

# OHIO HISTORIC INVENTORY

OHIO HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE  
567 East Hudson St.  
Columbus, Ohio 43211-1030  
614/297-2470-fax 614-297-2496



OHIO  
HISTORICAL  
SOCIETY

SINCE 1885

THIS IS A FACSIMILE OF THE FORM PRODUCED BY:

|   |  |                         |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|-------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| 1.No.<br>FRA-8841-1   |  | 2.County<br>FRANKLIN    |  | 4.Present Name(s)  |  | <input type="checkbox"/> CODED<br><input type="checkbox"/> CODED   |  |
| 3.Location of Negatives<br>CITY OF DUBLIN   |  |                         |  | 5.Historic or Other Name(s)  |  |  |  |
| Roll No.<br>2   |  | Picture No.(s)<br>10    |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6.Specific Address or Location<br>55 S. RIVERVIEW   |  |                         |  | 16. Thematic Association(s)  |  | 28. No. of Stories<br>1.5  |  |
| 6a. Lot, Section or VMD Number  |  |                         |  | 17. Date(s) or Period<br>C. 1900   |  | 29. Basement?<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No   |  |
| 7.City or Village If Rural, Township & Vicinity<br>DUBLIN   |  |                         |  | 18. Style or Design<br>vernacular  |  | 30. Foundation Material<br>STONE   |  |
| 8. Site Plan with North Arrow   |  |                         |  | 18a. Style of Addition or Element(s)   |  | 31. Wall Construction<br>BRICK   |  |
|   |  |                         |  | 19. Architect or Engineer  |  | 32. Roof Type & Material<br>INT. GABLE/ASP. SHNG   |  |
|   |  |                         |  | 19a. Design Sources  |  | 33. No. of Bays<br>Front 3 Side 2  |  |
|   |  |                         |  | 20. Contractor or Builder  |  | 34. Exterior Wall Material(s)<br>PAINTED BRICK   |  |
| 9. U.T.M. Reference   |  |                         |  | 21. Building Type or Plan<br>GABLED ELL  |  | 35. Plan Shape<br>IRREG.   |  |
| Quadrangle Name<br>NW Columbus  |  |                         |  | 22. Original Use, if apparent<br>RESIDENCE   |  | 36. Changes<br><input type="checkbox"/> Addition<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Altered<br><input type="checkbox"/> Moved (Explain in #42)                     |  |
| 17 319970 4440640   |  |                         |  | 23. Present Use<br>RESIDENCE   |  | 37. Window Types<br><input type="checkbox"/> 6 over 6 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 over 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 over 2<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other |  |
| Zone Easting Northing   |  |                         |  | 24. Ownership<br><input type="checkbox"/> Public <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Private |  | 38. Building Dimensions  |  |
| 10.<br><input type="checkbox"/> Site <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Building <input type="checkbox"/> Structure <input type="checkbox"/> Object  |  |                         |  | 25. Owner's Name & Address, if known   |  | 39. Endangered?<br>By What? No   |  |
| 11. On National Register? No  |  | 12. N.R. Potential?     |  | 26. Property Acreage   |  | 40. Chimney Placement<br>EXTERIOR/SIDE   |  |
| 13. Part of Estab. Hist. Dist? Yes  |  | 14. District Potential? |  | 27. Other Surveys in Which Included  |  | 41. Distance from and Frontage on Road   |  |
| 15. Name of Established District (N.R. or Local)<br>DUBLIN H.D. (local)   |  |                         |  |  |  |  |  |
| 42. Further Description of Important Interior and Exterior Features (Continue on reverse if necessary)<br>Brick gabled ell residence with a decorative porch in the ell, entrance with transom, one-over-one windows and simple stone lintels and sills. A contemporary addition was built at the rear. |  |                         |  |  |  |  |  |
| 43. History and Significance (Continue on reverse if necessary)<br>This home appears to date from the turn-of-the-century. It contributes to the scale and character of S. Riverview.   |  |                         |  |  |  |  |  |
| 44. Description of Environment and Outbuildings (See #52)<br>Located on a landscaped corner lot with a frame gabled garage and a small shed-roofed outbuilding at the rear of the lot. A stone wall runs along the rear property line.  |  |                         |  |  |  |  |  |
| 45. Sources of Information<br>observation   |  |                         |  |  |  |  |  |
|   |  |                         |  |  |  | 46. Prepared by<br>NANCY RECCHIE   |  |
|   |  |                         |  |  |  | 47. Organization<br>BDR&C  |  |
|   |  |                         |  |  |  | 48. Date Recorded in Field<br>3/03   |  |
|   |  |                         |  |  |  | 49. Revised by   |  |
|   |  |                         |  |  |  | 50. Date Revised   |  |
| 50b. Reviewed by  |  |                         |  |  |  |  |  |

FRA -  
8841-1

FRANKLIN

55 S. RIVERVIEW



PHOTO

**Parcel** 273-000048      **Address** 55 S Riverview St      **OHI** FRA-8841-1

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <b>Year Built:</b> Ca.1900  | <b>Map No:</b> 116  | <b>Photo No:</b> 1842-1846 (7/10/16)    |
| <b>Theme:</b> Domestic  | <b>Historic Use:</b> Single family house                            | <b>Present Use:</b> Single family house |
| <b>Style:</b> Vernacular/Gabled Ell                                     | <b>Foundation:</b> Parged stone                                     | <b>Wall Type:</b> Brick                 |
| <b>Roof Type:</b> Cross gable/asphalt shingle                           | <b>Exterior Wall:</b> Brick   | <b>Symmetry:</b> No                     |
| <b>Stories:</b> 2   | <b>Front Bays:</b> 3  | <b>Side Bays:</b> 4                     |
| <b>Porch:</b> Hipped roof on northeast corner supported by turned posts | <b>Chimney:</b> 2, Exterior, 1 on ridge at rear, on north elevation | <b>Windows:</b> 1-over-1 Replacements   |

**Description:** The two-story house has the Gabled Ell form, expanded by a rear addition. The cross-gable roof is sheathed in asphalt shingles and pierced by a gable dormer on the façade ell. The structure is clad in brick and rests on a parged stone foundation. A hipped roof porch is at the juncture of the façade gable and ell. It is supported by turned posts and features ornamental brackets and a spindle frieze. The windows are one-over-one double-hung sashes, topped by broad lintels. A one-story detached garage faces to the alley west of the house.

**Setting:** The building is located on the west side of Riverview St south of Spring Hill Ln. It is one in a row of late-nineteenth/early twentieth century residences. The property is landscaped by floral plantings.

**Condition:** Good

|                             |   |          |   |              |   |            |   |
|-----------------------------|---|----------|---|--------------|---|------------|---|
| <b>Integrity:</b> Location: | Y | Design:  | N | Setting:     | Y | Materials: | N |
| Workmanship:                | N | Feeling: | Y | Association: | Y |            |   |

**Integrity Notes:** The building has fair integrity, diminished by replacement materials.

**Historical Significance:** The building is within the boundaries of the City of Dublin’s local Historic Dublin district. The property is also recommended contributing to the recommended Dublin High Street Historic District, boundary increase, which is more inclusive of historic resources in the original village.

|                           |   |  |
|---------------------------|---|--|
| <b>District:</b> Yes      | Local Historic Dublin district                                      | <b>Contributing Status:</b> Recommended contributing |
| <b>National Register:</b> | Recommended Dublin High Street Historic District, boundary increase | <b>Property Name:</b> N/A                            |



55 S Riverview St, looking southwest



55 S Riverview St, garage, looking southeast



## 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



## BOARD ORDER

# Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, November 20, 2019 | 6:30 pm

The Architectural Review Board took the following action at this meeting:

**1. Kne Residence at 55 S. Riverview Street  
19-094ARB-MPR**

**Minor Project Review**

Proposal: A detached garage addition to create a three-car garage for an existing single-family home on a 0.40-acre site zoned Bridge Street District Historic Residential.

Location: Southwest of the intersection of South Riverview Street and Spring Hill Lane.

Request: Review and approval of a Minor Project under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.066—153.070, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Applicant: Tom Gale, Finish Line Building

Planning Contacts: Chase J. Ridge, Planner I

Contact Information: 614.410.4656, cridge@dublin.oh.us

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/19-094

**MOTION:** Mr. Keeler moved, Ms. Bryan seconded, to approve the Minor Project without conditions.


**VOTE:** 5 – 0

**RESULT:** The Minor Project was approved.

**RECORDED VOTES:**

|                  |     |
|------------------|-----|
| Shannon Stenberg | Yes |
| Gary Alexander   | Yes |
| Andrew Keeler    | Yes |
| Kathleen Bryan   | Yes |
| Robert Bailey    | Yes |

**STAFF CERTIFICATION**

  
Chase J. Ridge, Planner I







## MEETING MINUTES

# Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, November 20, 2019

### CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Stenberg, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Ms. Stenberg led the Pledge of Allegiance.

### ROLL CALL

Board Members present: Mr. Alexander, Mr. Keeler, Ms. Bryan, Mr. Bailey, Ms. Stenberg

Staff present: Ms. Martin, Mr. Ridge and Mr. Hounshell

Also present: Greg Dale, Consultant, McBride Dale Clarion

### ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS

Mr. Bailey moved, Ms. Stenberg seconded to accept the documents into the record.

Vote on the motion: Mr. Bailey, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Ms. Bryan, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes.

(Approved 5 – 0)

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Bryan moved, Mr. Alexander seconded to approve the October 16, 2019 meeting minutes.

Vote on the motion: Mr. Bailey, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Ms. Bryan, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes.

(Approved 5 – 0)

Ms. Stenberg stated that the Architectural Review Board is responsible for review of construction and modification or alteration to any site in the Review District or area subject to Architectural Review under the provision of Zoning Code Section 153.177. The Board has the decision-making responsibility on these cases. The Chair swore in any staff or member of the public who planned to address the Board on any of the cases during the meeting.

### CASES:

#### 1. **Kne Residence at 55 S. Riverview Street, 19-094ARB-MPR, Minor Project Review**

Ms. Stenberg stated that this application is a proposal for final details for a detached garage addition to create a three-car garage for an existing, single-family home on a 0.40-acre site zoned Bridge Street District Historic Residential.

## **Case Presentation**

Mr. Ridge stated that this is a request for review and approval of the final construction and design details for a previously conditionally approved Minor Project request for an addition to an existing detached garage. The subject site is approximately 0.4 acres in size and zoned BSD-HR – Bridge Street District, Historic Residential District. It is located on the southeast corner of Spring Hill and South Blacksmith Lane. The 1.5 car garage shares a drive with the neighbor to the south. The details provided tonight are supplemental. None of the details previously approved are changing. The new details include the following:

- Windows and pedestrian doors will have a three-quarter inch thick and 3.5-inch wide trim.
- The existing and proposed vents will also be adorned with the same trim.
- The overhead garage doors include a one-inch by six-inch door trim with a cap mold of the same size and material.
- Located above the southernmost garage door is a one-inch by six-inch band trim to conceal the horizontal break in the board and batten material.
- The roofline contains a one-inch by four-inch rake trim and a one-inch by six-inch eave fascia.
- The corners of the building will be wrapped in a three-quarter inch thick and 3.5-inch wide corner board.
- The proposed batten is one and three-quarter inches wide and is spaced at 16 inches on center to match the existing board and batten on the 2007 addition to the rear of the home.
- The new dimensional asphalt roof shingle color will be Estate Grey.
- The front façade will contain four lantern light fixtures.
- The east façade will have a new French door and lighting fixtures.

As a reminder, the windows on the north and south elevations will contain existing windows salvaged from the current garage.

The request was reviewed against all applicable review criteria, and staff recommends approval with no conditions.

## **Applicant Presentation**

The applicant provided no additional comments.

## **Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

## **Board Discussion**

Mr. Alexander requested a clarification to the staff reports, which become part of the legal records of the case. Staff's report identifies the trim as 1 inch x 4 inch, and 1 inch x 6 inch. He assumes what is meant are the nominal dimensions in the presentation. It is not actually inches. If the terminology used is the same as in the presentation, 1x4, it is the industry standard of three-quarters x by 3.5. For clarity purposes, he would recommend the reference to inches be deleted. If the measurement on the drawing is used – 1 x 4, that, per the industry standard, is .75 by 3.5.

Mr. Ridge responded that it would be so noted.

Mr. Keeler stated that he has only one comment. The existing block foundation is exposed. The preference would be to face with a veneer. Although it is not a requirement, it would improve the appearance.

Mr. Keeler moved, Ms. Bryan seconded to approve the Minor Project with no conditions.

Vote on the motion: Mr. Bailey, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Ms. Bryan, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes.

(Approved 5 – 0)

## **2- ~~Gardenia Market – Sign at 16 N. High Street, 19-095ARB-MPR, Minor Project Review~~**

~~Ms. Stenberg stated that this application is a proposal for the installation of one wall sign and one projecting sign for an existing tenant space on a 0.26-acre site zoned Bridge Street District Historic Core.~~

### **Case Presentation**

~~Mr. Hounshell stated this is a request for two signs for Gardenia Market. If approved tonight, the applicant will be able to file for sign permits with the City Building Department. The site is located at 16 North High Street, just south of 22 North High Street, which is located on the same parcel. These Minor Projects were also before the Board in September. In regard to previous sign approvals for the site:~~

- ~~• 2007: 6 sq. ft. projecting sign (subsequently removed)~~
- ~~• 2009: 2 wall signs (subsequently removed)~~
- ~~• 2011: 2 multi-tenant wall signs at front and rear of building. Only the second story tenant signage remains, which is 1 sq. foot.~~

~~The applicant is proposing to use the existing sign bracket~~

~~The signs were originally located at the rear of 22 N High with a previous tenant. The first sign is a projecting sign. The sign will be 21.88 inches in height by 27.88 inches in width. The panel will be mounted on the repurposed HDU sign. Both the HDU sign and bracket are being repurposed for this application. The second sign is a wall sign, which will be 18 inches in height by 84 inches in width, totaling 10.5 square feet. The maximum allowable wall sign square footage in the Historic District is 8 square feet, so the applicant must adjust the sign design to meet this zoning requirement. The sign panels are proposed to be made of 3mm aluminum composite. Because the wall sign span is longer than 3 feet, Code requires the depth of the sign to be increased to 4mm to reduce potential rippling effects. Staff is waiting to verify the height of the signs from grade. The sign backgrounds will be black; the logo, "Gardenia" will have white lettering; the word "Market" and crown on the logo on the projecting sign will be PMS 132 gold. The minimum height for a projecting sign is 8 feet from the bottom of the sign to grade; the minimum height for a wall sign is 15 feet from grade. Staff recommends revising the sign plan to include dimensional lettering and a dimensional logo to be consistent with previous sign applications in the area. The application has been reviewed against the appropriate criteria, and staff recommends approval with three conditions.~~



## BOARD ORDER

# Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, October 16, 2019 | 6:30 pm

The Architectural Review Board took the following action at this meeting:

**3. Kne Residence at 55 S. Riverview Street  
19-094ARB-MPR**

**Minor Project Review**

Proposal: A detached garage addition to create a three-car garage for an existing single-family home on a 0.40-acre site zoned Bridge Street District Historic Residential.

Location: Southwest of the intersection of South Riverview Street and Spring Hill Lane.

Request: Review and approval of a Minor Project under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.066—153.070, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Applicant: Tom Gale, Finish Line Building

Planning Contacts: Chase J. Ridge, Planner I

Contact Information: 614.410.4656, [cridge@dublin.oh.us](mailto:cridge@dublin.oh.us)

Case Information: [www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/19-094](http://www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/19-094)

**MOTION #1:** Ms. Bryan moved, Ms. Stenberg seconded, to approve the Administrative Departure to permit an increase to the detached accessory structure size requirements.

1. §153.074 (B)(2)(e) Accessory Uses and Structures. Maximum Square Footage Requirement: The maximum square footage permitted for a detached accessory structure on lots less than 1 acre is 840 square feet.  
Request: Maximum square footage totaling 924 square feet.

**VOTE:** 5 – 0

**RESULT:** The Administrative Departure was approved.

**RECORDED VOTES:**

|                  |     |
|------------------|-----|
| Shannon Stenberg | Yes |
| Gary Alexander   | Yes |
| Andrew Keeler    | Yes |
| Kathleen Bryan   | Yes |
| Robert Bailey    | Yes |

**MOTION #2:** Mr. Keeler moved, Ms. Bryan seconded, to approve the Minor Project with two conditions:

- 1) That the applicant select roof specifications for the proposed garage that complements the existing home in color and design, subject to Staff approval; and
- 2) That the applicant return to the Board with all trim and associated construction details.



**3. Kne Residence at 55 S. Riverview Street  
19-094ARB-MPR**

**Minor Project Review**

**VOTE:** 5 – 0

**RESULT:** The Minor Project was approved.

**RECORDED VOTES:**

|                  |     |
|------------------|-----|
| Shannon Stenberg | Yes |
| Gary Alexander   | Yes |
| Andrew Keeler    | Yes |
| Kathleen Bryan   | Yes |
| Robert Bailey    | Yes |

**STAFF CERTIFICATION**

  
Chase J. Ridge, Planner I



would remain on this building. The building located at 72 North High Street is proposed to be painted off-white (Snowbound, SW 7004) with all trim painted a white color (Pure White, SW 7005). The proposal includes painting 20 North Street the same off-white color (Snowbound, SW 7004) as 72 North High Street. All decking and trim on this building is proposed to be a dark brown color (Rockweed, SW 2735). The existing stone on this building would also remain. In order to expose more of the west-facing façade, the applicant is proposing to remove a large evergreen tree that is situated in front of 84 North High Street. Staff has reviewed all the applicable criteria and recommends approval with the one condition that the applicant be required to meet the Code for tree replacement or pay a fee in lieu.

### **Applicant Presentation**

Evan Fracasso, 72 Dublin LLC, 501 Morrison Road, Gahanna, Ohio, displayed paint samples to the Board.

There were no public comments.

### **Board Questions for Applicant**

Ms. Bryan inquired the reason for removing the evergreen tree.

Mr. Fracasso responded that the evergreen tree was planted 20 years ago within three feet of the building. It is now encroaching on the building and creating a hazard due to its height and proximity to the building.

Mr. Alexander inquired if the Sleepy Blue color originally provided with the application was not being used in the project.

Mr. Fracasso responded that it is not. Color studies were done, and staff determined that the color was too similar to the color used in the Crawford Z1 Building to the north of this site.

Mr. Alexander noted that he likes the Distance Blue color.

Mr. Fracasso responded that their intent was to create a color emphasis in the center of the building. Oscar's is the primary tenant. The inverse of the colors used on the front of the building will be used on the rear of this building, which will present a visual focal point in Historic Dublin from the pedestrian bridge.

Ms. Bryan moved, Mr. Keeler seconded approval of the Minor Project with the following condition:

- 1) That the applicant work with staff to satisfy the tree replacement requirements set forth in Code or pay a fee-in-lieu.

Vote: Mr. Keeler, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; Ms. Bryan, yes; Mr. Bailey, yes.  
(Motion approved 5-0.)

### **3. Kne Residence at 55 S. Riverview Street, 19-094ARB-MPR, Minor Project Review**

Ms. Stenberg stated that this application is a proposal for a detached garage addition to create a three-car garage for an existing, single-family home on a 0.40-acre site zoned Bridge Street District Historic Residential.

## **Staff Presentation**

Mr. Ridge stated that this is a request for an addition to an existing 1.5-car detached garage located to the rear of the home at 55 S. Riverview Street. The 0.40-acre site is located on the southeast corner of Spring Hill Lane and South Blacksmith Lane, fronts South Riverview Street, and is zoned BSD-HR – Bridge Street District, Historic Residential District. The proposed addition will be to the north of the existing garage and will add an additional 550 square feet to the existing 370-sq.ft detached garage, increasing the total area of the garage to 924 square feet. Code permits a driveway width of 10-20 feet at the right-of-way line. The driveway to the existing garage is a shared driveway with the property to the south. The existing drive is 35 feet wide, significantly wider at the right-of-way line than Code permits. The applicant is proposing to widen the existing drive closer to the garage addition, which does not impact the width of the driveway at the right-of-way line. The design preserves most of the existing garage, including the front gable roof. The applicant is proposing to retain portions of each of the four existing walls but create an opening in the existing north wall to allow access between the original structure and the new addition. The existing structure and the new addition will be finished in a vertical board and batten siding, new carriage-style garage doors and lantern lights. The existing windows on the south elevation of the 1.5-car garage will remain, as will the French door on the rear of the existing garage (east elevation). However, the windows on the existing north elevation will be reused on the new north elevation for consistency. A new, double French door will be added to the rear of the new addition, leading to the rear of the home. The colors on the existing home will be used on the garage, which will include Lyndhurst Grey for the primary color and Nesting Dove for the trim. Although a new asphalt roof is indicated, no specifications were provided. Therefore, staff recommends the applicant work with staff to identify the material and color. This application will require an Administrative Departure for accessories and structures due to the square footage, which exceeds the permitted maximum of 840 square feet. With the addition, the detached garage will be a total of 924 square feet. Staff has reviewed the application against applicable criteria and recommends approval of the Administrative Departure and of the Minor Project with one condition, that the applicant continue to work with staff to select a roof material.

There were no public comments.

## **Board Questions for the Applicant**

Mr. Alexander inquired if the board and batten pattern and spacing match that on the existing house.

Applicant, Angie Kne, 55 South Riverview Street, Dublin, indicated that the intent is that it will match what exists on the home.

Ms. Bryan inquired how many of the existing trees would need to be removed.

Ms. Kne responded that she believes the two Evergreens would be removed and potentially, the Weeping Willow, as well. She requested that the contractor provide additional comment.

Ms. Stenberg swore in Dan Custer, Finish Line Building, 9120 Dustin Road, Galena Ohio.

Responding to Ms. Bryan's inquiry, Mr. Custer indicated that it would be necessary to remove one Evergreen tree and the two shrubs behind it for the new driveway; however, the second Evergreen nearer to the street could be preserved. The Weeping Willow tree would likely need to be removed.

Mr. Keeler stated that he does not believe details were provided on the trim and window casing. Will they match those on the existing garage?

Mr. Custer responded that the existing garage has 3-inch corners, which would be removed and replicated, when the board and batten siding is added. Currently, there is no trim around the doors, so that will be added. The trim on the current windows is 3.5 inches. The existing garage door opening will be shifted to the right and the door replaced with a carriage-style garage door to match the proposed door on the new addition.

Mr. Keeler responded that at the last two ARB meetings, a higher-level of trim detail was requested. That level of detail is not shown for this application, but if the trim matches what currently exists on the garage and house, there would be no issue.

Mr. Alexander inquired if the trim would match what exists on the rear, non-original portion of the house.

Mr. Custer responded that he was not aware of the need to submit that level of detail, but more information can be provided, if it is desired. Their intent is to remain historically consistent by using narrower trims, closely matching what currently exists on the garage. He does not know if it would match the trim on the house, as he has not measured the existing trim. If that is the Board's request, they would ensure that it matched.

Mr. Alexander responded that previous applicants lacking that level of information were requested to bring the details back to the Board.

Ms. Martin inquired if the Board would like to add a condition that the applicant bring the details back to the Board, or a condition that the details be submitted subject to staff's review.

Ms. Stenberg responded that to be consistent, the applicant should bring the details back to the Board for approval.

Ms. Martin inquired if the Board is requesting both the board and batten and window casement details.

Mr. Alexander responded that the applicant should provide details on all the exterior trim, including fascia, gutters and downspouts. It could simply be identified more clearly on the drawing.

Ms. Kne inquired if a checklist could be provided to them, so that they would not miss anything. Ms. Stenberg responded affirmatively.

Ms. Bryan stated that with the previous application, a tree removal was involved, which was specifically discussed. With this application, trees are involved, as well. Why aren't these trees addressed similarly?



Mr. Ridge responded that residential landscaping is not regulated. The previous case was subject to commercial regulations.

Mr. Keeler stated that if trees are removed for a new development, the builder is required to provide tree replacement. Is that because a development is considered commercial, as opposed to an individual project?

Ms. Martin responded affirmatively. Subdivision construction is subject to commercial standards. A single-family home is not.

Ms. Bryan inquired if that is the case if the trees are historic.

Ms. Martin responded that single-family homeowners are not subject to the same tree replacement requirements even if the trees are historic.

Ms. Bryan responded that there are ancient sycamores in her rear yard. Although she would not consider cutting them down, could she do so?

Ms. Martin responded affirmatively.

Ms. Bryan requested that staff make a note that ARB would like to pursue historic tree regulations.

Ms. Martin responded that staff would check to see if they could be incorporated into the Historic District Guidelines. Including them in the Code would require more specific consideration by City Council.

Ms. Bryan responded that she would like to see it included in the Guidelines; however, she would also contact City Council about the issue.

Ms. Martin requested additional direction on the roof material. Most asphalt shingles are dimensional. Currently, the home has the older, one dimensional asphalt shingle, which would be different. A standing-seam metal roof can be intentionally different. Perhaps the Board could provide some direction to assist the applicant in preparation of the material details for the next meeting.

Mr. Custer stated that his assumption would be that it would not be preferable to match the three-tab shingle on a new building. An architectural, dimensional shingle would be preferable, although it would not match the house. A metal, standing-seam roof would be more costly.

Mr. Alexander noted that the addition to the back of the home matches the original structure only in color. Because a differentiation between an historical structure and a later addition is preferred, he would have no objection if a better roof were used on the new addition.

[Photos of existing structures shown.]

Mr. Custer stated that there is a single-story addition to the back of the original, two-story brick home. It has a low slope, similar to the existing garage. Due to the fireplace and windows on all sides, a minimum amount of board and batten was used on that addition.

Mr. Alexander inquired how much life remains on the home's shingle roof.

Ms. Kne responded that they anticipate the need to replace the roof in five years, so they would not want to match that existing roof. However, the roof replacement on the house could match the roof used on the garage addition.

Mr. Keeler stated it would be acceptable if the shingle used on the garage were the same as will be used for the roof replacement on the home.

Mr. Alexander noted that the pitch of the roof is so low that it will have minimal impact on neighboring views. There is also a separation between the two structures. He has no issues with what has been proposed.

Ms. Bryan moved, Ms. Stenberg seconded to approve an Administrative Departure to permit an increase to the detached accessory structure size requirements.

Vote: Mr. Bailey, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Ms. Bryan, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes.  
(Motion approved 5-0.)

Mr. Keeler moved, Ms. Bryan seconded to approve the Minor Project with the following two conditions:

- 1) The applicant select a roof specification for the proposed garage that complements the existing home in color and design, subject to staff approval.
- 2) That the applicant return to the Board with all trim and associated construction details.

Vote: Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Ms. Keeler, yes; Mr. Bailey, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes.  
(Motion approved 5-0.)

There were no additional questions or comments.

## **COMMUNICATIONS**

Ms. Martin reported that:

- Included in the ARB meeting packet was a flyer regarding an "Evening of Gratitude" on Tuesday, October 29 at The Exchange at Bridge Park. Board members can anticipate receiving individual invitations, as well, for which RSVPs are requested. The event will provide an opportunity to thank individuals who volunteer time on behalf of the City, which includes Board members.
- Additional cybersecurity training will be provided to Board members in 2020, one year following the date of their training completed in 2019. This training is important due to the electronic access Board members have to City resources.
- Staff is exploring the opportunity of holding a joint meeting with the Planning and Zoning Commission and Architectural Review Board before the end of the year. Presently, no date has been set, but members may be receiving notification of a proposed date.

Ms. Bryan noted that the previous date scheduled for the ARB walking tour of the Historic District was canceled. Will that be re-scheduled?

Ms. Martin responded that a new date will be identified for that tour, which will be optional for Board members. It is also a public meeting, so members of the community may participate in the tour, as well. Board members will receive email notification of the rescheduled date.

Ms. Stenberg inquired about the next steps in the ARB Code and Historic Guidelines amendment process.

Ms. Martin responded this item would be scheduled on the ARB's November meeting agenda. Recommendations received from the ARB, PZC and the public have been incorporated into revised draft documents, and the consultant has reviewed the revised draft. At their November meeting, ARB will be reviewing proposed revisions to the development standards. After final review, the ARB will be forwarding a recommendation for approval to PZC. If necessary, a Special ARB meeting can be scheduled for that review.

### **ADJOURNMENT**


The meeting was adjourned at 7:15 p.m.

---

Chair, Architectural Review Board

---

Deputy Clerk of Council



**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD**

**BOARD ORDER**

**MAY 23, 2007**

CITY OF DUBLIN

Land Use and  
Long Range Planning  
5800 Shier-Rings Road  
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236

Phone: 614-410-4600  
Fax: 614-410-4747  
Web Site: www.dublin.oh.us

The Architectural Review Board took the following action at this meeting:

**3. Bailey Residence 55 South Riverview Street  
07-020ARB Demolition/Building Modifications**

**Request:** To consider building modifications to include a 440-square-foot addition and the demolition of a shed for a residence located on the southwest corner of Spring Hill and South Riverview Street.  
**Procedure:** Review and approval of building modifications under the provisions of the Historic Dublin Design Guidelines.  
**Applicants:** Jonathan Bailey; represented by Justin Collamore.  
**Planning Contact:** Joanne M. Ochal, Planner.

**MOTION #1:** Thomas Holton made a motion, seconded by Clayton Bryan, to approve this shed demolition, with one condition:

- 1) That a demolition permit be obtained from the Building Standards Division prior to the removal of the building.

\* Justin Collamore, on behalf of Jonathan Bailey, agreed to the above condition.

**VOTE:** 5 - 0.

**RESULT:** The demolition of this shed was approved.

**RECORDED VOTES - MOTION #1:**

Thomas Holton Yes  
Tom Currie Yes  
Clayton Bryan Yes  
William Souders Yes  
Linda Kick Yes

**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD  
BOARD ORDER  
MAY 23, 2007**

**3. Bailey Residence  
07-020ARB (Continued)**

**55 South Riverview Street  
Demolition/Building Modifications**

**MOTION #2:** Clayton Bryan made a motion, seconded by Linda Kick, to approve this building addition and modification because it meets the criteria of the *Historic Dublin Guidelines* and Code. The building addition, demolition and the site improvements will contribute to the overall appearance of the District. Planning recommends approval of this application with six conditions:

- 1) That the air conditioner units be screened to meet Code using approved planting materials listed in the *Historic Dublin Guidelines*;
- 2) That the applicant provides documentation of the exact location of the black iron railing and obtain the necessary approval from City Council if located within the right-of-way;
- 3) That new plans be submitted to Land Use and Long Range Planning with any changes that occur with this approval;
- 4) That paint removal on the original structure be done in the least invasive process in order to preserve the brick;
- 5) That the proposed chimney be narrowed at the angled portion (shoulder) in order to closely mimic the existing chimney; and
- 6) That a continuous board and batten material be incorporated on the northern elevation where the enclosure abuts the main building.

\* Justin Collamore, on behalf of Jonathan Bailey, agreed to the above conditions.


**VOTE:** 5 - 0.

**RESULT:** The building addition and modification was approved.

**RECORDED VOTES - MOTION #2:**

|                 |     |
|-----------------|-----|
| Thomas Holton   | Yes |
| Tom Currie      | Yes |
| Clayton Bryan   | Yes |
| William Souders | Yes |
| Linda Kick      | Yes |

**STAFF CERTIFICATION**

  
Joanne M. Ochal  
Planner

**2. Steele Office Building  
07-024ARB**

**138 South High Street  
Sign**

Joanne Ochal presented this request for approval of a sign to be located on a site located on the east side of South High Street, at the intersection John Wright Lane. She said in 2005, the Board approved building and site modifications, including windows, doors, residing, repainting and landscaping. She said the applicant is proposing to remove the existing sign post. Ms. Ochal said the proposed sign is 6.75 square feet, and the maximum size allowed is six square feet, therefore a condition has been added. She said the applicant proposes to use forest green, for the lettering; soft cream for the sign face and post, and the border will be white with approved fonts from the *Guidelines*. Ms. Ochal said the applicant is proposing to locate the sign in the landscape bed, between the sidewalk and building. She said Planning evaluated the sign based on guidelines and recommends approval with the following four conditions, as listed in the Planning Report:

- 1) That the overall size of the sign be reduced to six square feet to meet the *Guidelines*;
- 2) That all paint be matte finish;
- 3) That the existing post be removed at installation of the new sign; and
- 4) That a sign permit be obtained from Land Use and Long Range Planning prior to installation.

Mr. Holton asked the applicant, Mike Steele, if there were plans to reduce the sign size. Mr. Steele said the sign manufacturer had measured other existing signs on the street and made it proportionate. He said they were not aware of the sign size limitation. Mr. Steele agreed to reduce the sign to six feet in area. Ms. Ochal confirmed that the existing sign post location would be moved eight inches.

Mr. Holton asked about the originally approved 2005 landscape plan. Mr. Steele said all that was left to do was to plant the three dogwood trees shown. Ms. Ochal said the sign did not require any additional landscaping.

**Motion and Vote**

Mr. Souders made a motion, seconded by Mr. Holton, to approve the post-mounted projection sign because it meets the criteria of the *Historic Dublin Guidelines* and Code, uses appropriate historic materials, colors, font styles, and continues the pedestrian scale of the Historic District, with the four conditions as listed above. Mr. Steele agreed to the conditions. The vote was as follows: Mr. Holton, yes; Mr. Currie, yes; Mr. Bryan, yes; Mr. Souders, yes; and Ms. Kick, yes. (Approved 5 - 0.)

**3. Bailey Residence  
07-020ARB**

**55 South Riverview Street  
Demolition/Building Modifications**

Joanne Ochal said the site is located on the southwest corner of South Riverview Street and Spring Hill. She said it contains a 1,700-square-foot two-story home listed on the Ohio Historic Inventory. She said the demolition of the 82-square-foot shed, located on Blacksmith Lane is proposed. Ms. Ochal said the applicant is proposing then to enclose an existing porch on the rear of the building, and add an addition to it. She said other modifications are a stamped concrete patio leading to the garage, an additional air conditioner on the side, and a stamped concrete walkway with a wrought iron railing system leading to South Riverview Street. Ms. Ochal said the main modifications will occur on the west elevation. She said the two Victorian brackets on the porch corners are proposed to be removed. She said the existing chimney is to be resurfaced with limestone veneer. (A sample of the limestone was shown.) Ms. Ochal presented slides of the proposed building modifications and additions. She said aluminum clad Pella windows

matching the trim color were proposed. A French door and a triple window on the west elevation are proposed. (A sample of the window color was provided.) Ms. Ochal said the additional chimney proposed will also have limestone veneer. She said board and batten siding along with asphalt shingles matching those on the existing roof are proposed. She said the existing porch will be enclosed and the proposed addition will be 440-square-feet. Ms. Ochal said all trim will be painted Nestle Dove (A sample was provided). She said OG-styled gutters and downspouts and a black iron railing at the street level.

Ms. Ochal said Planning reviewed this application to the evaluations of the *Historic Dublin Guidelines*. She said Planning recommends approval of the building additions and shed demolition with the conditions listed in the Planning Report.

Mr. Holton confirmed that the proposed demolition met two of the three criteria listed.

Justin Collamore, the applicant, said he had no knowledge of the shed's original purpose or age.

Mr. Holton said he was concerned that buildings in the District had been allowed to deteriorate to the point where they have to be demolished. He said there needed to be a way to prevent that so that it does not reach this point. Ms. Ochal said the City had an employee assigned especially to the District to inspect on a regular basis to inspect structures.

Mr. Souders said if Planning saw no reason not to demolish this structure, he saw no reason not to do so. Ms. Ochal said the City has a consultant that helps determine if a building has historic value of the buildings in the District.

Mr. Currie asked about the concrete pad under the foundation. Ms. Ochal said the applicant is required to remove any debris left from the demolition. Mr. Collamore said that he had not decided what to do with the area under the foundation. However, he assured the Board that it would not be left in an unsightly condition.

#### **Motion and Vote #1 (Demolition)**

Thomas Holton made a motion, seconded by Clayton Bryan, to approve this shed demolition, with one condition:

- 1) That a demolition permit be obtained from the Building Standards Division prior to the removal of the building.

Mr. Collamore, on behalf of Jonathan Bailey, agreed to the above condition. The vote was as follows: Ms. Kick, yes; Mr. Souders, yes; Mr. Bryan, yes; Mr. Currie, yes; and Mr. Holton, yes. (Demolition Approved 5 - 0.)

Ms. Ochal said the historian looked at the chimney and thought with the addition of limestone, the two chimneys would be similar in materials, but not the design.

Mr. Collamore clarified that he was using cultured stone, not limestone material on the chimneys and that he did not intend to paint anything on the existing building not already painted. He also assured the Board that he would not be using high gloss paint.

There was a lengthy discussion about the basic black wrought iron railing from the street to the sidewalk and on the porch. Mr. Souders noted that the issue was not the type of railing, but the railing location proposed. Ms. Kick said she had no problem with these railings.

Mr. Collamore clarified that the upper, square bedroom windows proposed were casement windows for egress purposes, but they had a double-hung one-over-one appearance with the interior grids. He said a double-hung window for egress would not fit elsewhere for the bedroom.

Mr. Holton said the Board strongly recommended that there be a continuous surface, especially on the north elevation to avoid future a maintenance problem.

**Motion and Vote #2 (Building Modifications and Addition)**

Clayton Bryan made a motion, seconded by Linda Kick, to approve this building addition and modification because it meets the criteria of the *Historic Dublin Guidelines* and Code, and the building addition, demolition and the site improvements will contribute to the overall appearance of the District, with six conditions:

- 1) That the air conditioner units be screened to meet Code using approved planting materials listed in the *Historic Dublin Guidelines*;
- 2) That the applicant provides documentation of the exact location of the black iron railing and obtain the necessary approval from City Council if located within the right-of-way;
- 3) That new plans be submitted to Land Use and Long Range Planning with any changes that occur with this approval;
- 4) That paint removal on the original structure be done in the least invasive process in order to preserve the brick;
- 5) That the proposed chimney be narrowed at the angled portion (shoulder) in order to closely mimic the existing chimney; and
- 6) That a continuous board and batten material be incorporated on the northern elevation where the enclosure abuts the main building.

Mr. Collamore, on behalf of Jonathan Bailey, agreed to the above conditions. The vote was as follows: Ms. Kick, yes; Mr. Souders, yes; Mr. Bryan, yes; Mr. Currie, yes; and Mr. Holton, yes. (Building Modification and Addition Approved 5 – 0.)

The meeting was adjourned at 8:36 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Libby Farley  
Administrative Assistant