



MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, July 24, 2024

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Cotter, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and welcomed everyone to the July 24, 2024 Architectural Review Board. He stated that the meeting is held in the Council Chamber, 5555 Perimeter Drive. Livestream video of the meeting can also be accessed at the City's website. Public comments on the cases are welcome from meeting attendees and from those viewing at the City's website. He reviewed the meeting procedures.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. Cotter led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Board members present: Sean Cotter, Michael Jewell, Martha Cooper, Lisa Patt-McDaniel
Board members absent: Hilary Damaser
Staff members present: Sarah Holt, Bassem Bitar, Rati Singh, Taylor Mullinax, Michael Hiatt

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Cotter moved, Mr. Jewell seconded acceptance of the documents into the record and approval of the June 26, 2024 meeting minutes.

Vote: Ms. Cooper, yes; Ms. Patt-McDaniel, yes; Mr. Jewell, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes.
[Motion carried 4-0]

Mr. Cotter 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.

CASE REVIEWS

- **Case #24-091INF – Informal Review - 16-22 N. High Street, Informal Review**

Informal review and feedback prior to the Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) application for the construction of a new mixed-use building in the Historic District. The 0.26-acre site is zoned HD-HC, Historic Core District, and is located approximately 70 feet northeast of the intersection of North High Street and East Bridge Street.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Singh stated that this is a request for an Informal Review of the proposed construction of a new mixed-use building at 16-22 N. High Street. Per the Historic Code, any development over 3,000 SF involves a 3-step process; the Informal Review is an optional step. At any stage of the process, the applicant may request an Informal Review for the purpose of obtaining additional feedback from the Board. Tonight, the applicant is requesting an additional Informal Review prior to submitting a Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) application. No determination is required with an Informal Review. The 0.26-acre site is zoned HD-HC, Historic Core District, and is located approximately 70 feet northeast of the intersection of North High Street and East Bridge Street. Historic Core is located to the north and south of this site; Historic Residential is located to the east, across N. Blacksmith Lane.). The lot contains two structures: 16 N. High Street and 22 N. High Street, and a concrete drive between the buildings. A surface parking lot to the rear (east) of the property is accessible from N. Blacksmith Lane. There is an attached existing dirt-floor shed at the rear of 22 N. High Street and an unusable, dilapidated outbuilding facing N. Blacksmith Lane.

In February 2024, the Board approved a Demolition for an existing shed and outbuilding and approved the Concept Plan (CP) for construction of a two-story, mixed-use building at the rear of the site with five conditions, which are listed in the staff report. Both 22 N. High Street and 16 N. High Street are listed individually in the National Register of Historic Places as Dr. Llewellyn McKittrick's office and house, respectively. 22 N. High Street was built circa 1900. The Queen Anne-style building has a rectilinear footprint, a hipped-roof core, and a cross-gable over a bay window on the front façade. The structure has original wood siding and a standing seam metal roof. The structure's historic use was a doctor's office, and the current use is commercial. 16 N. High Street was built in 1843. The stone building has a rectilinear footprint with a two-story core and a one-story frame addition spanning the width of the rear elevation. The side-gable roof is sheathed in standing seam metal and pierced by two gable wall dormers on the façade. Two doors serve as separate business entries on the façade. Most windows are two-over-two wood sashes, except in the dormers, which are one-over-one. The structure's historic use was a single-family home, and currently, the property is vacant. Both structures have distinct architectural styles, forms and materials.

Ms. Singh stated that the applicant proposes constructing a three-story mixed-use building at the rear, northeast corner of the site with vehicular access from N. Blacksmith Lane. The CP was approved with conditions earlier this year. At the CP review, the Board and staff expressed concerns about the form and monotony of the façade. The applicant was required to address the form and massing at the PDP and establish a pedestrian connection between this building and N. Blacksmith Lane. The applicant proposes two massing studies for the Board and requests feedback. The proposed massing studies display a reduced mass on the second floor and different options (A and B) for roof variations. The applicant has removed the symmetrical double gables and lowered the height of the second floor, which previously made it look like a 2.5-story building. As the Board supported the flat roof, the proposed roof forms now combine flat roofs with different gable styles. A colonnaded terrace wraps around the building's south side, and a terrace on the north side helps balance the overall structure. A pedestrian connection is proposed along the south facade. This will establish the future pedestrian corridor between N. High Street and N. Blacksmith Lane, further promoting a walkable environment within the District. With the CP approval, the building height at the rear of the building was 20 feet at the front gable. The applicant has provided additional information on the building height after this meeting packet was published. The approximate

building height facing N. High Street is 25 feet. At the rear, the proposed height is 32-35 feet, which is measured from the finished floor level to the middle of the ridge. A waiver will be required with the PDP if the height exceeds 30 feet. Therefore, staff would request the Board to provide feedback on the proposed building height in addition to the massing studies.

Tonight, there are two massing studies, A and B, on which the applicant is seeking feedback relative to the conditions of approval. The following discussion questions are provided for the Board's consideration:

- 1) Does the Board support either of the proposed Massing Studies?
- 2) Does the Board support the reduced scale, mass, and form of the front façade?
- 3) Does the Board support the proposed street edge at N. Blacksmith Lane?
- 4) Does the Board support the colonnaded building edge on the south façade and the established pedestrian corridor character?
- 5) Any other considerations by the Board?

Questions for Staff

Ms. Cooper inquired what the adjusted heights are in each of the massing studies.

Ms. Singh responded that information was submitted after the packets were published. The front height is approximately 25 feet and the rear height is between 32 and 35 feet on both massing studies.

Applicant Presentation

Anne Adams, 3989 Broadway, Grove City and Joe Trepicone, architect, 600 Stone Hedge Parkway, Dublin, were present.

Mr. Trepicone stated that even though the Concept Plan was approved, they did not receive solid positive feedback on the architectural massing; therefore, they knew the plan could be improved. They decided to revise the CP, incorporating all of the Board's earlier comments. They removed a floor from the top of the building and, even though it's not typical for Dublin, they included a flat roof. They have provided exterior spaces, including a pocket park, patio and a walkway that connects Blacksmith Lane to High Street. He pointed out that there is a 12-foot grade change from High Street to Blacksmith Lane, so there is a significant difference between the height of the front and rear of the building. In his measurements, he used the worst case scenario, which would be the highest point on the High Street side and the lowest point on the Blacksmith Lane side. That is the reason for the height discrepancy.

Questions for the Applicant

Mr. Cotter stated that the applicant has incorporated many of the changes the Board had suggested at the previous meeting. He appreciates the changes made.

Ms. Adams stated that they attempted to connect the interior to the exterior space in a way that would provide restaurant patrons the opportunity to enjoy both.

Mr. Jewell referred to the roof difference between Massing Study A and Massing Study B. Did they lose or gain anything with the difference made? Is it exposed on the interior?

Mr. Trepicone stated that, personally, he prefers the straight gable end of Massing Study A. The difference reflects their attempt to lower the roof height by 3-4 feet. They did not want to risk having the project disapproved because it was a couple of feet too high.

Ms. Cooper stated that she also prefers Massing Study A. She noted that although she was not present at the previous hearing, the minutes reflected the need to address the trash collection and access. The intent was that the greenspace be expanded between the historic portion and the new construction.

Ms. Adams responded that they met with the City Engineer. Per his direction, they have located the trash so that the trash collector can drive straight in, grab the trash, and back straight out. They have expanded the proposed greenspace.

Mr. Trepicone stated that the Board's decision to allow elimination of the awkwardly situated parking spaces with difficult access allowed them to be replaced with a pocket park.

Ms. Adams stated that where the shed is currently located, there will be greenspace, which will extend all the way to the walkway between the two buildings. The dumpster is in the location shown on the drawing and will be enclosed for aesthetic purposes. The Engineer has indicated that the access on Blacksmith Lane could be curved to allow ease of access for the trash truck.

Ms. Holt reminded the Board that this review is of the building massing only. Trash, parking and other issues will be addressed with the PDP.

Ms. Patt-McDaniel stated that she believes the roof in Massing Study A better reflects the front of the building and is reminiscent of what already exists. The flat roof does not. She believes achieving architectural flow and connection is more important than reducing the height.

Mr. Cotter inquired if the pedestrian path would be a 3-foot wide, paved pathway.

Mr. Trepicone responded that the path would be 36-38 inches in width. On the south side of the property, a stone dry-laid wall extends over the property line. To achieve the required 23-foot length for the pathway, they will need to use a small amount of that property width.

Mr. Cotter stated that he slightly prefers Option B, but believes either option would be acceptable.

Board Discussion

Mr. Cotter inquired if Board members had any feedback/comments to share related to the Discussion Questions provided.

Board members indicated that they had no objection to the revised massing options. The majority of members expressed a preference for Massing Study A.

Ms. Cooper noted that a pathway width of 36 inches is the minimum required for ADA accessibility.

Mr. Trepicone acknowledged the comment.

Mr. Cotter stated that Option A has a consensus, and he has no objection to it. Board members indicated that they had no objections to the reduced scale, mass, and form of the front façade.

Mr. Cotter stated that a waiver will be needed for a height greater than 30 feet, so efforts should be made to keep the height as low as possible. Board members had no objection to the height being a little above 30 feet. Board members indicated support for the proposed mixed-use infill building at the rear of the lot. They also were supportive of the proposed colonnaded building edge on the south façade and the established pedestrian corridor character. Mr. Cotter stated that the trash

enclosure, pocket park and parking will be addressed at the next step, the Preliminary Development Plan (PDP).

Public Comment

No public comments on the case were received.

As the case was an Informal Review, no action was taken.

- **Case #24-067MPR - 110 S. Riverview Street, Minor Project Review**

Proposal for exterior modifications to an existing home in Historic Dublin. The 0.32-acre site is zoned HD-HR, Historic Residential District and is located southeast of the intersection of South Riverview Street and Pinney Hill Lane.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Mullinax stated that this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project for exterior improvements at 110 S. Riverview Street. The 0.32-acre site is located southeast of the intersection of Pinney Hill Lane and S. Riverview Street with approximately 89 feet of frontage on S. Riverview Street and the Scioto River. The site topography significantly drops moving east from S. Riverview Street towards the Scioto River. Mature trees are located within the floodplain to the rear of the property. The property is zoned HD-HR, Historic Residential District. Residences to the north, south, and west lie within the same zoning classification. On the site is an existing home with an attached 2-car, front-loaded garage. This is a request for the following exterior site improvements: additional residential parking and a driveway expansion, new deck stairs and railings, hardscaping, and fencing. Waivers to the maximum permitted lot coverage and permitted driveway material are requested. Unfortunately, some of the proposed improvements were constructed without ARB approval. If an item is not approved by the Board or the Board requests modifications, the applicant is required to remove or make the necessary adjustments per a condition of approval. There is no street parking in front of this residence on the east side of S. Riverview Street. An existing storm sewer outlet and headwall are located on the north side of the home behind the wood fence. There are limestone steps and loose limestone rock in the rear yard. Railing is proposed on the decks that are east-facing toward the Scioto River.

Ms. Mullinax reviewed the recent development history of the site. In May 2021, the Board approved demolition of a residential duplex and construction of a 3,000-square-foot single-family home. In July 2021, staff administratively approved a lot split for 110-112 S. Riverview to split the parcel into two parcels. In January 2022, staff administratively approved a 250 SF lower deck extension to the rear of the home. On the front and sides of the residence, the proposed hardscape improvements include walking paths, steps, landscape borders and a stone mailbox. A fence enclosure will be added north of the garage area, and a driveway expansion is adjacent to the existing concrete driveway. She pointed out the constructed versus non-constructed improvements. A proposed maximum lot coverage of 47.7% includes the improvements. The applicant is requesting approval of a waiver to exceed the 45% maximum lot coverage to allow an additional 374 SF of hardscape, which is necessary for another improvement. The driveway expansion does not meet several Code requirements, including the maximum lot coverage and the maximum permitted pavement at the right-of-way. There is a 3-foot setback from the side lot line for driveway pavement. Gravel is not a permitted driveway pavement material. ARB approval of a waiver to permit gravel as a driveway

material is required. Generally, staff would not support a driveway expansion or gravel material in the Historic District; however, there are unique site conditions here to consider. First, the residence is located at the intersection of two narrow roadways, making turning movements by larger vehicles, such as a school bus challenging, with street parking at this location. The gravel parking area is located over a City storm sewer, so if access is needed in the future, the removal of gravel is much easier than other pavement types. Gravel is a pervious material and improves impervious area along the streetscape. There is gravel throughout the surrounding area on S. Riverview Street, including street parking. Staff is supportive of these improvements and the waiver request for the gravel material and the maximum lot coverage with a recommended condition that the applicant remove the taper of the driveway expansion. The proposed lot coverage would still be over 45%; therefore, warranting the waiver. Along the back and sides of the residence, site improvements include walking paths, steps, landscape borders and loose rock. Stairs will be added to the lower level of the deck on the back of the home. The applicant was granted an emergency provision by staff to install loose limestone rock between the headwall and the Scioto River to stabilize the site. The applicant is requesting a waiver to allow a maximum lot coverage of 47.7% to install additional limestone rock. Staff supports the additional rock, which will continue to allow water to flow through this site, and vegetation to grow through the rocks, which will restore the natural topography along the back of the house. On the east elevation facing the Scioto River, improvements include the addition of stairs to the lower deck and the deck railing material change on two levels. The stair materials will match the approved decking, a thermally modified oak. The approved deck railing will change from wood to a black powder-coated aluminum. We have seen modern railings approved in the Historic District previously, when contextually appropriate. Staff is supportive of the requested improvements. The 4-foot fence enclosure will be used for pets, as well as a safety barrier for the outlet headwall and grade change. An existing wood fence panel was installed adjacent to the headwall without approval for safety reasons. The item must be removed upon installation of the proposed fence. Staff has reviewed the Waiver and Minor Project review criteria for the application and found that the criteria has been met, met with conditions or not applicable. Staff recommends approval of the waivers and the Minor Project with three conditions.

Board Questions for Staff

Members requested clarification of the proposed parking expansion.

Ms. Holt stated that, based on the location of the intersection and the narrowness of the road, this house does not have an opportunity for on-street parking. Garbage trucks and school buses have asked these residents not to park on the road because they cannot navigate that tight corner.

Ms. Mullinax stated that the residential parking expansion is proposed to create two additional parking spaces constructed of gravel. Per Code, gravel is not a permitted driveway material and requires a material Waiver to be approved by ARB. Generally, staff would not support a driveway expansion in this district or the gravel material; however, there are several unique site conditions to consider:

- The residence is located at the intersection of two narrow roadways, so turning movements of vehicles at the intersection could be impeded by on-street parking at this location, especially for larger vehicles such as school busses, delivery trucks, garbage trucks, and construction equipment
- The 15-foot roadway width of S. Riverview Street at this location and further to the south is very narrow, so any on-street parking for visitors to the property would be difficult, including the possibility of damage to parked vehicles by passing or turning motorists.

- The parking area is located over a City storm sewer, so if access to the sewer is needed, the removal of gravel would be easier than the removal of other pavement types.
- Multiple instances of gravel street parking exist on the east and west sides of S. Riverview Street.
- Gravel is a pervious material and improves the impervious area along the streetscape.
- The gravel material is consistent with the surrounding landscape and hardscape on other properties along S. Riverview Street.

Ms. Mullinax stated that the driveway taper is not large enough to accommodate a vehicle; therefore, staff recommends a condition of approval to remove this section of the driveway to meet the 3-foot setback requirement, unless otherwise approved by ARB. Otherwise, staff supports the proposed parking expansion, location, and material with the requested Waiver. Acceptance of gravel parking at this location does not imply that future applicants will receive similar approval.

Ms. Cooper stated that the road width is very narrow in this area.

Ms. Mullinax agreed, noting that the road width is only 15 feet.

Mr. Jewell stated that curbs and curbcuts are not possible here.

Mr. Cotter requested clarification of the hardscape issue surrounding the home.

Ms. Mullinax explained that per the Code, the maximum permitted lot coverage is 45 percent. The applicant proposes a maximum lot coverage of 47.7 percent, including all impervious and semi-pervious surfaces. The applicant requests approval of a Waiver to the maximum lot coverage requirement to permit an additional 374 square feet of hardscape. The applicant was granted an emergency provision by staff to install loose limestone rock between the headwall and the Scioto River to stabilize the site and stormwater outlet immediately north of the home. Staff anticipated the rock would be limited to the width of the headwall, but the applicant installed more rock than expected. However, staff supports keeping the additional 374 square feet of rock in place at this time, because removing it could damage the site further. The outlet rock stabilizes the rear yard and the steep grade down to the Scioto River, while permitting water to continue to flow through the site and allowing vegetation to grow through the rocks. A recommended condition of approval requires the homeowner to keep any vegetation that grows through the loose limestone rock, except for the paths and staircases, to encourage the landscape to return to its natural state.

The Board had no objection to retention of the additional limestone rock.

Applicant Presentation

Krista LaRussa, The Arcaro & LaRussa Company, 250 McCoy Avenue, Worthington, stated that The Aracaro & LaRussa Company built the home. Ms. LaRussa clarified that the additional limestone was not added by the homeowners' choice but was deemed necessary to stabilize the ground. The home was built on caissons because the soil was not stable, and the limestone, which exceeds lot coverage requirements, was added solely to stabilize the area.

Public Comment

No public comments were received.

Board Discussion

Board members discussed the proposed waivers and voiced no objections. They discussed the proposed recommendations of approval for the Minor Project and determined that it would be preferable not to set a precedent for exceeding the Code and seeking ARB approval after the fact. Board members indicated, additionally, that it would not present a hardship for the homeowner to remove the northern 3 feet of gravel parking surface.

Mr. Jewell moved, Ms. Patt-McDaniel seconded approval of the following waiver:

Waiver to Code Section 153.210 (B)(8) that: Permitted primary pavement materials include asphalt, concrete, brick, concrete pavers, colored and imprinted concrete, or natural stone pavers or flagstones. Gravel is not a permitted driveway material. The primary pavement material on driveways and additions shall be identical.

To permit gravel for a driveway addition.

Vote: Ms. Cooper, yes; Mr. Jewell, yes; Ms. Patt-McDaniel, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes.

[Motion carried 4-0]

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

Waiver to Code Table 153.173(A) that: The maximum lot coverage is 45 percent in the Historic Residential District.

To permit a maximum lot coverage of 47.7 percent

Vote: Ms. Patt-McDaniel yes; Mr. Jewell, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes.

[Motion carried 4-0]

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

- 1) That the northern 3 feet of gravel parking surface be removed;
- 2) That the existing wood fence adjacent to the headwall be removed upon installation of the aluminum fencing; and
- 3) That the homeowner allow vegetation to grow through the loose limestone rock, except for the paths and staircases, to encourage the landscape to return to its natural state.

Vote: Ms. Patt-McDaniel yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Mr. Jewell, yes.

[Motion carried 4-0]

The following two cases were heard together, as they relate to the same address.

- **Case #24-060DEMO - 27 N. Riverview Street, Demolition**

Proposal for demolition of a Landmark accessory structure. The 0.21-acre site is zoned HD-HR, Historic Residential District, and is located southwest of the intersection of Wing Hill Lane and N. Riverview Street.

- **Case #24-030MPR - 27 N. Riverview Street, Minor Project Review**

Proposal for the remodel and construction of an addition to an existing home in the Historic District. The 0.21-acre site is zoned HD-HR, Historic Residential District, and is located southwest of the intersection of Wing Hill Lane and N. Riverview Street.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Holt stated that the 0.21-acre site is zoned HD-HR, Historic Residential District and is located at the intersection of N. Blacksmith Lane, Wing Hill Lane and N. Riverview Street. The site is located

between properties zoned HD-HC, Historic Core and HD-HP, Historic Public. The principal structure on site is a Landmark gabled-ell house with Queen Anne detailing, built ca. 1890. There is a large Landmark outbuilding at the rear of the property adjacent to N. Blacksmith Lane, which the applicant is requesting to demolish. In May 2024, ARB granted waivers for a building footprint increase and a rear-yard setback decrease, and subsequently, BZA granted variances for additional building footprint increase and rear-yard setback decrease. She stated that for this discussion, the Board would focus on the revised site plan. She showed graphics reflecting the existing house in its new location and the proposed addition. The revised plan reflects the following:

- Building footprint and lot coverage amounts are updated. The plan now reflects approximately 18-inch differentials between the additions and the historic house, per the redlined site plan, plus material changes.
- The east-facing front door, transom window, and trim have been preserved.
- Offset muntin is shown in the main window on the east elevation.
- Man door specifications are provided.
- Garage doors were changed to a traditional overhead door system, made of steel core, clad in thermally modified ash, painted Iron Core.
- The 1960s area chimney has been removed.

Ms. Holt noted that the materials are generally the same as proposed for the May ARB meeting with some color changes. The original drop siding will be preserved to the extent possible; any damaged drop siding will be replaced with new drop siding. The drop siding will be replaced with SmartSiding under specific circumstances with a 4-inch reveal.

Ms. Holt stated that none of the information for the Demolition request has changed since the last meeting. The application either meets the Landmark demolition criteria or it is not applicable. The criteria for the requested waivers have been met, not applicable or met with a condition for approval. The Minor Project criteria are met, not applicable or met with conditions and waivers. Staff recommends approval of the Demolition request, approval of all waivers except the one concerning the SmartSiding siding, and approval of the MPR with two conditions.

Applicant Presentation

Richard Taylor, AIA, Richard Taylor Architects, LLC, Dublin stated that staff's presentation covered all the information, and he has nothing additional to add.

Questions for the Applicant

Mr. Jewell inquired about the intended disposition of any artifacts that might be found during the demolition.

Ms. Holt responded that the applicant has been asked that they be preserved and turned over to the Dublin Historical Society. If the item should be too large to be removed, photographs would be taken for historical purposes.

Mr. Cotter inquired about the purpose of the two windows on the bump-out for the garage.

Mr. Taylor stated that both of the windows that extend are to add architectural interest in the stonewall.

Mr. Cotter inquired where the brick material would be used.

Mr. Taylor indicated that it would be used on the three steps to the front stoop and the two steps at the back and the two walkways.

Mr. Cotter requested confirmation that the intent was to retain the details of the porch.
Mr. Taylor responded that other than removing the old paint and cleaning, the porch will not be changed.

Mr. Cotter inquired if the applicant had any objections to the proposed conditions for approval.
Mr. Taylor responded that they had no objections.

Public Comment

There were no public comments.

Board Discussion

Board members indicated they had no further questions or discussion.

Mr. Jewell moved, Ms. Patt-McDaniel seconded approval of the Demolition of a Landmark Structure.
Vote: Ms. Cooper, yes; Mr. Jewell, yes; Ms. Patt-McDaniel, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes.

[Motion carried 4-0]

Mr. Jewell moved, Ms. Patt-McDaniel seconded to approve the following waiver:

- Waiver to Code Section 153.173(E)(2)(c) that: Roofs shall not be sloped less than 6:12...unless otherwise determined by the Board.
To permit roof pitches of 4:12 on the historic house, 3:12 on the garage shed roofs, and flat roof on the south-facing porch.

Vote: Ms. Cooper, yes; Ms. Patt-McDaniel, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Mr. Jewell, yes.

[Motion carried 4-0]

Mr. Jewell moved, Ms. Patt-McDaniel seconded to approve the following waiver:

- Waiver to Code Section 153.174(J)(1)(a) that: Permitted materials are high quality, durable materials including....wood siding.....
To permit the use of LP SmartSide siding.

Vote: Ms. Cooper, no; Ms. Patt-McDaniel, no; Mr. Cotter, no; Mr. Jewell, no.

[Motion failed 4-0]

Mr. Jewell moved, Ms. Patt-McDaniel seconded to approve the following waiver:

- Waiver to Code Section 153.174(J)(1)(a) that: Permitted materials are high quality, durable materials including....wood siding.....
To permit the use of LP SmartSide trim.

Vote: Mr. Cotter, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Ms. Patt-McDaniel, yes; Mr. Jewell, yes.

[Motion carried 4-0]

Ms. Cooper moved, Ms. Patt-McDaniel seconded approval of the Minor Project with the following conditions:

- 1) That the applicant diligently explore the preservation and repair of the original drop siding. If this is not feasible, then replica drop siding is permitted. If replica siding is not available (no other circumstances shall apply, such as cost or desire), with adequate evidence supplied by the applicant and confirmed by staff, an approximately 4-inch reveal of SmartSide horizontal lap siding is permitted without an additional Waiver. This will be determined prior to building permit.

- 2) That at building permit, the applicant supply sufficient graphic information about how the proposed trench drain ties into the street.

Vote: Ms. Patt-McDaniel, yes; Mr. Jewell, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes.
[Motion carried 4-0]

DISCUSSION ITEM

- **Dublin Cemetery Stone Wall Renovation**

Staff Presentation

Mr. Hiatt stated that this is a request for approval of the Dublin Cemetery stonewall renovation. The existing stonewall is failing in several areas, and staff is proposing to rebuild it in the same footprint as exists today. There are three sections of stonewall of approximately 200 linear feet each. The stonewall is similar to many others located throughout the City. The wall will be constructed by using more modern construction technology than was used for the previous wall. The technology includes a frost-depth, 3-foot below grade, cast in place concrete footing with steel reinforcement rebar. The wall will be built with double stone on each side, each course mortared with a bookend cap. The mortar will be raked back and not be visible. No date has been established yet, but the project will go out for bid within the next year.

Questions for Staff

Mr. Jewell noted that staff consulted with the Dublin Historical Society, which indicated support for the project.

Mr. Cotter inquired if the project would be coming back before the Board for review or approval, or if because it is a City project, that would be unnecessary.

Ms. Holt responded that at this point, the project is considered City maintenance, so review and approval of the Board is unnecessary.

Public Comment

There were no public comments concerning the project.

COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Holt updated Board members concerning the following case:

- Case #24-012-ADMC - Historic District Code and Guidelines Update – Phase II has been deferred to the August 28, 2024 meeting to allow staff time to simplify the proposed waiver process. Digital and hard copies will be available later this week for Board review and feedback, with a goal for ARB consideration and recommendation at the August meeting.

The next regular ARB meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, August 28, 2024 at 6:30 pm.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:03 p.m.



Chair, Architectural Review Board



Assistant Clerk of Council