



City of Dublin

Land Use and Long  
Range Planning

5800 Shier Rings Road  
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236

phone 614.410.4600

fax 614.410.4747

[www.dublinohiousa.gov](http://www.dublinohiousa.gov)

## ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

### MEETING MINUTES

JANUARY 29, 2014

#### AGENDA

**1. BSC Historic Residential District – Tackett Residence  
14-001ARB-MPR  
(Approved 4 – 0)**

**South High Street  
Minor Project Review**

Robert Schisler called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Board members present were Bob Dyas, Thomas Munhall, and David Rinaldi. City representatives were Jennifer Rauch, Jordan Fromm, and Laurie Wright.

#### **Motion and Vote**

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

#### **Motion and Vote**

Mr. Dyas moved, Mr. Munhall seconded, to accept the October 23, 2013 meeting minutes as presented. The vote was as follows: Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Schisler, yes; Mr. Munhall, yes; and Mr. Dyas, yes. (Approved 4 – 0)

#### **Motion and Vote**

Mr. Schisler moved, Mr. Rinaldi seconded, to accept the December 11, 2013 meeting minutes as presented. The vote was as follows: Mr. Dyas, yes; Mr. Munhall, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; and Mr. Schisler, yes. (Approved 4 – 0)

#### **Communications**

Jennifer Rauch announced Libby Farley retired at the end of the year and a retirement party was planned. She said she would pass along the details to the Board when the party was finalized, since Libby was the administrative support staff to the Board. She said the State of the City Address has been set for March 6 at 6 pm at the Wendy's Corporate Conference Center. She said the Board should have a revised condition sheet on the dais addressing an inconsistency in the setback requirements pointed out by Mr. Mathias. She stated the revised conditions stated the detached garage would need to be moved to the north to meet the setback requirement.

Mr. Schisler explained the rules and procedures of the Architectural Review Board. He swore in those wishing to speak in regards to an application on the agenda tonight.

**1. BSC Historic Residential District – Tackett Residence  
14-001ARB-MPR**

**South High Street  
Minor Project Review**

Ms. Rauch introduced Jordan Fromm, Planning Assistant, who will present the case.

Jordan Fromm said this case is for a Minor Project Review for the construction of a new single-family dwelling located southeast of the intersection of South High Street and Waterford Drive. He said it had been reviewed by the Administrative Review Team with a recommendation of approval. He noted the site was located on South High Street, just east of the Waterford Village subdivision and had been subdivided

as part of the final plat approval in 2009. He reported a condition of the plat approval required the future payment of the recreation fee, which is based on a percentage of the total land and building costs and said the fee was required to be paid prior to issuance of a building permit.

Mr. Fromm explained the site does not currently have access to sanitary sewer lines, and he identified the location where sewer service currently ends on the property located to north of the proposed home. He said a condition of approval requires the applicant to secure any off-site easements and/or agreements with the adjacent property owner to the north to provide this access.

Mr. Fromm said there was an existing manhole inlet located within close proximity to the proposed driveway at the southwestern corner of the property, and the applicant will need to work with Engineering, if any modifications to this inlet are necessary.

Mr. Fromm described the general site layout for the proposed single-family home with both an attached and detached garage. He said the attached garage is not visible along the front elevation and is made accessible from the rear. He said the detached garage is proposed in the southeastern portion of the site with a pool surrounded by a fence in center of the site. He noted the house is setback to the south by five feet due to the detached garage and eight feet two inches to the north. He said there is a three-foot setback for the driveway from the property line, a 15-foot setback for the front of the home, and a 25-foot setback of the home to the rear, which are all met. He stated the side yard setbacks have not been met and require a 4-foot minimum on one side with a total of 16 feet; in this case, it is approximately eight feet to the north and five feet to the south. He said the detached garage will need to be moved three feet to the north to meet the side yard requirements as outlined in the revised condition. Mr. Fromm reported the lot area and width, building height and lot coverage are all met in this proposal.

Mr. Fromm said the overall building design is appropriate and incorporates traditional dormers and gable roof design. He said the rear-loaded attached garage is invisible from the primary frontage along the front elevation and the detached garage is set back behind the home, which minimizes the visual impact along the front elevation.

Mr. Fromm said there is a stone wall that bounds the front of the property. He said the applicant is proposing to remove their portion of the stone wall and replace it with a stone wall consistent to its neighbors, retaining the historic character of the neighborhood. He said the applicant has worked with Engineering and will gain future permits as this process moves forward.

Mr. Fromm stated the applicable review criteria for the proposal have been met and the Administrative Review Team recommends approval with four conditions, the fourth added this afternoon:

1. That the recreation site fee be paid prior to issuance of a building permit;
2. That the applicant work with Engineering should any modifications need to be made to the inlet located along South High Street;
3. That the applicant will be responsible for securing off-site easements and/or agreements with the adjacent property owner to provide sanitary sewer service connection; and
4. That the applicant revise the Site Plan to move the detached garage to the north to meet the total side yard setback requirement of 16 feet.

Ms. Rauch said the applicant was present to answer any questions.

Jerry Schultz, architect at Behal, Sampson, Dietz, introduced himself and said he was present to answer questions.

Ms. Rauch said Mr. Mathias was absent this evening, but he had asked her to pass along his concerns about the proposed driveway material questioning whether the driveway should be paver or concrete

rather than the proposed asphalt. She said this was not raised or discussed by the ART and not a Code requirement. She stated Mr. Mathias expressed strong concerns about the driveway materials in terms of the character within the area.

David Rinaldi said his only concern with the driveway was that it appeared as though the islands were added to meet the 50 percent lot coverage requirement, which does not appear to be a very sustainable approach. He asked if this would be an eyesore to the neighbors shortly thereafter when the grass gets burned out in the heat of the summer or chewed up with a snow plow in the winter.

Mr. Schultz stated it had been used to meet the 50 percent requirement, but it had also come up previously by the owner as a consideration since the site is slight and small in nature and the desires to have as much green space as possible. He said sustainability comes down to the care of the owner. Mr. Rinaldi said he would not be surprised to see the driveway paved in shortly thereafter.

Mr. Schultz said this site is a very public and prominent spot and understands coverage requirements are serious and real. Thomas Munhall said another option could be small bushes instead of grass to retain character a little easier.

Mr. Schultz said it is a challenge on a small lot to put living space on one level and get the driveway and garage doors in back, which was an important aspect of the small front elevation meeting historic character. Mr. Rinaldi said he appreciated the attractive solution.

Robert Schisler questioned the size of the garage given the side yard setback. Mr. Schultz said he discussed with the owner the balance between the two sides either moving the detached garage closer to the house to move it further from the side property line, or shifting the balance by moving the house to the south closer to the driveway to meet the requirement.

Mr. Fromm cautioned the applicant that if the house is moved to the south, there must be three feet between the driveway and the property line. Mr. Schultz said the driveway would not move and said there is a planting bed between the garage and the edge of the driveway. He said options were still being considered to achieve the best balance and meet the requirement.

Mr. Schisler said if somebody comes to visit and pulls into the driveway, they will need to walk across the yard to get to the front door. Mr. Schultz responded that it is the old 'front entrance vs the friend's entrance'.

Mr. Rinaldi asked if there was consideration at all for the existing wall, because it was different than the typical Dublin stone wall and if there was any historic significance of the wall. He said it was not unattractive but supported replacement with a traditional wall seen on the adjacent properties.

Ms. Rauch said the replacement of the wall was discussed as part of the ART review with support from the group to replace the existing wall with a design more in-kind with the typical Dublin stone wall. She said it requires an approval from Engineering given its location in the right-of-way. She stated the ultimate thought of the ART was that it was appropriate.

Mr. Rinaldi asked if there was fencing around the pool and what fence material would be used. Mr. Schultz said they had not made that determination, but they want a traditional picket fence design that will match the trim color of the house.

Mr. Schisler invited public comment.

Mike Carroll, 190 South High Street, said he was the neighbor located to the north of the proposed site. He questioned the rules for the wall between Mr. Tackett's house and his property. He said he had met

with Ms. Rauch about putting up a 12-foot by 12-foot garden shed in his backyard and was told he needed to maintain a 20-foot setback from the rear property line and a ten-foot no-build zone requirement from the historic wall along the side property line. Mr. Carroll said he would have to locate his garden shed in the middle of his yard and does not understand why. He asked if the 10-foot no-build zone was just on his side of the wall.

Ms. Rauch said she would have to revisit the plat requirement and did not have the information in front of her. She said adjacent properties can have different requirements depending on the circumstances.

Mr. Carroll said he was stunned that what he considered a truly minor project of a small unheated, unlit garden shed could not be built in the desired location.

Mr. Munhall asked if the historic stone wall was on the property line or on Mr. Carroll's property only, and how long it had been there. Mr. Carroll confirmed the wall had been there for a very long time. Mr. Carroll thought it was the original wall that separated all the properties prior to development.

Mr. Dyas asked about Mr. Carroll's setbacks. Ms. Rauch confirmed there could be different plat requirements based on when the lots were platted, because his lot was platted under a different subdivision than the site for the current application.

Mr. Munhall asked Mr. Carroll if he had any issues with the new build that should be addressed before the home was constructed.

Mr. Carroll said he a few concerns. He said the first is the location of the driveway, which he felt it was unsafe because vehicles reach speeds between 37 mph – 52 mph. He requested the driveway be moved as far north as possible, allowing drivers the most time to react. He reported in front of his house, he has had someone run into a garbage truck picking up his garbage, and the tree in front of his house was also hit. He said another concern was the sewer connection. He said the diagram which showed the sewer easement on his property did not appear to be accurate. Ms. Rauch said there was an existing easement that runs north to south through his property and noted where the sewer ends.

Mr. Munhall questioned the reason for the condition regarding the sewer provisions. Ms. Rauch explained an easement on the property to the north existed to permit the extension, but it was the developer responsibility to gain permission and access to extend through Mr. Carroll's yard.

Mr. Carroll asked how the wall could be undisturbed in a no-build zone as they tunnel through his yard. Mr. Munhall said they could go underneath the wall easily or if they have to take down the wall and put it right back up the exact same way was an option too. Mr. Schisler said it was possible not to disturb the historic wall.

Mr. Carroll said there seems to be different rules for how the wall is handled by Mr. Tackett and what happens to the section of the wall on his property.

Ms. Rauch said sewer service also exists along South Riverview Street and a connection option could also be through the property to the east. She explained the developer would have to ensure enough slope is achieved to connect the sewer line from either property. She said Engineering would ensure that as part of the building permit process. Ms. Rauch reiterated the City was not installing the sewer line connection, the property owner was responsible.

Mr. Carroll said his final concern was the point that no trees would be harmed. He questioned how a 25-foot high building, located 8 feet from his property line could be constructed without harm to any trees. Ms. Rauch said the intent was not to disturb any trees from their site. Mr. Carroll said branches have

fallen on the Tackett property before and he was concerned about them falling on the house. He stated this could be another reason to move the driveway to the north.

Mr. Carroll asked if the City required the driveway in the proposed location or whether it was Mr. Tackett's decision. Ms. Rauch said Engineering desired the driveway to be located as far away from the Waterford Drive intersection as possible. Mr. Rinaldi responded, from a design standpoint, the current location is shown in the better place, away from intersection.

Mr. Schisler said he understands the comments on the driveway location. He said the character of the proposed house was a nice addition to the neighborhood.

Mr. Schisler invited any further comments from the Board. [Hearing none.]

Mr. Schisler asked the applicant if he accepted the conditions, as follows:

1. That the recreation site fee be paid prior to issuance of a building permit;
2. That the applicant work with Engineering should any modifications need to be made to the inlet located along South High Street;
3. That the applicant will be responsible for securing off-site easements and/or agreements with the adjacent property owner to provide sanitary sewer service connection; and
4. That the applicant revise the Site Plan to move the detached garage to the north to meet the total side yard setback requirement of 16 feet.

Jerry Schultz agreed to all the conditions.

#### **Motion and Vote**

Mr. Schisler moved, Mr. Munhall seconded, to approve this request with four conditions. The vote was as follows: Mr. Dyas, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Munhall, yes; and Mr. Schisler, yes. (Approved 4 – 0)

Ms. Rauch asked the Board Members if they were having any issues with electronic packets. She said if they experienced any problems to keep the dialogue open. She said email reminders will be sent when materials are ready, to be expected on the Friday before the meeting date.

Mr. Schisler adjourned the meeting at 7:19 p.m.

As approved by the Architectural Review Board on March 19, 2014.