



MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, May 24, 2023

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Alexander, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and welcomed everyone to the May 24, 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, Ms. Rauch

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Cooper moved, Mr. Jewell seconded acceptance of the documents into the record and approval of the April 26, 2023 minutes.

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

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.

CASES

1. Bolyard Residence at 60 Franklin Street, 23-032MPR, Minor Project Review

Construction of an addition for an existing, one-story home on a 0.35-acre site zoned Historic District – Historic Residential located northwest of the intersection of Eberly Hill Lane with Mill Lane.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Holt stated that the site is located between Franklin Street and Mill Lane, opposite the Dublin Community Church and Eberly Hill Lane. Vehicular access is from Mill Lane at the rear. The applicant desires to construct a 286-square-foot master bath addition at the rear of the house, with the intent that it appear to be part of the original form of the house and the 2020 addition. The height of the proposed addition is below the main roof of the home. It is inset approximately two feet from the original house on the right side. The proposed materials and colors will match the existing house. The deck and stairs located on the left side of the addition will mirror those existing on the 2020 addition. Staff, our consultant, and the applicant discussed an opportunity to use different body materials to better meet Guideline Section 4.12A and F (clearly subordinate, materials complementary to the district and original building) but agreed that matching the existing house is the best approach to keep the structure cohesive in its design. Staff has reviewed the application against the criteria and recommends approval of four (4) waivers and approval of the Minor Project with one (1) condition.

Board Questions

Mr. Cotter stated that he believes the Board has previously approved use of the Timbertek material. Ms. Holt responded affirmatively.

Mr. Cotter stated that vinyl windows were installed with the 2020 addition. Was the applicant granted a waiver to permit the use of vinyl windows?

Mr. Alexander responded that he does not recall the Board ever approving vinyl windows, but perhaps an even earlier Board did so. It would be unique.

Ms. Holt stated that her review of the 2020 addition did not show much discussion on that topic. She would defer that question to the applicant.

Applicant Presentation

Jeffrey Bolyard, applicant and property owner, 60 Franklin Street, Dublin stated that with the approved 2020 addition, 60-70% of the windows were relocated windows from an earlier expansion. He has no presentation but is available to answer any questions the Board may have.

Public Comments

There were no public comments.

Board Discussion

Mr. Jewell inquired about the size of the tree at the rear of the home that would be eliminated.

Mr. Bolyard responded that the tree is 18-20 inches in diameter.

Mr. Jewell moved, Mr. Cotter seconded approval of a waiver to:

Code section 153.174(J)(1)(a and b): Permitted materials are stone, manufactured stone, full depth brick, etc. and other high-quality synthetic materials may be approved by the Board if high quality and climatically appropriate.

To permit: Use of Azek for the trim and fascia

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

Ms. Damaser moved, Ms. Cooper seconded approval of a waiver to:

Code Section 153.174(J)(1)(a and b): Permitted materials are stone, manufactured stone, full depth brick, etc., and other synthetic materials may be approved by the Board if high quality and climatically appropriate.

To permit: Use of Fypon for gable vents

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

Mr. Jewell moved, Ms. Cooper seconded approval of a waiver to:

Code Section 153.174(D)(1): Windows shall be wood, metal-clad wood, or vinyl-clad wood; other synthetic materials may be approved by the Board that are high quality and climatically appropriate.

To permit: Use of vinyl windows for body and foundation of house.

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

Ms. Cooper moved, Mr. Jewell seconded approval of a waiver to:

Code Section 153.174(J)(1)(a and b): Permitted materials are stone, manufactured stone, full depth brick, etc.; other synthetic materials may be approved by the Board if high quality and climatically appropriate.

To permit: Use of Timbertech Composite for deck stairs.

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

Mr. Alexander inquired if the applicant had any objections to the recommended condition of approval for the Minor Project.

The applicant indicated he had no objection.

Ms. Cooper moved, Mr. Cotter seconded to approve the Minor Project with one condition:

- 1) That any additional lighting shall be reviewed and approved by Planning staff with building permit.

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

2. 5707 Dublin Road, James Davis House Addition, 23-022ARB-MPR, Minor Project Review

Construction of a two-story residential building on a 0.75-acre site zoned Planned Unit Development – Llewellyn Farms. The site is located ±300 feet north of the intersection with Hertford Lane.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Singh stated that this is a request for approval of a Minor Project to permit a two-story addition to a historic home located at 5707 Dublin Road. The 0.75-acre site is located in Llewellyn Farms and has approximately 150 feet frontage along Dublin Road. The home is listed in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). It is a Greek Revival home, which dates back to 1880. Simple, large cut stone quoins and a recessed entry distinguish 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 historic home is two-story facing Dublin Road, 1.5 stories at the rear and has a metal seam roof. In April 2023, the Board reviewed the MPR application to construct a two-story residential addition and relocate a shed on a 0.75-acre site zoned Planned Unit Development. The Board expressed concerns and tabled the application. In addition, staff previously consulted with the City's historic preservation consultant, who provided design review and feedback on the proposed addition. The applicant has made some changes to address the Board's concerns. Because 5707 and 5715 Dublin Road share the same driveway, there are concerns about the easement. An easement agreement has been provided, and staff has consulted with the Law Director's office. It has been confirmed that this matter should be handled privately between the two property owners. Staff has concerns regarding the plan form, elevation, massing, height and materials. The applicant is proposing to add a 2,200-square-foot addition to the existing 2,350-square-foot home. In addition to the at-grade patio and shared driveway, there is a shed that is proposed to be relocated to the southeast corner of the site within the setbacks.

The following design alternatives are proposed to meet the Board's concerns expressed at its April 26, 2023 meeting.

- The west elevation of the home remains unchanged, retaining its historic character; however, the Board and the consultant did not support any addition that would be wider than the existing home. A change has been made in the design to reduce the width of the home to not be wider than the historic home and retain its character facing Dublin Road, thus meeting the Historic Design Guidelines.
- The northern elevation shown in an Option A shows the hip-gabled historic façade facing Dublin Road and a side-gabled one-and-a-half-story form at the rear. The 6:12 pitch, side gable hyphen connects the rear façade of the historic home to the proposed two-story building addition, which has a reduced-width hyphen and connects the two-story addition and a two-car garage at the rear. This hyphen provides an appropriate break between the new and old structures, as anticipated in Guidelines Section 4.12C. The main portion of the addition, parallel to Dublin Road, has a roof pitch of 6:12 and a building height of 22 feet, 7 inches. The rear portion has pitches of 3:12, 4:12, and 6:12. Staff recommended simplifying the rear roof pitch further, and the applicant has provided different alternatives in an Option B.
- Staff recommended simplifying the roof pitches to be more in keeping with the simplicity of the historic structure with a potential solution of using a hipped gable form for the main portion of the addition and a single gable for the garage. The applicant explored the staff-requested changes with Option B using the hipped gable and removing the shed roof on the garage. This results in the main addition to the house being taller; however, it matches the iconic form of the historic house and appears to be subordinate in overall massing. On the rear elevation, staff has recommended simplifying the garage roof pitches to be more in keeping with the simplicity of the historic structure, which is reflected in both design options.

Staff has viewed the application against the applicable criteria and recommends approval with waivers for the roof pitch, garage door material and Fypon gable vents and approval of the Minor Project with four (4) conditions.

Commission Question

Mr. Schneier inquired if the roof pitch on the rear-facing gable is 6:12.
Ms. Singh responded affirmatively.

Mr. Alexander requested clarification of the window trim with the revised application.
Ms. Singh referred the question to the applicant.

Applicant Presentation

Emily Lukasik, property owner, 5707 Dublin Road, Dublin stated that as a result of the ARB's April 26 review, they now have a revised design, with which they are much happier. Of the two options presented, they much prefer Option A. Option A is responsive to the Board's direction to reduce the mass, reduce complexity and either lower the height or possibly maintain the height if the complexity is reduced. Option B was formed in response to staff's recommendation. They have no objection to switching to smooth hardie board, although are confused as to the reasoning.

Heidi Bolyard, Architect, Simplified Living Architecture, 6065 Frantz Road, #205, Dublin stated that in terms of the window trim question, all window trim will be hardie material.

Mr. Alexander stated that the reason smooth hardie board is recommended rather than embossed, is that in this particular product, the embossing is so exaggerated that it looks artificial, more like vinyl siding than wood siding.

Public Comment

Ms. Holt read the following public comment received via email today:

William Tabor, 5605 Dublin Road, Dublin:

"I am a retired American Electric Power employee. I retired in 2002, and my career was the budgeting, scheduling, and construction of major projects for the company. My specialty was getting them built on time and within budget, where possible. Historic houses and buildings give a community a sense of where they have been. I am biased over changing any historic structure away from what it was intended or the period look that it has. The original stone house at this location was a simple two-story construction. In my opinion, the addition of the very broken up roofline to the back of this structure greatly distracts from the simplicity of the original house. It is not in keeping with the original design or the look of the original house or period. It simply looks like a new structure that is stuck on without consideration to the original. A good job was not done in keeping it simple with the lines of the original."

Board Discussion

Mr. Alexander directed the Board's discussion to the size and height. The revised design of the addition no longer projects beyond the edge of the original house. Does any Board member have any issues with the revised footprint, which no longer projects beyond the edge of the existing house?

Board members had no objection to the revised footprint.

Mr. Alexander requested Board input regarding the height. Option B as initially drawn would be higher than the submission for Option A, but lower than the existing house.

Mr. Cotter stated that he is not opposed to either height. From the road, the addition will look subordinate. The roof pitch, however, may be the deciding factor as to which height should be chosen.

Mr. Jewell agreed that the roof pitch will decide the height option. The applicant has expressed a strong preference for Option A. What element does the applicant believe would be lost with Option B?

Ms. Lukasik responded that they recognize that Option B is simpler in design. However, the required changes to the roof to reduce the complexity result in a structure that feels very large.

Ms. Bolyard stated that the scale seems very wide, particularly from the west elevation. Other than a barn, there are no other structures that wide in Old Dublin.

Mr. Alexander inquired about the volume of the addition, beyond the garage. Why does the applicant prefer the lower version with the gable, which actually looks taller? Staff's recommendation for a hipped roof would achieve two things, even if the height is not lowered. Because there is less visible wall surface, it gives the perception that it is much lower than the gable version. It also ties better to the house and removes the focal point from an insignificant feature, the vent. With Option B, he does not believe the height would need to be lowered.

Ms. Lukasik responded that they agree, as long as they do not need to cut into the interior ceiling height, as is suggested by Option B. Other than that, they would have no objection to the higher height.

Ms. Bolyard stated that if they hip the roof, the inside pitch will be even lower, so it significantly reduces the height within the space; it needs to be raised to 8 ft. - 1 in.

Ms. Lukasik stated that if there are no objections to having a slightly higher roof in this section, they would have no objection to a hipped roof.

Mr. Alexander confirmed Board's consensus with Option B at the height originally drawn for the two-story structure.

Mr. Alexander requested Board input on the height of the rear portion of the addition.

Mr. Cotter requested clarification of the applicant's concerns with simplifying or not simplifying the roofline from the massing.

Ms. Bolyard responded that the result of Option B would be a wall that is 31.4 ft. in length. With Option A, the rear shed roof is set back to provide a visual separation, and so the trim properly terminates at the rear of the structure. Providing a visual break between the two structures would reduce the scale. Otherwise, the scale is large, long, and not very attractive. There is nothing similar in Historic Dublin.

Mr. Alexander requested confirmation that the space above the gabled volume at the rear is not needed as usable space.

The applicant indicated that the space is not needed.

Mr. Alexander stated that the offsets are not great enough. However, a metal roof can be used on a lower pitched roof. If the pitch is dropped, the recess could be made greater – 2 ft.4 in. instead of 1 ft.4 in.

Discussion continued regarding the roof pitch options.

Mr. Cotter inquired about the trim color.

Ms. Lukasik responded that the blue/gray trim will match the existing house.

Board members discussed the waiver related to the garage door materials.

Mr. Cotter indicated that the City does not approve metal doors.

Mr. Alexander requested the material specifications. Is the metal door covered by a synthetic material, which would be a composite material?

Ms. Singh responded that it is a painted metal door.

Mr. Alexander stated that he does not believe the Board has previously approved metal doors; they have approved composite doors.

Ms. Holt stated that a waiver permitting a composite garage door was recently approved for 83 S. High Street. The door had a metal core and was covered with a textured PVC material.

The applicant stated that they would have no objection to using a composite door instead of a metal door.

Mr. Alexander stated that if a stone material will be used on the foundation at the proposed height, it needs to have a cap.

Ms. Damaser moved, Mr. Jewell seconded approval of the Waiver of:

Code Section 153.174 (B)(4)(C)(1): Roofs shall not be sloped less than a 6:12.

To Permit: 4:12 at Hyphen roof pitch, 3:12 at the Garage

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

[Motion carried 5-0]

Ms. Cooper moved, Mr. Jewell seconded approval of the Waiver of:

Code Section 153.174(C)(3) and §153.174(D)(1): Doors shall have windows and be made of wood, metal-clad wood, or vinyl-clad wood.

To Permit: Use of a composite garage door

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

[Motion carried 5-0]

Ms. Cooper moved, Ms. Damaser seconded approval of the Waiver of:

Code Section 153.174(J)(1)(a and b): Permitted materials are stone, manufactured stone, full depth brick, etc.; other synthetic materials may be approved by the Board if high quality and climatically appropriate.

To Permit: Use of Fypon for gable vents

Vote: Mr. Jewell, no; Mr. Cotter, no; Mr. Alexander, no; Ms. Cooper, no; Ms. Damaser, no.

[Motion failed 0-5]

Mr. Jewell moved, Ms. Cooper seconded approval of the Minor Project with the following conditions:

- 1) The design elevations shall be revised to the hybrid option, also lowering the roof pitch on the north shed section and providing a greater jog between the sections, to be approved by staff prior to building permit.
- 2) Elevations shall be revised to show the use of smooth Hardie Board siding to be approved by staff prior to building permit.
- 3) Provide utility plans detailing the scope of work and any modifications to the existing utilities at the building permitting stage to be reviewed, approved, and inspected by Engineering.
- 4) Garage door shall be changed to composite, to be approved by staff prior to building permit.
- 5) Cap on watertable shall be cultured stone or limestone, to be approved by staff prior to building permit.

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

• PRESENTATION

Ms. Rauch provided an update regarding City Council proposed modifications to the Historic District Code and Guidelines, primarily as it relates to demolition of structures. She reviewed the history on the topic.

At the August 2022 City Council Work Session, staff and City consultant, Greg Dale (McBride, Dale, Clarion) presented information to address City Council's 2022 goal regarding the preservation, composition, and management of the District. At that time, it was agreed not to expand the historic district as suggested in the Historic and Cultural Assessment (HCA) of 2017, to investigate the standards for demolition based on contributing/non-contributing status per the HCA, and to identify the significant time period for preservation. There was a suggestion that structures outside the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) District should be considered non-contributing in order to lessen the burden of demolition on owners. Council reviewed this topic at their May 15, 2023 work session. A majority of Council preferred to move forward with removing the "contributing/non-contributing" nomenclature, with a goal of making demolition for buildings outside the 1830-1920 timeframe easier. The NRHP – Dublin High Street District contains properties constructed between 1833 – 1920), with the exception of some properties built within the last 50 years that are not considered historic nor should be subject to the higher burden of consideration for demolition (shown in grey). Similarly, the NRHP individually lists properties within the Architectural Review District, but outside the NRHP District, that were constructed 1830–1901. The time period of 1830–1920 would be used as a baseline to identify any additional properties that could be given the higher burden of consideration. All properties located within the district would remain under the purview of the Architectural Review Board, and would be subject to the Code and Guidelines, as amended. The "contributing/non-contributing" nomenclature and references would be eliminated from the Code and Guidelines and replaced with language that matches Council's direction. Staff has recommended to City Council that a higher burden of consideration for demolition be given to the buildings within the NRHP District and individually listed, buildings constructed from 1830 – 1920, and those additional properties with important context and character within the District. Before any further discussion occurs, staff desires to provide the Architectural Review Board opportunity for input and to make any suggestions for making the process clearer. If the project moves forward, staff will bring forward modifications to the Code and the Guidelines for the ARB

to review and make a recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC). Subsequently, PZC would review and make a recommendation to City Council.

Board Discussion

Mr. Alexander noted that it is important to maintain the correct zoning and guidelines for the properties along the river.

Mr. Cooper reiterated the concern. In the past, there have been situations where a modest structure has been permitted to be replaced by two very large new projects next door to older, smaller homes.

Mr. Alexander inquired if staff has received feedback that residents have not been pleased with some of the projects built as a result of the Board's review process.

Ms. Rauch responded that there have been concerns expressed. The concern is with what is allowed to be constructed in place of a building permitted to be demolished. There must be sufficient protections in the Code to ensure the character of the District is not being dramatically changed. There is concern that the properties that will have a lower level of scrutiny with this amendment will be purchased, demolished and replaced with something bigger. If demolition is permitted, what will go up in place of the old structure is equally important.

Mr. Cotter stated that it is important to provide clarity in the revised Code and Guidelines regarding the criteria any application would be subject to if attempting to replace a demolished structure.

COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Holt stated that:

- The 3D imaging and modeling project for the Historic District has been completed. Staff will be providing a demonstration at the June or July ARB meetings.
- The alternate materials document continues to be worked on with an estimated completion time at the end of summer.
- The Bridge Street Bridge is due to be reconstructed in 2027. She is working with Engineering staff on what will happen to the current historic structure. The project is in the planning and design stage. The goal is to provide pedestrians a greater degree of safety. An information session will occur late summer or early fall.

Mr. Alexander inquired about the possibility of opening up Riverview Street with the bridge design, as it would make a significant difference in what could be done with those properties. The current isolation of those properties has been very limiting.

Ms. Holt responded that she would share his recommendation with the team working on the bridge project.

- The owner of the Veterinary Office building located at 32 W. Bridge Street is working on a repair project for its original wood windows. For a couple of weeks, those windows may be boarded before the project is completed.
- The next regular ARB meeting is scheduled for 6:30 p.m., Wednesday, June 28, 2023.

Mr. Alexander suggested that in the alternate building materials consideration that thought be given as to whether, due to Council's goal to be a green community, the City's approved building materials should reflect that goal. For instance, vinyl windows should never be approved. Some

environmentalists believe vinyl is next to asbestos. There are also environmental concerns with the Fypon foam material.

Ms. Holt stated that the architectural consultant that PZC uses to review building materials material might be able to take a closer look at the sustainability and environmental friendliness of the building products.

Mr. Alexander stated that a few years ago, a Historic District resident asked the Board to consider cataloging the primary trees within the District to produce a list of trees that should be protected. Ms. Holt responded that staff has been working on an internal matrix of trees in the District. The intent is to clarify some of these items for the Code update. The residential versus commercial aspect of this topic needs to be clarified.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:35 p.m.


Chair, Architectural Review Board


Assistant Clerk of Council