



MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, June 27, 2018

AGENDA

- 1. BSD HC – Tackett Bakery & Office Addition** **18-027INF** **30 – 32 S. High Street**
Informal Review (Discussion Only)
- 2. BSD HC – Dublin Town Center Exterior Modifications** **18-034ARB/MPR** **19 W. Bridge Street**
Minor Project Review (Approved 4 – 0)

The Chair, David Rinaldi, called the meeting to order at 6:31 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Board Members present were: Jeffrey Leonhard, Gary Alexander, and Andrew Keeler. Shannon Stenberg was absent. City representatives were: Jennifer Rauch, Lori Burchett, Richard Hansen, and Laurie Wright.

Administrative Business

Motion and Vote

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

Motion and Vote

Mr. Keeler moved, Mr. Leonhard seconded, to approve the meeting minutes from April 25 and May 23, 2018, as presented. The vote was as follows: Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; and Mr. Leonhard, 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 HC – Tackett Bakery & Office Addition** **18-027INF** **30 – 32 S. High Street**
Informal Review

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following proposal is a request for modifications to two existing historic commercial buildings, an addition, and associated site improvements for a site zoned Bridge Street District Historic Core. He said the site is on the east side of South High Street, approximately 50 feet north of the intersection with Spring Hill Lane. He said this is a request for an informal review and feedback for a future application within the Bridge Street District under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066.



Lori Burchett said this is a second Informal Review following a site visit at last month's regular meeting. She said the applicant is requesting additional review and direction related to the demolition of the additions to the rear of 30 S. High Street; the proposed architectural details; and the scale of the proposed addition.

Ms. Burchett presented an aerial view of the site as well as photographs of the two properties directly adjacent to each other as viewed from North High Street. The two properties that are being considered, she explained, are shown with 30 N. High Street to the north on the left and 32 N. High Street to the south on the right side. She restated the Board visited the two buildings and site on May 23 and walked through both properties to assess: the condition of the properties; the lean-to addition to the rear of the 30 S. High Street building; the grade changes on the site where the parking lot is proposed; and the stone wall located in the rear of the property. She presented additional photographs that showed the existing conditions of the rear of the properties, which showed the lean-to addition at 30 S. High Street, and is one of the specific considerations requested by the applicant to be discussed this evening.

Ms. Burchett presented an illustration of the proposed site plan that showed the two buildings with additions with a parking area in the rear. She noted the applicant is proposing to relocate the existing stone wall on the current site to allow for the development of the parking lot off of Blacksmith Lane. She presented images of the west and east elevations of the proposed buildings that illustrated the modifications to the 30 S. High Street property that included: the removal of an existing addition; construction of a new two-story addition located to the rear of the building; and the addition of a roof and columns over the side entrance. She said the proposed modifications to 32 S. High Street included: replacement of the exterior siding and roof with like-for-like materials, which includes board and batten and a standing-seam, metal roof; storefront window replacement; the addition of awnings along the front elevation; a refurbished front door; installation of new, larger windows and the conversion of a window to an ADA accessible door along the southern elevation; addition of a new chimney along the southern elevation; and a 200-square-foot building addition to the rear with a deck.

Ms. Burchett presented an illustration of the south and north proposed elevations that generally illustrated the existing portions of each building in context with the new additions. For 32 S. High Street, she pointed out, the existing building and then the addition off of the rear with the deck. For 30 S. High Street, she explained, she added the black line in the graphic to show where 30 S. High Street ends and the rest, is what would be seen of the 32 S. High Street property.

Ms. Burchett reported that the Board informally reviewed the proposal on April 25th and provided non-binding feedback. She said the discussion centered around: the demolition of additions to the rear of 30 S. High Street; whether the window details and placement were appropriate for the historic buildings; the location of the proposed new addition; concerns that the addition to 30 S. High Street needed more separation from the original building and should be scaled down to not overwhelm the original building; the appropriateness of the chimney on the 32 S. High Street building; and whether the raised dormer on the front of the 30 S. High Street structure was duplicating the feature in an unauthentic way.

Ms. Burchett presented images that illustrated the mass and scale of the proposed structures from different vantage points and in context with the surrounding buildings.

Ms. Burchett presented discussion questions that had been provided for the Board's consideration and review as well as to provide additional feedback to the applicant:

1. Does the Board support the demolition of the rear addition?
2. Are the proposed architectural details including the raised dormer, windows, and chimney location historically appropriate?
3. Is the proposed addition at an appropriate scale and subordinate to the historic building?
4. Are there other considerations by the Board?

Ms. Burchett indicated the applicant may request further direction from the Board this evening. She said the applicant and representative are present and could field any questions she may not be able to answer.

The Chair invited the applicant to add to the presentation, if they felt inclined to do so.

Dan Morgan, 946 Mt. Pleasant Avenue, Columbus, Ohio, said he is the architect for the project and thanked the Board for taking time out from the regularly scheduled meeting last month to walk through the properties with them. He emphasized the most important question they are asking this evening is whether the Board supports the demolition of the rear additions on 30 S. High Street.

Mr. Morgan indicated that during the site visit and after subsequent conversations, the possible reuse of the lean-to addition was in question. He explained in order to reuse it, the applicant would need to scrape it down and rebuild it with new modern construction so it would be structurally sound to replicate what was there. He said the applicant prefers to take the building back to its original log structure with the proposed addition off the rear of the building.

The Chair invited the public to speak.

Nicholas Vesha, 38 S. High Street, said he fully supported the beautiful design and looked forward to the applicant being their neighbor. He said this redevelopment will be a great addition to Historic Dublin and he is excited about that.

Tom Holton, 5957 Roundstone Place, said he was speaking on behalf of the Historical Society. He indicated the building at 32 S. High Street would not have had a chimney as they had an internal pot belly stove when this was a grocery store, originally, as demonstrated by photographs. He said it is unknown when the chimney was added or why.

Mr. Holton said, in terms of the lean-to addition, he fully supports Mr. Morgan's perspective. He said having seen it last month, we know it is not in good shape. He indicated it can be difficult to decide exactly what time period defines history in Dublin because everything evolved over so many years. He suggested giving the applicant latitude in this particular case. He explained the building at 30 S. High Street has the log cabin structure inside from one period and then it was added onto later, and then followed by another addition in another period. He said allowing the applicant to take the building back to a workable structure allows the applicant to do something commercially with it, while still making it an attractive feature for the community.

The Chair said the Board discussion may begin and he wanted to start it off with a positive note because he is pleased a project may happen here. He said he is pleased someone is willing to invest in these two properties because they have both been in jeopardy for a long time. He stated Ms. Burchett highlighted the topics that were the sticking points at the first Informal Review a couple of months ago. He suggested revisiting those comments again and have the Board weigh in on this proposal. He asked the Board to discuss the comments on the demolition of the existing additions/lean-to(s) first.

Andrew Keeler clarified that when the portions of the existing structures are referred to as lean-tos, there are two of them to the rear of the property – the smaller one is to the far east end and in a serious state of disrepair, and then there is the section in between the log structure and the newest addition. He asked if both are proposed to be eliminated. The Chair answered that is what the drawings indicate today.

Gary Alexander indicated it is difficult to talk about this because what the ARB is tasked with per the Zoning Code. He said the proposed addition does not meet the standards in the Zoning Code

§153.174(D)(3) under additions so it is hard to approve this as proposed, while not keeping that center addition. He said if that is kept, the argument can be made that the standards are being met. He explained the Code suggests there should be separation between the primary structure and the addition; additions should be clearly distinguishable. He noted there is not separation in the proposal as it would attach one addition right onto another, marrying them, essentially. He said this standard in the Code matches preservation guidelines across the country and is not unique to Dublin, Ohio. He emphasized it is a standard approach to preservation for additions. He suggested that by keeping that lean-to, two things happen – it meets the Code by keeping a piece of history and gives the applicant the opportunity for the separation.

Mr. Alexander recalled, part of the discussion was about the functional issue with the existing stair, which is not compliant. He stated he has not worked with Dublin's Building Department but it has been his experience, that every building department he has worked in, in Central Ohio, when there is a historic structure involved, they have allowed for some leniency in areas of non-compliance. He said if the primary issue is to make a stair that can be accessed from the front, and even if the dormer makes it difficult for headroom to accommodate, the Building Department may be willing to grant a Waiver. He said that has been done in other communities in Central Ohio, some larger, some smaller. He said having a stair that accesses both should not drive the decision because he thinks there are other options. He added the lot is so long and there is no parking behind this structure. He said if the lean-to was kept and shifted back slightly, there is plenty of property to make it work.

Mr. Alexander also indicated there are other opportunities that are not being explored. He suggested that since the grade drops, the floor can be lowered to provide some connection in that area, build more mass and not be concerned with the height. He said this architect did a nice job on another project recently dealing with height issues and was approved.

Mr. Alexander said the accessibility issue could be overcome because there could be a second access area at the lower elevation. He noted the site provides other opportunities and keeping the larger lean-to will not impose a hardship. He agreed that eliminating the smaller lean-to makes sense. He concluded, keeping the larger lean-to solves the ARB problem by meeting the Code, provides the applicant great opportunities in terms of development while meeting the standards of the Zoning Code.

Jeff Leonhard asked for clarification when Mr. Alexander referred to the Code – if he meant Zoning Code or under the Architectural Review Board standards. Mr. Alexander referred Mr. Leonhard to §153.174, Board Order Standards, #3. He said it talks about additions, how there should be separation, subordinate to original structure, should be in the rear, etc.

Mr. Rinaldi added a number of things the developer has done has been done correctly. He said the addition is to the rear and that is one of the most important criteria. He indicated he could be persuaded that the second lean-to should be eliminated but also agreed there is not separation to distinguish the two. He said tying in rooflines is a big flag in the review guidelines and that should not be happening. He said if we have to have a two-story connection, if that could narrow to a passageway, and the new mass is separate behind that, he could be more supportive. He said the design may not be perfect but it needs to be compliant. He emphasized the new addition has to be smaller, inside, and the main mass has to be pulled back so the original structure is highlighted. He repeated he could be persuaded the second lean-to could be eliminated. He said the way the addition is rendered right now and designed, is not appropriate.

Mr. Leonhard stated he is in favor of the proposal and assumes they have paid a lot of money in architectural fees. He said if the Board makes the applicant change the proposal it will cost the applicant more money and more than likely, these buildings will be sitting here until next year when somebody else wants to do something with them. He stated he lives behind these buildings and they are an eyesore. He

said if we make it difficult for the properties to be developed, these buildings will never be used and fall down.

Alex Vesha, 38 S. High Street, said he wanted to address the Board so the Chair swore him in. He said he is the co-owner with his brother on the property next door. Mr. Vesha said he wanted to speak to the idea of building a basement on those properties or digging down. He said he and his brother wanted to do that on their property but it was prohibitively expensive due to the rock, so they did not pursue it. He said he did not think excavating was a reasonable expense to pass on to the applicant for this type of addition and business that is intended to go there. He understands there are issues with following the Code but these structures have been sitting here for a long time and there should be some reasonable accommodation made for this proposal. He stated the applicant's proposal will enhance his building as well as the entire street and neighborhood.

Mr. Alexander clarified he was not suggesting a basement, just lowering the floor level some.

Mr. Keeler said he was in favor of this proposal and agrees with the public that has commented. He said when considering to purchase a structure, the shortcomings need to be understood. He said the expectation cannot be that a property can be adopted to fit the use proposed; there may be hurdles to overcome. He said he understands these properties are an eyesore and he, too wants to see the structures improved but there are certain standards that the ARB needs to apply uniformly, not just for this applicant but those that follow. He stated his main point was that the City has certain standards and this Board needs to uphold them. He said that is an expense a property owner incurs in their exploration of a property; it is the cost of doing business.

Mr. Keeler said he was not in favor of the chimney because it did not appear to be authentic. He said the newest addition/lean-to to the east, is ready to fall apart and needs to be demolished. He said he is conflicted with the small section/addition because it tells a story. He does not believe that leaving that structure in place is going to make it impossible for the applicant to repurpose the property and make it useable. He said he believes the middle structure can be used and worked around.

Mr. Leonhard asked staff what the objection is to the chimney because there is already a chimney there. Ms. Burchett said the Staff and the historic consultant's perspective is the chimney was added later and part of the assessment considers when the chimney was added and if it contributes to the historic integrity of the structure. Mr. Leonhard said he did not understand why the applicant could not have a chimney that was already there. Mr. Alexander explained the proposed chimney is not in the location of the current chimney and it is a different kind of chimney being proposed – a flue, it is smaller, built with brick, and should be installed further back. He said the chimney is not original and it changes the perception of this part of the building.

Mr. Leonhard said the consultant noted there was a front door on 30 S. High Street so that leaves him to question if the consultant even visited the property. Mr. Alexander said we can bet she did a lot more research into the documents than we have. Mr. Alexander asked Mr. Morgan if the front door was original, to which he answered affirmatively.

Mr. Morgan wanted to address the first discussion question. He referred to the rear image of 30 S. High. He pointed to the lower left-hand side. He said they stepped in a second floor to make it a second floor hallway. He argued the addition the Board is deeming significant was never approved by any historic board nor would it be approved. He said it did not step in from the side and slams right in to the rear of the historic building. He restated their proposed addition stepped in approximately two feet from each side of that back portion of the existing building. He said the current addition continues that roofline at an angle where they clad over the change from the log structure to the two-by-four structure. He said it is lined up and skinned over with asbestos siding, blurring the original log structure and space between those two parts of the building.

Mr. Morgan said they are seeking to take it a step further back to what it once was and give it its due. He told Mr. Alexander he respected his opinion as an architect and the ideas of further separating the building and referencing the project they did at 113 S. High. He said those two projects cannot be compared because that is a second building, not an accessory structure or addition. He emphasized that was a second primary building on the same site.

Mr. Morgan explained they are trying to unify the building to have a usable office building but a small log structure on its own. He said keeping the lean-to addition is not viable for a modern day office. He said he can see the merit of a connector with a corridor to another unique free-standing building but that would look like two separate buildings connected by a covered breezeway and that is not what he wants to do here.

Mr. Morgan said in the interest of keeping the district alive and the nature of the district alive, he thinks this proposal is the right way to go. He said he could absolutely look through the details so it could be more distinct. He wanted to point out the proposal shows a separation and agreed he did not want it to look like the same building and there are treatments that could be pushed to emphasize that as they move forward with the design. He said 30 S. High is a one and a half story building, and the addition is also one and a half stories. He said they do a step down to create head height to get through that clearance. He said they walked through that with the existing shed dormer on the second story or that attic story of 30 S. High.

Mr. Morgan said he was not supportive of the idea of asking for leniency from the Chief Building Official on that existing staircase; he does not want to stand by that as it would not stand up in court. He said if it was his house, he would not trust the stairway, if his kids had to go down it in case of a fire.

The Chair asked if the Board had any more comments about the demolition request of the rear addition [Hearing none.] He reminded the applicant one member was not present this evening.

The Chair referred to question #2 - Are the proposed architectural details including the raised dormer, windows, and chimney location historically appropriate?

The Chair said the chimney was a point of discussion on 32 S. High with the Board the first time around and it is still. He said the other detail that is very prominent is the addition of the door on the front of 30 S. High. He said it appears one would be going into a conference room and asked if there was an advantage to having two doors from the outside for the same room. He said history indicated there was a door there. Mr. Rinaldi said personally he could support it. He asked for further comments.

Mr. Alexander said if other things worked out he would be willing to live with all the reservations about that. Mr. Rinaldi said he understood but one of the items the Board considers "is whether there is historical precedent."

Mr. Alexander asked if the dormer is being raised on the front. Mr. Morgan responded the dormer was not being raised.

Mr. Alexander said the fenestration on the windows is being changed on 32 S. High St.

Mr. Keeler asked about the structures being historically appropriate. He recalled asking about siding the last time they met. He emphasized he is in favor of preserving everything that can be. He understands it does not look new. He said it appears there may have been peeling paint at one time; and it was scraped, sanded, primed, and caulked but that is what a renovated old building is supposed to look like. He said he is not in favor of putting a new skin on an old building. He encouraged the applicant to keep

and reuse everything they can. He indicated he loves the new builds around Dublin that look old; they are pristine, but he also appreciates old structures.

Mr. Leonhard indicated lead paint and asbestos will be found on these structures.

Mr. Rinaldi recalled talking about the mullions on 32 S. High. He suggested in keeping with what the building use was, the non-divided lites is the way the window should look and he would not like to see divided lites added.

Mr. Alexander said the front is the most important part to preserving these buildings and preserving the identity.

The Chair referred to question #3 - Is the proposed addition at an appropriate scale and subordinate to the historic building?

Mr. Alexander asked the applicant what kind of input he wanted for the detailing in the back. He indicated there are a lot less reservations with the 32 S. High Street building. Mr. Morgan said detail wise, they have a clear picture of what they need to do. He restated the big question this evening was more about the lean-to additions on 30 S. High Street and whether they will be allowed to demolish both. He said if there is any merit of further architectural studies to deem it appropriate to replace those two shed additions, they would be interested in exploring that or if it is steadfast that the original addition needs to be there. He emphasized that was the feedback they were looking for this evening.

Mr. Morgan said if they are to move forward with this process, they need to get their site engineers going. He concluded they wanted to be open for business by Thanksgiving but sees now that is not happen. He said before they green light their engineers to move forward with an addition, they want to make sure they will have some sort of addition on this building and approximately the area they are showing, with the final elevations going to be we are going to refine that with staff. He said that is the direction they are looking for.

Mr. Morgan said Dublin has very simple architectural details, very simple vernacular type of buildings. He indicated the history of these structures being built by fathers coming home from work, putting the building together with their own two hands, not very ornate or elaborate and that is the kind of details they will be replicating.

Mr. Morgan noted the feedback received last time on the windows, on 32 S. High, and they are on board. He said in terms of the doors, they are discussing whether they put the door back in the middle on the front of 30 S. High, versus leaving it sided over, or maybe the door becomes a window again. He said they are looking for as much versatility in that space as they can in this stage of design.

The Chair asked if there was any detail that should be brought to the attention of the architect.

Mr. Alexander said Mr. Morgan is asking if it is prudent to take an intermediate next step and would the Board be willing to look at other options. He reiterated what he said earlier, which was to keep the middle lean-to so the proposal would adhere to the standards. He said he is sympathetic to wanting to move forward but he would have difficulty considering other schemes and would just fall back in the same position.

Mr. Rinaldi said he is trying to be as sympathetic as he can and there is no doubt the Board wants to support this project. He said the public also wants this to move forward and not see the area deteriorate. He said he has trouble with the proposed big addition on the back of the 30 S. High Street building. He reiterated the applicant can sway him to support the demolition of the existing second addition; he just does not like the way the new addition would be up close against the existing structure. Again, he said,

he would be willing to eliminate the second shed if the proposed new addition was sensitive to the size and separation needed and he does not see that in the design yet. He added the applicant should keep as much of the stone wall in the rear of the property as possible.

Mr. Holton said if the Board decides the first lean-to must remain, if the applicant can still build behind the current structure with a viable project.

Mr. Rinaldi answered there is no issue and yes there is a viable option, which he thought was clearly on the table.

Mr. Leonhard said it might not be a viable option for the applicant, financially, to go through all that. Mr. Alexander added he did not think what he proposed would cost more money - to build the addition a different way, off the lean-to.

Floyd Tackett said for them to get the usable space they want, the stair does not work to go up one building and down another. He said they are not asking for a big building. He said the lean-to is deteriorated; they would need to tear it down and rebuild it the way it was, which was poorly built the first time. He emphasized that did not make sense. He said if it was a nice lean-to, a well-built structure, he would surely keep it but there is nothing to work with. He said it is sitting in the dirt, the floor boards are rotten, and it rests on two-by-fours. He stressed it is an extremely poor design and they do not want to spend more money on something they do not want.

Mr. Leonhard asked when the final vote would occur. Ms. Burchett explained Planning would need to receive a formal application submitted and Staff would review. From the applicant's testimony, the applicant's representative had mentioned that they still need to engage some engineering to do the final design and did not want to invest until they had a clear direction from this Board.

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

**2. BSD HC – Dublin Town Center Exterior Modifications
18-034ARB/MPR**

**19 W. Bridge Street
Minor Project Review**

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following proposal is a request for exterior modifications, including window and siding replacement, to an existing commercial building within Historic Dublin zoned Bridge Street District Historic Core. He said the site is southwest of the intersection of West Bridge Street and High Street. He said this is a request for a review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.066 and 153.170, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Lori Burchett explained the Minor Project Review process is intended to address modifications conducted after initial Site and/or Development Plan Review approval. She said the Administrative Review Team (ART) is the final reviewing body with the exception of the Architectural Review Board (ARB) in the Historic District or the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC), if warranted by the proposal and in this instance, the proposal will be forwarded to the ARB for review and approval. She said the ART reviewed and made a recommendation of approval to the ARB on June 21, 2018. She said types of MPR applications (for example) would be: Single-family residences; Commercial <10,000 square feet; Additions <10,000 square feet; Exterior Modifications; Signs (if meeting Code); and Site Modifications.

Ms. Burchett added that upon the ARB's review and approval of this MPR, the applicant will be eligible to file a Building Permit from the Building Standards Division upon their review that can include: site, building and/or sign permits and meeting additional requirements from Building, Fire, or Landscaping, etc.

Ms. Burchett presented an aerial view of the site as well as a photograph of the current elevation on the north side. She said the applicant is proposing exterior modifications, including window and siding replacements, to an existing commercial building that was approved in 1999 as part of a PUD. She explained a Waiver is being requested to allow for the use of Hardie and LP siding as part of this application.

Ms. Burchett reported the ART reviewed the proposed modifications at their regular meeting on June 21 and while the team was supportive of the Hardie and LP siding in the color as proposed, the team expressed concerns with the window replacements and had recommended a vinyl clad wood replacement with true divided lites. However, she noted, the sample delivered to Planning was a vinyl replacement window without true divided lites (muntins or grilles). She said the ART recommended the replacement windows must be an accurate reproduction of the existing windows on the building.

Ms. Burchett said the ART discussed concerns regarding the replacement of only windows within the wood sided elevations and not the windows within brick or stone. They recommended that either the applicant replace all the windows in the building or propose a maintenance and repair program and schedule for the existing windows in order to match the proposed replacement windows. She stated conditions of approval were added to address these concerns.

Ms. Burchett presented a photograph of the current conditions of the wood siding and windows up close, which have significant deterioration. She said the applicant is requesting replacement of the existing siding with a material that requires less maintenance. She noted this is a non-historic structure so typically the ARB has approved the use of Hardie siding for new builds and not historic structures.

Ms. Burchett presented illustrations that outlined the locations of the proposed modifications on all of the elevations for each of the following: Exterior Material Replacement; Windows and Trim Replacement; and Trim Only Replacement. She noted the roofing would remain the same.

Ms. Burchett presented a graphic of the Jen-Weld windows proposed in a similar design and style to the existing. She reported that after conversations with the applicant's representative, they confirmed that the manufacturer will be able to produce an almond colored, vinyl clad wood window that is an accurate reproduction of the existing windows on the building.

Ms. Burchett said Staff and the ART have reviewed this application against the Waiver Review Analysis as part of the Minor Project Review and found that it met the criteria supporting Hardie and LP Siding. Therefore, she said, approval is recommended for the following Waiver:

1. §153.062(E)(1)(c) Materials – Primary Materials: Primary materials include stone, brick, and glass; Requested: Hardie and LP Siding.

Ms. Burchett said Staff and the ART reviewed the project against the Minor Project Review criteria and found all applicable criteria has been met with the Waiver or with conditions.

Ms. Burchett said Staff and the ART reviewed the Architectural Review Board Standards and finds the standards have been met as well as the Addition Standards for Alterations to the Building and Site.

Ms. Burchett stated there would be two motions and votes this evening that would be for the Waiver; and the Minor Project Review with three conditions.

Ms. Burchett said approval is recommended for the Minor Project Review with three conditions:

- 1) That the applicant selects a vinyl clad wood window with divided lites in an accurate reproduction of the design existing windows;
- 2) That the applicant provides maintenance and repair to the existing windows or the applicant agrees to simultaneously replace all windows in the building; and
- 3) That the pattern and color for Hardie and LP siding match the existing.

David Rinaldi asked the applicant if the existing windows are wood or vinyl clad. Ryan Schultz, Versa Real Estate, Royal Oak, Michigan, answered the existing windows are solid wood so they have shown their age.

Mr. Rinaldi inquired about the replacement of the windows that are set in stone or brick. Mr. Schultz said those windows have held up much better and will be evaluated on a window-by-window basis. He said those would be painted and re-caulked if not replaced.

The Chair asked if there was anything the applicant wanted to add to the presentation.

Mr. Schultz said they were very sensitive to the nature of the Historic District. He indicated their intent is to keep the building appearing exactly as it is but use more durable materials as replacements where needed.

Gary Alexander asked if the applicant will be matching the trim. Mr. Schultz answered affirmatively and they will be exactly as they are. He said they can achieve that same look with a Hardie material. He explained they were not the original owners of this building, which has taken quite a punch in the last three or four years.

The Chair did not call for public comment as no one was present. He then asked for the Board's final comments.

Mr. Alexander stated he did not have any concerns.

Mr. Rinaldi said he was fully supportive of this proposal and thought the switch out of the materials is a good idea. He said it is unfortunate this has to happen for this building at age ±19.

The Chair called for a motion since there was no further comments or discussion.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Leonhard moved, Mr. Rinaldi seconded, to approve the following Waiver:

1. §153.062 – Building Types (E)(1)(c) – Façade Materials: Permitted materials include stone, brick, and glass; Requested the use of Hardie and LP siding on multiple elevations.

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

Motion and Vote

Mr. Leonhard moved, Mr. Alexander seconded, to approve a Minor Project Review with three conditions:

- 1) That the applicant selects a vinyl clad wood window with divided lites in an accurate reproduction of the design of the existing windows;
- 2) That the applicant provides maintenance and repair to the existing windows or the applicant agrees to simultaneously replace all the windows in the building; and

3) That the pattern and color of the Hardie and LP siding match the existing siding.

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

Communications

Lori Burchett reported the City has been involved in a project for artistic bike racks to be installed in the Historic District. She explained there was a committee comprised of the Dublin Arts Council, Historic Business Association, and Staff including Planning, Parks, and Engineering and they put a call out for artists to submit design proposals. She said the committee selected a simple heron design. She said the City working with the artist to finalize the design. She stated the racks would vary in height but would be about six feet tall.

Ms. Burchett announced the Preservation Alliance is having their Preservation Forum in Des Moines, IA, in July, if anyone was interested in attending. Mr. Rinaldi thought it would be interesting but his work schedule will not allow attendance. Ms. Burchett said the pamphlet reflected some interesting speakers and topics but this opportunity will likely be available to the Board, annually.

Jennifer Rauch reported Staff had a work session with City Council last Wednesday to discuss the status of the updates to the Bridge Street Code, related to process. She said Council also inquired about the Historic District and whether it should be removed from the BSD due to its uniqueness. She said City Council recommended the Historic District be taken out of the BSD as the Form-Based Code is doing the district a disservice. She said that will require Staff to make changes to the Code, including rezoning properties, which also coincides with the updates to the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*. She added Council also discussed expanding the Historic District boundaries to the west, due to the scale of possible redevelopment of that area.

David Rinaldi inquired about the delineation of the Historic District monuments. Ms. Rauch said that came up as part of the previously mentioned work session with Council and whether the monuments should be removed or moved somewhere else and Council determined they should remain where they are. Mr. Rinaldi noted the ones at Bridge Park are gone.

With no further communications to share, the Chair adjourned the meeting at 7:35 pm.

As approved by the Architectural Review Board on August 22, 2017.