



MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, April 24, 2024

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Alexander called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and welcomed everyone to the April 24, 2024 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. He reviewed the meeting procedures.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. Alexander led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Board members present: Gary Alexander, Michael Jewell, Martha Cooper, Hilary Damaser
Sean Cotter

Staff members present: Bassem Bitar, Sarah Holt, Taylor Mullinax, Javon Henderson, James Condo

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS

Mr. Jewell moved, Mr. Cotter seconded acceptance of the documents into the record and approval of the 03-27-24 meeting minutes.

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

AMEND AGENDA

Mr. Alexander stated that for efficiency's sake, staff recommends the agenda be amended to move the Informal Review case to last.

Ms. Cooper moved, Ms. Damaser seconded moving Case 24-022ARB-INF - 40 E. Bridge Street - Informal Review, to last on the agenda.

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

[Motion carried 5-0]

CASE REVIEWS

- **Case #23-096ARB-MSP - Tucci's – Signs - Master Sign Plan**

Proposal for wall signs and a projecting sign at an existing restaurant in Historic Dublin. The 0.23-acre site is zoned HD-HC, Historic District Core and is located northwest of the intersection of North High Street and Wing Hill Lane.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Mullinax stated that this is a request for review and approval of a Master Sign Plan (MSP) for Tucci's Restaurant. The 0.23-acre site is zoned HD-HC, Historic District Core and is located northwest of the intersection of North High Street and Wing Hill Lane. The site has frontage on 3 streets - High Street, Wing Hill Lane and Darby Street. Various sign applications for Tucci's have been approved by ARB in the past. The sign types and locations generally have remained the same until now.

In December 2022, the ARB approved a Final Development Plan (FDP) for the construction of three building additions; a future MSP was anticipated. The Code permits a combination of two different sign types for this building. That includes ground and building-mounted signs. Lots with more than one street frontage are permitted one additional ground or building-mounted sign, not to exceed 3 signs. Three building-mounted signs are proposed including: 2 wall signs, 1 facing Darby Street and the other above the main entrance, and 1 projecting sign facing N. High Street. The 3 requested building-mounted signs trigger a Master Sign Plan request. The wall signs and projecting sign will be constructed of HDU panelling in 3 colors – burgundy, gold and white. The sign's branding has been updated, and the text logo and border are dimensional on a recessed background. Although the Guidelines recommend one letter size and style, staff is supportive of the proposed signs because they are simple yet balanced. All Code requirements are met. The sign heights and locations are appropriate. The applicant is proposing to remove the existing lighting above the Darby Street sign. While it was included in the FDP, staff is supportive of all 3 signs not being illuminated, because it is not a Code requirement and the signs are interactive with the streetscape. The FDP showed 6 "T" medallions that were to be artistically integrated into the masonry columns on the building addition, but they were eliminated and the areas filled in with brick. All Master Sign Plan criteria is met, and staff recommends approval with the condition that the applicant obtain sign permits through Building Standards.

Applicant Presentation

Jarrold Norton, Morrison Sign Company, 2757 Scioto Parkway, Columbus, stated that he is available to answer questions.

Public Comments

There were no public comments.

Board members indicated they had no questions.

Mr. Jewell moved, Ms. Damaser seconded approval of the Master Sign Plan with one condition:

- 1) That the applicant apply for and obtain permanent sign permits through Building Standards.

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

- **Case #24-028ARB-MPR - Dublin Historical Society, 35 S. High Street - Minor Project Review**

Proposal for exterior modifications to an existing building in Historic Dublin. The 0.03-acre site is zoned HD-HC, Historic District Core and is located northwest of the intersection of North High Street and Spring Hill Lane.

Mr. Jewell recused himself from the case, because he is a member of the Dublin Historical Society Board.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Henderson stated that the 0.03-acre site is zoned HD-HC, Historic District Core and is located northwest of the intersection of N. High Street and Spring Hill Lane. The site contains an existing 2-story structure. It shares a wall with 39 S. High Street to its south, and each building's lot follows the outline of the foundation. The site has ±30 feet of frontage on S. High Street. The applicant is proposing installation of 1 ground sign east of the existing historic building, facing S. High Street, with two ground lights and required landscaping and installation of five handrails to allow easy and safe access to the building's multiple entrances. The most recent ARB approval related to the site was in August 2016, at which time ARB approved a Minor Project Review (MPR) to paint the exterior on the original 2-story portion of the building.

Mr. Henderson stated that the property does not have any existing signs, and the applicant is proposing a sign within an existing landscape bed. The size of the sign face will be 6.25 feet square with an additional sign panel hanging beneath, at 0.65 square feet. The sign is double-sided, with the same logos and text on each side. The face will be 2"-thick High-Density Urethane (HDU), as required by Code, painted black and white with 1/2-inch depth on the letters and logo. The sign will hang from chain links mounted to a cedar post, which will be painted white. The sign will read "Dublin Historical Society," with an image of the Coffman House and the established date of the society. The lower hanging sign will read "Museum". The sign meets all Code Sign requirements described in Section 153.173(M), except the location, which will require a deviation.

The applicant also proposes two Best Pro BPL-100 light fixtures finished in Polyester UV powder coated (black) and mounted into the ground on the north and south sides of the sign. The lights will be within the proposed landscape bed and will consist of LED lamps with shielding components. The landscape bed will contain 4 Baby Gem Boxwood shrubs, consistent with landscape requirements. In the locations shown in the meeting materials, the applicant proposes installing five black aluminum handrails mounted into the ground with brackets. The handrail design aligns with the Historic Design Guidelines and will allow safer access into the building. The case has been reviewed against the applicable criteria, and staff recommends approval with no conditions.

Applicant Presentation

John Leppert, Dublin Historical Society board member, 478 Bright Road, Dublin, indicated that he is available to answer questions.

Public Comments

There were no public comments.

Board members indicated they had no questions.

Ms. Damaser moved, Ms. Cooper seconded approval of the Minor Project Review with no conditions.

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

Mr. Jewell returned to the meeting.

- **Case #24-042ARB-MPR - Chamber of Commerce, 129 S. High Street - Minor Project Review**

Proposal for exterior modifications to an existing building in Historic Dublin. The 0.25-acre site is zoned HD-HS, Historic South District and is located northwest of the intersection of South High Street and John Wright Lane.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Condo stated that the 0.246-acre site is located at the northwest corner of the intersection of S. High Street and John Wright Lane, and is zoned Historic District – Historic South District. The site has approximately 66 feet of frontage on S. High Street, 162 feet on John Wright Lane, and 66 feet on Mill Lane. Vehicular access to the rear parking lot is provided on Mill Lane and John Wright Lane, and two sidewalk connections are located along the south and east property line. Evergreen shrubs, trees, and various other plantings screen the parking lot and structure. Presently, the site is developed with a one-story Hall and Parlour building with side gable roof constructed ca. 1880 as noted in the Historic and Cultural Assessment (HCA) of 2017. The structure is Vernacular in style with a sizable addition to the rear (west), which was built in 1988. The condition of the structure is good as it has been maintained overtime. The property is designated as Landmark within the Historic Design Guidelines and is part of the Dublin High Street National Historic District. The site is owned by the City of Dublin. This is a request for a rehabilitation of a Landmark property. The proposal includes replacing the historic front and rear addition siding and trim, extending the rear siding to cover the exposed concrete foundation, replacing the window trim on both the historic structure and the rear addition, and painting the siding in appropriate colors. The synthetic wood shake siding that is in disrepair will be replaced with Historic District Code 153.174(J)(1)(a) permits the use of "high quality, durable materials" for building façades, including fiber cement siding, such as the proposed Hardie Plank lap siding in smooth finish, and the proposed James Hardie Plank window trim. A narrower siding reveal of 4 inches will be used for the historic front of the structure, whereas a wider siding reveal of 7 inches will be used for the rear additions to the structure, putting the Chamber into greater compliance with the Historic Design Guidelines Chapter 4.12 (A), which states that, "Additions should be clearly distinguishable from the original structure...." The Chamber of Commerce currently features cedar panelling, which is not original. The proposed materials will bring the exterior closer in line to its original condition. The Chamber of Commerce building is currently painted Pewter Green with white trim. The applicant is proposing the siding on the historic

building be painted in Pure White (SW 7005) and the trim be Pewter Green (SW 6208). Pure White is listed in the Pre-Approved Paint Colors as a recommended body color for the building's time period, and Pewter Green is the existing paint color of the structure. This color scheme will be inverted for the rear additions to the building, with Pewter Green siding and Pure White trim, helping to distinguish the addition from the historic building. The applicant is proposing to cover the currently exposed concrete masonry unit (CMU) foundation of the rear additions with the proposed Hardie Plank Lap Smooth Finish siding, and the foundation itself will be painted to match the rear siding. This proposal will disguise the unfinished CMU, a prohibited material elsewhere in the Code (153.173 (7)(c)), bringing the exterior into greater compliance with current historic preservation practices. Staff has no concerns regarding the Historic Design Guidelines Chapter 4.5(B) recommendation against painting foundations, as it refers to historic stone foundations, not unfinished CMU. Mr. Condo stated that staff has reviewed the proposal against the applicable criteria and recommends approval with no conditions.

Board Questions

Mr. Alexander inquired if the board trim would match exactly the width of the current trim.

Mr. Condo responded affirmatively.

Mr. Alexander inquired if the siding would be installed without corner boards, as the photo indicates.

Mr. Condo deferred the question to the applicant.

Applicant Presentation

John Burchett, Operations Administrator, Facilities & Fleet, City of Dublin, stated that the manner of installation of the hardiboard requires use of corner boards.

Mr. Alexander inquired if they would be the same width as the trim on the window.

Mr. Burchett responded that the width would be the same.

Public Comments

There were no public comments.

Board members indicated they had no questions.

Ms. Cooper moved, Ms. Damaser seconded approval of the Minor Project Review with no conditions.

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

[Motion carried 5-0]

- **Case #24-045ARB-MPR - 36-38 N. High Street – Garage Minor Project Review**

Proposal for exterior modification plus Waiver to a proposed two-story building in the Historic District. The 0.25-acre lot is zoned HD-HC, Historic Core District and is located northwest of the intersection of North High Street and Wing Hill Lane.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Holt stated that the 0.25-acre site is zoned HD-HC, Historic District-Historic Core. The property has ±65 feet of frontage along N. High Street and N. Blacksmith Lane, as well as ±125 feet of frontage on Wing Hill Lane. The previous building along N. High Street has been demolished, and

construction is underway for the mixed-use project per the Final Development Plan (FDP) (22-132FDP) approved in December 2022. The historic wall that spans 36-40 N. High Street is also under restoration, as approved in 2023 (23-147MPR). The Ticky Wing two-story privy within that wall is being preserved as part of this project. This request pertains only to the new residential building that will face N. Blacksmith Lane. The applicant is requesting a change to the two garage doors specified in the FDP for the residential portion of the project. The previously approved doors were wood-clad, as required by Code Section 153.174(D)(1). This new request is for review and approval of a steel door with a composite overlay, which requires a Waiver. The proposed garage doors are Clopay Coachman doors in a Shaker style without windows. This type of door has been approved previously via Waiver for a new construction at 112 S. Riverview Street and an addition to a Landmark/NRHP building at 5707 Dublin Road in 2023. The paint colors for the doors will remain as approved for the FDP: Pavestone (SW 7642) and Grapy (SW 7629). Most Waiver criteria are met; 3 criteria are not applicable. Staff recommends approval of the Waiver and the Minor Project with no conditions.

Applicant Presentation

John Montgomery, representative for Tim Lai, architect, 1060 Kingsmill Parkway, Columbus, stated that he is present to answer questions.

Board Questions for the Applicant

Mr. Jewell inquired what prompted the requested change to the FDP.

Mr. Montgomery responded that the building owner has requested the change for future maintenance purposes.

Public Comments

There were no public comments.

Board members had no questions.

Ms. Damaser moved, Ms. Cooper seconded approval of a Waiver to Code Section 153.174(D)(1) Requirement that Windows and Doors shall be Wood, Metal-Clad Wood, or Vinyl-Clad Wood, to Permit the Use of Composite Garage Doors.

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

Mr. Jewell moved, Ms. Cooper seconded approval of the Minor Project without conditions.

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

• Case #24-022ARB-INF - 40 E. Bridge Street - Informal Review

Informal review and feedback for the remodel and construction of an addition to an existing home in the Historic District. The 0.32-acre site is zoned HD-HR, Historic Residential District, and is located northeast of the intersection of N. Blacksmith Lane and E. Bridge Street.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Holt stated that 40 E. Bridge Street is a +/- 13,180-square-foot lot zoned HD-HR, Historic Residential District. The lot is between N. Riverview Street, E. Bridge Street, and N. Blacksmith Lane and faces E. Bridge Street, although it sits below the road. The Landmark house is a vernacular style built ca. 1850. There is an addition of unknown age on the right side of the home. The house has a cross-gabled form with a wrap-around porch on the left, facing E. Bridge Street. There are details that indicate that the brick foundation for the porch may not be original; it is not continuous with the stone foundation. There are two sets of simple columns in two different styles on the porch. That suggests a potential addition at some point. Windows also were added to that porch to enclose it. There are scalloped shingles on the 2nd floor and asbestos shingles cover the original lower siding. The porch originally was at grade with E. Bridge Street. When the new bridge was constructed in the 1930s, the road grade was raised. This resulted in a continuous high stone wall along E. Bridge Street and N. Blacksmith Lane from the construction. The E. Bridge Street porch wraps around to the N. Blacksmith Lane side. A set of historic stone stairs leads from N. Blacksmith Lane to the property. At the rear of the site is what is known as the "duplex privy". The structure is a Landmark building and will be preserved with this project. The privy and the 1930s wall and stairs are within the highway easement. [Different views of the building elevations were shown.]

Ms. Holt stated that the applicant is proposing significant additions, including an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU). ADUs are permitted with size restrictions. The applicant is informally requesting a lot coverage waiver of 5%, and an ADU size increase of 20%. Staff is concerned about the massing, as the N. Riverview Street elevation appears to be the primary facade. This is in conflict with the concept of using E. Bridge Street as the primary facade. The house historically has been addressed off E. Bridge Street, and the front door was originally in the main gable, based on interior details. In addition to the massing concerns, the proposed roof angles, shapes, and complexity create visual confusion and complication that is not found elsewhere in the district. The roof lines appear to be complicated and need to be simplified with design development. An addition directly to the historic house without a break or hyphen is inconsistent with the Guidelines. The ADU is located at the rear of the house facing N. Blacksmith Lane. Because the roof form of the ADU does not meet the roof pitch criteria, a Waiver will be needed. The N. Riverview Street overpowers the original facade. The original house is constructed of lap and scalloped siding, native stone foundation, and a brick porch base. The proposed addition materials include narrow vertical wood siding, board and batten siding, limestone, and three roof types. Three roof areas would require additional Waivers for less than 3:12 roof pitch as required by Code: the north elevation shows an almost flat-roofed addition, there is a flat roof section on the east elevation, and the hyphen has a flat roof. There are a variety of fascia details that add to the visual confusion; these should be simplified to one detail, ideally mimicking the original house. Many window ratios do not conform to the Guidelines' direction to use traditional window-to-wall ratios and historic patterns; the windows are often horizontal or square in form. This should be addressed at Minor Project Review (MPR).

Staff has provided the following discussion questions for the Commission:

- 1) Does the Board support the orientation of the building, where E. Bridge Street is the front?
- 2) Does the Board support the lot coverage and ADU size Waivers?
- 3) Does the Board support the proposed mass, scale, and forms of the additions and their response to the Code and Guidelines? Would the Board support the roof pitch Waivers?
- 4) Does the Board have comments on the number and type of proposed materials?

- 5) Other considerations by the Board.

Board Questions for Staff

Mr. Cotter inquired if the front entrance on a historical building can be changed. Is there precedent in Dublin for that occurring?

Ms. Holt responded that the City has no guidance other than Code. However, when Bridge Street was raised with the construction of the bridge, it appears that the functional front of this house was switched to N. Riverview Street. She has seen precedence in other historic towns where roads were vacated and the front elevations became the rear elevation of homes on those streets. Given the current layout, it would not be out of the question for the pathway to extend to the side of the porch. Accessing the house from the side of the porch would permit use of the historic front door of the structure.

Mr. Alexander noted that in German Village, it is not unusual to see what was once the front door acknowledged by a pane of glass or a door disabled by removal of the stoop or hardware. The front door continues to be in evidence but due to a drive at the side of the structure or an addition to the rear of the home, the location of the front door changes. There remains an acknowledgment, however, of the original front door of the structure.

Mr. Jewell stated the original front façade is still recognized as the front of the building, and it remains the address for postal service purposes.

Mr. Alexander stated that the Code of some communities are very specific about the front façade. Dublin's Code does give an option, if it is facing a street. However, the City's Zoning Code is very specific on what the rear lot line is. It indicates that, typically, the rear lot line is the line opposite the front lot line that separates the lot from an alley, rear lane or the rear of another lot. That may impact our consideration of this proposal. If we allow for the imposition of the setbacks in a different way, it would necessitate a waiver, as it would be contrary to Code. He reminded members that recently, ARB indicated to the property owner of the adjacent two properties (17 and 27 S. Riverview) that the Board would support a waiver to reduce the rear setback so the garage could be accessed from the alley and greater mass on the houses could be permitted. That is another avenue that might be available to this applicant.

Mr. Cotter requested clarification of the building footprint waiver ARB supported for 17 and 27 S. Riverview.

Mr. Alexander responded that the Board supported a waiver for the maximum building footprint for the smaller structure in excess of the 20% that ARB could approve, in order to have the same square footage (2754 sq. feet) of the other home. For the case the Board is reviewing tonight, the footprint size is not the issue; it is the overall lot coverage.

Ms. Holt stated that the lot for 40 E. Bridge Street is approximately 50% larger than 17 and 27 S. Riverview.

Mr. Alexander inquired the reason the proposed project could not be called an addition, as opposed to an ADU. Is it because of the additional door on the rear façade?

Ms. Holt responded that there is a definition of an ADU in the City Code. It says "a dwelling unit for occupancy by an individual who is providing services to a principal use of the property, such as a watchman, maintenance personnel, or a temporary guest, including corporate residences, or an

accessory dwelling associated with a single-family dwelling, two-family dwelling or townhouse dwelling.” She will defer to the applicant to explain his decision to request an ADU. There is specific criteria within the Historic District Code that addresses the location of the door, square footage, and the fact that the owner has to live on site. The ADU cannot be split off from the main property.

Ms. Damaser inquired if it was the applicant who chose to classify this as an ADU, not the City.

Ms. Holt responded affirmatively.

Mr. Cotter requested the Code reference just read.

Ms. Holt responded that it is Section 153.002(g), Definitions – Dwelling.

Applicant Presentation

Kelly Burke, property owner, 4389 Hunters Bend, Powell stated he is the owner.

David Knapp, architect, Tandem North Design, 202 South Union Street, Travers City, Michigan, stated that he is present to answer questions. This is a challenging site, given the orientation of the structure and the close proximity to a 15-foot stonewall on two sides of the property. What is referred to as the front elevation is a subject for conversation. They attempted to look at the property with Bridge Street as the frontage, then again with N. Riverview Street as the primary façade. Because there is a clear street presence, they decided to remain with Bridge Street as the primary façade. Vehicular egress to a garage was a major concern. To meet the setback requirements, the site itself governed where vehicular access could be provided. It could not be from Blacksmith Lane or Bridge Street, because of elevation changes. The only place for the garage was on the north side of the building with access to N. Riverview Street. That, however, necessitates a large driveway, which will cause them to exceed the lot coverage requirements. They tried to differentiate the historical structure from the large garage and ADU unit. Originally, the design included a 2-story hyphen, but it was reduced to a single-story with a flat roof. In regard to the size of the additions, they attempted to scale them back from the original house and follow the setback off Riverview to be more contextual with the existing neighborhood and share a street wall with the 3 properties to the north. They took the rooflines and pitches from the existing Gable Ell structure. The roof pitch was lowered on the major addition on the east. The carriage house sits two feet below the existing ridge of the Gable Ell. They are choosing to restore the historic privy at the rear of property. It sits within the roadway easement, and they do not contemplate demolition. The historic limestone stairs that extend to Blacksmith Lane have been integrated into the primary entranceway for the ADU. The porch columns, size and roof architecture are being integrated into the new addition.

Board Questions for the Applicant

Mr. Alexander inquired the reason the ADU must be so large.

Mr. Burke responded that was to provide additional dwelling space. They are interested in having the option for an in-law suite in the area above the garages. A 960-sq. foot area would accommodate a couple.

Mr. Alexander stated that it would be helpful going forward to present floor plans. If the Board is aware of what is occurring programmatically in the space, the logic of what is proposed is made clearer.

Ms. Cooper stated that the addition on the east façade would not be subordinate to the original structure. She inquired if they had considered positioning the proposed massing on the opposite, southwest side of the original structure.

Mr. Burke responded that because the intent is to retain the historical appearance of the structure, they assumed the front elevation should remain the front.

Mr. Alexander stated that the way the lot is designed, the front is on N. Riverview. This lot is unusual. The house site has an E. Bridge Street address, but the zoning indicates N. Blacksmith Lane is the rear lot line. He does not care which elevation is considered the front; however, the addition must be designed to be secondary and to support the house. As a design professional, he would have looked for where the addition could be built in a manner that supports the standards of the Historic District, and that would have been in the southwest corner that Ms. Cooper suggested. There, it would be subordinate to the existing structure, and the topography is to the architect's advantage. Structures are so tall on the other side of Blacksmith Lane that adding a tall addition there a distance from the home would tend to get lost in the mass of the other structures. He reiterated that it does not matter what is designated the front. What matters is how it supports the existing architecture.

Mr. Jewell agreed. As currently designed, the proposed addition engulfs the original structure, which can only be seen from E. Bridge Street.

Ms. Damaser stated that no one would look for the house on E. Bridge Street, and the original house cannot be seen from N. Riverview Street.

Mr. Alexander stated that, operationally, the design has made N. Riverview Street the front door. The house will be reached from the driveway access from that street.

Mr. Burke stated that is the only place to locate the driveway.

Mr. Alexander agreed, which supports the argument that N. Riverview should be considered the front of the home.

Ms. Cooper stated that the realistic approach is that the front of the structure will be N. Riverview. The current design for a large addition on the north and east sides does not meet any of the Code's subordination requirements.

Mr. Burke responded that because their approach was to use E. Bridge Street as the legal frontage, they scaled everything back from that frontage, placing the addition at the rear. The major elements of the house are the ell and the gabled roof. They provided separation and visual attention to the historic west facade by aligning the addition and access. From N. Blacksmith Lane and E. Bridge Street, the entire historic structure is visible. He assumes people walk along Bridge Street, and there is a set of stairs leading to/from the house.

Mr. Alexander stated that Bridge Street could still be used as the front of the home. However, the proposal may not be approved based on the fact that the addition in the proposed position is not subordinate to the house. He noted that the 17 and 27 N. Riverview proposals have placed additions behind the historic structures. From the designated fronts, the historic structures essentially are intact. If Mr. Burke wants to keep E. Bridge Street as the front, the addition must be placed behind it. However, there is not sufficient lot area there to do that. With very few exceptions, new additions in the Historic District have been added to the back. If an extension to the side is necessary, typically, it is a distance to the rear before it kicks out beyond the perimeter of the primary structure.

Mr. Jewell inquired if staff is aware of the renovation plans for the bridge. It may not be too far in the distant future, and he is concerned what the impact may be on Bridge Street.

Ms. Holt responded that Planning staff is in communication with Engineering staff about that project. Staff's understanding is that it will be only the bridge itself that will be reconstructed. No widening is anticipated.

Ms. Cooper inquired if it would remain the same height.

Ms. Holt responded affirmatively.

Mr. Alexander stated that the bridge is being re-designed. He advised the applicant to apprise himself of the plans regarding the bridge, as it would impact this property.

Mr. Burke responded that they have asked that numerous times, and they have not been made aware of any plans.

Mr. Alexander inquired if there is an anticipated timeframe for the bridge reconstruction.

Ms. Holt responded that she is not aware of that and has not seen any plans.

Mr. Burke stated that this property was City-owned for some time. He thought that staying with the original E. Bridge Street address was the more historical approach. Flipping it to N. Riverview Street ignores the structure's history. There is a historical wall on one side of the property.

Mr. Cotter stated that fundamentally, the massing that encompasses the historic structure is the primary issue. Both the Code and the Guidelines require new additions to be subordinate and add character to the historic structure. This proposal violates many of those requirements and guidelines.

Mr. Burke stated that to move forward, we need to begin to think of N. Riverview as the visual front of the house. In keeping the historical structure the primary focus, what would that allow to be added along Riverview Street? If the front door is there on the side of the house, would they be permitted to add a patio, for example?

Mr. Alexander responded that he could add a small porch that marks the front entry and creates some hierarchy on that elevation. That elevation needs something that indicates it is the front elevation, and if it is small, it will not detract from the remainder of the volume.

Mr. Burke stated that he is concerned about moving forward with that type of design, then in a few months the bridge construction begins.

Mr. Knapp stated that the east side is clearly a side elevation.

Mr. Alexander stated that the primary issue is the way the addition engulfs the house.

Mr. Cotter agreed. He is not saying whether the front door should be on N. Riverview or E. Bridge Street. However, his concern with what is proposed is that the addition has been placed on the east side and completely engulfs the house. It is not subordinate to the front. The applicant must identify a way to add an addition that is subordinate. The massing must fit with the existing structure.

Ms. Damaser stated that the Code requires hyphens between the old and new structures. The proposed wrap-around section is not separated by a hyphen, nor is it subordinate. The addition is large, close to the front and does not look like a minor addition. The addition should not be attached and must be smaller.

Mr. Alexander stated that the per the City's documents when the N. Riverview Street properties were sold, the City's stated intent was "to preserve the historic nature and mass of N. Riverview Street." The goal all along has been to continue to see these homes in their original context.

Public Comment

There were no public comments.

Board Discussion

Mr. Alexander reminded the applicant that they could return to the Board for as many Informal Reviews as they'd like. There are some suggestions from this meeting that may cause the applicant to have the plan re-designed, and that design also can be "tested" by the Board.

[5-minute break]

Mr. Alexander stated that the applicant has inquired if the bridge could be widened.

Mr. Cotter noted that the State owns the right-of-way.

Ms. Holt stated that she has not heard anything about widening the bridge; it would be a significant expense.

Mr. Alexander referred the Board members' attention to the Discussion Questions for response.

6) Does the Board support the orientation of the building, where E. Bridge Street is the front?

Board consensus was that they had no objection to orienting the building to retain E. Bridge Street as the front, as long as the design meets the Code and Guidelines of being subordinate to the historic structure and maintains the City's goal of preserving the historic nature and mass of N. Riverview. Variances would be necessary regardless of what approach is taken.

7) Does the Board support the lot coverage and ADU size Waivers?

Mr. Alexander stated that the difference between their lot coverage and the footprint is approximately 3,000 square feet. That is due to the significant amount of driveway payment. He noted that the applicant does not need to make the entire driveway 14 feet wide. Most of the driveway width could be reduced to 10 feet, widening near the garage to provide space for vehicular maneuverability. Reducing the driveway width would reduce the amount of a lot coverage waiver, if one is needed.

Consensus of members was that they would prefer the applicant attempt to meet Code and not require a lot coverage waiver.

Mr. Alexander inquired their responses regarding the ADU size waiver.

Mr. Jewell stated that at this time, he would not support the waiver. He would want to see the ADU floor plan and have better understanding of its use. The Code permits 800 square feet; the request is for 960 square feet. Per the discussion tonight, there may be other opportunities whereby this space would not be designated as an ADU.

Mr. Alexander stated that the primary issue is the building coverage. If it meets the building coverage requirements, he has no objection.

Members expressed consensus for flexibility with the ADU size waiver if the floorplans are provided and the usage is clarified.

8) Does the Board support the proposed mass, scale, and forms of the additions and their response to the Code and Guidelines? Would the Board support the roof pitch Waivers?

Consensus of the Board members was that the proposed mass of the addition wrapping around and hiding the original structure was an issue.

Mr. Burke stated that at the beginning of the discussion, Mr. Alexander inquired the reason this was being identified as an ADU as opposed to an addition. If it were located in the southwest corner near the stonewall, would that change this concern?

Ms. Damaser suggested that the applicant look into the requirements for an ADU and determine if it could be beneficial to change it something else.

Mr. Alexander noted that, for example, such additions have been called second primary suites. This is not an independent structure.

Mr. Jewell inquired if the definition was determined by the type of occupancy or how the unit would be utilized.

Ms. Holt responded that there are some occupancy limitations in the Code. There may also be some building code issues. It is very clear in the City's Historic Code that the ADU could be either an accessory structure or part of the primary structure. It is not necessary that the ADU be separate or separated by a hyphen.

Mr. Alexander noted that the proposed project contains many different roof forms and masses.

Board member consensus was that there were too many roof forms.

Mr. Cotter noted that the Board has encouraged applicants to minimize rooflines that are interacting on a single plane and to reduce the number of building materials. The goal is to achieve better harmony with the materials.

Mr. Jewell stated that if the rooflines are consistent, that type of waiver often is not needed.

Mr. Alexander stated that he wanted to reinforce one of the statements in the staff report, which is that extending the roofline of an original structure should be avoided. There would be no distinction between the original structure and the addition. On the north side, the gable is extended from the original structure. The Board would prefer to have the roof pitches be steep enough that they meet Code. In the past, there have been circumstances where a dormer was added to address that, but that solution is not for large surfaces or areas.

9) Does the Board have comments on the number and type of proposed materials?

Board member consensus was that the fewer building materials used, the better, and there must be differentiation between old and new materials. The shapes and proportions of windows should be addressed.

Mr. Alexander inquired if the applicant desired any additional input from the Board.

Mr. Burke stated that placing the addition in the southwest corner of the lot would place a bedroom near High Street, which is a busy street.

Mr. Alexander noted that there are ways to soundproof walls, such as adding double walls or utilizing triple pane glazing of windows to mitigate the street noise.

Mr. Burke inquired if the additions were located completely behind the east elevation of the existing home, it appears that massing attached to the side of the home would be less of an issue.

Ms. Cotter responded that it is essential to differentiate the subordinate addition from the original structure.

Ms. Cooper stated that a hyphen could be used between the original structure and the ADU to the south. The addition then would appear subordinate to the original structure. In doing that, N. Riverview could be designated as the front façade. It may be easier to achieve the subordinate nature of the addition.

Mr. Alexander noted that once the addition is located sufficiently to the rear of the house with a hyphen, there is more flexibility.

COMMUNICATIONS

- Ms. Holt noted that a copy of the final Alternative Materials document has been provided to board members tonight. The document is also posted at the City ARB webpage. It will be regularly used as a resource. The intent is to update it annually.
- Ms. Holt stated that she heard from all Board members that October 16, 2024 was an acceptable day for scheduling the next ARB project site tour.
- Board members thanked staff for the list of recent Administratively Approved projects, as it provided clarity on how the Administrative Approval process is being used.
- The next regular ARB meeting is scheduled for May 29, 2024, 6:30 pm. Because Mr. Alexander's term is expiring, that will be his last ARB meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:20 p.m.


Chair, Architectural Review Board


Assistant Clerk of Council