



MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, November 15, 2023

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Alexander, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and welcomed everyone to the November 15, 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, Rati Singh, Bassem Bitar

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Jewell moved, Ms. Cooper seconded acceptance of the documents into the record and approval of the 10-25-23 ARB minutes.

Vote: Ms. Cooper, yes; Mr. Jewell, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Ms. Damaser, 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 23-102ARB-INF – 55 S. Riverview Street, Informal Review**

Informal Review and of a Proposed Demolition of a Contributing Detached Garage and Construction of an Attached Garage with Living Space.

Case Presentation

Ms. Holt stated that the site is located at the corner of S. Blacksmith Lane, Spring Hill Lane and S. Riverview Street. It is zoned Historic District-Historic Residential (HD-HR) and is adjacent to the Historic South as well as Historic Core zoning districts. The large lot contains a vernacular style house constructed around 1900 with an addition constructed in 2008. The Historic and Cultural Assessment (HCA) indicates a stonewall, of which the owner is unaware. An existing garage faces S. Blacksmith Lane, which currently is listed as contributing in the HCA, although this is likely a misclassification as noted in staff's report. The applicant has the opportunity to request a waiver to reclassify it at the Minor Project Review. This is pertinent because the applicant would like to demolish the garage to make room for an addition. Ms. Holt shared the proposed site plan. All setbacks and lot coverage requirements are met at this stage of the project. The gable forms on the addition and windows meet Code requirements. There is a gable decoration that would require a waiver and the Board is asked to comment on that element. It matches the elements that are on the existing front porch. The applicant is proposing to use a standing seam roof on the hyphen and bay window. The elevation showing the access point from S. Blacksmith Lane shows two garage doors and a cross gable with four windows. All lighting and materials will be addressed at Minor Project Review (MPR).

Applicant Presentation

Dominic Luppino, CPBD Residential Designed Solutions, 7844 Flint Road, Columbus, stated that he had no new comments but was available for questions.

Mr. Jewell stated that he did not see a stonewall on the west edge of the site. He is aware of an existing stonewall that runs along the south side adjacent to the flowerbed.

Angela Kne, 55 S. Riverview Street, Dublin, homeowner, stated that she is aware of that wall but it does not seem historic. She added that she and her husband are available for any questions.

Board Questions

Mr. Jewell asked if the large tree on the site would be protected. Ms. Kne confirmed that the tree would be preserved.

Mr. Jewell stated that there was discussion about the roof needing to be replaced. Mrs. Kne stated that they would be replacing the entire roof less the mudroom area and they intend for the shingles to be consistent with the original house.

Mr. Cotter asked about the windows facing the south side on the hyphen. Mr. Luppino stated that there is a door and transom with access to an existing patio.

Mr. Cotter asked about the decorative element on the gable. Mr. Luppino stated that there is a decorative element on the porch that they would like to mimic. Mrs. Kne explained that there is Victorian-style millwork on the front porch that was added in the 1990s. They would like to mimic that on the gable.

Ms. Cooper asked for clarification on the decorative element on the front part of the home. Mrs. Kne stated that there is so much character on the street and they would like to enhance and add character where possible to the home. Ms. Cooper requested confirmation that the porch was a later addition. Mrs. Kne stated that the porch was added in 1991. It is a nice feature and they

would like to pull in those decorative elements on the remainder of the home. She was informed by staff that there could be some leeway on the addition.

Mr. Alexander asked what consideration was given to potential impact on the neighbor to the south. Mrs. Kne stated that the neighbor has a detached one-car garage and is supportive of the project.

Mr. Alexander asked the reason the addition was placed directly behind the structure rather than offsetting it. This is a large lot with ample space. Mr. Luppino stated it is a requirement in the Historic District Design Guidelines that the addition be fully behind the principal structure. Mr. Alexander stated that the Board has approved others that are not fully behind. Mr. Luppino stated that the owners also would like to keep as much lawn space as possible. They want the addition attached to the home.

Mr. Cotter stated that the neighbor to the south then ends up in a canyon. Mr. Alexander stated that the Board heard concerns about that at the last meeting. Mr. Luppino shared that in previous iterations, the addition was proposed to be more northward and staff advised moving to this design.

Public Comment

No public comments were received on the case.

Board Discussion

Mr. Alexander asked the Board about their position on the demolition of the garage. Mr. Jewell stated that he was comfortable with demolition of the garage. Ms. Damaser agreed. She inquired if the Board would need to approve a waiver in order to change the identification of the garage from contributing to a non-contributing structure. Ms. Holt confirmed that it would and stated that the process would be part of the Minor Project Review.

Mr. Alexander asked if staff was confident that the garage was non-contributing. Ms. Holt stated that it is difficult to tell when it was built. Staff has not been able to locate any building permits. In 2007, it shows up on Google Maps. Mr. Alexander asked if the framing is exposed in the garage. Mr. Luppino stated that his approximation was given based on construction materials. They indicated to him that the garage was built after the depression but prior to when roof trusses were used. He surmised it was built sometime in the 1940s to 1960. Mr. Alexander asked if the Historical Society has records regarding the garage. Mr. Jewell stated that he is unaware of information or concerns regarding the garage. Mr. Alexander summarized that the Board would have no problem with the demolition of the garage, if it were clearly non-contributing.

Mr. Alexander asked the Board for feedback regarding the scale, massing, and location of the addition.

Mr. Cotter stated that the Board has reviewed and approved many buildings similar to this project in scale and massing. The massing and scale are less of a concern than the impact to the neighbor.

Mr. Alexander stated that sliding the addition over would provide more exposure between the subject lot and the northwest. This location creates a tunnel about which he continues to have reservations.

Mr. Jewell stated that many of those lots are long, skinny and not conducive to expansion. Mr. Alexander noted that the subject lot is larger than the typical lot.

Mr. Luppino stated that the large tree on the renderings is on the south side of the property. The fence is four or five feet from the property line. The existing garage is much closer to the property line than it appears.

Mr. Alexander stated that he would support a variance for a two-story detached garage because it would be more in character with the Historic District.

Michael Kne, 55 S. Riverview Street, Dublin, stated that they came before the Board in 2019 and had a detached garage approved. Since then, there was a traffic survey done on the back alley and it identified 1,100 cars/day there. With two small children, they wanted to move the addition to provide space and distance from vehicular traffic.

Ms. Cooper stated that she understands why the applicants proposed this addition in a linear fashion based on current rules and processes. She also appreciates that they do have a larger lot. She feels it may be more interesting if the addition were offset; however, that is not to say that she would not support a linear design as submitted.

Ms. Damaser stated that from the front of the house, offsetting the addition could give the look of a historic outbuilding. Ms. Cooper clarified that because the hyphen would run straight, the addition would be offset. Mr. Alexander stated that the addition will be set quite far back and likely will not affect the front. He is not advocating that the entire addition be moved. He would just suggest a portion be moved to create more space so that it does not feel like a tunnel is being created. Some municipal codes have a long wall provision, and they do everything to dissuade the creation of those long walls. Ms. Damaser stated that she does not like all the tunnels. She understands the reason the applicant submitted this design and would be open to other options.

Mr. Cotter stated that it seems the Board has no objection to the remainder of the mass. The height is consistent with what has been approved before. From a massing standpoint, he is supportive. Mr. Jewell agreed.

Ms. Damaser inquired if it meets Code requirements as proposed. Ms. Holt answered affirmatively.

Mr. Cotter stated that he is not sure he understands the decorative element in the gable. Ms. Kne stated that she likes the detail and would like to add character and improve the aesthetics of the house. The intent is to replicate the corner detail of the porch on the gable.

Ms. Cooper asked if the applicant was proposing additions on the front gable. Mrs. Kne stated that she understands nothing can be added to the historical building but that there is more flexibility on the addition.

Mr. Alexander stated that one of the challenges with this home and others in the district is the vernacular style. They are simpler structures. The goal is to maintain the style. The porch is not typical of a vernacular house. Those types of homes do not have a lot of detail and fretwork. It is

difficult to approve additional detail not true to the style of home. We also do not advocate fake historical detail. Board and batten style siding comes from vernacular structures. The designer's intent of making the additions distinct using that material is great. The Board may be able to agree to simpler gable trim on the addition. However, applying Victorian detail to the addition would be a problem. Mrs. Kne stated that it would tie into the porch. Mr. Alexander stated that there might be a simplified way of accomplishing that. In his view, it should not be a literal application of the ornamental detail on a new structure.

Mr. Alexander stated that since the Board approves some gable vents, City Council has made a commitment that everything be as sustainable as possible. Environmentalists say that vinyl is the next asbestos. He believes the Board should be questioning if using products that contain foam are appropriate due to sustainability issues. The Board should be cognizant of that aspect of the materials.

Mr. Luppino asked what the Board would consider an appropriate offset to eliminate that tunnel effect. He will have to come up with a design that incorporates his clients' need for yard space and the Board's desire to eliminate the tunnel effect. He asked if the Board still recommends access to the garage be off S. Blacksmith Lane. The owners would prefer to have driveway access as far from the corner as possible. The Board offered consensus for the driveway access remaining on Blacksmith Lane. Mr. Alexander suggested locating the addition eight feet north of the proposed location would provide some relief. Mr. Luppino stated that they are proposing to remove much of the concrete to the south. They would like to separate the driveways. Mr. Alexander stated that if the plan comes back exactly as it is, some members of the Board would have issues with the siting. Mrs. Kne stated that the Board's feedback is helpful because it is not what they heard from staff. She asked if there is concern regarding access across from the coffee shop.

Ms. Hot indicated that staff would provide Engineering contact information to the applicant.

This was an Informal Review; therefore, no action was taken.

- **Case 23-096ARB-INF – 16-22 N. High Street, Informal Review**

Informal Review of a Proposed 3-Story Mixed-Use Building in the Historic District.

Case Presentation

Ms. Singh explained that this request is for an informal review of a new mixed-use building. The 0.26-acre site is located northeast of the intersection of North High Street and East Bridge Street. The site is zoned Historic District, Historic Core. There have been several applications for Minor Project Reviews on the site in the past. Details were provided in the staff report. Both buildings are individually listed on the National Register of Historic Places. 16 N. High Street was originally built as a single family home in 1843. Its current use is commercial. 22 N. High Street was built circa 1900 as a doctor's office and is currently used as a commercial building. Ms. Singh shared photos of existing conditions showing a detached garage in disrepair located at the rear of the property. At the rear of 16 N. High Street is the dirt floor shed. The site has a significant grade change from west to east. The applicant proposes to demolish both the garage and the dirt floor shed. There also is an asphalt driveway that the applicant proposes to deconstruct. The proposal

is for a mixed-use building with approximately 2,000 square feet of first floor space. The building would front on North High Street. Vehicular access is proposed from Blacksmith Lane. Six parking spaces are proposed for commercial use. The applicant proposes two 1,700-SF apartments on the second and third floors. Proposed materials include a combination of limestone walls, wood shake siding, wood siding, and a standing seam metal roof.

Ms. Singh shared the 3D model created by GIS staff.

Mr. Alexander asked if the language regarding number of colors in the Guidelines pertains to new builds. Ms. Holt stated that guidance regarding pre-approved paint colors is provided in the Guidelines. Three colors are the maximum number permitted.

Applicant Presentation

Joe Trepicone, Architect, Trepicone + Associates Architects, 600 Stonehenge Parkway, Floor 2, Dublin, thanked the Board and staff for their time and feedback. He shared that the GIS model shows an unfortunate view of the project. It would have been nice to see a more realistic view with the context. The pocket park is an opportunity for pedestrians to enter the site. Blacksmith Lane development to the east and north provided a major opportunity to them. Upon meeting with staff, they realized this building has two equally important fronts, one from High Street and one from Blacksmith Lane. The site has some challenges and opportunities. The main challenge is the grade change. That caused the two front elevations to have a conflict. The three-story building from High Street and Blacksmith Lane still had to adhere to the 30-foot height requirement, which is why the dormer was placed on the west side. More space could then be captured for the luxury apartments. Garages have been provided, which are necessary for this price point. Mr. Trepicone suggested that the building be considered from the pedestrian point of view. They recognize the site as one of the most historic sites in the area. The applicants are open to suggestion with regard to the colors. Contextually appropriate materials were chosen, but they are open to suggestions. Their intent is to have a dialogue to determine how best this development could be an integral part of the community.

Public Comment

No public comments were received on the case.

Board Questions/Discussion

Mr. Cotter asked how the industrial building integrates with this project. Mr. Trepicone explained that the intent is to look over that building and see the bridge and the new development. Mr. Cotter asked about the proposed stone material. Mr. Trepicone stated it would be a retaining wall integrated into the design.

Mr. Jewell asked for more information about the four-door garage. Ms. Holt stated that it is concrete block. Staff had an application to demolish the structure from the previous owner that did not make it to this board. It is built into the slope. It has concrete block on the back three walls. The front is a wood façade with rolling doors. Like most outbuildings, it was not a part of the 2017 Historic and Cultural Assessment. Staff is looking to remedy that with phase two of the Historic Code update that is anticipated in 2024. There is not much information regarding the structure, which is in poor condition. Mr. Trepicone stated that the block structure is sound. It appears there was a structure

above it. Historically, this site was owned by one of the founders of Dublin, an eye doctor, who had his practice in one building and residence in the other.

Mr. Jewell asked about their communications with COhatch.

Ann Adams, Project Representative, Coldwell Banker Realty, 960 N. Hamilton Road, Columbus, stated that they did not hear back from COhatch.

Mr. Alexander asked what the plan would be if they are unable to place windows on the north side. Mr. Trepicone stated there are many windows throughout the building. If they are able to keep windows in the residential areas on the north, south, and west facades, that would be sufficient. Mr. Alexander explained that those decisions are not the purview of the ARB but are determined by the Building Code. Mr. Trepicone stated that they have not yet done a full evaluation with Code requirements.

Board Discussion

Mr. Alexander asked for the Board's input on demolition of the two structures.

Mr. Cotter stated that they are non-contributing and in very poor shape, so he is comfortable with the demolition. Ms. Damaser agreed. Mr. Jewell agreed. The Board offered consensus in support of demolition of the two structures.

Mr. Trepicone stated that though they did not do a tree survey, he marked each tree with a laser. There are many trees, several of which are in bad locations. They want to keep all trees worth salvaging on the south property line.

Mr. Alexander asked for feedback from the Board regarding the proposed use.

Mr. Cotter stated that he is supportive of residential and office use. The Board agreed. Ms. Damaser noted that the Board approved 36-38 N. High for a residential use. The Board offered consensus in support of the proposed use.

Mr. Alexander introduced the topic of massing.

Mr. Jewell stated that we do not know where the COhatch development is going yet. There are homes that were sold privately so we do not know who is taking control of them. This proposal is different from 36-38 N. High Street. He is concerned that this structure will take the view away from existing private residences directly behind it.

Ms. Damaser asked if those properties are required to remain residential. Ms. Holt stated that there is no limitation placed in the property sale documents. An owner could apply to rezone. Ms. Damaser stated that the proposed building feels massive. It is higher than surrounding structures, although it meets regulations for the area. Ms. Singh stated that the total height on High Street is 30' and meets Code requirements.

Mr. Jewell stated that the height of the residence at 28 High Street is 28 feet 4 inches.

Mr. Alexander stated the COhatch structure is comparable; however, the site conditions are different because that structure is on a street and this is on an alley. Therefore, the scale and mass of COhatch seemed appropriate. The proposals that have come before the Board for consideration

from Oscar's have been substantial. The development scale across the alley is small residential. The Bridge Street Pizza is a 3-story flat roof building but is on a major arterial. He has some concerns with the proposed height.

Ms. Damaser stated that a three-story building seems out of place.

Mr. Cotter noted that anything placed on the alley would be large; the question is how to soften that. Everything from the back of this site feels too big.

Mr. Trepicone asked about lowering the building height on the east side to two stories and sloping it up to the COhatch building. That would reduce the size of apartments and the mass from the pedestrian level. The dilemma is there is 12 feet of grade change to make up between the front and back of the building.

Mr. Alexander stated that he would not use COhatch as a model. This will be across from one-story structures on the alley. He suggested that the Board may entertain reducing the building height on the alley side by one floor. A building that is two different heights might be something they would entertain.

Mr. Alexander asked for the Board's thoughts on the proposed access.

Mr. Cotter stated that the access from the alley would be challenging.

Mr. Jewell stated that Blacksmith Lane eventually would be a different concept. The applicant is trying to create pedestrian traffic, which is consistent with the goals for this District.

Mr. Alexander noted they would need dumpsters/trash pickup. Mr. Jewell stated that this configuration is not conducive to trash removal.

Mr. Alexander asked about flipping the plan to locate the drive on the north side of the site, which would be further from the congestion that could occur. Mr. Trepicone stated they considered shifting it to the south. However, the existing structure is cut into the hillside. It would be difficult to regrade the site; the cost would be prohibitive. Mr. Alexander stated that engineering staff will provide their assessment, and their view will be less subjective. He suggested having those conversations early in the design process. He advised the applicant to look at the plan for the alley. It is unsafe for pedestrians to pass through the site unless there are sidewalks. Mr. Trepicone stated he is under the impression that Blacksmith Lane would be one-way and have pedestrian access. Ms. Holt stated that staff is in the process of getting a traffic study; determinations have not been made yet.

Mr. Alexander asked for input from the Board regarding materials.

Mr. Cotter stated that it appears too complex. He advised cutting back on the number of colors. This should integrate with the design across the street.

Mr. Jewell suggested reducing the number of colors and being more consistent with materials.

Mr. Alexander summarized the Board's feedback by stating that the proposed structure is too big. Mr. Jewell suggested the applicant bring back options for review. They would like a rendering showing the site from the east.

Discussion continued regarding options to reduce the massing of the structure.

- **Case 23-096 – Tucci's Signs**

Case was postponed at the request of the applicant.

- **Case 23-116ARB – 119 S. High Street, Demolition**

Request for demolition of an existing outbuilding located within Historic Dublin.

Case Presentation

Ms. Holt stated that the subject site is located in the Historic District, Historic South zoning district. The structure under consideration is at the rear of 119 South High Street. The area directly west is zoned residential. The outbuilding is located in the parking lot adjacent to Mill Lane. It is not within the Mill Lane right-of-way as many outbuildings are. The building is an approximately 560 square foot, L-shaped structure likely constructed at two different times and joined together. The primary structure on the site is the Paulus House along with the Carriage step with the owner's name inscribed. The main portion of the outbuilding is likely a chicken coop and the smaller portion is a well house. There are various Code sections and Guidelines that apply to this request. Outbuildings are not typically identified as contributing or non-contributing. Therefore, staff has determined it to be non-contributing with concurrence from the Law Director. Code Section 153.176(j)(5)(b) applies to demolition. There is a lesser threshold for non-contributing than for contributing structures. Also applicable is Section 153.178 regarding maintenance, where structures within the district are to be provided sufficient care, maintenance and upkeep to prevent destruction by deterioration. Finally, Section 4.13 of the Historic Design Guidelines speaks to outbuildings being repaired or retained. Ms. Holt shared the demolition criteria for non-contributing structures. The requirement is that one of the three criteria must be met for demolition. Criterion #1 is related to economic hardship. No information was provided regarding economic hardship. One of the criteria is deliberate neglect and inadequate maintenance should be avoided. This is evident at the site. Criterion #2 is that the structure contain no features of architectural, historic, or archaeological significance. This structure does add character to Mill Lane and the District as a whole. Its removal would be contrary to Historic Design Guidelines Section 4.13. Replacement of the structure with grass will not add to the character of the District. Staff recommends disapproval of the demolition.

Mr. Alexander stated staff has made it clear this application does not meet Criteria 2 and 3. For Criterion #1, the applicant would have to show the repairs needed, the costs for those repairs, and the market value of the property. Ms. Holt stated that the applicant has the opportunity to choose any of the three criteria, and it is their responsibility to make that case to staff and then the Board.

Applicant Presentation

Nancy Davis, Property Manager for 119 S. High Street, 1480 Dublin Road, Columbus, stated that she has been involved with this property since the late 1990s. The current owner, Richard Toberen,

could not make it because he was not feeling well. She wanted to make the Board aware of the building's history. 119 S. High Street has been with the current owners' family since the turn of the century. Records on the parcel sheets show that the Smiths owned this property in 1920. The current owners are relatives of the Smith family. Four generations of this family have owned this property. The contributing property is the house, which also has been a bakery and a coffee shop. The outbuilding has never been considered anything more than a storage shed. There is evidence of a cistern near the back porch, so she is not sure the well would have been that far away. The property is located on a landscaped lot. The historic inventory description does not mention a well house. Information from the early 1920s indicates the addition of a garage. She does not feel that there is clear evidence of what was in this building. The structure has concrete, plywood and dirt floors. She could see no evidence of a well. While the family loves this property and has owned it for over 100 years, the shed has not been considered to be of significance and is in disrepair. There was discussion about the shed at the end of last year precipitated by the owner receiving City orders in July indicating repairs were required. Staff has been very helpful, but the process has been cumbersome and confusing. There is economic hardship. The owner is a retired individual living on a fixed income. They met with staff last month. She does not have knowledge of what is required at this time. The property is sentimental to the owners, but the shed is not sentimental and is non-conforming. It has not been an income-producing element of the property. The owners would prefer to demolish it and trying to repair it could be an economic hardship. She thanked the Board for their time.

Dyan Reckner, Business Owner and Renter, 119 S. High Street, Dublin, stated that she has worked in Old Dublin for 17½ years and has been a salon owner for 3½ years. As a small business owner, her costs keep rising. There is a lot of big business moving in. She currently has four independent business owners who are renting space and needs another two to defray her costs. The shed is taking up commercial space. It is very hard to find parking in Old Dublin. A great aspect of this site is that they have some parking but she needs to grow her business. It is such a pretty area behind the main structure. If that building were taken down and trees were planted, it would add aesthetic value to that lane. People walk that lane often, and it is difficult for a vehicle to pull out and turn left where the shed as it totally blocks the view. It would be beneficial to her as a business owner to have room to grow and remain in business.

Public Comment

No public comments were received on the case.

Board Questions/Discussion

Mr. Alexander asked the applicant if they understood the reason for staff's recommendation for disapproval. Ms. Davis stated that she understands now, after spending most of the day doing research. This process was rushed because we were told to complete the required paperwork. When they met with staff, they were told that if they failed to meet the deadlines, the consequences could be violations; so their application was rushed. She does believe that she could show hardship. She needed guidance, but when she requested help from staff, she received an email with a link that opened a 30-page document full of legal Code language. She followed the process as required and it has taken several months. They have secured and stabilized the structure.

Ms. Damaser asked about the timeline. Ms. Holt stated that this discussion started last October. The building was open and unsecured, which is a Code violation and liability to the owner. Code Enforcement became involved and letters were sent. Since the owners still want to demolish the structure, the remedy is to come before this Board and seek their approval for demolition. Staff provided a deadline for this meeting, which was not met.

Mr. Alexander asked if there was a financial penalty yet. Ms. Holt explained that staff did not want this structure to go through another winter and be demolished without the benefit of a permit. The desire was for this to be resolved for both the City and owner's benefit.

Mr. Alexander asked if someone on staff would be willing to meet personally with Ms. Davis. Ms. Holt stated they have met with the applicant and provided the summary requirement checklist for demolition; the result is the application before the Board for consideration this evening.

Ms. Davis stated that she was unaware of communication from staff from October of 2022. Staff provided a detailed history of communication with the applicant beginning with a phone conversation about demolition in October of 2022.

Discussion was held regarding the consideration process and the applicant's options such as appeal or postponement.

Ms. Cooper stated that it seems that nothing happened for a period of time and inaction resulted in City orders that this structure is in violation of City Code. The property is in the Architectural Review District, which requires further scrutiny. This Board was not provided information regarding repairs or architectural significance. The Board's job is to preserve the historic nature of the District and buildings therein.

Ms. Davis asked about criterion #3 regarding impeding orderly development. Mr. Alexander stated that the structure is not in the alley right-of-way, so it is not disrupting traffic. Ms. Reckner reiterated that this is a commercial area. Ms. Damaser stated that the Board is charged with preserving the history and development of the area. Ms. Reckner stated that she believes it distracts from the beauty of the area. Mr. Alexander stated that the lack of maintenance is the distraction. Ms. Reckner noted that many sheds in the area have been demolished. Mr. Alexander stated that at least one criterion must be met. He reiterated that the Board is willing to consider postponing their decision.

Mr. Cotter stated the Architectural Review Board's responsibility is defined by Code.

Ms. Davis requested that the case be postponed to the Board's next meeting.

The application deadline for the meeting was clarified for the applicant.

Ms. Damaser moved, Mr. Jewell seconded postponement of Case 23-116 to the Board's next regular meeting scheduled for December 13, 2023.

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

- **Adoption of ARB 2024 Meeting Schedule**

Ms. Holt stated that the proposed 2024 ARB Meeting Schedule was provided in the meeting packet. Ms. Cooper noted that the previously proposed March 2024 date was revised to March 27, 2024. Mr. Cotter noted that it would be necessary for him to miss two of the proposed dates due to work conflicts.

Ms. Cooper moved, Ms. Damaser seconded approval of the 2024 ARB Meeting Schedule.

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

Communications

- Ms. Holt shared that the Planning and Zoning Commission reviewed and has recommended City Council approval of the Historic District Code amendment. There was Commission discussion regarding the need to make potential homebuyers aware of the property's location in the Historic District, which has certain requirements, prior to purchase. The Code amendment is scheduled for City Council consideration on December 11, 2023.
- Mr. Alexander asked about the status on the historic wall. Ms. Holt stated that there was recently a meeting between staff and the property owners where they were reminded of opportunities for remedy. Mr. Alexander asked about Code violations on the site. Ms. Holt stated that she would speak with the Chief Building Official and inquire the status.
- Mr. Jewell asked about the 30-32 S. High Street application. Ms. Holt responded that would come before the Board next month.
- Ms. Holt stated that the Board will not be reviewing the Tucci application until Spring 2024.
- The next regular ARB meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, December 13, 2023.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:34 p.m.


Chair, Architectural Review Board


Deputy Clerk of Council