



MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, April 26, 2023

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Alexander, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and welcomed everyone to the April 26, 2023 Architectural Review Board. He stated that the meeting could also be accessed at the City's website. Public comments on the cases were welcome from meeting attendees and from those viewing from the City's website.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. Alexander led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Board Members present: Mr. Alexander, Mr. Cotter, Ms. Damaser, Mr. Jewell, Ms. Cooper
Staff present: Ms. Holt, Ms. Singh, Mr. Kline

ADJOURN TO EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. Alexander moved, Mr. Jewell seconded to adjourn to executive session for the discussion of a personnel matter related to the appointment of a public official.

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

MEETING RECONVENED

The meeting was reconvened at 6:45 p.m.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Ms. Cooper moved, Mr. Jewell seconded to elect Sean Cotter as Vice Chair for the term of April 2023 through May 2024.

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

Ms. Cooper moved, Mr. Jewell seconded to elect Gary Alexander as Chair for the term of April 2023 through May 2024.

Vote: Ms. Damaser, yes; Mr. Jewell, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes.

[Motion carried 5-0]

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Damaser moved, Mr. Cotter seconded acceptance of the documents into the record and approval of the March 15, 2023 minutes.

Vote: Mr. Jewell, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Ms. Damaser, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Mr. Alexander, abstained.

[Motion carried 4-0 with one abstention]

Mr. Alexander stated that the Architectural Review Board (ARB) is responsible for review of construction, modifications or alterations to any site in the Review District or area subject to ARB under the provision of Zoning Code Section 153.170. The Board has the decision-making responsibility on these cases.

The Chair swore in staff and applicants who planned to address the Board on any of the cases on the agenda.

Mr. Alexander stated that the first three cases would be addressed as Consent Agenda-light items, receiving only a minimal case presentation, and if there are no public comments, proceed to a vote.

CASES

1. Begley Residence, 6199 Dublin Road, 23-012MPR, Minor Project Review

Exterior site modifications to an existing, single-family residence on a 1.32-acre site zoned Limited Suburban Residential District and is located southwest of the intersection of Dublin Road with Short Street.

Case Presentation

Ms. Singh stated this is a request for exterior site modifications, as described in the staff report, to the single-family residence at 6199 Dublin Road, which is zoned Limited Suburban Residential District and located within the Historic District. Staff has reviewed the application against the applicable criteria and recommends approval of the construction of a 1,714-square-foot patio space containing a driveway apron and fire pit at the rear of the home and an 85-foot long stepping stone walkway in front of the home with no conditions.

Public Comment

There were no public comments.

Ms. Damaser moved, Ms. Cooper seconded approval of the Minor Project at 6199 Dublin Road, Dublin with no conditions.

Vote: Mr. Cotter, yes; Mr. Jewell, yes; Ms. Damaser, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes.

[Motion carried 5-0]

2. Brown Harris Cemetery, PID: 274-012328, 23-027MPR, Minor Project Review

Construction and design of a cemetery to preserve a historic grave site. The 0.13-acre site is zoned ID-1, Research Office District and is located northeast of the roundabout of Shier Rings Road and University Boulevard.

Case Presentation

Ms. Holt stated that this a request for review and approval of site improvements, as described in the staff report, at a historic cemetery site, which is an Appendix G property. Staff has reviewed the application against the applicable criteria and recommends approval with one condition, to which the applicant has agreed.

Public Comment

Gene Bostic, former Washington Township Trustee, stated that this project is in Washington Township, and the township is very interested in this project. This cemetery predates the township, which was formed in 1810. At their meeting last evening, the Township trustees expressed a desire to partner with the City of Dublin in a joint effort to make the site beautiful.

Mr. Alexander inquired if the Township trustees have been involved in the project planning. Ms. Holt responded that Councilmember Kramb has been working with Washington Township on this effort, so there appears to have been City and Township collaboration.

Mr. Jewell moved, Mr. Cotter seconded approval of the Minor Project at Brown Harris Cemetery with one condition:

- 1) Continue to work with staff to install one bike rack of appropriate style and color within the access easement for the project, to be shown at Certificate of Zoning Plan Approval (CZPA).

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

3. Trevor Furbay, Sign at 63 S. High Street, 23-033MPR, Minor Project Review

Installation of a ±6-square-foot ground sign on a 0.26-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic South. The site is located northwest of the intersection of S. High Street with Eberly Hill Lane.

Case Presentation

Mr. Klein stated that this is a request for the review and approval of one ground sign and painting of the front door and window trim at 63 S. High Street, as described in the staff report. Staff has reviewed the application against the applicable criteria and recommends approval with no conditions.

Public Comment

There were no public comments.

Ms. Damaser moved, Ms. Cooper seconded approval of the Minor Project for exterior site modifications at 63 S. High Street with no conditions.

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

4. 83 S. High Street, 23-013MPR, Minor Project Review

Remodel and addition to an existing, two-story building on a 0.15-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic South. The site is located southwest of the intersection of Eberly Hill Lane with S. High Street.

Case Presentation

Ms. Holt stated that this site is located within the Historic South District. This district extends north and east of this site; the area to the west is zoned Historic Residential. The site lies just north of Pinneyhill Lane and South High Street; Mill Lane lies rear of the property. This project was reviewed informally by the ARB twice previously. The building has been used as a business, and a shared parking lot is located between the house and garage; the parking lot extends to Pinneyhill Lane. The cross access easement was removed in 2017. The owners intend to convert the structure to their private residence, while using the carriage house in its current form as a home office. This is the Giles Weaver house, built ca. 1830. The house was found by the Historic Cultural Assessment to be contributing on the basis of location, design, setting, feeling, and association, and the condition was noted as good. She noted that the walls are clad in clapboard siding, and the roof is zinc-colored standing seam metal in a saltbox form. The new paint color will match what exists. The existing rear porch will be removed to accommodate the new addition. The carriage house, which was constructed in approximately 1940, is proposed as a future home office. No changes to that structure are proposed other than removal of the arbor and patio, which are located within the Mill Lane right-of-way. Ms. Holt described the proposed elevation changes, materials and colors. Staff has reviewed the application against the applicable criteria and recommends approval of three (3) waivers and approval of the Minor Project with five (5) conditions.

- 1) The visible addition foundation shall be clad in stone or manufactured stone to match the existing structure's foundation, to be approved by staff prior to building permit.
- 2) The proposed front façade lighting shall be revised to fixtures that are less ornate and more vernacular in character, to be approved by staff prior to building permit. Any additional lighting shall be approved by staff prior to building permit.
- 3) The proposed roof color shall closely match the original zinc color of the structure, to be demonstrated at building permit.
- 4) The applicant shall provide detailed plans for any modification to utilities at the building permit stage, to the satisfaction of staff.
- 5) A comprehensive redevelopment study shall be conducted at building permit, such that no other parcels are adversely affected (not necessarily limited to stormwater, parking, and access) by this development, in which any necessary improvements are incorporated to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

Applicant Presentation

Richard Taylor, architect, 48 S. High Street, Dublin, provided comments regarding the proposed conditions.

Concerning Condition #1, while he is not opposed to the condition for cladding the foundation, there is only one small area on the original house where the existing foundation shows. The remainder of the siding extends to grade, and that is their intent with the addition. It is wasteful to install stone cladding on the few inches of foundation that will be immediately obscured by landscaping. He would request that the condition be eliminated.

Concerning Condition #3, the existing roof and roof color are not original. The roof was replaced several years ago, and the homeowner had it painted a color lighter than the original roof color. The property owners indicate that there are at least two earlier roofs that lie beneath the existing roof. He showed images of the home at 113 S. High Street, which has a very dark roof color, which is indicated to be a historic roof color. Therefore, they believe their proposed color, which is not zinc, is appropriate. They have no idea what the original roof material or color were.

Concerning Condition #4, the only modification to utilities of which they are aware is the house sewer line that runs back to Mill Lane, which will be replaced after the porch is removed. They would be working with Engineering on that component.

Concerning Condition #5, he does not know what a comprehensive redevelopment study is, nor why it would need to be submitted with the building permit. They provided a very detailed site plan, which is permit ready.

Mr. Alexander responded that he believes Engineering staff wants to ensure that the stormwater runoff is addressed properly, so it does not impact the adjacent property.

Mr. Taylor stated that this is an item that will be addressed with Engineering. He does not understand the reason that it is a condition for ARB approval.

Ms. Holt noted there would be no need to come back before the Board. The intent is to make sure they are on the record as items that will be taken care of at the Building Permit stage.

Mr. Taylor inquired if Condition #4 could be modified to clarify that the item will be reviewed by Engineering staff, not Planning staff.

Ms. Damaser suggested modifying the term to "applicable staff."

Ms. Holt revised the term accordingly.

Mr. Taylor noted that additionally, Condition #2 can be eliminated, as they will be keeping the existing light fixture.

Public Comment

There were no public comments.

Board Questions to the Applicant

Mr. Cotter inquired what the foundation would be comprised of and the amount of it that would show.

Mr. Taylor responded that it would be poured concrete or concrete block. Approximately 3-4 inches of concrete would show.

Mr. Alexander stated that the diagrams of the wall section show more than a few inches.

Mr. Taylor indicated they will be matching the finished floor, thereby maintaining the same level. There will be no room for additional foundation to show. However, his client has agreed to clad it, if required, but they would be adding stone that will have no visibility. Additionally, that stone does not match the house. In regard to the roof color, there is precedent in the Historic District for very dark roof colors, and they believe the dark color would be appropriate with this project. The existing color is not original, nor was it the color when the present owner purchased the house. Mr. Alexander stated that he is assuming that the goal of staff's recommendation is to match the color of an untreated material and the type of material that might have been seen on this type of structure.

Ms. Holt responded that it is. Besides the porch, the roof is a prominent element on the house.

Board Discussion

Board members discussed the recommended conditions.

Mr. Jewell inquired if the new roof on the addition would be different from the color on the existing house.

Mr. Taylor responded that the old roof would be removed; the entire roof will be new.

Board consensus was to eliminate the conditions regarding the lighting and roof color and retain the remaining 3 conditions regarding cladding of the visible foundation and provision of detailed plans regarding utilities and a comprehensive redevelopment study.

Ms. Cooper moved, Mr. Jewell seconded approval of a Waiver to Section 153.173A - that no single building footprint shall exceed 1,800 SF, to permit a new addition with a total of 2,155 SF (19.7% increase).

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

Ms. Damaser moved, Mr. Cotter seconded approval of a Waiver to Section 53.174(B)(4)(c)(1) - that roofs shall not be sloped less than 6:12, to permit a 5:12 @ laundry hyphen and 4:12 @ connecting hyphen.

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

Ms. Cooper moved, Mr. Cotter seconded approval of a Waiver to Section 153.174(C)(3) and 153.174(D)(1) – that doors shall have windows and be made of wood, metal-clad wood or vinyl-clad wood, to permit the use of a composite garage door and a fiberglass man door.

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

Ms. Damaser moved, Mr. Cotter seconded approval of the Minor Project with three (3) conditions:

- 1) That the visible additional foundation be clad in stone or manufactured stone to match the existing structure's foundation, to be approved by staff prior to building permit.
- 2) That the applicant provide detailed plans for any modification to utilities at the building permit stage to the satisfaction of applicable staff.

- 3) That a comprehensive redevelopment study be conducted at building permit stage to confirm that no other parcels are adversely affected (not necessarily limited to stormwater, parking, and access) by this development.

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

5. 5707 Dublin Road, 23-022MPR, Minor Project Review

Construction of a two-story, residential addition and relocation of a shed on a 0.75-acre site zoned Planned Unit Development – Llewellyn Farms, located ±300 feet north of the intersection with Hertford Lane.

Case Presentation

Ms. Singh stated that this is a request for review and approval of construction of a two-story residential addition to a historic home located at 5707 Dublin Road and relocation of the shed at the southwest corner of the parcel. The 0.75-acre site is located in Llewellyn Farms and has approximately 150 feet of frontage along Dublin Road west of the Scioto River. The north side of the site is bounded by a tree row and the Cramer Ditch stream, and the remainder of the property is surrounded by modern single-family homes. The historic James Davis home is a Greek Revival with Italianate architectural elements that was erected circa 1840, which is listed in the National Register of Historic Places. The single-family, two-story home has simple, large cut stone quoins and a recessed entry that distinguishes the front-facing historic façade. The façade is symmetrical, with four fenestration bays and operable shutters. The hip-gabled roof has two wood-burning fireplaces on the north and south elevation and wood brackets at the eaves reflecting the simple design elements. The home has a rectilinear footprint, and the simplified elevations characterize all the façades. The existing roof is a metal seam roof, and there is an at-grade patio and shared driveway. The applicant is proposing an approximately 2,150-square-foot addition to the 2,350-square-foot home. The proposed addition consists of a footprint similar to the existing footprint, sited toward the rear of the historic house, but also wider than the historic structure. The shed is proposed to be relocated to the southeast corner within the setbacks. The proposed one-and-a-half-story addition would be connected via a hyphen at the rear of the historic structure. A part of the proposed addition will be visible from Dublin Road; however, is set back from the original façade. As proposed, the house is approximately 22.4 feet tall at the rear, meeting Code requirements. The height of the hyphen and the addition's visible façade from Dublin Road is 12'6". The addition is to be clad primarily in a combination of stucco, cultured stone, and fiber cement siding in a light grey/beige palette. The addition will have double-hung wood windows clad in extruded aluminium. The ARB previously approved these windows in May 2021. The metal roofing colors will match the existing roof color. [Description of proposed materials continued.]

The proposed project would require approval of a roof pitch waiver and a garage door waiver.

Staff has reviewed the proposed application against the applicable criteria and recommends disapproval of the Minor Project due to the following findings:

- 1) The addition is not subordinate to the original structure in height or footprint, thus not meeting Guideline Section 4.12A.

- 2) The mass of the addition overshadows the original structure in both size and complexity, not meeting Guideline Section 4.12A, E, G, and H.
- 3) The hyphen covers too much of the original building's fabric, in conflict with Guideline Section 4.12D.
- 4) The materials proposed are not complimentary to the original structure's fabric and are modern in nature, thus not addressing Guideline Section 4.12F.

Applicant Presentation

Heidi Bolyard, Architect, Simplified Living Architecture, 6065 Frantz Rd #205, Dublin stated that the existing, one bedroom home is too small for a family. The intent is to add bedrooms, utility space and a 2-car garage. The existing cellar door will be retained to provide access to the basement. The proposed size of the hyphen is necessary to accommodate that opening, as well as space for an entry. They have kept the roof pitch of the hyphen low to minimize visibility of the hyphen.

Emily Lukasik, 5707 Dublin Road, Dublin stated that because the proposed color of the stucco was a concern, it has been revised from gray to Morning Fog, a tan color. The color of the existing stone on the exterior of the house is gray, but it is heavily mortared, giving it a lighter appearance.

Andrew Stowe, 5707 Dublin Road, Dublin clarified that they have no intention of destroying any of the original structure. However, they do need the connector to be wide enough to accommodate a set of stairs and an entryway. Additionally, the lack of a subordinate nature of the addition was identified as an issue. He does not believe Dublin's Historic District Design Guidelines identify what constitutes a subordinate structure. The square footage and height of the addition are less than the existing structure.

Board Questions for the Applicant

Mr. Alexander inquired if the property owners have a shared access agreement for the driveway. Such agreements are common when adjacent property owners share a driveway to avert potential legal issues.

Ms. Lukasik noted that there have been discussions with the contractors in an attempt to ensure there is no impact to the neighbor's driveway access and parking ability.

Public Comment

Juanita Ayers, 5715 Dublin Road, Dublin stated that the driveway is entirely on their property. Their experience with construction projects of previous owners of 5707 Dublin Road is that the shared driveway became very cluttered. In the past, there have been dumpsters taking up the driveway space. Because her husband is slightly disabled, he sits in a chair within the garage to obtain some access to the outdoors and observe pedestrian activity along the multipurpose pathway. She is concerned about the noise, obstruction and the potential need for repairs to their driveway. Concrete trucks typically exceed the driveway load limits and seek approval from the property owners to do so. She will not give approval for them to exceed that load limit on her driveway. They have no objection to the proposed addition to their neighbor's home. She and her husband are here only to voice their concerns about their driveway. She noted that previously, a gravel driveway existed for the adjacent home on its other side. It is her understanding that because the

City no longer permitted gravel driveways, the wider, shared driveway between the homes was the solution. Perhaps that earlier gravel driveway could be permitted temporarily for this project.

Mr. Alexander inquired if there is a way to establish an agreement that defines the access for construction vehicles before construction begins. Ms. Ayers' concerns about the weight that construction vehicles put on driveways are legitimate. In his business, they typically tell their clients to plan to redo their driveway after the project is completed. How could a construction access be identified before the project begins?

Ms. Holt responded that she believes Engineering staff would need to be involved with any construction-only access.

Mr. Alexander responded that would be necessary only if the access to the site were to be different from the existing curbcut.

Ms. Damaser noted that, otherwise, it would be a private agreement between the two parties, and that type of agreement would not involve the City.

Ms. Cooper stated that with that type of agreement, the neighboring property owner would agree to hold the Ayers harmless for any damages and restore the driveway to its original condition upon completion of the project. There is also the need for maintaining consistent access for the Ayers during the neighbors' construction project.

Mr. Alexander stated that plywood could be laid down temporarily between this driveway and the neighbor's home. If the driveway is on their property, and there is no shared-access agreement, the Ayers are in control and can determine what the neighbors can or cannot do with that driveway. He believes a formal agreement is needed.

Ms. Damaser stated that if there is no easement and the neighbors have no legal access to the Ayers' driveway, the Ayers can prohibit use of their driveway and require an agreement that defines the access permitted during construction.

Mr. Alexander stated that the conclusion is that before construction starts, they need to have an agreement in place. The agreement could be drafted by a real estate attorney.

Ms. Ayers noted that most of the homes on Dublin Road have one driveway access, which subsequently separates into two, creating some privacy for the homeowners. If their homes shared the same entrance until it extended past Dublin's easement, then separated into individual drives, that would improve the situation for both homeowners.

Mr. Alexander recommended that the Ayers speak with a landscape architect or a design professional, because they have a legal right to do what they want with that driveway. A design professional could review Dublin's Code and identify the best option for them. In this zoning district, homes may be required to have separate drives. He believes someone needs to look into that. However, if there is no shared access agreement and that driveway is on the Ayers' property, they have the control and can determine a solution to achieve the best outcome. If they are willing to invest a little money with a landscape architect, the design professional would be able to review the City Code and offer potential options.

Ms. Ayers thanked the Board for their recommendations.

Mr. Stowe stated that they have a real estate attorney and intend to work with them on an access agreement. Additionally, they have discussed with their contractor the need to address the construction impact for the adjacent property owners. They do not want to impact them negatively.

Board Discussion

Consensus of the Board members was they would be inclined to disapprove the Minor Project as proposed. They identified the following issues.

- The proposed addition should be subordinate and secondary to the primary structure. It should not detract from the historical nature of the original structure.
- The hyphen connection is too wide; it should be narrowed.
- The massing is too complex; it should be simplified.

Ms. Damaser noted that the Historic Design Guidelines, 4.12(e) state the addition should take its major design cues, such as forms, massing, roof shapes, etc. from the original. This proposal does not do that.

- The height of the addition also should be subordinate to the original house.
- A detached garage could address the massing issue.
- The total square footage of the addition is not an issue if the addition is subordinate and the height is simplified.
- Building materials – the use of stucco and the amount of cultured stone are concerns.

Mr. Alexander inquired if the applicant wished to proceed with a vote or request the case to be tabled.

The applicant requested the case to be tabled.

Ms. Damaser moved, Ms. Cooper seconded to table the Minor Project application to permit the applicant to revise the plan to address the identified concerns.

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

USE OF CONSENT AGENDA

The Board discussed the potential use of a Consent Agenda for future meetings, using one of two options: (1) no description or discussion of the cases and one combined vote for all consent cases, or (2) a light description of each consent case, no discussion and individual votes on each consent case. Board consensus was to utilize Consent-light Cases on future meeting agendas.

Ms. Damaser moved, Ms. Cooper seconded use of a Consent Agenda-light on future agendas.

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

COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Holt:

- Advised Board members to wear their City credentials when making site visits.
- Reminded the Board of the following meeting dates:
 - A PZC, ARB and BZA joint training workshop will be held at 6:00 pm, Wednesday, May 10, 2023.
 - The next regular ARB meeting is scheduled for 6:30 pm, Wednesday, May 24, 2023.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:12 p.m.


Chair, Architectural Review Board


Assistant Clerk of Council