



**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**

**SEPTEMBER 21, 2016**

**AGENDA**

- 1. BSD HR 73 S. Riverview Street  
16-073ARB-MPR Minor Project Review (Approved 4 – 0)**
- 2. BSD HC - Town Center 1- Lighting W. Bridge Street and S. High Street  
16-072ARB-MPR Minor Project Review (Approved 4 – 0)**
- 3. Holder Wright Earthworks 4729 Bright Road  
16-054ARB Building and Site Modifications (Tabled 4 – 0)**
- 4. Public Nuisance Regulations – Code Amendment  
16-036ADM Administrative Request (Discussion Only)**

The Chair, David Rinaldi, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Board members present were: Thomas Munhall, Everett Musser, and Shannon Stenberg. Jane Fox was absent. City representatives were: Jennifer Rauch, JM Rayburn, Matt Earman, Shawn Krawetzki, and Laurie Wright.

**Administrative Business**

**Motion and Vote**

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

**Motion and Vote**

Mr. Munhall moved, Ms. Stenberg seconded, to approve the July 27<sup>th</sup> and August 24<sup>th</sup> meeting minutes. The vote was as follows: Mr. Musser, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; and Mr. Munhall, yes. (Approved 4 – 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 during this meeting.

- 1. BSD HR 73 S. Riverview Street  
16-073ARB-MPR Minor Project Review**

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following application is a request for the construction of a new single-family dwelling for a property at the southeast corner of South Riverview Street and Eberly Hill Lane. He said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board for a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

JM Rayburn presented an aerial view of the site and recalled the Board reviewed the demolition of the existing single-family residence and associated attached garage. He explained a condition of the approval was the demolition cannot occur until the ARB approves a proposed design for a new build of a single-family residence, which is why this case is before the Board. He presented the proposed site plan that included a 1.5-story single-family residence and attached garage centered on the lot with ±3,100-square-foot building footprint falling mostly on the eastern portion of the site, which is oriented toward South Riverview Street as the principle frontage street. He noted the pedestrian access to S. Riverview Street by a front paver walkway and vehicular access shown from Eberly Hill Lane via a driveway to the attached garage. He said the proposed development is located on a .26-acre lot at approximately 172 feet deep by 66 feet wide, which meets Code. He said the lot coverage is 32% and Code permits up to 50% lot coverage. He said the Code requires a minimum building setback on the main street frontages and the ART established S. Riverview Street as the frontage street.

Mr. Rayburn indicated Staff worked extensively with the applicant to resolve the details of the design. He said the proposed house is a Craftsman style bungalow with a proposed height of 27 feet, 10 inches, which meets the Code maximum of 35 feet in height. He described the design featuring a wide open front porch with double columns and stone base and a front facing shed dormer in shake siding. He noted the stone veneer at the base of the east, north, and south elevations and all of the windows that are white aluminum clad wood. He said the attached garage is shown with different primary materials consisting of board-and-batten siding and metal standing seam roof to suggest it was added on at a later date.

Mr. Rayburn said the applicant has made color selections for each of the materials but it is unclear if these colors are derived from a historic palette and if they are appropriate for the character of the neighborhood. He said Staff recommends approval with two conditions:

- 1) That the proposed color scheme is chosen from a historic palette and is appropriate for the character of the neighborhood; and
- 2) That the landscape design of the site is consistent with the overall architectural and historic character of the structures on and adjacent to the site.

Andrew Navarro presented the sample material boards that included the proposed white pre-finished HardiPlank shake siding for the majority of the building. He said the board-and-batten will be a HardiPlank product as well. He presented the dimensional asphalt shingles for the roof, the Lane Blue Vein stone, and the charcoal colored metal standing seam roof sample.

David Rinaldi asked the applicant if he considered a different window similar to what was used in the house previously. Mr. Navarro said they did not want to replicate what was there before and a Craftsman style bungalow calls for a different window than what was on the existing house.

Everett Musser inquired about the color of the trim. Mr. Navarro said it would be a flat-white, smooth Hardi panel and different sizes are used around the house based on the scale of the detail.

Tom Munhall inquired about the skylights on the south elevation between the main house and the garage. Mr. Navarro said that was the greatest experience on the inside of the building. He said light will flood the great room. He said the skylights are not located on the street-facing side to serve the best purpose and do not distract from the north elevation.

The Chair invited anyone from the public to speak with regard to this application.

Tom Holton, 5957 Roundstone Place, indicated this would be the first building with skylights that he is aware of in the Historic District. He recalled a case where the Board requested that skylights be removed.

He said that overall the building looks very good. He asked the applicant to consider scaling down the size of the dormer on the east elevation to make it appear more authentic.

Mr. Rinaldi said he liked the front porch. He said he would have preferred a detached garage but understands that is not as practical. He indicated Mr. Holton's comments about the skylights were appropriate but they do not bother him as they are not visible from the street. He said he thought the potential owner would not like the skylights very much because a strong harsh light will stream in from that south side.

Mr. Musser said he has two skylights in his high family room and they bring in plenty of light and they use blinds in the summer to keep the sun from shining directly in.

Shannon Stenberg asked if the porch on the south elevation was addressed with the neighbors. Mr. Navarro said he did not discuss with the neighbors but the porch is shielded with landscape to make it a private niche for the house. He added the adjacent house has a primary orientation straight back so the 90 degree turn should now affect them and there is also an eight-foot fence.

Mr. Munhall asked if it would be a problem to have dormers instead of skylights. He said he was concerned with the direct south-facing light. Mr. Navarro said they had considered shed dormers instead of skylights but the roof began to become quite heavy geometrically. He said aesthetically there is the shed dormer on the porch and there are two more sheds coming off that gable. He offered to drop the skylights all together if it is an issue.

Mr. Munhall said he had two concerns about the skylights: precedence and aesthetics. He asked how wide the skylights are. Mr. Navarro answered each skylight is two feet wide by three feet tall.

Mr. Munhall said he liked the design. He asked if the Code addressed skylights. Jennifer Rauch answered not in the current Zoning Code.

Mr. Holton read from the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

A roofline addition such as dormers, skylights, or penthouses, should be avoided in Old Dublin. The close spacing and modest scale of most of the buildings can mean these kinds of additions result in so much change that a building's character is adversely affected. If such additions are essential, try to place them toward the rear or along the rear slope where visibility is minimal. Skylights should be flat and low in profile.

Mr. Rinaldi said he thought that referred to additions and not new builds. He said skylights were not a make or break issue for him; he just wanted the applicant to consider the functionality.

Floyd Tackett, Tackett Custom Carpentry, LTD, said he has the same dormers in his similar house down the street that is also south facing. He said his wife thinks the skylights are great because the light is always there. He stated he is glad they incorporated them into his house.

Ms. Stenberg asked about the ART's condition that the color scheme be selected from a historic palette. She asked if the colors proposed fit within the historic palette. Ms. Rauch said they could amend the condition.

**Motion and Vote**

Mr. Munhall moved, Mr. Musser seconded, to approve a request for the Minor Project Review with two conditions:

- 1) That the proposed color scheme as presented is used; and
- 2) That the landscape design of the site is consistent with the overall architectural and historic character of the structures on and adjacent to the site.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; Mr. Musser, yes; and Mr. Munhall, yes. (Approved 4 – 0)

**2. BSD HC - Town Center 1- Lighting  
16-072ARB-MPR**

**W. Bridge Street and S. High Street  
Minor Project Review**

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following application is a request for the replacement of existing exterior light fixtures on the retail center building located on the southwest corner of the intersection of W. Bridge Street and S. High Street. He said this is a request for a review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Jennifer Rauch presented an aerial view of the site on .38 acres with commercial uses. She explained the original building was approved and constructed in the late 1990s so at this point the applicant is proposing to update the light fixtures. She said five different fixtures are proposed and noted which fixtures would be installed and where; they all have the same black/bronze finishes for consistency and complement the other fixtures in the district.

Ms. Rauch said approval is recommended with the following condition:

- 1) That the applicant provide a site photometric plan that meets Code prior to issuance of a building permit.

She said following further discussion with the applicant and due to smaller sized fixtures, staff recommends the removal of the condition.

David Rinaldi confirmed all the lights would be replaced with LED lighting.

The Chair called for public comments. [There were none.]

Tom Munhall asked what the driver was for replacement. Julie Godfrey, 208 Patty Drive, Westerville, Ohio, answered the fixtures were being replaced because they were in various states of disrepair with fading, hurricane globes broken, and glass missing, etc.

Everett Musser asked if the lights would be left on 24 hours a day. Ms. Godfrey said they are on photocell and all connected at the roof.

**Motion and Vote**

Mr. Musser moved, Ms. Stenberg seconded, to approve a request for a Minor Project Review with no conditions. The vote was as follows: Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Munhall, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; and Mr. Musser, yes. (Approved 4 – 0)

**3. Holder Wright Earthworks  
16-054ARB**

**4729 Bright Road  
Building and Site Modifications**

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following application is a request for building and site modifications for the Holder Wright Earthworks site located between Bright Road and Emerald Parkway, east of Riverside Drive. He said this is a request for a review and approval of an Architectural Review Board application for a designated property located outside of the Historic District and under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.170, Appendix G and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Jennifer Rauch presented an aerial view of the site, which is outside of the Historic District but one of the twelve properties on Appendix G that fall under the ARB's purview. She said the 18.8-acre site is surrounded on the north and east sides with single-family residential, the southern side with the last phase of Emerald Parkway, and the north is undeveloped land. She said there is a creek that runs through the middle portion of this site with tree stands as well as additional trees at the perimeter. She noted the earthworks that exist on the site. She reported the single-family house on the property was repurposed and incorporated into the park design.

Ms. Rauch referred to the overall master plan of what this park could look like. She said plans change as the plan is moved forward with the different phases and noted the specific section of the property being addressed tonight.

Ms. Rauch said the proposal includes construction of a restroom facility, parking lot, pathways, pedestrian bridge, and landscaping/mounding. She noted the vehicular entrance at Emerald Parkway, which will continue to be worked out with Engineering. She said the parking area has 34 spaces that lead up to the plaza and restroom facility. She pointed out the multi-use path as well as the current path at the end of Jenmar Court but that has been reworked after meeting with the neighbors and interested residents to provide additional screening to mitigate the noise from Emerald Parkway going into this neighborhood. She said there is no lighting within the parking lot as the park area is meant for dawn to dusk activity. She said minimal light fixtures will be requested for the restroom facilities in terms of safety in case anyone was there after hours. She noted the bridge element across the creek adjacent to the plaza. She said the restroom facility and the plaza is oriented towards the north providing direct access and visibility to the pedestrian bridge. She indicated the grading up behind this facility is to make it appear as it was buried into the ground to mimic the earthwork design. She reported Staff had concerns about the potential reorientation due to safety concerns. She explained that if anyone is doing a drive-by in this parking lot for safety concerns, one cannot see around the corner of this mound. She said there are significant concerns about the design of the facility, especially about the materials and the colors, therefore, modifications were requested. She said the proposed facility shows retaining walls on either side of the central portion of the entrance to the facility made of concrete with a wood texture design finish. She added the seating portion of the retaining wall has the limestone veneer with a stone cap. She said overall this does not fit within the soft natural character that is out there on the site. She focused on the proposed pedestrian bridge that shows the same stone columns that would match the seating wall on the restroom facility with wire mesh in front of stained railings to provide security as one transverses the creek.

Ms. Rauch said approval is recommended with eight conditions:

- 1) That the applicant incorporate a different mix of materials for the restroom facility to soften the design and blend with the surrounding natural and historic areas;
- 2) That the applicant use a high-quality stained wood paneling, or equivalent material in place of the proposed concrete masonry units shown along the entrance wall to the restroom facilities;

- 3) That the roof design and surrounding mounding be reviewed to discourage opportunities for visitors to climb up the grade and stand on top of the roof;
- 4) That the building entrance be relocated to face the parking area for security reasons;
- 5) That the plans be revised to incorporate lighting on or around the proposed building for safety purposes;
- 6) That a softer material choice be incorporated for the retaining wall and the design be a stepped design;
- 7) That the applicant continue to work with Engineering on the coordination of any required improvements related to the Emerald Parkway and the park entrance drive; and
- 8) That the applicant provide a tree removal, preservation and replacement plan, and a landscape plan with the building permit that meets Code.

Matt Earman, Director of Parks and Recreation, introduced himself. He reported the City went through a restructuring last year and created the Parks and Recreation Department. He said with the retirement of Fred Hahn and the departure of Laura Ball have resulted in a transition and new roles. He indicated he and Shawn Krawetzki have taken this project on while assuming these new roles.

David Rinaldi asked what the Parks and Recreation Department thought of the recommendations for the changes of materials and orientation. He indicated we could have a different project if this application were approved with these conditions.

Mr. Earman said he thought the conditions could be managed and agreed upon; none of the conditions are serious enough to go outside the character of the design. He said he was concerned with re-orienting the building itself as it would take away the ceremonial effect of it. From a safety standpoint, he questioned whether visibility could be provided in an alternative manner; aesthetics are a lot less of a priority than the safety of the public.

Mr. Rinaldi asked for their recommendations for softening the concrete and retaining wall design so it would be limited to masonry or concrete.

Chad Knight, CT Consultants, said it would depend on how the building was reoriented and the new configuration. He said the original design was to provide the appearance of a mound being excavated for exploratory purposes. He said they will reconsider the design and remember it is a structure for restroom facilities. He said they will consider bringing down the scale of the eight-foot-tall walls to a more pedestrian level. He explained the wood texture on the walls was the initial attempt at softening the appearance. He said the concrete color in the renderings is not accurately reflected; there is a series of different colors to look like if one was cutting into a mound, the different colored layers of the earth would be illustrated.

Mr. Rinaldi said he liked the design. He asked if the backside is meant to be accessed to which Mr. Knight answered it was not.

Everett Musser said he liked the design, too. He asked Staff if the recommendation for the entrance to be turned was so that it could be visible from the parking lot. Ms. Rauch answered yes.

Mr. Rinaldi asked if the restrooms would be locked like other facilities to which Ms. Rauch answered affirmatively.

Mr. Rinaldi said he did not understand what was being accomplished by rotating the facility. He said if anything inappropriate was going on, it would always be hidden by the mound itself.

Tom Munhall said with all these conditions and a total re-work of the design it would be difficult to vote on project they have not yet been presented.

Ms. Rauch said if the Board finds the design is appropriate, they have the ability to approve the proposal and eliminate any of the conditions they do not agree with.

Mr. Munhall indicated the proposal seems to be at the discussion stage and not ready for a vote this evening. He inquired about timing.

Mr. Earman said the applicant will do whatever it takes to get this right, no matter how long it takes. He added the capital funds are available this year for construction to begin so they intend for this to be available for bid and under contract by the end of the year but if that does not happen, he can certainly work with the finance department to encumber those funds.

Mr. Rinaldi asked if the application was approved with the conditions identified, if Parks would work with Staff to meet the conditions. Ms. Rauch answered in the affirmative but offered the Board the option to table the case if they did not agree with Staff's recommendations or conditions.

The Chair called for public comments.

Don Spangler, 3614 Jenmar Court, said his home is next door to this public parking lot and restroom. He said this is not what they planned on and initially thought this was a horrible thing to be placed here but over time with discussions with the City, they have been able to get many of the elements softened with the addition of trees and mounding. He indicated that noise from Emerald Parkway currently is not that bad; everything they have seen with this project is good. He said they like the building in the position proposed. He said he does not want to see the doors to the restrooms but the mound will help and he does not want to see a lot of light. However, he said he had suggested that the walking path route be changed due to the way the snow is plowed and produces mounding and drifting. He said a lot of people use the path and would expect a lot more to use it once this earthworks project is completed.

Tom Holton, 5957 Roundstone Place, suggested adding warmer colors to the project to tie into the theme of the earthworks. He suggested the use of information kiosks at the plaza to help prepare people for what they are about to encounter at the site.

Randy Roth, 6897 Grandee Cliffs Drive, said he is very excited about all of this. He said the City has been great to work with on this. He said he resides behind the Spanglers' home. He asked that the evergreen lines be extended to provide visual protection year round. He asked if permeable pavers could be used for the parking lot instead of piping water directly into the creek that runs through his backyard, which they are trying to rehabilitate in many ways. He reported the neighbors have been working with the City's Green Team to restore natural flora and fauna. He said a 100-foot setback is not needed to protect a creek but 10 - 20 foot strip of natural vegetation is needed. He said he hopes any blasting would not be as extensive as to what was done to complete Emerald Parkway because it caused a lot of damage to his home.

Mr. Musser inquired about the drainage of the stormwater from the parking lot and where the detention areas are located.

Dave Parkinson, CT Consultants, said the stormwater and sediments will be captured and taken to a stormwater detention, two-bay facility and then after there is a controlled release back to the stream. He said the detention area is west of the restroom facility.

Mr. Musser asked if permeable pavers had been considered for the parking lot. Mr. Parkinson said the City has had turnover of staffing during this project and his company has experienced turnover as well so since he did not start with the project, he cannot speak to the history of the project. He said pavers for the parking lot are not in the plans now and is uncertain if it was evaluated during the development of the plan. He said cost would be a consideration when installing permeable pavement versus the traditional/conventional method of conveying and treating stormwater.

Mr. Musser said using permeable pavers would eliminate any detention areas. Mr. Parkinson said not all stormwater is generated at the parking area, some is generated at the roadways and the patio area at the front.

Mr. Rinaldi asked if the City would consider using permeable pavers for this project. Mr. Earman said they are not part of this project because of the soils on site. He said the City has permeable pavement in two of its parks currently; they have been experimenting with the life span of that product and the maintenance aspect is on-going.

Mr. Munhall said he was not ready to vote on this as he needs to see the changes being proposed. Mr. Musser agreed.

Mr. Rinaldi said he finds the facility to be designed properly but if the City believes rotating the building is a safer option than he is not opposed.

Mr. Earman said this can be taken back to the risk department and discuss any concerns the risk manager may have. He indicated there may be some creative ways to adjust the retaining walls to give it the visual effect we are looking for without changing the orientation of the building itself to keep the ceremonial type aspect to the project. He offered to bring back alternatives for the Board's consideration.

Mr. Rinaldi agreed the earth-tone colors would be more appropriate and really likes the concept of the design as it fits the site very well.

Shannon Stenberg requested a better rendering of the wood texture design for the concrete to show the softening effect they expect it to provide. Mr. Earman said a better illustration could be provided at the next meeting.

Mr. Musser inquired about the security issue. Mr. Earman reported that as a result of public input sessions, the perception of public safety was considered. He said from a visibility standpoint, it is nice to see all four sides of a structure and in this case it would be the circumference of the structure as police do their patrols.

Mr. Spangler said he is not in favor of lighting but if it is a necessity, he suggested motion-sensor lighting. He said if the police drive by at 3 am and the light is on, they would know to check the facility. Mr. Rinaldi said there is a perfect soffit to provide minimal light that would not spill out beyond what is necessary.

Ms. Stenberg emphasized the site should not be so visible from the houses on that street.

Mr. Munhall indicated the City has done a great job with this so far and will continue to do a great job to address these concerns to help the residents.

### **Motion and Vote**

Mr. Munhall moved, Mr. Musser seconded, to table a request for Building and Site Modifications. The vote was as follows: Ms. Stenberg, yes, Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Musser, yes; and Mr. Munhall, yes. (Tabled 4 – 0)



**4. Public Nuisance Regulations – Code Amendment  
16-036ADM**

**Administrative Request**

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following application is a request for an amendment to the Zoning Code to amend the International Property Maintenance Code and relocating the Nuisance and Health/Safety Related Sections of the Code to §153.076, Public Nuisance Regulations. He said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to City Council for proposed amendments to the Codified Ordinances under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.232 and §153.234.

Jennifer Rauch said if the Board was comfortable, a recommendation could be made this evening but a discussion would be acceptable. She said this is part of a larger Code Amendment to consolidate all the Public Nuisance sections of the Zoning Code interspersed throughout the Code. She said a part of that relates to trash can/recycling bin screening and how it is addressed within the Historic District. She said the overall Code Amendment was reviewed by the PZC but they have not yet made a recommendation as they requested additional research and modifications for all the other sections included.

Ms. Rauch reported that in 2010, the Code was amended to add screening requirements. She indicated that in the last six years there have been compliance issues, especially within the Historic District given the small nature of the lots and side yards. She said City Council was not interested in reducing the requirements for the majority of the City but was willing to discuss minor modifications particular to the Historic District and how that is handled. Ms. Rauch reported this topic was discussed at the Historic District Stakeholder meeting a few months ago and they requested research be conducted on what other communities have done.

Ms. Rauch summarized the current Code states trash cans need to either be stored in the garage or to the side and rear of the property and screened only with landscape material at 100% opacity year round. She said when the resident is not compliant, Code Enforcement sends a letter to the resident. She presented photographic examples from throughout the district of non-compliance. She demonstrated what was proposed for the Historic District versus the remainder of the City. She stated the requirements for the Historic District included the use of a fence or a wall to screen the trash cans/recycle bins in areas where there is not room for landscape material to provide 100% opacity. She said the other component is that the trash cans/recycle bins do not need to be stored at just the side or rear of the property.

David Rinaldi asked if this would just apply to the Historic District or if it would also apply to the properties on Appendix G. Ms. Rauch said the assumption is for the Historic District. She explained that most of the properties on Appendix G are fairly large properties and could meet the requirement as it stands. Mr. Rinaldi said that should be made clear in the Code. Ms. Rauch agreed and clarified this only relates to residential properties.

Tom Munhall said he believes the trash cans/recycle bins should be stored in the garage, but said he agrees with the proposed amendment.

Mr. Rinaldi said the amendment should specify that a fence could only be permitted at the side or rear yards, not in the front even if it matched the architecture of the home.

Shannon Stenberg questioned if the resident would need to obtain approval from the Board to even build the fence for this purpose.

Mr. Rinaldi said it should require the Board's approval since the resident would be adding to their residential structure.

Tom Holton, 5957 Roundstone Place, said there are a couple of structures that do not have a backyard because they reside right on the riverbank and some do not even have a single-car garage. There will be a couple of special circumstances he said.

Ms. Stenberg asked if yard waste would be included. Mr. Rinaldi suggested the wording include the restriction of a fence for screening of trash/recycling to ensure a homeowner does not build a 20-foot-long fence and state it is meant to screen their trash.

### **Communications**

Jennifer Rauch said a workshop will be held with the consultant on October 4<sup>th</sup> to review the Code for the Historic District from 5:30 pm – 7:30 pm at the Dublin Community Church. She encouraged the Board to attend. She said four different stations will be set up for public input on: 1) mass and scale of buildings; 2) transitions/uses; 3) parking; and 4) appropriate materials.

She indicated that as the project at Bridge Park West progresses along with the pedestrian bridge and landing, more information will be brought to the ARB for review.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 8:06 pm.

As approved by the Architectural Review Board on October 26, 2016.