



MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, September 23, 2020

[Due to technical issues with Webex/live streaming, the meeting record was prepared from notes taken and staff reports.]

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Bryan, Chair, called the September 23, 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. 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, Mr. Cotter, Ms. Bryan, Mr. Kownacki and Ms. Kramb
Staff present: Ms. Rauch, Ms. Martin, Mr. Ridge, Ms. Noble

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Cotter moved, Mr. Kownacki seconded to accept the documents into the record and approve the July 29, August 12 and August 26, 2020 meeting minutes.

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

CONSENT CASE

Ms. Bryan stated that the Consent Agenda is intended to allow for expedited approval of minor cases where the Board, staff and applicant are in agreement with all conditions of approval. However, any member of the Board may remove a case from the Consent Agenda to permit discussion. There is one case eligible for the

Consent Agenda this evening: Case 3, #20-146 – Our Cupcakery – Sign. She inquired if any member wished to remove the case from the Consent Agenda.

No member requested that the case be removed from the Consent Agenda.

3. Our Cupcakery – Sign, 54 S. High Street, 20-146MPR, Minor Project Review

Ms. Bryan stated that this is a request for the installation of a 5-square-foot wall sign for an existing tenant space east of S. High Street, ±100 feet south of the intersection with Spring Hill Lane. The 0.17-acre parcel is zoned Bridge Street District Historic South. Approval of the Minor Project Review is recommended with no conditions.

Public Comment

No public comments were received on this case.

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

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

[Motion carried 5-0.]

CASES

1. 185 S. Riverview Street, 20-144INF, Informal Review

Ms. Bryan stated that this is a request for feedback on the proposed construction of a new 4,600-square-foot, single-family home west of S. Riverview Street, ±400 feet north of the intersection with Short Street. The 0.41-acre site is zoned Bridge Street District Historic Residential.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Martin stated that this is a request for informal review and feedback for a potential future application to construct a new, one and-a-half story, ±4,600-square-foot residence with a three-car attached garage on a .37-acre site located west of S. Riverview Street, approximately 300 feet north of the intersection with Short Street. The .37-acre parcel has approximately 80 feet of frontage along S. Riverview Street and contains a one-story, 1,200-square-foot, single-family home built in 1960. In June 2020, the ARB reviewed and approved demolition of the existing home due to the deteriorated and hazardous condition. There were no conditions of approval associated with the action to allow the property owner to demolish the home prior to approval of a new project.

Proposal

The applicant is requesting feedback on a potential future development application for the construction of a new, one-and-one-half-story, single-family home with a three-car attached garage. The home is proposed to be approximately 4,600 square feet in size and centrally located on a .37-acre lot. The front door addresses S. Riverview Street with vehicular access provided by a driveway to the north of the home. The primary form of the home is a side-gabled hall and parlor style cottage evoking agricultural forms. A series of forms are intended to represent additions to the primary home along with a two-story garage. An approximately 480-square-foot, three season room is located southwest of the primary residence providing access to an over-sized patio. The proposed front yard setback is 70 feet; proposed side yard setbacks are 16 feet north and 3 feet south; and the proposed rear yard setback is 25 feet. The Historic Dublin Design Guidelines recommend that homes be sited in a manner that is contextually sensitive to the District and surrounding properties. The consultant notes the proposed location is consistent with the homes to the north and south at 179 and 195 S. Riverview Street. The maximum permitted lot coverage in BSD-Historic Residential is 50 percent. Presently, Code amendments are under review that propose to reduce the maximum permitted lot coverage to 45 percent. The proposed lot coverage is 50 percent, or 9,006 square feet on an 18,011-square-foot lot. The applicant has

provided conceptual elevations, which depict the mass and scale of the home. The consultant recommends simplifying the floor plan in order to simplify the architectural complexities, which contribute to the perceived mass of the home.

Architecture

The east elevation is a side-gabled hall and parlor broken into three forms with an off-set entry located to the north. A front porch with a standing seam shed roof accents the front façade. The home is proposed to be clad in stone veneer with composite slate shingles. A variety of window patterns are used across the home. Along the east elevation, a combination of six and nine pane windows with dark trim are proposed. A box bay window is proposed as an architectural feature. Staff recommends the applicant consider moving the chimney to the east façade to provide additional visual interest and to break up the expanse of the roof. The consultant noted that the chimney should be clad in stone veneer. The north and south elevations are an elongated addition to the primary form; the north façade is simpler than the south façade. White vertical batten board siding is proposed for the home with brown vertical batten board siding for the garage. The consultant recommends eliminating the vertical siding on the home. In lieu of, staff recommends a simple horizontal siding. A variety of window patterns are used across the north façade including a box bay window, four oversized eight pane windows with transoms, and seven four pane windows in rectangular and square forms. The consultant notes expanses of glazing within stone facades is historically atypical. The garage is proposed to be two stories in height with a standing seam metal roof to further differentiate the home. The north and south façades differ greatly in character due to the variation in window pattern design. Staff recommends the applicant create greater consistency and continuity across the facades. Three carriage style garage doors are proposed along the north façade with a pedestrian entry along the interior east façade. The south façade is typified by a number of side gable roofs, which converge at the southeast corner of the home. The consultant notes this contributes to a visually busy façade. The three-season room is depicted with a nearly flat roof, which is inconsistent with the remainder of the home. The proposed cladding for the three-season chimney is unclear. Staff recommends that applicant provide the hidden elevations at the next step in the review process. The west elevation is typified by the front gable two-story garage with two stacked windows. Additions to the primary form are viable along the west elevation. The consultant expressed concern with the mass of the west elevation.

An Informal Review provides the opportunity for feedback at the formative stage of a project allowing the Architectural Review Board to provide non-binding feedback to an applicant regarding the proposal. Staff has provided the following questions for the Board's discussion:

- 1) Does the Board support the proposed site layout?
- 2) Does the Board support the proposed mass and scale of the proposed home?
- 3) Does the Board support the conceptual architectural character and details of the home?

Applicant Presentation

Paul Ghidotti, 6840 Macneil Drive, Dublin, OH 43017, noted that he and his wife have lived in Dublin for many years. He desires to be a good neighbor and to integrate the home within the existing context. He thanked the Board for approving demolition of the existing structure, which will occur this week. There is a large tree in the front yard they would like to preserve. Presently, there is protection fencing around the tree. The health of the tree is not great, but the location of the tree drove the decision to site the home further back on the lot.

Rich Taylor, Architect, 48 S. High Street, Dublin, OH, provided an overview of the architecture of the proposed home, including details regarding exterior materials and colors. He noted that the elevations portray vertical siding, not board and batten.

Ms. Kramb inquired the reason the statement provided described the garage as attached to the home with a connector. The elevation renderings depict something different.

Mr. Taylor responded that the statement was based on an earlier version of the design. He welcomes the Board's input on the proposed design.

Ms. Kramb stated she prefers the design solution be described in the statement.

Public Comment

No public comment was received on this case.

Board Discussion

Ms. Bryan led the Board in a discussion of the following questions:

1) Does the Board support the proposed site layout?

Board members expressed support for the site layout, and appreciation that the home is sited similarly to the surrounding properties. Although the layout is constrained by the narrowness of the lot, there was concern that the home could be sited too close to the property located to the rear.

Staff indicated that the lot to the rear of the home is presently undeveloped.

2) Does the Board support the proposed mass and scale of the proposed home?

Board members inquired if the garage is the same height as the home.

The applicant indicated that the garage is shorter in height than the proposed home.

Board members expressed concern with the mass of the structure and indicated the need to either reduce the height of the attached garage or detach it from the main structure. Although the preference was that the garage be detached, Board members acknowledged the practical difficulty of Ohio winters. The mass of the garage is indicative of a barn, which, historically, would have been more removed from the primary residence. If the structure is not detached, the applicant should consider attaching it with a connector to reduce the mass of the home.

3) Does the Board support the conceptual architectural character and details of the home?

The Board was generally supportive of the conceptual architectural character. Appreciation was expressed for the style and details, although there were some concerns with the dominance of the 1.5-story cottage roofline and the convergence of rooflines and dormers at the southeast corner of the home. There may be opportunity to simplify the design.

The Board expressed support of the conceptual color palette and materials, but indicated the chimney should be clad in stone rather than siding. Some support was expressed for the glazing within the stone façade, although there was concern about the proposed box bay windows. A suggestion was offered that the applicant consider dormers to break up the roof and allow for additional usable space.

The applicant indicated that the homeowners' preference was not to include dormers. The proposed roofline accommodates a great room.

The Board expressed concern with the south elevation of the home, particularly the three-season room, and requested that the hidden elevations be clarified at the next stage of review.

Mr. Ghidotti and Mr. Taylor thanked the Board for their input.

2. 54 S. High Street – Paint, 20-143MPR, Minor Project Review

Ms. Bryan stated that this is a request for the repainting of a historic building east of S. High Street, ±100 feet south of the intersection with Spring Hill Lane. The 0.17-acre parcel is zoned Bridge Street District Historic South.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Ridge stated that this is a request for review and approval of a proposed repainting of an existing structure in the Historic District. The site is located east of South High Street, approximately 100 feet south of the intersection with Spring Hill Lane. The 0.17-acre site has approximately 50 feet of frontage on the east side of S. High Street and consists of a single-story commercial building that rests on a stone foundation.

The proposal is to repaint the entire exterior of the primary structure, including the shake siding, doors, windows, and trim with a total of three colors. The detached garage at the rear of the property is proposed to be painted in the same manner as the primary structure. The shake siding is proposed to be painted a dark gray (Peppercorn); doors and windows (mullions and muntins only) a medium burgundy (Cerise); and trim an off white (Origami White). According to the Historic Dublin Design Guidelines, the proposed paint for the shake siding is darker and richer than is typical for a traditional mid-19th century commercial building, and the number of colors proposed typically would not have occurred on a building built in the mid-19th century. However, it was not uncommon to see three colors used on structures built starting in the early 1860s. Staff is recommending that the applicant choose the Origami White color for the entirety of the windows, doors, overhead garage door and trim details, much like the existing conditions of the site. Staff has reviewed the application against the applicable criteria and recommends approval with one condition.

Applicant Presentation

Amelia Jeffers, property owner, 54. S. High Street, Dublin, OH, expressed a desire for the Board to approve the exterior paint, as proposed. There are other buildings in the District of a similar era with three-color paint schemes. The proposed paint scheme was selected for the ease of long-term maintenance. White windows and doors would be difficult to keep clean over time. In addition, the Cerise color would add contrast to the exterior of the building.

Linda Kick, Our Cupcakery, tenant, 54 S. High Street, Dublin, OH, stated that she believes the proposed colors complement the sign that was approved earlier in this meeting, and reiterated the property owner's concerns regarding the difficulty with maintenance of a white door in this location.

Board members requested clarification regarding the existing requirements and guidelines concerning the proposed paint colors.

Staff indicated that although a revised color palette for the Historic District has been reviewed by the Board, it has not yet been adopted; therefore, the existing Historic Dublin Design Guidelines would be utilized in considering this application.

The Board expressed general support for the application of three colors, but indicated a concern that the window trim might not accommodate a two-tone paint scheme. White trim would provide a better contrast to the peppercorn color. Board consensus was that the Cerise paint color should be utilized for the front door to provide contrast, vibrancy and alleviate maintenance concerns.

Board members requested clarification of the intent regarding the window shutters.

The applicant indicated that the shutters had been removed for maintenance with the intent of reinstallation. The Board indicated that because the shutters were not historic to the building, it was not necessary that they be reinstalled.

The applicant indicated a preference not to reinstall.

Public Comment

No public comment was received on this case.

Board Discussion

Ms. Bryan inquired if the applicant had any objection to the revised conditions.
Ms. Jeffers responded that they had no objection.

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

- 1) That the applicant choose the Cerise color for the front door and Origami White for the window and trim details, subject to staff approval.
- 2) That the applicant not re-install the shutters on either side of the front door.

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

4. 143 S. High Street, 20-140ARB-Demo, Demolition

Ms. Bryan stated that this is a request for demolition of a single-family, 1,300-square-foot home and detached garage on a 0.25-acre site southwest of the intersection of S. High Street with John Wright Lane and zoned Bridge Street District Historic Residential.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Martin stated that this is a request for review and approval of a proposed demolition request of an existing single-family home on a 0.25-acre parcel located within Historic Dublin. The site is located southwest of the intersection of S. High Street and John Wright Lane. On April 23, 2014, the ARB reviewed and approved demolition of the existing structure with the condition that demolition not occur until approval of a new single-family residence. ARB Board Orders are only valid for one year from date of issuance. At the time, the Board discussed the importance of a compatible scale for new construction. Additionally, the Board encouraged a detached garage with courtyard access, or a rear access layout. This previous approval has since expired and requires a new demolition approval from the ARB. On June 3, 2020, the ARB informally reviewed and provided non-binding feedback on a potential future application for demolition of an existing home and detached garage, and for construction of a new one-and-a-half-story, ±4,000-square-foot residence with a three-car garage. The Board supported the demolition of the existing structure and construction of a new single-family home. On July 22, 2020, the ARB informally reviewed and provided non-binding feedback on revisions and refinements to the proposed new construction project, including site layout and architectural details. The applicant is now seeking approval for demolition of the existing single-family home on the site in preparation for the new construction home. The applicant has provided photos of the existing conditions from 2014, particularly of the interior. Since the demolition approval in 2014, the home has seen significant further deterioration. Staff has reviewed the application and recommends approval with one condition.

Applicant Presentation

Lance Schneier, 5455 Muirfield Ct., Dublin, Ohio stated the condition of the home has deteriorated since 2014, and now includes animal infestation. Photographs were included with the application. He appreciates the Board's consideration of their demolition request.

Board Discussion

The Board had no additional questions or discussion.

Ms. Kramb moved, Mr. Kownacki seconded to approve the request for Demolition with the following condition:

- 1) Demolition permit shall not be issued by the City until ARB approval of improvements to the lot as part of an associated application.

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

5. 143 S. High Street, 20-137MPR/WR, Minor Project Review with a Waiver Review

Ms. Bryan stated that this is a request for the construction of a new, single-family, ±4,000-square-foot residence with a three-car attached garage on a 0.25-acre site southwest of the intersection of S. High Street with John Wright Lane and zoned Bridge Street District Historic Residential.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Martin stated that this is a request for review and approval for the construction of a one-and-a-half-story, ±4,000-square-foot residence with a three-car attached garage. The 0.25-acre site is southwest of the intersection of S. High Street and John Wright Lane. After obtaining the Architectural Review Board's (ARB) input on June 3, 2020 and July 22, 2020, the applicant is seeking approval of final design for the construction of a one-and-a-half-story, ±4,000 square-foot residence with a three-car attached garage.

Background

On June 3, 2020, the ARB informally reviewed and provided non-binding feedback on a potential future application for demolition of an existing home and detached garage, and for construction of a new one-and-a-half-story, ±4,000-square-foot residence with a three-car garage. The Board supported the demolition of the existing structure and construction of a new single-family home. Additionally, the Board expressed support for the conceptual architectural character, specifically the gabled ell along S. High Street. The Board also supported encroachment into the required setback along John Wright Lane. The Board expressed concern with the total lot coverage and total footprint of the home. The Board encouraged the mass of the home along John Wright Lane to be broken down. The Board suggested a detached garage as a potential design solution. On July 22, 2020, the ARB informally reviewed and provided non-binding feedback on a revised proposal for a future application. The Board expressed continuing concerns with the total lot coverage, number of exterior materials, and the mass and scale of the attached garage. The applicant has worked to address the feedback including reducing lot coverage, modifying the mass and scale of the attached garage, and reducing the complexity of materials.

Proposal

In July, the footprint of the home was reduced by 171 square feet. The home will be set back from John Wright Lane approximately 4.5 feet. Additionally, the patio along the south side of the home has been reduced in size from approximately 487 to 148 square feet. With the reduction of hard surfaces, the applicant has been able to reduce lot coverage significantly. The Code identifies required setbacks by street based on existing context and character, and the Historic Dublin Design Guidelines recommend that homes be sited in a contextually sensitive manner. Staff recommends approval of a Waiver to permit the corner lot to have one front yard, two side yards, and one rear yard. Lot coverage is defined per the more specific regulation identified in the BSD Code, and not as in the general Definitions. The combined square footage of all principal and accessory structures and impervious surfaces shall not exceed 50% of the lot area, unless otherwise approved by the ARB. In June and July, the Board's feedback indicated they were not supportive of a potential Waiver to exceed lot coverage requirements of 50 percent. The applicant has revised the plans to reduce the lot coverage from 62.3 to 48.1 percent impervious surfaces plus 7.9 percent semi-pervious surfaces for a total of 56.1 percent lot coverage. The final proposed lot coverage is 49.8 percent impervious, which meets the Code requirement. The long side of the home along John Wright Lane, which is broken up by several gable roof sections, has been revised to modify the garage roofline, further differentiating it from the primary home. Additionally, a shed roof provides an additional architectural step down on the west side of the garage. The modifications to the garage successfully reduce the mass and scale.

Architecture

The refinements to the proposal include a reduction in the number of exterior materials and the elimination of brick masonry. The proposed exterior materials include horizontal, shake, and board and batten siding; limestone veneer; dove gray metal standing-seam roof; wood/clad double-hung windows; raised panel shutters with hardware; and carriage-style garage doors. The applicant should select a front door consistent with the proposed elevations, subject to staff approval. The applicant has reduced the complexity of the south elevation adjacent to the master suite to eliminate the convergence of multiple architectural elements. The east elevation is a limestone veneer clad gabled ell form with a centrally located entry with arched detail and covered porch with several columns consisting of 6x6 posts with wrap and built-up molding. The proposed roof is a dove gray 16-inch panel standing seam roof with 1-inch seams. Stacked two-over-two windows are proposed. The windows were previously indicated to be charcoal or espresso in color; however, staff and the Board have previously expressed concern with black or dark brown windows on primarily white structures. The windows are proposed to have limestone lintels and sills. A centrally located shed dormer with three square two-over-two windows is proposed to be finished in straight-edge shake LP siding painted white. The north elevation is an elongated addition to the primary form, which is broken down by a series of gabled roofs. The complexity of materials along the north façade has been reduced to eliminate the brick foundation, and the horizontal siding. The elevation includes a prominent limestone veneer chimney with limestone cap and clay flue. The façade of each open-end side gable roof is proposed to have a unique treatment (east to west): limestone veneer, white straight edge shake siding, and warm gray, 16-inch spaced, board and batten siding. The color of the garage should be revised to be a soft, light gray; the shutter detail has been eliminated from the garage to provide greater simplicity. The north elevation provides a pedestrian guest entrance from the driveway. The consultant noted that the garage is proposed to have three different roof pitches, and there may be an opportunity to simplify the design further. Staff believes the benefit of the step-down toward the east outweighs the variation in roof pitches. The west elevation provides a side-loaded, three-car garage clad in warm gray board and batten siding and three carriage style garage doors. A shed dormer, similar to the front façade, accommodates additional livable space above the garage. The south elevation, similar to the north elevation, is an elongated addition to the primary form, which is broken down by a series of gabled roofs separated by two covered, at-grade patios. The brick chimney has been eliminated from the elevation. The façade of each open-end side gable roof is proposed to have a unique treatment (east to west): limestone veneer, white straight edge shake siding, and warm gray board and batten siding. A stone foundation is proposed across the extent of the home. The central side gable façade is typified by a large window wall protrusion with transom windows and a shed roof.

Staff has reviewed the revised proposal against the applicable criteria and recommends approval with six conditions.

Applicant Presentation

Lance Schneier, 5455 Muirfield Ct., Dublin, OH, stated they have made revisions in response to the Board's feedback from the previous meeting, including lot coverage.

Rich Taylor, Architect, 48 S. High Street, Dublin, OH, stated that the design has been revised as outlined in staff's presentation. The exterior materials are simplified; the lot coverage is further reduced; and the garage mass has been reduced. They appreciate the previous input provided by the Board with the two Informal Reviews. The feedback provided was very helpful, and they believe the result reflects that process.

Public Comments

Debbi Bergwall, 7515 Ross Avenue, Dublin, OH 43017:

"I really like the look of this house and think it will make an excellent addition to the homes on South High Street. Having driven by the house currently at this address it is an obvious improvement. I like the style that

appears to be stone and shake siding and metal roof. I am excited to see all of the new homes being constructed where run-down homes once stood. It is a win for Downtown Dublin.”

Tom Heinmiller, 155 S. High Street, Dublin, OH 43017:

“I live at 155 S. High Street Dublin Ohio 43017. My wife and I are excited about having the building next store finally removed and replaced. We have reviewed the plans and had discussion with the new owners. We approve and support what they are planning to do. We believe it will be an asset to the neighborhood and good for us as well. We have been reluctant to invest in our property, believing that the property next to us would keep us from being able to get any return on that investment. The plans we have seen have spurred us to get back to work on restoring our home. We encourage the board to approve this project.”

Denise King, 170 S. Riverview Street, Dublin, OH 43017:

“I support the demolition of the existing home at 143 S. High St. The only image for the proposed replacement is a single side drawing without dimensions but given the petite size of the lot, .25 acres, the home appears to ignore the carefully crafted and community consensus driven code for the Historic District. In short, it appears to be too large for the lot and does not respect set back, greenspace (no, pervious drives are not greenspace), and scale for the Historic District. If the applicant wants that much house, build it on a larger lot outside the Historic District. Thank you.”

Tim and Cindy Picciano, 4482 Dunleary Drive, Dublin, OH 43017:

“We are residents of Donegal Cliffs and owners of the Dublin Village Tavern (DVT). The design looks very good from the Historic Dublin perspective. As the owners of the DVT, we desire to make sure that the historic elements of the District are maintained to the extent possible. Mr. Taylor has always honored that policy in his business dealings with the District. We are in favor of this design and recommend it be accepted.”

Mike Steele, 138 S. High Street, Dublin, OH 43017:

“As owners of the commercial building at 138 S. High Street since 2005, my wife and I are particularly interested in the houses that are being built close by. This house is directly across the street from my office on South High Street. Another new house is being constructed two lots south of us, which has similar external facades. We have reviewed the architectural drawings and are very comfortable with what has been proposed.”

Board Discussion

Board members acknowledged the two Informal Reviews were helpful. Some Board members expressed support for the revisions, and thanked the applicant for reducing the lot coverage. Other Board members expressed concern that while the proposal meets lot coverage, the building coverage represents a significant portion of the lot coverage, which far exceeds homes elsewhere in the district. Several Board members shared concern that the home is still too large particularly along John Wright Lane.

The applicant stated that the proposed home is located next to a commercial parking lot, which is notably different from other residential properties.

Board members noted that because the home is sited particularly close to John Wright Lane, approval of a Waiver is required.

Mr. Schneier responded that in their interpretation of the Code, a waiver of the Lot and Block standards is not necessary, because the application of two front yards is inconsistent with how setbacks have been interpreted and applied throughout the district.

Board members noted that the requirement would be clarified with the proposed ARB Code Amendment. The Board expressed appreciation of the simplification of the exterior material selections. Concerns remained that the proposed plan did not meet the mass and scale requirements.

Ms. Bryan moved, Mr. Cotter seconded to approve the following waiver:

- 1) South High Street be designated a front property line, and John Wright Lane and the south property line be designated side property lines.

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

Ms. Bryan inquired if the applicant was in agreement with the four conditions.
The applicant indicated that they had no objection to the proposed conditions.

Ms. Kramb moved, Mr. Kownacki seconded approval of the Minor Project with the following four conditions:

- 1) The applicant select a front door, consistent with the proposed elevations, subject to staff approval.
- 2) The shutters be revised to be a simple flat panel shutter.
- 3) Final paint/exterior colors for siding, windows, doors, and garage doors be selected, subject to staff approval.
- 4) The applicant select final fixtures, subject to staff approval.

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

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

Ms. Bryan stated that this is a request for amendments to Section 153.076 of the City of Dublin Zoning Code to provide regulations for enforcement procedures and additional property maintenance regulations.

Staff Report

Ms. Noble stated that Planning and Zoning Commission informally reviewed the draft Code modification regarding property maintenance on August 20, 2020. The Commission provided significant feedback on enforcement action regarding vacant structures, desiring to ensure vacant structures would be subject to the enforcement process only if they met one of the eight conditions as defined in the Definitions section. They also requested that an "Exemption" section be added to Section 153.076 to include buildings: under construction with valid building permits; that have suffered severe weather conditions; that are for sale for a period of up to twelve months; or by request of a property owner for reasons unspecified in the previous conditions. The Commission also addressed enforcement procedures, which are outlined in Administrative Order 8.5. A reference to the AO has been added in the section identified as "Penalties and Enforcement." On August 23, 2020, the Architectural Review Board reviewed the same information. The Board also discussed the term "vacant," and concurred that the term was an industry-wide term used to identify properties that only in certain circumstances should be subjected to enforcement measures. Consequently, language has been added under the term "vacant" that the property must meet one of eight conditions, as outlined in the Definitions section, to be subjected to enforcement procedures. Similarly, the Architectural Review Board requested exemption provisions be included in the proposed amendment. The updated draft includes these revisions for the Board's final review tonight and recommendation of consideration to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Board Discussion

The Board reviewed the proposed draft and recommended minor clarifications and corrections, including: any references to a registration process should be omitted; requirements should be written as direct statements; extraneous verbiage should be eliminated and punctuation reviewed.

Staff indicated that all the revisions would be incorporated into a final draft for the Planning and Zoning Commission's review and recommendation to City Council.

Ms. Kramb moved, Mr. Kownacki seconded to recommend to Planning and Zoning Commission review of the proposed amendment to Public Nuisance Code Section (153.076) and recommendation of approval to City Council.

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

COMMUNICATIONS

- The next regular meeting of the ARB is scheduled for October 28, 2020.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

Kathleen Bryan
Chair, Architectural Review Board

Judith K. Beal
Deputy Clerk of Council