



MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, September 27, 2017

AGENDA

- 1. BSD HTN – The Avenue
17-070ARB-MPR** **94 N. High Street
Minor Project Review (Approved 4 – 0)**
- 2. BSD HR – Schmitt Residence
17-096ARB-MPR** **109 S. Riverview Street
Minor Project Review (Approved 4 – 0)**
- 3. Yoder Residence
17-089ARB** **5927 Rings Road
Demolition (Approved 4 – 0)**
- 4. Yoder Residence
17-083ARB** **5927 Rings Road
Building Addition (Approved 3 – 1)**

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: Everett Musser, Jeffrey Leonhard, and Gary Alexander. Shannon Stenberg was absent. City representatives were: Jennifer Rauch, Claudia Husak, and Laurie Wright.

Administrative Business

Motion and Vote

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

Motion and Vote

Mr. Leonhard moved, Mr. Alexander seconded, to approve the meeting minutes from August 30 as presented. The vote was as follows: Mr. Musser, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; and Mr. Leonhard, yes. (Approved 4 – 0)

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



**1. BSD HTN – The Avenue
17-070ARB-MPR**

**94 N. High Street
Minor Project Review**

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following application is a request for exterior modifications for a tenant space in the commercial building Z1 of the Bridge Park West Development including an entry canopy, awnings, and courtesy panels; and an enclosed patio adjacent to the Riverside Crossing Park West Plaza. He said the site is on the east side of North High Street, approximately 400 feet north of the intersection with North Street. He stated this is a request for a review and approval of a Minor Project under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Jennifer Rauch presented an aerial view of the Z1 building, which is currently under construction. She presented the approved elevations. She said the applicant is proposing to add a metal canopy and fascia with black and white scalloped valances underneath and marquee lighting along the entrance canopy. She said five black awnings with white piped detail are proposed and the bottom portion of the window will have black courtesy panels for privacy. She presented the south/Riverside Crossing Park West Plaza proposed elevation that showed the approved covered patio area and the proposed design modifications, which include: the change to the soffit design area to match the awning; the addition of the black fabric with white piping on the scalloped edges to allow for screening of fans, lights, and heaters in the ceiling of the patio cover; the addition of roll down acrylic shades bordered by vinyl silver tweed with black/brown sunscreens in a basket weave pattern behind; and black painted cedar planters added to the outside of the patio abutting the West Plaza area to soften the edge and help the restaurant's patio area to blend in.

Ms. Rauch said the shades would require a Waiver of which the ART is recommending disapproval as they do not believe the materials are appropriate for the Historic District.

Ms. Rauch said the applicant is proposing a black table with brass surround and a black base and honey rattan chairs with a woven black and burgundy seat and backing.

Ms. Rauch presented the character image renderings with the shades both up and down and the view at night. She noted the marquee lights along the plaza and reported the ART recommends the lights be removed along the patio but the lights should remain at the front entrance canopy.

Ms. Rauch reiterated a request for a Waiver:

1. §153.062(E)(1)(d) – Building Types – Secondary Materials: glass, reinforced gypsum, wood siding, fiber cement siding, metal, and exterior architectural metal panels and cladding (Permitted); marine grade acrylic and vinyl with a PVC and polyester, ThermoVeil sunscreen (Requested) for the patio enclosure.

Ms. Rauch restated the ART recommends disapproval as they find the criteria is not met and not meeting the permitted secondary material standard.

Ms. Rauch said the criteria for a Minor Project Review has been met with two conditions. She said if the applicant is going to pursue an enclosure, it should be a more permanent structure installed so it appears more integrated as part of the building, similar to the Three Palms design. She said it is recommended the applicant not utilize the temporary vinyl screens and eliminate the marquee lighting along the proposed enclosed patio, which is adjacent to the West Plaza.

Jeff Leonhard asked what Three Palms constructed that was appropriate. Ms. Rauch presented a rendering and noted the roof structure with a permanent structural design with windows that can all be opened up to feel more like a patio.

Mr. Leonhard verified the applicant is requesting what Cap City Diner has on the other side of the river. Ms. Rauch confirmed that plan was approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission for the east side. She said the concern with this application is what is proposed for the Historic District, which the ART found not to be appropriate.

The Chair invited the applicant to add to the presentation.

Carter Bean, Bean Architects, 4400 N. High Street, Columbus, Ohio, introduced Wayne Schick, Sr. Vice President of Cameron Mitchell Restaurants.

Mr. Bean clarified the canopy over the main entrance has previously been approved but they are now asking for a valance beneath and marquee lighting. He noted the planters that were shown in the presentation were the planters used at Cap City Diner whereas this applicant is proposing a similar planter that is made of cedar and will be painted black.

Mr. Bean presented more exhibits to show the roll downs with the planters all around them, which keeps the area quiet. He said they are constructed with quality and exactly the same materials as seen in those pictures from Cap City Diner. He passed out material samples of the woven acrylic and marine-grade clear vinyl for the roll downs to protect patrons through inclement weather and explained a roll down screen goes behind that to screen patrons from the sun, when necessary. He said the reason they want something more temporary is to use the patio as much as possible and the covered patio will have a connection with the plaza whereas the patrons at Three Palms would not have a connection to the street. He explained with this fixed, yet operable system, it becomes another interior room that has the ability to be opened up and will feel much more like an outdoor space.

Mr. Bean showed the actual sample of the proposed valances that are constructed of a black material with white piping, which is the same product that is used at the Avenue in Grandview. He indicated they would also use the same marquee lights that are used at the Avenue in Grandview because they provide a dim illumination that will not be overbearing to the plaza at night; it is really just a nice piece of "jewelry". If they limit the marquee lighting only to the front entrance, he said it appears lopsided so they would prefer the lights wrap around the building.

Wayne Schick reported at Cap City Diner, they agreed to some operational rules to govern the use of both the screen and the sunshade; the shades are basically being treated like an umbrella. He explained they recess into a cove that is not visible when not in use. He emphasized it would enable their patrons to use the patio to engage with Ohio's outdoor climate.

Everett Musser asked the applicant if they plan to use this patio during the winter months with heaters, to which Mr. Schick answered affirmatively. He clarified probably in October/early November on the nicer days and would open the patio by April 1 each year.

The Chair invited public comment. [Hearing none.] He opened the discussion for the Board. He asked for thoughts about the alternative material to be used in the Historic District.

Mr. Musser asked what the option would be for the shades if these are not approved as proposed. Mr. Rinaldi answered he did not think the shades are the issue, it is the actual enclosure, which incorporates the vinyl.

Mr. Bean said, this is why they are putting a pause on asking for approval for an additional outdoor space because if they do not get the roll downs here, this truly becomes the outdoor space.

Mr. Schick indicated the only unapproved material would be the clear window vinyl; the woven acrylic was not a non-permitted material, which is supposed to be better than canvas. He said they would need the sunscreen.

Gary Alexander said an alternative Nano wall system could be opened while there were patrons seated but it would depend on what system was purchased and installed. He said he was in support of the proposal this evening, however. He said the proposed system is more appropriate in this instance than a Nano wall system because when it is closed, it is a fixed rigid system and looks like a permanent element to the building. He said this was designed as a porch so it is meant to be more porous and the space is meant to open up to the space of the plaza; and even when the system is down it will feel like awnings or an umbrella.

The Chair asked the Board if they were concerned with any extended period of use. Mr. Leonhard answered he had no objections to it being used no matter what month, if the weather and temperature were appropriate. Mr. Musser replied he did not have any objections to the proposal.

The Chair asked the Board if there were concerns with the awnings or scalloped valance. Mr. Leonhard answered he had that product on his previous home and it needed to be replaced every five years.

Mr. Alexander said he can understand staff's concerns with the lighting along the plaza and could see eliminating the lights around there. He said the West Plaza is going to be illuminated. He understands the applicant wanting brand identification but he would side with staff's recommendation.

Mr. Rinaldi noted the lights are similar to what is strung on the east side of the river. Mr. Schick clarified similar lights are also used at Oscar's and Tucci's.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Leonhard moved, Mr. Alexander seconded, to approve the request for a Waiver:

1. §153.062(E)(1)(d) – Building Types – Secondary Materials: glass, reinforced gypsum, wood siding, fiber cement siding, metal, and exterior architectural metal panels and cladding (Permitted); marine grade acrylic and vinyl with a PVC and polyester, ThermoVeil sunscreen (Requested) for the patio enclosure.

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

The Chair requested thoughts on the lighting. Mr. Leonhard responded that if the lighting is already being used at Oscar's and Tucci's, he would support the lighting.

Mr. Alexander asked if the lights were attached to the façade. Ms. Rauch emphasized the lighting issue was not how they were attached but their adjacency to the West Plaza. Mr. Musser indicated the lights were fine at the entrance but not certain for along the patio. Mr. Rinaldi said that was his feeling as well.

The Chair asked if there was anything else to discuss with regards to this proposal. They decided the furniture was fine and did not need to be discussed. [Hearing none.]

Motion and Vote

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

- 1) That the marquee lighting be eliminated along the enclosed patio.

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

**2. BSD HR – Schmitt Residence
17-096ARB-MPR**

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

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following application is a request for exterior modifications for the historic portion of an existing 2-story, single-family dwelling including replacement of the roof, windows, gutters, and downspouts. He noted the site is west of S. Riverview Street, southwest of the intersection with Pinneyhill Lane. He said this is a request for a review and approval of a Minor Project under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Jennifer Rauch presented an aerial view of the site as well as the existing home from the viewpoint of S. Riverview Street, looking west. She said there is a series of proposed modifications:

- Roof - replace existing raised seam metal roof with new raised seam metal roof
- Soffit Repairs - repair and rebuild existing soffits and gable end trims to match existing
- Windows - replace deteriorating windows with the same design of 6-over-6 sashes
- Brick – small spot repairs to existing masonry
- Front Door - replace existing non-historical front door and transom
- Gutters and Downspouts – replace with traditional period appropriate materials

Ms. Rauch said a number of the changes are like-for-like replacement or maintenance. She explained given the number of changes, staff thought it appropriate to come before this Board for a review of the application.

Ms. Rauch presented the proposed material palette via graphics and pictures. She noted the reduction in width for the replacement roofing, which will be in a charcoal color; the classic white windows, and the gutters and downspouts that are rounded and smooth.

Ms. Rauch reported the ART expressed concern with the proposed front door. She presented the current door, which appears to be a period appropriated door per the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*. She presented a graphic showing the applicant's proposed door, which has nine lights at the top and panel at the bottom. She said a consultant also reviewed this application whom agrees with staff and the ART's findings that the door should be modified to be more of a period specific door that was the 1820's.

Ms. Rauch said the Minor Project Review criteria has been met with the following condition, therefore, approval is recommended:

- 1) That the applicant work with staff to select a more architecturally and period appropriate door.

Nathan Sampson, Behal Sampson Dietz Architecture & Construction, clarified what they are doing with the house is mainly maintenance issues by replacing the roof and windows. He explained the windows they will install are clad windows as the current windows are just replacement windows. He said the existing roof is an older metal roof, certainly not the original roof, which would have been shake. He added they are trying to be as true to the existing or historical precedence of the neighborhood. He said the 18-inch raised-seam metal roof is the widest that they can obtain for a more contemporary made

metal roof. He explained they increased the gauge of it so they can keep a flat pan to prevent oil canning versus having ridges.

Mr. Sampson questioned the issues with the front door. He agreed the 6-panel front door is prevalent in the neighborhood but they are proposing to keep the four-panel transom above the door but the door they are proposing is one glazed panel over two panels with a nine-square grid volume pattern that fits in with the windows. He said that door is also prevalent throughout the neighborhood on both wooden and masonry structures. He said part of the goal for replacement of the door is to bring more light into the space and as a safety issue by knowing who is at the door. He indicated they are happy to work with staff but would like to hear comments from the Board on what aspects of that door may not be suitable.

Everett Musser asked if the proposed door was full length with no transom. Mr. Sampson said that was correct and they plan to replace the current transom with like-for-like materials.

David Rinaldi said it is hard to tell by the picture if the existing door is original or not. Mr. Sampson said the door itself is not the original door; it is more contemporary. Mr. Rinaldi asked if there was any documentation to show the door they are proposing is something similar to what might have once existed. Mr. Sampson answered he did not have that documentation. He provided visuals to help.

Gary Alexander said, per the consultant's report, she emphasized the original door would not have the glazing.

Jeff Leonhard said he has the original door to his house on Riverview and it is almost all glass and of really old wood, which he has hung on the wall and not left in the doorway. He agreed, not having glass in the front door is concerning as they replaced theirs with an all-wood door.

Mr. Sampson said they want to propose a replacement that fits in with the historic nature of the street and the neighborhood and that is why they chose the proposed design. He said the six-panel door that the consultant is recommending is also an acceptable style of door.

Mr. Rinaldi commended the applicant on the overall quality of everything proposed; it is very well done.

Mr. Alexander reported there was some additional information about doors with glazing that the consultant thought were appropriate. He encouraged the applicant to work with staff as he indicated there might be some flexibility there. He agreed with Mr. Rinaldi that everything proposed is first rate.

Ms. Rauch said it was possible for staff to help find an appropriate door that everyone could agree on. The Chair asked if there was any discussion needed on the other modifications. [Hearing none.]

Motion and Vote

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

- 1) That the applicant work with staff to select a more architecturally and period appropriate door.

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

**3. Yoder Residence
17-089ARB**

**5927 Rings Road
Demolition**

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following application is a request for demolition of a 1.5-story building addition, an attached garage, and two detached garages for an existing single-family historic structure. He noted the site is south of Rings Road, approximately 400 feet west of the intersection with Wilcox Road. He said this is a request for a review and approval of an Architectural Review Board application for the demolition of a portion of a historic structure and two detached accessory structures located outside of the Historic District and under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.170, Appendix G, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Jennifer Rauch noted this application was informally reviewed at the last ARB meeting as well as the proposed addition and site modifications, which is the subsequent application.

Ms. Rauch presented an aerial view of the site with the buildings proposed to be demolished highlighted, mostly in the northern portion of the lot. She presented photographs of two of the outbuildings proposed to be demolished (east and west garages) that have significant water damage as well as the 1.5-story addition to the rear of the existing home proposed to be removed. She presented a photograph of the front façade where the porch will be changed out as well as the attached garage to be demolished.

At the previous meeting, discussions most particularly were about the additions on the house, Ms. Rauch noted, and whether demolition of that portion of the house is appropriate. She said Christine Trebellas, AICP, LEED Green Associate, Historic Preservation Consultant, has provided some analysis of that and the applicant provided some subsequent details about the structural nature and issues that exist. She reported that staff has reviewed the additional information provided and have found that the criteria for demolition are met for all of those requests.

Ms. Rauch stated approval is recommended for the Demolition with two conditions:

- 1) That the applicant preserve, restore, or maintain any historically significant features and/or materials to the greatest extent possible; 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 Chair asked if the applicant had anything to add. While waiting for the other applicant to arrive, Mr. Rinaldi asked who compiled the structural report. Betsy Yoder, homeowner at 5927 Rings Road, answered the structural report was completed by the applicant.

Nelson Yoder, homeowner at 5927 Rings Road, presented a photograph of the house on the five-acre site, as well as a graphic from Google Earth that shows the property in its entirety including all the accessory structures. He recalled at the last meeting the floodway versus the flood plain and the location of the buildings, etc. was discussed and referred to the consultant's report and the Planning Report for more detail. He presented the graphic showing Cramer's Ditch and the floodway limits in context with the buildings on site. He presented photographs of the main historic structure as well as the past additions to be demolished along with the attached garage, east garage, and west garage all proposed to be demolished.

Mr. Yoder indicated that per the last meeting, staff and the consultant came to the conclusion that structures in the floodway are limited in time and have suffered a lot of structural damage. He said he now has additional documentation that show the structural damage by way of photographs.

To address the comments made at the last meeting about rebuilding the existing staircase in the existing stair shaft, Mr. Yoder said the existing stair shaft is limited in size and the stair is too small so if the stair footprint were to be increased in either direction, walls would be blown out and two bathrooms would be eliminated.

Mr. Yoder referred to the Structural Report Addendum Summary and said there are a lot of conditions in the existing structure, which are noted there and he provided photographs to further show the damaged conditions. The photographs presented showed the damage to the main structure/home:

- Extensive wood-destroying insect damage that exists all throughout the structure to be demolished;
- A loadbearing header that has been propped up with blocking and an expandable shoring post to prevent collapse due to insect damage;
- An unsecured wood post and loose steel beam added at some point that is the only thing preventing further collapse or further settlement;
- Portions of loadbearing walls have been demolished over time for mechanical systems including the reckless electrical system that was exposed;
- Significant horizontal and vertical plane cracks on ground floor and attic demonstrate ongoing failure of structural system and just since the purchase in 2013 they have witnessed significant shifts;
- Prolonged water infiltration and freeze-thaw has resulted in structural wall damage in multiple locations;
- Brick Chimney is leaning several inches out of plumb;
- Fascia, Soffit, and rafter tails are rotted;
- Prolonged water infiltration has led to onset of mold and rot in the roof structure above finished ceilings;

Additional photographs presented showed the damage to the attached garage:

- Several inches of ridge deflection that are indicative of failure of the roof structural system;
- Roof sheathing boards and lookouts are rotting away (typical of the entire structure to be demolished);
- Roof wall flashing has failed; and
- Slate roof is extremely weathered - delamination has progressed to point where slate is now trapping moisture and contributing to rot of structure below.

Mr. Yoder recalled there was significant discussion about preserving the historical quality of the core house and ensuring the decorative brackets remain. He presented the various elevations of the house and noted the brackets that will be saved and the windows to be preserved.

Mr. Yoder recalled talking about reusing and repurposing materials such as wood, brick, and stone so he presented examples of how they are considering the materials be reused in the project. He showed floor joists turned into risers that go up the stairs, wood for table tops, brick to be used in the landscaping by

way of paths, old bricks painted to look like old books and stacked on a bookshelf, and wood used for accent walls or decorative pieces. He indicated they would like to reuse foundation stones in the landscaping (perhaps in the front wall), but they could not find photographs to accurately depict their vision of the wall.

The Chair opened the discussion on the Demolition application. David Rinaldi said he had some reservations on the addition portion proposed to be demolished at the last meeting.

Gary Alexander said he did too so he visited the property and walked the site. He said his reservations after seeing the conditions were gone. He said that is the difference between reading a report and actually seeing the conditions on site. He stated he is fine with the demolition of the addition because he saw for himself what bad shape it was in (noting fallen brick, etc).

Motion and Vote

Mr. Leonhard moved, Mr. Musser seconded, to approve the request for a Demolition with two conditions:

- 1) That the applicant preserve, restore, or maintain any historically significant features and/or materials to the greatest extent possible; 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. Alexander, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Musser, yes; and Mr. Leonhard, yes. (Approved 4 – 0)

4. Yoder Residence 17-083ARB

5927 Rings Road Building Addition

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following application is a request for the construction of a ±3,600-square-foot addition, a detached garage, and landscape and site improvements 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 south side of Rings Road, approximately 400 feet west of the intersection with Wilcox Road. He said this is a request for a review and approval of an Architectural Review Board application for an addition to a designated historic structure and site improvements located outside of the Historic District and under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.170, Appendix G, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Jennifer Rauch said she wanted to make sure they discussed all the proposed improvements. She presented the proposed site plan oriented on Rings Road and noted the new driveway access, a more significant driveway leading to the proposed detached garage, the existing structure highlighted, the new proposed addition located in the rear, and the floodplain and flood way that prompted a Variance request to the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA) to permit the addition location, which was approved.

Ms. Rauch presented the Landscape Plan and noted the main house and driveway, the proposed addition again, the attached garage, pool, reconstruction of a crossing over Cramer's Ditch, and additional landscaping. She pointed out the front porch would be modified, also.

The proposed various elevations were presented that showed the previously proposed additions on the rear as compared to the new proposed changes that addressed the concerns discussed at the last meeting. Ms. Rauch said there are concerns to whether the addition meets the intent of the *Guidelines* that state "the addition should be subordinate to the original building and keeping the appearance of the

original structure as unchanged as possible.” She asked if the scale and massing has been reduced enough to address the *Guidelines* as well as the Zoning Code. She said the height was reduced and the eave line was broken up but staff still has concerns about the modifications being significant enough to meet the Code and the *Guidelines*. After the consultant’s and staff’s review, she said, several of the criteria have not been met. She added, in terms of materials and design, it is appropriate.

Ms. Rauch said disapproval is recommended.

Mr. Yoder referred to the consultant’s report, which he found extremely favorable. He said a lot of the concerns focused on size/massing. He said the existing house has two bedrooms and they have three girls. He explained they are trying to add just two more bedrooms upstairs and a first floor master bedroom, modern living room, kitchen, basement, laundry room, mud room, attached two-car garage that was reduced from three, the carriage house with the pool, and an entertaining room stuck behind the house. He said they are looking at a 98% increase in size not a 300% increase in the size of the existing house. He said with the existing, they are at 48,073 square feet; they are not tripling the size of the house. He said they shrunk the plans and pushed the additions back to address the comments and still make this more workable; this is a very reasonable request to make of the Board.

Mr. Yoder presented the original site plan and form graphics and noted the revisions on each. He pointed out the obvious changes and said they made as many compromises to the program as they could:

- Ridge of the second story addition was dropped below the original structure’s;
- Mudroom and porch were pushed back to expose more of the old side wall and to allow another window to be preserved; and
- Garage eave was lowered.

Mr. Yoder referred to the Planning Report that states the impression is the applicant has not made every effort but he disagrees as they have been working at this for many years. He said the impression was given that the consultant did not approve of where they have arrived but he presented a different impression as he highlighted comments directly from the consultant’s report:

“...the style and design materials of the new construction are appropriate and sympathetic to the historic building. They contribute to the rural architectural character of the building, yet are clearly new additions...” “...one can clearly see where the old building ends and the new begins...” “...the new additions no longer overpower the historic core and let the historic building take precedent...”

Mr. Yoder noted the consultant had one question and it was about the size and location of the west garage and asked the applicant if there was anything else they could do to modify it. Mr. Yoder had responded they cannot and explained his reasons. He said the consultant suggested then using landscaping as a screen to mitigate the view of the garage so that is what the applicant has done. He added his home is not a building grade home by any stretch for the City or for himself. He noted that the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* clearly state that if site constraints impact a design there can be flexibility as long as there is distinction between the new and the old and that the original stay unchanged as possible. He emphasized the consultant stated in his report - that requirement had been met.

Mr. Yoder presented the rendering of the front showing the original design and then the revised to highlight the additional changes, which exposes more of the original structure/house. He pointed out that they changed the front wall to stone instead of brick as it is a more Dublin appropriate use with the historic houses in the City. He said this design feature may not be appropriate anywhere else but they wanted to tie into the context of the area. He then presented the same for the back and explained how the addition is now more subordinate to the original structure.

Mr. Yoder presented an animation of what the property would look like as one is driving down Rings Road and further reflects how the addition is subordinate. He said the landscaping in this video is reflective of Gary's plan and pointed out the heavy tree line that screens the addition, approaching the house. He reported he has shown this video to other architects he knows and they have all provided the same exact feedback, which is "of course that is subordinate." "...it looks great, it is fantastic, and why would anyone not want to do this". He cited that the main house remains the star of the show.

Mr. Yoder said he had the revised floor plans ready to present, if reference is needed.

Mr. Yoder said there is a few minor tweaks in the landscaping that can be explored, if the Board so chooses, but in general, the landscaping plan is very similar to what was reviewed the last time.

Ms. Yoder said she wanted to provide a brief picture of their lives to help with the Board's decision this evening because for them, it is a very personal decision. Besides the need for more bedrooms for their girls, they also need a bedroom for her aging mother that is intended to move in with them in the future and this necessitates a two-story addition. She said they need to design a new stair to allow safe passage to the two new bedrooms as well as the existing. She reiterated that the historic stair drastically fails to meet Code. She added they need larger living spaces as they have a large extended family that requires adequate space for holidays but all the shared moments of life. She said they want a home that is accommodating and hospitable for their family, friends, and business associates. They believe the program is what every family wants and needs, she said; it is not a monument. She concluded they are preserving and significantly enhancing this important piece of early Dublin architecture and want the Board to view this as a living, breathing home for their growing family and not just a static, stagnate, structure.

The Chair invited the public to speak. [Hearing none.] He said the Board needs to approach this application based on the facts of the case as it relates to the Code; an addition is not justified just because there is a large family in a small house.

Jeff Leonhard inquired about the back garage that does not meet zoning. Ms. Rauch indicated the height of the detached structure does not meet the Zoning Code requirements of Washington Township. Mr. Yoder explained the existing Township Code limits all accessory structures to no more than 12 feet in height and that includes the carriage house as well. He added the carriage house sits in the middle of the grade change and the site slopes pretty significantly from the road down to the creek. He said they plan to go before the Board of Zoning Appeals next month to request a Variance to allow additional height. He noted there are existing outbuildings all taller than this. He requested the ARB discuss the height issue as their feedback may help going forward to the BZA.

David Rinaldi said his issue is "what is the definition of subordinate". He said does the addition have to be subordinate from all angles or subordinate from the road. He stated the applicant has done a good job of framing the house from the road but is it a subordinate addition.

Gary Alexander said he agreed with Mr. Rinaldi and he appreciates the efforts that have been made by the applicant to be as responsive as possible. He indicated he did not agree with the consultant's views about the garage size. He asked if the location was based on the grade change. He asked if there was a way to move one of those bays into the detached garage or perhaps the carriage house. He suggested that if the applicant did not want to change the grade, if he would consider moving the garage back a little bit so it is more like the other side.

Gary Schmidt, G2 Planning Design, explained the grade change as it goes down to the pool deck and patio; pushing the garage back would make a bad situation worse from a landscape architects point of view.

Mr. Rinaldi asked if the applicant had considered a physical break between the addition and the main structure as noted in the Code.

Gary Bruck, Sullivan Bruck Architects, they considered it but it was not an option and explained why. He added that the Yoder's are ready to spend a significant amount of money to improve this property with this addition. With his 40-years of experience, he said he is not sure anyone would appreciate a one-car garage attached to a million dollar plus property.

Everett Musser said he was impressed and originally thought this was a very ambitious project, which it is, and he appreciates all the effort that has been put into it. He said the two consultants have done a great job. He said the Board could say the addition is really not small enough but he questioned how it could be made smaller and still work. He said he does not see how that is going to happen. From his standpoint, he said this project is very acceptable.

Mr. Leonhard said he agreed with Mr. Musser. He said he is not an architect but the proposed design is very impressive.

Mr. Yoder indicated his impression was that two Board Members were on the fence and assured them that if this moves forward and time goes by and we are standing here 160 years from today, the existing historic core of this house will still be there – all the window openings, the lintels, brackets, etc. He said he thought they were taking a good steward approach to this plan. He said this is going to be a beautiful addition in the meantime, while preserving the core house for the future.

Mr. Alexander said the concerns expressed have been fair concerns based on the way the Code has been applied to other properties. He said he would feel a little bit better if more adjustments could be made as he is not quite there yet.

Ms. Yoder shared some diagrams straight from the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*. She stressed that they believe they are meeting the spirit and the purpose of the Code and the addition is subordinate in terms of the attachment. She pointed out a linear building with recommended addition types. She said they have tried as much as possible to keep pushing this further back; she said the roof is barely attaching. She referred to the consultant's comments that she can see where the new begins and the old ends; this is acceptable to her in her professional opinion.

Mr. Yoder referred to the Planning Report regarding style. He said rather than evaluating on style for styles purpose and materials for materials purpose and size, etc. it all comes back to the same argument, that staff does not like the size of the addition. He emphasized that same argument cannot be used for six different issues, especially when we are trying to enforce the Code.

Mr. Musser said he feels the existing house is predominant and it is not reduced in its appearance or its historic value with the proposed additions. He said this proposal is fine and the Board should approve it.

Mr. Rinaldi restated that the attachment concerns him and wished they could have pushed back the two-story section just four feet so there is a one-story attachment and then the stair. He indicated that might have made a bigger difference for him and less impactful on the back of that house. He said the other piece is if it is subordinate to the road or the back of the house.

Mr. Yoder said he puts himself in Mr. Rinaldi's position - wondering if he would get in trouble with his neighbors if he approved something. He emphasized what someone will see from the road after these modifications are built. He said he thinks it is beautiful and the neighbors will be ecstatic that this happened. He said whether something is subordinate or not is not specifically addressed in the Code. He said he has been asking architects the same question. He indicated as an architect, this is common sense in his mind and everybody he has talked to agrees.

Mr. Schmidt said as a landscape architect, he used to be on the Brewery District Commission Board so they dealt with these kinds of issues and this truly is a unique situation as the stream sets the parameter for the addition as they have to work between the stream and the house. He said it is an odd situation given this is on five acres of land but the buildable area for the addition is not even 10% of that. However, the concern about the back of the house, he said, nobody will see it except for the homeowners because of the mature pine trees all around the perimeter of five acres. Again, he said the addition is subordinate to public view and that is what the Board should be concerned with.

Ms. Yoder addressed Mr. Rinaldi's comment about hoping to see a one story with the stepping up of the two story. She explained the new stair they are proposing will also provide circulation to the other two bedrooms so they would not have to rely on the historic staircase to come and go throughout the house; they needed that portion of the two story to tie the whole second floor together.

The Chair asked if there was further discussion to be had. [Hearing none.]

Motion and Vote

Mr. Musser moved, Mr. Leonhard seconded, to approve the request for a Building Addition with no conditions. The vote was as follows: Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Alexander, no; Mr. Leonhard, yes; and Mr. Musser, yes. (Approved 3 – 1)

Communications

Claudia Husak stated staff is moving the electronic packet material delivery from Drop box to OneDrive so for the rest of the year, we are going to do a soft roll out so everything will be in both places but by January we want to be using OneDrive exclusively. She reported some tutorial materials have been created on how to access OneDrive. She said that should provide enough time to iron out any issues before we go live in January.

With no further communications to share, the Chair adjourned the meeting at 8:22 pm.
As approved by the Architectural Review Board on November 15, 2017.