



MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, August 23, 2023

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Alexander, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and welcomed everyone to the August 23, 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,
Michael Jewell

Staff members present: Sarah Holt, Bassem Bitar, Taylor Mullinax, Rati Singh, Shawn Krawetzski

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Damaser moved, Mr. Cotter seconded acceptance of the documents into the record and approval of the 07-26-23 ARB minutes.

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

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

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

CASES

- **Case 23-071: Ferris-Wright Historical Garden, PID: 273-013220, Minor Project Review**

A proposal for installation of a fence at an existing park to preserve a historic garden on a 13.39-acre site located north of the intersection of Wright Way and Emerald Parkway, zoned R-1, Restricted Suburban Residential District.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Mullinax stated that this is a request for review of a Minor Project for installation of a fence at an existing park to preserve a historic garden at Ferris Wright Park. The 13.39-acre site is located north of the intersection of Wright Way and Emerald Parkway. The property is zoned R-1, Restricted Suburban Residential District. The site is located outside of the Historic District and is an Appendix G property, which is within ARB's purview. The site is surrounded by single-family homes to the north and east and vacant land to the west. As Envision Dublin, the City's Community Plan update, is developed, City Council has adopted Interim Land Use Principles to guide development during this transition. The following principles apply to this request:

1. Think Comprehensively. Plan for the Big Picture. The project aligns with the approved Holder-Wright Farm and Earthworks Master Plan and the historical gardens featured in the plan.
2. Start with the Public Realm. The project preserves an important historic landscape and protects the garden for public educational opportunities.
3. Protect and Enhance our Historic and Cultural Resources. The project helps protect and celebrate the historic landscape and culture by allowing a typical vegetable garden to be demonstrated for visitors.

Ms. Mullinax that that over the years, this site has been inhabited by various occupants including indigenous people of the Hopewell era, modern Native American tribes (Wyandotte), and the Ferris farmhouse and farm. The Wyandotte Nation continues to support the interpretations of the park's indigenous history. In 2010, the City acquired the land to establish a park. Subsequently, the Holder Wright Farm and Earthworks Master Plan was created. Early phases of the park were implemented, and later, the park was renamed. Ms. Mullinax displayed a photo of the existing historical gardens facing west and facing north toward the farmhouse. The City's Parks and Recreation Division is partnering with an Eagle Scout to construct protective fencing around three historic gardens with the intent to add additional garden beds within the enclosure south of the farmhouse. The Wyandotte Nation Cultural Center has gifted the City of Dublin rare heirloom seed to be included as part of the educational opportunities within the proposed gardens. The fence will protect the rare seed and plantings from animals while allowing high visibility of the gardens. Per the Historic District Code Section 153.173(I), fences are permitted between the principal structure on a lot and the front, side and/or rear property lines and shall not exceed four feet in height or be more than fifty percent opaque, unless otherwise approved by the Board. Due to the value of the seeds within the gardens, staff is supportive of the proposed 5-foot fence height to protect the contents from intruding deer. The Historic Design Guidelines Section 6.4 (E, G, H) states that the design and materials of new fencing should be traditional in character and have painted or opaque stained wood rather than leaving it natural. The proposed 5-foot black welded wire fence contains 4" x 4" x 5' cedar posts. A 1" x 6" cedar top rail will secure the wiring around the fence perimeter. The fence gates contain black, self-closing hinges and a flip gate latch to lock the gate. The proposed natural cedar will weather to a gray color over time. A high style, painted fence, as the Guidelines suggest, is not appropriate

here. The proposed materials are rustic and traditional for historic homesteads. The fence style is utilitarian and similar to the character of vernacular fences. It is also the least intrusive fence type capable of protecting the value of the heirloom seeds. Staff has reviewed the application against the criteria and recommends approval with one condition.

Board Questions for Staff

Mr. Jewell inquired if the unpainted fence would be allowed to age naturally, although the Guidelines indicate otherwise.

Ms. Mullinax responded affirmatively.

Applicant Presentation

Shawn Krawetzski, City Parks and Recreation Department stated that staff has not yet received the heirloom seeds. They wanted to ensure there would be a fence, so that the valuable seeds would be protected when received. The food that will be grown there will go to the Dublin Food Pantry.

Public Comment

There were no public comments.

Board Discussion

Board members had no additional comments or questions.

Mr. Jewell moved, Ms. Damaser seconded approval of the Minor Project with one (1) condition:

- 1) The applicant apply for and obtain a Certificate of Zoning Plan Approval through the Planning Division

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

- **Case 23-081: Alternative Materials, Administrative Request**

A request to supplement the Historic Design Guidelines with a guide for property owners, staff, and the Board regarding the appropriate choice of alternative building materials within the Historic District and Appendix G properties. Alternative materials refers to the use of a non-traditional, synthetic material in place of an original material or modern materials used on new construction.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Holt stated that the Alternative Materials project originally was part of the Pre-Approved Paint Colors project, which was approved in March 2022, but during that process, it was separated for further study. In June of 2022, the Board confirmed that the Alternative Materials project was a continued topic of interest, and since that time, staff has been working with Preservation Designs Ltd (PDL) on drafting appropriate language. This project coordinates with the Pre-Approved Paint Color project, using the same layout and timeline analysis for consistency; both supplement the Code and the Historic Design Guidelines. Ms. Holt briefly reviewed the contents of the document.

The document emphasizes repair of existing materials over replacement while also describing where new materials might be used appropriately. Materials are also analyzed for their benefits and shortcomings. The document addresses contributing versus non-contributing structures, the waiver process, types of materials, brand names and manufacturers, Dublin architectural forms and styles spreadsheet, and material timelines. Of the proposed materials, staff is specifically requesting the Board's consideration of the use of fiberglass or fiberglass composite windows and doors.

Staff has provided the following discussion questions:

- 1) Is the draft Alternative Materials document what the Board was envisioning?
- 2) Are there additions or modifications that should be further investigated?
- 3) What is the Board's opinion about fiberglass and fiberglass composite windows and doors for the Historic District, based on the text on pages 25 – 27 and 32 - 36? Would the Board like to consider this an acceptable material, or should waivers be possible for new construction, for example?
- 4) Other considerations by the Board.

Board Questions/Discussion

Mr. Alexander stated that because of the length of the document, it was not considered appropriate to ask board members to read it and mark suggested revisions within the four days since it was provided in the meeting packet. Therefore, the Board will discuss the general topics tonight and defer more detailed discussion of the document to the next meeting.

Ms. Damaser requested an electronic version of the Word version of the document for ease of editing online.

Ms. Cooper and Mr. Cotter requested printed copies for their editing purposes. Ms. Cooper noted that with her review, she might provide a list of suggested changes.

Mr. Alexander directed the members' attention to the first question regarding whether this was the type of Alternative Materials document the Board was envisioning.

Mr. Cotter responded that it was more expansive than he anticipated. The format is acceptable, but he might need assistance in interpretation of the more technical terms. Architects would appreciate the level of detail, but he would need to review it more thoroughly to gain a better understanding of how to use the document effectively.

Mr. Jewell stated that at this point, he has conducted only a preliminary review of the document. The Table of Contents and glossary at the back were very helpful.

Mr. Alexander stated that as an architect, he thought the document was far too complicated. It could be significantly simplified. The document does not need to include materials that the Board would not consider nor has ever seen. One of the most helpful sections in it is Section V, which lays out the grounds or rules for approving an alternative material. He believes that as it is, the document would be difficult for the general public to use. If it were significantly simplified, it would be a more useful tool.

Ms. Cooper stated that she has skimmed through the document and found it to be too detailed. She believes there are too many variables with each property to say a material will never be approved.

Mr. Alexander stated that it is important to point out that we are not creating a pre-approved material list. It will still be essential to bring alternative materials to the Board for consideration. The alternative materials list provides flexibility, if desired, but the Board has the final word.

Ms. Cooper stated that it is somewhat misleading to provide a list of "approval materials" and "not approvable materials".

Mr. Alexander inquired if she is stating that the list wording should not give the impression that the materials would automatically be approved.

Ms. Cooper responded that the Board has experienced that issue in previous hearings, when a property owner has argued that because a material was approved for another property, it should be approved for his property, as well. Making the public aware that there are products that could be considered is a good idea, but placing them in previously approved materials and materials that have not been approved is misleading. However, at this point, she has not thoroughly reviewed the document.

Ms. Damaser stated that she is not supportive of listing an alternative material, which the Board would be disinclined to approve. She inquired how updates to the document would occur in the future.

Ms. Holt responded that she envisions an annual review/update of the document.

Mr. Alexander stated that he believes it is essential to provide a very clear standard upon which materials decisions will be made. If the Board approves new materials, they can be provided in the document update. It should be possible to use this document as a type of bible.

Mr. Alexander inquired if there were any other modifications the members believe should be considered.

[Members indicated that they had none at this time.]

Mr. Alexander stated that in the past, Council has talked about the community's environmental stewardship. There is very little in the document about sustainable materials. Many of the materials listed are alternatives to wood, yet wood is probably the most sustainable material that could be used in the projects. The list of materials provided have different environmental impacts. Should that element be included in this document, or would it be too much to include?

Mr. Alexander directed the Board's attention to Question 3 regarding their opinion about fiberglass and fiberglass composite windows and doors for the historic district. The document includes one material, which he believes was an Andersen's product, that was denied because of our existing standards. Would the Board like to consider that as an acceptable material?

Mr. Jewell stated that he would like to know more about the material. He believes Fibrex has a low heat point, which could require awareness and necessary precautions for fire safety.

Mr. Alexander pointed out that Fiberglass is pure and Fibrex is a blend.

Mr. Jewell stated that a good deal of research likely has already been done on the material, so there should be available information regarding the associated fire standards.

Mr. Alexander stated that traditional wood windows have a more detailed profile. Some Architectural Review Boards have considered the fiberglass Marvin and Pella windows because their profiles were similar to historic windows. In the document, the consultant has added a definition that the proposed material must appear almost indistinguishable from the historic material upon inspection. It also must maintain its appearance and function for a considerable duration. The fiberglass windows are much more sustainable than vinyl windows. He believes potentially they could meet the standard.

Board members indicated that they would be open to consideration of the fiberglass material if staff would provide information on the material's longevity and sustainability.

Ms. Holt responded that staff would obtain that information for the Board's consideration.

Mr. Alexander stated that the staff is also working on the definitions for Contributing and Non-Contributing Structures. Changes in those definitions could impact the Alternatives Materials document.

Ms. Holt responded that staff is working on those definitions in the month of September. However, she does not believe changes in those definitions would change how the Alternative Materials document would work.

She requested board members to provide their recommendations in advance of the September 27 meeting.

COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Holt reminded the Board of the following upcoming events.

- Consultant Greg Dale, McBride Dale Clarion, is working on a draft Code update for the City re Contributing vs. Non-Contributing Structures and Demolition criteria. Public meetings for discussion of this topic will be scheduled in September and October 2023.
- A Community Plan - Special Area Plans Open House will be held 6-8 pm, Tuesday, August 29 at the Development Building, 5200 Emerald Parkway.
- A Council-PZC-ARB-BZA joint work session is scheduled for 6-8 pm, Wednesday, August 30 in the Council Chamber building; dinner will be provided at 5:30 pm.
- An ARB tour of completed project sites within the Historic District, an Appendix G site and the log cabin construction in process at the Dublin Arts Council site is scheduled for September 20. A map and information packet will be provided to Board members before that date.
- The 2023 Heritage Ohio Conference will be held October 10-12 in Dayton, Ohio. Any members interested in attending the conference should contact the Clerk.
- The next regular ARB meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, September 27.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:21 p.m.

Chair, Architectural Review Board

Assistant Clerk of Council