



MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, June 3, 2020

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Bryan, Chair, called the June 3, 2020 meeting of the Architectural Review Board to order at 6:30 p.m. and provided the following opening comments: "Welcome to a virtual meeting of the City of Dublin Architectural Review Board. We are living in extraordinary times. Both the State of Ohio and the City of Dublin have declared states of emergency. The Ohio Legislature passed several emergency laws to address the pandemic, including the ability for public entities to have virtual meetings. We appreciate this ability to maintain our continuity of government. For the present time, we are holding our meetings online and live streaming those meetings on YouTube. You can access the live-stream on the City's website. The meeting procedure for each case this evening will begin with staff presentation followed by an opportunity for the applicant to make a presentation. The Board will then have the opportunity to ask clarifying questions prior to hearing Public Comment. Finally, the Board will deliberate on each case based on the information introduced. To submit any questions or comments during the meeting, please use the form under the streaming video on the City's website. These questions and comments will be relayed to the Board by the meeting moderator. We want to accommodate public participation and comment to the greatest extent possible. We welcome your comments on cases, please use a valid name and address when submitting your comments, and please refrain from making any inappropriate comments."

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Ms. Bryan led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

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

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS

Mr. Cotter moved, Mr. Kownacki seconded to accept the documents into the record.

Vote on the motion: Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Bryan, yes; Mr. Kownacki, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes.
[Motion carried 5-0]

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Kramb moved, Mr. Cotter seconded to approve the April 22, 2020 meeting minutes.

Vote on the motion: Ms. Bryan, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Mr. Kownacki, yes.
[Motion carried 5-0]

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 staff and applicants who planned to address the Board on any of the cases during the meeting.

CASES:

1. 143 S. High Street, 20-068INF, Informal Review

Ms. Bryan stated that is a request for feedback on the proposed demolition of an existing single-family home and detached garage for the construction of a one and a half story, ±4,000-square-foot residence with a three-car garage on a .25 acre site. The site is southwest of the intersection of S. High Street and John Wright Lane and is zoned Bridge Street District Historic Residential.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Martin stated that this is a request for Informal Review and non-binding feedback for a proposed development application for a potential future single-family home with a three-car attached garage. The site is located at the intersection of John Wright Lane and South High Street and is approximately .25 acres in size. [Context of surrounding neighborhood reviewed.] The lot currently has an existing one-story home and detached garage. The home was constructed in 1890 and is Vernacular in style with a front gable and side-gable ell. A large front porch with four Doric columns and a central entry flanked with sidelights typifies the home. The home has been altered over time with an addition, a stucco exterior, and a number of replacement windows. The request includes a future demolition. In 2014, the Architectural Review Board (ARB) reviewed and approved demolition of the structure with the condition that demolition not occur until approval of a new single-family residence. Demolition orders are valid only one year from the date of issuance; therefore, reconsideration of the demolition is required. The existing home is listed on the Ohio Historic Inventory and the City's Historic and Cultural Assessment. Both documents indicate that the form and location of the structure contribute to retaining the scale and character of Historic Dublin. Both documents also identify a diminished quality of the structure due to replacement materials and workmanship over time.

This site is zoned BSD-HR, Historic Residential District, which falls under the Neighborhood Standards section of the Bridge Street District Code. The Historic Dublin Design Guidelines supplement the Code and should be considered when new construction is proposed in the Historic District. The Guidelines provide recommendations regarding the overall character, building scale and mass, and development pattern. The Neighborhood Standards identify the applicable development standards, including setbacks, lot coverage, and building height, which alleviates property owners from the form-based requirements applicable in all other BSD zoning districts. The site is permitted to have a 15-foot setback along South High Street; a 20-foot setback along John Wright Lane; a total of 16 feet of setback along the south property line; and a 15-foot setback along the west property line. The maximum permitted lot coverage in BSD-Historic Residential is 50 percent. The applicant is requesting feedback from the Board on a potential future waiver to permit a lot coverage of 62.3 percent.

Site Plan

The Historic Dublin Design Guidelines encourage that a proposed development be sited in a manner that is contextually sensitive to the District. The home is proposed to be sited 15 feet west of S. High Street and four feet south of John Wright Lane, approximately 30 feet from the west property line and 12 feet from the southern property line. The vehicular access will be provided off John Wright Lane, and pedestrian access is provided from both streets. A large, open and uncovered patio is proposed along the south side of the home, encroaching approximately 9 feet into the side yard setback. By Code, at-grade patios are not permitted to encroach upon a required side yard setback. The applicant will need to revise the site layout to comply with the required setback or identify needed waiver requests prior to filing an application for a Minor Project Review. In review of the proposed site layout, the City Engineer is recommending the access point shift east to provide greater separation from the intersection. This revision will need to be made prior to filing an application for a Minor Project Review.

Building Elevations

The applicant has provided conceptual building elevations for the Commission's review and feedback. The east elevation on S. High Street is similar to that of the existing home, which is a side gabled ell form with a centrally located entry with arched detail and covered porch with several columns. The west elevation is a side-loaded, three-car garage. The north and south elevations are an elongated addition to the primary form, which is broken down by a series of gabled roofs. The windows are detailed in a variety of manner with trim, shutters and shed canopies. The north elevation has a masonry, tapered column. The applicant has indicated the final materials have not yet been selected, but a masonry base is intended. The south entry from the rear property line provides access to the outdoor living areas. The south façade continues the use of shed dormers, two-over-two windows and false arches. The applicant has provided conceptual massing within the context of the neighborhood. The home is proposed to be 1.5 stories, approximately 16-18 feet to the mid-point of the eaves, and a total height to the top of the roof of approximately 25 feet. The home is estimated to be 40 feet to 60 feet in width, and 120 feet in depth.

Staff recommends the Board consider the following questions:

- 1) Does the Board support the demolition of the existing single-family home and detached garage?
- 2) If the Board is supportive of the demolition, does the Board support the proposed mass, scale, height, and depth of the proposed home in relation to the surrounding development pattern?
- 3) Does the Board support potential future waivers to setbacks and lot coverage?
- 4) Does the Board support the conceptual architectural character of the home?
- 5) Other considerations by the Board.

Board Questions

Mr. Cotter requested clarification of the one-year limitation to the previous demolition approval. Does the applicant have one year to demolish it or one year for an approved demolition plan?

Ms. Martin responded that per the Code, all ARB Board orders are valid for one year.

Applicant Presentation

Lance Schneier, 5455 Muirfield Ct., Dublin, OH stated that he and his wife have lived in Dublin at the same address for 35+ years. However, they are now empty nesters and ready to downsize. They began this process a year ago. During that time, he has studied Dublin's history, reviewed past ARB proceedings and researched the relevant Zoning Code sections and Guidelines. He has solicited input from other Historic Dublin residents and previous ARB members. They are excited and proud of the project that is proposed and believe it will fit well into the unique fabric of Historic Dublin. He personally believes that a significant part of Historic Dublin's appeal is its vibrancy. It is the reason people are drawn to visit, shop, eat and walk its historic streets. It is also the reason people want to work and live in Historic Dublin. However, due to the economic impact of the recent pandemic and stay-at-home orders, the future viability of Historic Dublin is at risk. Everyone has a role to play in protecting that. ARB's purpose, in part, is to promote the economic well-being of the community. The Board's decisions shall improve the quality of life in the City and further the City's goals of sound economic and community development. Despite the uncertainty, he and his wife are committed to doing their part to ensure the viability of Historic Dublin.

Rich Taylor, architect, 48 S. High Street, Dublin, OH, stated that he has extensive experience working with old homes. He worked in German Village for ten years and moved his practice to Dublin in 1991 and into the Historic District 20 years ago. He has been a long-time advocate for the Historic District and has served previously on the ARB and PZC and is a member of the Historic Dublin Building Association. They realize a re-approval of the previous demolition order is not a foregone conclusion and will be discussing that more in a future meeting. Tonight, they will focus on the proposed house. The project is a very high quality home that fits into the fabric of Historic Dublin without replicating the existing buildings. The intent is that the

home appear to have always been there. To accomplish that, they have studied the overall area, the Historic Dublin Design Guidelines, the adjacent properties and similar homes and sites in Historic Dublin. The result is a home designed with a great deal of attention to the scale, massing, materials, colors and character of the Historic District. The design is in accordance with the construction standards of the Historic Dublin Design Guidelines. They employed a number of specific design strategies to ensure the home is a good fit with the District. This simple, 19th century cottage home facing S. High Street was designed to occupy most of the site's buildable area along S. High Street. The massing of the façade on John Wright Lane has been broken into several distinct sections, each of which is in keeping with the scale and massing of similar homes in the area. Those major masses have simple, gabled roofs and are closely spaced along the street and are clearly subordinate to the main cottage. The proximity of the cottage to the north property line is in keeping with the character of John Wright Lane. The position of the home has been used to create outdoor living space on the south side; the position of the home on John Wright Lane has been used to screen the outdoor living area from the house along with the space behind the home and immediately to the south from the exposed parking lot of the Dublin Chamber of Commerce building directly across the street. The garage has been turned to the north at the rear and away from the street. This will present a more attractive gabled elevation to the street. The exterior materials have not been finalized, but there will be a limited palette of traditional, authentic materials in keeping with the character of the District and the requirements of the Historic Dublin Design Guidelines. They anticipate this home will be a welcome addition to the District.

Public Comments

No public comments on the case were received.

Board Discussion

Ms. Bryan stated that the Informal Review will follow the questions posed by staff.

- 1) Does the Board support the demolition of the existing single-family home and detached garage?*

Board consensus was to support the proposed demolition of the structure.

- 2) If the Board is supportive of the demolition, does the Board support the proposed mass, scale, height, and depth of the proposed home in relation to the surrounding development pattern?*

Mr. Alexander stated that the applicant has indicated the intent to request waivers. The Code's criteria are very specific in regard to requesting variances. The Code inquires, what are the practical difficulties or unnecessary hardships that would require variances. Those have not been indicated, but are important.

Mr. Schneier stated that they have an interpretation of the setback standards that differ from staff's interpretation, specifically what setbacks apply to a corner lot. Staff's position is that a corner lot has two front lot lines and as such, is required to have two front setbacks. John Wright is an otherwise listed street, which has a setback requirement of 20 feet. The interpretation is not specific in the Code; there are three related sections that need to be considered together. For example, the Code indicates the front setback is determined from either street, not from both streets. The Code does not say a corner has two front setbacks. More important than that is the ARB precedence. There are four other corner lots within the Historic District in the approximate area – two on Eberly Hill and two on Pinneyhill Lane. Previous ARB deliberations regarding those lots were addressed in 2013 through 2018. In those cases, they designated setbacks less than 20 feet. Their side yard setbacks were a minimum of 3.0 feet. This would be the first case in which a corner lot is being identified as having two front yard setbacks. In comparison with the surrounding neighborhood, which includes The Dublin Chamber of Commerce -- they do not believe a waiver is necessary if the interpretation remains consistent with the established precedent.

Mr. Alexander stated that he could support encroachment into that setback. However, the lot coverage is another issue requiring a variance. Mr. Taylor has referred to the fabric of the neighborhood. For many of us, the urban fabric refers to the building to open space pattern within the area. Dublin's Code is very generous, allowing 50% lot coverage. He would need to understand the need for exceeding the 50% lot coverage.

Mr. Taylor stated that the Code allows them 50% lot coverage with the house and garage, and it allows another 20% of impervious space. If this plan proceeds, the next iteration will be within that 50%-20% guideline. They will tweak the house footprint slightly, and some of the walks, driveways and patio will be designated as impervious space. By doing so, the need for a variance will be removed.

Ms. Martin stated that she is not aware of any Code provision that would allow for an additional 20% lot coverage as impervious space. In the Bridge Street District – Historic Residential, the intent was not to impose any of the form-based regulations, but to keep all of the Historic Dublin standards fixed, as they had been over time. One of those fixed numbers is lot coverage; the type of lot coverage is not specified. The number to which he is referring would be for developing a single-family residence in one of the other districts, not the BSD-Historic Residential District.

Mr. Taylor stated that with the present iteration, the lot coverage is at 62.3%, which is not substantially over the required 50%. They would be able to make some alterations to the house to meet the required lot coverage.

Mr. Cotter stated that he agrees that designating the corner lot with two front setbacks is unclear and would make the site difficult, so there should be ability to address that issue. However, the maximum of 50% lot coverage is specified in the Code for the Historic Residential District, and that requirement needs to be met.

Mr. Kownacki expressed agreement. The setbacks do not concern him. However, the lot coverage does; it is a large house in a historic neighborhood comprised of smaller structures.

Ms. Krumb stated that she would not interpret this corner lot as having two front-yard setbacks. She likes how the house is sited near the front and the massing, scale and height from S. High Street. Her only concern is the length of the structure. Her suggestion would be a detached garage. That would solve the issue of the very long structure and the issue of lot coverage. Those issues are resolvable. Reducing the size of the patio on the south side would help meet the required setback.

Ms. Bryan stated that she also likes how the structure appears from High Street. It is very charming and fits with the neighborhood. However, the length of the house and the amount of lot coverage are issues. A detached garage would solve some of that issue. Although they are not popular in Ohio, they are authentic in the Historic District. She would encourage the applicant to avoid the need for requesting variances.

Ms. Krumb noted that if a detached garage were to be used, it also would allow the applicant to move the driveway to the east, as Engineering staff suggested.

3) Does the Board support potential future waivers to setbacks and lot coverage?

Ms. Bryan indicated that she is not supportive of future waivers for setbacks and lot coverage.

Mr. Alexander stated that the Code's allowance of 50% lot coverage is more generous than many other communities. He is supportive of easing the setback requirements, but is not supportive of a waiver of the 50% maximum lot coverage.

Mr. Cotter stated that he believes the house is very attractive. The structure does appear long, in relationship to the neighborhood. He is supportive of easing the side-yard setback requirement but the massing of the structure on the lot is an issue – it is too large. It needs to meet the lot coverage requirements.

Mr. Kownacki expressed agreement with the previous comments,

4) Does the Board support the conceptual architectural character of the home?

The Board members were complimentary of the conceptual architectural character of the home. The only issue is the size of the structure, which needs to be reduced to meet Code.

5) Other considerations by the Board.

There were no other considerations.

Ms. Bryan inquired if the applicant had received the input they need to proceed.

Mr. Schneier inquired if it would be possible for the Board to reaffirm their previous demolition approval, rather than needing to hear the entire case again.

Ms. Martin stated that the request to demolish would need to be advertised and re-considered by the Board.

Mr. Schneier thanked the Board for their input, which is very helpful. They will work on modification of the plan accordingly.

2. 158 S. High Street, 20-009MPR, Minor Project Review

Ms. Bryan stated that this is a proposal for construction of a one-story, ±3,600-square-foot residence with a three-car garage on a 0.39-acre site. The site is on the east side of S. High Street, ±125 feet south of the intersection with John Wright Lane and zoned BSD-HR, Bridge Street District Historic Residential.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Ridge stated that this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review application for the construction of a new, approximately 3,000 square-foot, single-family home in the Historic District. The site is located east of South High Street, south of Pinneyhill Lane, approximately 150 feet south of the intersection with John Wright Lane and southeast of the Dublin Chamber of Commerce. There are a variety of architectural styles in the immediate area.

History

In August of 2019, the applicant submitted plans for two new single-family homes on the lots where the two-family home currently sits. On September 25, 2019, the applicant submitted revised plans for review and approval by the ARB, which were approved with 12 conditions. On February 26, 2020, the ARB reviewed plans for a revised design concept for a similar, single-family home located at 158 South High Street. The ARB expressed concerns with a number of items, and the case was tabled. The applicant has submitted site plan updates for review tonight, including additional details regarding the following: grading and drainage; retaining wall details, including cladding, height, and general construction details; window trim, sill and lintels; extension of the stone watertable on the south and east elevations; revision of the proposed garage doors to a carriage style. Staff's consultant has reviewed the updates to the plans, and is supportive of the revised details. Staff has reviewed the plan against the applicable criteria and recommends approval with one condition.

Applicant Presentation

Susan Dyas, 180 S. Riverview Street, Dublin stated that they have attempted to address all of ARB's concerns and will continue to work with Engineering to ensure proper drainage on the site, as requested.

Bob Dyas, 180 S. Riverview Street, Dublin, stated that they have worked extensively on the site grading and ensured the driveway turn works appropriately.

Board Discussion

The Board expressed approval of the changes made.

Public Comments

No public comments were received.

Mr. Cotter moved, Mr. Kownacki seconded approval of the Minor Project Review with the following condition:

- 1) The applicant continue to work with Engineering on site grading to ensure proper drainage of the site with the Building Permit submittal.

Vote: Mr. Kownacki, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Bryan, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes.
[Motion carried 5-0]

3. 16-18 W. Bridge Street, 20-064MPR, Minor Project Review

Ms. Bryan stated that this is a proposal for exterior modifications to an existing ±2,500-square-foot, multi-family building on a 0.08-acre site. The site is north of E. Bridge Street, ±150 feet east of the intersection with High Street and is zoned Bridge Street District Historic Core.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Hounshell stated that this is a request for review and approval of proposed exterior modifications to an existing multi-tenant building located on a 0.08-acre site zoned Bridge Street District – Historic Core. The site is located approximately 150 feet northeast of the intersection of High Street and Bridge Street. The building was constructed circa 1900 and houses 16 and 18 East Bridge Street. Bridge Street Pizza currently occupies the one-story section of 16 E. Bridge Street. To the rear of that section, Casa Décor occupies the lower level of 18 E. Bridge Street and an apartment unit occupies the second level.

The building utilizes many exterior materials. The primary building is clad in three different materials: stucco, shiplap, and vertical board paneling. This is a non-contributing structure in the Historic District. The applicant is proposing exterior modifications on all four elevations of the building, including material changes, paint color changes and window replacements. In January 2020, the Board reviewed an Informal Review request for exterior modifications to the existing multi-tenant building. The applicant proposed changes to the exterior materials of the building, including new paint selections and window replacements. The Board was in favor of the improvements as presented. This application is identical to that submitted at that time.

On 16 E. Bridge Street, the applicant is proposing a Hardie Panel board and batten siding and a vertical Hardie Panel board and batten siding on the east, west, and south façades of the building. The board and batten siding will be painted "BM/HC-85 Fairview Taupe." This material would replace the existing vertical board paneling in this area. Hardie Plank and Hardie Board are brands of fiber cement siding, which are secondary permitted materials within the Bridge Street District. The applicant is requesting a waiver to allow fiber cement siding such as Hardie Plank/Board to be permitted as an additional primary material for this application. 18 E. Bridge Street is proposed to have a cultured stone veneer on the eastern portion of the south facade. The stone veneer material is Ohio Tan Limestone and will replace the existing stucco on the south facade. The west facade behind 16 E. Bridge Street is proposed to have horizontal Hardie Plank fiber cement siding, replacing the existing horizontal siding on the facade. The western half of the north facade will also include the incorporation of the fiber cement horizontal siding that will replace the existing siding.

The south elevation is proposed to have the fiber cement siding on the western half of the façade, above 16 E. Bridge Street. The horizontal siding and the existing railing and stucco on the east façade will be painted "BM/HC-83 Grand Beige." All windows will be replaced, except the existing display windows located on 16 and 18 E. Bridge Street. Two-over-two double hung wood windows will replace the existing six- and three-pane metal casement windows and will be painted "Sandstone." The existing trim on the display windows will be painted "BM/OC-31 Fog Mist." This building currently has three awnings: two located above Bridge Street Pizza and one located on the east elevation above the entrance to the residential unit. The awning above the residential unit is deteriorating. Staff recommends that the awning be replaced with a similar material and color to match the two awnings located above the Bridge Street Pizza entrance. Staff has reviewed the application against the applicable criteria and recommends approval of the materials waiver to permit fiber cement as a permitted primary material and recommends approval of the Minor Project Review with two conditions.

Applicant Presentation

Michael Maloof, 6308 Wyler Ct., Dublin, OH stated that he has only one clarification to add to the presentation. He has no evidence that the building was constructed in 1900. Photo records indicate it was built in approximately 1938.

Board Questions

Mr. Alexander stated that the one concern he has is that, as one is approaching from the bridge, four exterior materials will be visible. Could the Hardie siding proposed for half the north elevation also be placed on the west elevation? From the front, it would appear that the Hardie siding is wrapping the original building, except for the stone. Approaching from the bridge, only three materials would be visible. The entire back elevation should be stucco. This would achieve more visual continuity.

Mr. Maloof stated that the issue would be financial. The existing material is in good shape. During the previous discussion, the Board indicated they had no objection to his proceeding in the proposed direction, so he has done so.

Mr. Alexander stated that he did not suggest that with the previous review, because the issue was less obvious.

Mr. Cotter, Mr. Kownacki and Ms. Kramb indicated that they had no objections to the proposed plan.

Ms. Bryan suggested that the existing signs may need to be freshened as a result of the project.

Mr. Maloof responded that the signs were approved and installed many years earlier. He would agree that there is a need to freshen their appearance.

Ms. Bryan stated that she also is supportive of the proposed project.

Mr. Maloof stated that this section of Bridge Street and High Street, and the corner, specifically, are in need of some streetscape enhancement. He has mentioned this to staff in the past, and the response was that the suggestion was valid and staff would be following up. Does the ARB have any suggestions on how to have that need addressed?

Ms. Martin thanked Mr. Maloof for his suggestion. She will forward his inquiry and suggestion to Ms. O'Malley and the Parks and Recreation Department.

Public Comments

No public comments were received.

Mr. Kownacki moved, Mr. Cotter seconded to approve a waiver to permit fiber cement as a permitted primary material.

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

[Motion carried 5-0.]

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

- 1) The applicant replace the awning located on the east elevation with an awning of similar material and color; and,
- 2) The applicant paint the north elevation to match the proposed horizontal siding color "BM/HC-83 Grant Beige."

Vote: Ms. Bryan, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Kownacki, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes.
[Motion carried 5-0.]

4. The Getaway, 20-066MPR, Minor Project Review

Ms. Bryan stated that this is a proposal for a tenant space modification to establish an outdoor patio and enclosed patio with associated site improvements for an existing ±3,200-square-foot tenant space located within Bridge Park West – Building Z1. The site is east of N. High Street, ±350 feet north of the intersection with Rock Cress Parkway and is zoned Bridge Street District Historic Transition Neighborhood.

Staff Presentation

Overview

Ms. Martin stated that this is a proposal for a Minor Project Review for The Gateway. The site is located east of N. High Street, ±350 feet north of the intersection with Rock Cress Parkway and zoned BSD-HTN: Bridge Street District – Historic Transition Neighborhood. It is the northern-most tenant space located within Bridge Park West, in Building Z1. On the left side of the patio is the sidewalk along N. High Street, as well as a portion of the proposed patio space. On the north side is a cantilevered patio. In April 2017, the ARB reviewed and approved tenant modifications for the tenant space for Three Palms Pizza. The approval included a 600-square-foot pier framed enclosure patio along the north side of the building. Ultimately, Three Palms Pizza did not move forward with the project, although they did enclose the patio to allow indoor-outdoor dining.

Proposal

The applicant is proposing to enclose the north patio (North – Riverside Crossing Park – West) in a similar manner to what was approved for Three Palms Pizza. The proposal is for a 600-square-foot, steel framed enclosure with polycarbonate panels. The roof is proposed to be fixed while the sides will have operable windows. A waiver is required to permit polycarbonate as a permitted secondary material for the enclosed patio addition. The applicant has indicated that polycarbonate has been selected because it is a lighter weight than glass, and does not discolor over time like Plexiglas. A 650-square-foot open and uncovered patio also is proposed on the west, along the N. High Street frontage. The patio is proposed to encroach into the right-of-way 6 feet while maintaining 8 feet of clear sidewalk along N. High Street. The City Engineer has approved the proposed encroachment. The plan does maintain eight (8) feet of clear pedestrian area for circulation purposes. The west patio will be enclosed with cedar planters and a 42-inch white, prefinished metal railing. The request includes replacement of portions of the storefront system with operable folding doors to provide an indoor/outdoor connection. The window area is proposed to be maintained, therefore no decrease in transparency is proposed with this modification. The bi-fold door system will retain the same character as the windows with a similar muntin pattern. The cedar planters are proposed to have seasonal planting that soften the appearance of the patio from the street. Patio furniture of a similar quality and character to the interior furniture will be provided as required by the BSD Code. The applicant has met that requirement. Table lamps and string lighting are proposed to provide ambient patio light. The proposed lighting is consistent with lighting that has been approved by the Board for other outdoor dining facilities in Historic Dublin. Staff has reviewed the request against all applicable criteria and recommends approval of a waiver permitting use of

an Alternative Secondary Material of Polycarbonate Panels per Zoning Code Section 153.062 – Building Type Requirements (E)(1)(H) Materials and approval of the Minor Project Review with no conditions.

Board Questions

Ms. Kramb requested clarification of the proposed encroachment.

Ms. Martin responded that, per the development agreement between the City and Crawford Hoying, the City agreed to permit certain encroachments within the right-of-way with approval of staff. Staff has reviewed the application and determined that the proposed eight feet of circulation with an additional two feet to the center of the tree grate is consistent with what the City has permitted in other areas.

Applicant Presentation

Collin Castore, Seventh Son Brewing Company, Seventh Son Brewing Co., 1101 N. Fourth St., Columbus, Ohio, stated that the proposed patio seating is consistent with what exists with Condado, which is located immediately to the south of this site.

Ms. Kramb noted that in the drawings she is viewing, it appears to extend further than the patios to the south.

Ms. Rauch pointed out that the Code permits this particular building type to have patio encroachment into the right-of-way, per review by Planning and Engineering.

Steve Hurtt, Principal Partner, Urbanorder Architecture, 797 Summit Street, Columbus, Ohio, stated that one of the differences between this site and Condado is that because the tree grates are closer to the building, the sidewalk extends farther, and there is more space between the curb and the building. The necessary space remains from the centerline of the trees or edge of the tree grate to allow for pedestrian access outside the patio.

Mr. Cotter inquired what activity would occur in the space. Is this a restaurant?

Mr. Castore respond that this will be a tap room. They will be fermenting beer, not brewing it. They will brew beer at Seven Sons, and bring it up to The Getaway to ferment. This will be a bar and dining space. Their traditional model is to work with the food trucks. However, there are many great restaurant-bar vendors here, and they have developed relationships with Cameron Mitchell and Condado. They will have a satellite carryout/dining area here. The intent is to create an attractive dining and drinking environment without the need for extensive kitchen space.

Ms. Bryan requested the applicant to provide more detail about the business.

Mr. Castore stated that Seventh Son Brewing has been in Columbus since April 2013. Last year, they opened a satellite location in the German Village brewery district, called Antiques on High. That site has its own character; The Getaway in Dublin also will have a unique character and personality. The idea of that name is that this is the first time Seventh Son has ventured to “get away” from the downtown Columbus area. This site is also the furthest in the Bridge Park Development, so is a getaway in that sense. The beer styles that will be focused on here will be lighter styles, which is a getaway from their traditional approach of draft beer. A southwest, vacation vibe is anticipated here. A vintage, panhandle environment is envisioned. Inspiration will be taken from old travel posters with a Smithsonian Institute type of diorama behind the bar. As a brewery, they focus on doing things a little differently. They are not focused on the drinking aspect, but the experience aspect. The aesthetic and feel of the space is as important as the beverages served.

Board Discussion

Mr. Alexander inquired if the proposed sheet product had individual cells, and was not the solid polycarbonate.

Mr. Hurtt responded that the product had individual cells.

Mr. Alexander inquired if it would be used on the front wall, as well.

Mr. Hurtt responded that it would be used only on the roof. This product will enable them to have larger spans and make the enclosure more transparent.

Mr. Alexander stated that when looked at laterally, it is not as transparent as suggested, but if it is in the roof plane only, he has no objection. In similar covered patios in the community – the Cameron Mitchell restaurants are the best example – there has been an attempt to extend some aspect of the building into the definition of the enclosure. There is an element of the enclosure that identifies it with the adjacent building. However, this enclosure is very different. He would suggest that the projection be recessed three feet to align with the edge of the building and not extend into the patio significantly.

Mr. Hurtt responded that the primary reason for that projection is to provide egress from the space to the patio.

Mr. Alexander noted that he would suspect there will be an ADA issue with the proximity of that door to the bar, so they will need to make some adjustments, regardless. It would seem there could be a door in the plane of that wall and the walk flow along the front.

Mr. Hurtt responded that they would prefer the wall and door as proposed, but perhaps they could look at the potential of bringing the roofline down at that point. The idea is that this will be a conservatory, plant-filled, and a reflection of the nature occurring to the north – a transition between nature and the building.

Mr. Alexander stated that he was looking for a simple way in which to make the enclosure appear to have a relationship with the building. Most conservatories do lean against the side of a building, not project beyond it.

Jeanine Monks, Creative Designer, Dune House Creative, 122 East Dunedin Road, Columbus, Ohio, stated that she is part of the design team for this project. One of the biggest reasons they wanted to get extra feet in that space is that the intent is to lease it for private events. The extra space is needed to utilize that patio to the extent possible and avoid the need for extra walkway space on the exterior.

Mr. Hurtt stated that the enclosed space is farther back than the projection of the primary building.

Ms. Krumb expressed agreement with Mr. Alexander regarding the protrusion. The proposed greenhouse concept is not compatible with the character of the surrounding buildings.

Mr. Castore stated that they were attracted to the space because of its location at the end of the more urban part of Bridge Park. It is a unique space, and its character is defined by its proximity to the ravine, trees and natural setting. The intent was to highlight that, and this conservatory design seemed appropriate for the space.

Ms. Krumb responded that she understands the intent, but it does not work next to a stone clad building [audio unintelligible]. One of the criteria is that the character of the proposed design coincide with the building, and the design here is not compatible.

Ms. Monks inquired if the incompatibility concern is based on the structure's projection or on the glass material.

Mr. Alexander responded that he would be willing to approve the proposal, if the projection were pushed back to align with the adjacent building. The focus of his concern was its having a relationship to the building. It would be possible to table the request to allow the applicant time to address the concerns.

Ms. Bryan stated that Ms. Krumb has indicated that she disapproves of the material choice, as polycarbonate is not appropriate in the Historic District. She has no objection to the west patio.

Mr. Hurtt stated that this is a cantilevered patio sitting three stories over a ravine at the end of the development. A lightweight material was deliberately selected that would enable the patio to connect to the ravine.

Mr. Castore stated that the recent pandemic shutdown has been very stressful and difficult. They now are at a point with this project where, if it were tabled to be revised, it would not make sense to proceed with it. It has taken much longer than anticipated to work with staff on finalizing development of the plans and to secure the bids. In fact, this project has taken longer and been more difficult than any other on which he has worked. For the project to continue to make sense, they need to be able to move forward with it at this point.

Mr. Kownacki stated that he has no objection to the project as proposed because of its location – at the far end of the Historic District and in the ravine area. He has no issue with the projection; he believes the building also projects, and he has no concerns with the polycarbonate material due to the location.

Mr. Cotter stated that he is attempting to understand the projection, but has no objection to the polycarbonate material.

Ms. Bryan stated that Ms. Kramb has indicated that she concurs with Mr. Alexander regarding the need for the patio wall to be flush to the stone wall of the adjacent building.

Public Comment

No public comments were received.

Mr. Cotter inquired where the door would be located, if the wall were to be pushed back three feet. Mr. Alexander responded that would be the applicant's decision, but if the exterior wall were pushed back three feet, that area of the proposed greenhouse would become exterior walkway space.

Ms. Bryan indicated that a majority vote is needed for the project to be approved.

Mr. Cotter moved, Ms. Bryan seconded to approve a waiver permitting an Alternative Secondary Material of Polycarbonate Panels per Zoning Code Section 153.062 – Building Type Requirements (E)(1)(H). Materials.

Vote: Mr. Kownacki, yes; Ms. Kramb, no; Ms. Bryan, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes.
[Motion carried 4-1]

Mr. Kownacki moved, Ms. Bryan seconded to approve the Minor Project Review with no conditions.

Vote: Mr. Cotter, yes; Ms. Kramb, no; Ms. Bryan, yes; Mr. Kownacki, yes; Mr. Alexander, no.
[Motion carried 3-2]

5. No Soliciting, 20-069MPR, Minor Project Review

Ms. Bryan stated that this is a request for modifications to a patio gate, railing, and fence for an existing tenant space located within the lower level of Bridge Park West – Building Z2. The site is east of N. High Street, ±100 feet southeast of the intersection with Rock Cress Parkway and zoned Bridge Street District Historic Transition Neighborhood.

Staff Presentation

Overview

Ms. Martin stated that this is a request for a review and approval of a Minor Project Review for No Soliciting. This tenant space is located in Bridge Park West, in the lower level of Building Z2. The parcel is located on the east side of North High, just south of the West Plaza of the landing for the Dublin Link Pedestrian Bridge. No Soliciting is a members only bar. Consistent with that, No Soliciting has a very low profile. The tenant space does not have signs and has access protocol for patron entry. The proposal is for exterior modifications to an existing patio space. In March 2019, the ARB reviewed and approved a Minor Project Review for patio improvements for No Soliciting. The approval included a new patio railing, fireplace, fire pit, and associated site furnishings. In December 2019, as part of the required inspection for final occupancy, Planning staff and

building inspectors became aware that modifications that altered the intended character of the patio had been made that were not approved by ARB.

Proposal

The exterior modifications for the tenant space include changes to the north gate, east railing, and south fence. Previously, the ARB approved a 42-inch, black metal, prefinished gate and railing for the north, east, and south sides of the patio. On the north side, the applicant is requesting to install a 66-inch, black metal gate with solid panel and picket detail. The gate is intended to emulate the dumpster enclosure gate, which was previously approved by the Board for Building Z2 along N. High Street. The dumpster gate is located 46 feet from the N. High Street right-of-way. The proposed No Soliciting gate is located adjacent to a public walkway providing access to the West Plaza, and approximately 20 feet from the Dublin Link Pedestrian Bridge. The proposed gate is not sensitive to the surrounding character, particularly the site's adjacency to substantial public investment. Staff recommends the plans be revised and the gate be installed that was previously approved by ARB. On the east, the applicant has not installed the 42-inch, black metal, prefinished railing along the east edge of the patio. However, the current temporary construction grades do not allow for the removal of the fence, and a physical barrier from the future shared-use path that will run along the east edge of the patio is necessary. On the south, the applicant is requesting approval of a solid board-on-board fence to screen the patio from the adjacent surface parking lot. This wall is similar to that approved for The Pearl. The applicant intends to stain the fence to match The Pearl fence. The fence for No Soliciting would be 5 feet-1 inch in height from the top of the wall and a total of 6 feet-3 inches from grade. The fence should be reduced in height to 6 feet to meet Code requirements for a fence or screen wall defined in 153.065(E)(1)(b)(2). The application has been reviewed against the applicable criteria and the previous ARB order, and staff recommends approval with three conditions.

Board Questions

Mr. Cotter requested clarification of the installation or restoration of the gate.

Ms. Martin responded that the gate has never been installed, and staff recommends that it be installed as approved in March 2019.

Applicant Presentation

Dustin Todd, Architectural Alliance, 49 East Third Avenue, Columbus Ohio, stated that he desires to provide some clarification regarding the east railing. He has conducted some measurements and confirmed that at its closest point, the patio surface is six feet from the grade drop-off. Building Code requires a barrier for protection if a surface is closer than 36 inches.

Ms. Bryan stated that she believes the extra protection is needed for a place in which people are drinking.

Mr. Todd stated that they would prefer to add landscaping as a barrier. State Liquor License Laws state there must be a physical barrier, and stone walls and planters are often used to provide that barrier. They would request that the existing stone wall and landscaping remain to provide that required barrier.

Ms. Bryan inquired the height of the stone wall.

Mr. Todd responded that the stone wall is 13 inches in height.

Mr. Alexander stated that he believes he is focusing on Code issues and not the ARB issues. Visual continuity is needed, and currently, there is no visual continuity to that space. It is not well designed. Staff is attempting to help improve the continuity of what is there now by requiring the railing to integrate with the fence. In his opinion, they should use the original design and identify a way to provide shielding of the parking lot view and the railing around all three sides of the space that was previously proposed. Regardless of whether this is not required by Code, ARB's concern is with the character.

Mr. Todd stated that this is the same building in which The Pearl is located. However, on the basement level, materials do change. They have attempted, however, to align them with The Pearl.

Ms. Bryan inquired what was the issue with the previous design, which was very nice.

Mr. Todd responded that there was concern about shielding views of the rear parking lot to the south and behind Oscar's.

Ms. Bryan responded that landscaping with the fence could have been the solution.

Mr. Todd responded that when they saw The Pearl's fence, they thought it would be good to follow their lead.

Ms. Bryan stated that she is in agreement with Mr. Alexander. She does not care for the current proposal.

Mr. Cotter stated that he has visited the site and found it visually chaotic. The attempt to integrate the wall on the south with that of The Pearl on the upper level does not succeed.

Mr. Kownacki stated that perhaps the south wall would better fit with The Pearl's, if a plant element was added. However, the railing is needed to provide continuity around the space and the walkway to the bridge. Miscellaneous items have been added to block the view of the parking lot, which he understands, but a better flow of the items is needed.

Mr. Todd stated that they do intend to add greenery to the wall.

Ms. Bryan stated that he needs to understand that changes cannot be made that are not reviewed and approved by this Board. Unfortunately, that has occurred in this case.

Mr. Todd responded that their intent is to work with staff and the Board to identify a solution that will work for No Soliciting and the City. They would like to find that middle ground. Now that they are in the space, their client does not want the railing. It does not achieve the experience their client desired. Their patrons will not experience a view of the river, but a view of the railing instead. The railing is out of place.

Ms. Bryan stated that Ms. Kramb has indicated that she agrees with the conditions recommended by staff.

Ms. Bryan inquired if the applicant was in agreement with the proposed conditions.

Mr. Todd responded that the primary issue is the railing on the east side. Staff has indicated that it is needed due to plans for a future public path. He would request that the railing not be required at this time, but with the understanding that it be installed in the future when it can be seen what that public walkway is. If the City identifies a need to provide separation from the patio, it can be installed at that time. He would prefer not to install it now, if in the future, it could be considered unnecessary.

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

- 1) The applicant install the gate (north patio entrance) the ARB previously approved on March 20, 2019.
- 2) The applicant retain the railing along the east edge of the patio adjacent to the future shared use path.
- 3) The applicant reduce the height of the screen wall fence to meet Code.

Vote: Mr. Kownacki, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Bryan, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes.
[Motion carried 5-0]

COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Martin stated that:

- A Joint PZC/ARB meeting is scheduled for Thursday, June 4 at 6:30 p.m.

- A Special ARB meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, June 17 at 6:30 p.m. for review of a revised draft of the revised ARB Code Amendment and Historic Dublin Design Guidelines. This will provide the new ARB members opportunity to participate in discussion regarding the recommended changes.

Ms. Bryan requested clarification of the review and approval timeline. There is some concern that applications being filed under the current Code and Guidelines may be approved under and subject to new regulations.

Ms. Rauch responded that ARB's final review and recommendation to PZC would be followed up by a future public input session; PZC review and recommendation to City Council; and formal review and adoption by City Council. The intent is to complete the review process by the end of the summer. Applications submitted before the effective date of the adopting ordinance will be subject to the previous Code.

Mr. Kownacki inquired if the applicable Code would be determined by the application submission date or approval date.

Ms. Rauch responded that, per Legal, it is determined by the application submission date.

Mr. Cotter inquired if in the case of deviation from what the Board approved, as occurred with the last case on tonight's agenda, this was the preferred method to remedy the deviation.

Ms. Rauch responded that if the applicant does something different than the Board approved, the Code Enforcement Officer would contact the party and require them to work with staff to come into compliance or submit an application to the Board requesting an alternative to be approved.

Mr. Alexander complimented staff on identifying the noncompliance issue and requiring the applicant to follow the process.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

Kathleen Bryan

Chair, Architectural Review Board

Judith K. Beal

Deputy Clerk of Council