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

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

MEETING MINUTES

OCTOBER 21, 2015

AGENDA

1. BSD HC – Perimeter Fence **40 E. Bridge Street**
15-095ARB/MPR **Minor Project Review (Approved 5 – 0)**

David Rinaldi called the meeting to order at 6:28 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Board members present were: Jane Fox, Thomas Munhall, Everett Musser, and Shannon Stenberg. City representatives were: Greg Peterson, Jennifer Rauch, Joanne Shelly, Katie Dodaro, and Laurie Wright.

Administrative Business

The Chair said Council Member, Greg Peterson was in attendance to swear in the new board member, Ms. Shannon Stenberg.

Motion and Vote

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

Motion and Vote

Mr. Rinaldi moved, Mr. Musser seconded, to accept the September 23, 2015, meeting minutes as presented. The vote was as follows: Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; Mr. Munhall, yes; Mr. Musser, yes; and Mr. Rinaldi, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

The Chair briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Architectural Review Board [the minutes reflect the order of the published agenda.] He swore in anyone planning to address the Board on this application.

1. BSD HR – Perimeter Fence **40 E. Bridge Street**
15-095ARB/MPR **Minor Project Review**

The Chair said the following application is a request for the installation of a fence on a residential property located within the BSD Historic Residential District, northeast of the intersection of N. Blacksmith Lane and E. Bridge Street. He said this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Katie Dodaro presented the overview of the site, which fronts on North Riverview Street and backs on North Blacksmith Lane. She presented the proposed fence that will extend from the rear of the house to the existing stone wall running along the rear property line. She explained the proposed fence encroaches the rear setback. She presented the proposed French Gothic picket fence that will be painted white. She presented the existing conditions of the property, noting the different fence types.

Ms. Dodaro said the ART recommended approval with a Waiver to permit a zero rear setback as the Code requires a 15-foot rear setback. She noted this allows the fence to extend to the stone wall at the property line.

Jane Fox said a lattice fence was originally proposed and asked why the applicant has changed the proposal to a picket fence.

David Dirkhising, 40 E. Bridge Street, Dublin, OH 43017, said after Staff conducted research, he was encouraged to switch to a picket fence.

Jenny Rauch said the ART discussed the appropriate styles for a fence and thought a more traditional style fence would be more appropriate rather than using a "basket weave" type fence. She noted this property is not considered to be historic but the ART wanted the fence style to be consistent.

Ms. Fox questioned the proposed fence style with Bungalow-style architecture. She indicated concern with following the current *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* recommendation as a 'one size fits all' solution. She indicated there are many different types of fences that would coordinate with a Bungalow-style home. She said for the applicant to be told a "picket fence is appropriate because it is historic" probably limits what they can have. She noted the lattice-style fence that exists around the patio and asked if the applicant planned to replace that fence.

Mr. Dirkhising said they are new to the area and are trying to work with the City. Ideally, he said, they would like to keep the lattice to restrict the dogs from leaving the yard if the door is open. He indicated he is willing to do whatever the City requires.

Ms. Fox reiterated her concern for being too restrictive with a style of fence.

Thomas Munhall asked the applicant if they were agreeable to a picket fence.

Mr. Dirkhising answered their best option was to keep the lattice and add lattice to enclose the rear yard.

Ms. Fox explained the ARB and Staff are in the middle of revising the *Guidelines* for Historic Dublin. She said this case is a prime example of the issues the ARB struggles with trying to help owners in the Historic District achieve what they want for their structures and yards. She asked if the applicant was agreeable to a picket fence or whether the City's restrictions created a dilemma for the applicant.

Mr. Dirkhising said they love the City and are willing to work with the City.

Ms. Rauch reiterated the style of fence was discussed and recommended at the ART. She said the ART's main consideration is maintaining a consistent overall character of the District.

Mr. Rinaldi said non-conforming fences also exist in the District.

Ms. Rauch said the original proposal could be provided if the Board wanted to consider that fence. She explained when the proposal was introduced to the ART with a lattice fence, the recommendation was to have trim added for a finished edge along with posts to be more substantial.

Mr. Dirkhising said they could use lattice in four-foot by four-foot sections while adding the framework.

Mr. Rinaldi said he was fine with the picket fence proposed and is not opposed to a zero line setback.

Mr. Munhall questioned the fence going north that is solid other than the lattice at the top.

Mr. Rinaldi said 50% opacity is required. Ms. Dodaro added the opacity was a concern with the lattice type fence.

Mr. Munhall indicated this is a highly visible property on the south side from Bridge Street. He said if the proposal was changed this evening from a picket fence to a lattice fence, he would need to know exactly what the lattice fence was going to look like in order to support it.

Mr. Rinaldi confirmed the height of the proposed picket fence will be four feet.

Mr. Munhall asked the applicant if height was an issue.

Mr. Dirkhising said the difference between the lattice and the picket fence is the space between the pickets. He said if a picket fence is used, he would need to add a mesh on the inside to ensure the containment of his dogs.

The Chair moved to approve the proposal as presented this evening for a picket fence and proposed Waiver.

Motion and Vote
Mr. Rinaldi moved, Mr. Musser seconded, to approve a request for a Minor Project Review with the following Waiver and no conditions:

1. Rear Yard Setback – BSD Historic Residential Neighborhood – Zoning Code Section 153.063(B)(2)(e): 15-foot rear yard setback (required); zero setback (requested)

Ms. Fox asked the applicant if he was agreeable to the terms. He answered affirmatively. The vote was as follows: Mr. Munhall, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; Mr. Musser, yes; and Mr. Rinaldi, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

Administrative Business
The Chair said the Board needed to elect a Vice Chair but it was not necessary to adjourn to the back conference room. He asked if anyone wanted to volunteer for the Vice Chair position. Mr. Munhall said he would be happy to fill the position.

Motion and Vote
Mr. Rinaldi moved, Mr. Musser seconded, to elect Mr. Munhall as the 2015-2016 Vice Chair. The vote was as follows: Mr. Munhall, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; Mr. Musser, yes; and Mr. Rinaldi, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

Communications
Jennifer Rauch invited Ms. Stenberg to share a little bit about herself as the new Board Member. Ms. Stenberg provided her background and interest serving on the Architectural Review Board.

Ms. Rauch said the Walking Tour has been postponed.

Ms. Rauch said meeting dates proposed for next year will be provided in the next Board packet. She emphasized that next month's meeting is on a Tuesday – November 17th due to a schedule conflict with City Council.

Ms. Rauch reported the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* are still in process and will be presented in December as a formal review and potential recommendation. She said the Board will receive the *Guidelines* a week earlier than packets are normally distributed to ensure more review time.

Ms. Fox explained she brought up the appropriateness of a picket fence with a Bungalow-style home because she noticed there were already three different styles of fences existing on this property in a high-profile area. She said the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* limit types to iron, stone, and picket. She said she would like to see us achieve in the revised *Guidelines* a more specific approach in our recommendation based on the site conditions and features. She reiterated tonight's case was a prime example of how the *Guidelines* could be more context specific.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 6:50 pm.

As approved by the Architectural Review Board on November 17, 2015.