

MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, November 28, 2018

AGENDA

1. **110-112 S. Riverview Street, Demolition and New Construction**
18-068INF **Informal Review (Discussion Only)**
2. **Dublin Arts Council, Site Improvements** **7125 Riverside Drive**
18-069ARB **Informal Review (Discussion Only)**
3. **BSD HC – Dublin Toy Emporium, Sign** **28 N. High Street**
18-067ARB-MPR **Minor Project Review (Approved 4 – 0)**
4. **BSD HR - Vessels' Residence** **63 S. Riverview Street**
18-076ARB **Demolition Review (Approved 4 – 0)**
5. **BSD HR - Vessels' Residence** **63 S. Riverview Street**
18-073ARB-MPR **Minor Project Review (Approval to Table 4 – 0)**
6. **Keeler Residence** **5281 Brand Road**
18-072ARB **Architectural Review Board Application (Approved 3 – 0)**

The Chair, David Rinaldi, called the meeting to order at 6:29 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Board Members present were: Gary Alexander, Andrew Keeler and Shannon Stenberg. City representatives were: Jennifer Rauch, Nichole Martin, Shawn Krawetzki, Richard Hansen, Jimmy Hoppel, and Laurie Wright.

Administrative Business

Motion and Vote

Mr. Keeler moved, Ms. Stenberg seconded, to accept the documents into the record. The vote was as follows: Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; and Mr. Keeler, yes. (Approved 4 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Keeler moved, Mr. Alexander seconded, to approve the September 26, 2018, meeting minutes as presented. The vote was as follows: Shannon Stenberg, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; and Mr. Keeler, yes. (Approved 4 – 0)



Motion and Vote

Ms. Stenberg moved, Mr. Keeler seconded, to approve the 2019-2020 meeting dates as proposed. The vote was as follows: Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Shannon Stenberg, yes; and Mr. Keeler, yes. (Approved 4 – 0)

The Chair briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Architectural Review Board. He swore in anyone planning to address the Board during this meeting.

1. BSD HR - 110-112 S. Riverview Street, Demolition and New Construction 18-068INF Informal Review

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said this application is a proposal for informal review and feedback of a potential future application to demolish an existing two-family residential structure and construct a new single-family home on a 0.58-acre parcel zoned Bridge Street District – Historic Residential.

Nichole Martin said the home was built in 1966 and the applicant is requesting feedback on site layout, architecture, and general neighborhood compatibility for the new construction. She said the site is on the east side of South Riverview Street and presented an aerial view for context. She noted the Historic Residential Neighborhood emphasizes the character on each side of the street be maintained and the Scioto River side of the street is quite different from the opposing side. Another aerial view was shown to highlight the position of the house on the property, mature trees, the flood plain, and significant change in grade down to the river.

Ms. Martin presented photographs and a map of the five immediately adjacent homes. She emphasized the homes on the same side of the street as the applicants' are the most comparable.

Ms. Martin presented a photograph of the single-story, brick ranch with a walkout basement. She presented existing conditions as an assessment for a future demolition application. She pointed out the photographs depict the aging masonry, deteriorating foundation, the roof, windows, and deck in need of replacement and presence of lead paint, asbestos, and aluminum wiring.

Ms. Martin presented the proposed site plan depicting the footprint of a new ranch-style home that will be approximately 3,000 square feet in size and will be located outside the flood plain and flood way. She said the footprint is larger compared to the existing home, given the proposed three-car attached garage.

Ms. Martin presented a proposed west elevation on S. Riverview Street to obtain the Board's feedback on this approximately 100-foot wide home with a total height, to the top of the roof, of approximately 24 feet. She explained the design as largely symmetrical with a double front door and stoop with two columns on either side of the entry. There is a gable roof detail and a group of three six-over-six windows, stone water table, a mixture of horizontal and vertical board-and-batten siding, a shed dormer, and three-car front loaded garage with carriage style doors.

Ms. Martin asked the following discussion questions:

1. Does the Board support demolition of the existing structure?
2. Is the Board supportive of construction of a new home within the Historic Residential neighborhood?
3. If the Board is supportive of a potential demolition, is the proposed scale, architecture, and associated details appropriate for new construction?
4. Other considerations by the Board.

Ms. Martin concluded she could answer questions and the applicant was present as well.

David Rinaldi asked if the structure was contributing or not. Ms. Martin explained that the Historic, Cultural Assessment found it to not be a contributing structure, but that it is eligible to be considered as a contributing structure should the City engage in reassessing contributing structures throughout the District.

The Chair asked if the applicant had anything to add to the presentation.

Neil Widerschein, 7166 Coventry Woods Court, said he has lived in Dublin 'forever'. He said he and his wife have been looking at this particular neighborhood a long time in the hopes of building a retirement home in that neighborhood. He said they have always viewed this house as one to demolish and start over because they thought it was a great spot to contribute to the neighborhood. He said the elevations shared this evening are not a final plan; they brought something to the Board they could discuss possibly in this vein. He said they are trying very hard to keep the scale reasonable to keep the materials consistent but not duplicative of what is already happening. He said they would like to know if this plan has any chance of happening before they get too far with it. He suggested if the Board was generally supportive, if specifics could be discussed to advance this project.

The Chair called anyone from the public that would like to speak on behalf of this application.

Steve Rudy 129 S. Riverview Street, said personally he is excited to see someone do right by the property after ±20 of seeing this neglected and a physical hazard in the neighborhood.

Gary Alexander asked for further explanation about the eligibility of this property becoming contributing. Ms. Martin said a comprehensive historic and cultural assessment was made of all properties in the City and this included already designated contributing structures as well as potentially contributing structures. The consultant basically stated this is not contributing based on any architectural features or history; however, as time moves forward, and should the City reassess, eventually these ranches will be historic.

Tom Holton, The Historical Society, 5957 Roundstone Place, confirmed what Ms. Martin said was true. He indicated the consultant gave that fine point giving the City an out. He stated the structure has no architectural merit but from an age standpoint, 1966 meets the age requirement. He said for the assessment, they were charged with assessing anything 50 years old or older but this has no architectural features to speak of. He said they made the assessments to count it and put in a category but it is the City's call in the end. He recalled there were others like that as well. In summary, the consultant said yes and no.

The Chair asked the members to go through the questions. He asked if given an appropriate design, if they were supportive of a demolition.

Shannon Stenberg stated the applicant did a very good job at proving the structure is already starting to deteriorate so she would be supportive of the demolition.

Andrew Keeler said he would support a demolition, as well.

Gary Alexander said he thought two of the criteria were met so he would be supportive of a demolition.

David Rinaldi agreed, given an appropriate replacement project. He said obviously, in the residential district, they want to see a home there. He asked the Board if they were supportive of the proposed structure so far and if they could provide feedback.

Mr. Keeler said the original concept of the elevation looks good to him. He said the design is fairly simple and not overdone with a lot of exterior finishes or roof lines. He stated he liked it. He suggested there

could possibly be a little bit more differentiation between the height of the garage and the height of the main structure.

Mr. Alexander said this plan is a good start but is deceptive as it appears very flat and 100 feet long, which is a really long house. He said he knows the site and it is possible to build deeper on that property. He said there needs to be more offsets in breaks and planes as compared to the houses on the same side of the street. He indicated one of the problems is with the three gables as they do not hold your eyes. He suggested taking the gable off of the garage, removing one bay, and pushing it back slightly will downplay the front. He said the general height and scale of the house is appropriate to that site.

Ms. Stenberg said she was concerned with the overall length as the original house was 60 feet long and this is 100 feet long, making it longer than the houses on either side of it. She said the height of the building as well as materials used and overall appearance were appropriate for the neighborhood. She concluded it looks great.

Mr. Rinaldi said he would mirror some of those comments from his fellow members. He noted the original house was 66 feet across and this is proposed at 106 feet, an increase of 40 feet. He said that would take away some of the open views of the river as this appears as a street wall. He said he would support a two-car garage because it would be a better fit with what the rest of the street is doing; there may only be one house on the street with a three-car garage. He suggested some more home depth would be helpful, shorter in length, and this would be a great addition to the street and the neighbors should be very happy.

Mr. Widerschein asked specifically about height. Mr. Rinaldi said it is a fairly substantial change but generally it fits well with the rest of the neighbors and the height is fine.

Mr. Widerschein stated the design problem of going deeper would require building out over stilts but the fall off is shocking. He said per the engineers, to go back, the construction costs become daunting. Ms. Martin noted the applicant would be limited to 35 feet in height.

Mr. Alexander said the applicant should take the Board's comments and make subtle changes rather than radical revisions. He understands removing a bay off the garage is not so subtle but changing the roofline of the garage, make a greater offset between the garage and the house, and continuing the materials across does not help, it just makes the house appear longer. He said if there was more of a change from the house and the garage the difference would be greater and not appear so much as a train.

Mr. Widerschein summarized it is the similarity of materials moving across and repetition.

Mr. Holton said the sight lines and length of the building could be broken up with trees. He asked how many potential trees could be eliminated. Mr. Rinaldi indicated that from the presentation, the body of the house would sit where the current house sits and it is the garage that will take up open space.

Mr. Widerschein said there is currently a large tree where the proposed garage would go but the tree grows right into the power lines overhead. He said he does not understand why the power company allows that to happen. He said they plan to account for any trees they would take down and plant new. He said the lot and the area is not short on trees and the river behind it is almost not visible because of the amount of honeysuckle, etc. He said landscaping work will need to be done.

Mr. Rinaldi indicated that would not be a deal breaker either way; there will be consideration for additional planting if significant trees are lost. He concluded he is very excited about this project; it will be a nice asset and improvement to the neighborhood. He asked if there were any further questions or comments. [Hearing none.]

**2. Dublin Arts Council, Site Improvements
18-069ARB**

**7125 Riverside Drive
Informal Review**

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said this application is a proposal for site improvements, including landscape and hardscape modifications to the vehicular and pedestrian entrance for the Dublin Arts Council. He said the six-acre site is zoned Restricted Suburban Residential District.

Richard Hansen said according to the most recent Historic and Cultural Assessment, the property is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. He clarified the site is not in the Historic District, nor is it listed on Appendix G, which gives purview to the Board.

Mr. Hansen said this is an informal review including an entryway plaza, grass-paver access lane, increased landscaping, and a crushed granite pathway. He said the site is west of Riverside Drive, approximately 1,000 feet north of the intersection with Emerald Parkway as illustrated from an aerial view of the site. He presented an illustration of the planned site improvements alongside an overhead photograph of the current site, which showed the direct relation of the proposed improvement just east of the historic building and intended to create an outdoor event space or location for public art for the Arts Council. He added the improvements are focused around an extension of the entryway plaza providing an additional vehicular and pedestrian access to the building. He presented photographs of the existing conditions of the entryway and plaza.

Mr. Hansen said the specific proposed improvements include a Bluestone paver plaza lined by two-foot wide concrete band; Stone seatwalls and columns; In-ground tent anchors to accommodate three different tents; Space for public art; Increased landscaping along existing planting beds; Grass paver access lane; Crushed granite pathway; and the Relocation of an existing directional sign to a more visible location near the front of the site.

Mr. Hansen concluded by presenting discussion questions:

1. Are the proposed improvements complementary to the historic structure?
2. Are the proposed materials and plant selections appropriate?
3. Are the vehicular-use areas addressed in a sensitive manner?
4. Are there other considerations by the Board?

Mr. Hansen said the applicant was present to answer any questions as well.

The Chair asked the applicant if there was anything to add to the presentation. Shawn Krawetzki, Landscape Architect for the City of Dublin, answered he had nothing to add.

The Chair asked if there was any public comment with respect to this application. [Hearing none.]

David Rinaldi said he liked the proposal and the only cautionary comment is the grass by-pass road for events as it is usually hard to keep grass established. He said there is so much beautiful lawn there now, he would hate to not see that as a green space.

Eugenia M. Martin, CYP Studios, 148 E. North Street, Worthington, Ohio, said that is one of the considerations in regards to the pavers so they will ensure all the soil in that area is conducive to grass growth. She explained one of the biggest issues is compaction and making sure the area is well watered. Currently, she said, there are no plans for installing an irrigation system, as it is a fairly wet area.

Gary Alexander asked if this was going to be a grass block concrete system or the plastic system. Ms. Martin answered the plastic would be used.

Mr. Alexander said he had a concern with the number of cars coming for an event and maneuvering the turns. Ms. Martin explained the drive-aisle is meant to be more specifically used by the accessible parking located at the rear of the building. She said anyone using a wheelchair or walker would enter that way as that is where the building elevator is located. She said that drive-aisle would only be used during events if there are tents that are blocking the access. She said there is really just one way in and one way out.

Mr. Rinaldi said he resides about a half-mile north of that property so he cautioned the applicant about the minimal amount of top soil with clay right underneath it. He said the event space is a great idea and this plan has been done well.

**3. BSD HC – Dublin Toy Emporium, Sign
18-067ARB-MPR**

**28 N. High Street
Minor Project Review**

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said this application is a proposal for an approximately 4.5-square-foot projecting sign for an existing tenant space zoned Bridge Street District Historic Core.

Nichole Martin said the tenant space is located on the east side of North High Street, approximately 200 feet north of the intersection with Wing Hill. She said it is a single-story, brick building with a gabled roof, symmetrical design with windows on either sides of the main entry and raised-panel shutters.

Ms. Martin presented photographs of the existing conditions and noted the sign is already installed. She said approval of this application is intended to document the existing sign with a couple of conditions to ensure all of the Code provisions are met, as well as some final details are considered.

Ms. Martin presented a graphic of the sign plan. She said both the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* and the *Bridge Street District Sign Design Guidelines* provide guidance on creative sign designs. She reported Staff and the Administrative Review Team found this sign to be creative and compliment the use of the business.

Ms. Martin said approval is being recommended with three conditions:

- 1) That the material be HDU;
- 2) That the applicant provides a dimensioned drawing verifying an eight-foot clear distance beneath the sign, at the time of sign permitting; and
- 3) That the mounting hardware be cleaned up and painted to match the sign.

The Chair asked the applicant if she wanted to add to the presentation.

Enas Lanham, 6940 Ballantrae Loop, Dublin, Ohio, owner of Dublin Toy Emporium, said she has a concern with cost to re-do the sign or make modifications, being a new business owner and trying to make it the first year.

The Chair called for public comment on this application. [Hearing none.] He opened the meeting up to the Board for discussion.

Andrew Keeler said the sign drawing is 20 inches tall, the picture that has the scales of eight feet and nine feet show one foot difference between the bottom of the sign and the top of the sign. He said he knows the sign is eight feet from grade because he measured it but he did not measure the bottom of the sign to the top of the sign. He asked why the inconsistencies.

Ms. Martin said Staff has requested the applicant address that issue as the drawing submitted was not to scale.

Gary Alexander asked if the sign that exists is non-conforming to which Ms. Martin answered the sign is illegal.

Ms. Lanham explained when she moved into the tenant space, she received different information about what she should be doing as she followed the advice of the landlord and others only to find the sign was illegal.

David Rinaldi said the Board has reviewed applications where there were material issues. He indicated he is highly sympathetic to the applicant as generally it is a nice looking sign. He said the Board would be setting some sort of precedent if they were to say it is okay to have a sign that would not be approved if processed in the correct order just because the applicant was misinformed.

Mr. Rinaldi said the other conditions are simple such as adjusting the attachment colors and providing a detailed drawing when obtaining the sign permit. He asked what the other members felt about the sign material.

Shannon Stenberg said the way the Board has voted in the past for other sign applications, they have always been fairly stringent on the permitted materials and what they would allow. She said if the Board changed their vote for this application, she would only allow it for this specific instance. She indicated if the applicant had brought their application forward following the correct process, she would not have given any leeway to the non-permitted materials.

Mr. Rinaldi asked Ms. Stenberg if she would approve a sign in the scenario where the applicant put up a sign without a sign permit. Ms. Stenberg indicated she would hope that would never happen. Mr. Rinaldi emphasized that is the dilemma the Board is in.

Mr. Keeler said he sympathizes with the applicant but as the other members have stated, the Board has reviewed other case applications dealing with non-permitted materials. He said Dublin is a great place to work and live and it is because they have standards. He said it is unfortunate the applicant was misinformed, initially but the Board has to uphold the standards.

Ms. Lanham said she has been advised that a sign like the Board is requesting could be \$1,000 and that is a lot of money for a small business owner to put up when they are just trying to get off the ground.

Mr. Alexander recalled the Tickets Galore sign they reviewed. He said the Board allowed the sign to be built out of an alternative material. He said the Board was sympathetic to that applicant and thinks he voted to approve that sign so it would match the other on the same post. He said it would not be fair to this applicant to not support her application when he had agreed to approve another sign to be constructed out of an alternative material. He said there are questions about the quality of the non-permitted material and they are not to the standards of other signs in the community but that applicant was in a different situation. He said the Board could not require the existing sign on that post to change so visually it would look peculiar to have a new, much thicker sign of a permitted material. Because of that outcome, he said it is his opinion that the Board not require this applicant to change out her sign.

Mr. Rinaldi asked, from a City standpoint, if the Board approved this application, if it would be saying a person can be ignorant of the law and do something else whether the person just did not know the requirements or they just wanted to get away with something.

Jennifer Rauch said Staff and the Board considers each site individually so in the end, it is up to the Board. She recalled the Tickets Galore sign application where the goal was to match the signs and have consistency in the overall appearance. She said this could be argued both ways by stating the Board bent the rules before so they can bend the rules this time, too or there is the opportunity to make this sign, right, and adhere to the Code.

Mr. Rinaldi noted the conditions as written - the applicant is required to change the sign material to a permitted material.

Ms. Stenberg said she was struggling with that because the sign installed looks very nice and well designed, which the applicant incurred cost already.

Ms. Lanham said she would like the Board to consider giving her time, as a new business owner, to get on her feet and matching the other signs in the future would be something she would be open to.

Mr. Rinaldi asked if the number one condition can include "should this sign deteriorate in any way, that it has to be replaced with permitted materials". Ms. Rauch answered affirmatively. She also suggested the Board could allow the applicant a time frame to replace the sign.

The Chair asked the Board how they felt about making some sort of condition modification. He said he understands the struggles of a new business and he does not want to burden this applicant when residents/business owners may or may not notice if the sign has even been changed. He said more of the concern is the durability over the long haul.

Ms. Lanham said she would be willing to change out the sign if it deteriorated and incur the expense at that time. She said at the same time, she is hoping this sign will last at least a year to get herself going.

Mr. Keeler said he hopes the applicant's business outlasts the sign and he would lean towards supporting a longer time requirement of one or two years. He stated the sign looks pretty good at the moment and estimates it will take a little while before it deteriorates.

The Chair asked that the conditions be modified to state the sign needs to be replaced within 12 months. Ms. Lanham asked the Board if they would consider two years.

The Chair said this is already a reasonable compromise under the circumstances and the other condition is to remain as is. Condition revision options were briefly discussed. Ms. Martin made the revisions on screen for the Board's review. They are as follows:

- 1) That the applicant use a permitted wood material for the sign background (HDU, cedar, redwood, treated lumber, or equivalent material);
- 2) That the sign shall be replaced with a sign in compliance with all Code requirements, including material, within one year;
- 3) That the applicant demonstrate eight feet of clear area is provided beneath the sign to be verified by the Building Standards Division at sign permitting;
- 4) That the sign mounting hardware be painted to match the color of the hanging bracket; and
- 5) That the applicant replace the sign with a sign constructed of a permitted material should the sign deteriorate.

The Chair asked the Board if they agreed to the revised additions and if so, to make a motion to approve the Minor Project Review application with five conditions as written.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Keeler moved, Ms. Stenberg seconded, to approve the Minor Project Review with five conditions. The vote was as follows: Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; and Mr. Keeler, yes. (Approved 4 – 0)

**4. Vessels' Residence
18-076ARB**

**63 S. Riverview Street
Demolition Review**

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said this application is a proposal for the demolition of an existing 960-square-foot detached concrete block garage on an existing single-family lot zoned Bridge Street District Historic Residential.

Nichole Martin presented an aerial view of the site and said the garage is situated along Blacksmith Lane with the primary residence on South Riverview Street. To provide context, she presented photographs of the accessory garage structures along Blacksmith Lane. She noted the majority of those are detached from the home and in similar character to what is being proposed; this garage is slightly larger. She presented the existing conditions as seen from Eberly Hill in a photograph and pointed out the historic home built in the 1820's and subsequent additions to the home in the 70's, and the 1950's detached concrete block garage.

Ms. Martin presented the existing site plan highlighting the existing garage to be demolished as well as the brick paver driveway to be removed with a current photograph of the same. In detail, she said the garage is approximately 950 square feet in size, built in 1950, made of concrete block, behind the brick paver driveway. She said this also shows there are no historic architectural features but by being detached, it could be considered historic.

Ms. Martin stated that as a result of Staff's review, two of the four demolition criteria were found to have been met. She said approval is recommended to the Board with one condition.

Ms. Martin said if the Board approves this application, a building permit will need to be submitted for the replacement, prior to any demolition work.

The Chair asked if there were further comments from the applicant and there were not. He called for comments from the public for the demolition request. [Hearing none.] He opened the discussion up to the Board and concluded since there were no comments or questions, the Board was supportive and called for a motion.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Alexander moved, Mr. Rinaldi seconded, to approve the Demolition with the following condition:

- 1) That the order to allow a demolition shall not be issued by the City until a replacement use or building has been approved by the Architectural Review Board and an application for a building permit has been submitted to the City for the replacement building.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Stenberg, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; and Mr. Alexander, yes. (Approved 4 – 0)

**5. Vessels' Residence
18-073ARB-MPR**

**63 S. Riverview Street
Minor Project Review**

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said this application is a proposal for the construction of a 1,020-square-foot, two-story addition with a first floor mudroom and attached three-car garage with finished attic space on existing single-family lot zoned Bridge Street District Historic Residential.

Nichole Martin said this is a request for approval of a Minor Project Review and a Waiver Review. She said in addition to the construction of the addition and attached three-car garage, the application includes exterior material modifications and a drive-way expansion.

Ms. Martin provided background for this site. She noted this Board reviewed a Minor Project Review application on September 24, 2018, which was approved for the exterior modifications and second story addition. She recalled the Board expressed concerns with the fragmentation of the additions, overall height and mass of the additions, complexity of the rooflines, and application of the materials selections. She said the applicant returned to the Administrative Review Team (ART) on November 1 and 15, 2018, to move forward with the residential addition but also complete the project holistically, including the attached garage, etc. She reported the ART had concerns with the scale and height of the proposed garage and complexity of the rooflines. She reported the ART recommended approval to the ARB with a request that the ARB work with the applicant on the design complexities.

Ms. Martin said this was a .25-acre site located on South Riverview Street and she presented photographs for context of three of the four homes on the same side of the street and the one directly across the street, which have varying architectural styles. She presented the existing conditions in a photograph as seen from the south and pointed out the historic home built in the 1820's and subsequent additions to the home in the 70's, and the 1950's detached concrete block garage, which was just approved for demolition. She presented a photograph of the front of the original historic home. She described the historic home as a story and a half, very modest, simple vernacular design, fairly centrally located entrance with three windows, and a standing seam roof.

Ms. Martin presented the proposed site plan and highlighted the portions to be added and noted that there are modifications proposed on every elevation of the home. She presented illustrations of the existing elevations and she highlighted the different areas of the home.

Ms. Martin presented four slides where the illustrations compare what was approved by the Board in September, 2018, and what is being proposed this evening. She reported the applicant addressed the comments and conditions of the Board that the shutters be substituted for a more appropriate design for the front of the historic portion of the home on South Riverview Street. She said the south elevations depict the two-story existing addition completely refaced in stone, there is new siding on the existing first story addition as well as an extension above for a new second story addition. This portion of the home will have vertical board and batten siding and a black standing seam metal roof across the entire structure. She noted the current/November elevation where these additions are attached to a garage via a single-story mudroom. She said the applicant has substituted their stone selection with a darker colored limestone to address some of the Boards' suggestions from September and tied the design together with the stone water table on the garage. She presented the elevation on the north side. She reported the applicant revised the architecture for the garage, significantly as a result of working with the ART. She said the intent was to reduce the orientation of the gables and the number of peaks, although Staff recommended to the ART that the applicant reduce the garage to be a single story.

Ms. Martin presented some conceptual renderings to better show how all these pieces will go together. She recalled one of the primary discussions at the ART meeting was the number of shed dormers as there were five proposed. She said alternative design solutions were discussed to provide more livable space without using that architectural feature. She presented the materials, which remain largely the same with the exception of the substitution of the stone; the rest will be white, hardiplank board and batten siding and a standing seam, metal roof.

Ms. Martin explained the Waiver Review is to permit the encroachment that was previously permitted into the required, side yard setback. She stated that is a one-foot encroachment into the minimum three-foot setback. She said approval is recommended to the Architectural Review Board for a Minor Project Review with two conditions:

- 1) That the applicant ensures the existing stone wall is protected during construction; and
- 2) That the applicant work with the Architectural Review Board to reduce the complexity of the design, including the roof lines.

Gary Alexander asked about the condition that the applicant work with the ARB to reduce the complexity of the design. He asked if the ARB is to negotiate the design before they approve it this evening and asked for clarification. Ms. Martin said the ART proposed that condition to give this Board the greatest amount of latitude to address the complexity of this application. She stated generally best practices would be to not design applications on the floor, however, if the applicant feels confident enough to agree to certain recommendations that this application could move forward.

Mr. Alexander noted the ART had the same concerns that the consultant had. He said there was a sketch in the packet with suggested revisions. He asked if that was proposed by the consultant or the applicant. Ms. Martin answered that was proposed by the consultant.

David Rinaldi asked if the previously approved application would be superseded by this application, if approved, to which Ms. Martin answered affirmatively.

The Chair invited the applicant to add to the presentation.

Heidi Bolyard, Simplified Architecture, 6065 Frantz Road, said Ms. Martin referred to a sketch provided by the consultant that was included in the Board's packets but her office never saw the sketch. Ms. Martin said all the materials provided for this Board are posted on the website to ensure the applicant and public are given the same materials to review. Ms. Bolyard asked to see the sketch.

Ms. Martin emphasized the consultant provides architectural comments; although, the primary objective of this consultant is to hone in on preservation and highlight some of the contributing history, especially within historic neighborhoods.

The Chair suggested that if the applicant did not have anything to add to the presentation at the moment, perhaps the public has comments.

Tom Holton, 5957 Roundstone Place, asked what the ART's design responsibilities are on this application relative to the ARB's design responsibilities. He said it sounds like the ART has weighed in a lot on the design and suggested the ARB take it further. He said he was confused on the ART's design expertise versus the ARB. Ms. Martin explained process within the Bridge Street District requires a body of administrative officials with a variety of backgrounds (ART) to make recommendations to this Board, based on their expertise in building, engineering, and planning, etc. She said the ART deferred all latitude in terms of architectural considerations to the Board this evening. She said Staff works with applicants ahead of time to get them to a place where their application can be approved based on conformance with code regulations and design guidelines.

Jennifer Rauch added Ms. Bolyard was present at the last ART meeting where they made this recommendation as the ART had a lot of questions about the height and the reduction of height to one story, the roof line, and the overall design, etc. She said there were complications to this, which Ms. Bolyard can speak to. The ART, she said, really wanted the ARB to weigh in on the one and a half story versus a one story because of the ARB's understanding of the District and what is appropriate and this site in particular, without forcing this on the applicant, without the applicant being able to come to this Board. She added the Guidelines and the Code also had to be taken into consideration.

Ms. Bolyard said they were trying to match the roof pitch of the original historic home, which is 12:12 pitch to tie those back together and be able to use that space without having to add a second floor. Otherwise, it would be a whole lot of attic space, she said, that would go unused. She said there is no basement space so this growing family could use it as a bonus room.

Mr. Alexander indicated attaching the garage with a small link makes sense so it still reads as a volume along the alley, even though a detached garage was there, prior. He referred to the middle portion of the

consultant's sketch, which is more simplified and felt incorporating the consultants' design would make the proposed design more cohesive.

Mr. Rinaldi said there were two primary concerns from Board Members at the last review, which the Board did not agree on: 1) use of the cultured stone; and 2) complexity of the design. He agreed with Mr. Alexander's comment to simplify the center portion. He said the garage being close to the existing garage size is probably true. He said the complexity of the roof was mentioned in the consultant's report and he echoes that even more so now.

Mr. Keeler said he echoes all those comments. He said there are a lot of dormers that make the design very busy. He said when dealing with an old home, the original structure is used as a basis for additional design and shed dormers are in vogue these days. He said new homes have shed dormers and add a nice element but agrees it does not match this historic structure. He asked that the lines be simplified by eliminating the gable and possibly removing the dormer on the west end of the second-story addition.

Ms. Bolyard said the existing garage that is being removed is 956 square feet in size and the new garage with the mudroom is 867 square feet - almost 100 square feet less in size.

Ms. Stenberg said she echoed what everyone else had said. She said the one-story connector makes sense for the mudroom. She said while she does not necessarily love all dormers, it is appropriate compared to what is there now. She said she had a little bit of a challenge with the roofline in the center section. She stated she is supportive of the new selection of stone and liked that it is connected with the garage. She said she believes her challenges from the previous review have been resolved for the most part.

Kate Vessels, 63 S. Riverview Street, asked for clarity about the straight lines for the center section. Mr. Alexander explained what the Board is concerned with and suggestions to fix it by also pointing areas out on the screen. Ms. Vessels asked to see the consultant drawing again and Mr. Alexander explained it to her.

Mr. Rinaldi asked if it was possible to bring the garage addition roof down from the 12:12 pitch and still maintain the heights needed inside. Ms. Bolyard said she kept the height of the garage low and tried to allow more space in the addition for more useable space. Mr. Rinaldi asked the roof to be lowered slightly so it is not the same height as the original building. She said they have pushed it down and reworked the floor plan since the previous submission and lost quite a bit of square footage already on that second floor so it would be challenging to pull it down any further and still have useable space.

Design options were discussed further.

Ms. Bolyard said when she started designing this house, the homeowners really loved the house at 97 S. Riverview Street, which was just built a few years ago. She said the homeowners just purchased this property in 2017 so they were looking at all the other houses in the area and additions that had been completed. She stated they purchased this house, knowing they were going to do some work to this house; they did not realize some of the complexities that they would run into with additions. She said they did not want to lose any more lot coverage like green space for their kids to play, by doing a one-story addition on the back of the home. She noted that the house at 97 S. Riverview has 13 different roofs on it and they were trying to keep it simpler than that.

Mr. Rinaldi recalled discussing this in September that some of the houses the applicant is referencing as precedent are new builds and so there did not have to be sensitive to an existing story structure that is the core of this home and what makes it special. He asked if the applicant would be amicable to cleaning up the center piece. He said it does not have to be exactly what the consultant has drawn but similar in nature to eliminate that false gable on the south and north elevations and make it a clean, simple space.

He indicated they would not lose anything on the floor plan by doing that and it would make this application much more palatable, leaving the garage as is.

Mr. Alexander said he would be uncomfortable voting on a plan we do not have drawings for. He said the Board needs to see what it is going to look like and the applicant needs to ensure these revisions are going to work in terms of the floor plan. He said this impacts not just this face but the other two sides and we have not seen those elevations with the changes. He indicated this cannot be designed tonight as all the implications of every decision will not yet be known. He said maybe the Board is asking for modifications that are impossible so designing this on the dais puts both the Board and the applicant in a difficult situation.

The Chair suggested this should be tabled to let the applicant make appropriate modifications and bring them back to the Board. He said he hates to delay the process but also does not want to have this voted down this evening because all these decisions cannot be made on the fly here tonight.

Trevor Vessels, 63 S. Riverview Street, said he was frustrated with the process and wanted this to move forward and not have to come back in another month to discuss the same concerns.

The design modifications were discussed again. The Chair thought if the modifications were simple that possibly they could be written as conditions into the motion. Mr. Alexander asked if the sketches could be entered into the record. Jennifer Rauch asked if the modifications as noted in a sketch could be described well enough to go into the record because if this is the direction the Board wants to go, she wants it to be clear what is being approved. Mr. Rinaldi said it may be difficult to describe this for the record because of the complexity.

Ms. Rauch said the next ARB meeting will be on December 19, 2018. Mr. Vessels said he wanted to get this over with this evening. The Chair said it comes down to whether the changes can be described well enough for the Board Members to be comfortable. Ms. Rauch added Staff will have to fully understand the conditions for Staff to adhere to and approve.

Ms. Bolyard continued to work with the Board by trying to redraw sketches etc. during this public meeting but not being caught on record. Ms. Rauch said the conversation is not being recorded so the public is not hearing and understanding what is taking place. She said the neighbors may not understand what everyone is talking about and what this is going to look like so she is uncomfortable with this direction.

Mr. Rinaldi said the ART punted this to the Board to design on the dais and unfortunately, that is where we are at this point of the meeting. The design was discussed further.

The Chair determined there was enough complexity that the applicant needs to be given time to work this out as he does not want to put them in a position where a mistake is made. He recommended a motion to table this review be made.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Rinaldi moved, Mr. Alexander seconded, to table the Minor Project Review with a Waiver. The vote was as follows: Mr. Keeler, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; and Mr. Rinaldi, yes. (Approved 4 – 0)

The Chair stated Andrew Keeler is recusing himself from the next application review as he is the applicant.

**6. Keeler Residence
18-072ARB**

**5281 Brand Road
Architectural Review Board**

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said Mr. Keeler recused himself as he is the applicant.

The Chair said this application is a proposal for the construction of a 1½-story, 1,200-square-foot carriage house and associated site improvements. He said the 4-acre site is zoned R-1, Restricted Suburban Residential District and is located within the Architectural Review District.

Nichole Martin said this is a request for a review and approval of a general ARB application. She said this property is listed on Appendix G, which is outside the Historic District but still under the review of the ARB. She said the site is at the intersection of Coffman Road and Brand Road, and comprised of two parcels. She presented aerial views of the site. She noted the primary historic residence is on the east parcel and the west parcel contains the historic farmstead, including outbuildings, barns, and a concrete silo and presented photographs of all the structures to show existing conditions and for context. She said there are properties in the area that preserve their rural character.

Ms. Martin described the original two-story home as having Italianate style in all brick with a standing seam metal roof and a dentil detail just under the roof and a detailed porch on the roundabout side. She noted there have been two previous additions to the rear of the home, which is the south side, adjacent to the North Fork with the Indian Run Creek. She indicated those additions were much more modest than the Italianate home and more vernacular in style, although they do maintain the brick and standing seam metal roof.

Ms. Martin presented the proposed plan and noted the attached carriage house that is proposed at the maximum height of 35 feet. She said there was some misinformation in the consultant's report where it was indicated this was a detached carriage home.

Ms. Martin presented the proposed elevations facing the two roads. She restated the proposed addition is a story and a half with simple wood construction for a vernacular style carriage house. She said it will have vertical wood siding in white and a standing seam metal roof. She said Staff is recommending the total height of the attached structure be reduced to be just below the dentil detail on the home, which is a very nice feature and should be respected. She presented views of the elevations from the south and west sides, too. She explained the west side will be adjacent to the farmstead outbuildings and the south side will only be visible from the ravine of the North Fork of Indian Run. The three garage doors, she said, will not be visible from Coffman or Brand Roads but there will be a single garage door that will face Brand Road to break up the façade on the north side. She said gooseneck fixtures to accent the elevations are also proposed. She presented proposed character images, which are not to indicate specific selections but more generally to show a farmstead style.

Ms. Martin reported that Staff, in conjunction with the consultant's recommendations, are recommending approval of this ARB application with four conditions:

- 1) That the applicant update the plans to confirm all applicable development standards are met, prior to submittal of a Building Permit;
- 2) That the driveway width be reduced from 36 feet to 30 feet to meet the Code permitted maximum driveway width;
- 3) That the applicant reduce the total height of the addition to be below the dentil detail of the 1870's historic home; and
- 4) That the applicant replace the simulated divided lite windows on the proposed addition with true divided lite windows.

Gary Alexander said when he tried to look at the roofs of the barns on site, they were snow-covered. He asked if those roofs match the material of the house. Ms. Martin said she did not have the answer. Mr. Alexander said, if the roof materials do not match, which ones the addition will match. Ms. Martin clarified they do match.

Janine Keeler, 5281 Brand Road, said she goes by JJ.

Mr. Alexander asked her if it was the exact color and type. Ms. Keeler answered there are several different roofs on the barns over the years as they have been replaced. Mr. Alexander asked her which roof this is going to match. Ms. Keeler said their intent was for it to appear as if it were more like one of the barns rather than the house. Mr. Alexander indicated he was hoping that was what she was going to say.

Mr. Alexander asked Staff why they are making a qualification that true divided lite windows should be used. Ms. Martin answered, in her review of the application, it seemed like it would be more authentic. Mr. Alexander said there is a significant difference and wanted to know if the goal of the Planning Report is to have the exact look or a look that is very close or is it to have the exact construction. Ms. Martin answered from her point of view, it would not need to be the exact construction depending on what simulated window is selected. She said some simulated windows can look 'rather simulated'. Mr. Alexander stated, from his professional experience, some simulated windows can look terrific and perform a lot better than true lite windows. He asked her if she had a preference.

Tom Nau, 8360 Riverside Drive, Powell, Ohio, said he prefers the simulated divides for longevity and better performance. He said true divides are great but they are wood and can rot and he has seen issues in New Albany, Ohio - they only last so long. He suggested they be asked to hold to a standard for a simulated divide that would perform and last a long time, and not the ability to see between the panes.

Mr. Alexander thought Mr. Nau's intent is to stipulate the spacer bar with certain manufacturers. He said it sits in the "insulated sandwich" so the profile is as close as possible. He suggested revising conditions.

The Chair called for any public comment on this application.

Tom Holton, 5957 Roundstone Place, noted this is a new construction outside the Historic District so he supports the simulated windows as the architect mentioned. He said the main concern he has with the structure is the scale in relation to the house; it is so tall. He said he agreed with almost everything the consultant had said but was not sure the consultant noticed how close it is to the house. He said the height and the complexity is a concern and the mass in relation to the house is too large; he would like to see it smaller. He said this applicant has done such a great job on the restoration and reconditioning of the main house that is in such a prominent location. He emphasized this addition is going to stand out remarkably from the north and west side. He suggested the addition be much more subordinate to the main house and should be as different as possible. He indicated the house is remarkably breathtaking. He said to call the addition a carriage house is misleading; this house would have had a barn to store buggies, etc. and not many houses in Dublin would have had a carriage house. Chances are, if there were carriage houses, he affirmed, they would have been small.

With no other public comments, the Chair asked the applicant if they had anything else.

Mr. Nau said when looking at the front elevation two-dimensionally, much like the previous application, it can be a little misleading when the Board sees all that roof. He said in all fairness, when viewing the side elevations, the homes are juxtaposed diagonally from each other; they do not line up across the face and the roof pitch can be tilted away. He offered to lower it slightly. Mr. Rinaldi asked if it is possible to lower it a couple of feet and not lose program space to which the applicant answered affirmatively. Mr. Rinaldi pointed out that reading through this application and the consultant's report, the height was the only comment he had. He said the addition is in an appropriate location, it is done with a subtle link, and

there is a lot to like about the application. Obviously, he said, the applicant already has a wonderful home.

Mr. Nau said they tried to flavor it like a barn style but it ended up being a blend.

Mr. Alexander said the elevations are deceptive. He said the front elevation of the house is really in the foreground and the high point of the roof of the addition is way, way beyond. He said he is fine with the application as it was presented. He encouraged the applicant to ensure the grades were correct and if not, the roof would need to be adjusted.

Shannon Stenberg said she is fine with this application as presented. She stated it looks excellent and the applicant took a great deal of detail from the barn and really appreciates that. She said from Coffman Road or Brand Road, the addition may not be that visible because it is set back and will be landscaped. She said she is okay with the conditions. Mr. Rinaldi suggested tweaking condition #3 and rewrite #4. He said he does not know how the quality of a simulated divided lite can be qualified as his expertise is not with residential and deferred to Mr. Alexander. Mr. Alexander said the mutton bar is what should be controlled, and match the width of the current mutton bars. Mr. Rinaldi suggested writing in "as compared to a Marvin or a Pella window" to describe the quality desired. Ms. Rauch said they can add "subject to Staff approval" that way the applicant would not have to come back. The verbiage of the conditions was discussed further and the applicant agreed to the end product.

Ms. Stenberg moved, Mr. Alexander seconded, to approve the Architectural Review Board application with three conditions:

- 1) That the applicant update the plans to confirm all applicable development standards are met prior to submittal of a Building Permit;
- 2) That the driveway width be reduced from 36-feet to 30-feet to meet the Zoning Code permitted maximum driveway width; and
- 3) That the applicant use a simulated divided lite window that incorporates a spacer bar between the insulated window glass, and incorporates a muntin bar that matches other windows on the property similarly equivalent to a Marvin window, subject to Staff approval.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; and Ms. Stenberg, yes. (Approved 3 – 0)

The Chair asked the Board if they had any further comments. [There were none.]

Communications

Jennifer Rauch said a potential Special Meeting on the 12th was considered but everyone cannot attend so that discussion will be incorporated into the regular meeting in December.

Adjournment

With no further communications to share, the Chair adjourned the meeting at 8:45 pm.

As approved by the Architectural Review Board on December 20, 2018.