



## MEETING MINUTES

# Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, August 26, 2020

### CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Alexander, Vice Chair, called the August 26, 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. 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. He noted that the Chair, Ms. Bryan is absent tonight. The meeting procedure for each case potentially has five steps. A staff presentation will be 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 refrain from making any inappropriate comments. This is not a perfect system, but in these difficult times, we appreciate your patience.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. Alexander led the Pledge of Allegiance.

### ROLL CALL

Board Members present: Mr. Alexander, Mr. Cotter, Mr. Kownacki and Ms. Kramb

Board Members absent: Ms. Bryan

Staff present: Ms. Rauch, Mr. Ridge, Mr. Ganter, Mr. Krawetzki

### ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Kownacki moved, Ms. Kramb seconded to accept the documents into the record and approve the July 22, 2020 meeting minutes.

Vote on the motion: Mr. Cotter, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Kownacki, yes.

[Motion carried 4-0]

Mr. Alexander 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. Historic Dublin Stone Walls, 20-133INF, Informal Review**

Mr. Alexander stated that this is a request for feedback on the proposed installation of stone walls along S. High Street from Bridge Street to John Wright Lane. The area is zoned Bridge Street District, Historic Core and Historic South.

#### **Case Presentation**

Mr. Ridge stated that this is a request for an informal review and non-binding feedback on the installation of stone walls along S. High Street, north to south, from Bridge Street to John Wright Lane. This stretch of S. High Street is located within the City's right-of-way, and is comprised of a brick sidewalk, a tree lawn, and on the east side, primarily mature trees. On the west side of the street, a significant grade change exists between the sidewalk and curb, and the street trees have been removed. In the proposed site plan, a number of new trees are depicted. The tree species and locations have already been determined. There are a number of stone relics along the S. High Street corridor, which will be preserved, including two carriage steps, and a hitching post in obelisk style. In Phase 1, stone retaining walls will be installed along the west side of S. High Street. The primary purpose of the stone walls, which will be a maximum of 30 inches in height, is to establish a consistent grade for the trees that will be planted along S. High Street. Phase 2 will include the installation of stone seat walls and decorative columns that will be topped with a stone bookend. The Phase 2 walls will be installed later than the Phase 1 retaining wall in locations yet to be determined. The walls are proposed to be constructed of a natural limestone veneer with racked back mortared joints, which mimic Dublin's typical dry stacked historic walls. An example of this construction is at the Grounds of Remembrance. Staff is requesting the Board to provide informal review and feedback on the proposed stone walls along S. High Street.

Mr. Krawetzki stated that this project would be phased. Only the retaining wall in Phase 1 would occur initially. Future phases will involve a full design and will not occur until the trees on the east side begin to decline. The City arborist's review indicates that the trees are in decline, but it could be several years before the wall on the east side of the street would occur. Future phases of the walls will occur when appropriate locations have been identified. Those walls are intended to be seat walls for parade watching, etc. The Phase 1 wall is needed to retain the sidewalk, which exists high above the curb. Because the grassy space between will be removed so that the ground level will drop to the curb level, a retaining wall will be needed to hold up the sidewalk. The wall along the sidewalk will perch just slightly above it to provide an edge, so that a wheelchair or stroller will not topple over the edge; it will provide a block. It will be a stone course or two high, maintaining a 30-inch height maximum; there will be no need for a handrail. In the future, people watching parades will be able to stand next to the trees or sit/lean on the wall. The Engineering Department currently is working on a project to remove the power lines along S. High Street. That project will occur after the trees are planted but before they reach any size where they would be impacted by the lines. The trees must become established, then will begin to grow. By then, the power lines will have been removed. A few penetration points will be added via stairs, so that pedestrians do not need to walk to the end to get around the walls to access the sidewalk.

## **Board Questions**

Mr. Cotter stated that there are many power line poles in that area. Does staff foresee any issues in lowering the grade two or three feet? Does AEP have any objections to that? Will the poles interfere with the locations in which the trees are intended to be planted?

Mr. Krawetzki responded that they would need to work around the poles initially, so there may be breaks in the walks where the poles are located. It may be necessary to delay planting a couple of trees. If so, the wall would be patched in later and the tree planted. They have not had a conversation with AEP yet about how much they will be permitted to excavate, but if there is an issue, that is how it would be handled.

Mr. Cotter inquired if the street lights that are above grade also would be cut down to grade and leave them or add a new pedestal.

Mr. Krawetzki responded that the street lights would remain in their current locations. They would pour new foundations and lower the street lights.

Mr. Kownacki inquired if the walls would be completely in the right-of-way, and the wall would serve as a divider between the sidewalk and the street.

Mr. Krawetzki responded affirmatively.

Mr. Kownacki inquired if there would be sufficient room; some of the areas seem somewhat tight.

Mr. Krawetzki stated that there would be an average of four-five feet of verge area. The slope and curved inconsistencies in the sidewalk make it appear less. In building the wall, it will be necessary to de-construct some of the sidewalk, and after the wall is built along the edge, the sidewalk would be re-fit next to it. There will be some sidewalk repair work, as well.

Ms. Kramb stated that on the east side of the street, there is no slope; therefore, the walls would not be retaining walls.

Mr. Krawetzki responded that is correct. When the walls are added on that side in the future, they will be constructed at grade with a natural stacked-stone look that is common in the City. They will be seat walls and would not be retaining any soil.

Ms. Kramb stated that the entire west side of the street is not sloped, only certain sections are; so will the west wall serve as a retaining wall only in those sections?

Mr. Krawetzki responded that in Phase 1, only the retaining wall sections would occur, which is most of the block. The wall would extend from Dublin Tavern to the end of John Wright Lane. There is only a small section at the end that does not slope, so most of that length will be in a retaining condition at various heights.

Ms. Kramb stated that he has indicated that the retaining wall would extend only a course or two above the sidewalk height. Will that be consistent the entire length of the west side?

Mr. Krawetzki responded affirmatively.

Ms. Kramb inquired if the wall would abut the street curve.

Mr. Krawetzki responded that it would not; it will be behind the street curve, vertical to the sidewalk.

Ms. Kramb stated that it would be vertical to the sidewalk and only a course or two higher than the sidewalk.

Mr. Krawetzki stated that the wall height would gradually lower as the sidewalk elevation lowers.

Ms. Kramb inquired if the height of the wall adjacent to the sidewalk would remain consistent the entire length.

Mr. Krawetzki responded affirmatively. The top one or two courses will follow the sidewalk.

Ms. Kramb stated that on the east side of the street, however, the wall will extend two feet above the sidewalk.

Mr. Krawetzki responded that future east wall would be a standing wall.

Mr. Kownacki inquired if the existing bike racks in the right-of-way would be moved elsewhere when the Phase 2, east wall is constructed.

Mr. Krawetzki responded that they would likely work around them. There has been interest for some time in adding more of the historic walls in Historic Dublin. None of the existing amenities will be eliminated, although they may be located farther down the street.

Mr. Cotter stated that there was a public comment about the power lines. There are many power lines here, and some lines cross from the west to the east side of the street. Staff indicates they have not yet been in contact with AEP. The public comment regarding where future power lines would be placed is valid. If they must be run under the street to the other side, will it be necessary to tear up the sidewalk? We do not want to invest \$1.6 million in this project and later, have to tear it up.

Mr. Krawetzki clarified that Parks & Recreation staff has not contacted AEP. However, Engineering staff deals with power line issues, and they have spoken with AEP. He believes their intent is to remove them from the street frontage back to the alleys, and everything will be fed from the alleys on both sides of the street. Businesses will receive power from the lines extended from the alley on their side of the street.

Mr. Alexander stated that the maximum height of the wall is indicated to be 30 inches. Are they anticipating that people will sit on the side facing the street? The typical seat height is 16-18 inches. There is a significant grade change between the street and the west grade.

Mr. Krawetzki responded that the wall would need to be a height of 30 inches in some areas for retaining purposes, but not the entire length. The purpose of the 30-inch maximum was to avoid the need for handrails. Some of the wall will be too high to be comfortably sat upon without hopping up on it; it will not be a chair height.

Mr. Alexander stated that it appears the goal is to level the grade from curb to wall on both sides. Is the intent that the walls on both sides of the street will appear to be the same height?

Mr. Krawetzki responded that is the goal, but there may be some difference. The intent is that the free-standing wall on the east side will serve as a seat wall where possible. The retaining wall on the west side will have to be the same height as the sidewalk, but everywhere else, it will be a seat wall height, proposed to be between 18 inches and 24 inches in height. The aesthetic will be consistent throughout the corridor.

Mr. Alexander inquired if the wall would be a sufficient distance for opening car doors to clear.

Mr. Krawetzki responded affirmatively. Additionally, a suspended pavement system will be installed under portions of the street and parking areas to increase the tree lawn soil volume needed to support large trees. A shade tree needs approximately 1,000 cubic feet of soil to grow. The small, 5-foot area between the curb and the sidewalks will not provide 1,000 cubic feet, so it will be

extended under the roadway. Planting the trees at the top of curb grade will allow the roots to access the soil. With the construction of the walls, they will not be using a footer that goes all the way down, but using piers or caissons that carry a grade beam. Tree roots will be able to reach under the wall and take advantage of the soil.

### **Public Comments**

Kathy Lannan, 37 S. Riverview Street, Dublin, stated, "I see that you will be discussing the installation of stone walls along S. High St. at the ARB meeting this evening. I was not sure how to submit a question, but I have one question. I like the look, but the top of the wall appears to be level with the sidewalk. I'm wondering if there are liability issues that the City should consider before people inadvertently step off the edge."

Tom Bassett, 5720 Loch Maree Ct., 33 S. High Street, Dublin stated: "I think the walls and tree plantings are a wonderful idea! However, it seems like a repeat of past efforts: the City plants trees, the trees grow, the utility company removes! The area looks like a slum area! The streets are torn up, wires dominate the streetscape, and nothing changes. It is literally trying to make "a silk purse out of a sow's ear." Until a plan is developed to address the real issue, planting trees and building walls is absurd. North High has accomplished this, why not S. High? I, at my own expense, rerouted all overhead lines to the back of my properties at 35 S. High, and 41 West Bridge St. Why can't the City, or other property owners do the same, then replace curbs, pave the street, then plant trees and construct walls. South High is an embarrassment, but yet is touted as the heart of the Historic District! (The power lines along the rear of S. High also need to be cleaned up, new taller poles installed, and made safer). Interesting how rigorous review and approvals required for even minor changes in this area, but the most dominant characteristic of this area is ignored. I've owned numerous properties in Historic Dublin since 1974, and this is the third time trees have been planted, and then removed."

Tom Holton, 5957 Roundtree Place, Dublin, stated:

#01 - "I must be clear to staff and to the ARB that I am expressing an opinion as an amateur historian, and this is not the opinion of the Dublin Historical Society. I have not discussed this with any members of the Historical Society. I am no longer the President of the Society. Historically, there is not a precedent for stone walls along South High Street. Primarily for this reason -- absence of historic relevance -- I am not in favor of the stone walls in the application. The planning report does not state this nor specifically indicate it in the diagrams, but does the plan eliminate some of the parking on the west side of the street? It seems this is the only way to "modify the existing grades" from the walkway or sidewalk to the street. One of the photos shows vehicles adjacent to 55 South High, where there is very little grade change, but the slope is significant progressing south from 75 to 119 South High. I am curious how the plan allows for walkway, tree space, stone wall, grass, and parking." #02 – "The retaining wall vs. stone wall was confusing to me in the planning report. It is a little more clear now. I am still not in favor of it. The retaining wall is going to be even more difficult for opening car doors as people exit their cars, unless you eliminate parking."

Mr. Alexander stated that he believes a response to the first public comment was covered by Mr. Krawetzki's earlier explanation. The second comment relates to a significant issue, which we will rely on staff to handle, and it is that of coordinating the project with the utilities. Mr. Holton's questions about the opening of car doors was also answered earlier. This is an Informal Review,

and staff has asked the Board to provide input on whether we believe this is a good idea or have any misgivings concerning it.

### **Board Discussion**

Mr. Kownacki stated that he believes Mr. Holton posed an important question, which is, are we attempting to add history where it did not exist before? Should we contemplate this further before extending a wall up to SR 161?

Ms. Kramb stated that in response to that question, it is her primary concern. While she understands the need and the practicality of the retaining portion of the wall, and she might be able to agree to certain sections having a retaining wall, historically, these walls would never have been here. The stone walls that exist in Dublin have the bookshelf top – never a flat top to sit on. They also served a purpose of defining property lines; they were not random segments between blocks. From a historical perspective, these walls do not fit at all. She also is concerned with the limited space. When walking along these sidewalks, if someone is coming from the other direction, it is necessary to move off the sidewalk and into the grassy lawn. There is insufficient room for two people and a stroller to pass someone coming from the other direction. With no grass lawn to walk into, there is a risk of walking over the retaining wall. Cutting the sidewalk off at the edge of it would tightly squeeze pedestrian traffic down the sidewalk. The grassy area really is needed to sidestep/accommodate that traffic, including the occasional bicyclist, strollers, etc. She does not see how all that activity can occur within an even more limited space in a usable manner; it is already very narrow. While the wall would look nice, it is not really appropriate.

Mr. Cotter agreed that the wall looks nice, although, historically, it would not have looked as proposed. He also is concerned about safety, particularly at night when people are trying to pass in areas not well lit. In shadowed areas, they could step in the wrong space. If the wall extends only one or two courses above the sidewalk edge, a person could attempt to move over, trip and fall over that edge. The space is too narrow for a bicyclist and a stroller to attempt to pass, and stepping out of the way and over a 30-inch wall is not safe.

Ms. Kramb responded that, essentially, stepping out of the way could be falling down into the street.

Mr. Cotter stated that, setting aside the historical issue for a moment, the risk of falling over the course into the open space below is a safety concern. If it is dark or raining, someone is moving quickly, or pedestrian traffic is moving in both directions – from a safety standpoint, this is a concern.

Mr. Alexander stated that the details of the proposed walls are different than original walls in the City. In the community, there are original, historic walls and non-historic walls. He actually appreciated that the top of these walls is different. He understands the need for retaining walls in the District, and it would help the streetscape to have retaining walls. However, he would prefer that they occur only on the west side where they would be serving a retaining purpose, not run along both sides of the street. His concern is that these walls would be so pronounced, if they were on both sides of the street, that they would become the defining element of the District. They will create a continuous street wall – a very prominent feature that is not original. He is concerned that they will be visually overwhelming to the streetscape. He personally loves the landscaping and would like the landscaping to be extremely elaborate. However, he is concerned the walls would be too dominant.

Mr. Krawetzki stated that Phase 1 is just the retaining section. There are no plans or full design for other walls. At this point, a discussion regarding whether there should even be additional walls is valid. The design shown tonight shows the full possibilities. In regard to the tight sidewalk, there are some spaces where people could step off on the other side of the sidewalk onto private property. Of course, in some places, the buildings are up to the edge of the sidewalk.

Mr. Kownacki stated that for at least three Board members, the issue is adding a historical element where none previously existed and never would have, as traditionally, they would have defined property lines.

Mr. Krawetzki stated that one Council member requested the Board's feedback on the look of the proposed walls. They would be modeled similar to the style of the Grounds of Remembrance wall. Would ARB be comfortable with that look?

Mr. Kownacki responded that he believes most people would like the Ohio limestone look, which would feel right in the neighborhood. Perhaps it would be better not to try to make it look too historic, as it would appear that the City was trying to fabricate a history that did not exist. If the walls had existed, they never would have been flat-topped; they would have been the bookend type.

Ms. Kramb stated that for a retaining wall, it looks fine. Actually, a bookend wall could not be placed here, as it would be even more risky. She understands the need for a retaining wall for tree planting. However, a long stretch of wall that never would have been there, and placing a six-inch lip next to the sidewalk that people will constantly trip over are concerns.

Mr. Cotter stated that from the appearance perspective, the wall looks fine. If it were located somewhere else with trees and raised beds, he would like it. From a risk assessment standpoint, a 30-inch fall is a long fall.

Ms. Kramb stated that the concern is that here, it will be very easy to step to the edge of the sidewalk to let someone pass. It would be very easy to trip over that six-inch lip -- people trip over curbs of that height frequently. In this situation, it would be tripping over a curb and falling over a wall.

Mr. Alexander inquired if staff had sufficient input to proceed.

Ms. Rauch responded that the Board's comments would be shared with Council.

Ms. Kramb stated that the packet rendering was of a wall on the east side of the street. She would suggest that staff bring back a rendering of the west wall as a retaining wall. There should be two views: 1) a view from a parking space along High Street looking at the retaining wall; and 2) a view from the perspective of walking on the sidewalk, showing the height of the one to two-course lip along the sidewalk from the inside.

Mr. Alexander stated that if a grass strip were added between the sidewalk and the upper lip of the retaining wall, the grass strip could provide a buffer, a warning. If the Board could view a plan that depicted all the dimensions, we would be better able to evaluate the space.

Mr. Krawetzki stated that the grassy strip would be difficult to maintain.

Mr. Alexander suggested a planting bed instead.

Ms. Kramb stated that, unfortunately, there does not appear to be room for that. It appears that the wall is abutting the sidewalk.

Ms. Krawetzki responded that it is. They were attempting to maximize the tree area, as it would help in restoring the tree canopy. There may be other planting opportunities in that area between the trees. The initial goal was to plant trees in there that would have some height and take advantage of the soil under the road.

Mr. Cotter stated that if this plan is brought back, it should contain a plan for the power lines and lighting, in addition to the other concerns stated.

Mr. Krawetzki stated that the lighting level would not change; the lights would remain in their current positions, but just be lowered.

Mr. Cotter stated that the light level would change when trees are placed there. There will be significant shadows between the trees that will obscure the walking area.

Ms. Kramb inquired about the procedure. Typically, an Informal Review would need to return to ARB for approval.

Ms. Rauch stated that because this project is in the City right-of-way and part of a Capital Project, Council is the approving body. However, staff will report ARB's feedback to Council.

Ms. Kramb stated that for the record, as reflected in the minutes, she does not approve of what has been presented today.

Mr. Kownacki stated that it would be important for staff to contact AEP regarding potential drops from the alleys instead of drops along S. High Street, so the poles can be moved out.

Mr. Krawetzki clarified that Engineering would be moving all the power lines to the alleys; there would be no power lines down S. High Street.

Mr. Cotter inquired how staff would present the Board's concerns regarding the historical inconsistency and the safety issue to City Council.

Ms. Rauch responded that a memo would be provided to Council outlining the Board's concerns and comments, as well as the public comments.

## **2. 86 Franklin Street, 20-122MPR, Minor Project Review**

Mr. Alexander stated that this is a request for exterior modifications to an existing home east of Franklin Street, ±350 feet north of the intersection with John Wright Lane. The 0.36-acre site is 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 for exterior modifications to an existing residential home located at 86 Franklin Street, including the installation of new skylights and a new window on the rear of the home. The .36-acre parcel has approximately 70 feet of frontage along Franklin Street, and the rear of the property is adjacent to Mill Lane.



Franklin Street is unique in that the lots are deeper than in most of the Historic District. This lot has a depth of approximately 215 feet.

### Proposal

The home has three pedestrian entries; one is located centrally on the front of the home, another is located on the south elevation near the rear of home, and the third is located on the rear elevation. The applicant is proposing to update the existing doors with new Marvin Ultimate Swinging French doors. The doors are contemporary in design, consisting of a large, rectangular glass panel and consistent border. The applicant is proposing to paint the doors in a deep blue color (Calvary Blue). The rear doors will contain clear glass panels, while the front door will contain obscure glass for privacy. The applicant is proposing to replace the two existing overhead garage doors with new Midland Flush Panel garage doors, providing a minimalist, modern look, which complements the contemporary pedestrian doors. The garage doors will be a Sherwin Williams Polane Solar Reflective Polyurethane Enamel in a Coffee color (dark brown). Like the existing overhead doors, the new garage doors will not contain windows. Also proposed is the installation of four new skylights on the roof of the home -- two on the north side and two on the south. The skylights are Velux Fixed skylights, approximately 22 inches in width and 45 inches in height, including the frame. Each skylight provides approximately 5.5 square feet of glass panel for natural light. The skylight frames are constructed of aluminum. The skylights protrude approximately four inches above the shingles, but will not be highly visible from Franklin Street or Mill Lane due to their proposed locations. Additionally, the applicant is proposing the installation of one new, one-over-one window located on the lower level of the north face of the architectural bump out at the rear of the home. The proposed window is a Marvin Integrity Ultrex Window in a Stone White finish. The manufacturer and color were approved by the ARB on August 28, 2019 with a previous application. Staff has reviewed the application against the applicable criteria and recommends approval with one condition.

### **Applicant Presentation**

Heidi Bolyard, Simplified Living Architecture and Design, 6065 Frantz Road – Suite 205, Dublin, stated that she had no additional comments.

### **Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

### **Board Questions/Discussion**

The Board had no questions or discussion.

Mr. Alexander inquired if the applicant had any objections to the condition.

Ms. Bolyard indicated that she had no objections.

Mr. Kownacki moved, Ms. Kramb seconded to approve the Minor Project Review with one condition:

- 1) The applicant provide a window sill for the proposed window that is consistent with the other windows on the home, subject to staff approval.

Vote on the motion: Mr. Cotter, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Kownacki, yes.  
[Motion carried 4-0]

### **3. The Beauty Collective – Sign at 82 S. High Street, 20-126MPR, Minor Project Review**

Mr. Alexander stated that this is a request for a Minor Project Review of a proposed installation of a 4.4-square-foot projecting sign for an existing tenant space southeast of the intersection of S. High Street and Eberly Hill Lane. The 0.37-acre site is zoned Bridge Street District, Historic South.

#### **Staff Presentation**

Mr. Ganter stated that this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project for the installation of a 4.4-square-foot projecting sign for an existing tenant space located at 82 S. High Street in Historic Dublin. The 0.37-acre site is located southeast of the intersection of South High Street and Eberly Hill Lane and contains two existing detached commercial structures. [Photos of site context shown.] The applicant is proposing the installation of one new projecting sign on the west façade of the building, facing South High Street. The proposed sign is 20 inches in height, 32 inches in width, and is approximately 4.4 square feet. It is constructed of a routed HDU material, 1.5-inches thick; the white copy and border are raised. The proposed sign consists of two colors, black and white. The sign is affixed to the building using the existing black, classic metal sign bracket used by the previous tenant. The location of the projecting sign provides 9'-4" of clearance between the bottom of the sign and the sidewalk. The sign is proposed at a height of 11 feet from established grade to the top of the sign, which is within the maximum height limit of 15 feet. The previous tenant's sign was located within the right-of-way, and Engineering staff have indicated that they have no objection to that location. The sign consists of the business name centrally located on the rectangular sign. There are two rectangular borders, which surround the business name. The applicant provided text dimensions with the original submission; however, the applicant altered the design of the sign with a second submission and did not update the text dimension values. Staff recommends that the applicant update the plans to provide the new text dimensions prior to submitting a permanent sign permit.

Staff has reviewed the application against the applicable criteria and recommends approval with one condition.

#### **Applicant Presentation**

Karen Lykins, 6929 Pilar Court, Dublin, OH, applicant stated that she submitted the sign dimensions and letters, as requested.

#### **Board Questions**

Mr. Alexander inquired if staff had received the additional information requested.

Mr. Ganter responded that staff received only the initial submission. When the design was altered, staff was unsure if the text dimensions remained the same; therefore, they requested that a revised design be submitted with updated text dimensions. Currently, they are awaiting that information.

Mr. Cotter inquired if there is criteria that specifies the letter and space sizes.

Mr. Ganter responded that there is no criteria regarding spacing or text dimensions. However, there was some inconsistency above the business name on the sign; for that reason, a condition was added to require the text dimensions be clarified before submission for a sign permit.

Mr. Alexander inquired if he was inquiring about the limitations of text height.

Mr. Cotter inquired if there is a rubric re. size or space limitations.

Ms. Rauch responded that staff's concern was not related to the dimensions of the letters, but to the 20% requirement for graphics. Staff was attempting to confirm the graphics were consistent with the 20% percent requirement.

Mr. Cotter stated that the 20% maximum is a requirement for graphics, but not for letters. He was trying to obtain clarity for the applicant. Because we are attempting to make the process easier for our applicants, there should be clarity regarding required dimensions.

Ms. Kramb stated that she believes staff was attempting to confirm the dimensions of all of the graphics on the sign, which could include the thickness of the lines and lettering. The total calculation of those dimensions should not exceed 20%.

Mr. Cotter stated that if it is related to what comprises the 20% total, it is not clear in the Code. He is not concerned about the size in this case, but was trying to understand the Sign Code. However, the Code requirements can be discussed another time.

### **Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

### **Board Discussion**

The Board had no further questions or concerns.

Mr. Alexander inquired if the applicant had any issue with the condition.

Ms. Lykins responded that they had no objection.

Mr. Kownacki moved, Mr. Cotter seconded to approve the Minor Project with one condition:

- 1) That the applicant update the plans to provide the text dimensions prior to submitting for a sign permit, subject to staff approval.

Vote on the motion: Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Kownacki, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes.  
[Motion carried 4-0]

#### **4. Dublin Chamber of Commerce Addition, 129 S. High Street, 20-131MPR/WR, Minor Project Review/Waiver Request**

Mr. Alexander stated that this is a request for additions to the north and west elevations of an existing building northwest of the intersection of S. High Street and John Wright Lane. The 0.25 acre site is zoned Bridge Street District, Historic South.

### **Staff Presentation**

Ms. Rauch stated that she would provide a presentation for Cases 4 and 5 together, as both cases are for the same site. The first case is for a Minor Project Review and a Waiver Request for the Dublin Chamber of Commerce building. The 0.25-acre site is located northwest of the intersection of S. High Street and John Wright Lane. It is located against the S. High Street frontage, and a parking lot is located to the rear. [Site context photos shown.] The applicant is requesting to create two additions to the existing building, on the north and east elevations. The main entrance of the

building is located on the east elevation from a recessed porch. The proposal is to enclose the existing covered porch and an open area between the two existing portions of the building on the north elevation. The total square footage of the two proposed additions is 350 square feet. The Code permits a maximum building coverage of 50 percent; a maximum impervious coverage of 65 percent; and a maximum semi-pervious coverage allowance of 10 percent. The existing building coverage is 28.5 percent, and with the additions will be 31.7 percent, which meets Code. The existing lot coverage is 70 percent impervious, which includes the primary structure and all hard surfaces on the lot; with the additions, the proposed lot coverage is 73 percent. The previous zoning on this site of BSD-Historic Core permitted a maximum impervious lot coverage of 85, but with the 2017 rezoning to BSD-Historic South, the maximum lot coverage was greatly reduced. Because the minor modifications will accommodate ADA accessible restrooms, staff is supportive of a Waiver to permit additional lot coverage. Staff has encouraged the applicant to explore replacing select impervious surfaces with semi-pervious surfaces to more closely meet the intent of the BSD Code. The primary form of the structure will remain the same with the building additions. The exterior of the additions are proposed to be finished in natural wood siding and painted to match the existing structure; new windows will match the existing windows. Staff has reviewed the application against the applicable criteria and recommends approval of the Waiver and the Minor Project with no conditions.

### **Applicant Presentation**

William Andrews, AIA, Andrews Architects, 6631 Commerce Pkwy, Studio B, Dublin, OH stated that he has nothing to add to the presentation but is available for questions.

### **Board Questions**

Mr. Cotter inquired if the recommendation to explore replacing select impervious surfaces with semi-pervious surfaces to more closely meet the intent of the Code was considered.

Mr. Andrews responded that the only area that might have that potential is at the rear of the parking lot. Because parking is at a premium, they preferred not to eliminate one or two parking areas. It would not be a wise decision for the users of the property.

### **Public Comments**

There were no public comments.

### **Board Discussion**

Mr. Kownacki stated that, typically, he would not be in favor of a Waiver to increase lot coverage. However, the existing lot coverage already exceeds the amount permitted, so in this case, the Waiver makes sense.

Mr. Cotter stated that with recent cases, the Board has been very judicious in permitting lot coverage to exceed Code. However, in this case, no other option seems possible.

Ms. Kramb stated that she has no objection to the additions. However, unless we want to require them to lose two parking spots, no option other than a Waiver exists. This seems to be a "grandfathered in" situation. She would be willing to waive the requirements for the additions.

Mr. Alexander stated that he believes the existing additions are simple and make sense from a builder's point of view; however, they are not sensitive to the original thinking. The previous additions appear to have been done in a manner to differentiate them from the existing historical structure, which could have occurred at the request of a previous Board. Our standards today are not quite as doctrinaire as that, but such things are very clear in design circles. He could concede on the additions, however, but not on the lot coverage. This Board has been holding other applicants within this area to strict lot coverage standards. We need more greenspace. This site is paved and the proposal is to add more solid surface. Environmentally, that is not good practice. Perhaps part of the parking lot could become permeable pavers, or two parking spaces removed and landscaping substituted. He would not support the Waiver, as it will make it difficult with other requests to exceed lot coverage.

Ms. Krumb stated that she would have no objection to requiring the applicant to remove pavement somewhere to avoid additional lot coverage. In regard to the additions, she agrees with Mr. Alexander. However, because the walls of the additions are not flush to the front building – there is a five-foot gap -- the original building core will be clear. Because the existing lot coverage is 70%, if they can make up the additional three percent in some manner other than impervious surface, she would have no objection.

Mr. Cotter inquired if these additions would be Non-Contributing.

Ms. Rauch responded that is her understanding.

Ms. Krumb stated that the reason the survey would have called it non-contributing is that the addition is not subordinate to the original structure. Although the addition is three times the size of the original, the original historic building remains distinct and noticeable from S. High Street.

Mr. Cotter stated that he would prefer to remain consistent with requirements being made of other applicants regarding lot coverage. The additional amount of lot coverage requested is approximately 375 feet.

Ms. Krumb inquired if it would be possible to deny the waiver and approve the Minor Project Review with a condition that the applicant remove the additional 3% of impervious surface somewhere on the site. That could be a parking space or some of the pavers in front of the building could be made permeable.

Ms. Rauch confirmed that would be acceptable.

Mr. Alexander inquired if the applicant would be agreeable to the condition.

Mr. Andrews responded that his client is the City of Dublin. He believes it is reasonable to identify surface materials that would address the three percent satisfactorily.

Mr. Alexander stated that because the City of Dublin is the client, there is even more reason to ensure the Code is met appropriately.

Ms. Krumb moved, Mr. Kownacki seconded to approve the following Waiver:

To permit an increase to the maximum permitted impervious surface requirements per Zoning Code Section 153.062 – Building Type Requirements (O)(10)(2).

Vote on the motion: Mr. Kownacki, no; Mr. Alexander, no; Mr. Cotter, no; Ms. Krumb, no.  
[Motion failed 0-4]

Mr. Kownacki moved, Ms. Kramb seconded to approve the Minor Project Review with one condition:  
1) That the applicant work with staff to revise the plans to maintain the existing 70% lot coverage.

Vote on the motion: Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Kownacki, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes.  
[Motion carried 4-0]

## **5. Dublin Chamber of Commerce at 129 S. High Street, 20-132INF, Informal Review**

Mr. Alexander stated that this is a request for feedback on the construction of a ±300-square-foot pavilion and associated site improvements northwest of the intersection of S. High Street and John Wright Lane. The 0.25-acre site is zoned Bridge Street District, Historic South.

### **Staff Presentation**

Ms. Rauch stated that this request for an Informal Review relates to the same site. The request is for feedback on the proposed construction of a 289-square-foot pavilion forward of the primary structure to replace an existing paver patio. The structure would be an open-air pavilion with a pyramidal roof finished in asphalt shingles to match the primary structure. The roof would be supported by four white columns. The area under the pavilion would be paved with a brick matching the existing walkway. A new stone retaining wall along John Wright Lane would tie into the existing retaining wall just east of the primary structure. This structure would increase the impervious surface on the site. In view of the previous approval with the condition that the site not exceed 70% lot coverage, this application would increase the existing lot coverage by 3%, to a total of 73%. Staff requests that the Board consider the following questions with this Informal Review:

- 1) Does the proposed scale, mass, and location of the accessory structure fit with the character of the neighborhood?
- 2) Is the orientation and placement on the lot consistent with the Historic District Design Guidelines?
- 3) Are the proposed materials and design character appropriate for the Historic District and complementary to the primary structure?
- 4) Other considerations by the Board.

### **Applicant Presentation**

William Andrews, AIA, Andrews Architects, 6631 Commerce Pkwy, Studio B, Dublin, OH stated that this project has been proposed after a series of meetings that occurred regarding how the Chamber could better serve its members in the years ahead and subsequently sharing those thoughts with the City of Dublin, who is the property owner. The additional space will allow informal space for collaboration. It is also important to remember that this facility on S. High Street is also a public space. The addition for ADA-compliant restrooms will serve the public during business hours, and this open pavilion space will offer the public a space to stop and relax in the Historic District. There is no other such public space along S. High Street. He requests the Board's input on this proposal.

### **Board Questions**

Mr. Cotter inquired if the proposed seating area would be permanent or mobile.

Mr. Andrews responded that the seating is undefined, but would be mobile. The casual seating will provide a couple of high-top café style seating arrangements. In winter months, those items could be placed in storage. Mr. Andrews noted that Chamber staff showed renderings of the proposed pavilion with the neighbors and obtained their feedback. The neighbors they were able to contact were supportive of the proposal.

### **Public Comment**

No public comments were received.

### **Board Discussion**

Mr. Alexander inquired if, as designed, this pavilion space would be available to pedestrians and access would not be limited by a gate or otherwise.

Mr. Andrews responded that it would be available to everyone.

Ms. Krumb stated that she supports the concept, but the lot coverage numbers do not work. We have just denied them a waiver of the lot coverage requirements for the proposed addition. We cannot grant them a waiver of the same requirements for this proposal. It is possible to make the existing patio a more usable space for themselves and the public. In addition, the pavilion would be an accessory structure, which typically is located at the rear of a property, not along the main street.

Mr. Cotter stated that it would dominate the front of the building, but perhaps it could be done differently with permeable materials.

Mr. Kownacki stated that he is supportive of the purpose of the structure, but not the location on the main street. Additionally, the design is not historic or fitting to this Historic District. Perhaps that design at the rear of the building would not be such an issue.

Mr. Alexander stated that he could consider something more along the lines of a pocket park here. The structure detracts from the historic building. The rendering depicts a more solid, undifferentiated surface. A heavily landscaped pocket park could be treated as an amenity for the community, not primarily for the building occupants. An argument could be made that would be adding something to the community and does not overwhelm the historic structure. He could more easily rationalize exceeding the requirements slightly for an amenity for the neighborhood. An elaborate landscape plan, perhaps with a fountain, could make that an attractive amenity.

Ms. Krumb stated that she would be supportive of an additional percent of lot coverage to extend the existing stone wall that runs parallel to the building for the purpose of framing this space. It could be a grassy, landscaped pocket park with permeable materials and benches. However, the proposed structure does not work here.

Mr. Kownacki stated that he agrees. A roof over the space may not be needed. He would be supportive of eliminating the roof structure over a landscaped space that remains permeable.

Mr. Cotter stated that he would be supportive of a permeable space with perhaps a temporary roof option for days the Chamber plans to use the space. The applicant could pursue options for a permeable, green space with temporary sun protection without increasing the lot coverage.

Mr. Andrews stated that he appreciates the Board's suggestions. Their team would consider options consistent with the Board's input.

## **6. Property Maintenance Code Update, 20-097ADMC, Administrative Request – Code Amendment**

Mr. Alexander stated that this an administrative request for an amendment to Section 153.076 of the City of Dublin Zoning Code to provide regulations for enforcement procedures and additional property maintenance regulations.

### **Staff Presentation**

#### Background

Ms. Noble provided an overview. On February 18, 2020, the Public Services Committee reviewed the property maintenance topic, and recommended that Council approve an update of the City Code to incorporate the 2018 International Property Maintenance Code. The Committee also recommended that other options be considered by PZC and ARB, as they deal with property maintenance zoning regulations. On April 13, 2020, Council passed Ordinance 09-20, adopting the 2018 International Property Maintenance Code, and at a joint meeting on June 4, 2020, the Planning and Zoning Commission and the Architectural Review Board discussed property maintenance and nuisance abatement regulations. Input from that discussion was incorporated into a draft amendment to Section 153.076 Public Nuisance Regulations, which provides the following: a more definitive enforcement process that includes escalating enforcement measures; a definition for vacant properties; and regulations for securing residential and commercial properties. The Planning and Zoning Commission informally reviewed the revised Code Amendment draft on August 20 and provided additional recommendations.

#### Securing Properties/Vacant Buildings

Staff also has drafted additional language in Section 153.076 of the City's Nuisance Code to address vacant properties and provide regulations for securing buildings. The proposed draft language includes definitions for vacant properties and secured buildings and a new section that provides regulations for securing properties and maintenance requirements for vacant structures. The draft language was based on the regulations of other communities regarding timeframes for length of time a property may remain unsecured once a health and safety risk has been identified, and how long it can remain in that status. A timeframe of 30 days has been added. Also included are maintenance requirements for roofs, drainage systems, structures, walls, decorative fixtures, overhangs, chimneys, walkways, accessory structures and premises. Maintenance is necessary so as not to jeopardize the integrity of the structure while it is vacant.

#### Enforcement

At the June 4 PZC/ARB joint meeting, there was no discussion regarding the fact that there is also an existing Administrative Order that outlines the steps of the City's Code Enforcement Process. In August 2016, the City adopted Administrative Order (AO) AO 8.5, which provides specific action steps for the issuance, inspection and corrections of enforcement cases. Legal staff indicates that



the AO, which is enforceable, was adopted as opposed to providing enforcement procedures within the Zoning Code to allow staff flexibility with compliance timeframes due to the complexities and extenuating circumstances of individual cases. The AO allows Code Enforcement to exercise discretion. Legal staff recommends continuing this method of administering the Enforcement Process.

For review purposes, the document begins with the Definitions and is followed with the Regulations.

### **Board Review/Discussion**

The Board reviewed the revised draft Code and made additional recommendations as follow:

#### Definitions

*SECURED. A building which has all points of entry into the structure closed by use of windows and doors which are in proper working order, intact, without holes, broken elements, and are locked.*

*VACANT STRUCTURE. Any building or structure, in whole or in part, including an accessory building, which has become vacant or abandoned for a period of at least thirty (30) consecutive days and which also meet at least one of the following conditions:*

- (1) Is open to casual entry or trespass;
- (2) Is damaged to an extent which prohibits safe human occupancy;
- (3) Demonstrates a lack of property maintenance and upkeep;
- (4) Is under notice for being in violation of City ordinances;
- (5) Has been secured or boarded up for at least thirty days;
- (6) Has utilities disconnected or not in use;
- (7) Is under a condemnation notice or legal order to vacate; or
- (8) Is structurally unsound.

The Board discussed the definition of a Vacant Structure. Members pointed out that it is difficult for a Code to define vacant versus abandoned, derelict or blighted structures.

Ms. Noble stated that the Planning Commission had struggled with the definition for a vacant and abandoned structure. Commission consensus was that the proposed definition could remain with the stipulation that one of the eight listed conditions must be present before enforcement action could occur.

After review, ARB members indicated that they had no objection to the proposed definition with the elimination of (5), which is redundant as the 30-day timeframe is already part of the definition.

#### Enforcement Process

Ms. Noble noted that the Planning and Zoning Commission had no objection to continuing to use AO 8.5 for flexibility in administering the enforcement process.

ARB members had no objections to continuing to use AO 8.5 for administration of enforcement.

Mr. Kownacki stated that he would recommend that enforcement issues be referred to the Franklin County Environmental Court versus Dublin Mayor's Court, because that Environmental Court carries more weight and is more transparent.

Ms. Kramb stated that the City does work with the County Environmental Court. This Code amendment, which lists specific nuisances, will provide the Court ability to address cases more specifically.

Next Steps

Ms. Noble stated that a final draft will be prepared that will incorporate all of the input received. The final draft will be provided to the Planning and Zoning Commission for recommendation to City Council. The Board will be apprised of that continuing process.

**COMMUNICATIONS**

- The next regular meeting of the ARB is scheduled for September 23.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

*Gary Alexander*  
Vice Chair, Architectural Review Board

*Judith K. Beal*  
Deputy Clerk of Council