



MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, August 30, 2017

AGENDA

- 1. BSD-HC – 55 S. High St.
17-077ARB-MPR** **55 South High Street
Minor Project Review (Approved 5 – 0)**
- 2. Yoder Residence – Building Addition
17-083ARB-INF** **5927 Rings Road
ARB – Building Addition (Discussion Only)**
- 3. Historic and Cultural Assessment**

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: Shannon Stenberg, Everett Musser, Jeffrey Leonhard, and Gary Alexander. City representatives were: Mayor Greg Peterson, Jennifer Rauch, Lori Burchett, JM Rayburn, and Laurie Wright.

Administrative Business

The Chair introduced Mayor Greg Peterson to swear in Mr. Gary Alexander as he was appointed by City Council. Mayor Peterson performed the Oath of Office for Mr. Alexander.

Motion and Vote

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

Motion and Vote

Ms. Stenberg moved, Mr. Musser seconded, to approve the meeting minutes from July 26 as presented. The vote was as follows: Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Alexander, abstain; Mr. Leonhard, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; and Mr. Musser, yes. (Approved 4 – 0 – 1)

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 – 55 S. High St.
17-077ARB-MPR**

**55 South High Street
Minor Project Review**

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following application is a request for modifications to the exterior, including painting of an existing commercial building. He said the site is on the west side of South High Street, at the intersection with Spring Hill. He stated this is a request for a review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of the Zoning Code Section 153.066 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Lori Burchett presented an aerial view of the site and the existing conditions, which is a Tudor-style structure built in the late 70s. She said the applicant is requesting to paint the stucco areas as well as the trim details and there are no intended changes to the existing stone or roof area.

Ms. Burchett reported the applicant met with the Administrative Review Team (ART) proposing a light 'Cultured Pearl' color for the stucco and 'Dusted Truffle' for the trim. She said ART requested a color in between the existing color of the stucco and the 'Cultured Pearl'. She reported the applicant selected 'China Doll' that was reviewed and recommended for approved by the ART to better complement the proposed brown color trim.

Ms. Burchett said staff and ART has reviewed this proposal against the Minor Project Review criteria and finds the criteria has been met, as well as the Architectural Review Board standards. Therefore, Ms. Burchett said, approval is recommended with the one condition:

- 1) That the main exterior color be Sherwin-Williams 'China Doll' (SW 7517)

The Chair invited the applicant to add anything to the presentation.

Renata Allespach, 55 S. High Street, said she wants to paint the building and was hoping for a decision from the ARB today.

The Chair asked the applicant if she agreed with the recommendation of the one condition to which Ms. Allespach answered affirmatively.

Motion and Vote

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

- 1) That the main exterior color be Sherwin-Williams 'China Doll' (SW 7517)

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

**2. Yoder Residence – Building Addition
17-083ARB-INF**

**5927 Rings Road
ARB – Building Addition**

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following application is a request for a building addition for a single-family dwelling on a 4.71-acre parcel, zoned R-1B, Limited Suburban Residential District Washington Township. He noted the site is on the west side of South High Street, at the intersection with Spring Hill. He said this is a request for an informal review and feedback of an Architectural Review Board application for the designated property located outside of the Historic District and under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.170, Appendix G, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Lori Burchett stated this proposal was originally filed as a formal application but given the complexity of the proposal and the location outside of the boundaries of the Historic District, staff deemed it appropriate to forward this to the Board for informal review and feedback prior to asking for a vote on the project.

Ms. Burchett presented an aerial view of the site for context as well as the zoomed in view of the farmstead. She noted the historic farmstead is listed on the National Historic Register under the Washington Township Multiple Resource Area. She said the lot is approximately 4.7 acres and the existing structures are primarily north of Cramer's Creek, which bisects the property. The existing single-family home, she said, is located towards the northeast corner of the property and several existing outbuildings are to the west and south of the home. Two of the outbuildings closest to the home, she stated, are proposed for demolition with a future application and the applicant is also proposing to demolish the additions that have been constructed over time on the existing single-family home.

Ms. Burchett presented the proposed site plan, which shows the whole farmstead and includes the floodplain and floodway areas highlighted. She said the applicant is proposing an addition to the existing home as well as an addition of a new detached carriage house to the west of the home. She highlighted the portion of the residence that will remain, as well as the areas that will contain new construction. She said additional site improvements include a circular drive with two curb-cuts and landscaping throughout the property were also included. She stated Engineering has reviewed the two driveways and did not express concerns.

Ms. Burchett stated the site is zoned R1-B Washington Township and under this zoning, the front yard setback requirement would be 20% or more of the depth of the lot. For this lot, the setback would be approximately 125 feet from the centerline of the right-of-way. She indicated any development within any portion of the flood hazard area is discouraged.

She stated conversations between the applicant and staff required the applicant to file an application with the Board of Zoning Appeals for a front-yard setback variance. She noted without a variance the applicant would be significantly constricted on where additional construction could occur on the site. Ms. Burchett said under the existing front-yard setback requirement, nearly all of the existing structure is located within the required setback and any development would likely be pushed into the flood hazard area. She said staff determined resolving the front-yard setback would be the appropriate first step for this proposal. She reported the Board of Zoning Appeals approved the Variance for a front-yard setback at the existing building line of 63 feet. She indicated the applicant had also requested a side-yard setback of 6 feet, where 8 feet is required but after much discussion, the side yard variance request was tabled to a future meeting date.

Ms. Burchett presented the proposed demolition areas in context with the whole property. She pointed out the applicant is proposing demolition of two existing outbuildings and an existing addition to the single-family home. She reported this request has been reviewed by a third-party consultant of whom had little concern over the demolition of the two outbuildings, but expressed some concerns about a portion of the existing additions to the single-family home.

Ms. Burchett indicated the additions appear to have been constructed over time and while some of the later additions have less significance, the addition that is closest to the existing structure may fall within the period of significance of the original structure and contains elements, including the same foundation materials, as the home. She reported the consultant recommends that an engineer provide a historic structure assessment or report to indicate the extent of the damage to the building to justify its removal as part of that demolition request.

Ms. Burchett presented a photograph of the existing home and described it as a two-story, gable-roof brick house dating to approximately 1855. Features of the residence include a stone foundation, for a

rectangular plan, a gable-front, wood-frame porch, a seam-metal, side-gable roof, two interior brick chimneys, and decorative Italianate brackets along the roofline. The six-over-six light sash windows have stone sills and lintels while the wood-frame Gothic-arc windows provide light to the attic. The seven-panel, Greek Revival-style wood front door has sidelights and a transom with decorative molding and brackets.

Ms. Burchett presented a graphic of the proposed front elevation that shows the proposed addition with single-story additions to the east and west of the structure. She pointed out where a new detached accessory building is proposed to the west of the home. She said the applicant is proposing a two-story main addition directly behind the existing structure, which will contain living space and bedrooms above. A flanking one-story master bedroom addition she said is proposed to the east and a garage and living space, one-story addition to the west. She added a walk-out basement will be below the addition. She stated the total square footage of the existing home to remain is 1,894 and the first and second floors of the addition total 3,576 square feet; this is excluding the basement area and garages.

In regards to additions, Ms. Burchett noted the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* have five considerations that the Board should review:

1. That the materials should be traditional but do not necessarily have to match those in the original building;
2. That the addition should be subordinate to the original building and it should be obvious, which is the original and which is the addition;
3. That the most common solution according to the *Guidelines* is to keep the addition smaller in scale with its height and roofline below those of the original building;
4. That the addition be located to the rear of the original building keeping the appearance of the original structures unchanged as possible and to avoid trying to duplicate the original building's architecture and design as to not create a false historic look; and
5. That the roofline additions such as dormers, skylights, and penthouses should be avoided and close spacing and modest scale to most buildings can result in too much change.

Ms. Burchett said staff finds this proposal is consistent with items 1, 4, and 5 of these *Guideline* recommendations.

Ms. Burchett presented a graphic of the proposed left side/east elevation of the structure and pointed out the portion of the existing residence to remain; the rest of the structure would be new construction.

Ms. Burchett indicated that Staff and the consultants have concerns whether that portion of the addition meets the intent of the two considerations for additions from the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* and whether the addition meets the addition recommendations of being subordinate to the original building and keeping the appearance of the original structure as unchanged as possible. She said this is the same concern they have for the right side/west elevation of the proposed structure as well as the rear/south elevation that were presented and highlighted.

Ms. Burchett presented a rendering of the existing structure with the addition as it would be seen from Rings Road. She said some of the elements of the proposed addition include a board and batten style siding in white and a metal roof style similar to the existing residence. The east and west sides of the addition, she said, are proposed to be one story, flanking the existing residence at a lower height.

Ms. Burchett also presented a rendering of the addition as it would be seen from the rear/southwest. She said a center, two-story addition is proposed with flanking one-story additions.

She stated that in regards to the informal discussion this evening, Staff proposes four questions for the Board to review and to provide feedback. The discussion questions are as follows:

1. Does the Board support the demolition of the existing additions and accessory structures?
2. Does the proposed scale and mass of the addition fit with the historic nature of the existing structure?
3. Is the Board supportive of the proposed design concept as it compares the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* for additions?
4. Are there other considerations by the Board?

Ms. Burchett said that concludes her presentation but is available to answer any questions and the applicant is here as well and also has a presentation.

Nelson Yoder, Crawford Hoying, said he is a registered architect as well as being in development and finance and spends half his day doing design work and the other half doing finance and spreadsheets. He introduced his wife, Betsy Yoder, who is also an architect.

Mr. Yoder said he had a long history with this house (40 of the 160 years the house has been in existence) as he grew up next door and spent most of his childhood playing at the homestead.

Betsy Yoder said she grew up in a 1860s farmhouse and her father was a history teacher, who then started a construction and restoration company. She said she worked for her father dismantling and repurposing historic barns; she salvaged and repurposed doors, trim, and mantles from homes to be demolished. She indicated she has always had a strong interest in historic preservation and practiced architecture for over 10 years, before becoming a stay-at-home mom for three girls.

Ms. Yoder said she and Nelson purchased the home in 2013 and wanted to live there for a time before making any modifications to the property. She said besides the house, they were aware that all the agricultural out buildings had deferred maintenance for close to 50 years. She indicated tonight's presentation was a culmination of their vision achieved over the past four years. She presented the goals of the project as follows:

- Reverse many decades of deferred maintenance & restore the core historic home:
 - Make critical structural repairs and replace the roof
 - Restore rotting wood trim and ornamental brackets
 - Restore weathered mortar
 - Replace the newer modern front porch with a historically appropriate one
- Create an attractive, dramatic entry sequence fitting for the structure
- Create a safe, nurturing environment to raise their three children and future generations
- Expand the home to meet the family's needs, however:
- Highlight view of core historic home on public-facing facades, expand to rear and sides
- Salvage and repurpose demolished materials in new additions: stone, wood, brick

Ms. Yoder emphasized, that from the street, the house looks nice but there is a lot of work that has to be done to it.

Mr. Yoder presented maps of their five-acre property that is surrounded by large lots, screened on three sides, and noted the house and creek in context with the rest of the property and structures.

Mr. Yoder presented a summary of his demolition request:

- Preserves core historic structure
- Removes areas to rear documented as later additions that are not significant
- Removes two garages located in the floodway (not floodplain).

- Meets criteria's 1 and 4 for Demolition in Historic District Guidelines, as well as special circumstances:
 - Both garages to be demolished are located in the floodway (not floodplain), causing water entry and posing safety risk to surrounding property owners.
 - Demolitions also provide for improved health, safety and welfare of building occupants: Egress, Interior Environment, and Energy Efficiency.

Mr. Yoder presented a graphic of his demolition plan as well as photographs of the structures he proposes to demolish.

Mr. Yoder referenced the Dictionary of Ohio Historic Places, Volume 1 that describes his house (formerly Myer House). He read Demolition Criteria 1 - "The structure contains no features of architectural and historic significance to the character of the area in which it is located." He said the only proposed area to be demolished on the original home is documented as later additions to the historic structure. He presented several photographs showing the proposed areas to be demolished that lack significant architectural features and the front historic core structure that will remain, including ornamental brackets and six-pane, arched-top windows. He presented photographs of doors and a window stating no original doors or windows that remain in the area are to be demolished. A photograph of a hearth rebuilt in the 1980s to be demolished and a photograph of one of the two identical artisan plaster fireplaces to be preserved were also presented. He summarized there is a big difference in design between the front and the back.

Mr. Yoder read Demolition Criteria 4 – "The location of the structure impedes the orderly development of the District, or detracts from the historical character of its immediate vicinity; or, the proposed construction to replace the demolition significantly improves the overall quality of the Architectural Review District without diminishing the historic value of the vicinity or the District." He said:

- The proposed demolition area is a "hodge-podge" of additions made at various times that detracts from the historical character of the front core structure;
- The location of the proposed demolition impedes expansion of the home to the south – the only area that is both tucked behind the core structure where not visible from the street and north of the floodway; and
- The proposed construction to replace demolition significantly improves the quality of the site and vicinity, reflecting the 1855 farmhouse plus only one, high quality addition.

Mr. Yoder presented a graphic to help explain the existing conditions and how they are limited in where they can build due to the floodway as compared to the proposed plan. He provided photographs during a heavy rain event and said both garages to be demolished sit in the floodway; water infiltration is relatively common and their presence in the floodway presents a hazard to surrounding properties. He added that if he did not bring them down, Mother Nature would.

Mr. Yoder said there were additional extenuating circumstances that include:

- An existing historic stair that is significantly less safe than current Code would allow, and has led to multiple falls; and
- Demolition of extensions to the south allows for construction of a new Code compliant stair connecting all levels of the historic core home, immediately south of the south wall, and preservation of the front stair as a non-required means of exiting.

Mr. Yoder concluded his presentation and introduced Gary Bruck, Sullivan Bruck Architects, who then provided his background and experience. He noted the first time he toured the home, Mr. Yoder took him down the historic stair just mentioned and he emphasized how it needed to be fixed with the addition.

Mr. Bruck said the existing home has only two bedrooms and the family now has three kids. He said the home is lacking a lot of the fundamentals of today's life that would include: an office, mudroom, laundry room, usable basement (partial basement is less than 6 feet clear), usable garage, and an indoor and outdoor gathering space for family and business functions.

Mr. Bruck explained as they move into this new design, they are trying to accommodate the following:

- 2 more bedrooms upstairs and a first floor master, bringing total to 5 BR (4 + guest).
- A modern living room, kitchen and basement, allows for the two front historic rooms to revert to traditional uses: dining room and parlor/office.
- Laundry room and mudroom
- Attached two-car garage
- Detached carriage house with 1 additional car garage and a screened porch
- A Pool / entertaining area (behind house)

Mr. Bruck reintroduced the area map to explain how this property is surrounded by new or newer construction. He said they do not want to be contextual to the area but more contextual to the historic home.

Mr. Bruck presented two forms for a design approach that he thought were applicable to this project. He explained how this house is a hybrid. He showed the original presentation form from a couple of months ago and said they are no longer requesting a side-yard Variance. He presented the new floor plans and the elements proposed for within as well as three-dimensional views of the exterior that were changed from what Ms. Burchett had just shared that also included the revised carriage house. He emphasized this is the type of home needed for today's living, which concluded his portion of the presentation.

Gary Schmidt, G2 Planning + Design, 720 E. Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio, said he is a landscape architect and presented his experience. He presented the landscape plan and walked through all the various components that include: a formal entry drive in the front, sidewalk for the front entry, relocated historic water pump framed with a low brick wall, guest parking, and formal plantings around the historic house that frame the sidewalks. He indicated this architectural design is like a farmhouse ranch with outbuildings that create little spaces they can do interesting things in. He said once one passes the formal area, he noted the auto court, a gate and steps to the pool and hot tub area designed to be very family oriented, seating wall on the floodway line that will include a little waterfall into the pool, a pedestrian bridge over the creek, and a large plant palette including formal and informal plantings.

Mr. Yoder restated the reason they were here was to gain feedback from the Board. He said they would like to hear thoughts on the design and massing, etc.

Jeff Leonhard said the applicant made a good case about the garages coming down on their own. He said he understands wanting to get rid of the 'hodge podge' appearance. He qualified he is not an architect but lives in an old house. He indicated he understood the applicant's reasons for wanting to fix this property since he grew up here and has become an architect. He said he would like this on his property.

Everett Musser said he was very impressed with the design team who have captured the needs of the family but to be sensitive to the historic aspect of the existing structure. He said he is very impressed with the design and agrees with the selective demolition, as proposed.

Shannon Stenberg said she respects the documentation that showed where the areas have flooded and how the flood waters come right up to the structure. She said she appreciates the applicant proposing to salvage as much material as possible from the existing additions. She said she was slightly concerned about the date the addition was built and what damage might be done as it is removed. She stated she fully supports the demolition of the two other buildings.

Gary Alexander said he understands what the applicant is struggling with because he sees the volume of a new space and the site constraints; however, he does not necessarily agree the addition has to go behind it. He said the presentation was fantastic. He said he was appointed to the Board on Monday but has reviewed all of the documents but he has not had the opportunity to walk the site, which he wants to do. He indicated he wants to see the brick structure behind because he also agrees with the preservation consultant's concerns. He indicated there might be sections of the addition that could be removed. He said he agrees it is a 'hodge podge' look but just because it does not have the detail that the front does that does not mean the rear is not significant in terms of history. He said he wants to see the report regarding the integrity of that structure and would like to walk the site before the applicant returns with the formal application. He stated he has some reservations about taking that addition off because of the concept that evolves when that addition is removed.

David Rinaldi said he has a pause with that portion of the demolition as well and wants to feel a little more confident that they are doing the right thing. He said the later additions to the back of the house did not add to the character but the brick portion required more documentation. He noted that if there was structural damage, certainly that would lend support to that decision. He stated he fully supports the demolition of the accessory structures. He said from the documents already received the brick portion of the addition is of the same design and has the same foundation as the main structure. He concluded he hoped the applicant was hearing what the Board was saying about the demolition portion of the proposal.

Mr. Rinaldi said he would open up the discussion to the Board's thoughts and comments regarding the proposed scale and mass of the addition and if it fits within the nature of the existing structure. He said overall, he cannot say enough; it is a beautiful design and is gorgeous. He said his concern is about the scale, which would tie into the other considerations in the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*. He said the addition, primarily the rear portion, truly subordinate to the primary structure. He said considering the scale of the whole design that is the thing that jumps out at him. He made note of the matching roof lines and the addition being of similar massing to the primary structure.

Mr. Alexander said he was also concerned with the design concept. He said imbedding the house with the addition and the same cornice line around the house or the eave line is not appropriate. He stated it is an important architectural feature to define the original structure. He said true preservationists would state touching those eaves and overhangs is sacrosanct. He said this is a different situation because we are dealing with more adaptation and reuse here but because it is not visible from the front does not mean it is not an important defining element. He indicated he has difficulty with the mass. He said understands the challenges when he looks at the site and sees the floodway issue, but looking at it from a preservationist recommendation and the Columbus Foundation it appears other opportunities exist to address the mass issue. He said it may require thinking of the function differently but would preserve the character of the house along the lines of what the preservation consultant is suggesting and allow some breathing room for the original structure.

Mr. Rinaldi said he thought the applicant did that successfully on the sides with the hyphens but somehow that should be carried around to the rear.

Ms. Stenberg said she agrees with Mr. Alexander and Mr. Rinaldi especially about the rear portion where it is the two stories. She said she is not convinced the rear addition is subordinate to the primary structure as proposed.

Mr. Rinaldi said he sees the effort of the applicant in framing the views so the Board does not see necessarily as much of the back but that is only part of the equation.

Ms. Stenberg indicated she respects the fact the applicant pulled the side-yard setback to meet the Code.

Mr. Rinaldi said the applicant did a fantastic job with the materials and making the addition look one cohesive. He noted the applicant framed up the historic building and did a good job of making that distinctive in terms of what is the original structure and what is the addition. He said he agreed with Ms. Stenberg's comment about the rear changes not being subordinate to the primary structure.

Ms. Stenberg asked staff, when this proposal goes for a formal review, if the ARB would also be reviewing the materials for the main structure. Jennifer Rauch answered affirmatively.

Mr. Rinaldi said the front porch proposal is a big improvement over what exists. Mr. Alexander stated he agreed about the front porch and the appendices to the side look great.

The Chair asked the Board for thoughts on the proposed brick landscape wall.

Ms. Stenberg noted this property is outside of the Historic Dublin boundaries and they do not see as much of the stone walls that are traditionally used throughout the City. She said she does not mind the brick wall as long as it matches the existing brick on the main structure and does not deter from it.

Mr. Alexander said his only concern was if the applicant was trying match the brick on the wall to the house. Mr. Schmidt answered they are trying to match the color but to match exactly is not necessary because the wall is pretty far away from the house.

Mr. Rinaldi asked if any of the mature trees will be lost. Mr. Schmidt answered they would lose some trees, mostly really large Silver Maples. He noted those are on the City's prohibited tree list.

Mr. Musser stated the addition is twice as big as the existing house and hopefully, the design will be subordinate to the existing architecture and the house itself.

Mr. Rinaldi added the applicant did a very good job with the scale of the wings additions being subordinate. He said it appears the applicant has done everything the *Guidelines* have directed them to do. He restated the only place he is struggling with is the rear addition.

Mr. Sullivan said, in terms of the rear portion, obviously they need to add rooms to this project so it needs to be at some level a two-story addition. He asked for clarification – if anything that crosses that upper eave is a problem.

Mr. Alexander indicated there are other solutions to building a two-story addition and still not break the eave. He said there are other solutions to make the house more unified. He said an important element defining the volume of the house is that continuity of that eave around it. He indicated the other addition from the photos looks like it is below the eave. He asked the applicant to view the photographs for the rear of the house and see if the addition is below the eave, which again, is a defining feature of the house. He added the height of the roof is a concern for the fact that the applicant matched the ridge exactly also blurs that boundary between the addition and the original structure. He noted how the applicant spoke about differentiating the addition and has done great with the sides but the boundary is blurred at the rear.

Mr. Bruck indicated that was obvious, and easy to remedy. He asked if breaking the cornice was a problem as they obviously need to know that. He reiterated they have three children and they are adding a master suite downstairs and adding two bedrooms and will use one of the bedrooms in the existing home. He said there needs to be circulation between the two parts and it is virtually impossible without a flat roof to make that happen.

Mr. Alexander suggested the stair could be rebuilt in the volume of the house.

Mr. Bruck clarified it is not a question of the stairs, it is the question of the circulation up above. He said they are trying to use existing openings to communicate between the existing home – second floor and the addition's second floor, which are on the same level. He said the children need access to the new stair they are building to avoid using the old stair that is somewhat problematic.

The Chair concluded consistent feedback has been given from a few of the Board members. Mr. Bruck noted he wanted the Board to appreciate the complication they have here. The Chair said the decision is not that easy on this end, either. He summarized there was some reservations and concerns from the preservation consultant and the Board.

Mr. Bruck said he understood that but wanted the Board to understand they are trying to make something happen and making a livable house for the Yoders is difficult, within these constraints.

Mr. Musser stated he has no problem with the rear addition. He said putting an addition onto an existing house is obviously going to be intersecting and covering up a portion of that house. He said he understands the need for that second floor. He indicated he would like to see a flat roof there but it is fine.

3. Historic and Cultural Assessment

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following presentation is a review of the results from the historic and cultural assessment of the built resources, landscape features, and archaeological sites within the entire Dublin Planning Area, and a list of preservation strategies appropriate to Dublin.

JM Rayburn presented the background as follows:

- 2015 City staff and the Architectural Review Board (ARB) highlighted the need to update the existing Ohio Historic Inventory and to provide additional information and analysis regarding historic and cultural assets within the City.
- 2015 Staff issued a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) and Request for Proposal (RFP).
- 2016 Staff selected a consultant, Commonwealth Heritage Group, to undertake a Historic and Cultural Assessment.
- 2016 Inventory and general assessment of the built environment, landscape features, and archaeological sites.
- 2017 Final report delivered. It includes a set of preservation standards and strategies appropriate to Dublin, and a series of planning recommendations.
- 2017 Staff presented the Historic and Cultural Assessment to the ARB in June and the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) in August. It will go before City Council in September as a Resolution of Acceptance.

Mr. Rayburn said he had provided a "Cheat Sheet" of the recommendations from the Historic Cultural Assessment in front of each of the Board Members. He indicated staff is interested in gathering final comments prior to forwarding the final Assessment to City Council. He reported the Assessment was presented to the PZC last week for comments. He explained following the Board's final review tonight, the Assessment would be forwarded to City Council for a Resolution of Acceptance. He said following City Council's acceptance the next steps would be to determine which of the recommendations the Board would like to pursue next year.

Jennifer Rauch stated the recommendations were presented to the Commission and no changes were recommended. She explained the recommendations from this Board do not have to be formally identified tonight; but can be the beginning of a discussion by the Board regarding what should be pursued further. She said Council will determine what recommendations they would like staff to pursue in conjunction with the ARB.

Mr. Rinaldi asked what would be the process of adding properties to Appendix G. He said this has been discussed over the years and said it would seem the City would prefer a property owner asked to be placed on the Appendix as opposed to the City requiring them to do so.

Ms. Rauch answered the Code outlines a process to add properties to Appendix G. She said there is an opportunity to meet with property owners and see if they want to come along. She said Council directed staff to add all relevant properties to the list without the owner's support. She said there would be consequences to that. She said there are a lot of properties that should have been added to Appendix G as they were annexed into the City but that did not happen. Mr. Rinaldi said he is in favor of protecting as many historic properties as possible and if by adding them to the Appendix would help with that aspect, then so be it. Ms. Rauch said it is possible we could open it up to see who would be interested in being added as a first step. She said it is also a benefit for the property owner to protect the history of their property within the community.

Lori Burchett added that was one of the recommendations from the consultant - to see if the eligible owners wanted their property on the National Historic Register. She suggested an option could be for staff to serve as a resource of information to help landowners through that process. Mr. Rayburn stated the Historic and Cultural Assessment provided information that could help with that process as well.

Shannon Stenberg inquired about the Davis Mound. She asked if that is something the City would consider because the consultant recommended possibly annexing. Mr. Rayburn said it is outside of the City, but could be a joint effort if the Township wanted to pursue it.

Ms. Rauch added if that is something the Board felt really strongly about and Council agreed, then staff would outline a process to make that happen.

Everett Musser asked how many properties we are talking about. Ms. Rauch indicated potentially hundreds and it would depend on what criteria is used. Ms. Burchett said part of the recommendations from the consultant were to expand the period of significance so ultimately we could be putting more structures on there just by expanding that time period.

Mr. Rinaldi said he had thoughts about adding other districts like Indian Run and Dublin Heights.

Ms. Burchett indicated the consultant identified the Dublin Heights properties and ended with mixed conclusions. She said the consultant team decided to bring that forward due to the uniqueness of the same architecture in an area; however some have been torn down, and the value of a cohesive collection of structures that are very similar has been lost.

Mr. Musser asked if there was any consideration given to various levels of historic significance. Ms. Rauch said the properties could be categorized that way. Mr. Musser indicated we need to understand the levels of importance. Mr. Rayburn said the consultant provided a very detailed analysis based on a qualitative assessment of the properties.

Mr. Rinaldi said he was impressed with the volume of work that went into this project. He said he was blown away with the depth of information. He suggested we might consider restoration of the Indian cemeteries as he believes it is an important artifact.

Mr. Rayburn encouraged the Board to review the list, which can be revisited in the future. He suggested the members consider their top selections.

Jeff Leonhard said he thought Item 15 was a good one to move forward with – “Utilize some of the financing mechanisms for the new Bridge Street District to provide incentives to improve existing properties in Historic Dublin.” He said that could help things that are in progress now. He said we want to keep owners from tearing down properties but we are not helping them financially to take on that burden.

Mr. Rinaldi said he thought financial mechanisms were an overarching issue that has been discussed over the years. He said we talked about providing education regarding the financing available. He said this recommendation seemed like something to explore to highly strengthen the District.

Mr. Rayburn recalled the consultant had a conversation during the Planning and Zoning Commission and Mr. Papsidero shared the City of Columbus is able to work with owners on appropriate substitutes of materials that may be cheaper but also are appropriate for the time. Mr. Rayburn said the City could explore expanding the list of permitted materials given today’s technology and products on the market. He said the German Village Commission serves as a regional example. He said we can assess their list of approved substitutes to determine if they are appropriate to apply to our historical stock as well.

Mr. Rinaldi indicated we have been open to looking at alternative materials as they come forward, but we did not want to create a carte blanche list because it changes and with technology, products are changing all the time.

Mr. Rinaldi inquired to the PZC’s overall impression of the presentation. Mr. Rayburn said they were very supportive with similar reactions – very impressed with the breadth of the work and the scope of the historic assessment. He said they expressed concerns of implications if the boundary was expanded. While there may be more of a need to provide resources for some of these properties that could be burdensome, overall the historic properties retain value and can have more value than a non-historic property. He indicated it balances out in some ways. He said the concerns were the economic impacts and opportunities for a trade-off. He said having a historic property may be more work and money up front but in the end, may retain more value in the real estate market.

Gary Alexander asked to what extent staff would identify intensive level survey - is that primarily in the documentation that was done for the house presented tonight or is it beyond that. Ms. Burchett explained the initial assessment the consultants produced was based on the existing documentation from the National Register, institutional knowledge, interviews with the Dublin Historic Society, and what they could view from the street. The intensive level survey is more of a high level review of the structures to determine if they would be eligible. She said this included determining the period of significance of the structure, other contributing materials, and diving into those properties further.

Mr. Rayburn added one takeaway from the Historic and Cultural Assessment was that it falls on the local community to set the rules and expectations for historic preservation. This is a moment, he indicated, for the City to feel a sense of empowerment and to use this as a tool to either strengthen or make changes to some of the Code and regulations.

Mr. Rinaldi said education overall is a big component of this whole study in terms of information. He said we did not have this as a Board or as a community before this study. He said he is supportive of getting anything else on Appendix G or expand the neighborhood as appropriate to protect more properties but is concerned with what it may take to accomplish that.

Ms. Rauch said staff will look into this and prioritize what they would recommend and get the Board’s thoughts before seeking guidance from City Council.

Mr. Rinaldi said the stone walls need to be protected. He suggested we could strengthen something in the ordinances so they cannot just be torn down.

Ms. Stenberg said, for some of these recommendations to add to the National Register, for instance the Indian Run neighborhood, she asked if staff had received any comments from residents.

Ms. Burchett said she had not heard any responses specifically from the residents but knows that the consultant had conducted some interviews; whether or not they mentioned expanding the boundary, she is not sure. Of course this would be a public process; we would move forward and work hard with those residents in order to see that happen. She added it is going to be politically sensitive.

Mr. Rinaldi suggested it would be 60s residents, primarily but we are not that far from looking at 80s structures, which would include Muirfield and everything else.

Mr. Leonhard inquired about the consultant's process of determining these recommendations. He said his house was deemed as having no real significance and that it was built in 1920, which is what the county auditor's website states but it is not the case; it is older than that. Mr. Leonhard said some of the houses were just described as "old" and again, his was deemed 1920 but he has seen pictures from before that period so that is why he posed his question about process.

Ms. Burchett said her understanding is the consultants have different levels of criteria of what makes a contributing structure and so part of that is how much is left of the existing structure, if it was contributing, had there been additions and changes over time, and various levels that go along with it. She recalled the consultant used the terms "does it still tell its story".

Mr. Rayburn stated the consultants also used archives and a variety of resources locally, regionally, and state-wide, and perhaps even national resources so there was a full suite of resources they pulled from to assist with their assessment. Mr. Leonhard said the assessment is impressive and it is a lot of information.

The Chair concluded this is all great material and he appreciates it.

Communications

Jennifer Rauch said site visit wise, she clarified, if the applicant authorizes the application, the Board can take a site visit and could visit as long as they let them know you are there and they should not be giving you a guided tour. She emphasized to make sure the Board Members are not having exparte contact.

Ms. Rauch said Council approved the Downtown Garage on Monday, as well as the West Plaza and the updates to the Grounds of Remembrance.

Lori Burchett said we are transitioning from Drop box to One Drive so the City has access to the One Drive materials; Drop box has been limiting their space storage. She said this can be accessed from the I-Pad so there will be an app that can be downloaded onto that and the City login information will get the Board Members into that One Drive system. She said we will use both locations for digital materials for next month but would like to use One Drive solely after that.

With no further communications to share, the Chair adjourned the meeting at 8:21 pm.

As approved by the Architectural Review Board on September 27, 2017.