



MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, June 25, 2025

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Cotter, Chair, called the June 25, 2025 Architectural Review Board (ARB) meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. in Council Chamber, 5555 Perimeter Drive. He welcomed everyone and stated that the livestream video of the meeting can also be accessed at the City's website. Public comments on the cases are welcome from both in-person meeting attendees and those viewing at the City's website. He reviewed the meeting procedures for meeting attendees.

ROLL CALL

Board members present: Sean Cotter, Martha Cooper, Hilary Damaser, Lisa Patt-McDaniel, Mark Stechschulte

Staff members present: Bassem Bitar, Rati Singh

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. Cotter moved, Ms. Damaser seconded to adjourn the meeting to Executive Session for the consideration of the appointment of public officials.

Vote: Ms. Cooper, yes; Ms. Patt-McDaniel, yes; Ms. Damaser, yes; Dr. Stechschulte, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes.

[Motion carried 5-0.]

The meeting was reconvened at 6:35 p.m.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Ms. Cooper moved, Dr. Stechschulte seconded the election of Mr. Cotter as Chair for a one-year term.

Vote: Ms. Damaser, yes; Ms. Patt-McDaniel, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Dr. Stechschulte, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes.

[Motion carried 5-0]

Ms. Patt-McDaniel moved, Ms. Cooper seconded the election of Ms. Damaser as Vice Chair for a one-year term.

Vote: Dr. Stechschulte, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Ms. Patt-McDaniel, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Ms. Damaser, yes.

[Motion carried 5-0]

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. Cotter led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Cotter moved, Ms. Patt-McDaniel seconded acceptance of the documents into the record and approval of the May 21, 2025 ARB meeting minutes.

Vote: Ms. Damaser, yes; Dr. Stechschulte, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Ms. Patt-McDaniel, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes.

[Motion carried 5-0]

Mr. Cotter stated that the Architectural Review Board (ARB) is responsible for review of construction, modifications or alterations to any site in the Review District or area subject to ARB under the provision of Zoning Code Section 153.170. The Board has the decision-making responsibility on these cases. The Chair swore in staff and applicants who planned to address the Board on any of the cases on the agenda.

AMEND AGENDA ORDER

Mr. Cotter stated that staff has requested the agenda order be changed this evening to hear Case #25 -049MPR first.

Mr. Cotter moved, Ms. Cooper seconded to change the agenda order to hear Case #25-049MPR regarding Teriyaki Madness, 16 N. High Street first.

Vote: Ms. Damaser, yes; Dr. Stechschulte, yes; Ms. Patt-McDaniel, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes.

[Motion carried 5-0]

CASE REVIEWS

Case #25-049MPR, Minor Project Review - Teriyaki Madness, 16 N. High Street

A request for approval of a Minor Project Review for building and site modifications at 16 N. High Street. The 0.26-acre site is zoned HD-HC, Historic Core District and is located at S. Riverview Street.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Singh stated that the application is a proposal for modifications to a landmark building and associated site improvements on a 0.26-acre site. The site is located northeast of the intersection of N. High Street and E. Riverview Street and is zoned HD-HC, Historic Core District on the north, south and west portions of the property and HD-HR, Historic Residential on the east side of the property across from Blacksmith Lane. The Board provided non-binding feedback on the proposal at its April 2025 meeting, and they recommended removal of the unapproved HVAC unit and relocation or additional screening of the dumpsters. They expressed support for the pedestrian walkway and offsite parking plan. Previously, in February 2024, the Board approved the demolition of an existing shed at the rear of 22 N. High Street and the outbuilding that faces N. Blacksmith Lane, finding that both buildings met the demolition criteria. They approved the Concept Plan (CP)

for construction of a two-story, mixed-use building at the rear of the site with five conditions. 16 N. High Street, built around 1843, is listed in the National Register of Historic Places as Dr. Llewellyn McKittrick's house. The limestone building has a rectilinear footprint with a two-story core and a one-story frame addition spanning the width of the rear elevation. The side-gable roof is sheathed in standing seam metal and pierced by two gable wall dormers on the façade. Two doors serve as separate business entries on the façade. The building is currently vacant. An outbuilding/garage exists at the rear of the lot. The existing driveway, a mix of asphalt and gravel, extends to Blacksmith Lane. Ms. Singh reviewed the surrounding conditions. To the left of 16 N. High on the same parcel is 22 N. High Street, built circa 1900 in the Queen Anne style. To the right and south is 8 East Bridge Street. As this is an Informal Review, the applicant is proposing some site improvements as well as some enhancements to the landmark building to accommodate a new restaurant use. The proposal includes removing the current vehicular access from N. High Street and creating a pedestrian path between 16 and 22 N. High Street. The goal is to restore the area to match the surrounding conditions. The pedestrian walkway will create a corridor connecting High Street to the parking and in the future, to Blacksmith Lane. Asphalt will replace the gravel at the entry of N. Blacksmith Lane, and the parking lot will be re-stripped for 180 parking spaces. The applicant is also re-siding the existing outbuilding and enclosing it with panels. The dumpster is being located at the rear of 22 N. High Street. Patio furniture will be located in front of the building for restaurant use. Due to potential impact on the trees, the fence that was originally shown on the application is no longer proposed. The applicant will consider using plant screening instead. Should the applicant decide to pursue the fence in the future, he would be required to file another Minor Project Review application. Building improvements are proposed to accommodate a restaurant use, including a new Type 2 exhaust hood. Per Code, all roof-mounted mechanical equipment must be completely screened from view at ground level on all sides of the structure. The applicant is proposing a 16-ft. x 10-ft. width, 7-foot-tall screening. The applicant would like to use the unoccupied space in the attic and is proposing to place the hood along the south edge of the rear of the building. This new alignment better suits the internal layout and preserves the existing dormer. Currently, there are two unapproved storm doors on the front façade of the building. Staff recommends that these doors be removed during the building improvements to maintain the original character of the structure. These doors are not original to the building, and staff has no record of approving them. The current proposal shows limestone gravel for the proposed walkway between 16 and 22 N. High Street. Gravel is not a permitted material within the District. Staff has had numerous discussions with the applicant and recommends brick pavers. During previous informal discussions and the Concept Plan approval last year, it was anticipated that this access route would serve as a pedestrian corridor connecting N. High Street to N. Blacksmith Lane. The applicant has agreed to use brick pavers instead of gravel between 16 and 22 N High Street. The applicant will also remove the unapproved HVAC unit installations on the north façade of the building and restore the façade to its original state. To preserve the historic character of the District, staff recommends that these installations be removed as soon as possible. Staff will need to know if penetrations were made into the historic rock façade, and if so, what appropriate measures will be taken for restoration. The applicant is proposing 3 parking spaces on site and proposes to use public parking to meet the parking requirements. The nearest public parking is located within 600 feet and meets the Code requirement (660' max). At the Informal Review, the Board expressed support for an off-site parking plan but requested more information about the available parking options within the District. The City is currently creating a Downtown Dublin Curbside Management Plan, which will be considered by City Council on June 23rd. As part of this initiative, a comprehensive survey of parking spaces has been conducted to provide the City with accurate data. The survey also

included monitoring parking spaces in the Historic District, and the findings indicate that there is ample parking available within the District. Two bicycle parking spots are proposed along the pedestrian walkway between 16 and 22 N. High. [Description of the proposal continued.] Staff has reviewed the application against the criteria and found that it was met or met with conditions and recommends approval of the MPR.

Board Questions for Staff

Ms. Cooper inquired if there was any consideration for using the same color of hardie board as will be used for the enclosure for the trash receptacle.

Ms. Singh responded that it was not considered because the two proposed colors are quite similar, and there is a distance between where they will be used.

Applicant Presentation

Tim Lai and Eliza Ho, 401 W. Town Street, Columbus, were present for questions.

Board Questions for Applicant

Mr. Cotter stated that the applicant has received approval for demolition of the outbuilding, which is in poor shape. The building will be deteriorating further, and even if it is enclosed, it will become a problem in the area. The road behind the site is anticipated to become a pedestrian walkway. He inquired the reason the applicant wished to keep the structure rather than removing it and improving the aesthetics of the site.

Ms. Ho responded that the owner also shares the view that the outbuilding should be removed. Prudent allocation of the resources only make it a matter of time as to when that happens. For the owner, it is more important to focus the resources on the immediate site around 16 N. High Street and the interior renovations for the restaurant. Their ultimate intent is to remove the outbuilding. Right now, they are obtaining pricing from different contractors for removal of the structure, removal of the gravel and seeding the site. While they wait on the costs, the intent is to temporarily enhance the structure with hardie board.

Mr. Lai stated that the cost of removing the building is not that much. The concern is the cost and difficulty of doing the removal while also stabilizing the retaining wall and topography behind it. That is part of the investigation that needs to be done beforehand.

Mr. Cotter stated that the ARB's goal is to make sure the entire site looks appropriate for the Historic District. He inquired if they anticipate having a report on the investigation's findings within the next few weeks.

Ms. Ho responded that they should have the information within three weeks.

Ms. Patt-McDaniel stated that if they don't take the building down, it will be necessary to do more than add hardie board. The expectation is that it would be made a sustainable building.

Mr. Cotter stated that the structure should look aesthetically appropriate from the front. There should be a condition that staff review it.

Ms. Singh stated that there is a condition that opening hardware be added, so it is not completely enclosed. Staff is concerned that there could be a significant degree of moisture trapped within it, so there must be ability to open the structure and check it periodically.

Dr. Stechschulte inquired if it would be reasonable to establish a timeframe in which the building must be removed.

Ms. Damaser stated that she believes a demolition permit is valid for one year.

Mr. Singh responded that an approval is valid for two years, but she would check to see if a demolition approval is the same.

Ms. Cooper stated that the Board has the ability to extend an approval time period for six months for the purpose of allowing a project to be completed without repeating the approval process. She is concerned, as is Mr. Cotter, that the property could be an attractive nuisance even with hardie board panels installed.

Mr. Cotter inquired if they would be addressing the fascia boards, as well, or only adding hardie wood.

Mr. Liu stated that their concern was addressing safety and prohibiting people from entering the building. Their intent is essentially to board it up but use trim/detail to make it look more appealing.

Mr. Cotter stated that if the building is not removed within a reasonable time, it will become a Code issue.

Ms. Patt-McDaniel stated that the applicant has indicated that they will have a report in a short period of time. Why not wait to see what the report says, especially about the retaining wall.

Ms. Damaser stated that they are seeking approval tonight, unless it is tabled.

Mr. Bitar stated that there the City's Code Enforcement Department can address the site safety. The role of the Board tonight is only to review the application and conditions for approval.

Mr. Cotter stated that he is aware that Code Enforcement would address public nuisance issues; however, he would also like to add a condition that staff review how the building exterior is addressed appropriately, including the rear of the building. It may be necessary to paint the hardie board, fascia and soffit to make it look appropriate. If it is going to remain on the site for a few years, it needs to be beautified.

Ms. Cooper stated that there are different grants that are available for building beautification in the Historic District. Perhaps they could obtain a grant for either the removal or the seeding. The building has a dirt floor, so there is the possibility of an animal nuisance situation. With restaurants in the neighborhood, that would become a health department concern.

Mr. Cotter stated that his concern is that the structure be made aesthetically pleasing for the length of time it remains on the site.

Ms. Singh noted that the applicant's intent is to paint the panels, details and CMU all the way around in the tan and off-white colors shown.

Dr. Stechschulte requested clarification of the direction. His understanding is that if the Board approves the Minor Project as proposed, the intention is that the outbuilding eventually comes down. The applicant will temporize the issue by putting hardie board up to make it attractive and safe, but if at some point in time the structure is not attractive or safe, there are Code regulations in place that would require it to come down.

Mr. Bitar responded that the applicant could submit a proposal to completely renovate and stabilize the building. If it is a safety hazard or Code nuisance issue, there are mechanisms aside from this Board to address it.

Board Discussion

Dr. Stechschulte stated that the 6-foot fence that was proposed originally would have blocked the line of sight into the historic areas. He appreciates the reasons they wanted to install it, but it is outside the purview of this Board to help with the problem. They put a lot of effort into screening their dumpster, yet there are two unsightly dumpsters right at the edge of their property.

Mr. Cotter inquired if the applicant had any objection to the conditions for approval. The applicant indicated he had no objection.

Public Comments

There were no public comments.

Ms. Damaser moved, Ms. Cooper seconded approval of the Minor Project Review with the following amended conditions:

- 1) The applicant shall remove the unapproved HVAC installation on the north elevation and storm doors on the front façade. The applicant must provide appropriate restoration details if penetrations were made into the historic stone façade prior to building permit.
- 2) The applicant shall revise the drawings to show the following prior to building permit:
 - a) Brick paver pathway;
 - b) Replacement of existing gravel with seeding along N. Blacksmith Lane;
 - c) Architecturally appropriate detailed panels with hardware details to be reviewed by staff (outbuilding panels);
 - d) Umbrella base and pole in black color;
 - e) Light fixture details (restoration, installation height and details, wattage);
 - f) Removal of 6-foot privacy fence on south side of lot.
- 3) The applicant must ensure that all patio furniture is stored during off-season at an off-site location.
- 4) The applicant shall provide a striping and signing plan if on-street parking space can take the place of the current curbcut, as determined by staff, during Site Permit.

Vote: Ms. Damaser, yes; Ms. Patt-McDaniel, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Dr. Stechschulte, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes.

[Motion carried 5-0]

Case #25-048INF - 83 S. Riverview, Informal Review

A request for review and non-binding feedback for a house addition. The .25-acre lot is zoned HD – HR, Historic Residential, and is located at 83 S. Riverview.

Applicant Presentation

Jeffrey Hahm, MD, 83 S. Riverview Street, Dublin, introduced his father, who was present in the audience. His father purchased this house in 1970, when the population of Dublin was 670 people. His father, Dr. David Hahm, a retired Classics professor from Ohio State, was one of the founding members of the Dublin Historical Society and its first president. He was also one of the founders of Dublin's Architectural Review Board (ARB), and for many years, worked with Planning and Zoning and ARB. In the 1970s, his parents worked to get all Dublin's historical homes on the National Register of Historic Places. He indicated he would share the background of their home and their desire to add an addition and make some renovations. The house was built by Elliot Sells in 1820 as a one-story structure. In approximately 1830, Mr. Sells added a second story and built a 1.5-story kitchen wing at the back. Originally, it was a house and a tavern. In the 1920-1930s, a concrete addition was added next to the kitchen wing. In November 2024, they sought ARB permission to demolish that addition and add on to the home, although their intent with that

now has changed. When his father purchased the home in 1970, he conducted many interior renovations in an attempt to bring it back to its historical roots. In doing so, the hand-hewn beams of the kitchen were exposed and hardwood floors were added. A brick fireplace was built in the original location of the kitchen fireplace, which was built to the standards allowing fireplace cooking. In 1970, his mother conducted fireplace cooking demonstrations for historical groups. However, the kitchen is small; that is a constraint, as is the fact that there is only one full bathroom. About 10 years ago, due to the constraints of the house, his parents moved out of the house. Eventually, he took over the house, and his son now is living there. Although he currently lives out of town, he would like to update the house to today's standards and move back to it. Mr. Hahm showed slides of the interior of the home. He noted that if they keep the concrete addition, it has a chronically leaking roof. He would like to increase the roof pitch to 3/12; currently, it is 2/12. Staff is concerned the proposed addition would cover a historic window. It would not; it would be very similar to the alignment at the window now. Their goals are to increase the kitchen space by moving it from the historic kitchen wing and into the adjacent concrete addition and add a covered porch; increase the roof pitch over the concrete addition and improve its exterior appearance; add a new addition. The addition would have a master suite and extra living space. It is important to them to minimize the footprint of the new addition. There are two designs. His first design is 1.5 stories. The second design is a one-story requested by City staff. Both are viable plans. The main downside to the one-story is that it provides less square footage. To keep it from sprawling into the backyard, he reduced the size of the hyphen to 5 or 6 feet. With his first design, the hyphen is over 11 feet long.

Mr. Cotter stated that this is a very important house in the Historic District and the City.

Dr. Hahm stated that they are very aware of that, and their goal is to make the upgrades in the right way.

Board Questions for the Applicant

Ms. Patt-McDaniel inquired if the porch would be open.

Dr. Hahm responded affirmatively.

Ms. Damaser inquired the reason he does not want to remove the 1930s addition.

Dr. Hahm responded that he is physician, but as a sideline, he does building and remodeling. He consulted with building professionals about the design and the historic manner in which the historic house was constructed. The foundation for the original part of the house extends down to the bedrock. Below ground level, it looks just like it does above ground...rubble stone. The 1940s addition is on a concrete slab. If it is torn down, it means significant excavation would be done right next to the foundation of the original structure. That will jeopardize the integrity of the house. Although it might be possible to underpin the foundation, the cost would be exorbitant. He decided to avoid the risk and the cost and use the existing concrete slab, which is in good shape.

Dr. Stechschulte inquired the plans for the chimney on the back of the house.

Dr. Hahm stated that they previously obtained ARB's approval to remove the chimney. In addition, they would restore the roof.

Ms. Patt-McDaniel stated that some earlier additions are now historic, as well. She understands why they are replacing the windows but is glad they are preserving the structure.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Bitar stated that this house is located just north of Pinney Hill Lane between S. Blacksmith and S. Riverview streets. It is zoned HR-Historic Residential. The site contains a Landmark Federal-style house, built in 1824 by Eliud Sells, making it the oldest stone house in the district. The front of the building reflects a simple, Federal style of architecture. The rough-hewn beams were part of the construction of the second floor in the 1800s. The building was used as a tavern as well as a residence, and it has evolved over time. A single-story kitchen ell was also added early in the house's history. A ca. 1930 CMU addition and chimney were added between the core and kitchen ell. His understanding, in looking at the National Register nomination is that the 1930s addition was originally an open porch that later was enclosed with concrete block. There are some interesting details from the original porch construction that staff suggests be taken advantage of in informing the elements of the proposed addition. Over time, the windows have changed. The original windows probably were 6/6. Currently, they are 1/1 in the front and 2/2 in the back in a variety of configurations. Mr. Bitar reviewed details of the two options under consideration. Option 1 was the applicant's first design. Option 2 requires a little more lot coverage than Option 1; however, both options would exceed the 25% lot coverage limitation, so a Code waiver would be required. The waiver is reasonable, given previous approvals in the surrounding area.

Option 1

The proposal is for a first-floor primary suite and second-floor storage area addition on the western side of the home, along with various interior and exterior renovations. The 1930s CMU addition is kept, renovated and reclad with new siding materials. A porch is proposed on the north edge of the 1930s addition, with another porch at the rear of the new addition. A hyphen connects the existing home with the proposed new addition to the rear. The staff report included comments about the pitch of the proposed roof, which is steeper than what is on the existing house. Staff recommends that the pitches match, if Option 1 is pursued. Staff is also concerned that the shed dormers are not consistent in character with the rest of the house. They extend all the way to the same surface as the outer walls. Traditionally, shed dormers are set back from the main façade of the house. In addition to the pitch, the roof forms over the existing addition, new porch and hyphen need to be simplified. The Federal style of architecture traditionally has more delicate proportions for the columns and beam above than is reflected in this option. The 3/12 roof pitches will require a waiver. The proposed height of the addition is taller than the kitchen ell but shorter than the original portion of the building. On the rear elevation, the window orientation should be more vertical. Staff is concerned with the proportions and organization of the dormers and windows.

Option 2

This single-story option lowers the building height, and the roof line is more in line with the existing kitchen ell. The hyphen is much narrower. Whether that provides adequate separation from the original components of the house is a matter of discussion. The roof pitches would require a waiver.

Staff believes that there are architectural details/cues in the original open porch architecture that could be integrated into the design of the addition, regardless which option is selected. There may be opportunities with the materials and the openings, especially within the hyphen to give it a more open feel similar to the original open porch.

Staff has provided the following review questions to guide the Board's discussion for this Informal Review:

- 1) Does the Board favor Option 1 or Option 2?
- 2) Relative to the favored option, does the Board support the massing of the addition?
- 3) Per the favored option, would the Board support maximum footprint and roof pitch Waivers?
- 4) Per the favored option, is the hyphen adequately expressed?
- 5) Does the Board support the porch forms and/or horizontal windows?
- 6) Does the Board agree with the materials as suggested?
- 7) Other discussion by the Board.

Mr. Bitar stated that staff would like the Board's input concerning the proposed materials. Stone is the historic material. Shake and board and batten elements are proposed; however, additions to early structures typically would have been very simple lap siding.

Board Questions

Ms. Patt-McDaniel requested clarification of the reason for staff's preference for Option 2. She assumes Option 1 includes another bedroom upstairs.

Dr. Hahm responded that in Option 1, the master bedroom suite also is on the first floor. The second floor would contain additional living space.

Ms. Patt-McDaniel inquired if the difference is the loss of living space.

Dr. Hahm responded that the one-story addition requires more lot coverage. It also provides a little less living space, although the removal of the stairs recovers some amount of living space. He stated that he would also like to comment on staff's suggestion to step back the dormers. He does not agree with that proposal. In the time period in which the house was constructed, shed dormers were very common; they were never stepped back into the roofline. That was something that was done later in Craftsman style houses in the 1930s and 1940s. Previous to that time, they did not want to build an extra structure to support a step-back dormer, which also would have resulted in loss of living space on the second floor. He owns a historical home in Gatlinburg, as well, and can state that those early houses never stepped back a shed dormer. Staff also indicates the windows are not sufficiently vertical. One of the challenges here is that these are not very big dormers, so there is not much vertical space in which to place windows. If the shed dormer were to be stepped back, there would be an even narrower area. There are some historic structures on High Street with shed dormers and there, square windows are seen. It is difficult to put a vertical window into a shed dormer. In regard to the roof pitch, he took various measures and found that the pitch varied from an 8 to 9 pitch. Because the intent is to maintain the roof pitch between the original structure and the addition, they are constrained not to do more than an 8 or 9 pitch. That is the reason the dormers end up having smaller windows.

Ms. Patt-McDaniel stated that if the existing addition was once an open porch, it would had to have been raised.

Dr. Hahm stated that in his opinion, he is not sure it was ever that open. His belief is that the right side where there are metal windows reflects the original porch design, and that portion is completely framed in wood. He believes on the left side, Eli Pinney replaced the windows with concrete block. There is a dividing wall in the center of that porch addition. Ms. Patt-McDaniel stated that she finds it hard to believe the addition was ever an open porch due to how it looks.

Dr. Hahm concurred. It could have been a sunroom. He asked his father about the passage from the front of the house to the back.

Dr. David Hahm, 3281 Lily Mar Ct., Dublin, stated that it originally was a porch with access only from the kitchen. It was not part of the original structure. Originally, that was where the cellar access via an outside stairway was located. Eli Pinney bought the house in 1938 from the Davis family, who had let the house conditions deteriorate. During the Depression years, they sold the ash flooring in the living room and the beautiful walnut staircase that extended from the front room to the upstairs. Consequently, when the Pinneys purchased the home, they were unable to access the upstairs. His theory was that the metal windows originally surrounded the entire porch area, and Dr. Pinney enclosed it.

Board members reviewed the two options.

Mr. Bitar clarified that he does not believe staff prefers one option over the other. The preference question is posed to the Board with the discussion questions to guide their review.

Dr. Jeffrey Hahm stated that he believes staff's concern was that the height of the roof on the addition would be higher than the roof on the kitchen ell. He pointed out the addition's 1.5-story height is dictated by modern Code, so it will be a little taller. In regard to staff's concern about the complexity of the roof, in the design, there is a notch on the left side of the roof. They were asked to add that to ensure the roof does not touch the historic stone. Cosmetically, he finds that jarring. He would rather have a straight roofline all the way across. Other than that, the porches on both options will be identical. The hyphen on the single-story addition will be shorter. He likes both options. He would not mind if the Board selected Option 2.

Mr. Bitar stated that the feedback might indicate that a combination of both options would be preferred.

Ms. Patt-McDaniel stated that while she likes how the ell is articulated in Option 1, she understands the reason it was reduced in Option 2 was to maximize the backyard, which also is desirable. Her preference would be Option 1.

Ms. Cooper stated that Option 1 looks more subordinate to the original structure. Option 2 looks very crowded. The house is so small and has such a colorful history and reflects historical changes made to the home. She prefers the porch in Option 1.

Mr. Cotter inquired if Board members had any concern with the height of Option 1.

Ms. Cooper and Ms. Patt-McDaniel indicated they did not.

Ms. Cooper indicated that Option 1 reflects the different eras; Option 2 looks blockier. She stated that Option 1 provides more separation; the addition looks more subordinate. It is a better look. She also agrees with Dr. Hahm about the notch in the roofline. She prefers Option 1 with less pitch to the roofline.

Ms. Damaser stated that she prefers the hyphen design in Option 1. She agrees that it adds more separation and subordination to the historical structure. She does not like the horizontal windows in the dormers, although she is aware the Board recently approved square windows in a Riverview case.

Dr. Hahm stated that he would be amenable to any window that would fit in there. It may be possible to use a squarer window in there.

Dr. Stechschulte stated that he agrees that Option 1 is the better option. He realizes the roof pitch and footprint are a concern. This is his first meeting. In the orientation materials, he received the Historic Design Guidelines for the City of Dublin. On p. 51, under outbuildings, it indicates that the shed in the back counts toward the lot coverage, which will take the total amount over 25%. However, that shed is very appealing. He would like to see that incorporated into the design. Dr. Hahm agreed. It actually has a privy in it. They definitely want to keep that outbuilding.

Dr. Stechschulte stated that he prefers Option 1 and would like to see greater emphasis given to the shed. Although it results in greater than 25% lot coverage, he does not have a problem with that.

Mr. Cotter stated that he prefers Option 2. He finds the rooflines of Option 1 overwhelming and distracting. They are overly busy for a simple house. He doesn't mind the height, but the complexity of Option 1 is off-putting. Option 2 is simpler. However, summarizing the Board's input, members believe Option 1 is acceptable due to its more subordinate look with adjustments to the roof pitch and square windows.

Mr. Cooper stated that she would be supportive of a waiver for footprint, particularly in view of the outbuilding on the site.

Ms. Damaser stated that she assumes the roof pitch waivers are for the 1930s porch. She understands staff's concerns about the roof covering the window; however, the applicant's calculations indicate it will not cover the window.

Dr. Hahm confirmed that it would not cover the window.

Board members indicated that they had no objection to a waiver for the footprint.

Board members expressed a preference for the longer Option 1 hyphen.

Dr. Hahm requested Board members' input on the notch in the roof caused by shortening the roof of the porch two feet to avoid covering the stone of the original structure. He believes the appearance is awkward.

[Discussion continued regarding the notch in the roofline.]

Mr. Cotter stated that the intent is to preserve the view of the original stone.

Ms. Patt-McDaniel stated that she believes it becomes a balance between proportion and preserving the view of two feet of stone in an area that actually will not be seen.

Board members indicated that they were unable to take a position on the notch in the roofline until they see the completed design.

Mr. Cotter reiterated that the Board's preference is to abide by the Historic District Code and Guidelines.

Board members indicated a preference for square windows rather than horizontal.

Board members sought clarification of the questions concerning porch forms.

Mr. Bitar stated that it refers to the columns. Staff is asking if the Board is comfortable with the staff and applicant working to refine the porch forms so that the proportions are appropriate.

Board members indicated that they were comfortable with that process.

Mr. Cotter requested clarification of the proposed materials.

Dr. Hahm stated that his proposal was for shingled siding on the outside of the 1930s addition to cover the concrete, transitioning to board and batten on the new addition.

Ms. Patt-McDaniel inquired if Mr. Bitar indicated that early additions to structures traditionally used lap siding.

Mr. Bitar stated that historically, additions to masonry structures would have been frame construction with lap siding. However, there are many examples of board and batten in the district. The thought is that stone has a certain character, and it is desirable not to compete with it. Shingle is a texture that competes with stone. The simplicity of lap siding would be preferred.

Mr. Cotter suggested that the applicant consider a smoother texture material.

Dr. Hahm responded that he does not like lap siding but would have no issue with doing the entire renovation in board and batten. They were trying to distinguish the two structures.

Mr. Cotter emphasized the need for simple lines and simple textures, taking care not to overwhelm the front, historic structure with too much behind it.

Mr. Bitar reiterated that with masonry structures of brick or stone, traditionally, additions were frame with lap siding.

Ms. Cooper and Ms. Damaser inquired when that was the practice and the time period of the addition.

Mr. Bitar responded that the practice was not tied to a single time period, but it was the traditional practice.

Mr. Cotter summarized that Board's preference is for Option 1, softening the roof pitches and simplifying the fenestrations. The Board has no objections to the roof height, or the waivers for roof pitch or footprint. The Board has no objection to the proposed building materials.

Mr. Cotter asked if the applicant sought any additional clarification.

Dr. Hahm indicated that he did not.

Public Comments

There were no public comments on the case.

COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Bitar shared the following:

- Members were reminded of the joint PZC-ARB-BZA training on Tuesday, July 22 at 6:30 p.m. in the Dublin Development Building, 5200 Emerald Parkway. Closer to that date, members will be receiving an agenda and more details.
- Members were provided print copies of the Envision Dublin Community Plan. It is also available online.
- The next regular ARB meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, July 23 at 6:30 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:45 p.m.



Chair, Architectural Review Board



Assistant Clerk of Council