



BOARD ORDER

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, February 24, 2021 | 6:30 pm

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

3. Pearl Patio Canopy at 88 N. High Street 20-141ARB-MPR

Minor Project Review

Proposal: Installation of a louvered canopy structure over an existing restaurant patio space in the Bridge Park West Development, Building Z2 on a 0.34-acre site zoned Bridge Street District, Historic Transitional Neighborhood.

Location: East of N. High Street, ±100 feet southeast of the intersection with Rock Cress Parkway.

Request: Review and approval of a Minor Project under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.066 and 153.070 and the *Historic Design Guidelines*.

Applicant: Dublin West D, LLC

Representative: Carter Bean, Bean Architects

Planning Contact: J.M. Rayburn, Planner I

Contact Information: 614.410.4653, jrayburn@dublin.oh.us

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/20-141

MOTION: Mr. Kownacki moved, Mr. Cotter seconded, to approve the Minor Project with three conditions:

- 1) That the applicant work with staff to recess the outdoor heaters within housing with a finish matching the proposed structure, subject to staff approval, prior to submitting for building permits;
- 2) That the applicant work with staff to modify the photometric plan to comply with the Code requirement that the maximum lumens per square foot not exceed 9.7 and additionally, that the maximum lumens per square foot not exceed 1 lumen per square foot at the edge of the patio; and
- 3) That the applicant be prohibited from creating a 3-season enclosure of the patio canopy through use of vinyl, glass, or similar material.


VOTE: 5 – 0

RESULT: The Minor Project was conditionally approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Gary Alexander	Yes
Kathleen Bryan	Yes
Amy Kramb	Yes
Sean Cotter	Yes
Frank Kownacki	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned By

75C74AB22B6A420
 J.M. Rayburn, Planner I



3. Pearl Patio Canopy at 88 N. High Street, 20-141ARB-MPR, Minor Project Review

A request for the installation of a louvered canopy structure over an existing restaurant patio space in the Bridge Park West Development, Building Z2, on a 0.34-acre site zoned Bridge Street District, Historic Transitional Neighborhood. The site is east of N. High Street, 100 feet southeast of the intersection with Rock Cress Parkway.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Rayburn stated that the site, which is located east of N. High Street, 400 feet north of the intersection with North Street and adjacent to the West Plaza, is in close proximity to the Scioto River and the future Riverside Crossing Park. The tenant space is located in building Z2 of the Bridge Park West development and has frontage to the west along N. High Street. Building Z2 is a non-historic structure, designed to complement the vernacular style of architecture in the District through the use of materials, colors, and window details, as identified in the Historic Dublin Design Guidelines. The applicant is requesting review and approval of a Minor Project Review for external modifications for the patio space located on the east side of Building Z2. Modifications include the installation of a louvered canopy structure over an existing patio, as well as associated furniture and fixture details. The east elevation is proposed to have a patio canopy with a louvered system, 11 feet in height from the established grade of the patio to the top of the structure. The bottom of the trellis would align with the storefront transom framing on the Z2 Building. The existing storefront features a bronze finish. The frame and louvers of the patio canopy are pre-finished aluminum in a bronze color to complement the existing materials. Three outdoor ceiling fans would be placed on the bottom side of the canopy, also finished in an oil-rubbed bronze color. The existing patio space was programmed to serve as an outdoor lounge space with casual seating around fire pits. The applicant is proposing to convert the outdoor lounge space into a more typical outdoor dining configuration with the optional louvered canopy providing protection from the natural elements. The new outdoor configuration consists of eight square tabletops and one tabletop for the existing fire table, accommodating 32 patrons. The tabletops will have a plywood core with an exterior white Kashmir White Granite finish. The table bases are cast iron with a black finish and zinc coating. The dining chairs have a bronze antique finish. The applicant is also proposing outdoor heaters, but has not provided unit specifications. The applicant should work with staff to provide those details prior to applying for building permits. The applicant is providing lighting, as well, in the patio canopy, but as proposed, it exceeds what is permitted per Code. Given the significant public investment in the pedestrian bridge and other public spaces nearby, staff is concerned that the lighting as proposed will negatively compete with that infrastructure. Staff recommends that the applicant continue to work with staff to provide more appropriate lighting levels.

Staff has reviewed the application against all applicable criteria and recommends approval with two conditions.

Applicant Presentation

Carter Bean, Architect/Principal, J Carter Bean Architect, 4400 North High Street, Suite 401, Columbus, Ohio 43214, thanked the Board for their comments on the first case tonight, which if built, would have cast a shadow on this patio from midday on. The reason for their application is that the current lounge configuration is not conducive to this particular restaurant. Although there is a need for more outdoor dining space, an outdoor space without a covering is inadequate. In order to provide covering for their

customers without diminishing the view of the river view from the terrace, a louvered system was proposed. The louvers will remain open to the extent possible, being closed only in inclement weather. They will work with staff to identify an unobtrusive light solution. The photometric plan provided shows the maximum levels of the proposed fixtures, which would be controlled by dimmers, keeping the lighting low to create mood. The only time the lighting would be on the high setting would be for very short periods of time for cleaning. He is unsure what technical tests could be used to provide assurance of meeting Code requirements, but they have no objection to providing that assurance.

Board Questions

Ms. Kramb inquired if there was a height limit for patio roofs.

Mr. Rayburn responded that they had looked at comparable patios and structures and confirmed the height of this proposal is in alignment.

Ms. Martin clarified that it would not be, as proposed. If the canopy were detached, the height would be limited. Because it is considered an architectural feature of the structure, the Board has discretion.

Ms. Kownacki inquired if governors could be incorporated to limit the light level of the fixtures.

Ms. Martin responded that the recommended condition would require the applicant to work with staff to identify a resolution that would meet Code, either a governor or an alternate light bulb or distribution. As proposed, the light level exceeds Code.

Mr. Kownacki noted that while the current manager of the Pearl might be in agreement with a lighting limitation, a future manager might not be. What would be the enforcement mechanism?

Ms. Martin responded that most of their enforcement is reactive rather than proactive, and given the location, it would probably be brought to the City's attention. Light meters can be used to test it. The tenants and building owner have been very collaborative, so it is safe to assume that any issues would be addressed promptly.

Mr. Alexander stated that there are two types of exterior heaters, which are either ground level or mounted at a height on a ceiling or a structural element. Mounted heaters at the perimeter could completely change the look.

Mr. Cotter inquired if the lights were located on the beams or the fans.

Mr. Bean responded that the fixture on which they ultimately decided is a can light applied to the surface of a beam, which would keep the hotspot of the fixture from being seen at angles. There are two beam lines that run over the patio, which will hold twelve can lights, with fans mounted between.

Mr. Cotter noted that there should not be much scattering of light into the neighborhood.

Mr. Bean responded affirmatively.

Mr. Cotter inquired about the line over the windows.

Mr. Bean responded that it was located at the transom line of the windows on the building.

Public Comment

No public comments were received on the case.

Board Discussion

Ms. Kramb expressed concern that the height of the canopy was cutting off the top part of the window. These are not true transoms, but are light-divided. The width of the roof is actually wider than the

light division. It looks odd leaving part of the window exposed. Could they raise the canopy height to just above the window?

Mr. Bean responded that while they were trying to make the structure as transparent as possible, it will still diminish the amount of natural light entering the space. They attempted to leave some portion of the window unobstructed, allowing sight lines to the sky and the entrance of natural light.

Ms. Kramb noted that in a new build, a patio roof could not be placed three-quarters of the way up on a window, so her preference would be to place it above the window. Is there any intention to add enclosure or shades to the space? She would object to shades or use of a plastic enclosure to permit year-round use.

Wayne Schick, Senior VP of Restaurant Planning and Procurement, Cameron Mitchell Restaurants, 390 W. Nationwide Blvd., Columbus, Ohio 43215, responded that there was no intent to do so. They want to be very respectful of the amazing view and the amount of money invested to have that. Although the river patio was intended as a lounging area, their patrons want to use the patio for dining; so they have searched for and found this solution. The proposed system will not provide much weather protection, however. It will provide some sun and light rain/mist protection, heaters, and fans to move the air, all of which will add more comfort to the experience.

Ms. Kramb stated that her concern is that the current conditions do not adequately address potential actions of a future owner.

Ms. Martin responded that the Board could add a condition that would address their concerns. If a future owner wished to do otherwise, they would need to submit an application to a public body for consideration. This is the last time the ARB will review an application for this building, as it will no longer be within the Board's jurisdiction.

Ms. Kramb stated that she would like to add a condition that would prohibit the patio space being made into a three-season space. In addition, she would prefer the canopy height be raised.

Mr. Kownacki stated that in regard to the canopy height, initially, his reaction was the same. However, from inside the restaurant, diners will have more view, including that of the top of the bridge. He understands the reasoning for the proposed height.

Mr. Cotter stated that he also understands the reasoning for where the patio roof has been located. He would agree with a condition that would require an application to add shades or an enclosure to the patio.

Mr. Alexander expressed agreement for raising the canopy roof height. Where it is proposed, it is not respectful to the building.

Ms. Bryan stated that she agrees with the need for a condition regarding future "wrapping" of the patio. The Board has differing views regarding the roof height in relationship to the windows.

Mr. Schick stated that there is a practical reason for the proposed 11-foot height. The heaters will provide little warmth above that height. They know this from experience, as they previously have mounted them to the ceiling at 11.6 feet and at 12.6 feet. At any greater height than what they have proposed, the heaters will not provide sufficient heat for dining in fall and spring weather. That is one of the main reasons for the transom line in the design.

Ms. Kramb stated that she would object to heaters in the ceiling of the canopy.

Mr. Alexander indicated he also would object.

Ms. Kramb stated that she assumed they would be portable heaters.

Mr. Schick stated that the restaurant currently has ceiling-mounted heaters under the front entry canopy and under the north patio.

Mr. Alexander inquired where they would be mounted, relative to this particular system. Would they be tucked up sufficiently, so that their depth would match that of the beams, blocking view of the heaters?

Mr. Bean responded that the beam depth is only two inches. They would have to use deeper beams just inside the gutter on the east and west sides, so that the heaters can be recessed into the beams. They would not hang down from the ceiling. There is a beam and a gutter to capture the rain off the louvers. They would add another horizontal beam inside the gutter, which would be sufficiently deep to contain the housing of the heaters, which are approximately 5.6 inches deep.

Mr. Cotter inquired the type and color of the heaters.

Mr. Bean responded that they are electric heaters. The face and backing of the heating element is reflective.

Mr. Alexander requested that a condition be added to clarify that the heaters must be recessed into a housing with a finish that matches the rest of the patio structure. He understands the need for the heaters to function as needed, so he has no objection to the height.

The applicant indicated they had no objection to the proposed conditions.

Mr. Kownacki moved, Mr. Cotter seconded approval of the Minor Project with three conditions:

- 1) That the applicant work with staff to recess the outdoor heaters within housing with a finish matching the proposed structure, subject to staff approval, prior to submitting for building permits.
- 2) That the applicant work with staff to modify the photometric plan to comply with the Code requirement that the maximum lumens per square foot not exceed 9.7 and additionally, that the maximum lumens per square foot not exceed 1 lumen per square foot at the edge of the patio.
- 3) That the applicant be prohibited from creating a 3-season enclosure of the patio canopy through use of vinyl, glass, or similar material.

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

~~5. Historic District Guidelines, 18-037ARB-ADM, Administrative Request~~

~~A request for review and recommendation of approval to Planning and Zoning Commission of the revised Historic Design Guidelines for properties located within the Architectural Review District and its outlying historic properties.~~

~~Staff Presentation~~

~~Ms. Martin stated that the Architectural Review Board Code and the Historic Dublin area rezoning were approved by City Council on February 22, 2021. The Historic Design Guidelines would replace the existing guidelines, providing additional direction for application of the Code by staff and the ARB. It would also be provided to residents and property owners to provide guidance for redevelopment of or preservation of existing structures within the District. The Board reviewed the draft at their November 18 meeting and requested more differentiation between architectural styles and building types. Staff consulted Stephen Gordon's, *How to Complete the Ohio Historic Inventory*, and revised the Guidelines so that the document is now aligned with the building types and architectural styles recognized by the State Historic Preservation Office. This also fulfills the Board's objective of making the Guidelines a user-friendly document.~~



BOARD ORDER

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, June 26, 2019 | 6:30 pm

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

**4. Bridge Park, Building Z2 – The Pearl
19-039ARB-MSP**

**88 N. High Street
Master Sign Plan**

Proposal:	An amendment to a previously approved Bridge Park West Master Sign Plan for a tenant-specific sign package for a space zoned Bridge Street District Historic Transition Neighborhood.
Location:	On the east side of North High Street, approximately 400 feet north of the intersection with North Street.
Request:	Review and approval for amendments to a Master Sign Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.065(H), 153.066, 153.170, the Bridge Street District Sign Guidelines, and the <i>Historic Dublin Design Guidelines</i> .
Applicant:	Wayne Schick, Cameron Mitchell Restaurants
Planning Contact:	Nichole M. Martin, AICP, Planner II
Contact Information:	614.410.4635, nmartin@dublin.oh.us
Case Information:	www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/19-039

MOTION: Ms. Bryan moved, Mr. Bailey seconded, to approve an amendment to an approved Master Sign Plan to permit an addendum for signs not meeting regulations within the approved Master Sign Plan for Bridge Park West with the following condition:

- 1) That the canopy edge sign design be modified to be individually mounted letters without a raceway.

VOTE: 3 – 2

RESULT: The Master Sign Plan was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Shannon Stenberg	No
Gary Alexander	No
Andrew Keeler	Yes
Kathleen Bryan	Yes
Robert Bailey	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Nichole M. Martin, AICP, Planner II



4. Bridge Park, Building Z2 – The Pearl, 88 N. High Street, 19-039ARB-MSP, Master Sign Plan

Ms. Stenberg stated that this application is a proposal for an amendment to a previously approved Bridge Park West Master Sign Plan for a tenant-specific sign package for a tenant space zoned Bridge Street District Historic Transition Neighborhood.

Case Presentation

Ms. Martin stated this request would stand as an exception to the Bridge Park West Master Sign Plan (MSP). With approval of this request, there would be no changes to all the other standards that apply to the tenants throughout Bridge Park West. These would be unique allowances. The site is located on North High Street, just south of the soon-to-be West Plaza of the pedestrian bridge landing. The tenant space is located in Building Z2 of Bridge Park West. Building Z1 of Bridge Park West is located just to the north of the plaza. Both buildings are typified by modest architecture. The intent of these buildings was to complement the Vernacular character of Historic Dublin, so natural materials and simple window fenestration is reflected. The Bridge Park West MSP permits three signs for Level 1 tenants with corner frontage (The Pearl). Of the three permitted signs, one must be a projecting sign and the other two can be sign types of the tenant's choice. The applicant is requesting three signs: one Canopy Edge Sign, one Projecting Sign, and one Placemaking Art Sign. The primary reason the case is before the Board for review is its design. Per staff's review, the sign design is not in compliance and incompatible with Historic Dublin. The final consideration is in regard to location. There is some flexibility with location in Master Sign Plans, so consideration could be made to permit a placemaking art sign on the first level. Details regarding the three requested signs follow:

1. Canopy Edge Sign (N. High Street)

The request is for a Canopy Edge Sign with exposed bulbs, which are prohibited in the MSP. The sign area and location are permitted at less than 12 square feet in area and located on a canopy above the main entrance to the restaurant. The proposed sign design is aluminum channel letters with open faces finished in semi-gloss black. The letters must be individually mounted and may not be attached to a raceway as shown. Each letter has exposed LED marquee lamps, which is prohibited. In total, the proposed sign design includes approximately 450, 1-inch frosted white bulbs. Permitting marquee lighting for a sign other than a Placemaking Art Sign is inconsistent with staff's interpretation of the plan as well as the architectural character of Building Z2. Building Z2 is typified by simple Vernacular architecture accented with Craftsman elements. The majority of Historic Dublin's architecture is of a simple vernacular style dating to the 19th Century whereas the popularity of marquee lighting dates to the early 20th century. Staff does not support its application, as it is not a design reflective of the present day nor of the period of the District as a whole.

2. Projecting Sign (N. High Street)

An approximately four-square-foot projecting sign is proposed along N. High Street at the north end of the tenant space adjacent to the West Plaza. The projecting sign meets the requirement for one projecting sign and meets all MSP regulations for area, location, and design. The sign is

a double-sided, aluminum face finished in a semi-gloss black. The non-illuminated sign includes raised PVC graphics in varying thickness from 1/2-inch to 3/4-inch. Staff has determined the sign design character is consistent with the understated signs consistent throughout Historic Dublin irrespective of architectural character.

3. Placemaking Art Sign (West Plaza/Pedestrian Bridge)

A Placemaking Art Sign is proposed at the terminus of the pedestrian bridge at the northeast corner of Building Z2/the West Plaza. This location is a permitted location for a Placemaking Art Sign. Placemaking Art Signs are intended to contribute to the "diverse visual culture of Bridge Park West" by activating the pedestrian realm through design to "create a highly unique presence for their location." The proposed sign is similar to The Avenue's Placemaking Art Sign due to the use of similar form, materials, and illumination. Therefore, it does not activate the highly visible location in a unique manner. In detail, the sign is a double-sided, aluminum face finished in a semi-gloss black with open face channel letter that incorporate approximately 100 exposed LED marquee lamps per side. A second smaller panel hangs below the main sign. The panel is a coordinating material and color with 1/2-inch raised PVC copy and is externally illuminated with two spotlights. In total, the sign is approximately 22 square feet in area. Placemaking Art Signs are generally required to be at a height located within the second level; however, the first level location could be permitted with a minimum of eight feet of clear area below the sign.

After reviewing the proposal against the Bridge Street Sign Design Guidelines, the Master Sign Plan's intent, and the ARB's standards, staff recommends disapproval of the application.

Applicant Presentation

Matt Starr, Crawford Hoying, Director of Development, 6640 Riverside Drive, Dublin stated that he receives many sign requests from tenants that do not meet the Bridge Park Sign Guidelines, and he does not bring those requests forward. However, this case is different. The design reflects the Cameron Mitchell brand, and they already have the sign in another location. The sign locations and sizes are in compliance. They could make the signs compliant by doing a less expensive sign, but they prefer not to do that. They could use a backlit white acrylic letter, which would be compliant with the MSP. The reason the sign near the pedestrian bridge is located lower than required is due to the residential unit above. The sign across the plaza is positioned higher, but an office is located there, which is vacant during the evening. The reason their case is before the Board is due to the light bulbs. The MSP prohibits exposed lamps. The intent behind the requirement was to prohibit fluorescent tube lighting and low-quality signs. In regard to the raceway, he believes it should be possible to come up with a sign alternative that does not use a raceway. Individual mounted letters on the canopy sign should be possible. The existing canopy will be replaced per a prior approval.

Steve Weiss, 8488 Tralee Drive, Dublin, stated that Cameron Mitchell has invested significantly in Bridge Park and in Dublin. The signs, specifically the bulbs on the canopy sign in the front are one of the most iconic features of The Pearl. One-inch Edison bulbs are much more expensive than acrylic-covered channel letters, which if used, everyone would hate. Because they believe this sign is important to and consistent with their brand, they request the Board's consideration

Board Discussion

Mr. Keeler stated that he is in disagreement with staff's recommendation to disapprove the proposal. He likes the signs as they are. They are part of the brand. This is an interesting area of Dublin, where old meets new. It is across the street from a library that clearly does not meet Architectural Review Board standards. He understands the purpose of the Bridge Street District Code, but this is part of the brand.

Mr. Alexander inquired if the projecting sign is compliant.

Ms. Martin responded that is completely compliant.

Mr. Alexander stated that with the placemaking sign, flexibility can be extended regarding the height. However, the issues are that the sign is not unique, and exposed bulbs are not permitted.

Ms. Martin responded that exposed bulbs were permitted for The Avenue, located to the north. They were permitted because the placemaking art sign definition allows that additional flexibility. In this case, it was determined that this sign would not be unique, because both placemaking art signs would be using exposed bulbs.

Mr. Starr noted that the exposed bulbs are used differently on The Avenue sign. They light the external edges of the sign.

Mr. Alexander agreed that there is some difference. Some flexibility was extended with The Avenue sign, although some features were denied approval.

Ms. Martin responded that the lights around the patio were disapproved.

Mr. Alexander stated that this building is prominent -- more prominent than The Avenue building. There are no visibility issues in this location, and no one will have difficulty finding The Pearl. He noted that the canopy sign on their restaurant in the Short North is on the surface of the building.

Mr. Weiss responded that it is located on the raceway, slightly off the front of the building.

Mr. Alexander stated that it is not on the awning. There are other sign options that would permit their brand in another format on the front of the building, not on the edge of the awning. In summary, he has no issue with the projecting or placemaking signs. Both The Pearl and The Avenue are Cameron Mitchell restaurants, and he sees benefit in having similar signs. His objection is with the canopy sign on the edge of the awning.

Mr. Weiss stated there is a need to identify The Pearl from the other two businesses and the apartments located there, although he understands his point about the building prominence. Although visibility would not be an issue to pedestrians on this side of the street, a sign will be important for visibility from the other side of the street near the Library and to motorists.

Mr. Bailey concurred with Mr. Keeler's position. This is The Pearl brand and should remain consistent. Having a sign located on the front surface of the building would not change staff's recommendation on the MSP, however, as their objection was also due to the exposed bulbs.

Ms. Martin responded that the recommendation based on the exposed bulbs would remain.

Mr. Alexander responded that his rationale related to the opportunity for branding, not to the exposed bulbs.

Ms. Bryan stated that she tends to be more historically conservative; however, there is nothing historic whatsoever about the Library, which is located across the street. Therefore, she is supportive of having this iconic sign within this area.

Ms. Stenberg stated she has no objection to the projecting or the placemaking art signs. Because their sign in the Short North has the marquis style, exposed illumination light bulbs, having a similar sign in this location seems appropriate. Tying it to The Avenue also is appropriate, because both are Cameron Mitchell restaurants. She is challenged with the front canopy sign, although her issue is primarily with the exposed raceway bar. She likes the location and size. The brand text is fine, if the letters were cut out individually, but not individually lighted. Instead of disapproving the entire Master Sign Plan proposal, she would prefer to approve with a condition related to the front canopy sign.

Ms. Stenberg inquired if the applicant would prefer to have a vote tonight and obtain approval of all or some of the signs, or have action tabled tonight so that the applicant could return with a revised Master Sign Plan proposal.

Mr. Weiss responded that he would prefer to have a vote tonight.

Mr. Alexander cautioned that a vote to approve a proposal not consistent with Code would be contradicting staff's recommendation and creating a precedent that could make it more difficult to enforce the Code in the future.

Ms. Stenberg reviewed the vote options.

Mr. Starr stated that the applicant would prefer to have a vote on all three signs tonight, but the minutes could reflect that they would make their best effort to mount the letters individually on the canopy sign and eliminate the raceway. He cannot commit more definitely to that because he believes part of the reason for the raceway was related to the script and small letters. Extending the effort, however, will result in a better sign.

Mr. Alexander stated that would be his preference.

Mr. Starr stated that he has always been encouraged by both ARB and PZC to submit any unique sign proposals for consideration. He may not be willing to do that in the future, depending on the results of this effort.

Ms. Bryan moved, Mr. Bailey seconded, to approve the proposal for an amendment to a previously approved Bridge Park West Master Sign Plan with one condition:

- 1) That the canopy edge sign design be modified to be individually mounted letters without a raceway.

Vote: Ms. Bryan, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Mr. Bailey, yes; Mr. Alexander, no; Ms. Stenberg, no.
(Motion passed 3-2)

5. ~~113-115 S. High Street, 19-042ARB-MSP, Master Sign Plan~~

~~Ms. Stenberg stated that this application is a proposal for a new sign plan for two existing, multi-tenant buildings on a site zoned Bridge Street District Historic South.~~

Case Presentation

~~Mr. Hoppel stated that this is a request for a Master Sign Plan for 113-115 S. High Street. The site is located west of S. High Street, approximately 100 feet south of the intersection with Pinneyhill Lane. Per Code, the applicant would typically be eligible for a maximum of three signs for this site. They would be able to select two of the following sign types — wall, projecting or ground. A third sign would be a multi-tenant directory sign. The applicant is seeking approval of a Master Sign Plan that would permit the flexibility for a fourth sign. Due to the placement of the entrances on the newly constructed building as well as the existence of two multi-tenant buildings on one lot, there is the need for additional signage to provide clear wayfinding and business identifications for pedestrian and vehicular traffic.~~

~~The applicant is proposing a total of four signs: one hanging building-mounted sign (Sign 1), one multi-panel ground sign (Sign 2), one multi-panel directional projecting sign (Signs 3) and one multi-panel tenant identification wall sign (Sign 4).~~

- ~~1. Sign 1 is single-sided, HDU, 1-inch routed, with black background and white copy, and is approximately 8 square feet. From the porch to the top of the sign is 84" (7 feet). Height from grade of the site to the top of the sign has not been provided. The sign is located within the first story, which is a compliant location and height.~~
- ~~2. Sign 2 is a double-sided ground sign with hanging HDU panels with painted borders and painted aluminum inserts with black vinyl copy, and is approximately 5.2 square feet. This ground sign also has a yardarm post that is welded steel with a black powder coated finish. From grade to top of sign is 78" (6.5 feet). HDU is a permitted sign material; however, the sign face should be revised to be dimensionally routed. The use of aluminum panel inserts with vinyl copy should be eliminated, as it does not meet the existing quality or character established in Historic Dublin. The ground sign post/yardarm should be constructed of a natural material finished to match the sign and may not be constructed of steel. The total height of the signpost must be reduced to 6 feet to meet the Code requirement. Ground signs are required to be a minimum of 8 feet from the right-of-way and may not be located within an easement. The applicant should confirm compliance with their Permanent Sign Permit.~~
- ~~3. Sign 3 is a double-sided projecting sign, one-inch HDU, with painted aluminum inserts and vinyl copy, and approximately 4.25 square feet. A 36-inch bracket is proposed with this projecting sign. From grade to the top of the sign is 86" (7.17 feet) and does not extend into the pedestrian walkway. HDU is a permitted sign material; however, the sign face should be revised to be dimensionally routed. The use of aluminum panel inserts with vinyl copy should be eliminated, as it does not meet the existing quality or character~~



BOARD ORDER

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, February 27, 2019 | 6:30 pm

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

**1. Building Z2, the Pearl
19-006ARB-MPR**

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

Proposal: Installation of two patios, a platform lift, awnings, and associated site improvements for an existing tenant space zoned Bridge Street District Historic Transition Neighborhood.

Location: East of N. High Street, approximately 400 feet north of the intersection with North Street.

Request: Review and approval of a Minor Project under the provisions of Zoning Code §§153.066, 153.170, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Applicant: J. Carter Bean, Bean Architects; and Wayne Schick, Cameron Mitchell Restaurants.

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

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

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/19-004

MOTION: Mr. Alexander moved, Ms. Bryan seconded, to approve the Minor Project Review with three conditions:

- 1) That the 'L' shaped awning be revised to fit within the storefront openings as two separate awnings;
- 2) That the height of the screen wall be reduced to meet Code; and
- 3) That the screen wall design be revised to be finished with wood batten on the north, east, and south exteriors.

VOTE: 4 – 0

RESULT: The Minor Project Review was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

David Rinaldi	Yes
Shannon Stenberg	Absent
Gary Alexander	Yes
Andrew Keeler	Yes
Kathleen Bryan	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION



Nichole M. Martin, AICP, Planner I





BOARD ORDER

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, February 27, 2019 | 6:30 pm

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

**2. Building Z2, the Pearl
19-015CU**

**86 N. High Street
Conditional Use**

Proposal: Installation of outdoor speakers at an existing tenant space with two proposed outdoor patios for a restaurant zoned Bridge Street District Historic Transition Neighborhood.

Location: East of N. High Street, approximately 400 feet north of the intersection with North Street.

Request: Review and approval of a Conditional Use under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.236, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Applicant: J. Carter Bean, Bean Architects; and Wayne Schick, Cameron Mitchell Restaurants.

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

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

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/19-015

MOTION: Mr. Alexander moved, Mr. Keeler seconded, to approve the Conditional Use with three conditions:

- 1) That the use of the outdoor speakers be limited to the tenant's hours of operation, not to exceed one hour past closing;
- 2) That the speakers only be permitted for the patio and therefore be removed at the rear entry/exit; and
- 3) That the use of outdoor speakers be prohibited during City-sanctioned special events or programming in the Riverside Crossing Park – West Plaza.

VOTE: 4 – 0

RESULT: The Conditional Use was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

David Rinaldi	Yes
Shannon Stenberg	Absent
Gary Alexander	Yes
Andrew Keeler	Yes
Kathleen Bryan	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Nichole M. Martin, AICP, Planner I





BOARD ORDER

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, February 27, 2019 | 6:30 pm

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

MOTION: Ms. Bryan moved, Mr. Keeler seconded, to accept the 2018 ARB Annual Report.

VOTE: 4 – 0

RESULT: The 2018 ARB Annual Report was accepted into the record.

RECORDED VOTES:

David Rinaldi	Yes
Shannon Stenberg	Absent
Gary Alexander	Yes
Andrew Keeler	Yes
Kathleen Bryan	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Jennifer M. Rauch, AICP, Planning Manager





MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, February 27, 2019

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Rinaldi called the meeting to order at 6:32 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. Rinaldi led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Board Members present: Mr. Rinaldi, Mr. Alexander, Mr. Keeler and Ms. Bryan.
Board Member absent: Ms. Stenberg
Staff present: Ms. Rauch, Ms. Martin, Mr. Hoppel, Mr. Rayfield and Mr. Hansen.

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS

Mr. Keeler moved, Ms. Bryan seconded to accept the documents into the record.

Vote on the motion: Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Ms. Bryan, yes.
(Approved 4 – 0)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Alexander moved, Mr. Keeler seconded to approve the January 23, 2019 meeting minutes as submitted.

Vote on the motion: Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; and Ms. Bryan, yes.
(Approved 4 – 0)

The Chair briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Architectural Review Board and swore in any staff or member of the public planning to address the Board during this meeting.

CASE

1. **Building Z2, the Pearl 19-006ARB-MPR**

86 N. High Street Minor Project Review

Mr. Rinaldi stated that this application is a proposal for the installation of two patios, a platform lift, awnings, and associated site improvements for an existing tenant space zoned Bridge Street District Historic Transition Neighborhood.

Case Presentation

Ms. Martin stated that this a request for a review and approval of a Minor Project Review. The site is located on the east side of North High Street. Currently, there is a single building on this site, a mixed-use building with approximately 13,000 square feet of commercial, as well as four residential units, previously approved by this Board. This is a request for a tenant fit-up for a

proposed restaurant space, located at the northwest corner of the building. The primarily brick building with cedar window frames is located at the western terminus of the pedestrian bridge adjacent to the Riverside Crossing Park landing. The main entrance to the restaurant is located on the west façade of the structure, on N. High Street. The West Plaza for the bridge landing is located on the north side of the restaurant adjacent to the covered patio. The Scioto River and future Riverside Crossing Park West are adjacent to the open and uncovered portion of the patio. With this Minor Project, several modifications to the existing tenant space are requested. The first is the removal and replacement of the existing metal awning with a new metal awning that will be larger and include new metal tie-backs. This awning will have integrated lighting and heating. There will be two new fixtures, gas-lit lamps, on each side of the entry. The applicant is also proposing to enclose the former entry to this tenant space, at the northwest corner, which was formerly covered but open-air. Eight awnings, in a dark taupe, are included. That color has been field-verified to match the brick. They will be straight hood awnings with a valance. Staff recommends one condition for the eighth awning located at the rear entrance to the uncovered patio – that the eighth awning be separated into two separate awnings, given the architectural prominence of the cedar window frames. In addition, the north patio will contain 30 tables with chairs -- a mixture of two-top and four-tops. There will be ceiling fans, and heating and lighting will be integrated into the covered patio awning structure. The open, uncovered patio will have lounge-style seating, which includes four fire tables and eight couches, as well as some flexible seating. Also proposed is a 6.5-foot screen wall on the south side of the patio with a landscape treatment. Staff has added a condition that this wall be finished on all sides and reduced to 6.0 feet, consistent with Code requirement. This wall is intended to screen an at-grade dumpster; however, there is a need to be sensitive to the wall's appearance from adjacent properties.

ART and staff has reviewed the Minor Project against the Code criteria, as well as the Architectural Review Board's standards for alterations to buildings and structures and recommends approval with three conditions.

Applicant Presentation

Carter Bean, Bean Architects, 4400 N. High Street, Columbus, Ohio, stated that this is a joint venture project between Crawford Hoying and Cameron Mitchell Restaurants. The Avenue project directly across from the West Plaza was a recent project, as well. These two businesses will complement each other and activate the pedestrian space. They have attempted to make the proposed modifications as fitting to the shell building as possible. The two ART reviews have provided very positive feedback, and they accept the recommended ART conditions. On the east patio that overlooks the Scioto River, the metal railing that was originally proposed will be replaced with a glass railing to take advantage of the view down into the river. This will make the lounge-style seating area a spectacular place to sit and dine.

Mr. Alexander inquired if the drawings that were initially submitted for the building permits included the patios.

Mr. Bean responded that the patios were not included.

Mr. Alexander stated that the amount of seating in these patios significantly changes the occupancy count. Has this been factored into the restroom capacity/egress evaluation?

Mr. Bean responded affirmatively. They are required to include the capacity of the exterior patio spaces for such items as fixture counts.

Mr. Alexander stated that the information indicates that staff has asked about a batten pattern for the fence. Is there any detail on that? The image provided indicates a horizontal pattern rather than a traditional vertical batten.

Mr. Bean responded that it is a horizontal rail comprised of natural wood slats. Per ART's requested condition, this will be replicated on the other side, as well. Part of the reason for selecting this horizontal rail, in addition to its more contemporary look, is to mimic the wood headers that are above the store-front windows.

Mr. Alexander inquired if the staff's report identification of it as a batten rail was correct.

Ms. Martin responded that it may be a misnomer.

There was no public comment.

Board Member Discussion

Mr. Rinaldi inquired if the awning that is recommended by ART to be split would be replaced with two separate awnings, one on each side.

Mr. Bean confirmed that is correct.

Mr. Alexander moved, Ms. Bryan seconded, to approve the Minor Project Review with three conditions:

- 1) That the "L" shaped awning be revised to fit within the storefront openings as two separate awnings;
- 2) That the height of the screen wall be reduced to meet Code; and
- 3) That the screen wall design be revised to be finished with wood batten on the north, east and south exteriors.

Vote: Mr. Keeler, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Ms. Bryan, yes.

Motion passed 4-0.

2. Building Z2, the Pearl 19-015CU

86 N. High Street Conditional Use

Mr. Rinaldi stated that this application is a proposal for the installation of outdoor speakers at an existing tenant space with two proposed outdoor patios for a restaurant zoned Bridge Street District Historic Transition Neighborhood.

Case Presentation

Ms. Martin stated that this a request for a recommendation on a Conditional Use to the Planning and Zoning Commission, which is the final reviewing body. This request is also for the Z2 building and The Pearl restaurant. The applicant is proposing eleven (11) speakers across two patios and a rear entry. Speakers are reviewed as a use-specific standard. Conditionally, these speakers must be in conjunction with outdoor seating and dining; therefore, the speaker located above the rear entry is conditioned to be removed from this application. The applicant has provided operational details, as is customary for a Conditional Use application. The intent is to use the outdoor speakers only during the hours of operation of the patio, not to exceed one

hour past the hour of operation of the patio. No live music or amplified outdoor speakers are requested with this Conditional Use.

Staff Recommendation

In review of the Conditional Use criteria, staff recommends that ARB provide a recommendation of approval to the Planning Commission with the following three conditions:

- 1) The use of the outdoor speakers be limited to the tenant's hours of operation, not to exceed one hour past closing;
- 2) Speakers only be permitted for the patio, and therefore be removed at the rear entry/exit;
- 3) The use of outdoor speakers be prohibited during City sanctioned special events or programming in the Riverside Crossing Park – West Plaza.

These are the same conditions that were made for the previous project, The Avenue.

Public Comment

Michael Steele, 138 S. High Street, Dublin, stated that he operates a business at this address. He inquired if there will be music coming from the speakers.

Ms. Martin responded affirmatively.

Mr. Steele stated that if he were a resident in one of the condos just 50 feet away, he would not want music penetrating his home until midnight. He does not believe this feature is appropriate at this location in consideration of the 41 condos within such close proximity.

There were no other public comments.

Board Member Discussion

Mr. Alexander inquired if there have been any complaints about the music emanating from The Avenue.

Ms. Martin responded that staff is not aware of any complaints. The applicant may have more information.

Mr. Bean stated that he asked this question of Matt Starr, Crawford Hoying, the developer of those properties, and he has indicated there have been no complaints.

Ms. Bryan stated that she is concerned with the speakers that will be facing the river. Living on the river in Historic Dublin, she is able to say that sound is a problem. There is a dynamic that happens with the nearby river that causes sound to be magnified. When Vaso plays music, she can hear it clearly from within her home. There is a need to consider the sound phenomenon that occurs when a body of water is present.

Mr. Bean responded that sound likely carries across it. In consideration of that issue, they will attempt to identify a way to incorporate the sound at a lower area near the fire pits and contain it where the restaurant patrons are rather than projecting it out and toward the river.

Mr. Alexander moved and Mr. Keeler seconded to approve the Minor Project Review with three (3) Conditions.

Vote: Ms. Bryan, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes.

Motion carried 4-0.



RECORD OF DETERMINATION

Administrative Review Team

Thursday, February 21, 2019

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

- 1. BSD HTN – The Pearl – Site Improvements** **86 N. High Street**
19-006ARB-MPR **Minor Project Review**
- Proposal: Installation of two patios, a platform lift, awnings, and associated site improvements for an existing tenant space. The site is zoned Bridge Street District Historic Transition Neighborhood.
- Location: East of North High Street, approximately 100 feet southeast of the intersection with Rock Cress Parkway.
- 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*.
- Contact Information: Nichole M. Martin, AICP, Planner I; 614.410.4635, nmartin@dublin.oh.us
- Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/19-006

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

- 1) That the 'L' shaped awning be revised to fit within the storefront openings as two separate awnings;
- 2) That the height of the screen wall be reduced to meet Code; and
- 3) That the screen wall design be revised to be finished on the north, east, and south exterior sides with wood batten.

Determination: The Minor Project Review was forwarded to the Architectural Review Board with a recommendation of approval.

STAFF CERTIFICATION


Jennifer M. Rauch, AICP
Planning Manager





MEETING MINUTES

Administrative Review Team

Thursday, February 21, 2019 | 2:00 pm

ART Members and Designees: Jennifer Rauch, Planning Manager; (Acting Chair); Donna Goss, Director of Development; Colleen Gilger, Director of Economic Development; Brad Fagrell, Director of Building Standards; Shawn Krawetzki, Landscape Architect; Aaron Stanford, Senior Civil Engineer; and Mike Altomare, Fire Marshal.

Other Staff: Logan Stang, Planner II; Claudia Husak, Senior Planner; Nicki Martin, Planner I; Chase Ridge, Planner I; Jimmy Hoppel, Planning Assistant; Richard Hansen, Planning Assistant; and Laurie Wright, Administrative Support II.

Applicants: J. Carter Bean, Bean Architects; and Matt Starr, Crawford Hoying Development Partners (Cases 1 & 2).

Ms. Rauch called the meeting to order at 2:03 pm. She asked if there were any amendments to the meeting minutes from February 7, 2019. [There were none.] The minutes were approved as presented.

RECOMMENDATION

1. BSD HTN – The Pearl – Site Improvements 19-006ARB-MPR

86 N. High Street Minor Project Review

Nichole Martin said this application is a proposal for the installation of two patios, a platform lift, awnings, and associated site improvements for an existing tenant space zoned Bridge Street District Historic Transition Neighborhood. She said the site is east of N. High Street, approximately 100 feet southeast of the intersection with Rock Cress Parkway. She stated 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 §§153.066, 153.170, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Ms. Martin outlined the Minor Project Review process, which entails a recommendation from the ART today to enable the applicant to go before the Architectural Review Board on February 27, 2019, as the final reviewing body.

Ms. Martin presented an aerial view of the site for this restaurant tenant in Building Z2 of the Bridge Park West Development and the proposed site plan, which borders the West Plaza at the terminus of the (future) pedestrian bridge and North High Street and is adjacent to Riverside Crossing Park along the Scioto River. She highlighted the areas directly related to this proposal that included the proposed primary entrance along N. High Street that will have a larger canopy that has: new metal tiebacks; integrated lights; speakers; heaters; and two gas-lit sconces located on either side of the double aluminum entry door. The proposal also includes eight Sunbrella awnings with a straight hood and valance in a taupe color that match the cedar lintels, sills, and trim. One of the awnings is an 'L' shape, which Staff requested be changed to two separate awnings, one for each window at the northeast corner of the building. The north patio adjacent to the West Plaza/Pedestrian Bridge landing will have a curved, taupe awning that will match the curvature of the building. Ceiling fans, heaters, and lighting will be integrated into that awning.



Ms. Martin explained this covered patio will seat 30 people at white marble table tops on a cast iron bases with aluminum chairs powder coated in a faux wood finish with modern rattan details. The uncovered patio on the east, facing Riverside Crossing Park and the Scioto River beyond will contain: soft seating options of eight couches and four lounge chairs; four tables with fire features; and five, two-person tables. This patio has an 'L' shaped screening wall on the south side to screen the dumpster at grade used by the Oscar Restaurant next door. The applicant originally proposed a height of seven feet of which Staff requested be reduced. The applicant is now proposing a height of six feet, six inches but Ms. Martin emphasized the Code limits the height to six feet when used in landscaping. Staff is also concerned with the appearance on the rear side of this screening as it is on the second level. Staff requested the applicant finish the exterior sides with a wood batten material.

Ms. Martin presented a rendering at N. High Street and noted the awnings as proposed. She presented a rendering of the east patio and pointed out the existing railing that is proposed to be replaced with glass similar to Building Z1.

Ms. Martin said the application was reviewed against the Minor Project Review Criteria, Architectural Review Board Standards, and Alterations to Buildings, Structure, and Site and found the criteria had been met with three conditions.

J. Carter Bean, Bean Architects, said they reduced the height of the screen walls to six feet, six inches to match the top of the water table course on the building. He said they are now going to use natural wood to be stained to match the building instead of using metal and agrees to add wood batten on the exterior sides. As for the 'L' shaped corner awning, he could install just one awning above the door on the north face of the building. Ms. Martin said she was concerned that would extend beyond the cedar trim to which Mr. Bean said he would review again. Colleen Gilger said she preferred to see the awning over the door.

Shawn Krawetzki asked if there would be caps on the ends of the screen wall to provide a finished surface. Mr. Bean said they could provide that or a wraparound feature for a consistent look.

Mr. Krawetzki inquired about the plants to be used in front of the screen. Mr. Bean said a selection had not been made yet but they plan on using seasonal plants.

Mr. Krawetzki asked about the true awning color. Jennifer Rauch said she visited the site and the color matches but is not reflected well in the renderings. Mr. Krawetzki asked if the awning extends over the lift outside to which Mr. Bean answered affirmatively.

Ms. Martin said approval is recommended for the Minor Project Review with three conditions:

- 1) That the 'L' shaped awning be revised to fit within the storefront openings as two separate awnings;
- 2) That the height of the screen wall be reduced to meet Code; and
- 3) That the screen wall design be revised to be finished on the north, east, and south exterior sides with wood batten.

Jenny Rauch asked the applicant if he agreed to the three conditions to which he answered affirmatively. Ms. Rauch asked if there were any further questions or concerns. [Hearing none.] She called for a vote. (Recommended for Approval 7 – 0) The Minor Project Review was forwarded to the Architectural Review Board with a recommendation of approval.