



MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, September 26, 2018

AGENDA

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. BSD HC – Christensen Property
18-058ARB-MPR | 56 Franklin Street
Minor Project Review (Approved 5 – 0) |
| 2. BSD HR – Vessels Residence
18-059ARB-MPR | 63 S. Riverview Street
Waiver (Approved 5 – 0)
Minor Project Review (Approved 3 – 2) |
| 3. BSD HC – Tackett Bakery & Office Addition
18-027ARB-MPR | 30 – 32 S. High Street
Minor Project Review (Approved 5 – 0) |

The Chair, David Rinaldi, called the meeting to order at 6:32 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Board Members present were: Jeffrey Leonhard, Gary Alexander, Andrew Keeler and Shannon Stenberg. City representatives were: Jennifer Rauch, Lori Burchett, Richard Hansen, Jimmy Hoppel, and Laurie Wright.

Administrative Business

Motion and Vote

Mr. Alexander moved, Ms. Stenberg seconded, to accept the documents into the record. The vote was as follows: Mr. Keeler, yes; Mr. Leonhard, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; and Mr. Alexander, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Keeler moved, Ms. Stenberg seconded, to approve the August 22, 2018, meeting minutes as presented. The vote was as follows: Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Leonhard, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Shannon Stenberg, yes; and Mr. Keeler, yes. (Approved 5 – 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 – Christensen Property
18-058ARB-MPR | 56 Franklin Street
Minor Project Review |
|---|--|

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said this application is a proposal for exterior modifications, an attached garage addition, a detached garage addition ±840 square feet in size, and associated site improvements to an

existing home within the Historic District. He said the property is zoned Bridge Street District - Historic Residential and is east of Franklin Street, ±400 feet south of the intersection with West Bridge 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*.

Richard Hansen said this is a request for a review and approval of a Minor Project Review including exterior modifications and additions of an attached garage, front porch, mud room, and a detached garage. He reported this application was reviewed by the Administrative Review Team (ART) on September 20, 2018, and recommended approval for the ARB's review.

Mr. Hansen presented an aerial view of the site. He reported this property was deemed non-contributing when the Historic and Cultural Assessment was completed. He presented the proposed site plan that included three additions to the existing principal structure including the front porch addition, the attached garage, and mud room. He said the addition of the attached garage will require the removal of the existing drive and relocation of the drive-way to the north. He said it would also require the removal of the existing deck.

Mr. Hansen said the new detached garage is proposed at 840 square feet in size. According to our Accessory Use and Structures Code, he said, a lot this size is permitted two accessory structures, however, they cannot exceed 840 cumulative square feet in size. He said that would require the removal of the existing shed, which is approximately 66 square feet in size or the decrease of size of the proposed detached garage to meet the regulations.

Mr. Hansen said the driveway in the rear from Mill Lane is too close to the existing parking lot, east of Mill Lane. He said Engineering has requested the applicant to move the garage and the driveway to the south to eliminate this conflict.

Mr. Hansen presented the existing conditions of the home where the applicant is proposing a white HardiPlank siding, which would be installed over the existing siding. He said the applicant intends to keep the stone front as well as any brick and will be painted white to match the HardiPlank.

Mr. Hansen presented the proposed floor plans and noted the setbacks and lot coverage are in line with the Zoning Code. He presented the proposed addition elevations that will not exceed the height of the existing structure. He explained the proposed porch will be covered by a gray metal, standing-seam roof, complimentary to the asphalt shingles used on the rest of the structure as well as the detached garage. He presented the proposed detached garage elevations. Lastly, he presented the materials inspiration showing the metal roof with the asphalt shingles and inspiration for the single garage doors.

Mr. Hansen said Staff reviewed this proposal against the Minor Project Review Criteria and the Architectural Review Board Standards. He recommended approval with two conditions:

- 1) That the applicant shall remove the existing accessory structure, or reduce the size of the proposed detached garage to ensure the cumulative square footage of the two detached accessory structures does not exceed 840 square feet; and
- 2) That the applicant shall work with the Engineering Division to relocate the proposed detached garage and associated drive-way to the south.

Mr. Hansen offered to answer questions and stated the applicant was also present.

The Chair invited the applicant to add to the presentation and he declined. He then invited the public to speak with regard to this application.

Tom Holton, 5957 Roundstone Place asked the applicant about the painting of the masonry because the *Guidelines* suggest that if masonry is not painted, it should remain unpainted.

Gary Alexander said he had a question for the applicant as well. The Chair invited the applicant to come forward.

Andrew Christianson, 56 Franklin Street.

Mr. Alexander asked why there were no windows on the sides of both the garage and the garage addition. He explained windows need to be added because the applicant's building is close to his neighbor's property and as proposed, there are no breaks or material changes. He also noted both of the neighbors have windows on their side walls, which breaks up their elevations and massing of their homes, providing a visual relief. He suggested windows would benefit the design, the neighborhood and improve the streetscape while also becoming consistent with the Zoning Code for a single-family residence. He said for homes in the area, continuing the features and materials from the front and around is expected and that should apply here as well. He said he has the same concern about the garage. He said one side of the garage faces the parking lot but the gable ends of the garage should have windows also. He said any large structures or those that even look like barns in the area, have something in the gable end to break the massing.

Mr. Christianson said he agreed windows would complement the exterior. He explained these were basic renderings provided to Staff but he would be happy to add windows. He suggested even if the area above the garage is not used, he could place a window there for decorative purposes.

Andrew Keeler asked if stone will be used at the base of the front porch. Mr. Christianson indicated he had not made a decision on that yet. He said the decision will be based on the grade. He thought a concrete base would probably be used since not very much of the base will be visible.

Mr. Alexander asked Mr. Rinaldi if there is an answer to the question about the brick. Mr. Rinaldi said, given the overall scheme presented and the fact that this is a non-contributing structure, he found the request to permit the brick to be painted was appropriate. Shannon Stenberg agreed and found the proposed white would be more visually appealing. Mr. Keeler agreed.

The Chair asked for a condition to be written regarding the windows. Mr. Alexander recommended three windows, one in each of the gables, one in the attached garage, and one in each side of the detached garage. The Chair asked the applicant if he was agreeable to that condition. Mr. Christianson agreed to the conditions.

Ms. Stenberg inquired about how much the garage would need to be moved to the south to eliminate the conflict. Ms. Rauch said this distance would only need to be what is needed to resolve Engineering's concerns.

Mr. Rinaldi clarified the condition is to remove the shed or decrease the size of the proposed garage. Ms. Rauch answered affirmatively and if the removal is desired then the applicant would need to return to this Board to request a demolition of the shed.

The Chair asked the Board if they had any further comments. [There were none.] The Chair called for a motion to approve the application with three conditions rather than the two originally stated.

Motion and Vote

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

- 1) That the applicant remove the existing accessory structure or reduce the size of the proposed

detached garage to ensure the cumulative square footage of the two detached accessory structures does not exceed 840 feet;

- 2) That the applicant work with the Engineering Department to relocate the proposed detached garage and associated drive-way to the south; and
- 3) That the applicant work with Staff to add three windows in the gabled ends of the additions; one window in the house addition and two windows in the detached garage.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Stenberg, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Leonhard, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; and Mr. Alexander, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

**2. BSD HR – Vessels Residence
18-059ARB-MPR**

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

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said this application is a proposal for a second-story addition and exterior modifications to an existing home within the Historic District. He said the property is zoned Bridge Street District - Historic Residential and is west of South Riverview Street, northwest of the intersection with Eberly Hill Lane. He said this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.066 and 153.170, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Lori Burchett reported the Administrative Review Team (ART) recommended approval of the Minor Project Review at their meeting on September 20, 2018. She said there is one Waiver being requested with this project, which the ART also recommended approval of to the ARB.

Lori Burchett presented an aerial view of the site and photographs of the existing conditions on the west elevation (S. Riverview Street). She said this is the portion of the home built in the 1820s and is considered to be a contributing structure to the Historic District and it is also on the National Register. She said the home consists of white wooden siding and a black metal roof.

Ms. Burchett presented the south elevation (Eberly Hill Lane). She noted these two sections of the home were previous additions – one was built in 1980 and the second-story addition was built in 1990, which encroaches into the side yard setback by one foot. Both the two-story and one-story sections consist of white wooden siding and asphalt shingle roofing. She pointed out the location of the proposed second-story addition for a master suite to be constructed on top of the existing living room.

Ms. Burchett presented the proposed site plan and noted the addition is in roughly the same footprint as the existing first floor except for a small overhang on the south side of the building. Again, she said the addition encroaches one-foot into the required 3-foot side yard setback. A Waiver for this encroachment is requested. She said the ART recommended approval as the existing first story already encroached for this same distance and the encroachment is minor.

Ms. Burchett said the applicant also proposed an AC unit on the north side of the building. She said Staff and the ART conditioned that the AC unit meet the 3-foot side yard setback and be screened from the adjacent property and right-of-way.

Ms. Burchett presented the proposed elevations for each side. She said the only change proposed for the Riverview façade is three sets of shutters. She said the applicant had proposed standard, closed-style Tudor, board and batten shutters with decorative hinges. She reported Staff and the ART had recommended that the shutters be replaced by a two-panel, operable shutter to better fit the architecture and historical time period of the home.

Ms. Burchett pointed out the addition is located to the rear of the existing historic structure and is one-foot, 2 inches lower in height than the existing two-story home. She said with the addition, there are also some exterior modifications proposed; a stone veneer is being proposed for the middle section of the home while a beige vertical board and batten siding is used in the portion with the addition and the roof will be changed from an asphalt shingle to a black metal roof. She reported Staff and the ART also recommended the removal of the brackets used at the overhang, and that they be replaced with a simple band board instead.

Ms. Burchett presented additional elevations including the view from the alley way and the view from the north side of the property illustrating the mass of the addition being proposed.

Since the ART meeting, Ms. Burchett said, the applicant has resubmitted new drawings meeting three of the four conditions imposed by the ART. She presented the existing and proposed elevations and noted the shutters had been replaced with operable, two-panel shutters, the overhang brackets have been removed, and the AC unit meets the 3-foot setback and will be screened.

Ms. Burchett presented graphics of the proposed materials that consist of HardiePanel vertical board and batten siding; tilt-wash, double hung Anderson windows and wood trim painted white; matte black, standing-seam metal for the roof; Old Ohio Heritage cultured stone veneer; and operable two-panel shutters with louvers.

Ms. Burchett stated Staff and the ART reviewed the project against the applicable Minor Project Review Criteria, Architectural Review Board Standards, and Waiver Review Criteria and found the application met all the criteria.

Ms. Burchett said approval is recommended for one Waiver for the one-foot, side yard setback encroachment as well as the Minor Project Review with four conditions:

- 1) That the applicant ensures the HVAC system is at least 3 feet from the property line and screened from the right-of-way and adjacent property to the north;
- 2) That the applicant ensures that the existing stone wall is protected during the construction of the second-story addition;
- 3) That the applicant replaces the board and batten shutters with operable two-panel shutters with louvers to preserve the historical significance and traditional style; and
- 4) That the applicant replaces the overhang brackets with a simple, band board design to separate the first and second stories of the addition.

Ms. Burchett said since the applicant has addressed three of the conditions, staff recommends approval of the single Waiver and the Minor Project Review with one condition:

- 1) That the applicant ensures that the existing stone wall is protected during the construction of the second-story addition.

Ms. Burchett presented illustrations of the existing elevations viewed from both the alley and the north side of the property to compare to the proposed elevations as they have been changed.

Ms. Burchett presented the applicant's resubmitted, new drawings meeting three of the four conditions imposed by the ART. She noted the drawings illustrated the shutters had been replaced with operable two-panel shutters, the overhang brackets had been removed, and the AC unit meets the 3-foot setback and will be screened.

Ms. Burchett concluded her presentation by stating both her and the applicant can answer any questions as they are present as well.

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

Heidi Bolyard, Simplified Living Architecture, said she did the design work for the project. She said her clients would prefer to leave the brackets between the first and second floor, if at all possible. Ms. Burchett said the issue of the brackets would be up to the Board's consideration this evening.

Gary Alexander asked Ms. Bolyard why they chose to put the stone where they did. Ms. Bolyard confirmed he was referring to the space between the existing and the original historic home. She said the client wanted to break up that area.

Mr. Alexander said the proposed material seems arbitrary. He said the siding on the front is wood detailed to look like stone, but as soon as it turns the corner it is clapboard siding. He noted there are four materials. He said the garage which is not shown in the drawings, is painted concrete block. He said materials on additions should be used to ensure the historic portion is articulated. He said instead of the design becoming more cohesive, the design becomes another fragment in the rear.

Mr. Alexander stated he does not agree with Staff that this application meets standards because there is a guideline stating roofs should be simple, volumetric forms. He said the proposed roof has a ridge, shed dormers in two directions, and a gable, and this is not simple like the end of the house. He indicated an early conceptual review would have really helped this process.

Ms. Bolyard indicated the clients plan to replace the garage at some point because they do not like the existing concrete block. In reference to the shape of the addition, she said, the client is trying to gain space but they cannot due to the height of the original historic home. She noted there has been two houses, on Riverview Street, that have similar things done to the roof as the house develops to the rear yard. She said the design for this client was based on those other homes on the street that created additions.

The Chair asked if anyone from the public wished to speak with regard to this application.

Steve Rudy, 129 S. Riverview Street, inquired about the overhang on the south side of the addition. He asked if it was for connectivity or space. Ms. Bolyard answered the overhang was used to break up that plane on the south elevation.

Tom Holton, 5957 Roundstone Place, said he was not certain which roof the applicant was referring to but each has different roof lines and different builds. He indicated the additions appear like they were built in sections but each section seems to have its own roof pitch, designed to look like each section was built in a different point in time. He said there is another house that has separate sections and each one was built at separate time, with a different roofline. He said he is not sure how those two homes differentiate with this application. He recalled when the Everlee's lived in this house (previous owner), they just added all these sections at different points in time and that is why the plan is so cut up the way it is.

The Chair opened the meeting up to the Board for discussion since there was no one else from the public that wanted to speak with respect to this case.

Mr. Alexander said the history of the house shows multiple additions. He suggested connecting the materials choices except for the main, historic part of the house. He said stone could be used across the base. He said he has concerns that the roof form does not conform to the *Guidelines*.

Jeff Leonhard inquired about the siding. Ms. Bolyard said it was wood.

Trevor Vessels, 63 S. Riverview Street, said the siding in the section they are considering to replace with stone, is different than the siding on the original house.

Mr. Alexander said the goal is to tie the previous additions together with the proposal. He indicated for the house that was cited by Mr. Holton, there was more of a sense of hierarchy because of the way it was designed and developed.

Mr. Vessels asked Mr. Alexander if he was suggesting all the same siding be used instead of breaking up the façade with stone.

Mr. Alexander said he thought the roof could be simplified and it would help. Mr. Vessels said before they met with the architect, they walked down their street and picked out the houses that they liked and that is how they decided on their roof. He said they used the assumption that the design had been approved in the past and he is confused on what is the difference between what has been approved in the past and what he has proposed.

Mr. Rinaldi said the difference is some projects cited were new builds versus additions. He said there is a difference as to how the Board would approach each of those.

Mr. Leonhard said he recalls discussions about additions and how these additions were expected to be differentiated from the existing structure. He said he does not see what the problem is with differentiating with stone instead of keeping the existing siding. He said the stone breaks it up.

Mr. Vessels said he and his wife thought of the stone idea because there are seven different types of siding and five different colors of white on their existing home.

Ms. Bolyard noted that unfortunately, that two-story, unappealing addition was put on the back. She said for true, historic design everything is supposed to be set apart from the original historic structure of the home.

Mr. Alexander said there are a number of other ways to handle this that meet more closely with the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* and would be more sensitive to the original home. Otherwise, he said there is an opportunity being missed here.

Ms. Stenberg said she appreciated the thought behind separating the original structure from the rest of the additions, but one of her challenges with the stone is the cultured stone, aspect. From the consultant report, she noted they specifically brought up one of the issues of trying to create a false sense of history. She indicated the cultured stone took away from the amazing stone wall that exists out front and some of the other features that were really important and contributing to this structure. Ms. Stenberg said the consultant had suggested using some other material to differentiate the building.

Andrew Keeler said it is tempting to pull different elements from different houses to create what the applicant desires. He said because this is a contributing structure, the options are more limited.

Ms. Bolyard explained the previous two-story structure has a 3:12 pitch and the challenge is trying to do a new roof type and stay below the original home. She said this is why they added dormers to create space through there. She indicated if dormers are not permitted, the applicant would lose one of the bedrooms and there would be no point of doing an addition.

Ms. Stenberg said she did not have a problem with the rooflines.

Ms. Bolyard inquired about the Board's opinion of the brackets. Mr. Rinaldi said it was brought up that the brackets were not recommended. He agreed because the brackets bring additional detail that is not

necessary. He said bringing the roofline down below the existing roofline and breaking up the mass was well done. He said he appreciates the comments on the complexity of the roof. He said even though it is not exactly what we want, there is a practical application as to how this addition should be achieved. He said he did not have an alternative suggestion for the space without using the dormers. He asked the Board how they should approach this roof comment.

Mr. Leonhard said he is fine with the proposed roof and he liked the design proposed.

Mr. Alexander said he does not have an issue with the shed dormer and it makes a nice transition element. He explained his concerns were with all of the roof elements together and the way they are composed. He found that there was a lack of continuity in the design.

Mr. Rinaldi said there are two issues that have been raised – roof design and the use of cultured stone. He said the consultant also brought up the cultured stone issue and brackets. He asked the Board for consensus as to how the cultured stone fits into this design. He said he thought it was appropriate to break the mass up and said stone was appropriate from his standpoint. He said the goal is to get the applicant a resolution that they can work with to move forward.

Mr. Leonhard said Staff approved the application and he suggested a motion be made to approve the application.

Mr. Rinaldi said it is the Board that has the authority to approve the application, and staff provides a recommendation. He asked if the Board had a constructive recommendation or a condition of approval and allow the application to move forward.

Mr. Alexander asked if the application could be tabled. He said the Chair may want to take a straw poll and offer that to the applicant. He said, if the result is a no vote that is a problem for the applicant. He said if the application is tabled, it is still active.

Ms. Stenberg noted that not everyone on the Board has to agree and she thought the applicant wanted to be able to start the renovation as soon as possible. She said she is okay with the side yard setback condition, has no problem with the differences in the roof, and agrees the stone wall should be protected. She said not having the brackets and keeping the design cleaner is closer to the historic structure's character.

Mr. Keeler said he agreed with Ms. Stenberg about the roof and the brackets. He said he could be convinced either way on the stone.

Mr. Rinaldi asked if the applicant or the architect had a recommendation for the stone. He asked if they would be amenable to propose a different material. Mr. Vessels said the stone is important to them to move forward. He said the stone makes the structure look better.

Mr. Alexander noted that applications have been tabled when the Board has had concerns and after reviewing the Board's comments, the applicant has come back with a significantly enhanced proposal.

Ms. Bolyard reported this is not the first design; they have spent months to get to this proposal. She said there have been several options presented to the Vessels.

The Chair asked to review the recommendation from staff that is before them. He said there will be a motion for a Waiver and a motion for the MPR. Lori Burchett said the recommendation from staff was to remove the brackets to meet the condition. The Chair clarified they were back to the four conditions.

The Chair asked the Board if they had any further comments. [There were none.] The Chair called for a motion since there was no further comments or discussion.

Motion and Vote

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

1. §153.063-A – Minimum Yard Requirements for BSD Historic Residential District – Required: Three-foot, side yard setback; Requested: Encroach one foot into the required side yard setback.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Leonhard, yes; and Mr. Keeler, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

The Chair confirmed the Board has agreed the brackets should be removed but the applicant would like to keep the brackets. Mr. Leonhard asked for clarification on the conditions. He said the Board could make a motion to approve the first three conditions and not the fourth, if the applicant wanted the brackets. The Chair said he had not heard that the Board wanted the brackets and he, himself, is not a fan. Mr. Alexander said he did not want the brackets.

The Chair called for a motion to approve the MPR with the following four conditions:

- 1) That the applicant ensures the HVAC system is at least 3 feet from the property line and screened from the right-of-way and adjacent property to the north;
- 2) That the applicant ensures that the existing stone wall is protected during the construction of the second-story addition;
- 3) That the applicant replaces the board and batten shutters with operable two-panel shutters with louvers to preserve the historical significance and traditional style; and
- 4) That the applicant replaces the overhang brackets with a simple, band board design to separate the first and second stories of the addition.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Keeler moved, Mr. Leonhard seconded, to approve the Minor Project Review with the stated four conditions. The vote was as follows: Mr. Alexander, no; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Ms. Stenberg, no; Mr. Leonhard, yes; and Mr. Keeler, yes. (Approved 3 – 2)

3. BSD HC – Tackett Bakery & Office Addition 18-027ARB-MPR

30 – 32 S. High Street Minor Project Review

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said this application is a proposal for building additions, renovations, and associated site improvements to two existing historic structures within the Historic District. He said the properties are zoned Bridge Street District Historic Core and are 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 a review and approval of a Minor Project under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.066 and 153.170, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Lori Burchett reviewed the Minor Project Review process and reported this application was reviewed recently by the Administrative Review Team on September 20, 2018, with a recommendation of approval to the Board this evening. She explained there are Waivers associated with this project and they are outlined in the presentation.

Ms. Burchett presented an aerial view of the site for context and then photographs of the front facades on the existing structures, which were both listed on the National Historic Register. She presented photographs of the rear of each building. She said the image of 30 S. High Street showed the additions that have been added over time. During the informal review by this Board, she said, the removal of the

addition closest to the original building was discussed, particularly as this addition created the saltbox roof character and it represented the growth of the area over time.

Ms. Burchett presented the proposed site plan and explained it showed the additions off the rear of both buildings with a 12-space parking lot with access from Blacksmith Lane. She said the applicant requested a Parking Plan to allow for 14 total spaces with 2 on-street parking spaces where 24 spaces in total would be required. Due to the nature of the proposed use in both of the buildings, particularly with the bakery with a lot of kitchen space, she indicated, it is anticipated these businesses would produce a low amount of vehicular traffic.

Additionally, Ms. Burchett said the applicant requested a side yard setback Waiver to allow for a setback for the addition of 30 S. High Street property to be less than 3 feet. She noted this was requested to stay somewhat in line with the existing non-conforming building. She explained a Waiver for lot coverage to be permitted at 87% for the 32 S. High Street lot was also requested. Due to the site improvements with the parking lot over both lots, and the construction of an accessible route, she said, lot coverage would be over the maximum 75% required. She said in order to construct the accessible route, a Waiver for wall height was requested. She noted this would allow a wall height of no more than 8 feet in height where 6 feet is required. She indicated this is necessary due to the grade and size of the lot.

Ms. Burchett said, a Fee-in-Lieu of Open Space was requested as part of this application. The open space dedication required would be \pm 30 square feet. She said the applicants have the option to request a Fee-in-Lieu of Open Space, if the amount is less than the minimum required for any of the open space types outlined in the Code.

Ms. Burchett presented drawings of the proposed front elevations of both buildings from different vantage points and in context with the surrounding buildings with the previous elevations that were reviewed informally by the ARB in June to highlight the changes for a comparison. She recalled during the previous review, Board members expressed concerns with the addition to the 30 S. High Street building and had recommended scaling down the addition, particularly as it attached to the historic building. She said the applicant requested a Waiver for primary materials on the north and south elevations of the 30 S. High Street addition. With the architectural detailing on these elevations, she reported, the ART was supportive of this request.

Ms. Burchett presented drawings of the proposed rear elevations of both buildings from different vantage points and in context with the surrounding buildings to show the proposed one and a half story addition to the 30 S. High Street building connected via a one-story hyphen. Since the previous review, she reported, the applicant removed the proposed chimney on the 32 S. High Street building and proposed a single-pane, storefront window on the front elevation as recommended by the Board. She said a Waiver was requested for non-street façade transparency to allow for 0% transparency for the addition on the south elevation at 30 S. High Street. She explained this was due to the Building Code requirements that limit windows on elevations that are less than 5 feet from a property line.

Ms. Burchett said Staff and the ART reviewed the applicable review criteria, the Minor Project Review Criteria, and the Architectural Review Board Standards and found the criteria to have been met. She reported the ART approved the following Administrative Departure on September 20, 2018, as the request was within 10% of the requirement:

1. Primary Materials – Zoning Code §153.062 – Building Types (O)(9)(d)(5)

Ms. Burchett said approval was recommended for five Waivers as follows, which she addressed earlier in the presentation:

1. Side Yard Setback §153.062 – Building Types (O)(9)(a)(2)

2. Maximum Impervious Lot Coverage §153.062 – Building Types (O)(9)
3. Non-Street Façade Transparency §153.062 – Building Types (O)(9)(d)(1)
4. Primary Materials §153.062 – Building Types (O)(9)(d)(5)
5. Wall Height §153.065 – Site Development Standards (E)(1)(b)(2)

Ms. Burchett said approval was recommended for a Fee-in-Lieu of Open Space as well as the Minor Project Review with a Parking Plan that allowed for 14 parking spaces where 24 are required with four conditions:

- 1) That the applicant receive a demolition permit prior to building permit approval and that demolition does not occur until the building permit is approved;
- 2) That the applicant pay a fee-in-lieu of open space prior to building permit approval;
- 3) That the applicant provides required bicycle parking on site; and
- 4) Should any archeological resources be identified during excavation, aside from the relocation of the existing stone wall, the applicant shall make a reasonable effort to record, protect, and preserve these resources.

Ms. Burchett concluded the applicant and representative were present to address any questions, as well.

The Chair asked the applicant if they had anything to add to the presentation, to which they declined.

The Chair invited the public to speak.

Nelson Yoder, 5927 Rings Road, Dublin, said he is currently residing at 181 S. High Street in the Historic District while his home on Rings Road is being renovated. He said he extends his support for this project. He said he has lived/worked in Dublin for 40 of his 42 years of age, including time in a historic house out on Rings Road. He said he has known Sherry and Floyd Tackett for about 10 years since Sherry decided to move her \$1 billion business back to Dublin, Ohio. He indicated they are fantastic people, long-term Dublin residents who trusted Dublin with their business but also with their home and now with the new business, as they turn the page. He said as a registered architect and someone who walks up and down High Street early in the morning and late at night and living in the heart of the Historic District, he is absolutely thrilled with what he sees the Tacketts proposed. He said the proposal brings a great business to downtown Dublin and restores some old structures that are in disrepair by bringing them back to life with new vibrancy and improvements. He concluded he could not be happier with what Sherry and Floyd have elected to do in the Historic District. He noted the quality of the proposal and that they are committing to our city so he urged the Board to approve what they have proposed.

Steve Rudy, 129 S. Riverview Street, said his main concern is parking, especially with the incoming parking garage at the other corner of the district. He said he loves the structures in the project but he does not like the logic coming across from the ART with an infill pattern that was too heavy. He said he was hoping this Board will keep the characteristic layout of the district, which is a backyard orientation, with open space separating structures across the alleys. He said he does not like seeing Waivers for Open Space or the rationale for it. He urged the Tacketts to looking into a Parking Plan that would involve parking lot sharing to eliminate the need for the Waiver. He recalled the Tacketts had a plan that left up some of the trees, had room for 20+ parking spaces, blended the lots, allowed more trees to remain, so there would be a protective canopy, keeping the open space, which is a much superior plan that he does not think would affect the current building mass. He said he is happy to see these old structures getting some love.

Tom Holton, 5957 Roundstone Place, asked about the stone walls that will need to be relocated. He said the stone walls are very fragile and may not be able to be protected and preserved. He said once they begin to relocate the stone, they may fall apart so he asked if there was a Plan B. He asked if the

applicant will be required to build a stone wall similar to what is on Dublin Road, if the existing stone wall cannot be stored and reconstructed. He encouraged the Board to ask that question.

Dan Morgan, architect, Behal Sampson Dietz Architects, 946 Mt. Pleasant Avenue, Columbus, Ohio.

Gary Alexander asked the applicant about the shed dormer on the original house. He asked if it had to be reframed, to which the applicant answered affirmatively. Mr. Alexander asked if the size of windows was being changed. Mr. Morgan answered they plan to maintain the size of the windows.

David Rinaldi said he appreciated that the applicant listened to this Board and obviously we have all spent a lot of time with this application and visited the property with the applicant. He said he struggled with the addition and how it attached to the 30 High Street property. He said he sees now the applicant has created a one story. He said he regrets that now the addition is massive, and much more impactful than it once was. He said for the most part, this applicant has listened to the Board and made the connection much better, the chimney was removed, and the windows were addressed on 32 S. High.

Mr. Alexander said he was sympathetic to the size the addition had become because when the adjustment was made, square footage needed to be gained because the loft could not be used. He said he would have liked to have seen the shed remain but understands the realities of taller structure adjacent to that. He stated he is pleased to see the revisions as well. He said he was not concerned with the height because it is now pushed back and may not be as perceivable from the street and it is not leaning on that structure. He said he was concerned with the Waiver request, pre-building permit. He said the shed across the back has been deemed a historic structure. He said he would be okay with the applicant demolishing everything else but left this shed until they got the permit and a 100% commitment. He said if the permit is not obtained and part of the historic structure is demolished, and the project does not go forward, the demolition would have been approved that is part of history and someone else might have chosen to retain it. He said he understands the shed cannot be retained here to make this design work. He said he had an issue with how that one Waiver is written.

Mr. Alexander said, in terms of the parking, he is deferring to Staff. He said a reduction in parking, generally, are occurring because most Zoning Codes are over proportioning parking.

Mr. Rinaldi said the Board has had arguments both ways; there is too much parking and there is enough parking. Jeff Leonhard said parking is needed but having parking behind these structures is going to add to the existing traffic. He said he would rather have a nice parking lot than just a field with occasional patches of gravel like some of the other parking lots back there. He said it is unfortunate the applicant cannot get more parking in there but it seems out of their control.

Shannon Stenberg said, in this particular application, because the City is looking to add bike racks with the initiative for Dublin to be more green and not to have as much parking, along with this applicant being limited to what type of business can go in so traffic is not increased, she supported the Parking Plan.

Andrew Keeler said he liked the direction the applicant was heading.

Ms. Stenberg said the north elevation had been improved. She said she was concerned with the open space to address Mr. Rudy's comment. She said the fact that a Fee-in-Lieu is being proposed in this instance, she said she does not know it can be avoided but she also recognized the importance of having open space, protecting that canopy, and it is not something that the Board looks at, while going forward for every case. She said this is an exception where she is okay with reducing open space.

Mr. Rinaldi asked for Ms. Stenberg to clarify her comment. He said part of that was to get an accessible route. Ms. Burchett said the requirement would be about 30 square feet of open space and how the site

is constructed with the parking lot, the existing buildings, the addition, having it publically accessible and something the public would utilize, it would not feel like a private space. She said if the applicant added 30 square feet of open space, which the ART grappled with, would it really feel accessible to the public.

The Chair asked the Board if they had any further comments. [There were none.] The Chair called for a motion for the five Waivers.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Keeler moved, Mr. Leonhard seconded, to approve the five Waivers requested:

1. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(9)(a)(2) – Side Yard Setback
Required: Minimum 3-foot side yard setback for Historic Cottage Commercial building types
Requested: Allow for a setback of less than 3-feet for the addition to 30 S. High Street
2. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(9) – Maximum Impervious Lot Coverage
Required: A maximum lot coverage of 75% is permitted
Requested: To allow for 87% lot coverage at 32 S. High Street. Maximum Impervious Lot Coverage
3. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(9)(d)(1) – Non-Street Façade Transparency
Required: Minimum of 15% non-street facing transparency
Requested: To provide 0% on the south elevation of 30 S. High Street
4. §153.062 – Building Types (O)(9)(d)(5) – Primary Materials
Required: Minimum of 80% of façade be of a primary material
Requested: To allow the north elevation at $\pm 60\%$, south elevation at $\pm 57\%$ for 30 S. High Street
5. §153.065 – Site Development Standards (E)(1)(b)(2) – Wall Height
Required: Maximum height of 6 feet for walls between a principal structure and rear property line
Requested: To allow for a retaining wall no greater than 8 feet in height

The vote was as follows: Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Leonhard, yes; and Mr. Keeler, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Leonhard moved, Mr. Rinaldi seconded, to approve the Fee-in-Lieu of Open Space:

- 1) Based on the square footage of the proposed use, a total of 29 square feet of publicly accessible open space is required. Code permits a Fee-in-Lieu of Open Space if the open space requirement is less than the minimum required for the smallest open space type. At 29 square feet, this is less than the minimum of 300 square feet required for a pocket plaza. With its relatively minimal dedication requirement, the applicant is requesting approval of a Fee-in-Lieu of Open Space.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Stenberg, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; and Mr. Leonhard, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

Jennifer Rauch asked if the first condition should be reworded, per the point made by Mr. Alexander.

Mr. Morgan said, from a standard constructability standpoint, the applicant would not have the equipment to tear those off and secure the buildings; there would be a big hole in the back of the building. He said he does not believe there will be an issue and the owners were present.

Mr. Rinaldi suggested for Condition #1, demolition does not occur until a building permit is issued. Mr. Leonhard clarified the applicant just wanted approval to demolish the shed. Mr. Alexander asked if that is

the goal to demolition approval or to start some demolitions before the permit. Mr. Alexander answered they want a full project ready to go before they would mobilize it. Mr. Rinaldi suggested tweaking that condition.

Motion and Vote

Ms. Stenberg moved, Mr. Leonhard seconded, to approve a Parking Plan to allow for 14 parking spaces when 24 spaces are required and a Minor Project Review with four conditions:

- 1) That the applicant receives a demolition permit prior to the building permit approval and that demolition does not occur until the building permit is approved;
- 2) That the applicant pay a Fee-in-Lieu of open space, prior to building permit approval;
- 3) That the applicant provides required bicycle parking on site; and
- 4) That should any archeological resources be identified during excavation, aside from the relocation of the existing stone wall, the applicant shall make a reasonable effort to record, protect, and preserve those resources.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Keeler, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Leonhard, yes; and Ms. Stenberg, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

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

Communications

Jennifer Rauch said Staff is working through the update to the *Guidelines* as well as the Code Modifications that have been discussed with this Board. She reported there will be a public meeting held on October 9, 2018, from 6 – 8 pm at the Dublin Community Church to gain input on new construction and for staff to present an overview of the project. She said notices will be sent out this week to every resident, business owner, and tenant, in the District.

Shannon Stenberg and Gary Alexander stated they will not be present at the October 24, 2018, ARB meeting.

Ms. Rauch said Lori Burchett is leaving Planning and her last day is Monday, October 1, 2018. She is going back to Seattle, WA for a great job opportunity.

Adjournment

With no further communications to share, the Chair adjourned the meeting at 7:57 pm.

As approved by the Architectural Review Board on November 28, 2018.