



# MEETING MINUTES

## Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, January 25, 2023

### CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Alexander, Chair, called the January 25, 2023, meeting of the City of Dublin Architectural Review Board (ARB) to order at 6:31 p.m.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Chair led the Pledge of Allegiance.

### ROLL CALL

Board Members present: Mr. Alexander, Mr. Cotter, Mr. Jewell, Ms. Cooper, and Ms. Damaser  
Staff present: Ms. Holt and Ms. Goliver

### CHAIR COMMENTS

Mr. Alexander noted that the second case on the agenda - 22-179MPR, Minor Project Review, Franklin Street Extension Project – Landscaping may not require a presentation if nothing has changed since the last presentation and could be reviewed first.

Ms. Damaser moved, Mr. Jewell seconded, to consider the Franklin Street Extension Project, first.  
Vote: Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Mr. Jewell, yes; and Ms. Damaser, yes.  
[Motion Carried 5 - 0]

### ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Cooper moved, Mr. Jewell seconded, to accept the documents into the record and to approve the minutes from December 14, 2022.  
Vote: Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Mr. Jewell, yes; and Ms. Damaser, yes.  
[Motion Carried 5 - 0]

### CASE PROCEDURES

The Chair stated the Architectural Review Board is responsible for the review of construction, modifications or alterations to any site in the area subject to the Architectural Board Review (ARB) under the provision of Zoning Code §153.170. This Board has the final decision-making responsibility on cases under their purview. Anyone who intends to address the Board on any of the cases this evening will be sworn in. There were no cases eligible for the Consent Agenda. The agenda order is typically determined at the beginning of the meeting by the Chair, but the cases in the minutes will still follow the order of the published agenda.

The procedures of the meeting were stated and included that anyone who addresses the Board will need to provide their full name and address for the record.

The Chair swore in anyone planning to address the Board on any of the cases to be reviewed.

## **NEW CASES**

### **1. 112 S. Riverview Street, 22-182INF, Informal Review**

The Chair stated this application was a request for the construction of a two-story, residential building for a 0.26-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic Residential. The site is located southeast of the intersection of Pinneyhill Lane with S. Riverview Street.

#### **Staff Presentation**

Ms. Holt presented an aerial view of the site which was split in 2021 following the approved demolition of 110-112 S. Riverview Street. The property at 110 S. Riverview Street is currently under construction, just north of this property. The Scioto River is directly to the east where there are grade changes and a flood plain.

Photographs were shown for context and character of homes on the same side of the street and across, and the gross square footage for each structure has been noted for reference.

The property was reviewed informally by the ARB in October 2022. At that time, the Board made the following comments:

- The Board supported the layout on lot, as long as side yard setbacks were met;
- The Board was concerned about the massing and scale of the structure;
- Concerned about the complexity of rooflines;
- Concerned about the character and context;
- Made recommendations for a simpler, more vernacular, design; and
- Made a recommendation to relocate the garage to south side of the lot.

The site plan is largely the same as before.

- The four-car garage is still located on the north side of the building;
- There is a request for a Waiver for the front yard setback due to the existing grade similar to what was already approved for adjacent property at 110 S. Riverview Street; and
- The site plan now meets all required setbacks.

At the Minor Project Review, a survey will be required to confirm lot lines and any easements, and floodplain bounds will also need to be provided.

The elevations from the October 2022 review were presented in direct comparison with tonight's proposal. The design has been updated to a Cape Cod style, 1.5-story home. The midpoint of the roofline is 20 feet, four inches. The front façade now has a simplified form with new dormer windows and reduced number of materials used. The gutters section the home into different bays. The application is still showing some liveable space above the garage.

Preservation Designs, Ltd. (PDL) recommended the different material usage be minimized, to increase setbacks in the hyphen area, and to minimize faux historicisms, such as the ornate front entry detail on the west elevation/front.

For the north elevation/side there is now a stepped stone foundation; a reduction in the width of the shed dormer over the garage; and horizontal siding is the primary material.

PDL made recommendations that the stone foundation should be one height and that the ±16-inch stone front façade should wrap around the house and be more substantial.

The south elevation/side was updated for the massing to better reflect the natural slope of the site, the stepped stone foundation was added, horizontal siding again is the primary material and windows were provided in a more functional manner but not a traditional pattern. Staff recommends more consistent window placements.

PDL recommended the consistent wrap of stone foundation with no stair stepping effect.

The east elevation/rear massing appears to be driven somewhat by the four-car garage and this elevation was updated for the massing to better reflect the natural slope of the site. The stepped stone foundation was added, horizontal siding again is the primary material and windows were provided in a more functional manner with better traditional groupings.

PDL recommended the consistent wrap of stone foundation with no stair stepping effect.

Staff is still concerned with the 3.5-story mass on the rear elevation that exceeds height requirements, which would require a Waiver, which Staff is reluctant to support. A Waiver was granted for 110 S. Riverview but the massing was different. This is still essentially a rectangular, boxy form with multiple roof forms and slopes.

The front elevation for 110 S. Riverview Street was compared with the proposed elevation for 112 S. Riverview Street. The eave heights at 112 were greater and taller in size, with a greater emphasis on the half-story windows and living space. She noted 110 was approved under the new Code and Guidelines.

Ms. Holt presented the following discussion questions:

1. Does the Board support the updated mass and scale of the home, including the massing's response to the topography?
2. Does the Board support the updated conceptual architectural character and details of the home, including roof lines, window placement, and front entry detail?
3. Does the Board support the variety and use of materials proposed for the home?

### **Questions for Staff**

Ms. Damaser – She inquired about Staff's reasoning for not supporting a roof height Waiver as it related to the massing in the rear.

Ms. Holt – The boxy forms and the very vertical forms at 3.5 stories tall on the rear does not attempt to step down the slope as much as it could.

## **Applicant Presentation**

David Johnson, 8965 Cove Drive, Plain City, Ohio, presented other houses shown in the neighborhood. PDL had comments for the steepness of the roof and at 185 S. Riverview Street, it illustrates a 12:12 or 14:12 main roof that appears more massive. Another house was shown with a more ornate treatment of the entry, similar to what was in their proposal, but the client would be willing to do a simpler stone entry with a limestone lintel. PDL noted the height of the floors in the proposal. At 97 S. Riverview Street, there is clearly a 10-foot floor height with a 2-story main floor in this larger home within 500 – 600 feet of this site. The house did not even address the corner it sits upon. He wanted to compare the size of the footprint to his design. The dormers are engaged and flush with the wall at 84 S. Riverview Street. The client agreed to drop the roof pitch to 12:12 and go to a nine-foot first floor plate, allowing the main living areas to step down. Part of the simplification of the front façade is a stone front with engaged dormers and not set back on the roofline similar to 16 N. Dublin Road. The front presentation would be lower in scale and bring the roofline down another 2 – 3 feet. Parking on that side of the street is a big issue. This design presents as a two-car garage, even though it manages four cars. This helps get 2 cars that might otherwise be parked on the street. One story in the rear is technically a crawl space due to topography. They tried to reduce the flat roof and create more of a Cape Cod style on the rear. The main gable off the main roof is the Master Bedroom. There is also a second bedroom. The intent was to get both bedrooms up higher for a great view of the river. The Board suggested moving them to a lower level but the client wants to keep them higher/top floor.

## **Questions for the Applicant**

Mr. Jewell – He asked if the lower level floor plan was available.

Mr. Johnson – The client would like a family room, exercise room, and maybe an additional bedroom as well as the unfinished portion for utilities on that level.

Mr. Cotter – He verified the pitch of the garage is 12:12.

## **Public Comment**

No public comment has been received.

## **Board Discussion**

The Chair began with the discussion questions:

(Q1) Mr. Cotter – This is a nice improvement from October’s plan; it softened and dampened the whole view. The garage pitch overwhelms the house and dropping it will reduce the mass. The dormers fit with the other homes in the area. He asked to discuss the wraparound stone.

Mr. Johnson – The client is willing to drop the water table.

Mr. Alexander – Historic homes have a constant stone water table level. The applicant is trying to suggest they have a stone foundation, therefore it should be detailed appropriately, which is standard in preservation guidelines. This presents problems with breaking up the scale on the rear as there will be a lot of stone.

Mr. Jewell – He shared the same thoughts as Mr. Cotter.

Ms. Cooper – The stone will provide a simpler appearance like the other homes in the area. She asked about the hyphen being set back farther.

Mr. Johnson – He could bring it back another 2 – 3 feet without changing the plan too much.

Mr. Alexander – The front elevation was never his greatest concern. This is an improvement over the last time. We are looking for a greater shadow line to articulate between the house and the garage. Because the garage is so long, there is so much mass against the neighbor's house, blocking the potential for light. As stated at the last meeting, flipping the plan will allow more light into that house over a deck, and the projection will not be so deep on that side of the neighbor's house. It is still a three-story wall against the neighbor's house.

Mr. Johnson - The Razors had spoken with the neighbor, who prefers their garage to be on the left. Mr. Alexander – The Board is here to respond to architectural issues and how they respond to the Code. Whether someone likes something or not is outside the Code issues. And the consultant suggested reducing the depth of the garage. Changes will need to be made to get this project approved. The consultant made a lot of suggestions.

Mr. Johnson – There could be compromises made.

Mr. Alexander – The shed dormer on the upper floor against the neighbor contributes to the wall.

Mr. Johnson – He suggested smaller dormers instead of one large one.

Mr. Jewell – The northeast corner is the issue of additional mass and the dominance it projects. The design does not allow for the appearance that the house is coming down the slope; it is coming straight out to that side. There is very little space between the two houses because of the small lots. Mr. Johnson – No matter what is there, it will feel larger due to the nature of the topography.

Ms. Cooper – There is a lot less massing to the southeast of the property with the double decks that are open, if the plan was flipped. The whole garage area could be reduced in size. The rear elevation appears out of place to the community due to its size and square shape.

Mr. Cotter – Guidelines state to follow the contour of the topography. The focus is still on the northeast corner and how it appears as one large mass not broken up at all. It appears more than three stories, which is outside what this Board would normally approve and needs to be softened and dampened down. The middle section even appears large.

Mr. Johnson – The function of the rear is to fulfil the client's desire and the front can be reduced. He was looking for a compromise as this is the Razors' dream home.

The Board offered many design changes.

(Q2) Mr. Cotter – Suggested simplifying the front detail.

Mr. Alexander – He referred to the report. Wood details added to a stone building should be stone. The house across the street with that amount of detail was never approved by this Board. That is a great example of what is not acceptable. Strip out some of the detail; it is not found in a vernacular building.

Ms. Cooper – She had agreed to many of the comments from PDL in their report. There is still too much activity of the rooflines. She asked if anyone had spoken to the neighbor about switching the garage to the other side.

Bill Razor, 6857 Holbein Drive, Dublin, 43016, said he spoke with the neighbor after the last meeting about the garage. There is a privacy issue and the neighbors do not want to have to look at each other. Both would have more privacy with both garages together in between the living spaces. The neighbor offered to send his comments directly to the Board. He was the one that split the lot and

they bought the lot from him. The neighbor wants the process expedited and the street to get back to normal. He stated he was not an architect but the design is pretty cool. He understands the driving forces of the historic nature of the neighborhood but it is a river view lot and would like to take advantage of that. Most of the houses there have decks and such and maximize the number of windows that face the river. He said it is to be historic looking on the front but a river view feel on the back. It does not seem to be a typical lot.

Mr. Johnson – For context, the rear façade at 134 - 136 S. Riverview Street, next door, appears clearly as a three-story house based on the topography.

The Chair – The Board does not dispute the rear is going to be taller, more open, with the amount of windows proposed; there are more sensitive ways it can be handled.

(Q3) Mr. Cotter – The stone in the front is fine. He wanted to better understand the wraparound.

Ms. Damaser and Mr. Jewell had the same concern.

Mr. Alexander – Stepping should be simpler.

Mr. Johnson – He suggested adding a chimney to connect to.

Ms. Holt – Chimneys cannot project into a setback.

Mr. Johnson – To limit materials, all board and batten would be removed and just have stone and horizontal siding.

Mr. Cotter – He inquired about the window size and placements on the south side.

Mr. Alexander – The consultant commented on the variety of windows and grid pattern changes.

Ms. Holt – She agreed there is a variety and interpreted the comments of wanting traditional forms and groupings, not randomly placed on the exterior as dictated by the interior.

Ms. Cooper – She inquired about the little window that appears between floors.

Mr. Johnson – A small eye window in a bathtub/shower area in the bathroom.

Ms. Cooper – She asked about the one above by the gable.

Mr. Johnson – There's a switchback stairway and the landing is dropped down from the second floor.

The Chair summarized the Board's comments:

- The mass and scale is related to the articulation of the rear elevation. The 3.5 story mass on the one plane in the rear needs to be reduced.
- Simplify the conceptual character and detail to be more appropriate using vernacular detail for a traditional home.
- Simplify rooflines.
- Reduce the number of materials to two but a third might be permitted if used as an accent.
- Organize the windows on the elevations where the windows do not appear to line up. Create some continuity in the grid patterns in the windows, themselves.

## **2. Franklin Street Extension Project - Landscaping at 50 W. Bridge Street 22-179MPR, Minor Project Review**

The Chair stated this application was a request for modifications to landscaping on private property in association with the Franklin Street Extension Project from the City of Dublin Department of Engineering.

### **Staff Presentation**

Ms. Holt stated just the improvements on private property were going to be discussed. An aerial view was shown of the proposed road extension with the associated project site within two different zones. The

Historic District, Historic Core is on the east side of Franklin Street, and Historic District, Historic Public is on the west side where the school is located. Darby Street Public Parking Lot and J. Liu's Restaurant is to the east, to the south is Bridge Street, and the library garage is to the north. The existing chain link fence was noted in one of the photographs taken along Franklin Street. There are three different project areas:

The first area is at the School. Emerald City Tulip Trees are proposed for along the newly-relocated access drive. The current fence will be replaced with a new black, vinyl-coated chain-link fence and screened with compact size Pfitzer Junipers in the new location. A Waiver has been requested as chain-link fencing is not normally permitted in the district.

The second area is at J. Liu's Restaurant, where a drive aisle and parking spaces were previously located. A variety of shrubs, small trees, and foundation plantings have been proposed. Two small walls will be added on each side of the entry drive to match other walls to match those at the Darby Street Public Parking Lot.

The third project area is at the Darby Street Parking Lot. A variety of small trees, shrubs, and grasses, (listed in the Planning Report) will be installed to screen the parking lot and utilities.

The majority of the Waiver Approval Criteria have been met or are not applicable. Overall, this is an improvement to the area. The application was also reviewed against the Minor Project Review Criteria, which have been met. Planning recommends approval of both the Waiver and the Minor Project without conditions.

#### **Questions for Staff**

There were none.

#### **Applicant Presentation**

The Chair determined the Board could make a determination on this case without further presentations, which Mr. Gable agreed to.

#### **Questions for the Applicant**

There were none.

#### **Public Comment**

There were no public comments received.

#### **Board Discussion**

The Chair determined the Waiver was sufficiently discussed at the last meeting and called for a motion to approve the Waiver.

Ms. Cooper moved and Ms. Damaser seconded, to approve the Waiver to allow the black, vinyl-coated, chain-link fence improvement.

Vote: Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Mr. Jewell, yes; and Ms. Damaser, yes.  
[Motion Carried 5 - 0]

Mr. Jewell moved and Ms. Damaser seconded, to approve the Minor Project.

Vote: Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Mr. Jewell, yes; and Ms. Damaser, yes.  
[Motion Carried 5 – 0]

The Chair affirmed the Minor Project was approved.

The Chair indicated Cases three and four will be presented together.

**3. Mothballing Historic Roofs at 40 E. Bridge Street, 27, 37, 53, and 62 N. Riverview Street, 23-003MPR, Minor Project Review**

The Chair stated this application was a request for mothballing of historic property roofs in association with the North Riverview Street Project from the City of Dublin Facilities Division. The sites are zoned Historic District, Historic Residential and located north of E. Bridge Street and between N. Blacksmith Lane and N. Riverview Street.

**4. Carport Demolition at 40 E. Bridge Street, 23-004ARB, Architectural Review**

The Chair stated this application was a request for Demolition of a non-contributing structure/carport at an existing home on a 0.319-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic Residential. The site is located northeast of the intersection of N. Blacksmith Lane with E. Bridge Street.

**Staff Presentation**

Ms. Holt stated these two cases are part of the larger, N. Riverview Project and presented the sites involved [aerial view]. West of N. Riverview Street is zoned Historic Residential, east of N. Riverview is zoned Historic Public, and to the west of the project it is zoned Historic Core. The address of 40 E. Bridge Street is part of both applications. The structure's roof will be repaired and carport demolished. Not included properties involve like-for-like maintenance related to standing-seam, metal roofs.

In January 2021, the City purchased all these properties for redevelopment opportunities. In April 2021, Council appointed an Advisory Committee who indicated support to create a Request for Proposal (RFP) for the project. In June 2022, the RFP was advertised. In September 2022, the Advisory Committee recommended a proposal to City Council, which was accepted. The City is currently working with the chosen developer.

Photographs were shown of the five properties with the deteriorating structures all in fair to poor condition as reported by CTL Engineering in 2020. The structure at 40 E. Bridge Street is suffering interior damage due to leaks. The non-compliant and non-contributing carport was shown for the demolition request for 40 E. Bridge Street.

The application was reviewed against the Minor Project Review Criteria. Staff recommended approval with the following condition:

- 1) This temporary solution may be required for longer than six months, the projected lifespan of the proposed materials. At that time, the condition of roof felt shall be examined, and replacement may be necessary based on condition and the timeline of the N. Riverview Properties project.



The application was reviewed against the Demolition Review Criteria. Due to the age of the structure and the detractor from the historic character, Staff recommended approval. Two separate motions are being requested.

### **Questions for Staff**

Mr. Cotter – He confirmed the material will keep the structures safe until the proposal is completed as part of this larger project.

### **Applicant Presentation**

Brian Ashford, Director of Facilities stated he did not have a presentation.

### **Public Comment**

There were no public comments received.

### **Board Discussion**

As there was no further comments, the Chair called for the motions.

Ms. Cooper moved and Mr. Jewell seconded to approve the Demolition of the carport at 40 E. Bridge Street.  
Vote: Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Mr. Jewell, yes; and Ms. Damaser, yes.  
[Motion carried 5 – 0]

Mr. Jewell moved and Mr. Cotter seconded, to approve the Minor Project with one condition.  
Vote: Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Mr. Jewell, yes; and Ms. Damaser, yes.  
[Motion carried 5 – 0]

The Chair affirmed the Minor Project was approved.

### **Communications**

- Ms. Holt thanked Emily Goliver for sitting in for Laurie Wright to record the meeting's proceedings. She introduced Ms. Rati Singh as the new Planner I for the division. She is an architect with a lot of project management experience.
- Ms. Holt noted the year-end report.
- Ms. Cooper will not be able to attend the February meeting.
- Mr. Jewell will not be able to attend the February and March meetings.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 8:03 p.m.

*Gary Alexander*  
Chair, Architectural Review Board