

RECORD OF ACTION

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, May 21, 2025 | 6:30 p.m.

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

**2. Laird Residence
25-025MPR**

Minor Project Review

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| Proposal: | Request for review and approval of Minor Project Review to allow for construction of a new home on PID 273-013558. The 0.27-acre site is zoned HD-HS, Historic Residential District. |
| Location: | Approximately 200 feet north of Short Street on the east side of S. Riverview Street. |
| Planning Contact: | Sarah Tresouthick Holt, AICP, ASLA, Senior Planner |
| Contact Information: | 614.410.4662, sholt@dublin.oh.us |
| Case Information: | www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/25-025 |

MOTION 1: Ms. Damaser moved, Mr. Jewell seconded approval of a Waiver to Code Section 153.173A to allow 40' of building height at rear where 24' is required.

VOTE: 4-0

RESULT: The Waiver was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

| | |
|--------------------|--------|
| Lisa Patt-McDaniel | Yes |
| Sean Cotter | Yes |
| Martha Cooper | Absent |
| Michael Jewell | Yes |
| Hilary Damaser | Yes |

MOTION 2: Mr. Damaser moved, Mr. Jewell seconded approval of a Waiver to Section 153.174(B)(4)(c)(3) to allow roof pitches of 3:12 for shed roofs and sunroom roof where pitches are required to be greater than 3:12.

VOTE: 4-0

RESULT: The Waiver was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

| | |
|--------------------|--------|
| Lisa Patt-McDaniel | Yes |
| Sean Cotter | Yes |
| Martha Cooper | Absent |
| Michael Jewell | Yes |
| Hilary Damaser | Yes |

MOTION 3: Ms. Damaser moved, Mr. Jewell seconded approval of a waiver to Section 153.174(J)(1) to allow Trex for rear decks where wood is required.

VOTE: 4-0

RESULT: The Waiver was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

| | |
|--------------------|--------|
| Lisa Patt-McDaniel | Yes |
| Sean Cotter | Yes |
| Martha Cooper | Absent |
| Michael Jewell | Yes |
| Hilary Damaser | Yes |

MOTION 4: Ms. Damaser moved, Mr. Jewell seconded approval of the Minor Project Review with the following two conditions:

- 1) Prior to building permit the applicant shall supply staff with the colors for the sunroom panels and the columns.
- 2) Prior to building permit, the applicant shall supply staff with the materials, colors, and hardware for shutters.

VOTE: 4-0

RESULT: The Minor Project was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

| | |
|--------------------|--------|
| Lisa Patt-McDaniel | Yes |
| Sean Cotter | Yes |
| Martha Cooper | Absent |
| Michael Jewell | Yes |
| Hilary Damaser | Yes |

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Signed by:

Sarah Tresouthick Holt

89A2805342A848D...

Sarah Tresouthick Holt, AICP, ASLA
Senior Planner



Community Planning and Development



5200 Emerald Parkway
Dublin, Ohio 43017



614.410.4600
dublinohiousa.gov

Sustainable | Connected | Resilient

front all the way around. They were being cautious of crowding the window trim but can find a balance.

Mr. Cotter asked if the vertical siding on the front elevation at the top is four-inch siding. Mr. Memmer stated that board and batten siding typically has a one-inch by two-inch batten strip that can be spread as appropriate. Mr. Cotter sought confirmation that all vertical siding will be board and batten and at the same dimension. Mr. Memmer answered affirmatively.

Ms. Patt-McDaniel stated that staff mentioned the screen enclosure in their report and asked the applicant for comment. Mr. Memmer stated that the upper deck will have a dryscape system and beadboard ceiling will be underneath everything that is first floor deck height. There will be no exposed framing. Regarding the screening, there are products available that are more low visibility that can be used to keep that feeling more open, which is also the desire of the client. They are happy to name that product at the next step.

Ms. Holt stated that staff does not have experience with this. They contacted Heritage Ohio to see if they had any experience with screening, and they agreed that the goal is to make it as transparent as possible. Mr. Cotter stated that it may be helpful to provide an example at Minor Project Review.

Mr. Cotter asked if there is a way to make the roof pitch conform. Mr. Hemmer stated that there is nothing preventing it from being 4:12.

Ms. Patt-McDaniel stated that she thinks the front is appropriate for the street. Regarding the rear of the structure, the Board has approved that kind of massing in the rear of properties.

Mr. Jewell stated that the back massing has been consistent because of the elevation change.

Ms. Damaser agreed. This project is similar to what has been approved lately and she thinks it looks great. She appreciates the simplicity and symmetry.

Mr. Cotter stated that he appreciates the back being symmetrical. All sides look good. The design fits in. Making the shed roof conform makes approval easier.

Mr. Jewell stated that the Board will want to see a sample of the screen. He encouraged the applicant to make it as transparent as possible while serving its purpose.

Mr. Cotter asked if the applicant needed any further clarification from the Board. Mr. Memmer did not seek any further information.

As the case was an Informal Review requesting Board input only, no Board action was taken.

Public Comment

There was no public comment on the case.

Case #25-025MPR Laird Residence

Minor Project Review Request for review and approval of Minor Project Review to allow for construction of a new home on PID 273-013558. The 0.27-acre site is zoned HD-HS, Historic Residential District and is located approximately 200 feet north of Short Street on the east side of S. Riverview Street.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Holt stated that this approximately .25-acre site is zoned Historic Residential. In January of 2025, there was an informal review where overall massing was supported, larger windows and simplification of materials was suggested. The surroundings include mostly background buildings and vacant lots. Some changes to the project include thickening of the columns at the front door, and windows and hardware added to the garage door. Window sizes were difficult to increase due to the internal layout, so staff has requested shutters. Those have been added. A condition of approval has been added requiring the submission of those materials prior to building permit. Ms. Damaser asked if shutters are only planned on the lower level. Ms. Holt stated that shutters were not added on the upper level. Ms. Holt stated that staff questioned the shake panels on the first floor as they are very regular in appearance and perhaps not authentic but found that they were approved for 53 North Riverview Street. They were used at 53 North Riverview Street to reduce the busyness of the façade, which was one of the Board's comments for this project so it may be appropriate. Three waivers are requested for the shed roof pitch on the rear façade, decking material, and rear building height. Otherwise, the project is as presented at informal review. Staff is appreciative of the appropriate door and window arrangements. Staff expressed a concern about the cross gable size relative to the parallel gable size on the north elevation. It will not be very visible but may be overwhelming. The south elevation has good window placement. The windows in the garage were paired based on comments made by the Board at the informal review. The front entry is moved slightly forward of the main plane of the house, as is the center rear.

Ms. Holt continued with the materials and colors. The roof will be Certaineed Landmark in weathered wood. The coated metals group will be the standing seam in Iron Ore, low gloss. All siding and trim materials are Hardie Plank, which does not require a waiver. The board and batten is smooth with the 12-inch on center battens. Trim and decorative panels are also smooth Hardie board. The stone is Halquist dimensional in Beaver Creek. The deck and porch columns will be made from the Hardie smooth material. The colors are alabaster for the board and batten, trim, columns and panels and Oyster Bay for the shake. Other materials include a wood door from Cloplay with windows and hardware. Marvin Ultimate windows and doors, all of which will be casement window sliders or french style for the front entry and all will be clad in ebony. Staff is supportive of the ebony because it goes well with the ivory, and this is a new build, so it is less traditional. The lighting is from Visual Comfort.

Three waivers are requested for the 40-foot rear height, the 3:12 roof pitches, and the Trex decking. Staff supports all three waiver requests and approval of the Minor Project with one condition.

Applicant Presentation

Ataylor Sommer, 7422 Silver Leaf Court, Columbus, stated that staff did a great job explaining their request.

Public Comment

There was one comment shared in packet materials.

Board Questions

Ms. Damaser asked the applicant to speak on the shake siding. Ms. Sommer stated that at the Informal Review, the Board and staff expressed that the shake could make the design too busy. She noted that drawings done on the computer look busier. Taking those comments into consideration, she thought the straight edge would simplify the design and would be a more appropriate choice based on previous feedback.

Ms. Patt-McDaniel complimented the applicant on her house color choice.

Board Discussion

Ms. Damaser moved, Mr. Jewell seconded approval of a waiver to Section 153.173A to allow 40' of building height at rear where 24' is required.

Vote: Mr. Jewell, yes; Ms. Damaser, yes; Ms. Patt-McDaniel, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes.
[Motion carried 4-0]

Ms. Damaser moved, Mr. Jewell seconded approval of a waiver to Section 153.174(B)(4)(c)(3) to allow roof pitches of 3:12 for shed roofs and sunroom roof where pitches are required to be greater than 3:12.

Vote: Ms. Damaser, yes; Mr. Jewell, yes; Ms. Patt-McDaniel, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes.
[Motion carried 4-0]

Ms. Damaser moved, Mr. Jewell seconded approval of a waiver to Section 153.174(J)(1) to allow Trex for rear decks where wood is required.

Vote: Mr. Cotter, yes; Ms. Damaser, yes; Mr. Jewell, yes; Ms. Patt-McDaniel, yes.
[Motion carried 4-0]

Ms. Damaser moved, Mr. Jewell seconded approval of the Minor Project Review with the following condition:

- 1) Prior to building permit, the applicant shall supply staff with the materials, colors, and hardware for the shutters.

Vote: Mr. Cotter, yes; Ms. Patt-McDaniel, yes; Mr. Jewell, yes; Ms. Damaser, yes.
[Motion carried 4-0]

Case #24-142MPR

40 E. Bridge Street

Minor Project Review

Request for review and approval of Minor Project Review to allow the remodel and construction of an addition. The 0.32-acre site is zoned HD-HR, Historic Residential District, and is located northeast of the intersection of N. Blacksmith Lane and E. Bridge Street.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Holt stated that this location is bordered by North Riverview Street, East Bridge Street and North Blacksmith Lane. It is zoned Historic Residential and is one of the three auction houses sold in October of 2023. [Photos showing context were shared.] The historic privy is not a part of this request. In January 2025, the Board had discussion about whether the rear addition is subordinate,



SUMMARY OF ACTIONS

Architectural Review Board Meeting

~~Wednesday, January 29, 2025, 6:30 p.m.~~

Members Present: ~~Sean Cotter, Martha Cooper, Lisa Patt-McDaniel, Hilary Damaser~~

~~ACCEPTANCE OF MEETING DOCUMENTS AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES~~

~~*MOTION CARRIED 4-0 TO ACCEPT THE DOCUMENTS INTO THE RECORD AND APPROVE THE 12-18-24 MEETING MINUTES*~~

CASE REVIEWS

Case #24-161INF, Laird Residence, Informal Review

Informal review and feedback for the construction of a new single-family home in the Historic District. The 0.27-acre site is zoned HD-HR, Historic Residential District, and is located approximately 60 feet north of the intersection of S Riverview Street and Short Street.

NON-BINDING FEEDBACK

The Board appreciated the good design start for this new construction on a newly-split lot just north of Short Street. Roof angles were discussed, along with window sizes and the number materials initially proposed.

~~Case #25-004INF, 48 S. High Street, Informal Review~~

~~Informal review and feedback on façade renovations to a Landmark Building. The 0.25-acre site is zoned HD-HS: Historic South District and is located southeast of the South High Street and Spring Hill Lane intersection.~~

NON-BINDING FEEDBACK

~~The Board provided the following feedback:~~

- ~~• Design should be vernacular and simple in approach.~~
- ~~• The applicant should consider using a preservation architect to assist with the application.~~

~~Note: The owner is interested in a Façade Improvement Grant for the proposed work.~~

~~Case #24-153MPR~~

~~Coffman House – Garden Beds, Minor Project Review~~

~~Proposal for renovations to Giving Garden Beds at the Coffman House. The beds exist on a 20'x10' plot, two of the existing beds will be raised, allowing for ADA accessibility. The 1.286-acre site is zoned PUD: Coffman Park, and is located north of the Emerald Pkwy and Post Rd intersection.~~

~~*MOTION CARRIED 4-0 TO APPROVE THE MINOR PROJECT REVIEW (MPR)*~~



MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, January 29, 2025

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Cotter, Chair, called the January 29, 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.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. Cotter led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Board members present: Sean Cotter, Martha Cooper, Lisa Patt-McDaniel, Hilary Damaser
Board members absent: Michael Jewell
Staff members present: Sarah Holt, Bassem Bitar, Rati Singh, Michaela Evans

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Cotter moved, Ms. Cooper seconded acceptance of the documents into the record and approval of the December 18, 2024 meeting minutes.

Vote: Ms. Patt-McDaniel, yes; Ms. Damaser, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes.
[Motion carried 4-0]

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.

CASE REVIEWS

Case #24-161INF

Laird Residence

Informal Review

Informal review and feedback for the construction of a new single-family home in the Historic District. The 0.27-acre site is zoned HD-HR, Historic Residential District, and is

located approximately 60 feet north of the intersection of S Riverview Street and Short Street.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Holt stated that the site is located on a newly split lot done administratively per Code and is currently zoned Historic Residential. Images of context shown. The ¼-acre site sits above the Scioto River and faces South Riverview Street. The proposal is for a 1½-story simple traditional form front façade new structure. It follows Guidelines 5.0 and 5.1B. There is a projecting center gable, which is the focus for the proposed front door. There are shed roof forms throughout providing upper-level usability. The addition of mullions between the windows are necessary for a traditional look. Different materials are indicated. The plan shows a stone foundation and entries, shingled siding, and two roof types (asphalt and standing seam). The Board is asked to comment on if that is too busy for a small façade. The rear façade is broken into smaller masses. The center portion comes forward and the side portions sit further back. There are decks and a sunroom shown. Staff suggests the sunroom roof be broken and the Board is asked to comment on whether they would support a waiver for the sunroom roof pitch. Overall, the window arrangements are appropriate at this stage. Materials for the rear façade are the same as the front with the addition of board and batten. The massing steps downhill to the river as suggested in the Guidelines. This could be enhanced with hip gable form. The south side shows simple fenestration. Perhaps window sizes could be adjusted. Paired windows need mullions. Staff feels it is a good start and appreciates the applicant's efforts to meet the Code and Guidelines.

The following discussion questions have been provided to guide the Board's discussion:

- 1) Does the Board support the proposed massing, especially front and rear?
- 2) Does the Board support the elevations as shown, specifically the form of the side elevations?
- 3) Would the Board support a Waiver for the sunroom roof pitch?
- 4) What are the Board's thoughts on the use of materials?
- 5) Other considerations by the Board.

Applicant Presentation

Taylor Sommer, His and Hers Architects, 7422 Silver Court, Columbus, referenced Board comments on the materials and stated that they would be happy to match the color of the standing seam on the dormers to the shingles. The neighboring house has board and batten and they did not want to directly match that house. Shake is a busy material and stone is a busy material. The intent of the addition of board and batten was to break that up. With regard to the roof, Ms. Sommer stated that they could go to a 3:12 slope understanding that is against the District Guidelines. They would be willing to consider the shed gable. To add a hip gable to the rear elevation would have two roofs shedding in the same direction coming to a point, creating potential snow buildup and water buildup that could cause damage.

Board Questions

Mr. Cotter asked for the reasoning behind the configuration of the stone on the south side. Ms. Sommer stated that from the front, the entire garage structure is stone. Another way to change the mass from the side would be to bump that side out but the size constraints of the site do not allow

that. The taller gable presents the stronger mass and so the decision was made to carry the stone material up that.

Ms. Patt-McDaniel asked about the size of the windows on the south elevation. Ms. Sommer stated she is willing to consider larger windows. Her thought process was that it is a garage as is evident from the front of the house. Ms. Patt-McDaniel stated that larger windows there would balance out the windows on that side. Mr. Cotter agreed.

Ms. Patt-McDaniel stated the roofline meets Guidelines now. She does not see the need for the hip gable on the rear roof. Ms. Sommer stated that it might feel out of place since it is nowhere else on the house. Ms. Damaser stated that she likes the sunroom as presented. Ms. Sommer stated that the sunroom was a shed to match the dormers so that they would feel secondary.

Ms. Cooper sought confirmation that the applicant is agreeable with idea of using a flat roof on the sunroom. Ms. Sommer stated that she would explore the idea but would prefer what is presented because this is best solution for water.

Ms. Sommer stated that standing seam has a better warranty with a 3:12 pitch and that would ensure that it is less visible. Ms. Damaser confirmed 3:12 would require a waiver. Ms. Holt answered affirmatively, adding that those have been routinely granted by this Board. Ms. Damaser stated that it seems like that would be appropriate in this context.

Board Discussion

Mr. Cotter requested the Board's response to the discussion questions.

1) Does the Board support the proposed massing, especially front and rear?

Ms. Cooper stated that she thinks the project fits in well and meets the requirements. She is supportive of the idea of the applicant suggesting different materials than an adjacent property, especially since they are so close to one another. Ms. Damaser and Mr. Cotter agreed.

2) Does the Board support the elevations as shown, specifically the form of the side elevations?

3) Would the Board support a Waiver for the sunroom roof pitch?

There was consensus among the board members on support for the roof as presented and a potential waiver for the sunroom roof.

Ms. Damaser stated that she agrees with staff's suggestion for larger windows on the south side. It is not identifiable as a garage from that side and those windows are added to hide the fact that it is a garage. Ms. Patt-McDaniel agreed regarding the windows being larger. Ms. Damaser added that the desire is to protect the historic image and historically, there would not have been a garage.

4) What are the Board's thoughts on the use of materials?

Ms. Damaser stated that the structure needs to be differentiated from the neighboring house but the design seems busy.

Mr. Cotter stated that the design feels busy. Color could soften that. Ms. Sommer stated that the black and white drawings do not read well; adding color to renderings will help but she will keep the Board's comments in mind.

As the case was an Informal Review requesting Board input only, no Board action was taken.

Public Comment

There was no public comment on the case.

Case #25-004INF

48 S. High Street

~~Informal review and feedback on façade renovations to a Landmark Building. The 0.25-acre site is zoned HD-HS: Historic South District and is located southeast of the South High Street and Spring Hill Lane intersection.~~

Staff Presentation

~~Ms. Singh stated that the 0.25-acre site is zoned Historic District Historic Core and is located southeast at the intersection of South High Street and Spring Hill Lane. The property consists of two adjacent buildings (48 and 50 South High Street). The property under consideration is 48 South High Street. These structures were added to the National Register of Historic Places in 1979. The applicant is seeking feedback on the front façade improvements. Historic photos from 1898 and 1920 were displayed. Over time there have been several alterations to both buildings. The historic photos show that the main entrance originally faced North High Street, and the applicant aims to restore that access via the façade improvements. It can also be seen that there were minimal architectural features on both 48 and 50 South High Street. The proposed improvements to the building include removing the two bay windows, re-establishing an earlier door location, and installing a new storefront window where an older window once existed. The applicant is seeking feedback prior to a formal Minor Project Review application. Historical photos indicated that the bay windows were not original to the building, and they are considered an inappropriate addition.~~

~~Staff supports the improvement to the façade, which will allow the first-floor access from North High Street, restoring the original intent. The applicant proposes to use the same awning and detail as seen on 50 South High Street. Under today's Codes and Guidelines, what exists at 50 South High Street would not be approved as a façade improvement. The Historic Guidelines stated that the design should be consistent with the historic storefront character, including the window sizes and architectural features. Any downsizing and enlarging of the window opening shall be avoided and windows should match the appearance of the historic originals if evidence is found. The applicant proposes a Therma-Tru fiberglass front door and a Pella Lifestyle 51-inch by 55-inch window. The proposed door would require a waiver. The Board has approved waivers for fiberglass doors, both for background buildings and landmark buildings where criteria are met. The existing landscaping is proposed to be removed and replaced with pavers, which will meet the Bridge Street streetscape character.~~

~~The following discussion questions have been provided to guide the Board's discussion:~~

- ~~1) Does the Board support the renovation of the existing front façade:~~