16 feet (roughly) with eight-inch walls is not much usable space for any type of business. That prompted asking for removal of the original addition and providing a larger addition (story and a half) in its place. He said 30 S. High is 1.5 stories and not two stories tall. The attic room will have a vaulted ceiling making use of the shed dormer.

Mr. Alexander said when he reviewed 32 S. High, the structure appeared to have three siding conditions, board and batten, board-on-board, and then the beveled side. He asked the applicant if he was proposing to re-side everything. Mr. Morgan answered affirmatively for the structure at 32 S. High. He said the sidings on the original buildings are deteriorated and they plan to replace with wood. He said they plan to keep the board and batten going down the side of the main structure and switching to a horizontal siding with a slightly less reveal for the contemporary addition to the rear.

Mr. Alexander asked if corrugated siding was used on the north side. Mr. Morgan answered they believe that was there as the previous owners started some demolition, whether exploratory or maliciously, he does not know, and there are materials there more or less inherited but the corrugated siding is not intended to remain.

David Rinaldi said he was glad someone had a plan for these properties as they have been in jeopardy for a long time. Mr. Leonhard agreed.

Mr. Morgan asked for some general thoughts on the site plan from the Board such as the amount of parking. Mr. Leonhard said, the fact that Code requires 22 and the applicant wants to reduce that number, he is fine with that. He said he lives right behind there and there's a lot of traffic on Blacksmith Lane so the less number of parking spaces back there the better.

The Chair indicated there would be a lot more Board discussion later but wanted to allow the public to speak in regards to this case.

Tom Holton, 5957 Roundstone Place, said he was speaking on behalf of the Historical Society. He said the last inventory was done in 1980 and the property at 30 S. High Street was a rental property, referred to as the "Weber" property.

Mr. Holton said when the applicant comes back to answer questions, he would like to know how the applicant plans to expose the log structure so visitors to the office can see the original structure. He said he was inside the structure with the owner and has seen a significant amount of it but it has been several months. He stated it is a remarkable site and it would be very useful for the log structure to be exposed. He wanted to know how the stone wall will be relocated from its current location right between the two properties; it is not easy to do and not often done but that should be addressed somehow. He noted there is a fire hydrant in the back, almost to Blacksmith Lane and former Chief Bostic would be very upset if that was disturbed. He wanted to know how the applicant would work around that or relocate it. In terms of the parking, he indicated, the homeowners in the back will certainly be interested in how the stormwater will be managed. He stated there is a fairly substantial berm on the east side of Blacksmith Lane but it can be breached with heavy rains as it has recently.

Mr. Holton questioned the chimney on 32 S. High Street. He said that building was originally built as a grocery store and lasted until the late 60's or so, then it became multiple uses including an antique store. He said the large display windows indicate that they were for the owner to display his wares for the people walking by. He noted the consultant said the windows were replaced but he has never heard any indication of the windows being altered. He said he has never seen a photograph of that place in an earlier stage but as an original building they needed the greatest amount of light possible for a shotgun type of building and grocery. He indicated it makes sense that those windows were large in the first place. He reported there are interior photos of that building as a grocery and it is long and well lighted in the front but dark in the back. Regarding a fireplace, he said there was no fireplace as they had a pot belly stove for heat so the chimney is not historically correct so the consultant is right in that sense. For the local residents that could not be here this evening, in particular, Mr. Rudy, he was asked to request consideration of the residents and the traffic on Blacksmith Lane from the Board.

Mr. Alexander asked Mr. Holton for clarity on his last statement. He said when you are asking the Board to consider the residents in terms of traffic, if that meant they prefer more parking. Mr. Holton clarified to consider additional customers who might be coming to and from the establishment. He said the local residents are very much in favor of this project, anything to upgrade the property but it is likely to increase traffic on Blacksmith Lane and Spring Hill Lane but it is one more thing for the Board to consider as more and more projects are anticipated for this district.

Shannon Stenberg said for the structure that is being considered for demolition, which the consultant had deemed contributing, she wanted to know Mr. Holton's thoughts on the demolition proposed. Mr. Holton said he was in favor of the demolition of the non-historic addition behind 32 S. High Street. He said he spoke to Mr. Tackett about it when they walked around the site because it is in terrible condition. He said the outhouse back should be demolished. He said the lean-to portion on 30 S. High on the left, is again an add-on so it could also be demolished. He clarified there are two additions to 30 S. High - a portion on the back where it is narrow and then another to the original cabin.

The Chair asked if there was anyone else from the public that wanted to speak on this case. [Hearing none.] He opened the discussion up for the Board.

Mr. Leonhard said he agreed; improving that structure is needed and parking is a challenge to address because the Zoning Code requires 22 spaces. He indicated there is not room for 22 spaces, and the majority of the traffic on Blacksmith is not people parking in the lots, but people cutting through to avoid the main intersection. He said the businesses will need parking spaces and he does not anticipate that to cause any more meaningful traffic than rush hour does. He said he lives on Blacksmith Lane and the traffic is bad during rush hour, especially on Fridays.

Mr. Rinaldi reported he had walked the site and the structure on 32 S. High Street and the smaller addition on 30 S. High Street are in terrible shape.

Mr. Alexander said he had an issue with the demolition at 30 S. High Street because there is a small lean-to, which was added to the original to set the first addition. He said he can understand the small lean-to but asked what happens when that is removed. He noted the applicant is proposing to build an addition that is big and overwhelming to the historic structure so he has an issue with the nature of that addition proposed that removing that lean-to allows. He suggested there are other ways to get floor space on two levels without jamming the proposed addition right up to the back of the historic building. He added it is import to understand the original historic structure and how it changed over time because not only does it reflect how the building changed but also how the environment changed as well. He said it is not unusual to reframe structures from the inside; it is very common because most of the older structures are not built to current codes. He said when structural changes are made by reframing from the inside, the roof is supported. He said he does not see an issue with the first addition on the 30 S. High building. He suggested there are other ways to connect to that addition, no matter how large the new addition is back there. Additionally, he noted, that shed creates space so the original building is not being overwhelmed and the cottage character of the building is retained. He stated he is definitely not in support of removing everything on the back of 30 S. High Street.

Mr. Rinaldi asked Mr. Alexander if he would consider more of a single-story link through that first addition. Mr. Alexander said the stair could be placed in the addition. He said the architect created breathing space with the other project on S. High Street and that can be done with this historic structure as well. He said it may take rethinking the programming and the intended uses but he thinks it creates a problem where the addition is too big, relative to the rest of the house.

Mr. Rinaldi asked Mr. Alexander for his thoughts on the other structure because there is a substantial addition proposed for there as well. Mr. Alexander answered he would like to see the material there re-used because the volume is the same; the space they want to create is a linear volume just like that. He said repairs and patches of existing materials can be seen throughout the district and the original material is still visible. He said it is unfortunate to tear something down and just rebuild with all new materials in that space.

Mr. Rinaldi asked if there were any issues with the proposed demolitions of the ancillary structures (outhouse). Ms. Stenberg said she does not have any problems with demolishing the outbuildings. She added she would like to see the addition on the rear of 30 S. High Street stepped down slightly. She said

she is more concerned about the siding and making sure the historic siding is incorporated in the structure itself whether interior or to show the character of the original, if it is salvageable. She indicates she likes the proposed structure for 32 S. High Street flows; and the appropriate way the demolition looked.

Mr. Morgan said there is no demolition planned for 32 S. High Street; the main structure is 2x4 walls and 4x4 walls. He said they are rebuilding the structure from the inside out to maintain the integrity. Mr. Alexander said the presentation suggested the rear portion was coming off. Mr. Morgan said that was not coming off.

Mr. Rinaldi clarified that the only main building demolition from the whole project is at 30 S. High Street with two additions proposed (the first lean-to plus the small lean-to). Mr. Morgan agreed. He said the intent is to take it back to its original structure and expose the logs on the inside of the building and maintain the insulation on the outside of the log structure. He explained they are creating a hole in the passageway where the window is.

Mr. Keeler asked to clarify demolition sections. Mr. Morgan said the intent on 30 S. High Street is to peel off the two additions, peeling it back to the original log structure and constructing one, story and a half addition, matching the footprint and turning it so it steps in and fits an appropriate scale. He said there is a connection on the attic story just wide enough for a person to walk through to get to the attic level of the addition so they are stepping it in on the side. He said the experience is to walk from the original building to a new building. He said the aesthetic will be fairly sleek and clean on the inside letting the more minimal modern materials play off the older logs to get a sense of texture. He said they found the logs of this cabin were repurposed to build this log cabin originally. The logs have more holes and joints where one would not expect to see them so they want to demonstrate that with this project.

Mr. Keeler asked Mr. Alexander if he had a problem with that demolition. Mr. Alexander answered he did but what he is comfortable with is removing the second addition, which is where the two windows are in 30 S. High because he can understand the low, head-height issues and he can also see the siding changes. He said the shed behind that is the first addition, and it should stay because it gets the addition further off the roof of the original structure and completely changes the scale of the cottage character or cabin. He said there are other issues about it as it is not a sensitive way to deal with a historic structure.

Mr. Rinaldi indicated he was partially in agreement.

Mr. Morgan said the original shed was the wrong way to do an addition. He said there is no differentiation between the originally and what was added because of the way the asbestos siding was installed.

Mr. Alexander noted with vernacular buildings in this district, there are a lot of things that are not higher architecture and that is why they are trying to maintain the tradition and the character that is there and that is the ARB's role. He emphasized these buildings were not designed by architects.

Mr. Rinaldi restated he agreed with some of Mr. Alexander's comments. He said the later shed addition on 30 S. High is one that should go. He said he could be swayed either way on the original addition but the big issue Mr. Alexander brought up was – to give those buildings some space so it does not feel like a new building is being crammed in there. He said the ARB ran into this with a residential addition not too long ago and giving it space helped a lot for the original building to read.

Mr. Rinaldi emphasized the applicant should keep the original window patterns, window lites, and the number of lites. Mr. Morgan presented a photograph that demonstrated divided lites in those initial storefronts. He referred to the pictures of the windows provided on the back of the third party review. He noted the mullion between the transom and the main window are different on both sides so that

indicates there was a repair done. He said to this day, it has been cobbled together worse than it was initially so there is room for judgement about which style is historically appropriate given this was built and modified at various times. He argued the photograph is significant evidence that what they are proposing is similar to what there once was. Mr. Rinaldi said he certainly does not know but his guess is that photograph is somewhere between original and where it is today because he cannot say for sure it is from the 1800s. He said in the 1900s it was typical for a business to have the wide open glass.

Technical issues occurred and the members had to only refer to their tablets as information could no longer be shown on the screens.

Mr. Alexander said, on the second point of architectural character, he would keep the original window openings wherever possible. He said if there is evidence of the door on High Street, then he would not have an issue. Mr. Morgan said they discussed with staff that they would be add a limestone or brick step down from the structure's floor onto High Street like many of the older structures have. He said they would be asking for permission for that as the right-of-way starts at the face of the building. Mr. Morgan said they proposed more windows to gain more natural light into the space. Mr. Alexander said that exposure, when one is driving north on High Street is so important because the adjacent building at the south is set back and not only does the applicant have the front to deal with but also the exposure on that side.

Mr. Rinaldi added the fireplace chimney comment was appropriate because unless there is some evidence there was a fireplace in that location it would not be appropriate. He said the proposed design presented the inclusion of a chimney on the exterior. Mr. Alexander said that does not preclude the applicant from having a fireplace on inside. He said the issues is how it is exposed on the outside. He said functionally, there are other ways that can be handled. Ms. Stenberg agreed. She said for 32 S. High Street she would prefer to keep the single pane window as it was as the grocery store. Mr. Rinaldi added, for the proposed use, it would be appropriate as well.

Mr. Rinaldi stated he did not want to minimize the importance of the stone wall that runs right down the property line between the two properties. He said he understands something has to be done to create the parking lot. He asked if the applicant intended to maintain the eastern portion of the wall and relocate it to the north to create an L-shape. Mr. Morgan answered they are engaged with their civil engineers over the stormwater to make the grading work with the parking lot, which includes an accessible ramp up the south side of the lot. He indicated they might have to raise the grade of the parking lot a foot back toward Blacksmith Lane. He said they propose to repurpose a portion of the stacked stone wall to help camouflage the grade elevation. Mr. Rinaldi stated the ARB would like to see the stone wall addressed in a sensitive way, and retained as much as possible. He understands to make the plan work, at least a portion of the wall needs to be moved.

Ms. Stenberg indicated she would like to see the plan that describing the means and methods to repurpose the originals stones.

Mr. Rinaldi emphasized the applicant needs to more clearly distinguish the old from the new on 30 S. High. Mr. Alexander said the addition on the south building is fine and he likes the historic detail with the railing system distinguishing the new from the old.

Mr. Alexander expressed concerns with the raised dormer in the center of the north building. He said by trying to mimic the original, it appears suspect. He said it is an important artifact to the building and didn't agree with duplicating it. He suggested a design solution that is complementary but trying to be exactly like it in the dormer area. He said he would be more comfortable with a different approach. Mr. Rinaldi agreed.

Mr. Rinaldi said the side door works pretty well with the covered entrance provided.

Mr. Keeler said he would be very interested in preserving the exterior finishes. He indicated it is hard to tell from the drawings what is being proposed on the south wall of 32 S. High Street. Mr. Morgan said the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* are pretty specific on what the material needs to be. He said board and batten will be used on the south side of 32 S. High Street.

Mr. Keeler asked if the applicant will be reusing as much material as possible. Mr. Morgan answered affirmatively, if it is possible. He explained the board and batten extends to the bottom and six to eight inches of it is below grade where soil and mulch have been stacked up against causing it to splinter. He said they want to upgrade the skin to keep the weather and rodents out.

Mr. Rinaldi asked the members if they have an issue with the reduced parking as 22 spaces are required and the applicant is proposing 12 spaces. Ms. Husak said 12 spaces can fit in the parking lot and there are two available on-street parking spaces.

Mr. Alexander requested the potential occupancy number anticipated. Mr. Morgan answered they are at ±25 for the restaurant and they plan on eight people for the office building. He said he anticipates these to be success businesses but does not anticipate flocks of people. Mr. Alexander indicated this is the first retail tenant he can recall wanting less parking than is required. He said if the neighbors are supportive, he would not be oppose it. Mr. Leonhard said this is a walkable area and that is what people want. Mr. Morgan said this will be more of a neighborhood café for local residents and business people to walk to. Mr. Rinaldi said there will be a lot of parking coming online with the parking garages. Ms. Husak said parking is calculated in the Code based on more sit down/lingering type of use. Mr. Morgan said their parking was calculated based on gross area to which Ms. Husak affirmed. Mr. Leonhard asked about a parking Waiver and Ms. Husak said it would be the Board's prerogative to allow that Waiver when this comes back for a formal review. Mr. Rinaldi said he thought the applicant provided a sufficient number of parking spaces and he is comfortable with the proposal.

The Chair asked the Board if they had any further comments. Ms. Husak asked the applicant if he received all the feedback he needed. Mr. Morgan answered affirmatively.

Mr. Rinaldi said he was excited to see this project move forward and for the structures to be saved. Ms. Stenberg said it is a great project.

Ms. Husak requested a break in order to restart the equipment for the next presentation. The Chair agreed to the break for staff and asked that the Board elect the Chair and Vice Chair while they waited for the technical difficulties to be resolved. This is recorded at the beginning of the minutes.

Ms. Husak suggested she continue on with the Communications portion of the meeting while the equipment was still being dealt with. Those comments can be found at the end of these minutes.

**2. BSD HC – Office Building
17-110ARB-MPR**

**113 S. High Street
Minor Project Review**

~~The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following proposal is a request for retention of an existing historic structure and construction of a new two-story, 3,300-square-foot office building and associated site improvements. He said the site is zoned Bridge Street District Historic South and is west of South High Street, approximately 100 feet south of the intersection with Pinneyhill Lane. He said this is a request for a review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.066 and 153.170, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.~~

~~Lori Burchett could not present anything on the screens as there were still technical difficulties that could not be resolved. Ms. Husak said the Planning Report contained the information Ms. Burchett would be~~

covering, and asked the Board to refer to that document. She said there were paper copies available if anyone from the public needed the information to review.

Ms. Burchett said the ARB had reviewed and approved the demolition of the existing detached building at the previous meeting with a condition that the project be approved before the removal of the accessory structure. She said this site contains a historic structure, which will be maintained and the proposed building located to the rear with a parking lot behind, which is accessed from Mill Lane. She added the applicant is requesting a Parking Plan to allow for 10 parking spaces where 11 are required, including three on-street parking spaces. She said the request is appropriate the low volume use proposed. She said should a new use replace this use in the future required parking would need to be met for that particular use.

Ms. Burchett reported the applicant has reduced the overall gross floor area from 4000 square feet to 3,300 square feet, while the footprint, itself, has increased approximately 100 square feet. She said the applicant has addressed the building mass by incorporating recesses and projections along multiple facades.

Ms. Burchett said the proposed open space would be required to be 85 square feet, however, after review with the applicants by the ART and Staff, it was recommended that the applicant pay a Fee-in-Lieu of the open space and maintain a landscaped area, which is more typical of the open spaces in between buildings. She added it would be appropriate to have the applicant pay that fee and it is an option within the Zoning Code given the relatively small amount that is required.

Ms. Burchett reported the applicant provided renderings that show the proposed building looking northeast and northwest. She described the architectural design as contemporary with a farmhouse cottage aesthetic. She said the character is most similar to simple, rectangular, commercial buildings as described in the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*. She added the building is proposed to be one and one-half stories with a gable roof line and dormers at the east and west elevations.

Ms. Burchett said the rhythm of the openings in the proposed building is consistent with that of nearby buildings and the cottage-commercial building.

Ms. Burchett continued with the proposed concepts. She said the materials include shiplap, cedar wood siding in dark gray and a split-faced concrete masonry base with horizontal wood accents. She noted that split-faced concrete masonry is not a permitted material; the ART recommends a condition that the applicant use an approved material. She said the applicant or their representative can describe how the materials are being utilized in this design in further detail. She concluded, in regards to scale and proportion, the building has a scale consistent with existing structures to the east and south, and the cross-gable design breaks the building into smaller masses with gable ends oriented in all four directions. She said the proposed building is a one and one-half story, cross-gable with the half story located within the roof structure. She added the existing historic building is 14 feet, 4 inches in height and the proposed building is 19 feet, 2 inches and is approximately 42 inches taller than the roof peak of the existing historic building. Hopefully, she said, this will give the Board a sense of the massing.

Ms. Burchett said the applicant is requesting four Waivers and they are as follows:

1. Roof Pitch - Required: >3:12; Requested: Pitch on the east building entry is 0.5:12.
2. Entrance and Pedestrianways - Required: principal entrances at pedestrian scale; Requested: northeast entrance and northwest entrance to not address South High Street and Mill Lane, respectively.

3. ~~Articulation of Stories on Street Façades – Required: Façades shall be designed to follow the stories of the building with fenestration organized along and occupying each floor. Requested: To allow for gabled portion of the west elevation to feature a large window, which spans the first and second stories.~~
4. ~~Street Façade Transparency – Required: 25%; Requested: to allow 10% on the west elevation.~~

Ms. Burchett reported the ART approved one Administrative Departure to allow for the non-street façade transparency to be 14 percent where 15 percent is required on the south elevation which faces Mill Lane.

Ms. Burchett stated the ART reviewed the Waivers against the applicable review criteria and found it to be consistent. She said Staff has reviewed the application against the Minor Project Review Criteria and found the applicable criteria has been met or met with a condition. She said Staff has reviewed this application against the Board Order Standards of Review and the applicable criteria had all been met as well as Alterations to Buildings, Structure, and Site and Additions to Existing Buildings, Structure, and Site.

Ms. Burchett said the ART is recommending approval of four Waivers and the Fee-In-Lieu of Open Space. She said the ART is also recommending approval of the Minor Project Review with a Parking Plan allowing for 10 parking spaces when 11 are required, along with the following four conditions:

- 1) That the applicant replaces the proposed split-face block on the lower portion of the proposed building with brick or stone;
- 2) That the applicant pay a Fee-in-Lieu of Open Space prior to the building permit approval;
- 3) That the applicant provides required bicycle parking on site; and
- 4) Should any archeological resources be identified during excavation, the applicant shall make a reasonable effort to record, protect, and preserve these resources.

Ms. Burchett pointed out there are three separate motions/votes as part of this review. She said the Waivers should be considered first, followed by the Fee-In-Lieu of Open Space, and then the Minor Project Review with the Parking Plan and four conditions.

Ms. Burchett reported during the ART, the applicant indicated bicycle parking is provided on site but they would continue to work with Staff to ensure it is in the best location, particularly with any removal of the Open Space.

Ms. Burchett said the applicant's representative is present to answer any questions. The Chair invited the applicant to add to the presentation.

Dan Morgan, Behal, Sampson, Dietz Architects, explained they have proposed two shed dormers at the height of 19.2 feet and at the main gable they are 16.10 feet. He reported they worked with the civil engineer to get it as low as possible.

David Rinaldi asked how this height compares to the outbuilding and the Gem Law building. Mr. Morgan said there is a substantial grade change. He said their building is higher and further back to the alley so these two buildings are not right next to each other.

Mr. Morgan noted, for the south perspective and the west perspective given that the building is right in the middle of their lot, they do not want the building to appear higher than it actually is.

Mr. Rinaldi asked about materials and confirmed that black stain was proposed.

Mr. Morgan indicated the goal was to mimic the texture and look of the existing barn structure located in the public park at the south end of High Street where there is. He said rather than letting the cedar siding fade naturally over time with streaks and striations, they thought it would be better to use this opaque stain to ensure the siding color met their goals.

Gary Alexander inquired about the glazing at the entry door. Mr. Morgan affirmed the door would have a frame. He added the larger panel to the left of the door will be glazed. Mr. Alexander said he really liked how the applicant took the window module and transitioned it. He said the façade will have nine feet of glass.

The Chair called for public comment.

Tom Holton, 5957 Roundstone Place, representing the Historical Society, commended the applicant as they have worked long and hard on this project to meet the requirements. He said they involved him many times for which they did not have to and he thanked them. He said he has never been real happy with that large glass window proposed on the west side because he did not think it looked right on a barn-style structure but he could not find a better solution per his limited ability. He reported the applicant also worked closely with the neighborhood association on Franklin Street. He said he was concerned about the reflection of the setting sun on the west side and wants to see the reflection minimized as much as possible because it could be a significant glare for the houses on Franklin Street. He suggested maybe adding a treatment on the glass and asked the Board to consider that.

The Chair called for the Board's discussion as the rest of the public had left. He applauded the applicant for listening to the Board, working so hard, and taking the extra effort to engage the community in these decisions.

Jeff Leonhard referred to the first condition - That the applicant replaces the proposed split-face block on the lower portion of the proposed building with brick or stone. Mr. Morgan said they are trying to push this building low into the grade and their finished floor is only about four inches above grade. He said they are considering a thin material so the minimum amount of foundation block material will be exposed above the planting beds. He said the chimney stone they are using, is a man-made product, and not meant to go to grade. He said they are considering ±eight inches of exposure to not bring too much attention to the foundation block, similar to other buildings built in the 50s and 60s. He added they will bring plantings up close to the building to help manage the moisture. Mr. Leonhard wanted to know if using brick or stone was feasible. Mr. Morgan said that would be an additional material to their palette.

Mr. Morgan said he wanted to speak to Mr. Holton's comment about the window on the west elevation because that was a large part of our conversations with our neighbors on Franklin Street. He indicated initially the window was much larger.

Mr. Rinaldi restated the building is recessed back from the building to the north and asked if he had any concerns about reflection or glare. Mr. Morgan answered he did not.

Mr. Rinaldi commented on the loss of the big tree. Mr. Morgan stated that tree has been maintained and there are signs that it is failing. He said there might be five years left or so. He said they are proposing to plant a fair amount of new trees and still working with staff to get that finalized.

The Chair called for a motion to approve the Waivers if the Board was supportive.

Mr. Morgan said he thought they put in their application that they wanted to put on a new roof on the existing building. Ms. Burchett said that would be considered a like-for-like substitution.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Alexander moved, Mr. Leonhard seconded, to approve the request for four Waivers:

1. ~~§153.062(D)(2)(b)(4) Building Types – Pitch Measure Required: A pitch greater than 3:12 on roofs of dormers, porches, balconies, or other minor roofs; Requested: Pitch of 5:12 for the east building entry.~~
2. ~~§153.062(F)(3)(a) Building Types – Entrances and Pedestrianways Required: All principal entrances are to be at a pedestrian scale, effectively address the street, and be given prominence on the façade through the use of architectural features; Requested: Northeast and northwest entrances do not address South High Street and Mill Lane, respectively.~~
3. ~~§153.062(G) Building Types – Articulation of Stories on Street Façades Required: Façades shall be designed to follow the stories of the building with fenestration organized along and occupying each floor. Story heights are set to limit areas of the façade without fenestration; Requested: To allow for the gabled portion of the west elevation to feature a large window which spans the first and second stories.~~
4. ~~§153.062(O)(9)(d)(1) Building Types – Street Façade Transparency Required: Minimum of 25% ground story, street facing transparency; Requested: 10% on the west elevation (Mill Lane).~~

The vote was as follows: Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Mr. Leonhard, yes; and Mr. Alexander, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Keeler moved, Ms. Stenberg seconded, to approve the request for a Fee-in-Lieu of Open Space. The vote was as follows: Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Leonhard, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; and Mr. Keeler, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Keeler moved, Mr. Leonhard seconded, to approve the request for a Parking Plan to allow 10 parking spaces where 11 would be required and the Minor Project Review with four conditions:

- 1) That the applicant replaces the proposed split-face block on the lower portion of the proposed building with brick or stone;
- 2) That the applicant pays a Fee-in-Lieu of Open Space, prior to building permit approval;
- 3) That the applicant provides required bicycle parking on site; and
- 4) That for any archeological resources identified during excavation, the applicant shall make a reasonable effort to record, protect, and preserve those resources.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Leonhard, yes; and Mr. Keeler, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

3. BSD HC – Daso Custom Cabinetry – Signs 18-022ARB-MSP

13 S. High Street Master Sign Plan

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following proposal is a request for the installation of two, eight-square-foot wall signs and one, six-square-foot projecting sign for an existing tenant space zoned Bridge Street District Historic Core. He said the site is west of South High Street, approximately 125 feet southwest of

the intersection with Bridge Street. He said this is a request for a review and approval of a Master Sign Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.066 and 153.170 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Ms. Burchett explained the Master Sign Plan process, which is designed to give some flexibility to sign regulations based on cohesive sign design. She said they are first reviewed by the Administrative Review Team (ART) with final approval by the ARB, when located in the district. Upon approval from the ARB, she said applicants can file for building, site, and/or sign permits. She stated that building permits are required for construction to begin.

Ms. Burchett presented an aerial view of the site and noted the existing tenant space located west of S. High Street in the Town Center development, which was originally developed as a Planned District. She said the PUD provided for consistent signs across the development. She reported in 2012, the site was rezoned to BSD-Historic Core and tenants are permitted signs based on the BSD Code.

Ms. Burchett presented the existing tenant space that has a primary entrance on S. High Street with a secondary entrance on the south elevation providing access to a public parking lot. She stated the sign allowances:

- Number of signs permitted:
 - Two building mounted sign of different types
 - One additional building mounted sign for tenant spaces with access to a public parking lot
- Wall signs permitted: 8 square feet in area at a height within the first story
- Projecting signs permitted: 8 square feet in area at a height of less than 15 feet with an 8-foot-clear area below the sign to the grade.
 - Must be located within 6 feet of the entrance, whereas 10 feet is being proposed.

Ms. Burchett presented the proposed signs that include two wall-mounted signs and one projecting sign made of a 1.5-inch thick High Density Urethane (HDU). She said the letters will be V-carved into the sign and the signs will consist of three colors – black for the background, gold for the lettering, and yellow for the border on the edge of routed corners. She said the wall signs are proposed at eight square feet in area and the projecting sign at six square feet in size.

Ms. Burchett presented a graphic representing the sign locations. She pointed out the wall-mounted sign on the east elevation (front) will be installed with the top of the sign at 14 feet, 4 inches. The wall-mounted sign on the south elevation (side) will be installed with the top of the sign at 12 feet, 5 inches and both wall-mounted signs will be centered above the entrances. She said the projecting sign is proposed to be extend three feet from the face of the building with the bottom of the projecting sign to be 10 feet, 5 inches above the sidewalk. The projecting sign is proposed to be approximately 10 horizontal feet from the main entrance of the building, which does not meet Code, but it was the previously approved location, which appears to be appropriate and the applicant would like to use the existing bracket.

Ms. Burchett reported staff and the ART reviewed this proposal against the BSD Sign Design Guidelines and determined the application has met the intent for the BSD Sign Design Guidelines established by Council in 2015 for the BSD and Historic Dublin. She added the applicant has worked to blend the previously approved PUD with the intent of the BSD to allow for wayfinding for pedestrian and vehicular traffic alike.

Lastly, Ms. Burchett said the MSP is requested to permit the projecting sign located on the east elevation (S. High Street) to be located greater than six feet from the entrance.

Ms. Burchett said the proposal has been reviewed against the Architectural Review Board Standards and approval is recommended to the ARB for the Master Sign Plan with no conditions.

The Chair asked the applicant if they wanted to add anything to the presentation.

Joe Tanoury, 8000 Walton Parkway, New Albany, Ohio, said staff has been great helping them navigate through the nuances of the Bridge Street District but there was previous zoning, which made this challenging. He said he was available for questions.

The Chair asked if there was anyone from the public that wanted to speak in regards to this case. [Hearing none.]

Mr. Rinaldi asked if this proposal could have been presented as a sign application with a Waiver for the six feet requirement but ten feet requested for the distance to the entrance. Ms. Burchett said the MSP is the only mechanism to request a deviation to happen.

The Chair asked for any other questions or comments from the Board. [There were none.]

Motion and Vote

Ms. Stenberg moved, Mr. Leonhard seconded, to approve the request for a Master Sign Plan with no conditions. The vote was as follows: Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Mr. Leonhard, yes; and Ms. Stenberg, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

4. PUD, Coffman Homestead – Sign 18-024ARB-AFDP

6659 Coffman Road Amended Final Development Plan

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following proposal is a request for the installation of a new projecting sign for the existing Historic Coffman Homestead site, which is west of Emerald Parkway, approximately 400 feet north of the intersection of Post Road. He said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission of an Amended Final Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.150 and 153.172, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

JM Rayburn said the applicant is Matt Earman, Director of Parks and Recreation for the City of Dublin, who wants to install a new sign to replace the existing sign for the existing Historic Coffman Homestead Site. He presented an aerial view of the site. He reported that staff went back and forth as to how to best lay out the procedure for review as it is a tricky one because this property is one of the 12 properties listed on Appendix G, which are properties of historic significance outside of the Historic District as well as being listed on the Ohio Historical Inventory. Per the Code, this property falls within the jurisdiction of the ARB. He said concurrently, Code requires site modifications, including signs for sites zoned PUD to be approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC). He stated the Code also requires the ARB to provide a recommendation to the PZC.

Mr. Rayburn presented the existing sign and site plan and said the existing sign is located within the right-of-way, and this is an opportunity to move it out of the right-of-way with the replacement sign. He reported that when the text and Code were reviewed, they realized the regulations call for the sign to be moved within eight feet from the right-of-way, which would be 15 feet west of where the sign is located today. It was determined that to be in compliance with the Code, it would impede on wayfinding and would not be a good location to mark where the homestead was actually located. He said that even though the new sign would not be in compliance it would be most appropriate to have it located in the open lawn area of the Homestead, just west of where it is located today, which he pointed out on the screen for context.

Mr. Rayburn presented the proposed projecting sign and described it as a 7.5-square-foot sign as a carved, high density urethane (HDU) sign with two colors, which meets the material and color requirements in the Code. He said the background is a Sherwin Williams color of brown and the letters and border that will be recessed are a Sherwin Williams color of tan. The text was presented as "DUBLIN HISTORICAL SOCIETY" in small letters under the curved top portion of the sign with text "The Coffman Homestead" in large letters in the square center of the sign and the text "Est. 1867" will be placed in the bottom curve of the sign. He said the sign will be hung from a cedar post at eight feet in height, with the top of the sign approximately seven feet from grade. Additionally, he said, the Code requires the base of ground signs to be landscaped at least three feet beyond all faces of the sign or supporting structures so the applicant will be required to submit a landscape plan with the sign permit.

Mr. Rayburn said the proposal was reviewed against the Architectural Review Board Standards and was found to meet those criteria with condition as well as Alterations to Buildings, Structures, and Sites. Therefore, he said, approval is recommended to the Planning and Zoning Commission to allow the sign on the right-of-way line with the following condition:

- 1) That the applicant include a landscape plan for the sign as part of sign permitting.

Mr. Rayburn stated Mr. Earman, the applicant, was present to take any questions the Board may have.

The Chair asked the applicant if he had anything to add to the presentation and he responded he did not. The Chair then asked if there was anyone from the public that wanted to speak in regard to this application. [Hearing none.] He opened the discussion up to the Board but they had no concerns or questions.

David Rinaldi stated he thought this proposal was a good solution.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Alexander moved, Mr. Leonhard seconded, to recommend approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a requested Amended Final Development Plan to allow the sign on the right-of-way line with one condition:

- 1) That the applicant include a landscape plan for the sign as part of the sign permit.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Stenberg, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Leonhard, yes; and Mr. Alexander, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

Claudia Husak said this application will be forwarded to the Planning and Zoning Commission with the ARB's recommendation of approval for their meeting on May 17, 2018.

5. BSD HS – Midwest Gas - Sign 18-025ARB-MSP

58 S. High Street Master Sign Plan

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following proposal is a request for the installation of a three-square-foot sign for an existing tenant space zoned Bridge Street District Historic South. He said the site is east of South High Street, approximately 50 feet northeast of the intersection of Eberly Hill Lane. He said this is a request for a review and approval for a Master Sign Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.066 and 153.170, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Richard Hansen restated this is for a three-square-foot sign for an existing tenant space, located within a required setback zoned Bridge Street District Historic South.

Mr. Hansen stated the process for Master Sign Plans. He said a MSP allows for flexibility in sign regulations based on a cohesive overall sign design. He said these plans are reviewed by the Administrative Review Team (ART) who then gives the ARB a recommendation; the ARB reviews the plans for final approval. Upon approval, he said applicants can file for a permit, which is required to begin the construction process.

Mr. Hansen presented an aerial view of the site and photographs of the existing site conditions. He reported this sign was originally approved by the ARB in 1995 against staff suggestion. He pointed out that the sign is located in the right-of-way. He stated that after a review by the Law Director's Office when this application has come through again, it was determined that the existing sign is non-conforming and therefore, any modifications or expansions would need to meet the Code provisions we have in place at this time. He said staff has conditioned that the sign be moved to the east side of the sidewalk and out of the public right-of-way.

Mr. Hansen reported there is currently no set of requirements for MSPs so staff reviewed this proposal against the BSD Code for the Historic South District. He presented the BSD Historic South ground sign allowances as follows:

- Maximum size of 8 square feet;
- Maximum height of 6 feet; and
- Minimum setback of 8 feet from the street right-of-way or any property line

Mr. Hansen noted the size of the proposed sign meets Code but ART recommended a condition that the applicant confirm the height of the sign does not exceed six feet in height and that the sign be moved three feet from the edge of the public right-of-way. He reminded the Board the MSP is necessary to allow for the deviation in location in this instance.

Mr. Hansen presented the proposed sign. He pointed out the proposed sign is meant to match the existing sign in all elements of design and materials. He noted the photo of the sign has a blue tint to it but the existing sign is black and white, which are permitted colors. He said the proposed material for the sign is a Medium Density Overlay Plywood (MDO), which is not a permitted material. He said Staff has conditioned the applicant use a permitted wood material for the sign background and lettering, which are as follows: High Density Urethane (HDU), cedar, redwood, treated lumber, or equivalent material.

During the ART review, Mr. Hansen said the applicant stated the MDO material was of an equivalent standard to the recommended materials; would match the design of the existing panel; and would have less warping and maintenance over time. He had added that the existing sign consists of MDO and has lasted over 10 years. While the ART agreed it would be good to match the existing sign, he said they decided the final determination on materials should be made by the ARB.

Mr. Hansen reported the ART has determined the proposed sign has met the intent of the BSD Sign Design Guidelines as it enhances the pedestrian experience.

Mr. Hansen said in review of the intent of a MSP as defined in the Code, the applicant has requested a greater degree in flexibility and the ART was supportive and is recommending approval to the ARB.

Mr. Hansen said the application has been reviewed against the Architectural Review Board Standards and the Alterations to Buildings, Structure, and Site and found to have met the criteria or met the criteria with a condition. Therefore, he said the ART is recommending approval to the ARB with three conditions:

- 1) That the applicant relocate the sign to approximately three feet to the east side of the sidewalk to ensure the sign post, arm, and panels do not extend into the sidewalk;

- 2) That the applicant use a permitted wood material for the sign background and lettering (HDU, cedar, redwood, treated lumber, or equivalent material); and
- 3) That the applicant verify the height of the sign so it does not exceed the six-foot height requirement.

Mr. Hansen concluded his presentation and said the applicant's representative is present to answer any questions the Board may have.

The Chair invited the applicant to add to the presentation.

Steve Moore, Moore Signs, Westerville, Ohio, said he has been there for 18 years and in custom sign work for 28 years. He said he has been before the City representing several clients with signs and was before ARB for the existing sign for Tickets Galore, which he believed was in 2007. He indicated he understood signs are not permitted in the right-of-way, which seems to be the same all over the state of Ohio. He said they agreed with the sign relocation to the proposed location, but he would like to ask the ARB the same question he asked of the ART regarding the material. He said MDO is Medium Density Overlay, which is a treated plywood, and he asked what the aversion was to the use of MDO for a sign panel in the Historic District. He reported the ART had stated the material list in the Code was made several years ago and there is a possibility that the list may be reviewed shortly. He presented sample materials and asked the Board if they could distinguish between the HDU and plywood.

Mr. Moore said the issue with HDU in this panel situation is that it is susceptible to breaking with sway, warping when not supported by a post or a stringer behind it, which he believes is better than redwood or cedar. He said he believes HDU is unstable for this kind of application. He stated plywood is a more stable material at this thickness. He indicated he would not use redwood or cedar for any hanging projecting sign. He reported he has made a couple of sandblast signs in the Historic District over the years and the smaller size was stable but they still prefer to use plywood. He said that would match the existing sign, which is one of the issues that the owner of the building and the tenant Ticket Galore wants achieved for material, design, shape, and size. He said he will ensure the sign height does not exceed six feet when it is moved to the new location.

The Chair asked if there was anyone from the public that wanted to speak in regards to this case. [Hearing none.] He turned the discussion over to the Board.

Jeff Leonhard said the proposed sign should match the existing sign and using two different materials would not achieve that. He said it is unfortunate for the applicant that they cannot just hang another sign but now have to uproot that sign and move it across the sidewalk and possibly replace two signs if the Board does not approve that material.

Gary Alexander said, with respect to the applicant's experience, he has heard similar reservations to the use of plywood in applications like that as it can swell from moisture but will return to its shape. In terms of stability, he said, his experience is different with redwood signs because he is in a historic building and they have had a very elaborate, sandblasted redwood sign for 25 years and it has been fine. He said his experience is a different and would defer to the standards.

Mr. Leonhard said the existing sign is MDO and has not had any damage. He is supportive of the proposed material.

Mr. Moore said MDO plywood is a marine-grade plywood and it does not swell when it gets wet. He said it is true that it will delaminate over years of time if it is not taken care of and any material that is not taken care of will degrade. He suggested the Board's experience with plywood was probably not a MDO plywood. He said the sign is treated with a significantly higher grade of paint. He indicated the paint is

not available at Home Depot, Lowe's, or Sherwin Williams. He said the sign is pre-primed, primed again and the edges are sealed and painted twice. He said the sign that is there for the other tenant has been there since 2007 (10 years) and there are no issues. He said the MDO performance is proven. He said he agreed that redwood signs, if they are the right thickness, and treated correctly, then they stay in a stable condition.

Mr. Rinaldi asked if there were any cost implications between the two. Mr. Moore answered it is triple the cost for HDU and cedar and much more for redwood.

Mr. Keeler inquired about the life expectancy of the sign that is there now. Mr. Moore answered four or five more years. He said when that sign starts to look bad, he is sure the owner would recognize that and have it redone. He said he has looked at it and it is weatherworn after 10 years but still in pretty good shape.

With the MSP, Ms. Stenberg asked if the Board allows the MDO product in this instance, when/if the applicant comes back to replace the existing sign, will that need to go through the same process. Ms. Husak said if the applicant changes the material and they wanted to change the Tickets Galore sign, they would have to return to the ARB because it is not a permitted material.

Mr. Rinaldi said he is hearing only the sign material is the issue. Ms. Stenberg affirmed she is fine with conditions 1 and 3 but for 2, she would like to keep with the permitted materials that are currently listed in the Code.

Mr. Leonhard clarified the applicant would then have to replace the Tickets Galore sign to which Mr. Rinaldi answered affirmatively.

Mr. Rinaldi restated he would defer to what materials are already in the Code, as he is not a sign expert.

Mr. Leonhard noted that in Condition 2, it states "treated lumber" and asked why the MDO would not be considered treated lumber. Ms. Burchett answered treated lumber is a solid wood product and this is a pressed material.

Mr. Leonhard asked how often the Code gets updated. He indicated quality plywood is used elsewhere and it is silly to spend time debating an additional sign with the same sign and different letters on the front. He said if they look different after the applicant creates this new sign using HDU, it would be unfortunate if there were two signs that were different that were supposed to look the same. Mr. Rinaldi responded the applicant made the case they do look the same with the sample materials he brought in.

Mr. Moore said he cannot make that sign out of HDU and hang it under the other one without making them look different. Mr. Alexander asked what the difference in width would be. Mr. Moore answered it would have to be 1.5 inches thick or it will come apart with the swinging action.

Mr. Leonhard asked for confirmation that the HDU was much lighter than the MDO. Mr. Moore emphasized it is lighter but the action is going to snap it apart at that thickness. Mr. Alexander asked for the thickness of the current sign. Mr. Moore answered 3/4-inch thick. Mr. Alexander said he is sensitive to the thickness issue because it will be noticeable when one passes by.

Mr. Moore indicated another issue is the fasteners and the hardware that goes between the two signs when trying to transition from one thickness to another. He said he does not even know how he would accomplish that without making some kind of custom hardware.

Mr. Rinaldi said he would consider eliminating Condition 2 and accepting the MDO material. Mr. Alexander said he could support that as long as the Board is not giving carte blanche for other signs. Ms. Stenberg

added if that is the only way to keep it exactly the same thickness and exactly the same look, she would support it.

Ms. Husak suggested eliminating this condition with the motion.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Leonhard moved, Mr. Rinaldi seconded, to approve the request for a Master Sign Plan with the following amended two conditions:

- 1) That the applicant relocate the sign to approximately three feet to the east side of the sidewalk to ensure the sign post, arm and panels do not extend into the sidewalk; and
- 2) That the applicant verify the height of the sign does not exceed six feet.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Stenberg, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Mr. Leonhard, yes; and Mr. Rinaldi, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

Communications

Claudia Husak indicated staff is looking for a date for a Joint Work Session with the PZC to review the Bridge Street Code process changes will be considered. She asked if May 9 or May 22 would be a possibility for this Board. The Board agreed May 9 was their preference.

Ms. Husak said Communications team has requested a photograph of the full Board and newly elected officers to update the website and she asked them to stay for a picture at the end of the meeting.

Ms. Husak said Planning and IT have been working together on ensuring the iPads are all up-to-date. She said the older ones will be collected and replaced with newer technology in the next month or so. She said the City will push all the applications to the devices that the Board will need and no additional iTunes accounts will be needed. She said the hope is this be more manageable.

Ms. Husak said she inadvertently forgot to mention Sierra Saumenig, Planning's graduate student serving as a Planning Assistant. She said she is graduating this month with her graduate's degree and we are all proud and happy for her. She reported she has been with Planning for a year and has completed a tremendous amount of work and a lot of what funneled through the ARB were brought in part by her.

With no further communications to share, the Chair adjourned the meeting at 8:57 pm.

As approved by the Architectural Review Board on _____, 2017.