MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, July 26, 2023

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Alexander, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and welcomed everyone to the July 26, 2023 Architectural Review Board. He stated that the meeting could also be accessed at the City's website. Public comments on the cases are 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:	Sean Cotter, Hilary Damaser, Martha Cooper, Gary Alexander
Board members absent:	Michael Jewell
Staff members present:	Sarah Holt, Rati Singh, Bassem Bitar, Brandon Brown, Rick Franz, Langdon Sanders, Cara Sheets

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Damaser moved, Ms. Cooper seconded acceptance of the documents into the record and approval of the 06-28-23 ARB minutes.

Vote: Mr. Cotter, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Ms. Damaser, yes.
[Motion carried 4-0]

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.

Mr. Alexander welcomed Bassem Bitar, new Deputy Director of Planning.
Mr. Bitar stated that he began his employment with the City of Dublin last week after more than 25 years with the City of Westerville, where he managed their Planning division. He is looking forward to learning Dublin's board and commission meeting process and participating in future meetings.

CASES

- **36-40 N. High Street, Minor Project Review, Case 22-147**

Modifications to a historic retaining wall between the properties at 36-38 and 40 N. High Street. The 0.46-acre site is zoned Historic District, Historic Core and is located northeast of the intersection of N. High Street with Wing Hill Lane.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Holt stated that this property is located immediately north of Wing Hill Lane, between N. High Street and N. Blacksmith Lane. This approximately 102-foot long historic wall straddles three lots and ownerships: 36-38 N. High Street, 40 N. High Street, and 25 North Street and is part of a continuous wall system that includes the historic privy behind 36-38 N. High Street. The section between 36-38 and 40 N. High Street that is failing is approximately 8 feet x 20 feet. While the City is updating its Community Plan, City Council has requested that new applications be evaluated according to the recently adopted Interim Land Use Principles. The Zoning Code and Design Guidelines continue to legally apply, as well. For this application, the land use principles that would apply have been highlighted in the staff report.

History:
Previous proposals that would impact this historic wall were reviewed by the Board in early 2020, May 2021 and November and December 2022. Most recently in March 2023, the Board heard an Informal Review of the proposed project and considered three options: no action, replace the wall with a modern structure, or repair/preserve the existing wall. The Board unanimously indicated a preference for the repair/preserve option using historic materials and techniques and encouraged the two owners to work together. At that meeting, the Board also requested the following information: indication of whether the historic wall could support the parking at 40 N. High Street; which property owners would participate; any limitations that would prevent a holistic approach; and if the existing stones were suitable for reconstruction.

Proposed Project:
Based on the Board's feedback in March, the project engineering team proposes to disassemble the wall in the affected areas and reconstruct it matching it to the original style as much as practicable. An 8-foot by 20-foot area at the southeast corner will be excavated in order to install an underdrain. This underdrain shall be made of gravel backfill, perforated drain pipe wrapped in filter fabric, and earth backfill. At the surface, a French drain will be installed to allow surface drainage from 40 N. High Street to be directed through the new drainage system. The wall itself will be reconstructed using dry stack methods. Mortar will be used sparingly, only enough to ensure wall stability and will not be visible to the public. Any missing stones will be taken from the wall at 36-38 N. High Street, which was previously approved to be removed as part of that property's Final Development Plan (FDP). If that location cannot furnish an adequate amount or quality of stone, the applicant will use a local stone quarry that can best match the form, texture, and color of the existing stone. To finish the wall, large cap blocks will be reinstalled to match the rest of the wall. Stone scuppers will be provided to allow the newly directed drainage through the wall. Additionally, stone splash blocks will be placed below the scuppers to prevent erosion and maintain a historic appearance. The proposed scupper options are too fancy for the existing vernacular wall and the District character; therefore, staff has recommended a simple, vernacular detail be provided before a building permit is requested. Building Standards has requested structural

engineering calculations be provided to ensure that a dry laid wall will be adequate to retain both earth and gravel backfill and the parking surcharge; these have not been provided. It is anticipated that the wall may need to be a more conventional retaining wall with concrete footers and vertical structure to meet this requirement. Such a wall could be faced with the original stone, using minimally visible mortar. A condition of approval is recommended that the applicant obtain these calculations prior to any building permits being issued.

Additionally, an existing sewer pipe that currently protrudes from the southeast corner of the wall behind 40 N. High Street should be incorporated within the wall. This will protect the pipe from freezing and damage and create a condition where the pipe more closely matches modern specifications. Plans for how to incorporate this pipe into the wall have yet to be determined, because there may be bedrock behind the wall, which will affect the location and/or slope of the pipe. The applicant has requested that this be determined once this section of the wall has been removed and the drain system has been created. Staff recommends that if the sewer pipe cannot be fully located within the wall that an extension be made to enclose the pipe. Due to the previously approved utility work at 36-38 N. High Street, there will be potential impacts upon this wall. New utilities could either undermine the wall or conflict with existing underground utilities. Engineering has requested drawings that show all utilities, proposed and existing, in order to be able to evaluate these conflicts. This is a recommended condition of approval to be provided at building permit. In order to prevent unnecessary surcharges on the reconstructed wall, the owner of 40 N. High Street has committed to establishing parking setbacks from the wall. Because structural calculations have not yet been provided, it is possible the wheel stops will need to be moved. The plans indicate that parking shall be set back six feet from the south and east-facing wall segments using concrete wheel stops. Lastly, the large Ailanthus tree at the rear of 40 N. High Street was previously mistakenly tagged as a landmark tree. The tree is an invasive species, therefore, should be removed. A condition of approval has been recommended that maintenance to prevent reinfestation be the responsibility of the 40 N. High Street owner.

Staff has reviewed the applicable criteria and recommends approval with seven (7) conditions.

Board Questions for Staff

Ms. Damaser referred to the Condition of Approval #1 that states, "Should a conventional retaining wall faced with the original stone be necessary based on those calculations, this shall be permitted with the demonstration that mortar between the stones shall not be visible." She requested clarification of what could occur.
Ms. Holt responded that because structural calculations have not yet been provided confirming that with the drainage required, a dry laid stone wall is possible. Should a concrete footer and wall be necessary, it will be faced with a dry laid façade to match the original structure.
Ms. Damaser inquired, should that be necessary, if the existing old limestone on the site could be used.
Ms. Holt deferred the question to the applicant.

Applicant Presentation

Wes Davis, Osborn Engineering, 130 E. Chestnut Street, Columbus, Ohio stated that many of the Board's recommendations provided at their March Informal Review have been incorporated into the revised plan presented this evening. A holistic approach was discussed. They will be

repairing/reconstructing the 20-foot section of the south-facing wall on 36-38 N. High Street and an 8-foot section primarily on the 40 N. High Street property. Beyond that, the section of the wall that extends up to the COhatch Building is in good condition. They attribute the sections of failure to a stormwater issue. They will be removing the 28-foot section of the wall and reconstructing it, using the dry laid method and the existing stone on the site. There is an adequate amount of that material on the site. They have completed and will be able to provide their calculations, which indicate that the dry laid method works structurally. They will be utilizing some modern techniques. The Board had requested that the use of those techniques to enhance the overall structural integrity of the wall would not be visible to the public. One of those techniques is the drainage that will be installed. They will use a 2-tiered underground system to capture all of the stormwater discharge occurring in that corner and ensure the future structural integrity of the wall. The other modern technique is the installation of pea gravel behind the wall. This will remove some of the current pressure on the wall. The existing wall is able to support the current parking load, but the pea gravel will alleviate it. Additionally, the wheel stops will be at least 6 feet away from the wall. The structural calculations they will provide will show that the dry laid method is feasible for this project. The stonemason who attended the Informal Review and will be constructing the wall is Jim Cox of Vic Art Masonry. Mr. Cox was unable to attend tonight's meeting due to a conflict but has shared his information with Mr. Davis for tonight's meeting. The structural engineer for the 40 N. High Street site is present tonight, as well.

Questions for the Applicant

Mr. Alexander inquired how many scuppers would be included and where they would be located.
Mr. Davis responded that there would be two (2) scuppers; they would be located where the underdrain outlets.
Mr. Alexander inquired if they would be in the wall itself.
Mr. Davis responded affirmatively. They will hide the modern pipe and retain a historic look. The intent is to use the existing limestone material and custom-make the stone scuppers and splash blocks.

Mr. Alexander inquired if the assumption is that the wall is approximately four (4) feet thick at the base. If so, is that also how the new wall would be constructed?
Mr. Davis responded that is their assumption concerning the existing wall.

Mr. Alexander stated that it is unusual to come to an architectural review without any elevation drawings for what is being discussed. Therefore, there are many questions, including if anything special would occur at the corner. On the northeast corner abutting the COhatch site, there is a stony projection due either to design buttressing or to the wall bulging. He requested clarification of what would occur particularly at that corner.
Mr. Davis responded that in their assessment, the reason for the bulging is that the majority of the stormwater flows to that corner. The wall beyond that point is in very good shape. Therefore, their approach will be to alleviate the drainage issue, which over time has caused the wall to bulge. Dry laid stone is intended to allow pass-through stormwater drainage, but over time, that section has failed. They will be adding the additional security needed there.

Mr. Alexander inquired how they would tie this wall into the mortared wall and the wall with the privy.

Mr. Davis responded that the stonemason would be able to provide that information. Because this wall is over 100 years old, it will be necessary to coordinate how that ties in. That might occur at the next joint.
Mr. Alexander inquired if he is aware of whether steel rods would be used.
Mr. Davis responded that the stonemason would be able to provide that information; unfortunately, he is not aware if they will be used.

Mr. Alexander stated that on the wall corner adjacent to COhatch, the top course has been mortared in and it is visible. The assurance with this project is that if it is necessary to use it, the mortar will be hidden.
Mr. Davis responded that the intent is not to use mortar, but if used, it would be only sparingly behind the wall to help the structural integrity. It would not visible from the face of the wall.
Mr. Alexander inquired if they could provide examples of projects that they have designed that meet the Code requirements and the length of time the projects have been standing.
Mr. Davis responded that he assumes Mr. Cox, the stonemason, would be able to provide that information.

Mr. Alexander requested Mr. Coy, who is listed as one of the applicants, to come forward. An earlier letter of Mr. Coy's was provided in the case information, in which he recommended a concrete retaining wall to be built to protect the existing wall. Is that still his recommendation?

Bernie Coy, Structural Engineer, 900 Foxcreek Road, Sunbury, Ohio, responded that there are many potential options for the re-build of this wall. A more modern method would be to use a concrete retaining wall, as it does not require any maintenance. A dry laid stone wall will need to be maintained, and if any portion of it shifts, it will need to be addressed. Either re-build option is viable. The difference is the maintenance required. With conventional, modern methods, property owners have better success identifying contractors. A dry laid wall requires a skilled stonemason. Site conditions may change, and they must be able to adapt the repair to accommodate that. Typically, he would recommend a concrete retaining wall. However, initially, he did not realize this was a historic wall nor that the City of Dublin has invested in it. The historic wall can be retained. Many of the dry stack walls that were built in the past have withstood the test of time; others have not. The contributing factor was drainage. If that issue is addressed here, the wall will last much longer.

Mr. Alexander inquired if this solution would preclude any of the work that the 40 N. High Street property owner intended.
Mr. Coy responded that the proposed historic wall project would not hinder anything outside of its immediate area.

Mr. Cotter inquired who is doing the structural analysis for the wall renovation.
Mr. Davis responded that a member of his staff would be doing that.
Mr. Cotter stated that there are two (2) properties involved, so it is important both parties are confident the dry laid stone wall will support the anticipated parking load above.

Mr. Alexander stated that if in the future the wall should fail and need to be rebuilt, it would impact the current parking areas. He inquired if the sanitary sewer question relates to the depth or the horizontal location.

Mr. Davis responded that it is the depth and the existing location of the bedrock.
Mr. Alexander inquired if it is possible it would need to be extended through the wall as it is today.
Mr. Davis responded that it is a possibility.
Mr. Alexander responded that the Board needs to consider the fact that the sewer may continue to extend through the historic wall.
Mr. Coy responded that they have discussed with staff the unknown nature of the sewer and the bedrock. Once the wall has been dismantled, the goal is to move and hide that sewer pipe behind the wall in a safe manner. However, if they discover the bedrock is right behind the wall and the sewer pipe cannot fit behind the wall, it will be necessary to include a buttressing element to encapsulate the sanitary line so that it is not visible.

Mr. Alexander stated that there are many unknowns. If the Board should decide to move forward, another condition may be necessary.

Mr. Cotter inquired if the scuppers for the stormwater drainage would be located at the base of the wall.
Mr. Davis responded affirmatively; the scuppers would be located in two (2) locations, 5 to 8 feet apart.
Mr. Cotter inquired if the sanitary sewer would be located under the wall, if possible.
Mr. Davis responded that, ideally, it will be located under the wall.
Mr. Cotter asked if the wall would be removed in that location and excavation occur to a depth of 8 feet, extending north, in an attempt to install a French drain.
Mr. Davis responded affirmatively.

Ms. Cooper requested clarification of the drain locations.
Mr. Davis responded that there are three (3) pipes. The intent is to locate the large sanitary sewer underneath the wall. The two additional pipes are underdrain stormsewer pipes. Those would come out of the wall right at its face. That is where the stone scuppers would be installed to camouflage the pipes in a historic-looking manner.
Ms. Cooper inquired if the intent is to use existing limestone from the 36 N. High Street property.
Mr. Davis responded affirmatively.
Ms. Cooper stated that as she understood it, the intent was to take down that section of the wall, determine what needed to be done behind it to make it structurally sound, and determine if mortar would be needed in the replacement of the stones to make the wall structurally sound. The outline of the wall would not change. Only what is behind the wall would change.
Mr. Davis responded that is correct. The intent would be that if mortar should be needed, it would be used in the back layers. No mortar would be used in the front layer.

Mr. Alexander stated that his questions focused on the preferred method if the wall were to be built from scratch today, and today, it would be a concrete wall.
Ms. Cooper responded that our purpose is to preserve the historic nature of the wall. So her questions relate to that. She understands that utilizing a concrete wall was discussed in 2020 by that Board, but she does not believe that the discussions of this Board have been other than that the wall should be maintained as historically possible.

Ms. Damaser stated that at the last Informal Review discussion, the stonemason, who was present, was not particularly supportive of using the dry laid method, although he was capable of doing so. What has changed his mind?
Mr. Davis responded that he was referring to the effort required on his part. He preferred the other method discussed, but he indicated that the dry laid method is possible. They have confirmed that it is structurally possible, as well. While the other option would be easier to construct, this Board is trying to preserve the historic nature of this wall. At the previous meeting, they were encouraged to utilize historic materials and methods, which is the basis for the proposal they have submitted for consideration.

Public Comments

No public comments were received.

Board Discussion

Mr. Alexander stated that has he two concerns. First, these walls can be very unreliable. The success of a dry laid wall depends upon the skill of the stonemason. As examples, on old Route 315 north, three of the most beautifully detailed homes in central Ohio were built 30 years ago across from the Del-Co Water site. A dry laid wall was included, which was constructed by a skilled dry laid stonemason. The wall has been difficult to maintain and is falling down. In Arlington, close to the corner of Fishinger and Riverside Drive, a dry laid retaining wall is located, against which the hill is pressing. Staff has indicated that in Dublin, a short, dry laid wall in another location was washed out during the recent rains. He has reservations due to the potential risk. Secondly, we have no indication of how the wall would look. Typically, applicants provide drawings and details with their applications. What the Board is being asked to approve is too vague. The Chief Building Official has indicted that he would attempt to ensure the project complies with the Building Code. Even if the calculations are correct, however, the results will depend on the skill of the mason. Additionally, there is the potential that the sanitary sewer could create a bulge in the wall. He struggles with approving this in its current form, unless more conditions are included.

Ms. Damaser stated that was the reason she questioned Condition #1; it seems too vague. The Board's purpose is to ensure that the appearance of the Historic District is protected. Without seeing drawings, how can the Board assess its appearance? It appears that we cannot know what we are looking at until the area is excavated.

Mr. Cotter stated that he is less concerned. The skill of the stonemason is key here. The Board is trying to preserve the appearance of the historic stonewall. We know the existing load on the wall is being maintained. The issue is that, currently, the stormwater drainage is washing it out. If the hydraulic flow, pressure and mechanics behind the wall can be controlled, we know essentially how the wall will look. It is impossible to wrestle the drainage issues before that wall section is taken down. There are some unknowns, but the engineering team can ensure the foundation behind the wall is stable. While the preferred method today is a concrete wall, we are interested in maintaining an historic element that we believe is important for Dublin.

Ms. Cooper pointed out that the Board is not guaranteeing the structure. We are looking for compliance with Historic Guidelines. When the applicant removes the wall and evaluates the situation, should they decide pea gravel is sufficient and mortar is unnecessary, we will rely on

their calculations. If the wall should fail in the future, more repairs will be necessary. If the Board wants to recommend that the applicant do something more structurally sound before rebuilding the stonewall to look as it does today, she has no objection. She has no objection to leaving the language of Condition #1 as it is.
Ms. Damaser indicated she had no objection to Condition #1.

Mr. Alexander stated that he is not comfortable with the general direction, but if the other members had no objections, he would not belabour the points.

Ms. Cooper inquired Mr. Alexander's recommendation.
Mr. Alexander responded that if the application were to be tabled, he would request that when it came back that they would provide actual examples of successful projects that the applicant has designed and of the stonemason's work that show this can work. He would like to know how long those projects have been standing. He would also request the Building Official's confirmation that the structural calculations will meet the Code requirements. This information has been requested from the applicant previously. The conditions of approval have been provided to move this project along; however, in any other historic district, this project would not proceed with the information currently provided. Although he is not comfortable with it, if the majority of the members are comfortable, the project can proceed.

Mr. Cotter stated that he is not sure what would be gained by requiring that information be provided for an additional review.
Ms. Cooper agreed, noting that having photos of those projects would not guarantee that this project would be done correctly.
Mr. Alexander responded that it would not, but it would support their argument that they can do it. This project will require a real art, more than just making the math work.

Ms. Damaser stated that while having photos of actual projects could show the stonemason could construct the project with the historical method, the Board would still be deferring the decision to Building and Planning staff as to whether or not to the conventional method should be used. She inquired if Mr. Alexander would prefer the Board to make that decision, not staff.
Mr. Alexander responded that he might prefer that, but does not want to require it due to the cost issue. Although he is more familiar with projects that have failed, he is willing to be convinced with more information. If the stonemason were present, he would inquire about the typical one-year warranty on the work. How long would this stonemason be willing to warrant this project?
Ms. Damaser stated that not having the stonemason present does make her less inclined to approve the project. We do not have the primary player here to promote his work.

Ms. Cooper stated that the concern is contemplated in Condition #1. If the applicant decides to proceed without the conventional retaining wall, for their permits, they will be required to show that the wall will be able to accommodate the parking surcharge. If they determine that it would not be adequate, they would be able to build the conventional retaining wall. Additionally, any mortar used would be required not to be visible.

Board members discussed the proposed conditions of approval, including the scuppers, and potential issues with the location of bedrock beneath the wall.

Staff indicated the scuppers would be made of the existing stone on the site in a simple vernacular design. It is possible bedrock would prohibit the sanitary sewer line to be run below the wall, but Condition #1 is responsive to that possibility.
Board members requested revision of the language of Condition #7 to state "…all invasive species, are proactively…."

Mr. Alexander inquired if the applicants had any objections to the proposed conditions.
The applicant indicated they had no objections.

Ms. Cooper moved, Ms. Damaser seconded approval of the Minor Project with the following seven (7) conditions:

1) Structural engineering calculations shall be provided at building permit to prove that the wall can retain both earth and gravel backfill and accommodate the parking surcharge while meeting the Building Code requirements, to the satisfaction of staff. Should a conventional retaining wall, faced with the original stone, be necessary based on those calculations, then this shall be permitted, with the demonstration that mortar between the stones shall not be visible.
2) At building permit, the applicant shall show wheel stops placed six feet back from the top side of the east wall face; greater distances, both east and south, may be required by the structural engineering calculations and shall be made as necessary.
3) At building permit, the applicant shall field locate the existing sanitary sewer service line for 40 N. High Street from the existing wall to the main line in N. Blacksmith Lane to the satisfaction of staff.
4) At building permit, a utility drawing showing all proposed and existing underground and aboveground lines and poles from each property to the N. Blacksmith Lane ROW shall be provided to staff's satisfaction.
5) At building permit, appropriate stone scuppers and splash blocks shall be shown as details. Design shall be vernacular in character, appropriate to the original construction.
6) During construction, the exposed sewer pipe on 40 N. High Street shall be rerouted to best meet all current requirements once excavations and work have determined the geologic conditions behind the stonewall. The applicant shall work with staff to determine both the best pipe route and configuration, as well as the best aesthetic solution, including slight wall adjustments.
7) The owners at 36-38 and 40 N. High Street, their successors and assigns, shall ensure that all invasive species are proactively managed to avoid a reinfestation and resulting negative effects on the wall system.

Vote: Mr. Cotter, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Ms. Damaser, yes; Mr. Alexander, no.
[Motion carried 3-1]

- **112 S. Riverview Street, Minor Project Review, Case 23-021**

  Construction of a new, two-story, residential building on a 0.26-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic Residential. The site is located southeast of the intersection of S. Riverview Street with Pinneyhill Lane.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Singh stated that this is a request for review of a Minor Project at 112 S. Riverview Street. The 0.26-acre site is located southeast of the intersection of S. Riverview Street and Pinneyhill Lane, and is zoned HD-HR, Historic District – Historic Residential. The lot was created in 2021 when the 110-112 S. Riverview Street site was approved for demolition, and the single lot was split into two lots. The 0.58-acre site located to the north at 110 S. Riverview Street is currently under construction. This site is located along the western bank of the Scioto River and experiences a significant change in grade from west to east with floodplain on the eastern half of the lot. The western portion is the only developable area. The site has frontage along S. Riverview Street with no sidewalks. While the City is updating its current Community Plan, City Council has requested that the boards and commission use the recently adopted Interim Land Use Principles for the review of applications. The Zoning Code and Guidelines will continue to apply as legal requirements. The principles that would apply for this project have been highlighted in the staff report.

The Board provided informal reviews of the project in October 2022 and January 2023, and in June 2023, the Board reviewed a Minor Project application to construct a two-story, single-family home. The Board expressed concerns and tabled the application to allow the applicant additional time to work on the items recommended as conditions for approval. The applicant has provided a revised proposal with a more cohesive architectural character that better meets the Historic District Code and Guidelines.

The proposed site layout remains consistent with the previous proposals. The applicant proposes a new ±3,050-square-foot home on the east side of S. Riverview Street. Due to the site's topography, the home is largely located toward the front of the lot, as steep grade change and floodplain hazards occupy the site's eastern half. The maximum permitted lot coverage in the HD-HR zoning district is 45%. The proposal, including all impervious surfaces, would provide 28% lot coverage. Building coverage, which Code limits to 25%, is proposed to be 25.36%. Code Section 153.173(E)(3)(b) requires that garages for residential dwellings not be more than 35% of the linear distance of the front façade; the proposed garage occupies 34%, meeting this requirement. The Cape Cod style home is proposed with a two-story mass in front and a three-story mass at the rear, consistent with previous applications. The proposed structure is approximately 18 feet, 8 inches tall in the front and 35 feet tall at the rear, both measured from grade to the center of the gable. The height of the home from the rear elevation exceeds the height requirement of 24' maximum; therefore, a waiver is required from the ARB to permit the proposed height at the rear of the home. For comparison, a waiver was approved for a 29-foot, 5-inch height for 110 S. Riverview Street in 2021. The roof plan has been updated to address the inconsistencies with the floor plan. The design changes now reflect a simplified roof to address the ARB's previous concerns. The roof pitches and height meet the Code requirements. The roof form is simplified, and the applicant has matched gable heights and depths, creating a more harmonious elevation. A stepped stone foundation has been proposed, consistent with the Board's previous recommendations. The application now proposes similar sized windows, consistent with the Board's recommendation. The revised proposal reflects a more symmetrical façade through aligning and matching the pitch of the gables. A waiver will be required for the proposed TimberTech composite deck and Therma Tru front door. The applicant proposes to use gooseneck, wall-mounted lights for the garage and the use of double-headed, wall-mounted floodlights with LED bulbs. The proposed lights are not consistent with the Historic District Guidelines, and staff recommends the applicant work with staff

to identify lighting more appropriate for the Historic District. Overall, the project will require five (5) waivers.

Staff has reviewed the proposed Minor Project application against the applicable criteria and recommends approval of four (4) waivers and approval of the Minor Project with five (5) conditions.

Applicant Presentation

The applicant indicated he had nothing additional to present since the previous review.

Public Comment

There were no public comments.

Board Discussion

Mr. Alexander stated that the waivers were discussed at the previous project review and the Board members voiced no objections. The design has been revised consistent with the Board's previous recommendations. He inquired if the members were satisfied with the revised proposal.
The members indicated that they were satisfied with the revised design, which meets the Board's recommendations.

Mr. Alexander inquired if the applicant had any objection to the proposed conditions.
The applicant indicated that they had no objections.

Ms. Damaser moved, Ms. Cooper seconded approval of the following waiver:

Code Section 153.173(E)(3)(a): Front-loaded garages shall be a minimum of 20 feet behind the front façade of the home.
Request: To allow an attached front-loaded garage to be in line with the front façade.

Vote: Mr. Cotter, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Damaser, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes.
[Motion approved 4 – 0]

Mr. Cotter moved, Ms. Cooper seconded approval of the following waiver:

Code Section 153.173(C): Maximum Building Height = 24'
Request: To allow a height of approximately 35' at the rear elevation of the home measured from grade point to the mid-point of the eaves.

Vote: Ms. Damaser, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes.
[Motion approved 4 – 0]

Ms. Cooper moved, Ms. Damaser seconded approval of the following waiver:

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.
Request: Use of a composite garage door and front door.

Vote: Ms. Damaser, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes.
[Motion approved 4 – 0]

Mr. Cotter moved, Ms. Cooper seconded approval of the following waiver:

Code Section 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.
Request: Use of a composite material (TimberTech) for the rear decks.

Vote: Ms. Damaser, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes.
[Motion approved 4 – 0]

Ms. Damaser moved, Ms. Cooper seconded approval of the Minor Project with the following six (6) conditions:

1) The lot coverage shall be revised from 25.36% to 25% in order to meet the Code, at building permit. Area calculations shall be provided to ensure that the data is correct.
2) The elevations shall be revised to show correct height of window sills, if applicable, at building permit.
3) The elevations shall be revised to show the north stone foundation to reflect the internal floor level, as indicated herein with the dashed red line, at building permit.
4) The window muntins shall be revised to a simulated divided light with spacer bars, at building permit.
5) The applicant shall work with staff to choose appropriate light fixtures for the rear of the house, prior to building permit, subject to staff approval.
6) The applicant shall provide utility plans detailing the scope of work to be reviewed, approved, and inspected by Engineering, at building permit.

Vote: Ms. Cooper, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Ms. Damaser, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes.
[Motion approved 4 – 0]

The applicant thanked the Board and staff for their work with the applicant on the project.

- **91 S. High Street, Minor Project Review, Case #23-055**

  Exterior modifications at an existing, one-story building on a 0.18-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic South. The site is located northwest of the intersection of S. High Street with Pinneyhill Lane.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Holt presented the case. The J. Evans residence was built in approximately 1840 in the Greek Revival style and has a rear addition from the 1990s, creating an L-shaped form. The structure has a stone foundation, clapboard siding, standing seam metal roof, and a majority of two-over-two windows. The structure is part of the Dublin High Street National Historic District. It is also recommended contributing in the 2017 Historic and Cultural Assessment. A historic hitching post/boundary marker and hand pump exist in the southeast corner of the site in the public right-of-way. The 0.18-acre site is located on the east side of S. High Street, north of Pinneyhill Lane and is zoned Historic District – Historic South District. The site has approximately 50 feet of frontage on S. High Street and Mill Lane, and 165 feet on Pinneyhill Lane. A shared parking lot for 91, 83 and 87 S. High Street is located at the rear. The new owners intend to convert the structure from a hair salon to an eating/drinking establishment. While the City is updating its current Community

Plan, City Council has requested that boards and commission use the recently adopted Interim Land Use Principles for the review of applications. The Zoning Code and Guidelines will continue to apply as legal requirements. The principles that would apply for this project have been highlighted in the staff report.
There are existing Bradford Pear trees along the south side of the site. This tree type has been classified as invasive; however, replacements are not required at this time. The site is fully developed and will remain largely as it is. Parking exists in two locations on the site, one facing S. High Street.

Ms. Holt reviewed the proposed changes on each elevation of the building, as detailed in the staff report, including materials, lighting and screening, and the recommended conditions for approval.

Board Questions

Ms. Cooper stated that she is concerned about moving the trash enclosure farther to the east and closer to the house. Will the enclosure run along the property line?
Ms. Holt responded that the existing enclosure does not cover all the trash bins. The enclosure needs to be extended sufficiently to enclose all the bins. She believes it will run concurrent with the property line. The applicant will be able to provide the details.
Mr. Cotter inquired if the number of parking spaces is compliant with Code.
Ms. Holt responded that the number of parking spaces match the requirements for the restaurant.

Applicant Presentation

Kevin Parzych, Gunzelman architecture + interiors, LLC, 3223 Stewart Avenue, Columbus, Ohio stated that he would respond to the question regarding the trash enclosure. The enclosure will be within the property line. It will extend slightly past the corner of the adjacent house to provide the requested coverage.

Public Comments

There were no public comments.

Board Discussion

Board members indicated that they were satisfied with the proposed project.

Mr. Alexander inquired if the applicant had any objection to the proposed conditions for approval.
Mr. Parzych indicated that he had no objection.

Ms. Damaser moved, Ms. Cooper seconded approval of the Minor Project with the following four (4) conditions:

1) At the time of sign permit, the applicant shall also include a lighting plan to update, or remove, all non-compliant fixtures to current Code requirements to be approved by the Architectural Review Board.
2) All new siding, trim, and soffits shall be wood or engineered wood approved by staff. Lap siding with reveals that match the original structure shall be used for the north elevation, to be demonstrated at building permit. Boral, or a similar flyash product, is not supported.

3) At building permit, the following per staff approval, shall be shown for the trash enclosure:
   a. The siding shall be wood or engineered wood to match the adjacent existing siding style and reveal, and
   b. Fencing shall be extended to the east to fully enclose the trash area from view of the adjacent residential structure.
4) Minor inconsistencies between the civil and landscape drawings shall be addressed at building permit. Proposed improvements shall not adversely impact adjacent properties and existing drainage patterns to staff's satisfaction.

Vote: Mr. Cotter, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Damaser, yes.
[Motion carried 4-0]

- **PRESENTATION**

  Historic District 3D Modeling Project

Ms. Holt stated that the City staff would provide an update on the new Historic Dublin 3D Modeling Project. She introduced Brandon Brown, Rick Franz, Langdon Sanders and Cara Sheets, City Performance and Analytics Division. The I.T./GIS staff members have been working with Planners Zach Hounshell and Chris Will to develop tonight's presentation. Planning and GIS staff began working with ESRI in 2022 to determine how ArcGIS Urban could be a useful tool for imagining building massing and detailing relative to development review applications. The opportunity to provide 3D information was discussed at the joint work session with City Council and Board and Commission members in August 2022. It was suggested this software could be especially helpful for the Architectural Review Board for these same reasons, particularly for demonstrating how building massing and scale would appear in 3D compared to elevations and plans. Subsequently, both Planning and GIS staff determined that using ArcGIS Urban would be a very helpful tool in these matters, and GIS staff contracted with a provider to create a base map of the Historic District as a demonstration for the software. This work is complete, and while there are still some important details to address, staff is prepared to provide the Board with an update on the project. Assisted by Rick Franz, she provided a demonstration of the 3D modeling tool, beginning with the standard base map for the City and focusing on various locations and views within the Historic District. The following discussion topics have been provided to gain the ARB members' feedback and guidance:

1) Is the demonstration, provided at the meeting, what the Board was envisioning? What additions or modifications should be further investigated, if any?
2) What are the Board's expectations for use: live demos or static screen shots for applications?
3) What are the anticipated guidelines for how/when to use ArcGIS Urban?
4) Other considerations by the Board.

Board Questions/Discussion

Mr. Alexander inquired if it is possible to turn on/off the color characteristic in the 3D modeling tool.
Mr. Franz responded affirmatively.
Mr. Alexander inquired if there is ability to show the trees within a particular area, if not the branches, just the trunks.

Mr. Franz responded that it might be possible to add two views of the trees within an area to toggle between – a winter view and a summer view.

Mr. Alexander inquired how the tool could be used. Would the applicant provide a model sketch that could be imported into the 3D map?
Mr. Franz that at this point, they have provided only the context; they have not developed the mechanics of how a project model could be imported.

Ms. Cooper inquired about the level of project detail and dimensionality possible.
Mr. Franz responded that it would be easy to plop in a white box, but it would not yet provide the level of detail he believes the Board is looking for.
Mr. Alexander responded that just plopping in a white box for a proposed building would be helpful, and if the fenestration could be added, as shown in the demonstration, it would be valuable. He does not believe the Board is looking for the ability to walk through or fly through the site. The challenge has been in evaluating the anticipated mass and scale of a building in an area. It also would be valuable to see the massing from different views, particularly the street level.
Ms. Cooper stated that it would be helpful to show that view to an applicant, as well, so they can better understand the Board's concerns about their proposed project.

Ms. Damaser referred to the question regarding expectation for use. It would be used for applications for both new builds and expansions.
Mr. Alexander stated that the 3D modeling would be helpful in evaluating the subordinate component of a project.
Board members discussed recent projects where the 3D modeling would have been beneficial.

Ms. Holt stated that if the members would be satisfied with the proposed massing depicted as a white box added to the streetscape or onto an existing building, that can be easily achieved.
Mr. Cotter stated that if they could depict the gables and the windows and doors, it would be helpful.
Mr. Franz responded that the windows would be difficult to show in the project.
Ms. Cooper inquired if the height and angles of the rooftop could be shown – the building outline.
Mr. Franz confirmed the building outline can be shown, including the roofline of the structure, if consistent. The proposed redevelopment of a structure could also be imposed over an existing structure. Showing gables and other details would be more difficult.

Mr. Cotter inquired the length of time involved in importing a proposed project massing and structure outline.
Mr. Franz responded that there is a learning curve involved at this point, but he believes the time involved could be measured in hours, as opposed to days.
Mr. Alexander inquired if the modelling could be accommodated within the current application deadlines provided to applicants, or if it would be necessary to extend the application submission timeframe before a meeting.
Ms. Holt responded that she believes it could be accommodated with the existing submission deadlines. Perhaps the next project submission could be used as a beta test, and the Board could provide feedback on its usefulness.

Ms. Cooper suggested that staff use it with a couple of recent projects, such as the 112 S. Riverview Street project and the home addition on S. High Street. That should show the potential usefulness of the 3D massing.
Ms. Holt stated that staff could do so. They would contemplate having something for a September meeting.
Mr. Alexander stated that he believes it would be better for staff to import the information from an applicant's drawing. It would provide the desired neutrality if staff, rather than an applicant, prepared the model.
Ms. Cooper noted that it could be made part of the staff report analysis.

Mr. Alexander inquired if the I.T./GIS division had other 3D modelling applications, which they make open source for residents.
Mr. Franz responded that they hope to use the 3D base map in other ways. They do anticipate making the models available to the public. The idea is a companion website that would allow residents to download models of existing City buildings.

Ms. Damaser referred to Question #2, and stated that it would helpful to see examples using both live demos and static screen shots; then, the Board could evaluate the usefulness of both.

Board members were supportive of proceeding with the beta project.

COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Holt stated that:

- The next regular ARB meeting is scheduled for 6:30 pm, Wednesday, August 24, 2023.
- A joint Council-PZC-ARB-BZA work session is scheduled for Wednesday, August 30, 2023.
- A tour of a selected list of existing projects within the Historic District is tentatively being scheduled in September. The meeting discussion of the tour would be scheduled on the same day or a different day. More information will be forthcoming.
- The final draft of the Alternative Building Materials will be provided to the ARB for consideration and adoption at the end of the summer.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

_____
Chair, Architectural Review Board

_____
Assistant Clerk of Council