



## MEETING MINUTES

# Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, February 22, 2017

### AGENDA

- 1. BSD HC – Honest Advertising  
16-108ARB-MPR** **39 W. Bridge Street  
Minor Project Review (Approved 5 – 0)**
- 2. BSD HR  
17-009ARB-MPR** **170 S. Riverview Street  
Minor Project Review (Approved 5 – 0)**
- 3. BSD HC – Shed and Garage (Former Biddies site)  
17-007ARB** **76 – 82 S. High Street  
Demolition (Approved 5 – 0)**
- 4. BSD HC – Mixed-Use Development (Former Biddies site)  
17-008ARB-SPR** **76 – 82 S. High Street  
Site Plan Review (Tabled 5 – 0)**

The Chair, David Rinaldi, called the meeting to order at 6:31 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Board members present were: Jane Fox, Thomas Munhall, Shannon Stenberg, and Everett Musser. City representatives were: Jennifer Rauch, JM Rayburn, Lori Burchett, and Laurie Wright.

### Administrative Business

#### Motion and Vote

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

#### Motion and Vote

Ms. Fox moved, Mr. Munhall seconded, to approve the January 25<sup>th</sup> meeting minutes. The vote was as follows: Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; Mr. Musser, yes; Mr. Munhall, yes; and Ms. Fox, 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 during this meeting.



**1. BSD HC – Honest Advertising  
16-108ARB-MPR**

**39 W. Bridge Street  
Minor Project Review**

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following application is a request for the installation of two new signs on an existing office building on the south side of W. Bridge Street, approximately 80 feet west of the intersection with Mill Lane. He said this is a request for a review and approval for a Minor Project Review under the provisions of the Zoning Code and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

JM Rayburn presented an aerial view of the site and pointed out the locations of the 7.75-square-foot proposed wall signs that are intended for each entrance. He stated the signs meet Code for color, size, location, and number. He described the signs as pre-assembled, high density urethane (HDU) sign panels with two colors (black with grey letters). He explained the raised areas and return edges will be painted Map Cool Gray and the recessed areas painted Map Black. The non-illuminated signs are rectangular with added character from the wing tip design he said and the letter sizes and styles are easy to read.

Mr. Rayburn stated after reviewing the criteria for a Minor Project Review, the ARB Standards and general review standards, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*, approval is recommended with one condition:

- 1) That the applicant provide revised drawings indicating the exact height of the sign not to exceed 15 feet, subject to staff approval.

The Chair invited the applicant to add to the presentation, which they declined and then invited public comment [Hearing none.]

Jane Fox inquired about the graphic showing the sign height. Mr. Rayburn said it appears to be under the 15-foot maximum height but is requesting that the applicant verify that measurement.

**Motion and Vote**

Ms. Stenberg moved, Mr. Musser seconded, to approve a request for a Minor Project Review with the following condition:

- 1) That the applicant provide revised drawings indicating the exact height of the sign not to exceed 15 feet, subject to staff approval.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Munhall, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Musser, yes; and Ms. Stenberg, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

**2. BSD HR  
17-009ARB-MPR**

**170 S. Riverview Street  
Minor Project Review**

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following application is a request for a deck addition and modification to the front porch on an existing residence on a 0.66-acre parcel on the east side of S. Riverview Street, approximately 400 feet south of the intersection with Pinney Hill Lane. He said this is a request for a review and approval for a Minor Project Review under the provisions of the Zoning Code and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Jennifer Rauch presented an aerial view of the site and explained it is surrounded by other single-family residences to the north, west, and south, with the Scioto River abutting the property to the east. She presented a photograph of the front of the property.

Ms. Rauch said the following is a summary of the proposal:

- Deck and stair addition to the existing rear patio
- Rear door replacement
- Walkway from rear deck addition to existing stone stairs
- Four column additions to the existing front porch
- Replacement of an existing door at the front of the building with a window
- Addition of flower boxes to the front left and right windows

Ms. Rauch presented the existing site plan compared to the proposed site plan and noted the locations of each of the proposed revisions. She presented the proposed rear deck addition compared to the existing conditions as well as the materials proposed for the rear deck addition. She explained the following:

- New Door: Full Lite Style, Mahogany Woodgrain, in "Brilliant White"
- Deck Material: Trex Decking, 1" Square Edge Boards, Pebble Grey
- New Railing: 38" tall, Azek posts, Charcoal Black; 3/8" tempered glass sections between posts, clear glass; 6" x 5/4" Azek top rail, Charcoal Black; and Azek bottom rail, Charcoal Black
- New Stairway: Pressure treated stringers with Azek treads, railing will be Azek
- New Pathway: Natural stone, matches material of existing stairs

Ms. Rauch presented the existing and proposed front elevation and pointed out the addition of the proposed four columns with Azek trim on the front porch. She noted the front door will be converted to a new Jeld-Wen Premium Vinyl Casement window, in white with Azek trim, and an Azek panel below. Lastly, she highlighted where the window boxes would be positioned under each of the two existing windows.

Ms. Rauch reported the ART reviewed this application with the Minor Project Review Standards, Code requirements of the ARB sections of the Code as well as the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*. She said approval is recommended with the following condition:

- 1) That the applicant provide further details regarding the proposed design, material, and color of the proposed flower boxes for the left and right front windows.

Jane Fox inquired about the columns because the one in front of the picture window seems to be in an odd place. Ms. Rauch explained the third column was already in front of that window, which made the front appear off balance so the request was for a fourth column to space the columns more appropriately.

Heidi Bolyard, Simplified Architecture, explained the graphic is not doing the columns justice because in 3-dimensions it feels different and pushing the columns over would make the placement awkward; it is not a symmetrical façade. She said the applicant wanted to maintain the existing sidewalk and moving the columns would place one right in the middle of the sidewalk.

Ms. Fox asked if the applicant is happy with having a fourth column.

Denise Frantz King, 170 S. Riverview, said her goal with this project was to simply improve the look of the house. She stated she does not need to make any of these changes but it is a very plain house, especially in the winter when the landscaping is down; it is not an asset to the street. She said this is a 60s ranch house and all those same houses around this property have those columns. She indicated she is not thrilled having a column in front of a window but it looks better and does not want a column in the middle of her sidewalk.

Ms. King explained the house grew over time so that is why there are two front doors.

Tom Munhall said he agreed these are all great improvements to the house.

Steve Rudy, 129 S. Riverview Street, said he supports this proposal and loves his neighborhood.

Shannon Stenberg said the proposal looks fantastic.

David Rinaldi said he is not a fan of the columns but he can accept them.

### **Motion and Vote**

Mr. Musser moved, Ms. Fox seconded, to approve a request for a Minor Project Review with the following condition:

- 1) That pending case approval, the applicant provide further details regarding the proposed design, material, and color of the proposed flower boxes for the left and right front windows.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Stenberg, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Munhall, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; and Mr. Musser, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

### **3. BSD HC – Shed and Garage (Former Biddies site) 17-007ARB**

### **76 – 82 S. High Street Demolition**

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following application is a request for Demolition of an existing shed and garage. He said the site is on the east side of South High Street, approximately 35 feet southeast of the intersection with Eberly Hill Lane. He said this is a request for a review and approval for a Demolition request under the provisions of the Zoning Code and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Lori Burchett presented an aerial view of the site and the proposed site plan and noted the 9-square-foot wood-frame shed, a garage, and a set of steps on the existing structure all associated with the ca. 1830 main structure located on the property. She stated none of these elements are considered architecturally or historically significant on their own. She presented photographs of the existing structures and the set of stairs proposed to be demolished.

Ms. Burchett reported staff and an outside historic consultant reviewed the proposal with the demolition review criteria and went through each. As a result, she reported all three sources determined the criteria has been met and recommends approval with two conditions:

- 1) That prior to actual demolition, the owner shall permit the Dublin Historical Society to enter the premises and salvage any historic architectural features worthy of preservation; and
- 2) That the order to allow a demolition shall not be issued by the City until a replacement sue or building has been approved by the Reviewing Body and an application for a building permit has been submitted for the replacement building to the City.

Jane Fox indicated she thought the small building was original to the site. Ms. Burchett reported the consultant had said that there is a possibility that the structure could have been moved to the site but it was hard to determine when and how the structure was placed.

Frank Albanese, ISO Communities, 5277 Blue Ash Road, Columbus, Ohio, said the smaller structure is sitting on a shallow concrete foundation.

The Chair invited the public to speak in regard to this application.

David Hahm, 83 S. Riverview Street, said it was an outhouse and he has seen it in that location since 1969 but suspects it is from the 1930s.

Shannon Stenberg inquired about architectural or archeological features. Mr. Rinaldi said if either are uncovered during excavation, they are to be recovered or investigated.

### **Motion and Vote**

Mr. Munhall moved, Mr. Rinaldi seconded, to approve a request for a Demolition with two conditions:

- 1) That prior to actual demolition, the owner shall permit the Dublin Historical Society to enter the premises and salvage any historic architectural features worthy of preservation; and
- 2) That the order to allow a demolition shall not be issued by the City until a replacement use or building has been approved by the Reviewing Body and an application for a building permit has been submitted for the replacement building to the City.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Musser, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; Mr. Munhall, yes; and Mr. Rinaldi, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

### **4. BSD HC – Mixed-Use Development (Former Biddies site) 76 – 82 S. High Street 17-008ARB-SPR Site Plan Review**

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following application is a request for a mixed-use building with associated parking and site improvements on the east side of South High Street, approximately 35 feet southeast of the intersection with Eberly Hill Lane. He said this is a request for a review and approval for a Site Plan Review under the provisions of the Zoning Code and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Lori Burchett reported the Basic Plan Review was approved with Waivers by the ARB on November 16, 2016 and the Site Plan Review conducted by the ART was recommended for approval with conditions, more Waivers, a Parking Plan, and a Fee-in-Lieu of Open Space. She said the Demolition for this site of the accessory buildings will also need to be approved as well as an approval for a future application for a Sign Plan.

Ms. Burchett went over the previously approved Waivers and conditions as part of the Basic Plan Review. They are as follows:

#### Approved Waivers

- ✓ Front Property Line Coverage
- ✓ Corner Side RBZ
- ✓ Occupancy of Corner
- ✓ Parking within building and off-street parking on side

#### Conditions

- ✓ Demolition Application
- ✓ Lot Combination
- ✓ Increase Accessibility
- ✓ Off-street Parking Layout
- ✓ Auto-turn Data
- ✓ Principal Entrance on Eberly Hill
- ✓ Material and Design Details
- ✓ Final Open Space, Landscape Details

While the Height Waiver was not approved, she said a condition was placed to decrease the number of stories, leading to the changes in the layout. She reported the building stories have been decreased to meet this condition. She added the conditions have been either met or carried over as continued conditions as part of the Site Plan Review.

Ms. Burchett presented the proposed Site Plan. She explained the applicant has changed the orientation of the building to address some of the conditions from Basic Plan Review. The front of the building is now oriented towards Eberly Hill Lane she said and steps down towards Blacksmith Lane. She stated the current proposed building is located east and south of the existing historic buildings, oriented along Eberly Hill Lane with access to the site proposed from Blacksmith Lane. She indicated the proposed building was re-oriented on the site to better incorporate the building into the existing grade change and the existing neighborhood.

Ms. Burchett explained there is a significant grade change from High Street towards Blacksmith Lane and the proposed site layout better addresses the site conditions. She added the applicant is proposing to preserve the existing contributing historic structures located on the property. These would include 6,160 square feet of office and two multiple-family dwelling units she said and parking is located within the structure with two, two-car attached garages proposed at the rear of the building. Additional parking is proposed along the side of the building with landscaped areas along Blacksmith Lane.

Ms. Burchett stated the applicant is requesting three Waivers as shown on the slide:

1. To allow parking to be permitted within the building;
2. To allow for foundation plantings around the rear of the property; and
3. To allow the applicant to have one primary entrance along Eberly Hill Lane where three would be required.

Ms. Burchett said the following conditions are associated with the proposal and explained each:

- 1) That the applicant works with staff to identify a more appropriate location for the bicycle parking area;
- 2) The applicant combine the two lots prior to issuance of building permit;
- 3) That the applicant ensures all light fixtures and site photometrics meet Code, and any outstanding information be provided as part of the building permitting;
- 4) That the construction of the proposed development is subject to the approval of the demolition request;
- 5) That if a change of use should occur to include a different mix of uses for the existing or proposed buildings that require additional parking provisions, the applicant would be required to gain approval of a modified Parking Plan from the ARB;
- 6) That the applicant works with staff to relocate transformers and AC units to a location more interior to the site, to the extent possible; and
- 7) That the northern portion of the proposed street wall be relocated to provide screening of the A/C units, gas meters, and transformer on the eastern side of the building;

The applicant is requesting a fee-in-lieu of open space. The current layout provides open space, that although meets the minimum size requirements, it is stepped down from High Street and would be in

between two buildings. After review at ART the board had determined that a fee-in-lieu of would be more appropriate and would be used to enhance the existing open space in the area at a greater benefit to the public.

Ms. Burchett presented the proposed elevations and explained the following Waivers and Conditions requested in association with same:

Ms. Burchett state the applicant is requesting approval of Waivers to allow for a combination gable roof type, a gambrel roof type, and a pitched roof with a gambrel type. She explained this is proposed in order to best break up the massing and façade to give architectural interest in the roofline.

Ms. Burchett said a Waiver is requested to allow ground floor transparency along Eberly Hill to be 31% and 33% for S. Blacksmith Lane where 40% is required; this is proposed due to the grade changes.

A Waiver to allow the use of fiber cement siding where brick, stone, glass, and wood are permitted materials is being requested. She indicated fiber cement is appropriate for new construction and gives the appearance of wood siding.

Conditions:

- 1) That the applicant reduces the size of the upper balcony (length and depth) and detach the upper balcony from the lower balcony;
- 2) That the applicant conceals all roof penetrations (fans, exhaust, vents, etc.) and ensure these will not be visible from principal frontage streets; and
- 3) That all sign details shall be approved by the ARB, prior to the installation of signs.

Ms. Burchett explained the proposed elevations facing west - High Street and facing the east elevation - Blacksmith Lane along with adjacent properties. She said additional conditions are proposed that would include:

- 1) That the applicant revises the plan to show use of a stacked stone wall for the street wall provided on Blacksmith Lane in accordance with Code;
- 2) That additional shrubs of a similar mix as currently shown, be provide along he northerly street wall along Blacksmith Lane to meet Code;
- 3) That the doors for commercial uses along the street frontages shall be consistent with the design of the principal entrances and include full glass and full operating hardware;
- 4) That all sign details shall be approved by the ARB, prior to the installation of signs; and
- 5) That approval of the western elevation design is subject to the building permit review process.

Ms. Burchett explained the proposed Waivers and conditions for the north and south elevations:

1. To allow the retaining wall height to be 12-feet in height where a maximum 6-feet is required.

Conditions:

- 1) That the applicant ensures all recesses and/or projections required for vertical facade divisions shall meet the required depth of 18 inches; and
- 2) That all dormers be recessed by 12 inches.

Ms. Burchett reported the ART has reviewed the Waivers against the applicable review criteria and found the criteria has been met or will be met. They also reviewed the Open Space Fee-in-Lieu criteria she said and found that the criteria has been met.

Ms. Burchett noted Staff and the ART have reviewed the Architectural Review Board Standards against the applicable review criteria and found the criteria has been met or will be met with conditions.

In conclusion, the ART has reviewed the Site Plan criteria and found the criteria that is applicable to this proposal is met or will be met with conditions. She said four motions/votes are being requested from the Board this evening, which would include 10 Waivers, Parking Plan, Fee-in-Lieu, and Site Plan with 16 conditions.

Ms. Burchett indicated that the ART recommends approval of the 10 Waivers, Parking Plan, Fee-in-Lieu, and Site Plan with 16 conditions. She noted that Staff has reworded number 7 to reflect the applicant combine the two lots prior to issuance of the building permit rather than file an application.

Recommendation of Approval to ARB of 10 Waivers:

1. Roof Type Requirements (3)
2. Parking Location
3. Transparency Requirements (2)
4. Building Entrances
5. Permitted Materials
6. Retaining Wall Height
7. Foundation Plantings

Recommendation of Approval to ARB of a Parking Plan:

To approve a reduction of required parking from 22 to 20 parking spaces.

Recommendation of Approval to ARB of Fee-in-lieu of Open Space

To approve a fee paid in lieu of the provision of open space.

Recommendation of Approval to the ARB for a Site Plan Review with 16 conditions:

- 1) That the applicant work with staff to relocate transformers and AC units to a location more interior to the site, to the extent possible;
- 2) That the applicant reduces the size of the upper balcony (length and depth) and detach the upper balcony from the lower balcony;
- 3) That the applicant work with staff to identify a more appropriate location for the bicycle parking area;
- 4) That the applicant revises the plan to show use of a stacked stone for the street wall provided on Blacksmith Lane in accordance with Code;
- 5) That additional shrubs of a similar mix as currently shown be provide along the northerly street wall along Blacksmith Lane to meet Code;
- 6) That the applicant ensures all light fixtures and site photometrics meet Code and any outstanding information be provided as part of the building permitting
- 7) That the applicant combine the two lots prior to issuance of building permit;

- 8) That the applicant conceals all roof penetrations (fans, exhaust, vents, etc.) and ensures these will not be visible from principal frontage streets;
- 9) That the doors for commercial uses along the street frontages shall be consistent with the design of the principal entrances and include full glass and full operating hardware;
- 10) That the applicant ensures all recesses and/or projections required for vertical facade divisions meet the required depth of 18 inches;
- 11) That all sign details shall be approved by the ARB, prior to the installation of signs;
- 12) That the construction of the proposed development is subject to the approval of the demolition request;
- 13) That if a change of use should occur to include a different mix of uses for the existing or proposed buildings that require additional parking provisions, the applicant would be required to gain approval of a modified Parking Plan from the ARB;
- 14) That the northern portion of the proposed street wall be relocated to provide screening of the A/C units, gas meters, and transformer on the eastern side of the building;
- 15) That all dormers be recessed by 12 inches; and
- 16) That approval of the western elevation design is subject to the building permit review process.

Jane Fox stated she did not see the criteria meeting the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Ms. Burchett said the criteria is not in the presentation but it is in the Planning Report on page 12 and offered to go through those as well. Ms. Fox asked that this be discussed.

Ms. Burchett explained how the proposal meets each of the following *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*:

1. Placement and Orientation on the Lot
2. Scale and Proportion
3. Height
4. Materials, Textures, and Colors
5. Massing, Form, and Roof Shape
6. Rhythm of Openings
7. Window-to-Wall Ratio
8. Fences and Walls

*The details of the explanations can be found in the Planning Report.*

The Chair invited the applicant to add to the presentation.

David Meleca, architect, 144 E. State Street, Columbus, Ohio, said they listened to the Boards comments at the last review and made some dramatic changes. He said they have devised an economical solution that still has value for the owner but will also enhance the district. He said they broke the massing up into three pieces to make it appear as an assemblage of smaller historic buildings.

Mr. Meleca reported when they discussed the second story balcony with the ART initially, everyone was in favor of it and he is not sure what changed from the staff report, which he recalls as very different. He explained the balcony is an amenity area for the upstairs tenant and does not believe it is an opposing

structure but rather a fairly lazy structure that happens over time and not inappropriate for that type of architecture.

Steve Rudy, 129 S. Riverview Street, inquired about the height of each story. David Rinaldi answered, 12, 11, and 13 to the ridge height.

Mr. Rudy said regardless of the Board's opinions, the staff discussion read like an alternative reality having lived in the district for 20 years; he knows what scale and character are and to say we are bending language is putting it lightly. He noted the staff comments referred not to old buildings but rather to recent developments. He said it appears the height baseline has gone up by 12 or 14 feet. He said using BriHi as the baseline is absurd. As a resident, he indicated the building will appear as three stories and not 2.5 stories. He questioned if the economic value would be there if the story height was reduced that is more in tune with historic structures. He noted there are plenty of viable businesses using 9 and 10-foot ceilings all up and down High Street. He said the applicant's previous proposal disrupted the site lines less before reorienting the building. He recalled that the complaint then was the building was too tall but the orientation made it better because it was moved back and let the hill speak for itself. He asked if the applicant would consider bringing down the structure height. He added it is the building spacing that disturbs site lines and this reads as one big building because you cannot see trees, etc., between the supposed "separate" buildings.

Mr. Rudy brought up the blasting aspect and how it would affect the first footprint versus this one.

Mr. Rudy thought the City has been very kind to gain public feedback and opinions proactively on transitioning, scale, and character down through the district to the south. He said if this is a precedent he assumes this will happen everywhere like the Planning Report indicated.

David Hahm, 83 S. Riverview Street, noted he saw a few small changes made based on the feedback but his serious objections still remain and that includes the volume/mass of the building that the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* were designed to ensure the infill behind High Street, either direction, east or west, make a transition to the residential neighborhood behind it, which means less intense development, smaller volume, more open space and in this case is just the opposite. Therefore, he believes it violates all the *Guidelines* in terms of scale and proportion, despite what staff says. He stated it is a three-story building with three habitable floors, no matter how you describe it. He added now this huge mass has been moved closer to the residential district. He said he is still very concerned about the alley and asked what the width of the alley would be curb to curb. He said it was 13 feet, which enables only one-way traffic at a time. Right now it works he said because there are parking lots that are accessible. He said if this goes through, drivers will have to go onto other private properties to pass. Jennifer Rauch confirmed the current plan shows 13.8 feet for the width of pavement. She added this has been reviewed by Engineering and Fire and they are supportive.

Jane Fox said BSD Code states there should be 22 feet of surface in order to pass vehicles on a service street and asked if this alley applied. Ms. Rauch requested this be discussed by the Board once the public portion has been closed.

Mr. Hahm said he would like that to be attended to because there is an emerging problem. He said 22 feet would be nice but questions where it would come from. He concluded this project be disapproved in its current form.

Tom Holton, 5957 Roundstone Place, said an approved project as shown here might stand up in an analogous manner to the library. He indicated it is almost over designed in the context of surrounding structures. He said he would have liked to see it in color on the website. He suggested the windows be decreased in size on the upper levels. He inquired about the character of the stone wall, and the lighting plan for at night, and how the illumination would be shielded from the residences across the street.

Mr. Holton suggested that if the Board went through the ART's comments one by one, they would find them to be untrue. He said he was shocked at how inaccurate that information is and how disconnected from reality the ART is in terms of the Historic District. He encouraged the ARB not to rubber stamp the recommendations of the ART. He emphasized this property is in the Historic Core and it is an important site.

Mr. Meleca requested to address some of the public's comments. He said the units are 9 and 10 feet in height, which is typical and the height of the building is lower than (former) Biddies building and they meet the 2.5 story criteria due to the requirement to have a pitched roof. He restated the applicant is meeting the engineering and fire department requirements regarding all the roads and the applicant has done everything they have asked them to do during the review process. He argued that this is not overdesigned but rather simple structures and the architecture leans towards the Williamsburg character. He said there is a variety of window sizes and window divides. He restated the structure is meant to look like three separate buildings with shared walls. He explained they took the cue for colors from the (former) Biddies structure and the yellow building and but muting them a bit. He said all the lighting will be maintained on the site.

Bob Benson said he owns the Shamrock Barbershop at 86 S. High Street. He said he is right next to the property south and he is concerned about parking. He asked why parking was being downsized instead of asking for more because parking in the Historic District has always been a problem. He asked if the developer constructs this structure and then decides to sell off the front two buildings, where those people would park.

The Chair asked if there was anyone else from the public that wished to speak with regard to this case [hearing none] he closed the public portion of the meeting.

Ms. Fox said the ARB appreciates the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* are as important and carry as much weight as the BSD Code. She suggested the Board go through each of these items and determine if they are met as this is a very sensitive building in a very sensitive part of the City. She said the criteria can be interpreted differently. She said the Standards of Review that the ARB must follow and in the *Historic District Design Guidelines* she would say many of the criteria are not met.

Tom Munhall indicated he had a few direct questions for Mr. Meleca. He said the biggest element he struggled with was the roof. He asked if the gambrel roof was an architectural feature they planned to use or if that was part of trying to meet height restrictions. Mr. Meleca explained the gambrel roof is fashioned after a house in the Historic District on High Street, south of this parcel and noted there were secondary roof structures on either side of it proposed. He thought this would be an appropriate roof form for this building as it would encompass the width of the building as well as complete the roof form.

Mr. Munhall requested a ridgeline view to better see the transitions between the roofs. He said he understands the intentions of those designs but is concerned how it is going to appear because he cannot see that ridgeline. Mr. Meleca confirmed the gambrel roof is a little higher than the other two roofs by two feet on each side. Therefore, he said the rake of the gambrel along with some siding will be visible and the transition will not be seen happening but will add volume to the roof without adding height.

Ms. Fox noted that some of the historical concerns that the Board had looking back, trying to design a structure with mixes to appear as two separate structures. She asked the applicant if two separate structures were discussed and considered. She said she is struggling with the footprint and the volume. She said this does not look authentic as the Historic District is made up of small individual structures, which allows this rhythm that happens on the site allowing for open spaces and informal parking. She emphasized a footprint this large is uncharacteristic of the Historic District so she is struggling with trying to create an artificial look, which is against the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*. She noted the

*Guidelines* specifically state that if new construction is added it should not be made to look artificially like something that is already there. She suggested larger setbacks so there is not a wall of buildings and large step backs amongst the buildings so they look they were added over time. Mr. Meleca said it was a balancing act to try and get usable floor plates so setbacks were a challenge. Economics, he said, dictated not constructing three separate individual buildings; it does not meet the program they were given and it is not feasible.

Ms. Fox said she is concerned about the proximity to (former) Biddies, the building inspector, Mr. Tyler, expressed the same concerns, and the consultant is concerned because the rooflines almost abut. She added Mr. Tyler said this would not fly due to fire hazards.

Ms. Rauch said the discussion with Mr. Tyler was that the applicant would need to mitigate that. Mr. Meleca said he found this was not a building Code issue and they have a certified plans examiner on staff. Again, he said this will be addressed during the Building Permit process.

Everett Musser noted the applicant has quite a challenge designing a building in our Historic Core and on the slope of this site. He indicated he likes this building more than what was presented before. He inquired if the top floor was removed, would a sloping roof still be required and wanted to know how that might take place.

Mr. Meleca said all they would really be doing is removing the dormers off of that roof form. Mr. Musser confirmed the roof would be there but considerably lower.

Mr. Meleca added the character of a traditional roof would have a steeper roof. Mr. Musser asked if there are any flat-roof historic buildings to which Mr. Meleca answered not often.

The Chair asked Ms. Fox if she wanted to go through the exercise of reviewing each point or if there were a few that were really bothering her to discuss as a Board.

Ms. Fox strongly suggested the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* and the Architectural Review Board Standards be reviewed as the ART appears to have covered the BSD Code thoroughly.

The Board discussed how to best approach this. Ms. Rauch said the expectation was that the Board would review this application based on all that criteria so she suggested she raise her questions now.

Ms. Fox questioned the following:

Height – She thought the requirement was 35 feet with a step down utilizing the current grade to be compatible with surrounding properties and she does not believe that was proposed. Mr. Rinaldi said he agreed.

Alterations to the Site – She said the requirement is to be minimal and she said there are huge alterations including 12-foot walls proposed to be excavated out, a 90-foot long wall to be excavated, and sewer issues. She indicated this site is solid bedrock and so close to the historic structure on the front. She said if this is considered minimal alteration to the site, they are kidding ourselves.

Ms. Rauch explained that Engineering has reviewed this and did not have comments at the ART review but that is not the only time this is reviewed by the group; there are multiple internal staff meetings and Engineering will continue to review this as part of the Building Permit issuance.

Mr. Munhall said he is not an engineer or geologist so the bedrock issue is out of his area therefore he does not know how he would give an educated response. He asked how much is being developed underground versus above grade.

Mr. Rinaldi noted there is a drastic amount of excavation required to build this proposal as presented.

Conforms to the Character of the Site – Ms. Fox noted the Planning Report states the applicant is trying to minimize the impact to material selection. She said material selection does not minimize the impact. She restated the impact is due to the large footprint.

Placement and Orientation on the Site – Ms. Fox referenced page 12 of the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*, which states the new construction has to look like historic structures in the district whereas the Planning Report states this proposal looks like other mixed-use construction in the district. Therefore, Ms. Fox does not believe that criteria is met.

Scale and Proportion – Ms. Fox said the Planning Report states it was met but this is supposed to appear as three smaller structures and it reads as one large structure divided by walls and a little bit different architecture.

Mr. Musser said the elevations are misleading because they are only being presented in 2-dimension. He suggested if the Board had a 3-dimensional rendering in color, that some of Ms. Fox's concerns might not be so valid. He said the Board could table this and ask the architect to come back but every time they come back, there is always going to be some issues that someone on the Board does not agree with. Somewhere along the way, he said the Board needs to say we are not going to let anything happen on this site or we need to approve something.

Ms. Fox said she disagreed because she wants to see development on the site, but it has to be appropriate to scale of the district. She indicated the structure is 110 feet long along Eberly Hill Lane and it is only 15 feet wide, then there is a five-foot sidewalk and adding curbs would be a problem. She suggested curbs and islands need to be eliminated from the Historic District because they do not exist back on those alleys. She added there is going to be large excavation taking place along the Barbershop. The scale of the surrounding properties she noted are much smaller than this proposal will appear. She said behind the Yarn Shop, there was a new infill development and it was 1.5 – 2 stories in height and it fit appropriately by scale. She said there is no way with the curbing next to that narrow lane that two cars can pass each other unless one of the vehicles pulls way over into someone's parking lot and this will invite more traffic; this is an accessory street, not a main road. She emphasized a structure with a smaller footprint and lower profile would fit beautifully. She said that is not her opinion that is what is required according to the criteria.

Ms. Fox said some materials are nice but when it comes to retaining walls, they need to be constructed of the original old stone, not a substitute face. She asked if a 12-foot retaining wall could be reduced to a terrace six and six with plantings. She stated authentic materials need to be used in the Historic Core and the Board cannot permit a lot of artificial materials or the entire district will be degraded, little by little. She emphasized the review needs to be based on criteria to make a determination; the Board should not be asked to say yes just to get a building constructed here.

Mr. Musser said the Board is asking the applicant to design according to the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* but also the applicant has to have a building that will realize a return on his investment. He asked if there is a specific square-footage or size of building where it is no longer economically reasonable to build on this site. He said we are looking at Historic Guidelines but a business is a business.

Frank Albanese said staff has been working diligently for the last four months on the ARB's recommendations and the site was approved with conditions of doing a new building. He said they believe the building is down to the size that is economically feasible to build and they do not have any other choices unless they turned it back into restaurant and bar or another use that is already there and paving the parking lot. He stated this is a two-story building and how the inside of the roof is used is not important. He explained they tried to use the dirt to minimize the architecture and the demolition. He

said they intend to go 6 – 8 feet into the existing ground for footers for the wall and it will be a total of 12 feet. He said (former) Biddies is 32 feet by 110 feet. He recognized the proposal is reading 2-dimensional and not 3-dimensional. He noted the Mezzo building has parapet walls that go nowhere. He said Mr. Meleca has done a great job designing a gambrel roof. He said the building cannot be moved back because they have to follow parking requirements. He reported the Fire Department requested a larger turn radius. He said there is a curb on the east side of Blacksmith Lane and there is 26 feet in there and they are proposing a malleable curb so if a fire truck is needed it can drive over top of it.

Mr. Munhall inquired about the distance from the building to the edge of the right-of-way. Mr. Albanese answered it is 13 feet, 6 inches.

Steve Lamphear, Diamond V, 8205 Smith Calhoun Road. Plain City, Ohio, said the curb plus the sidewalk is an additional seven feet totaling 20 feet, six inches.

Shannon Stenberg asked if the expectation was for passing cars to drive up on the sidewalk. Mr. Lamphear said that scenario would only happen on a rare occasion. He said if there is an instance when a car is coming they can always move over to the curb a little bit.

Ms. Fox inquired about being able to preserve open space for this and how it would affect landscaping.

Ms. Rauch emphasized the existing condition is being preserved with this proposal.

Mr. Munhall pointed out that currently someone's back yard is being driven on when two cars need to pass. So if a neighbor requested a garage for the backyard, the answer would be no because we need their yard to drive on if this building is constructed.

Ms. Fox recommended granting an easement cars could still get through there; that is how these alleys operate but we are trying to treat them as a principal roadway. Ms. Rauch clarified this is being addressed as an alley, which aligns with the Street Network Map; nowhere does the proposal or Planning Report state this is principal frontage street. She restated both Fire and Engineering reviewed this and understand the challenges in that area. She said we have to deal with what is in front of us in context with what is existing.

Ms. Fox indicated it is going to be a nightmare down there because people are used to using the alley because that neighborhood only has one access point/Short Street other than these alleys.

Mr. Musser said the only way the conditions can stay exactly the same is if nothing is developed on this property.

Mr. Albanese said it is the intent of the applicant to bring a historical looking building to the community to set a standard. He said they are hoping for approval this evening.

Fences and Walls – Ms. Fox stated per the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*, fences and walls cannot be more than 6 feet and need to be made out of authentic limestone so putting a face on a concrete wall is not authentic to the district. She suggested that if we have to have 12-foot retaining walls that they be built with limestone but it would nice if we could terrace that out so there could be two, six-foot fences. She asked if it is necessary to have that 90-foot wall along the side where the Barbershop is located.

Mr. Rinaldi said a 12-foot dry-laid limestone retaining wall is not possible.

Mr. Meleca agreed. He said the wall is 8 feet not 12 and the railing on top of it is the additional height. He said the only way to get a two-foot thick straight wall is to use something poured and face it with

another material. He said a stepped and terraced fence system would take five to six feet of width, which would eat up all the property.

Mr. Musser confirmed the proposed stone is Glengary Landmark Stone.

Mr. Holton interjected there is an eight foot retaining wall on E. Bridge Street.

Ms. Fox said she has a problem with artificial stone that does not keep within the character of the district. She said it is happening up at the corners. She noted the artificial stone on the Mezzo building, which does not fit in with the characteristics of the district and suggested the City be careful with the materials being used.

Ms. Fox emphasized the criteria has absolutely not been met and wants to discuss each one. Ms. Stenberg asked why the application needs to be tabled if they will just address the same issues. She asked the rest of the Board how they felt about the criteria being met besides Ms. Fox.

Mr. Rinaldi said there are a couple of things for him that are more recent - equal weighing of the Code versus the *Guidelines*. He said the *Guidelines* clearly state the structure shall not exceed two stories, which is in conflict with the Code. He said that is his biggest hang-up he did not have before that meeting. He said we had legal staff there that supported that. Ms. Stenberg said her problems were with the height as well as the massing.

Mr. Rinaldi said he still wished the building stepped down with the hill. He indicated the ART was wrong in stating it does. He said the eave line seems fairly identical. He said the ridge lines are a little different but the buildings do not step down but the grade does.

Mr. Rinaldi said he is not supportive of a 10-foot retaining wall – six foot plus railing or whatever it is. In order to make the site useful, he understands that has to be done to have parking.

Ms. Fox said she would be willing to be much more lenient on retaining walls and landscaping if we could get more of a sense that it is broken up and steps down rather than one solid mass.

Mr. Rinaldi agreed the proposal is one story closer to the existing building and the grade makes it two, two and a half, however you want to read it.

Mr. Albanese said that was addressed back in December 2016. He said they would have to do a three-tiered parking lot and they were at an 8% slope, which does not work.

Mr. Rinaldi said the applicant could make the buildings lower as they progress down the hill. A second or third floor would be lost if that was done.

Ms. Stenberg inquired about the overall square feet for the residential unit B. Mr. Albanese answered  $\pm 1,700$  square feet. She suggested that by reducing the size, it would be difficult to sell to which Mr. Albanese agreed. Ms. Stenberg agrees that the structure needs to step down.

Ms. Fox restated that the height is a big issue; this is too tall for the surrounding adjacent properties. She said she is not opposed to the style of the architecture. She said she really likes the cottage front. She said this is too close to the existing historic structure. She noted anything to be added to a historic site should be subordinate to the existing structures. She said she does not want to give up public landscape space. She said she cannot support the massing and of one plane and would like to see the height decreased.

Mr. Munhall suggested this application should probably be voted on and then if the applicant wants to return they can.

Mr. Rinaldi said he does not disagree because we can work through these comments. He indicated it is somewhat unfair to the applicant that the Board has this ruling that the various sources for criteria have equal weight and that was not the case the last time they were here. He said he had been using the Zoning Code essentially, as the standard and fills in the detail with the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*. He indicated this puts the Board in a little bit of a predicament.

Ms. Rauch said the discussion was also yes they can be used in the Board's review, they are weighted as both important, but in the end trying to tie the determination back to the criteria. She said the Code is the law and the *Guidelines* do provide guidance and both should be used to review these applications. She added the Board needs to decide what direction to take. She reminded the Board that they approved the Basic Plan with a condition that the height be reduced. If the Board does not feel that was addressed appropriately, that can still be up for discussion.

Ms. Stenberg inquired about the Basic Plan Review approval because the orientation of the structure has changed from that. Ms. Rauch said the Board needs to decide if the conditions of the Basic Plan approval have been met. She said the orientation changed but that was to address the comments of the Board in terms of meeting requirements. Changing the orientation of the building she explained was how the applicant chose to meet all the requirements.

Mr. Musser said we have changed the rules of the game, as Mr. Rinaldi pointed out, and that is not fair to the applicant. Mr. Rinaldi clarified he did not think the rules changed, but rather the interpretation of how they can be applied.

Ms. Fox said the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* are there purposefully so the Board gives quite a bit of weight to whether or not a particular new infill development is appropriate for the Historic Core District.

Mr. Munhall stated he agreed with that but in some ways he disagrees with that. He said a resident brought up the library, which is a strong one. He said his house was built in 1860 and its peak is 32 feet, original, two-story and roof. He said the brick house on South High Street, not too far from the one we approved a couple of years ago, same height, the original building sat where the Starbuck's sat was that high or higher. He said it is hard for him to get all the historical relevance to Dublin being 19 feet high, one-story with a little roof; that is not all of Dublin. He said he struggles with what Dublin is supposed to be. He sees a lot of mixed designs and heights. He agreed with Mr. Rinaldi that our perspectives have adjusted but is not sure it is that stark but the weighting that the Board needs to give to the *Guidelines* is heavier than what it was in the past, but again, not a stark departure. He indicated it just needs to be threaded into our discussions more regularly than it was before.

Ms. Fox said she thought this roof only came down about 14 inches from the original. She indicated the *Guidelines* state two stories are 35 feet and this is at 38 feet.

Ms. Rauch asked if the Board as a whole would like to see the applicant change the proposal.

Mr. Rinaldi reiterated his biggest concerns were two stories and not stepping down. He said however the Board proceeds, they need to give the applicant guidance.

Mr. Meleca said they were here the last time and given criteria by the ARB and the ART to meet height and they met that and now they are being told that the conditions are changing.

Ms. Stenberg said the criteria is not changing but by the applicant changing the orientation and changing the massing and the appearance, the overall character was affected the way the light hits, and the way people are going to travel and get into the lot and walk down the street.

Mr. Meleca noted the Board is asking for 2 stories versus 2.5 stories. Mr. Rinaldi answered the Board is stating that is a consideration; we have not denied 2.5 stories at this point.

Mr. Meleca said the façade that is being presented are shown flat and a lot of the line work disappears so the ins and outs of 18 inches in five sections is being read like one big plane. He restated the building is as deep as (former) Biddies and as long. He explained in stepping down the structure, they will lose two stories because he does not know how to step multiple buildings and have all the cores and rooflines connect and still try to come close to the proposed square footage. He said it seems like we have a moving bar where criteria is concerned and the client has been bending over backwards to comply and he has as well.

Mr. Musser agreed the flat elevations are misleading to the lay person. He said the block drawings are hurting the proposal where color renderings would help to show how the building goes in and out.

Ms. Fox asked Mr. Musser if a model or computer generated dimensional elevation would give the Board a better sense of the actual building proposed. Mr. Musser said these are all computer generated but a 3-dimensional rendering would be the best as this is not helpful. Ms. Fox said she would like to see that.

Ms. Stenberg asked Ms. Fox if that is going to change her opinion of the height, scale, or the massing.

Ms. Fox pointed out that the proposal went from three stories to 2.5 and only lost 14 inches and she would have expected the height would have been reduced like six feet to be more subordinate to the principal historic structure.

Mr. Rinaldi noted it was changed to a steeper roof to keep liveable space up there.

Mr. Musser asked Mr. Rinaldi if he would be agreeable to requesting color renderings.

Mr. Rinaldi said not only is it the height that is a concern but it is the concept that this is to portray development over time as three separate buildings. He said currently there is roughly the same eave height and ridge height and that is not normally how buildings would develop over time.

Ms. Rauch reiterated the Code states 2.5 stories and these old *Guidelines* that did not anticipate this type of development in Bridge Street, state 2 stories but typically the measurement would have been calculated to the mid-point of the roof, which would be under the 35-foot requirement and that would be comparing apples to apples. Mr. Meleca clarified the measurement to the mid-point of the roof would be 30 feet.

Ms. Fox said the change in orientation changed how the building reads from the back of the property so it looks like three stories and more massive.

The Chair asked where the members were individually.

Ms. Stenberg referred to the *Guidelines*. She said she has a problem with the way it was reoriented so it is not meeting Placement and Orientation. For Scale and Proportion, she said while she agrees the overall footprint is the same as (former) Biddies, she does not think the height on #3 would be met. She concluded the *Guidelines* address her biggest issues.

Ms. Fox said in addition to what has been discussed, authentic materials are necessary.

Mr. Musser said he likes the current orientation over the first proposal and asked Ms. Stenberg how she felt. Ms. Stenberg responded she was not opposed to the first proposal but it was very high and obstructed the view of the older buildings. She said she understands the new orientation to the street to gain access from both sides, which is a nice feature, however, it does impede more on the way the landscaping and overall feel of that lot seems to shrink because it has this L-shape rather than being back to back.

Mr. Musser suggested the Board will have trouble with whatever is proposed here although there is some criteria here that he may not agree with totally but he likes the building overall and he would be willing to support it. He said he can understand how the roofs really look flat as presented but they really recede back and he is not sure everyone understands that.

Mr. Munhall said he likes this orientation overall. The massing he said is an issue. He agreed with everyone's comments that if the structure could step down from a ridgeline perspective he understands the ground floor steps down from a visual perspective. He added he likes the balconies the way they are and the amount of sunlight that does not get blocked as it appears 50% less by this design. He said the wall is not ideal but it is not visual until one gets to the back of the property. He said it is not ideal to use some of the materials he would like to see them use but it may not be practical to use them. From a massing standpoint, he said he would rather get down to a lower level as one steps back and that is the major issue he has. If it came to a vote, it is not his preference to support this proposal, as is.

Mr. Rinaldi summarized the building does not feel as if it has developed over time, which apparently was the intent. He said he wishes the last third of the structure closest to Blacksmith Lane would step down; it would have made this proposal much more palatable to the group and potentially to some of the residents. He said for the balcony he agrees with staff that it does not meet Code so he would like that depth reduced to at least half to help the back elevation. He concluded those are his strongest comments.

The Chair asked the Board if they wanted to discuss other issues or go through the various motions.

Ms. Fox questioned whether more information and materials could be requested. She noted the consultant had brought up similar concerns about the proximity of this building next to a historic building. She said she would like to see better renderings of the grading of the site, the retaining wall, the impact on the parking lot, and neighboring properties to help the Board to move forward by obtaining better direction.

The Chair asked what Ms. Fox is unclear about that she wants to see in renderings because that is putting a substantial burden on the applicant. She answered Mr. Musser has a point that we are not truly appreciating the rooflines and the dimensions in fairness to the architect because while he tried to describe it, she is not an architect, so she wants to see something that might change her mind to be fair. Because there is so much excavation of the site, she said if there is a way she could get a better understanding of what those walls look like and how this will impact the site and the Barbershop next door it would be helpful.

The Chair said he did not believe they needed any more discussion and moved onto the first motion, which is to approve the Parking Plan that is short a couple of parking spots. Ms. Rauch confirmed the applicant is short two parking spaces but there is a shared agreement with another user to use this parking during the evening hours for Harvest Pizza, after 5 pm; that is after office hours to which the ART agreed was a good solution. She clarified the parking numbers do not account for the existing uses of office in those existing buildings but if the uses change for any of this or existing buildings, from office and residential to retail and restaurant for example that would require more parking and the business would have to come back for that discussion and then the Board would have to approve something different.

Ms. Fox said in saying yes to this we limit uses in the Historic District and if we are looking for vitality, it would be limited because we would have all office and residential because not enough allowance was made for parking for the possibility that a tavern or small restaurant or like these previous come in. Ms. Rauch said on this site they would be limited to the uses they have but that is not different than any other site.

Ms. Rauch noted this is a package deal. If the Board is leaning towards wanting to table for more information she suggested the entire application be tabled. Mr. Munhall said if the motion to table gets denied then they would be proceeding.

Ms. Fox motioned to table this application to obtain additional information. Mr. Rinaldi said he disagrees unless the Board gives the applicant specific direction or this will not accomplish anything.

Mr. Rinaldi restated the biggest issue is the scale and massing. He said 2.5 stories at the west end is fine but the east end needs to step down. He asked the Board for more direction for the applicant. Mr. Munhall said he agreed with that. Ms. Fox said with the massing the issue of having it appear as it was developed over time did not happen. She said a structure that is broken up more, stepped down more, not one long piece and that has movement on the site is preferable to her. Mr. Rinaldi said it does move back and forth but agrees it does not read well on the flat 2-dimensional graphic. He said his concern is that the structure is not moving vertically the same way.

Ms. Stenberg asked if requesting the structure to step down could be made as the 17<sup>th</sup> condition or if the entire application is what the Board needs to deny. Ms. Rauch said this application can be approved with conditions and the conditions can be modified if there are ways the applicant could address the step down issue but it would not come back to the Board. If the application is tabled, and giving the applicant direction on what you want to see but if this is disapproved, the applicant appeals to City Council for review. Mr. Rinaldi said the third option would be to approve a condition, which would be worked out by the ART and out of the Board's control.

Mr. Munhall asked to make a motion to table the matter and let the applicant give consideration to the Board's comments.

Mr. Rinaldi said he wanted to make it very clear to the applicant what the Board is asking them to do. Again, he asked if the direction is the height of the whole structure or part of it. Mr. Munhall said he is not in agreement of the overall height but is in agreement on the height of the back like he said earlier; he would like to see the eastern side step down.

Ms. Fox said unless they walk through each of the criteria it is hard to give positive constructive comments because one has to go point by point. She noted the height and stepping it down so it does not look so tall from the east and to use authentic materials. She said she is fine with architecture and balconies. She asked that this be tabled so the Board has the opportunity to either get better renderings or have the architect address the Board's comments made this evening.

Mr. Rinaldi said he wanted to address authentic materials. Ms. Rauch said HardiPlank would require a Waiver because the approved primary materials are wood, siding, brick, and stone in the Historic Core for this particular building type. Ms. Fox said she is not opposed to HardiPlank. Since Dublin is known for their distinctive stone work and walls, she said then using an artificial stone face is a mistake, especially with the amount of stone proposed for the retaining walls on the site so it is a major issue for her. She indicated there may be some original stone walls on the site currently, which the Board has not even addressed.

The Chair asked if Ms. Fox would not approve a retaining wall with anything other than limestone. He indicated the applicant will find it challenging to find a structural engineer to approve dry-laid limestone

for that height. Ms. Fox said artificial stone is also being proposed for the building itself and she is opposed to that because if this is to look like something that has been here awhile, real stone has to be used and that is doable.

Ms. Rauch said the Code does not differentiate between a real stone or a stone veneer; Code would permit both. Ms. Fox said it is the particular selection then that she does not find appropriate color wise and style wise as it does not show up anywhere in the district. Mr. Munhall said not everyone will agree to the same materials. Mr. Rinaldi said he is not opposed to cultured stone that is what is being constructed today for a new building; a veneer of some sort will be used. Mr. Rinaldi said he would not mind seeing samples of materials. Ms. Rauch brought the sample to their attention.

Ms. Fox said the Board does not have a sense of what the building looks like within context of the neighborhood. Ms. Rauch said there is a massing drawing in the packet. Ms. Fox said she is only seeing one angle view so the context is not being fully shown. Ms. Fox said she is having a hard time visualizing how the sidewalk works.

Mr. Musser said he likes the stone veneer. He indicated eclectic type materials will be use throughout the district; we cannot have everything look like it was built back in the 1800s.

Ms. Stenberg stated she does not have a problem with any of the materials. Mr. Rinaldi said he did not either and concluded they are being used appropriately.

Ms. Fox said she is concerned about the alley and the residents' ability to maneuver back there. She said if someone did have to pass, she does not want to see them have to run over the sidewalk and the landscaping. Ms. Rauch said she would consult with Engineering and request that someone address that because they have reviewed this proposal. Mr. Rinaldi added he is sensitive to the neighbors that use that alley but we cannot force the applicant to use private property for public domain; it is not the Board's purview and it has been reviewed and approved by Engineering. Ms. Fox said whatever we can do to mediate the difficulties down there we should consider them; that does not mean we have to rule out what is there now.

The Chair asked if there are any objections to Waivers.

Mr. Rinaldi inquired about the gambrel roof type. Ms. Burchett answered the gambrel roof with the mix of the different roof types coming together and to determine if that is architecturally appropriate for the gambrel to meet the pitch of the other roof types. She said the gambrel roof is generally associated with single family. Mr. Munhall said he is not a big fan of the gambrel roof and would prefer a higher roof up two to three feet to hide the elevator part. He clarified that does not mean he would vote against it, it is just his opinion. Mr. Musser said he is fine with the roofs. Ms. Fox said she is not opposed to the roofs, just opposed to the height and would prefer a shallower slope. Mr. Rinaldi said he does not have any issues with the roof type Waivers.

Mr. Rinaldi inquired about the parking Waiver. None of the Board members had issues with the parking.

Mr. Rinaldi said transparency had to do with the amount of windows versus solid walls on elevations that are slightly under the request. Ms. Rauch clarified it is Eberly Hill Lane on the ground floor and on the non-street facing, which is also on the ground floor on the parking lot side. Mr. Munhall answered he had no issues. Mr. Rinaldi said given the applicant is trying to look more like buildings the larger windows and he does not have an issue with transparency. The rest of the Board did not have any issues, either.

The Board did not have issues with the building entrance Waiver or materials.

Mr. Rinaldi asked the Board's opinion on the height of the retaining wall Waiver. Mr. Munhall answered he did not have an issue but Ms. Fox questioned the 90-foot wall that runs along the south side. She said she is not understanding what it looks like and the consultant questioned it as well.

Mr. Albanese said the wall is not 90 feet as it has been reduced to 50 feet. He said that is at its highest point and then it tapers down to 0 and turns into a curb the rest of the way out. He said on the backside of the Barbershop, it is going to be faced with the stone. He said the applicant can create a small ledge to make it actually look like the stone is sitting on the wall versus stuck to the wall, which provides a better appearance. He explained the space between the dumpster and the building is 36 feet approximately; there is not much wall exposed, the rest is covered with landscaping or dirt.

Ms. Fox asked if it is possible to soften the wall utilizing plantings over the wall in the landscaping plan. Mr. Albanese indicated that has been addressed where they will build planters in the wall and have vines over the top, and Cypress trees in the front.

Mr. Rinaldi again asked about the Waiver for the retaining wall height. He said he appreciates every effort that can soften the wall. No Board members had issues.

Mr. Rinaldi asked about foundation plantings as a Waiver. The Board had no issues.

The Chair summarized it is the scale, massing, and height at the Eberly Hill Lane elevation that is a concern as a consensus of the Board.

Mr. Meleca requested to see the east elevation and for the Board to help them understand how much it should be stepped down. He asked if the Board is requesting the entire height be removed of the roof mass and drop it a whole floor. He asked if they are requesting a two-foot step or 18 inches. He asked for clarity for stepping that façade.

Mr. Rinaldi said he is speaking for himself as well as what he heard from the residents. He said it is the mass of a three-story building; whether that has to come down a whole floor, he is uncertain, but that would make the structure a lot more appealing to the residents.

Mr. Munhall stated he does not like the height on the alley. He indicated the consensus is the massing is too much, now how that is addressed he cannot say. He said he is not going to tell the applicant it should be only two stories or should be a flat roof or anything like that. The massing he said is too much in general as a consensus of the Board.

Mr. Musser asked if there is any way the shingle portion of the roofline on the north elevation could be dropped down; that might satisfy a lot of what people are saying here but he is not sure how that is accomplished. He understands there are dormers in that residential unit already.

Mr. Meleca asked if he was requesting stepping the eave line as well as the roof. Mr. Musser answered the ridgeline. Mr. Rinaldi said the consistent eave line makes it read as one building instead of three buildings even though it steps forward and back 18 inches with a different type of roof in the middle. Mr. Munhall said the eave does not bother him but is hearing each Board member has separate issues.

Mr. Rinaldi restated the eave line has to drop maybe a foot if that is possible to break up the consistent line to make it appear as three buildings that grew up over time. Mr. Musser suggested if the eave line was dropped perhaps it could produce a low slope roof.

Mr. Munhall said he does not believe the Board needs to tell the applicant how to redesign it as long as the applicant understands the general idea of the Board's comments.

Ms. Fox said it is not just dropping it down a foot or two. From the alley, she said it has to read more like two stories or transitioning into the neighborhood.

Mr. Albanese reported his engineer had to leave but he stated if they step the building, they have to step the parking lot, which would take a Waiver. He said they had considered it at one time but cannot meet a 3 – 5% slope.

Having parking on different levels, Ms. Rauch said may be an engineering issue dealing with drainage and grading and not necessarily a Code requirement. Ms. Fox said people are parking on a really steep slope now and get away with it. Mr. Albanese said it is gravel but once there is blacktop, it does not work for ice or snow.

Ms. Fox recognized that the applicant is having to deal with really unusual areas in the back. She said she would be more than willing to loosen up on that in order to get mass down.

The Chair asked the Board if they were still hung up on the east end. He asked if it is to appear as two stories or something else. Ms. Fox answered it has to come down to look more like a two story structure. Mr. Rinaldi said he does not care what it is called, he just wants the overall height reduced at the east end on Blacksmith Lane near the residences.

Ms. Fox restated the structure reads as one building but because of the east end, there is a way to break that up so it could be stair-stepped down it would be an easier transition on the alley and into the neighborhood.

Mr. Rinaldi said to reduce that height at that end, the roof pitch needs to be lowered that essentially eliminates the floor. He asked the Board if that was the direction they were sending the applicant. Mr. Munhall answered the Board is not going to give the applicant a generic all in one direction because they all have different ideas to reduce massing.

Mr. Musser said having different pitches from one end to the other does not work, either.

Mr. Meleca presented a modified drawing to Mr. Musser to which he responded he liked.

Mr. Meleca said he is proposing is on the gambrel portion, to raise it 8 – 12 inches to eave height and lower the eaves on the east and west ends and then lowering the pitch on the eastern building a couple of degrees. He said it would eat some square footage out of it but it will reduce height a couple of feet.

Mr. Musser requested that the applicant make those revisions and bring it back to which Mr. Meleca answered affirmatively.

The Chair asked if he is hearing the Board is getting closer to a consensus if the ridge is lowered a couple of feet on the eastern end. He asked the applicant if he was contemplating lowering the ridge on the western end as well. Mr. Meleca answered he would keep it higher on the western end. Mr. Musser said that works for him. Mr. Munhall said they are getting closer to which Mr. Rinaldi and Ms. Stenberg agreed. Ms. Fox said lowering the height on the alley side the best they can is what she would hope for.

The Chair asked the applicant if he received enough direction to which he answered he had.

### **Motion and Vote**

Mr. Munhall moved, Ms. Fox seconded, to table the application for a Basic Plan Review. The vote was as follows: Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Musser, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; and Mr. Munhall, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

### **Communications**

Jennifer Rauch said on March 6, 2017, City Council is conducting a Work Session to review the Library and associated Parking Garage from 6 – 8 pm at City Hall. This will also include any possible changes for the Grounds of Remembrance with the construction of Rock Cress Parkway.

Ms. Rauch said an email was distributed about a potential special meeting for the ARB to meet with the consultants who are assisting with revising the Code. She confirmed this meeting will be at our offices at 5800 Shier Rings Road at 8 am on March 8<sup>th</sup>.

Shannon Stenberg inquired about the National Trust informational booklet that Vince Papsidero mentioned to the Board. Ms. Rauch said she would make that available to the Board.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 9:51 pm.

As approved by the Architectural Review Board on April 26, 2017.