



MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, February 26, 2020

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Alexander, Vice Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. Alexander led the Pledge of Allegiance.

OATH OF OFFICE

Vice Mayor Cathy De Rosa administered the Oath of Office to Architectural Review Board (ARB) appointees, Amy Kramb and Frank Kownacki.

ROLL CALL

Board Members present: Mr. Alexander, Ms. Bryan, Mr. Kownacki and Ms. Kramb
Staff present: Ms. Rauch, Ms. Martin and Mr. Ridge

ADJOURNMENT TO EXECUTIVE SESSION

Ms. Bryan moved, Ms. Kramb seconded to adjourn to executive session to consider the appointment of a public official.

Vote on the motion: Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Bryan, yes; Mr. Kownacki, yes.
(Motion passed 4-0)

The meeting was reconvened at 6:37 p.m.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Ms. Kramb moved, Mr. Kownacki seconded, to appoint Gary Alexander as Vice Chair for the term of 2020-2021(April).

Vote: Ms. Bryan, yes; Mr. Kownacki, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes.
(Motion carried 4-0)

Mr. Alexander moved, Ms. Kramb seconded, to appoint Kathleen Bryan as Chair for the term of 2020-2021(April).

Vote: Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Bryan, yes; Mr. Kownacki, yes.
(Motion carried 4-0)

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS

Mr. Alexander moved, Ms. Kramb seconded to accept the documents into the record.

Vote on the motion: Ms. Bryan, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Kownacki, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes.
(Motion carried 4-0)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Alexander moved, Ms. Kramb seconded to approve the January 29, 2020 meeting minutes.
Vote on the motion: Mr. Kownacki, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Bryan, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes.
(Motion carried 4-0)

Ms. Bryan stated that the Architectural Review Board is responsible for review of construction, modification or alteration to any site in the Review District or area subject to Architectural Board Review under the provision of Zoning Code Section 153.177. The Board has the decision-making responsibility on these cases. The Chair swore in any staff or members of the public who planned to address the Board on any of the cases during the meeting.

CASES:

1. 158 South High Street, 20-029MPR, Minor Project Review

Ms. Bryan stated that this is a proposal for the construction of a one-story, 3,600-square-foot residence and associated site improvements. The 0.39-acre site is east of S. High Street, ±150 feet south of the intersection with John Wright Lane and zoned Bridge Street District Historic Residential.

Case Presentation

Mr. Ridge stated that is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review (MPR) for construction of a new, single-family home in the Historic District. The site is located east of South High Street, approximately 150 feet south of the intersection with John Wright Lane. The. 0.37-acre site contains half of a two-family, 1.5 story home and a detached garage. A driveway provides access to the site south of the primary structure. Views of surrounding homes shown for context revealed a variety of architectural styles in the immediate area.

Background

On June 26, 2019, the ARB reviewed and approved demolition of the existing two-family home with the condition that demolition permits not be issued until a replacement use or building plans had been approved by the ARB. At the same meeting, the Board provided an Informal Review of two proposed single-family homes to be constructed at 156 and 158 S. High Street, respectively. The board discussed their concerns with the complex rooflines, number of dormers, and design of the driveway, among other issues. For the August 28, 2019 ARB meeting, the applicant submitted applications for two new single-family homes on the lots where the two-family home currently sits. However, the Board expressed concerns with the proposed porte-cochere, the massing of the home, and the similar color palette and design details of the homes. The case was tabled at that meeting. The applicant resubmitted plans for review and approval, and on September 25, 2019, the ARB approved the MPR with 12 conditions.

Proposal

Today, the applicant is proposing a new construction, single-family home on the southernmost parcel of 158 S. High Street. It is important to note that this is a separate application and an updated version of the plan previously approved by the Board. The applicant has worked diligently

to address the conditions of approval from the September meeting to ensure a simpler and cohesive design, with a more appropriate massing. The previously approved site plan had two rear-loaded garages, one centrally located in the home and one at the rear of the home. There was also a large turnaround/parking pad at the rear of the home and a large, screened-in porch on the south side of the home. The proposed site plan provides driveway access to the north of the home. There will be side-loaded garages, and the screened-in porch has been moved from the south side of the lot to the east side/rear of the home. Overall, the home has shifted seven feet to the south. The redesign has created more open space at the rear of the home due to removal of the parking pad. The applicant has proposed a retaining wall on the site, alongside the driveway. Staff has concerns with how this area will function, and has recommended that more grading details be provided. With the redesign, the width of the front façade has decreased from approximately 65 feet to 60 feet, the screened-in porch has moved to the rear of the home, and the application of materials has been modified. Hardishake shingles will be used in the entirety of the gable ends and a stone watertable will be added to the connector. The applicant is proposing the use of a Cassa di Sassi Bianco stone on portions of all facades and on the chimneys. The applicant is also proposing the use of a vertical board and batten siding in a Revere Pewter color on portions of all facades, as well as a Hardishake shingle in the gable ends.

Many of the conditions for the September 2019 approval addressed concerns about the complex south elevation. The applicant has simplified the application of materials, proposing the use of primarily stone on the western half, board and batten on the eastern half, and relocation of the screened-in porch to the rear of the home. The roof system has been reworked and the deck removed from the south elevation. Staff was concerned that the window immediately east of the bump-out was inconsistent with the other large windows on the south elevation and is recommending it be modified to be more consistent. The applicant has worked to decrease the massing of the home, creating a much more compact and appropriate massing. Architectural details were provided, including column, trim, and retaining wall details. Columns are to be 10X10 square columns with a 1-inch trim and a base consisting of a 1X10 trim and a smaller 1X2 trim. The retaining wall consists of an 8-inch poured concrete wall, clad in the same stone used on the rest of the home and topped with a cultured stone cap. The plan has been reviewed against the applicable criteria, and staff recommends approval with four conditions.

Applicant Presentation

Bob Dyas, 180 S. Riverview Street, Dublin, stated that he has been a member of the Dublin community since the 1980s and moved to the downtown area over ten years ago. He is acquainted with four generations of the Eger family. He has a view of the Eger property from his front porch, and when it became available, he purchased the property. As the builder of the new home, his goal is to have a design that is compatible with the Historic District. The prospective buyers of the home previously approved by the Board changed their mind. A new client is interested in having a new home on this property. They have tweaked the previous design to address the previous conditions for approval.

Susan Dyas, 180 S. Riverview Street, Dublin, stated that they believe they have addressed the previous concerns of the Board. In regard to staff's condition regarding modification of the window – the reason that window is shorter is that it is the window over the kitchen sink. In the earlier

discussion, Mr. Alexander made some suggestions as to how to address this internally, but she has not seen any of those suggestions used.

Mr. Alexander stated that he would like to compliment them. This design is an improvement over the previous design. In some historic districts -- German Village, for example, window openings are required to be certain sizes. One workaround that has been used is extending the kitchen countertop over the lower portion of the window opening and having the bottom of the window casing meet the backsplash. Either an upward or downward acting interior blind can fit within the window frame. An upward-acting blind would hide the backside of the cabinet from view. In New Albany, which has window design/size restrictions, drywall has been run over the undesired portion of the window if needed for the interior layout. These are two examples of methods that have been used.

Public Comment

Janice Carroll, 190 S. High Street, Dublin, OH, stated that it was her understanding that there must be approved plans for both sides of the two-family home before the structure could be demolished.

Mr. Ridge responded that the condition for the demolition approval was that the demolition could not occur until building permits were issued for redevelopment of the site.

Mr. Dyas responded that they understand that only one-half of the building cannot be demolished. When the building permit is issued for 158 S. High Street, the entire structure will be demolished. The lot of 156 S. High Street will be cleaned, secured and backfilled until there are plans for a future structure.

Ms. Bryan requested staff confirmation that only one building project must be approved before the structure could be demolished with the other lot remaining empty.

Ms. Martin stated that they would check the wording of that particular condition. Typically, there must be an approved development project for that other lot, and there are actually two approved development projects for that lot.

Board Questions for the Applicant

Mr. Alexander inquired why the site plan was revised to have side-loading garages.

Mr. Dyas responded that he and the new client preferred not to have rear-loading garages visible from the backyard. A neighbor, Mr. Rudy, has expressed concerns about garages and extra pavement impacting the neighbors' views. With this new design, there is sufficient room to have side-loading garages. The view from the south side is more buffered.

Mr. Alexander stated that he would be more confident about this change if there were an accurate site-grading plan. The consultant's report expressed some concern that a retaining wall may be needed on the other side of the driveway. If there is some retaining on the other side of the drive, it would be close to the property line. If the adjacent property owner were to build at the five-foot setback line and over-dug the footings, it could create damage to the adjacent area. In addition, the maximum recommended slope into parking garages is 16%. According to the consultant's

report, it will be 29.5% with this plan. Even at 16%, the slope must be controlled or cars can bottom out. Another issue is the proximity to a retaining wall of that height. With tall retaining walls, the footer must be in the wall, which does occur here. A vehicle attempting to turn to access the bay could hit that retaining wall. More detail is needed; otherwise, he hesitates to approve something that may not work.

Mr. Dyas stated that he agrees with those points. The retaining wall will be tiered. What cannot be seen from the north elevation, just past the front side-load garage, the grade of the driveway will drop a foot lower than it appears. Everything will be graded away from the house and the stairs towards the rear garage. The retaining wall by the garage should be approximately five feet tall and three-tiered.

Mr. Alexander responded that those details are reassuring. This is a new application, so the previous Board approval with certain conditions no longer stands. Some of those conditions were ignored in this application, some of which he understands. The windows on the elevations have been simplified, even though they still have transoms. There is more continuity on the elevations. However, there was a suggestion to wrap the stone around the entire base. Having a stone foundation around the entire lower level would be more consistent with older structures.

Heidi Bolyard, Simplified Living Architecture, 6065 Frantz Road, Dublin, stated that they had sent a list of the changes that they had made to staff; this was before the previous buyers decided not to move forward.

Mr. Alexander inquired if they were made on the previous design but not incorporated into this one.

Ms. Bolyard responded that some of the changes were incorporated. There was previous discussion about removing the bumpout on the south façade, but after the screened-in porch was eliminated, some feature was needed to break up the massing of the wall. There was some confusion regarding what was approved or not approved at that previous meeting.

Ms. Rauch requested clarification of Mr. Alexander's concern.

Mr. Alexander responded that he is referring to the condition for the removal of the proposed bumpout and shed dormer located along the south elevation and replaced with vertical Hardipanel siding and stone watertable design extended along the south elevation.

Mr. Ridge responded that there is a more updated version than the slide shown. The applicant is proposing both the stone watertable and bumpout.

Mr. Alexander stated that he appreciates all the information, but it is not consistent with the Board Order. The design would be better if the stone watertable were extended all the way around, because it would then look like a stone foundation.

Mr. Dyas responded that they would have no objection to adding stone all the way around, as described.

Mr. Ridge responded that a fifth (5th) item would be added to the list of conditions.

Ms. Kramb stated that this is the first time she has seen the revised design, which she likes much better. She has concerns about the slope and grade by the garages. She would want to know more about the appearance and details of the retaining wall. In her opinion, transom windows are not appropriate here, although she understands the intent to have taller windows, yet break up the expanse. On the front façade, there are two windows with transoms to the right of the door and no transoms anywhere else. They appear much taller and narrower than all the other windows.

One of the conditions from the prior project was to make all the windows more consistent. Those two windows are different. There was also a condition to make sure that all windows had lintels and sills. If there are sills in the non-masonry-clad section, they are not evident. On the drawing provided in the website packet, there are windows that are straight trimmed, some with lintels and no sills, some with both, and some with transoms. Some of those are on the same elevation, which is very distracting – particularly on the front façade. There is also a very decorative door. In general, the style is overly decorative. More simplification and standardization of the windows is needed, per the condition of the prior report. Brackets are proposed for the garage doors, but there are no cut sheets or product details for the brackets. In her opinion, the brackets should be simple, not ornate.

Ms. Bolyard responded that they are solid wood, so they appear just as drawn. The profile is shown on the front elevation.

Ms. Kramb stated that the previous condition was to remove the standing seam roof material, which remains in these plans.

Mr. Ridge responded that there was much more of that material in previous versions. Staff believed what was proposed here was appropriate, as it would be over the garages.

Mr. Alexander stated that he must reinforce the point that the number one emphasis in the Historical Design Guidelines is that the buildings in Old Dublin are simple, vernacular buildings. It is rare to have more than two materials on the front façade; most have one material. Using another material would give more clarity in the design.

Ms. Kramb stated that that existing number of materials is excessive. One roofing material would be appropriate. The dormers and bumpout should not have standing seam metal. If a watertable will be used on the structure, it should not be partial and fake, but a real watertable foundation extended all the way around. The front façade has three main building materials, which is too busy on one facade. The slide of the garage door, showing three vertical sections, is different from the printed version, which shows three horizontal panels. One or two wood panels would be simpler. The most significant issue, however, is the grade of the driveway, which seems steep and impractical.

Ms. Bryan requested explanation of the two versions of the garage door panels.

Mr. Ridge responded that the most recent version has horizontal panels.

Ms. Kramb stated that the version in the packet is not an appropriate garage door. In addition, the three window wells on the south elevation are not appropriate on those very large windows. She also agrees that the kitchen window should be the same size as the two windows next to it, which is one of the conditions.

Mr. Alexander stated that he would defend the deep window wells, as those are probably egress windows, as required by the Building Code.

Mr. Dyas stated that they have been working on a design for this site for over a year. He does not disagree with the comments, but they have changed over time, along with a change in staff and previous Board members. For instance, the metal over the dormers, as well as the shakes in the front gable, were added upon staff or Board request. He can remove them, but he would prefer to have clear direction.

Ms. Kramb stated that she does see that he was directed to use shake shingles over vertical siding, so if that was the previous direction, she has no objection.

Mr. Dyas responded that there is a similar situation with the transoms.

Ms. Kramb stated that the issue with the transoms is having them match. Whatever windows are used, they need to match in height and size.

Mr. Alexander inquired what was the reason they revised the design from the carriage house style garage door. That would seem to have been the more logical choice, given the remainder of the design, as opposed to the horizontal panels in the revised design.

Mr. Dyas responded that change was based upon the client's request, but they would follow the Board's direction.

Ms. Bryan stated that there are now five conditions for approval.

Ms. Kramb stated that the first condition is only that a survey of the existing and the proposed grade be provided. A survey is insufficient. Based on the survey results, the Board needs to see a design of the retaining wall. A study also is needed regarding the ability of vehicles to turn and access the garage.

Mr. Alexander concurred. The Board needs to see how the drive will look. The applicant might prefer to request the case be tabled rather than risking a negative vote.

Ms. Bryan stated that she concurs that the case should be tabled, but the direction to the applicant must be very clear, so that the case will not need to be tabled again. She clarified the requests.

1. Grading survey and proposed changes to the driveway slope. Show contours, current and proposed topography.
2. Details of the retaining wall, including overall height.
3. Standardization of the windows, consistent lentils and sills.

Mr. Alexander noted that there would be some differences in the masonry versus non-masonry. They cannot be identical; they need only to be addressed in a similar way, appropriate to the material.

Ms. Kramb stated that the best example of that is on the front, west elevation. The drawing in the packet shows four different finishes around the windows in the dormer, cedar shakes and masonry areas. There is also a smaller window immediately left of the door with a sill, but the other two windows do not appear to have sills.

Mr. Dyas stated that the four windows in the Hardiwood siding, whether it is shake or board and batten, would be consistently trimmed. The two windows in the stone will have a different masonry trim, lentil and sill.

Ms. Bryan requested clarification of the direction regarding the ornate front door.

Board consensus was that because the door has been simplified since the original design, they have no further objections.

4. Extension of the stone watertable across the entire lower level.

Ms. Kramb requested clarification of the Board's direction regarding the standing seam metal on the dormers.

The Board indicated that item also has been changed per previous Board direction, so no further changes would be requested.

Mr. Dyas requested clarification regarding extension of the stone watertable over the bumpout. Ms. Bolyard noted that the bumpout was intended to appear as a small addition to the structure. Mr. Alexander stated that he believes it does add relief/contrast to the wall, and the design has already been simplified significantly.

Mr. Dyas requested clarification regarding the requested kitchen sink window. Because this is the south elevation facing the trees, would the Board permit the shorter kitchen window?

Ms. Bolyard noted that if the window were to extend lower, it would not be an operable window. The Board had no further objections to the shorter kitchen sink window.

Mr. Alexander moved, Mr. Kownacki seconded a motion to table the Minor Project Review.

Vote: Ms. Bryan, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Kownacki, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes.

[Motion carried 4-0]

2. 60 Franklin Street, 20-016MPR, Minor Project Review

Ms. Bryan stated that this is a proposal for a building addition to an existing residence. The site is east of Franklin Street, ±475 feet south of the intersection with West Bridge Street and zoned Bridge Street District Historic Residential.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Ridge stated that this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review (MPR) to allow for the construction of a 683-square-foot building addition to an existing residential home located within Historic Dublin. The site is located east of Franklin Street, approximately 475 feet south of the intersection with West Bridge Street. The .35-acre parcel has approximately 70 feet of frontage along Franklin Street, with the rear of the property adjacent to Mill Lane. Franklin Street is unique in that the lots are deeper than typical in the Historic District. This lot has a depth of approximately 215 feet. For context, the cemetery is located to the west and the Chamber of Commerce is located to the southeast. The site contains a single-story residential building built in 1957, which is to be preserved. A family room addition is proposed to the rear of the home, above the existing two-car garage. There will be no change in lot coverage, which is approximately 31 percent; 50 percent is permitted. In order to accommodate the addition, the applicant is proposing to remove the existing patio built on top of the garage, as well as the staircase on the south side of the patio. The applicant is proposing a new staircase and covered porch along the north side of the addition, replacing the existing staircase that leads from the porch to the backyard. Overall, the site is to remain largely unchanged. An addition with a cross-gabled roof that ties into the gabled roofline of the existing structure is proposed. The existing gabled roof has a 6:12 pitch, while the proposed pitch of the addition is a 7 and 3/8:12 pitch, allowing for taller ceilings in the addition and a clean connection to the existing roofline. The resulting roof height is approximately 28 inches higher than the existing lower roof ridge, and five inches higher than the existing upper roof ridge, allowing the upper and lower roof ridges to terminate cleanly into the roof of the addition. A portion of the new roof is visible from on the front façade, and is finished with a Dutch gable with a triangular, white vent to match the existing structure. The proposed roofing material,

a dimensional asphalt shingle in a Driftwood color, will match the existing roof. The addition will be finished in a Downing Sand stucco to match the existing home. The stucco on the two-car garage will be replaced with a manufactured stone veneer in Bucktown Limestone with a gray grout to match the existing stone cladding on the home. The gable end on the east-facing portion of the addition will contain cedar shingles in a Roycroft Bronze Green color to match the existing cedar shingles on the front façade of the home. In addition to new windows, the applicant is proposing to reuse and relocate several windows with this application. The existing Jeld-Wen double-hung, white vinyl windows will be relocated from the existing structure to the new areas of the home as indicated on the elevations. On the south elevation, the applicant is proposing two small clerestory windows below the soffit. These are inconsistent with the rest of the windows on the addition, and do little to break up the long wall created by the addition; therefore, staff recommends that the two windows match the third window proposed on the south elevation of the addition, as outlined in the consultant memo. Staff also has concerns with the arched top transom windows on the east elevation of the addition as the home does not presently contain arched architectural features, but rather angular architectural features. Because these windows are inconsistent with any other window or architectural element on the home, staff is recommending that they be revised to standard dimension windows, as used elsewhere on the building and as outlined in the consultant's memo. Per staff's request, the consultant conducted a window analysis and four options were proposed; the fourth option is the consultant's preference. The project was reviewed against all applicable criteria, and staff recommends approval with two conditions.

Applicant Presentation

Jeff Bolyard, 60 Franklin Street, Dublin stated that he is the owner and the applicant. One of staff's recommendations would create a line of sight issue, which they are attempting to resolve with the neighbor to the south; that neighbor, Mr. Szuter, is present tonight. He does not understand why the two proposed clerestory windows would not be permitted. Clerestory windows are common in downtown Dublin. If not permitted, he would request approval of Option B, which is similar to staff's recommendation, except it does not put two windows awkwardly side by side and permits them to address the line of sight issue with the neighbor. A greater issue is the window on the rear elevation of the home, which faces Mill Lane, the alley running behind the properties. The residents on this street essentially live in their backyards. Front-yard property lines are very shallow and will become more so with the anticipated sidewalk construction, so the desire is to have a good rear view. He has proposed a picture window in the middle to provide the desired view, which matches the window on the front elevation of the home. Staff has recommended a split window. The issue is the arch. In his opinion, the arch is more aesthetically pleasing. There are also two interior arch design elements in the home with which they are attempting to tie in the window arch. Staff's recommendation does not work, because the home is designed to be a cove structure with a flat ceiling. There will not be a clear pitch to the peak. The arch design provides ability to have a contour that matches the ceiling. He referred the Board to an inspirational photo depicting two storage closets in the arched space with a bench between.

Mr. Alexander stated that is different from what is drawn. When the windows are subdivided, the scale is changed. The consultant had pointed out two issues. One is the arch, which is not an architectural characteristic in Dublin; the other is the scale – the massive window on that facade. The consultant recommends more continuity with the existing windows. The recommendations suggest making the opening more vertical. Instead of dividing the middle window into two with a

5.5-inch strip of trim, there could be a much narrower division. Then, it would be viewed as four windows across the elevation, as opposed to one massive window with a smaller window on each side. Regarding the transoms – in the earlier proposal, nearly all were attached to another window. Because the windows were joined together in the middle, similar to his suggestion, they are viewed more as one.

Mr. Bolyard stated he could consider that on the south façade, if the Board would support his Option B for two windows, not three.

Mr. Kownacki responded that he would have no objection to Option B.

Ms. Kramb responded that she has no objection if the windows are full length and match the existing windows on that elevation.

Mr. Bolyard referred to the other page of options/variations. He would consider both Options B and C. In his opinion, staff's suggestion to move from one to three windows would be too high. The options he has suggested have only two in the middle section.

Ms. Bryan inquired about Mr. Alexander's suggestion to revise the large window to make it appear to be two windows.

Mr. Bolyard responded that, on the north elevation is the proposed relocation of two, double-hung windows. He would probably move those to this elevation, instead. On the north elevation, he could use a picture window or a double-hung window.

Ms. Kramb stated that in the drawings, the center section has one large picture window. Two double-hung windows, side by side, would match the rest of the house.

Mr. Bolyard stated that the placement would be single, double-hung; double double-hung; single, double-hung.

Mr. Alexander inquired if one of the factors is the intent to relocate and utilize existing windows.

Mr. Bolyard responded affirmatively. Three double-hung windows, one double double-hung window and a French door are being relocated.

Mr. Alexander stated that his suggestion was to divide either Option C or D in that manner – one, two, one. Instead of having a gap between them, however, they would be placed together.

Mr. Bolyard noted that there would be a divided top section, as well.

Ms. Kramb stated that they should be paired, similar to the paired windows on the east elevation. She has no objection to Option C. She did not like Option B, preferring rectangular windows to arched or angled.

Ms. Bryan stated that the Board is recommending modification of the windows on the south façade to Option B, and on the east façade -- Option C with the large window divided into two sections.

Public Comment

Alan Szuter, 80 Franklin Street, Dublin, stated that he lives 10 feet to the south of the proposed addition. He and Mr. Bolyard have discussed the south elevation, which is 15 feet south of the sunroom in their home, which has windows on all sides, including the north façade. He appreciates Mr. Bolyard's attempts to lay out the proposed addition in a manner to avoid direct sight lines. The homes are very close in this neighborhood. He does not believe that factor has been part of the Board's consideration.

Ms. Bryan inquired if he would have any objection to the window placements.
Mr. Szuter responded that if Mr. Bolyard is satisfied, he would have no objection.

Ms. Kramb stated that the Board would have no objection to Option B, removing the one window that would create the most difficulty on that elevation.

Board Discussion

Ms. Kramb inquired if the existing basement windows, particularly those in the garage, would be retained.

Mr. Bolyard responded affirmatively.

Ms. Kramb stated that if the intent is to place stone cladding over the existing concrete blocks, the existing windows in the block walls will sit back further. How would they be trimmed?

Mr. Bolyard stated that some of that depth is due to the stucco, which can be reduced, and the stone veneer is not thick. He is confident he will be able to address the wrapping need satisfactorily. The same situation existed with the basement windows in the concrete block when the previous stone veneer was installed.

Ms. Kramb inquired if the windows were single-pane, framed.

Mr. Bolyard responded that they are white vinyl solid windows.

Mr. Alexander noted that to answer these questions, it would have been helpful to be provided a wall section. The Board has been generous in viewing projects that are not full construction, permit ready drawings. The depth difference between the stucco and the cultured stone applied to the block will create an offset. The trim application can address it, but the drawings, which are needed to secure a permit, would have been helpful for the Board's review.

Ms. Kramb noted that the newer vinyl windows would provide more leeway; they will be easier to trim out adequately. She has no objection if they match the existing windows with the similar application.

Mr. Alexander moved, Mr. Kownacki seconded to approve the Minor Project Review with the following two conditions:

- 1) The applicant modify the windows on the south elevation to select the applicant's proposed Option B, subject to staff approval.
- 2) The applicant modify the windows on the east elevation to select the applicant's proposed Option C with the middle window divided into two separate windows, subject to staff approval.

Vote: Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Bryan, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Kownacki, yes.
[Motion carried 4-0.]

3. 185 South Riverview Street, 20-005MPR, Minor Project Review

Ms. Bryan stated that this is a proposal for the construction of a new, one-and-a-half-story, 2,900 square-foot residence with an 800-square-foot detached garage and associated site improvements. The site is located on the west side of S. Riverview Street, ±400 feet north of the intersection with Short Street and zoned Bridge Street District Historic Residential.

Staff Presentation

Background

Ms. Martin stated that this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review application for the construction of a one-story, 2,900-square-foot residence and associated site improvements on a 0.39-acre site within the Historic Residential District. The site is located on the west side of S. Riverview, approximately 325 feet north of the intersection with Short Street. The home immediately to the north is owned by the same individual. That structure is a 1997 modern millennium home. It has a suburban character; the site layout is not typical to Historic Dublin. North of the site is a small cottage with a hipped roof. The character on the east side of South Riverview is quite different, due to the steep drop-offs toward the Scioto River. There are ranch-style homes, which are located closer to the street. The house to the south of this property at 195 S. Riverview Street is also too modern to be considered a historical cultural resource, and it sits on a larger lot with a larger massing scale. The existing structure at 185 S. Riverview was approved for demolition in September 2019 as part of an application for 179-185 S. Riverview. Significant modifications were requested for the 185 S. Riverview St. property, as well as building additions that would have required the combination of the two lots. Since that meeting, the applicant has decided to pursue the alternate direction that is before the Board at this time. No modifications to the northernmost property are proposed.

Site Plan

The proposed 2,900-square-foot home includes a two-car, attached garage to be accessed from a driveway located to the north of the structure. There will also be a detached, two-car garage located to the side rear of the home. With the proposed site improvements, including the new home, driveway, at grade patio and detached garage, the approximate lot coverage is slightly less than 50%, which meets the Historic Residential District zoning requirements. While the proposal is compliant with the required setbacks, the site plan incorrectly depicts the limits of the parcel as the parcel extends to the centerline of S. Riverview Street. The setback in Historic Dublin is consistently measured from the edge of pavement of the street. The applicant should revise the site plan to show correctly the extent of the lot and setback of the home from the edge of pavement of S. Riverview Street. The result will be that the home will be sited further back than currently proposed.

Proposal

The proposal is for the construction of a new approximately 2,900 square-foot, one and a half-story Craftsman style bungalow with a side gable roof and a prominent shed dormer. It will have a traditional, front porch character with stone columns with tapered piers. On the south side of the front elevation is an enclosed sunroom. The entry is centrally located, and on the north side of the front elevation is a covered porch. The composition of the first story of the Craftsman bungalow is historically accurate. There is an existing example on N. Riverview Street. The north and south elevations have a Craftsman bungalow expression on the east with a more modern addition at the rear. The addition is separated into two masses with a hyphen connector. The consultant and staff had concerns regarding the transition of materials on the Craftsman portion of the home, which will sit on S. Riverview Street. Horizontal siding is proposed on the majority of the home; however, there is a transition of materials within the gabled ends. That is traditional for a bungalow home; however, it occurs at different heights on the north and south elevations. This could be due to the

difference between the covered porch and the enclosed sunroom. The ways in which these areas are finished need to be more cohesive north to south. Additionally, a condition has been added that a sixth pier be added; there is a companion pier on the south elevation. A single window is located within the gable end of the north elevation, which is inconsistent with the window located in the gable end on the south elevation. The applicant should revise the window in the gable end on the south elevation to match the north elevation. The gable ends are proposed to be finished with a straight edge HardieShingle finished in Bunglehouse Gray (SW 2845). The material transition between shingles and horizontal siding is inconsistent between the north and south elevations, occurring at different heights. The heights should be revised to match, as well as the finishing details. The details on the sunroom differ from the south to the north façade, so a condition has been added to provide additional details. On the south elevation, particularly with the tapered piers, the transition of materials occurs at a different height, resulting in a different character. Finally, the consultant has recommended two additional tapered piers on the enclosed, screened-in patio. The rear elevation is the most modest, with an open, gabled end finished in Hardipanel shakes. This elevation provides access from the attached two-car garage to the rear of the property, as well as from the enclosed porch to an at-grade patio. A detached garage is proposed in the northwest portion of the lot. Detached accessory structures are encouraged, as they are consistent with the historic character of the District. The structure does meet the maximum height requirement, which is 18 feet to the midpoint of the eaves. The 2.5-car garage has a front gabled roof and a lean-to shed, which will accommodate a workshop. The garage doors are proposed to match the main home. The windows are a more modest selection that is appropriate for an accessory structure, and gooseneck fixtures are proposed over each garage door. Although the proposed materials include the Cassa di Sassi Bianco stone, which is the same material used on the 158 S. High Street structure, and duplication of materials across projects is discouraged, the detailing will be different. The house will be finished in a HardiePlank siding in a Bunglehouse Gray and Hardieshake shingles. A natural oak Arts and Crafts style front door with decorative panels on either side accented with Craftsman style lanterns is proposed. At staff's request, the applicant has provided column details for the masonry, tapered pier, as well as the railing for the covered porch. A landscape plan has also been provided. Although residential landscaping is not reviewed or approved by the Board, the plan does provide context for how the lot will be finished. The project has been reviewed against all criteria, and staff recommends approval with five conditions.

Applicant Presentation

Heidi Bolyard, Simplified Living Architecture, 6065 Frantz Road, Dublin, stated that the trim piece on the north and south side is in the same location and the same height as the fascia board extending all the way around the house.

Ms. Martin responded that on the scaled plans, it is off.

Ms. Bolyard responded that the plans would be updated, as that was not the intent. In addition, they added the base trim on the south side of the sunroom to be consistent with the front façade. They also added it on the north side, as it also was lacking that detail. They have no objection to using matching windows in the north and south gables and adding the additional column on the front porch on the north elevation.

Kent Underwood, 181 S. High Street, Dublin, stated that the consultant also suggested a gable vent on the west side, and they agree it would be a nice detail.

Ms. Martin stated that the applicant provided a response earlier today, and it was added to the Board's meeting packet. [Displayed slide depicting proposed vent.]

Ms. Bolyard indicated that they would prefer not to have columns around the screened porch at the rear.

Public Comment

Denise Franz King, 70 S. Riverview Street, Dublin, stated that the neighborhood welcomes the Underwoods. The proposed plan will be a lovely alternative to the previous structure. Her one request is the same as she has expressed over the past 50 years, and that is that new construction be set back to the same degree as the adjacent homes. In this case, Chi Weber's old home is set back 30 feet. What is the setback of the proposed home?

Ms. Martin responded that this house will sit forward of the homes to the north and south of it. It will be located approximately 22 feet from the edge of the pavement, which would be approximately seven feet forward of Chi Weber's old house. The Historic Dublin Design Guidelines recommend that the context be considered; however, based on the age of the homes to the north and south, staff determined they were not comparable setbacks.

Ms. King responded that just because a home is not historic, it does not mean there is not an existing character to the neighborhood. There is a different character to the south end of the street versus the north. She requests that the Board take that factor into account and require a setback for this home that better matches its neighbors and maintains some semblance of the pastoral character that draws so many pedestrians and slow drivers to this street to experience that character. She trusts the lovely new home can fit within that character. Mr. Weber's former home is at 179 S. Riverview. The different elevations of the new home show different addresses.

Ms. Martin responded that the address should be 185 S. Riverview.

Board Questions

Ms. Bryan inquired if there was sufficient room to position the house further back on the lot, more consistent with the Weber home.

Ms. Bolyard responded that when they met with staff, they were encouraged to push the home as close to the street as possible to make it match the other homes on the street. Consequently, they moved it immediately up to the setback.

Ms. Martin stated that staff discussed the plan with the applicant prior to submission of their application. A bungalow character typically does not have a suburban type of setback; therefore, they encouraged the applicant to move it closer to the street. That opportunity did not exist with the previous application, because it was an existing structure.

Mr. Underwood stated that, as a point of practicality, they prefer to have a backyard. Although they appreciate having a front porch, backyard living fits their lifestyle.

Ms. Bolyard stated that the Underwoods have selected a different stone than noted in the staff report. They have brought a sample for the Board's consideration.

Mr. Underwood noted that they followed the consultant's recommendation. The stone selected fits the character of the stone in the Historic District, which was locally quarried.

Board Discussion

Mr. Alexander inquired what would be the use of the upper room with the window in the detached garage.

Mr. Underwood responded that although there is a 15-ft. ceiling, there would be no living space in the upper level.

Mr. Alexander stated that the detached garage is consistent with how the community was developed. The Board has received numerous complaints about recent construction of long houses and the loss of rear yard open space in the Historic District. Although Dublin's current Code has more generous height allowances for detached garages than some communities, does the garage need to be of that height?

Mr. Underwood responded that the height is necessary for the items that will be placed in that storage area. The structure was initially shorter, but he requested that height for that purpose. There is an undeveloped, treed lot behind it.

Ms. Kramb inquired how the exposed rafter tails under all of the eaves would be finished. Will they be cut on a bias or scrolled?

Ms. Bolyard responded that they would be straight cut.

Ms. Kramb inquired if there would be exposed rafters from the front all the way back to the main wall. Would they be seen in the ceiling of the porch?

Mr. Underwood responded that is the intent.

Ms. Bolyard noted that there should be no fascia on the end of the column detail.

Mr. Alexander that one of the issues is that some of the detail does not appear to have any relationship to what occurs on the elevation. The details are very important, particularly with the front porch.

Ms. Kramb concurred. The front porch is the key characteristic of a bungalow, and many of the details are missing. A cut sheet with a photograph of a column was provided. That photo looks nothing like the architectural drawings, which also are inconsistent with the column details. She is confused regarding the intended look. In addition, staff is asking that a sixth column be added, but it is not possible to put the same tapered column on the side next to the façade wall. There is an open porch on one side and a sunroom on the other, but the distances are not the same. It is important that the distances and trim be identical on both sides.

Mr. Alexander stated that he has issues with the entire front facade. The house is not symmetrical, although attempts have been made to suggest that. The front porch is not symmetrical. The plane of the sunroom extends forward, and although a trimband is proposed to achieve horizontality with the concrete slab on the other side, it does not succeed. The centerline is held so strongly by the dormer and front door that it would be preferable not to use half columns on the side. It might be better to make the column at the corner a pilaster, where the edge of the porch returns. The sequence at the porch would be pilaster, column, column, then pilaster. The fake symmetry is not important for a bungalow design.

Mr. Underwood agreed, noting that more bungalows are asymmetric than symmetric.

Ms. Kramb stated that they appear to have combined two ideas, however. Initially, the intent was an original bungalow with an open porch, which would have been symmetrical. However, at some point, it was decided that one-half of it would be enclosed and the other side screened, which is

not symmetrical. The sunroom and the open porch need to be the same width with the same trim on the ends. If the intent is that, originally, it was a full porch built all at once, those factors need to be consistent.

Discussion continued regarding the front elevation, porch depth and columns.

Mr. Alexander stated that the wall-to-column relationship needs to be clearly established. The attempts at symmetry are a crutch that is creating problems, as is the lack of column details.

Mr. Underwood inquired what information was missing.

Discussion continued regarding column post sizes and trims with a suggestion that some columns be larger.

The Board agreed that there is a need to have more detail on the columns.

Ms. Bryan stated that due to the additional information needed, it would be preferable to table the application. She inquired if the applicant understood what information and changes were needed.

Ms. Bolyard responded that as she understands it, the Board is requesting the following:

1. One window is to be eliminated on the south elevation, as well as the column to the left or west of it;
2. Replace some of the columns on the screened porch with larger ones; and
3. Provide additional detailing regarding the front porch.

Mr. Alexander stated the detail requested would require providing cut sections of the walls, but they will have to provide that level of detail for their construction drawings.

Mr. Underwood inquired if the additional column recommended by the consultant on the north elevation would be unnecessary.

Ms. Martin responded that is correct; there would be only four columns.

Mr. Alexander stated that is correct, but is contingent upon addressing the other issues involved.

Ms. Bryan stated that the setback of the home is an issue. She understands the applicant's desire for a deep backyard; however, it is inconsistent with that side of the street. What are Board members' thoughts regarding the setback?

Ms. Kramb stated that the proposed home is 22 feet from the edge of the street. In comparison, 73 S. Riverview St. is 24 feet from the edge and 97 S. Riverview St. is 27 feet from the edge. At a minimum, the house should be set back approximately an additional five feet. Although bungalows are typically urban, such as in Clintonville, she has seen many bungalows in rural areas. It is not essential that they be located next to the street.

Mr. Alexander stated that he understands the neighbors' preferences, but the lot is quite narrow. He would have no objection to it remaining as is. There are other issues of greater concern.

Ms. Bryan stated that, as a resident of Riverview Street, she would appreciate having the home pushed back more.

Ms. Kramb stated that the other homes mentioned have setbacks of 24 feet and 27 feet. Making the setback of the proposed home closer to the other homes would be sufficient.

Ms. Bolyard inquired if 22 feet is the legal front-yard setback, would it be possible to remain with that. Ms. Martin responded that the ARB has purview over the character of the entire District. If the location were not within a review district, the legal setback would be the property owner's right. However, this site is within the ARB Review District, so the Board has purview to review the application within the context of the District.

Ms. Bryan stated that the issue is the context of the street, which is pastoral in nature on that side. The Board would like to preserve that character.

Ms. Bryan inquired if the applicant had any other questions about what is being requested.

Ms. Bolyard responded that they had no further questions, but they would prefer to address everything the Board would request now and avoid future need to re-table the application.

Ms. Bryan stated that would depend upon the details provided for the next review.

Mr. Alexander stated that it would be fair to re-state some of the other concerns, including that of making the two windows in the gable ends match.

Ms. Bolyard noted that the plan has already been updated accordingly.

Mr. Alexander stated that the intent is that the horizontal trim be aligned. On the left elevation, the way in which the top of the column is trimmed is awkward. As the columns and trim are refined, it may be necessary to provide a trim band across the enclosed front porch. Currently, that issue is not well resolved.

Ms. Bryan inquired if the Board wanted to provide any clarification regarding the front door selection and the elevations and material cut sheets.

Ms. Martin noted the door on the cut sheet is inconsistent with the drawing.

Ms. Bolyard responded that updated information on the door was forwarded to staff earlier today.

Ms. Martin provided a slide of what was received today, which remains inconsistent with the drawing of the front façade.

Ms. Bryan stated that it would be necessary to provide information clarifying the door, as well.

Ms. Kramb stated that when providing the column details, a three-dimensional view is also needed, including how the intersection of the wall and column would be addressed – how will they abut; what is the relief.

Ms. Bolyard responded that they would provide the information; however, in previous projects, that level of detail was not requested for the Board review.

Mr. Alexander stated that the application form specifically states the need to provide wall cut sheets. However, previous Boards have not required them, and, unfortunately, some projects were not built in the way expected, perhaps due to misunderstandings. The Board is not requesting information that is not provided for construction drawings.

Ms. Bolyard responded that in preparing for the Board's review, it was uncertain if the design itself would be approved.

Mr. Alexander agreed. If the intent is a conceptual design review, a greater level of detail is not required.

Ms. Martin stated that an ARB Informal Review application is being developed for future conceptual reviews.

Ms. Kramb stated that when the review is intended to be the only time the Board would see the project, a greater level of detail is needed.

Mr. Alexander stated that it would be preferable to have a conceptual review first, followed by a final review and approval.

Ms. Kramb noted that the frieze on all elevations should be consistent.

Mr. Kownacki moved, Mr. Alexander seconded to table the Minor Project Review.

Vote: Ms. Bryan, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Kownacki, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes.

[Motion carried 4-0]

COMMUNICATIONS

Staff reported the following:

- On March 3, 2020, a Heritage Ohio Downtown Assessment Resource Team (D.A.R.T.) will be conducting a site visit and making an assessment of the Historic District for the purpose of providing suggestions for revitalization. Ms. Frances Jo Hamilton, Director of Revitalization, is the Heritage Ohio D.A.R.T. contact for the City. This assessment is part of a larger visioning effort on which the Historic Dublin Vision Task Force is working. Ms. Bryan noted that ARB members are invited to attend the Task Force meetings.
- As part of the D.A.R.T. visit, a Community Visioning Session also will be held on March 3, from 6:00-8:00 p.m. at the Dublin Community Recreation Center. The public is invited to attend.
- At the February 13 joint Council-PZC-ARB meeting, members discussed educational opportunities for members. Attendees provided valuable feedback, which will guide the continuing discussion.
- A recommendation from the joint meeting discussion was that a tour of the Historic District be scheduled to improve members' awareness. A proposed tour date will be forwarded to members. In the meantime, ARB members are requested to forward to staff a list of sites they would prefer to visit on the tour.
- The Central Ohio Planning and Zoning workshop is scheduled for Friday, May 8, 2020, from 8:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m. ARB members are encouraged to contact staff if they would like to attend. The theme is "Creating Great Places."
- The final draft of the revised ARB Code Amendment and Historic Dublin Design Guidelines will be provided in ARB packets this Friday to provide sufficient opportunity for review before the March 18 meeting. That final draft will be posted to the City website for public review, as well. Following review, the ARB will make a recommendation for approval to PZC, and following the Commission's review, the revised Code Amendment and Guidelines would be forwarded to Council for final review and approval.

OTHER

- Ms. Bryan noted that she would not be present at the April 22 ARB meeting due to travel.
- The Board discussed the need for:
 - (1) Detailed construction drawings to be provided with applications for construction projects to permit more thorough Board review.
 - (2) A follow-up review step to be added to the process to ensure projects are constructed as approved.

- (3) Due to increased caseload, there may be a need to add a second ARB meeting per month or special meetings, as needed.

The next ARB meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, March 18, 2020.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:13 p.m.

Kathleen Bryan
Chair, Architectural Review Board

Hudith K. Beal
Deputy Clerk of Council