

Parcel 273-000071 **Address** 26-28 N High St **OHI** N/A

Year Built: 1960	Map No: 116	Photo No: 1753-1756 (7/10/16)
Theme: Commercial	Historic Use: Commercial	Present Use: Commercial
Style: Colonial Revival	Foundation: Concrete block	Wall Type: Concrete block
Roof Type: Front gable/asphalt shingle	Exterior Wall: Brick/concrete block	Symmetry: Yes
Stories: 1	Front Bays: 3	Side Bays: -
Porch: None	Chimney: None visible	Windows: 1-over-1 Replacements

Description: The one-story concrete block building has a rectilinear footprint and a front-gable roof. The façade is clad in brick and divided into three fenestration bays. The center bay has a wood paneled door with a pilaster surround, topped by an entablature molding. Above the door is a fixed oculus window. The outer two bays have one-over-one windows flanked by fixed shutters. This window type is repeated on the north elevation. The building is connected by a rear hyphen to its neighbor, 26 N High. A concrete block garage faces to the alley east of the building.

Setting: The building is located on the southeast corner of N High St and Wing Hill Ln in the old village center of Dublin.

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. The property is also recommended 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:** Recommended contributing
National Register: Recommended Dublin High Street Historic District, boundary increase **Property Name:** N/A



26-28 N High St, looking southeast



26-28 N High St, looking northeast



BOARD DISCUSSION

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, July 21, 2021 | 6:30 pm

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

**2. Fairy Garden at 28 N. High Street
21-100INF**

Informal Review

Proposal: Site modifications for an open space associated with an existing commercial building on a 0.15-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic Core.

Location: East of N. High Street, ±175 feet north of the intersection with Bridge Street.

Request: Informal review with non-binding feedback under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.176 and the *Historic Design Guidelines*.

Applicant: Enas Lanham, Dublin Toy Emporium

Planning Contact: Nichole M. Martin, AICP, Senior Planner

Contact Information: 614.410.4635, nmartin@dublin.oh.us

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/21-100

RESULT: The Board reviewed and provided informal feedback on a proposal for site modifications and landscaping. Members were supportive of activating the open space. The proposed landscaping and art features were generally supported, although the Board was not supportive of the proposed artificial ivy wall. Members recommended that the applicant paint a mural instead of installing artificial ivy. Board members were supportive of the proposed seating and concrete walkway. Members suggested that any fencing be dull or rounded.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Gary Alexander	Yes
Amy Kramb	Yes
Sean Cotter	Yes
Martha Cooper	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:

3A45F751698D466...

Chase J. Ridge, Planner II, AICP Candidate



~~Ms. Kramb said her preference is no shutters because one would not put shutters on some windows and not the others, on a house.~~

~~Mr. Cotter said the dark shutters would aid the contrast.~~

~~Ms. Cooper said she has no specific objections to the shutters.~~

~~Mr. Alexander said he was okay with the shutters, reluctantly. The Board has approved designs on the newer houses proposing some shutters while not requiring all the windows to have shutters. He does not like that practice but in this instance, it helps break up the wall and the applicant is at a disadvantage of not building a new house. Visually, there is some value to that shutter being added to the center of the facade. As noted in the staff report, the guidelines are that the shutters have to appear as they are able to cover the window.~~

~~Ms. Kramb said she has no objection to the proposed paint colors.~~

~~Mr. Cotter said he could not distinguish between the beige and the white colors, online.~~

~~Ms. Pfeffenberger said it was a very light contrast, she did not want three different paint colors to be apparent on the structure.~~

~~Mr. Cotter clarified there is the fourth color with the dark stained shutters and doors.~~

~~Mr. Alexander requested actual paint chips, to which the applicant provided.~~

Summary of the Board's Comments

~~The Chair stated the Board is supportive of the changes to the front entry.~~

~~There is some desire to see the doors moved forward.~~

~~All members are comfortable with the board and batten and the paint colors.~~

~~There is some disagreement on the shutters but the applicant may have enough support for that plan to be accepted.~~

Public Comment

~~There were no public comments received.~~

2. Fairy Garden at 28 N. High Street, 21-100INF, Informal Review

The Chair said this is a request for site modifications for an open space associated with an existing commercial building on a 0.15-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic Core. The site is east of N. High Street, ±175 feet north of the intersection with Bridge Street. Mr. Ridge will be our presenter on the behalf of Ms. Martin.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Ridge presented an aerial view of the overall site, as well as a zoomed-in view of the layout and the existing conditions. The zoomed-in aerial provided context to the focus area of this application - located between the primary structure on 28 N. High Street and bound by the neighboring structure on 24 N. High Street. There was a photograph of the vacant open space that is ±275 square feet in size, surrounded by concrete walls of the buildings on three sides [shown] with a gravel surface. Unlike residential landscaping in the Historic District, commercial landscaping is regulated by the standard landscape Code.

The proposed character [shown] includes: a three-foot tall, wrought-iron fence on either side of a concrete paver path; a wrought-iron tree bench; artificial ivy privacy screens along the concrete walls; and outdoor LED string lights; all with the focus on showcasing fairy houses intermingled with stumps, river rocks, and artificial succulents, etc. The standard Code prohibits artificial plants. Detail of specific materials proposed for the area [shown.]

Staff identified the following questions for discussion amongst the Board:

1. Does the Board support activating open space in Historic Dublin?
2. Is the Board supportive of the proposed landscape modifications?
3. Is the Board supportive of the proposed design details including plant, fence, and accent materials?
4. Are there other considerations by the Board?

Board Questions for Staff

Mr. Cotter asked if this proposed garden area was counted towards the overall covered area calculation for this site.

Mr. Ridge answered not currently but any impervious material added like a concrete walk, would need to be included in the lot coverage limit of 85%. These calculations would be provided with the formal review.

Mr. Alexander asked if staff had a sense that if this garden were added, if it would exceed the 85% lot coverage allowable.

Mr. Ridge answered based on aerial photography alone, at this point, the site could already be over the 85% limit on lot coverage. With a formal application, a Waiver would need to be considered.

Applicant Presentation

Enas Lanham, owner of Dublin Toy Emporium, said a Fairy Garden is something she wanted to do since acquiring the space. She explained the business is on the Fairy Trail and they get a lot of people from all over that will follow the Fairy Trail and thought this would be a nice additional attraction and a way to engage the community. Money is a factor so her choices have been driven to be aesthetically pleasing while fitting within a limited budget. She is a new business (open three years) but would like to create something special for the community. Another concern is that she is not a gardener and keeping the attraction fresh with natural plants could be problematic for her. She is hoping that some of the unique products she considered to provide seating will still be available, if this application is approved.

Board Questions for the Applicant

Mr. Cotter indicated he was trying to picture how this area would be used both during the day and perhaps after dinner on a Friday - if people would go in to the garden to sit and possibly enjoy a beverage.

Ms. Lanham answered she thought they would. In addition, inside the store there is a giant fairy door and little fairy items that the kids pretend play with. She indicated the parents would sit while their children enjoyed the Fairy Garden – seeing this as being interactive. The hope is that people will not be reluctant to enter the garden with a closed gate. Being visible right on High Street does not raise concerns with vandalism.

Ms. Kramb asked if the applicant owns the southern wall.

Ms. Lanham answered she owns all of the space.

Mr. Alexander asked if the applicant considered having a door from her building that would open up directly to this Fairy Garden.

Ms. Lanham answered she is keeping the project minimal at this point. There is a window, however.

Board Discussion

Ms. Cooper asked if murals would be allowed.

Ms. Lanham explained she considered a mural at the conception but found working with an artist was expensive and time consuming.

Ms. Kramb said a mural would be the applicant's best option and encouraged her to contact the Dublin Arts Council, who could put her in touch with artists who might give their time for free or a significantly reduced

rate. There are also wonderful artists in the Dublin schools. Ms. Kramb was not in favor of the artificial privacy screens but would be extremely supportive of a mural.

Ms. Lanham said they spent a lot of time trying to find someone to paint a mural and had also explored enlisting volunteers.

Ms. Cooper recommended exploring the mural option with the Dublin Arts Council. School students and art teachers do shows in conjunction with the Arts Council. A mural would not look odd during winter as opposed to using artificial plants. In addition, 614 Artists that generally work in Columbus were suggested as an option. Given the opportunity to paint a mural that will last years for someone early in their career would be immense and suggested contacting the Columbus School of Art & Design. This vision could also be considered for a class project.

All members thought this was a splendid use for an open space of this type but are not supportive of artificial plants.

Ms. Lanham asked for clarification.

Ms. Kramb said if artificial material was incorporated into displaying fairy houses they could work but large artificial plants would not be supported.

Members were supportive of the gravel, rocks, or mulch integrated into the displays.

Mr. Alexander encouraged the applicant to look at fences that do not have sharp points where possibly someone could get injured. He would also be supportive of a natural landscape, but that was not discussed.

Ms. Cooper understood the applicant's hesitancy toward natural plants and encouraged the applicant to explore gardening opportunities through local gardening groups. They could suggest specific plants that would survive better than others in this area with limited light exposure. Consider other vining/climbing plants appropriate for walls or trellises and perhaps those that may flower in the spring or summer.

Ms. Lanham said she was reluctant to have others care for live plants as they may not be as attentive as she would hope.

Mr. Ridge asked the Board if this concept would move forward in a formal capacity and lot coverage is exceeded, would they be supportive of a Waiver to that requirement.

Ms. Kramb answered she was supportive of this concept for this space; otherwise, it would remain vacant and Ms. Cooper agreed.

Mr. Ridge asked the Board what they thought of the concrete path.

Mr. Alexander and Mr. Cotter both answered they were in favor.

The Chair confirmed the Board would support a Waiver for the addition of an impervious path.

Summary of the Board's Comments

The Chair stated all members are supportive of the concept plan.

All members have concerns about using artificial ivy.

The biggest reservation of the Board is what will be placed on the walls.

NEW CASES

~~3. Berkshire Hathaway Sign at 122 S. High Street, 21-000MSP, Master Sign Plan~~

~~The Chair said this application is a request for the installation of a multi-tenant ground sign for an existing tenant space on a 0.11-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic South. The site is northwest of the intersection of S. High Street with John Wright Lane. Mr. Hounshell will present this case.~~



BOARD ORDER

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, November 28, 2018 | 6:30 pm

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

**3. BSD HC – Dublin Toy Emporium, Sign
18-067ARB-MPR**

**28 N. High Street
Minor Project Review**

Proposal: An approximately 4.5-square-foot projecting sign for an existing tenant space on a 0.15-acre site zoned Bridge Street District Historic Core.

Location: East of North High Street, approximately 200 feet north of the intersection with West Bridge Street.

Request: Review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.066, 154.170, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Planning Contact: Nichole M. Martin, AICP, Planner I

Contact Information: 614.410.4635, nmartin@dublin.oh.us

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/18-067

MOTION: Mr. Keeler moved, Ms. Stenberg seconded, to approve the Minor Project Review with five conditions:

- 1) That the applicant use a permitted wood material for the sign background (HDU, cedar, redwood, treated lumber, or equivalent material);
- 2) That the sign shall be replaced with a sign in compliance with all Code requirements, including material, within one year;
- 3) That the applicant demonstrate eight feet of clear area is provided beneath the sign to be verified by the Building Standards Division at sign permitting;
- 4) That the sign mounting hardware be painted to match the color of the hanging bracket; and
- 5) That the applicant replace the sign with a sign constructed of a permitted material should the sign deteriorate.


VOTE: 4 – 0

RESULT: The request for a Minor Project Review was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

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

STAFF CERTIFICATION



Nichole M. Martin, AICP, Planner I

Mr. Alexander said he had a concern with the number of cars coming for an event and maneuvering the turns. Ms. Martin explained the drive-aisle is meant to be more specifically used by the accessible parking located at the rear of the building. She said anyone using a wheelchair or walker would enter that way as that is where the building elevator is located. She said that drive-aisle would only be used during events if there are tents that are blocking the access. She said there is really just one way in and one way out.

Mr. Rinaldi said he resides about a half-mile north of that property so he cautioned the applicant about the minimal amount of top soil with clay right underneath it. He said the event space is a great idea and this plan has been done well.

**3. BSD HC – Dublin Toy Emporium, Sign
18-067ARB-MPR**

**28 N. High Street
Minor Project Review**

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said this application is a proposal for an approximately 4.5-square-foot projecting sign for an existing tenant space zoned Bridge Street District Historic Core.

Nichole Martin said the tenant space is located on the east side of North High Street, approximately 200 feet north of the intersection with Wing Hill. She said it is a single-story, brick building with a gabled roof, symmetrical design with windows on either sides of the main entry and raised-panel shutters.

Ms. Martin presented photographs of the existing conditions and noted the sign is already installed. She said approval of this application is intended to document the existing sign with a couple of conditions to ensure all of the Code provisions are met, as well as some final details are considered.

Ms. Martin presented a graphic of the sign plan. She said both the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* and the *Bridge Street District Sign Design Guidelines* provide guidance on creative sign designs. She reported Staff and the Administrative Review Team found this sign to be creative and compliment the use of the business.

Ms. Martin said approval is being recommended with three conditions:

- 1) That the material be HDU;
- 2) That the applicant provides a dimensioned drawing verifying an eight-foot clear distance beneath the sign, at the time of sign permitting; and
- 3) That the mounting hardware be cleaned up and painted to match the sign.

The Chair asked the applicant if she wanted to add to the presentation.

Enas Lanham, 6940 Ballantrae Loop, Dublin, Ohio, owner of Dublin Toy Emporium, said she has a concern with cost to re-do the sign or make modifications, being a new business owner and trying to make it the first year.

The Chair called for public comment on this application. [Hearing none.] He opened the meeting up to the Board for discussion.

Andrew Keeler said the sign drawing is 20 inches tall, the picture that has the scales of eight feet and nine feet show one foot difference between the bottom of the sign and the top of the sign. He said he knows the sign is eight feet from grade because he measured it but he did not measure the bottom of the sign to the top of the sign. He asked why the inconsistencies.

Ms. Martin said Staff has requested the applicant address that issue as the drawing submitted was not to scale.

Gary Alexander asked if the sign that exists is non-conforming to which Ms. Martin answered the sign is illegal.

Ms. Lanham explained when she moved into the tenant space, she received different information about what she should be doing as she followed the advice of the landlord and others only to find the sign was illegal.

David Rinaldi said the Board has reviewed applications where there were material issues. He indicated he is highly sympathetic to the applicant as generally it is a nice looking sign. He said the Board would be setting some sort of precedent if they were to say it is okay to have a sign that would not be approved if processed in the correct order just because the applicant was misinformed.

Mr. Rinaldi said the other conditions are simple such as adjusting the attachment colors and providing a detailed drawing when obtaining the sign permit. He asked what the other members felt about the sign material.

Shannon Stenberg said the way the Board has voted in the past for other sign applications, they have always been fairly stringent on the permitted materials and what they would allow. She said if the Board changed their vote for this application, she would only allow it for this specific instance. She indicated if the applicant had brought their application forward following the correct process, she would not have given any leeway to the non-permitted materials.

Mr. Rinaldi asked Ms. Stenberg if she would approve a sign in the scenario where the applicant put up a sign without a sign permit. Ms. Stenberg indicated she would hope that would never happen. Mr. Rinaldi emphasized that is the dilemma the Board is in.

Mr. Keeler said he sympathizes with the applicant but as the other members have stated, the Board has reviewed other case applications dealing with non-permitted materials. He said Dublin is a great place to work and live and it is because they have standards. He said it is unfortunate the applicant was misinformed, initially but the Board has to uphold the standards.

Ms. Lanham said she has been advised that a sign like the Board is requesting could be \$1,000 and that is a lot of money for a small business owner to put up when they are just trying to get off the ground.

Mr. Alexander recalled the Tickets Galore sign they reviewed. He said the Board allowed the sign to be built out of an alternative material. He said the Board was sympathetic to that applicant and thinks he voted to approve that sign so it would match the other on the same post. He said it would not be fair to this applicant to not support her application when he had agreed to approve another sign to be constructed out of an alternative material. He said there are questions about the quality of the non-permitted material and they are not to the standards of other signs in the community but that applicant was in a different situation. He said the Board could not require the existing sign on that post to change so visually it would look peculiar to have a new, much thicker sign of a permitted material. Because of that outcome, he said it is his opinion that the Board not require this applicant to change out her sign.

Mr. Rinaldi asked, from a City standpoint, if the Board approved this application, if it would be saying a person can be ignorant of the law and do something else whether the person just did not know the requirements or they just wanted to get away with something.

Jennifer Rauch said Staff and the Board considers each site individually so in the end, it is up to the Board. She recalled the Tickets Galore sign application where the goal was to match the signs and have consistency in the overall appearance. She said this could be argued both ways by stating the Board bent the rules before so they can bend the rules this time, too or there is the opportunity to make this sign, right, and adhere to the Code.

Mr. Rinaldi noted the conditions as written - the applicant is required to change the sign material to a permitted material.

Ms. Stenberg said she was struggling with that because the sign installed looks very nice and well designed, which the applicant incurred cost already.

Ms. Lanham said she would like the Board to consider giving her time, as a new business owner, to get on her feet and matching the other signs in the future would be something she would be open to.

Mr. Rinaldi asked if the number one condition can include "should this sign deteriorate in any way, that it has to be replaced with permitted materials". Ms. Rauch answered affirmatively. She also suggested the Board could allow the applicant a time frame to replace the sign.

The Chair asked the Board how they felt about making some sort of condition modification. He said he understands the struggles of a new business and he does not want to burden this applicant when residents/business owners may or may not notice if the sign has even been changed. He said more of the concern is the durability over the long haul.

Ms. Lanham said she would be willing to change out the sign if it deteriorated and incur the expense at that time. She said at the same time, she is hoping this sign will last at least a year to get herself going.

Mr. Keeler said he hopes the applicant's business outlasts the sign and he would lean towards supporting a longer time requirement of one or two years. He stated the sign looks pretty good at the moment and estimates it will take a little while before it deteriorates.

The Chair asked that the conditions be modified to state the sign needs to be replaced within 12 months. Ms. Lanham asked the Board if they would consider two years.

The Chair said this is already a reasonable compromise under the circumstances and the other condition is to remain as is. Condition revision options were briefly discussed. Ms. Martin made the revisions on screen for the Board's review. They are as follows:

- 1) That the applicant use a permitted wood material for the sign background (HDU, cedar, redwood, treated lumber, or equivalent material);
- 2) That the sign shall be replaced with a sign in compliance with all Code requirements, including material, within one year;
- 3) That the applicant demonstrate eight feet of clear area is provided beneath the sign to be verified by the Building Standards Division at sign permitting;
- 4) That the sign mounting hardware be painted to match the color of the hanging bracket; and
- 5) That the applicant replace the sign with a sign constructed of a permitted material should the sign deteriorate.

The Chair asked the Board if they agreed to the revised additions and if so, to make a motion to approve the Minor Project Review application with five conditions as written.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Keeler moved, Ms. Stenberg seconded, to approve the Minor Project Review with five conditions. The vote was as follows: Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; and Mr. Keeler, yes. (Approved 4 – 0)



RECORD OF DETERMINATION

Administrative Review Team

Thursday, October 11, 2018

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

3. BSD HC – Dublin Toy Emporium, Sign **28 N. High Street**
18-067ARB-MPR **Minor Project Review**

Proposal: An approximately 4.5-square-foot blade sign for an existing tenant space within Historic Dublin on a 0.15-acre site zoned Bridge Street District Historic Core.

Location: East of North High Street, ±200 feet north of the intersection with West Bridge Street.

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 & 153.170, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Applicant: Enas Lanham, Dublin Toy Emporium.

Planning Contact: Nichole M. Martin, Planner I.

Contact Information: 614.410.4635, nmartin@dublin.oh.us

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/18-067

REQUEST: Recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board for a Minor Project Review with three conditions:

- 1) That the applicant use a permitted wood material for the sign background (HDU, cedar, redwood, treated lumber, or equivalent material);
- 2) That the applicant demonstrate eight feet of clear area is provided beneath the sign to be verified by the Building Standards Division at sign permitting; and
- 3) That the sign mounting hardware is painted to match the color of the hanging bracket.

Determination: This application was forwarded to the Architectural Review Board with a recommendation of approval. This approval shall be valid for a period of two years from the date of approval in accordance with Zoning Code Sections 153.065(H) and 153.066(G).

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Vince A. Papsidero, FAICP
Director of Planning





MEETING MINUTES

Administrative Review Team

Thursday, October 11, 2018 | 2:00 pm

ART Members and Designees: Vince Papsidero, Planning Director (Chair); Donna Goss, Director of Development; Colleen Gilger, Director of Economic Development; Ray Harpham, Interim Building Official, Aaron Stanford, Senior Civil Engineer; Mike Altomare, Fire Marshal; and Shawn Krawetzki, Landscape Architect.

Other Staff: Claudia Husak, Senior Planner; Nichole Martin, Planner I; Mike Kettler, Planning Technician; Hunter Rayfield, Planning Assistant; and Laurie Wright, Administrative Support II.

Applicants: James Peltier, EMH&T; Pete Scott, Meyers + Associates Architecture; and John Woods, MKSK (Cases 1 & 2).

Vince Papsidero called the meeting to order at 2:03 pm. He asked if there were any amendments to the September 20, 2018, meeting minutes. [There were none.] The minutes were approved as presented. He made note of the following Minor Modifications:

1. Bridge Park, Fado – Other modifications deemed appropriate by the Planning Director.
2. Bridge Park, Block H – Modifications to building material or color of equal or higher quality.
3. 250 W. Bridge – Modifications to the location and layout of parking lots.

RECOMMENDATIONS

**1. ~~BSD SRN – Bridge Park, Block F~~
~~18-060BPR~~**

**~~PID: 273-000867~~
~~Basic Plan Review~~**

~~Claudia Husak said this application is a proposal for the construction of a mixed-use development consisting of a hotel, a parking structure with a residential liner, and an additional building as part of the Bridge Park Development. She said the site is zoned Bridge Street District - Scioto River Neighborhood and is west of Dale Drive, southwest of the intersection with Bridge Park Avenue. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation for approval to City Council of a Basic Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.~~

~~Ms. Husak presented the Bridge Street District (BSD) process and said the final approval will be made by City Council as there is an Economic Development Agreement in place. She said this application will be reviewed at their meeting on October 22, 2018, where City Council will make a determination on the Basic Plan Review and the future required reviewing body.~~

~~Ms. Husak presented an aerial view of Blocks F & G and the layout of the labeled blocks to illustrate context within the Bridge Park Development. She noted that Block G is directly across from Block H and Blocks A, B, C, D, and H have all been approved while Blocks D & H are still under construction.~~

~~Ms. Husak presented the general layout proposed for the three buildings in Block F. She said the applicant has proposed building F1 to contain a hotel and a restaurant, F2 as a parking garage, F3, which is a liner for the parking garage for hotel/commercial use, and F4 that is intended for office space in the future. She indicated details for the hotel such as the number of rooms, footprint, and architecture will come later as~~



Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any other questions or concerns regarding this proposal. [Hearing none.] He called for a vote for the Basic Plan Review and the results were unanimous for a recommendation of approval to City Council with seven conditions.

**3. BSD HC – Dublin Toy Emporium, Sign
18-067ARB/MPR**

**28 N. High Street
Minor Project Review**

Nichole Martin said this application is a proposal for an approximately 4.5-square-foot blade sign for an existing tenant space within Historic Dublin on a 0.15-acre site zoned Bridge Street District Historic Core, east of North High Street, ±200 feet north of the intersection with West Bridge Street. 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 & 153.170, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Ms. Martin presented the process for a Minor Project Review. She noted the ART is making a recommendation today to the Architectural Review Board that will hear this application on October 24, 2018.

Ms. Martin presented an aerial view of the site for context. She explained that in general, the Code allows two signs of different types and one additional sign for buildings with access to a public parking lot located to the side or rear of the structure. She added the Code allows for a projecting sign within the Historic District to be a maximum of eight square feet in size on the first story of the structure with a minimum of eight feet of clear distance between grade and the bottom of the sign.

Ms. Martin presented a photograph of the building on North High Street, which has a small concrete entrance between the front door and the City's brick sidewalk in the front at the corner of Wing Hill. She presented the proposed sign that consists of three colors, approximately nine feet in height, and 4.48 square feet in size. She described the proposed sign as a panel that is a double-faced, 0.5-inch MDO (Medium Density Overlay) plywood. She said the graphic is printed on 3M ControlTac with a UV laminate coating and is subsequently affixed to the MDO, which is not a permitted material in the Code. She said the sign will need to be revised to incorporate an approved material of High Density Urethane (HDU), cedar, redwood, treated lumber, or equivalent materials, as required by Code.

Ms. Martin said the sign is affixed to an existing wrought iron bracket, which the applicant has indicated is mounted to allow for 8 feet of clear distance below the sign. She stated the applicant will need to submit verification to the Building Standards Division confirming the clear distance below the sign prior to the issuance of a sign permit. She said additionally, all mounting hardware should be painted to match the mounting bracket. She reported this sign is already installed.

Ms. Martin said this sign was reviewed against the BSD Sign Design Guidelines, Minor Project Review Criteria, Architectural Review Board Standards, and Alterations to Buildings, Structure, and Site. She stated three conditions of approval were identified for the requested recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board:

- 1) That the applicant use a permitted wood material for the sign background (HDU, cedar, redwood, treated lumber, or equivalent material);
- 2) That the applicant demonstrate eight feet of clear area is provided beneath the sign to be verified by the Building Standards Division at sign permitting; and
- 3) That the sign mounting hardware is painted to match the color of the hanging bracket.

Shawn Krawetzki inquired about the detailed sign dimension. Ms. Martin assured him the sign meets all applicable Code provisions.

Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any other questions or concerns regarding this proposal. [Hearing none.] He called for a vote for the Minor Project Review and all were in favor of a recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board with the stated three conditions.

INTRODUCTION

4. BSD C – McDonald’s Exterior Modifications & Signs 337 W. Bridge Street 18-036MPR/WR Minor Project Review/Waiver Review

Nichole Martin said this application is a proposal for exterior modifications and new sign installations for an existing drive-thru restaurant on a site zoned Bridge Street District – Commercial. The restaurant is south of W. Bridge Street, approximately 250 feet east of the intersection with Frantz Road. She said this is a request for a review and approval of a Minor Project Review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Waiver Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.

Ms. Martin presented the process for a Minor Project Review. She explained there is an additional review process for the requested Waiver and Master Sign Plan, which the ART will need to make a recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission as the Minor Project Review is not meeting Code. She said the intent of today’s discussion was to gather the ART’s feedback to relay to the applicant.

Ms. Martin presented the aerial view of the site for context and zoomed in closer to show the surrounding development. She explained there is a shared parking agreement for this standalone restaurant with the larger plaza. She said the circulation for this structure contains one drive-thru lane that works counter-clockwise.

Ms. Martin said the proposal consists of site improvements, architectural modifications to the building, and a comprehensive sign package. She presented a photograph of the existing conditions. She said the applicant is proposing to add a patio with outdoor seating and other site improvements will include the removal and replacement of paving materials for 11 parking spaces including two ADA marked spaces. She said they will also remove and replace the sidewalk and patio with like-for-like materials as these have deteriorated over time.

Ms. Martin presented a landscape plan and reported Michael Hiatt has been out to the site and found the proposed landscape plan to be appropriate.

Ms. Martin presented renderings of each of the four elevations and explained the building structure itself would not change and the architectural modifications will just affect the facade. She said the applicant has proposed a variety of materials: brick will be on the main building to match the existing brick, and E-wood to create two feature walls (black tile arcade) with the iconic golden “M”, aluminum trellis awnings and portions of the upper façade will contain fiber cement siding. She said this “look” is becoming a common part of McDonald’s concept.

Vince Papsidero inquired about the drive-thru accent material as shown and Ms. Martin answered she thought it was intended to be a darker brick than the rest of the building.

Aaron Stanford inquired about the transparency requirement. Ms. Martin noted the BSD Code does not address transparency with existing structures and the applicant will now be required to comply with the new standards as defined in the Code.