



MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, October 28, 2020

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Bryan called the October 28, 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 Public Comment prior to Board review and discussion. 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 and 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, Mr. Kownacki, Ms. Bryan and Ms. Kramb
Staff present: Ms. Rauch, Ms. Martin, Mr. Boggs, Mr. Ridge, Mr. Hounshell

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Kownacki moved, Ms. Kramb seconded to accept the documents into the record and approve the September 23, 2020 meeting minutes.

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

CONSENT CASES

Ms. Bryan stated that two cases were scheduled on the Consent Agenda, and inquired if any Board member wished to move them to the regular agenda for discussion. No member requested to do so.

1. Kne Residence, 55 S. Riverview Street, 19-094ARB-MPR - Extension

A request for a six-month extension of a previously approved Board Order for Case 19-094ARB-MPR for an addition to a detached garage on a 0.40-acre site zoned Bridge Street District Historic Residential, southwest of the intersection of S. Riverview Street with Spring Hill Lane.

Mr. Kownacki moved, Ms. Kramb seconded to approve the six-month extension.

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

[Motion carried 5-0]

4. Magnolia at 119 S. High Street, 20-152ARB-MPR, Minor Project Review

A request for the installation of a 5.5-square-foot projecting sign for an existing tenant space zoned Bridge Street District Historic South, located west of S. High Street, approximately 125 feet north of the intersection with John Wright Lane.

Ms. Bryan inquired if the applicant had any objection to the proposed conditions. The applicant indicated they had no objection.

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

- 1) The applicant remove the existing non-conforming sign post prior to issuance of a new sign permit.
- 2) The applicant revise the sign design to provide .5-inch relief for the border and copy of the sign to add dimensionality to the proposed sign, subject to staff approval.

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

[Motion carried 5-0]

CASES

2. Bechert Residence at 156 S. High Street, 20-155INF, Informal Review

Ms. Bryan stated that this is a request for feedback on the proposed construction of a two-story, single-family home on a 0.24-acre site zoned Bridge Street District Historic Residential, located east of S. High Street, approximately 100 feet south of the intersection with John Wright Lane.

STAFF PRESENTATION

History

Mr. Ridge stated that that on February 27, 2019, ARB provided an Informal Review of this site, 156 S. High, and the adjacent 158 S. High site. The proposal was for demolition of the existing structure and the construction of three residential units. On June 24, 2019, ARB approved the demolition and informally reviewed a proposal for two single-family homes. On September 25, 2019, the ARB approved a new single-family home for 158 S. High Street, and that construction has begun. A previous applicant came before the Architectural Review Board on the same date with a proposal for

a new, approximately 2,350-square-foot home for 156 S. High Street. The proposed 1.5-story home was approved at that meeting; however, the applicant did not move forward with the approved plans. This is a request for review and informal feedback from a new applicant on a new proposal for the site.

Site Layout

The proposed site layout retains vehicular access on the north side of the site. The driveway accesses a side-loaded, three-car garage at the north side and rear of the home, with a turnaround area provided for maneuverability. The L-shaped home will be oriented toward the south property line and is proposed to be set back 15 feet from S. High Street, in line with the minimum front yard setback. The proposal includes a large deck at the rear of the home and a porch on the front of the home. The applicant is also proposing a stone wall along the S. High Street property line. The siting of the primary structure maintains a large open space in the rear yard. The lot coverage is proposed to be approximately 43 percent, where 50 percent is permitted.

Proposal

The proposal is for an approximately 3,300-square-foot, two-story, single-family home. The west, front façade along S. High Street is typified by its front gable form and crenulations in elevation, overlapping rooflines, and a prominent front porch. The roof of the porch appears to be sheathed in a metal standing seam material, while the rest of the roof is covered in an asphalt shingle.

On the west elevation, a variety of window styles is proposed, including: ganged two-over-two windows on the second floor; single two-over-two windows with transom and shutters on the first floor; and an oval bullseye window located above the front entry on the second story. Decorative finials on the roof and a pendant light on the porch are proposed. The first story will be clad in stone and the second story clad in a shake shingle material. The stone is carried to the front property line, where the applicant is proposing the installation of a stonewall along the S. High Street frontage. The plans show stone piers on either side of the driveway and the front entry sidewalk. The applicant is also proposing a wooden front entry gate, supported by wood posts capped with ball post caps. The consultant recommended removing the double windows in favor of single windows; removing the bullseye window, decorative finials, and pendant light on the front porch; and ensuring the proposed stone wall is comprised of a dry-laid, locally quarried limestone, similar to those located south of this site.

The north, side elevation contains two prominent side gables. The elevation contains a deep front porch with a diamond-paned glass window; a bay window on the gable closest to S. High Street; an overhang which covers a pedestrian entry just west of the two-car garage; a large bay window and wall of windows on the second side gable form; and a large raised deck at the rear of the home. The applicant is proposing a stone water table on this elevation, with shake siding on the majority of the elevation.

The south, side elevation contains two prominent side gable forms, a stone water table; that stone is carried to the rear of the home where the applicant is proposing a full two-story chimney clad in stone. The majority of the south elevation is clad in shake siding, with the easternmost gable clad in vertical board and batten to match the north elevation. The applicant is proposing a cupola with a height of nearly 40 feet from established grade, which is approximately five feet taller than Code permits. The architectural consultant recommends redesigning and realigning windows for a simpler

pattern across the elevations; removing some historicism, such as the diamond-paned windows, and relocating and reducing the size of the chimney.

The east elevation contains a combination side and front gable, which forms the rear portion of the home, and is clad in a combination of vertical board and batten and shake siding. The front gable contains a series of two-over-two windows with transom. The consultant recommended an over-all redesign of this elevation to be more compatible with adjacent building forms.

Staff has provided the following questions to guide 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 home?
3. Does the Board support the conceptual architectural character and details of the home?

Applicant Presentation

Greg Bechert, 156 S. High Street, Dublin, OH, stated that he has no additional presentation but is available to answer questions.

Board Questions

Mr. Cotter inquired the proposed height of the structure.

Mr. Ridge stated that the front elevation will be 34 feet in height, although it has been incorrectly measured. Per Code, the height should be measured at the midpoint of the eaves. The height at the cupola is approximately 40 feet.

Ms. Martin clarified that the height is measured from the established grade to the midpoint of the eaves. That dimension is not reflected on the conceptual elevation provided with the meeting materials. The applicant provided the overall heights to the peak of the roof.

Mr. Alexander inquired if Dublin's Zoning Code specifies where the measurement should be taken on sites with slopes. Can it be measured from any location or at the primary elevation on the street front? This could impact whether a variance is required.

Ms. Martin responded that her understanding is that it should be measured from grade for the street-facing elevation and the rear elevation.

Mr. Cotter stated that from the rear, the front gable appears to be too high. Should it be 35 feet, looking from the rear?

Ms. Martin responded that it should not.

Mr. Cotter inquired if the cupola was the only element that would be measured from the rear grade.

Ms. Martin responded that the cupola and the entire rear elevation would be measured from the rear grade.

Mr. Alexander stated that previously, staff submitted a proposal to add stonewalls along this street. What is the status of that project, and could it conflict with this proposal?

Ms. Rauch responded that due to concerns raised by ARB during that review, staff is currently re-evaluating the design of that project. That earlier proposal did not include this side of the street, however, or at least not until a later undetermined date.

Ms. Martin noted that the City project did not extend this far south.

Mr. Alexander inquired what is the ceiling height on the first floor of the street elevation.

Tim Carr, T. Walton Carr Architects, Dublin, Ohio, responded that the height is 10 feet from floor to ceiling; the second floor is 9 feet, floor to ceiling.

Mr. Kownacki inquired if the material proposed for the north and south facades is board and batten.

Mr. Ridge responded that it is board and batten.

Mr. Kownacki inquired the number of proposed materials.

Mr. Ridge responded that there are three materials -- stone, shake siding and board and batten. No brick is used.

Public Comment

There were no public comments.

Board Discussion

The Board provided input re. the discussion questions.

1. Does the Board support the proposed site layout?

Mr. Cotter stated that he believes the proposed layout is acceptable. It fits within the context of the surrounding sites.

Ms. Kramb stated that the proposed layout is appropriate with the required setbacks. She is concerned with the grade of the driveway. With the adjacent site, which has a similar grade, there was need for a retaining wall. She has no objection to the stonewall, if it is dry-laid stone with the bookshelf top to match the historic stone walls within the area.

Mr. Kownacki and Ms. Bryan stated that they had similar concerns with the stonewall matching the historic stonewalls in the District and with the driveway grade.

Mr. Alexander stated that this is one of the most logical site layouts that the Board has seen. Residents within this District have expressed that they want the backs of these properties open and to retain the open space across the properties. This project will achieve that. The slope of this driveway seems to be more gradual than other proposals the ARB has reviewed. The garage is in the right location, and the stonewall is a nice gesture. He is comfortable with the proposed site layout.

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

Mr. Cotter stated that it is difficult to assess the 35-ft. height of the roofline with the surrounding homes, which are set at grade. Because the front porch on this home will be a few feet above grade, the front façade with three gables will appear to be noticeably higher and out of scale with the surrounding structures. From the side (north and south) elevations, the mass and scale appear more appropriate. He is not opposed to the proposed two stories, but the front elevation appears out of context with the surrounding area.

Mr. Alexander stated that he agrees with Mr. Cotter. The consultant seems to have "cherry picked" houses with which to compare the proposed structure. He does not have an issue with the proposed two stories, but he is concerned with the height. There are two existing two-story homes nearby, and he would suggest using the height of the red house across the street as the height limit. With

that structure, the fascia was lowered to the top of the windows to help lower the height. There are ways to do so here, as well – perhaps by reducing the number of steps off grade or reducing the floor to ceiling height at the front of the structure. It is possible to retain the two-story look without it being as tall as proposed. He does not agree with the consultant in terms of the massing at the back of the structure. Continuity is established while the masses are broken down. The mass of the house should break down from the front to the rear, and the massing, front to back, is very nice. The only issue is the height, which is measured at the cupola.

Ms. Kramb stated that she agrees that the height is an issue. Perhaps the pitch of the roof could be lowered. There are ways to tweak the two-story design to make it appear lower, or the design could be changed to 1.5 stories. She does not recall the height of the home that is being constructed on the site next to this home. Because of that proximity, when this project returns for consideration, the Board will need to know the height of the structure being built next to it. The overall height of this structure should be in context with the surrounding buildings, including the two nearby two-story homes across and further down the street. The proposed height is the only issue; eliminating the cupola would be another way to reduce the height.

Mr. Kownacki stated that he agrees that the new structure to be built next to this will need to be considered in assessing the scale and massing of this home.

Ms. Bryan stated that she concurs with the comments that have been made. It will be important for this applicant to view the plans of the new house next to it. In the past, there has been an issue with the dining room window of one home looking into the window of the home on the adjacent lot. To avoid that issue here, they will need to look at the window placement on the other structure.

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

Mr. Cotter stated that a number of materials are proposed for the building facades. Because the other homes within this area have only one or two materials, he would recommend simplification of the proposed materials to fit with the character of the surrounding neighborhood. If this house were at grade, it would lower the mass and have a cleaner line.

Mr. Alexander stated that he is concerned about the need for a simple vernacular design. The bulls-eye and diamond windows; the material change in the gables; the arch and the slope of the roof on the porch; and the finials on the roof are not consistent with a simple vernacular design. If those details were simplified or removed, the house would be more consistent with the simple vernacular tradition. He has no objection to the use of multiple materials, because ARB has approved the use of multiple materials for other new homes. In fact, they are better composed here than in some of the other cases. Ganged windows have been approved very recently, so it would be unfair not to approve them here. There is continuity of window type, which helps to unify the elevation. The simple box bay windows are well composed and also have been approved in previous projects. Everything seems well selected except the deck railing system, which is too contemporary for a traditional style home. Overall, the design elements are very well composed; he compliments the architect.

Mr. Kramb stated that she has no objection to any particular architectural element, but there are too many and need to be simplified. They should pick the theme wanted, keep those elements and

eliminate those that are not compatible with the architectural type selected. The cupola could be eliminated, and the rear deck is too modern for a traditional design.

Mr. Kownacki stated that he likes the cupola, but included with everything else, the design is too "busy." He has no issue with board and batten, but it is becoming very vogue.

Mr. Bryan stated she agrees that the design should be simplified. She inquired if the applicant had any questions or comments.

Mr. Carr explained that the issue driving the height is the grade. To avoid having to change the grade, a 9-foot basement has been proposed. That has resulted in a front porch with five instead of three front steps. The height limit is 35 feet. Is the Board requesting that the height be consistent with the house across the street and the house on the adjacent lot?

Ms. Bryan responded that is the recommendation. Context is critical, and this home should not appear to be sitting higher than the surrounding homes.

Mr. Carr noted that the cupola is six feet taller than the peak on which it sits and has been designed to be reminiscent of an old barn; he has attempted to keep its height lower than the main ridge of the front façade. Finally, board and batten material has been used for many years, and because it has historical reference, he does not believe it is reflective of a trend. However, the same general contractor is building this home and the one on the adjacent site, so it will not be difficult to identify the ridge height of the other home.

Mr. Alexander stated that this applicant should not be penalized because two other new homes in the neighborhood have 1.5 story expressions at the front. There are a couple of other structures that do have a prominent height, and this home should be evaluated within that context.

Public Comments

There were no public comments.

3. Tucci's at 35 N. High Street, 20-175INF, Informal Review

Ms. Bryan stated that this is a request for feedback on the proposed construction of an approximately 215-square-foot, wine room addition to an existing restaurant on a .23-acre site zoned Bridge Street District Historic Core, located west of N. High Street and approximately 150 feet south of North Street.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Martin stated that this is a request for informal review and feedback for a property located on the west side of North High Street, zoned BSD-HC: Bridge Street District – Historic Core. The surrounding commercial development reflects a variety of architectural styles. The site is developed with a single-story building constructed in 1955, which was converted to a restaurant in 1997. The single-story restaurant building is located in the western portion of the site with a patio in the eastern portion, along N. High Street. Wing Hill is located to the south of the restaurant, and a City-owned parcel containing a pedestrian walkway is located to the north. The existing building has an irregular footprint with an L-plan, cross-gable core and additions to the rear. The construction is concrete block with brick veneer along the south and east façades. A flat roof porch defines the

main entry along the east façade. The architecture is vernacular in character and does not represent any single style. The applicant is proposing to expand the existing wine room north of the building with an approximately 215-square foot building addition. The north elevation of the building is proposed to be modified. The proposed architectural style of the addition is a lean-to shed roof addition clad in vertical cedar board and batten siding painted to match the existing structure. The applicant is also proposing two trellis accents and new landscaping to soften the appearance of the addition from the public walkway. The roof will match that of the existing building. Should a formal application be pursued, the applicant will need to work with the City to purchase a portion of the property required for the addition, and preliminary discussions have occurred. The pedestrian walkway and connectivity will be maintained with the proposed improvements.

Staff has suggested the following informal review questions:

- 1) Does the Board support the location of the proposed addition?
- 2) Does the Board support the proposed mass and scale of the addition?
- 3) Does the Board support the proposed character including the conceptual building materials and landscaping?

Applicant Presentation

Craig Barnum, Tucci's at 35 N. High Street, Dublin, OH, stated that Tucci's is a very wine-centric restaurant. The existing wine cellar is extremely small. Currently, they must keep coolers and cases of wine in the garage; the wine cannot be kept in a temperature-controlled environment. This addition to the existing wine cellar will increase the capacity up to 20,000 bottles. The addition will be made architecturally pleasing. Guests will be able to enter the wine cellar and select the wine they desire. The site is on City property, and, although not officially approved, City Council has expressed support for the proposed purchase of the property. He would like to have the Board's informal feedback before filing a formal application for the development.

Board Discussion

- 1) *Does the Board support the location of the proposed addition?*

Mr. Cotter inquired if staff anticipates a future need for a variance.

Ms. Martin responded that there may need for a waiver, but until the property is purchased, the property line is uncertain. It is a priority to maintain the existing pedestrian connectivity.

Mr. Cotter inquired if there will be a need for new HVAC in this addition.

Mr. Barnum responded that it will be necessary to add a cooling unit to be able to keep the wine cellar at 50 degrees. The existing cooling unit is insufficient for the increased capacity.

Mr. Cotter inquired if the location of the units will be the same as the existing location.

Mr. Barnum responded that at this time, he is uncertain.

Mr. Cotter stated that he does not see an issue with the proposed location of the addition.

Ms. Krumb stated that she has no objection to the proposed location, as long as the pedestrian location is maintained.

Mr. Alexander stated that he has no objection to the proposed location, massing and scale.

Mr. Kownacki stated that he has no objections. He would recommend that the mechanicals be kept away from the street view.

Ms. Bryan indicated that she was supportive of the location, as well.

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

Board members expressed support of the proposed mass and scale.

3) *Does the Board support the proposed character including the conceptual building materials and landscaping?*

Ms. Krumb stated that the existing bushes will be removed. When the application returns for Board review, she would like to see the final landscaping plan and how the additional mechanicals will be screened. Currently, the large AEP power box is not screened, but it would be good if that could be screened somewhat, as well.

Mr. Barnum stated all the existing landscape is on City property and maintained by the City. There is a large volume of pedestrian traffic on that sidewalk, so it is in his best interest that the landscaping be attractive. They have worked in partnership with the City and added flowers within the area. Whatever he plants in the future would, as well, be on City property.

Mr. Alexander stated that he sees no need for a trellis. It would be difficult to maintain the painted surface behind if there are mature plantings on the trellis.

Mr. Barnum stated that the trellis element was added by the architect; he would prefer not to have it.

Mr. Alexander stated that adding two more vertical landscaping elements should be satisfactory. Board members were supportive of that suggestion.

Ms. Krumb stated that screening the electrical box is more important.

Mr. Barnum stated that those are City utilities, but he would be willing to partner with the City on the screening needs.

5. Gardenia Market at 16-22 N. High Street, 20-164ARB-MPR, Minor Project Review

Ms. Bryan stated that this is a request for the approval of the installation of a lattice fence and overhead lighting for an existing tenant space zoned Bridge Street District Historic Core, northeast of the intersection of N. High Street with West Bridge Street.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Hounshell stated that this is a request for review and approval for a Minor Project Review of the property at 16 and 22 N. High Street, which are located on the same parcel. In September 2019, the Architectural Review Board conditionally approved site modifications and exterior modifications to both 16-22 N. High Street. The improvements approved included a roof replacement, façade improvements, window replacements, and a new brick-paved path between the buildings leading into a courtyard space to the rear of 16 N. High Street. With the approved site plan, a condition applied to the proposed lattice fencing on the site that required the applicant to update the lattice to a more durable material such as metal or cedar wood. In 2019, the Architectural Review Board

(ARB) approved an application for site and building improvements for both buildings on the site. The building improvements that have been made include roof replacement, window and door replacements and new exterior paint. These improvements were included in the Façade Improvement Grant that was awarded to the applicant to complete the building improvements. The applicant had previously indicated their hope to apply for a second grant to help cover the remaining site improvements; however, the Façade Improvement Grant has since been suspended due to COVID restrictions. In July 2020, Code Enforcement was notified of additional site improvements not approved by the ARB that had been located on the site, including a food trailer stationed and stored on site; outdoor dining spaces; additional lighting and sandwich board signs; and a lattice screening fence. The applicant has come into compliance with most of the items of concern but is requesting authorization for the existing string lighting and lattice fence to remain on the site. The string lighting is in the alley between 16 and 22 North High Street. It is identical in design to the alley lighting that was proposed in September 2019. The sole difference is that this lighting has interchangeable colors. Approval is also requested for the existing six-foot tall lattice fence, which is made of 4-ft. by 8-ft. wooden lattice panels connected to 4-inch by 4-inch wood posts. The fence height is six feet with a two-foot gap below the lattice panels. The fence is located three feet from the southern property line, which meets the setback requirements for this building type. The Historic Dublin Design Guidelines specifically addresses fences within the Historic District and states that fences are appropriate in the District as long as the design and materials are appropriate for the District. It also states that any wooden fence shall use paint or a stain for wood, rather than leaving it natural. In terms of materials and designs, lattice fences are not specified within the text of the Guidelines. Typically, traditional fencing is recommended; however, there are exceptions, should the Board find them appropriate. Staff has included four conditions for approval, based on the Dublin Design Guidelines.

Applicant Presentation

Eric Ward, property owner, 16-22 N. High Street, Dublin, stated that they have no additional presentation and have no objections to the proposed conditions, other than the staining of the fence. It was their understanding that Code does not require the fence be stained. They prefer the unfinished look, and staining would be an additional cost. The lighting is identical to that which they requested last year, except that the colors are adjustable through remote control.

Mr. Hounshell responded that the Code does not require the fence to be stained; it is recommended in the Historic Dublin Design Guidelines. It is the Board's purview to determine if they agree with that recommendation.

Board Questions

Ms. Krumb inquired if a fence was approved or had been installed without approval. It is her understanding that a fence must be metal or cedar.

Mr. Hounshell responded that at the ARB's September 25, 2019 review, the Board approved a lattice fence as a decorative feature around the proposed courtyard patio; the current location was not approved. Staff has been working with the applicant in an attempt to bring the fence into compliance; because they were unable to do so, this request was submitted for the Board's review and consideration.

Ms. Bryan clarified that the lattice fence was installed without Board request or approval. The lattice fencing approved was for something entirely different. She does not agree that the Historic Dublin Design Guidelines are only suggestions; they provide significant guidance.

Mr. Kramb stated that there is a practical reason that the wood must be stained or painted -- it will last longer. Otherwise, it will look unsightly within two years.

Mr. Ward noted that treated lumber is intended not to need paint or staining for a certain length of time.

Mr. Kramb responded that in time, it would fade, stain and require painting.

Ms. Bryan inquired if the lights are colored and twinkling.

Marvic Titus, business owner, 16 N. High Street, Dublin, responded that there is ability to make the lights twinkle, as well as change the colors.

Ms. Bryan stated that it was her understanding that the earlier application requested white lights.

Ms. Titus responded that no color of lighting was specified.

Ms. Bryan stated that, therefore, the Board has neither approved or disapproved colored lights.

Public Comment

Michael Maloof, 6308 Wyler Ct , Dublin, OH 43016:

"I would like to ask that they complete the fence all the way to intersect with my building at 16 E. Bridge St. The activities they have going on have created issues and complaints from the tenants that people are parking on our property and walking to the rear of this property. They also cut across the property to get to the back instead of walking around to the front or rear of their building. They have also complained that the restaurant has been using the dumpster. I think if they continued the fence to close off the property it would help."

Mr. Ward responded that the owner of that property gave them permission to use his dumpster. Initially, it was a friendly agreement. The food truck, which has been removed, was the cause of most of the problems.

Ms. Titus noted that part of the problem, as well, was the fact that they had to close their alley. That alley, which is their private property and not public access, had previously been used by Domino Pizza customers picking up pizza and by Domino Pizza employees to "hang out" during their breaks. Because of certain undesirable activities of those individuals, it was necessary for them to send a letter to the store owner regarding the issues.

Board Discussion

Ms. Kramb stated that the existing lattice fence is not appropriate. ARB would not approve a lattice fence anywhere in the Historic District. Perhaps they could utilize a landscaping fence/screening to achieve their purpose.

Mr. Alexander expressed agreement. He credits staff with attempting to identify a compromise, but the Board would not approve this fence. The appearance, function and appropriateness are issues. Lattice panels are inexpensive and easy to use, but it will not reflect well on this business and its owners, nor on the community. There may be other fencing options that are less flimsy.

Ms. Kramb stated that the Board is not opposed to fencing; metal fencing has been approved in the Historic District. However, there are no lattice fences anywhere within the area.

Mr. Cotter stated that the existing fence would deteriorate within a short period of time; they are not sturdy. Typically, lattice fencing is decorative only.

Mr. Kownacki stated that he agrees with other members' comments. This site is within the Historic District, and this location has both positives and negatives, including the cost of a sturdy fence. A lattice fence would not be appropriate in any historic neighborhood, not just in Dublin.

Ms. Bryan stated that the lattice fence is not appropriate within the Dublin Historic District. She is sympathetic with the applicants in regard to the economics of the situation. However, the Board would never approve this fence in this District.

Ms. Titus noted that the fencing is at the rear of the property; it is not located in the public's view. In addition, it is made of a wood material.

Mr. Ward stated that the fence was installed for a purpose. The pizza shop delivery drivers are smoking pot, are not respectful, and shine vehicle headlights into their property at all hours. They were trying to address the issue by creating a simple screen. A wrought iron fence would not accomplish that purpose. They are open to suggestions for addressing this problem between the properties. Another neighbor has requested that the fence be extended.

Ms. Krumb stated that the Board is not opposed to a fence here, only the material. She understands the need for the fence, but perhaps a landscaping screen could achieve their purpose.

Ms. Bryan stated that the Board agrees that there is a good reason for a fence here, but not a lattice fence. Although the existing fence will be disapproved and needs to be removed, staff will work with the applicant on identifying an alternative type of fence.

Mr. Cotter moved, Mr. Alexander seconded approval of the Minor Project Review with the following four conditions:

- 1) The applicant modify the south side of the fence to match the finished quality of the north side of the fence, subject to staff approval;
- 2) The applicant stain or paint the fencing, subject to staff approval;
- 3) The applicant finish and secure the bottom of the existing lattice with the addition of a 2-inch by 4-inch wooden support, similar to the top of the fence; and,
- 4) The applicant submit for a Certificate of Zoning Plan Approval for the fence within 90 days of ARB approval.

Vote: Mr. Kownacki, no; Ms. Krumb, no; Mr. Cotter, no; Mr. Alexander, no; Ms. Bryan, no.

6. Bergwall Residence at 181 S. High Street, 20-156INF, Informal Review

Ms. Bryan stated that this is a request for feedback on the proposed addition and exterior modifications for an existing single-family home on a 0.47-acre site zoned Bridge Street District Historic Residential, northwest of the intersection of S. High Street with Waterford Drive.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Martin stated that this is a request for informal review and feedback for exterior modifications and additions to an existing single-family home located at 181 S. High Street. The 0.47-acre site is

located northwest of the intersection of South High Street and Waterford Drive and is zoned Bridge Street District Historic Residential. The parcel was platted as part of Historic Dublin, whereas Waterford Drive was platted with the development of the Waterford Village neighborhood to the west. The site has approximately 100 feet of frontage along S. High Street with vehicular access from Waterford Drive. A historic dry-laid stone retaining wall extends along the S. High Street frontage, and sidewalks extend along S. High Street and Waterford Drive. The site contains a two-story, 2,700-square-foot, single-family home built in 1967. The architectural style of the home is a raised ranch with masonry façades.

Proposal

The applicant is requesting feedback on exterior modifications and additions to the home. The intent is to give the home a "Farmhouse" character, responsive in context with the adjacent Karrer Barn. The site layout remains generally the same with the footprint of the main home and vehicular access remaining in their existing locations. The existing detached shed in the southwest portion of the site will be retained. The proposal is to maintain the existing site configuration with the following modifications: demolition and reconstruction of the garage; removal and replacement/expansion of the front porch; a living room addition with a covered and screened porch; and a new open, uncovered patio. The conceptual layout results in a lot coverage of approximately 27 percent. The applicant is requesting feedback on the location of the proposed garage, which will be located six feet to the west of its existing location. There are two front-yard setbacks, one along S. High Street and the other along Waterford Drive. The existing and the proposed garage encroach into the required setback, and the applicant is inquiring if the Board would be supportive of the new garage's continued encroachment into the setback. When the Historic and Cultural Assessment was conducted and adopted in 2017, the home was not yet 50 years of age; therefore, it was designated as non-contributing. Today, the home is eligible for consideration as historically contributing to the overall integrity of Historic Dublin. It is a good example of a mid-century raised ranch home.

Elevations

The east elevation will have a new front porch with six columns supporting a flat roof highlighting a recessed double-door entry. Gothic-style, full height windows will be located on either side of the front door. The brick on the base portion of the home will be covered with new vertical board and on the upper story, the brick will be painted white. Two ganged, two-over-two windows are proposed above the main entry. A front gable roofline addition will be finished in vertical board and batten, and a two-over-two window will be located on either side of the ganged windows. The window placement on the upper story will be similar to what exists today. The new garage will be located to the south, approximately six feet from the front façade of the home. On the south elevation along Waterford Drive, the existing shed will be repainted, and the new attached garage will have a single, two-over-two window and be finished in white vertical board and batten siding. A new family room addition west of the "T" portion of the main structure will have three equally spaced, two-over-two windows. On the northern, side elevation, the existing addition north of the "T" portion of the main structure will be replaced to allow for a continuous side gable roof form. The larger living room addition will be located to the west with the screened-in porch visible from the north. On the rear, west elevation, various additions and the new attached, rear-loaded garage will be prominent, although largely screened by existing trees and shrubs. The brick upper story will be repainted white, and the lower portion will be clad in vertical board and batten siding. A new front gable will be added to the ground story with three ganged, two-over-two windows accented with transoms. Two pedestrian entries are provided, one to the north accessing the screened in porch, and one to the

south accessing the mudroom. A new chimney, clad in siding, intersects the roofline of the porch addition. The attached, rear-loaded garage will have two separate bays, and its roof will be accented with a shed dormer containing four square windows.

The following discussion questions are suggested to facilitate the Board's discussion:

- 1) Does the Board support the conceptual Farmhouse character?
- 2) Does the Board support the proposed garage demolition?
- 3) Does the Board support the proposed mass and scale of the additions?
- 4) Does the Board support exterior alterations including materials and architectural details?

Applicant Presentation

Deborah Bergwall, 181 S. High Street, Dublin stated that they purchased this home when it became available over four years ago, as they had future plans for a home within downtown Dublin. They have been renting out the home in the meantime, but are ready to begin the renovation.

Rich Taylor, architect, 48 S. High Street, Dublin stated this is a preliminary design. They have not resolved all the exterior issues but would like to have the Board's input on the preliminary elements before proceeding. They will be making significant changes to the exterior of the home, but those changes will be improvements. The massing of the existing home is simple but is marred by some poorly designed elements that they will correct with this renovation. One of those changes is the way in which the garage attaches to the house. With a traditional design, it is desirable to clearly separate the major masses. The intent is to demolish the existing garage and replace it with an appropriately separate garage mass. The pitch in the new garage roof is steeper than the main house, but it will be offset by the proper location and massing. Another major change is to correct the symmetry of the east façade, because the office bumpout will remain, and the front door and upper windows are off center. They will match the bumpout on the left with that on the right and tie both together with a full-length front porch. The front door will be moved back to the center. They recognize that painting brick is not preferred, but in this case, they believe it is necessary for a couple reasons. First, some of the existing brick and mortar is deteriorated, and it is always difficult to match it with new brick and mortar. Second, in moving windows around, patching around doors, removing additions, etc., brick will be exposed that has been hidden behind other elements since 1967; that will never match new brick. A poor match is worse than painting it. He disagrees with the consultant's report regarding the significance of the raised ranch typology of this house. Although the home's age qualifies it as historic, age alone does not mean the home contributes positively to the architectural character of the surroundings. In fact, the design of the current house detracts significantly from the desirable character of the Historic District. The changes that they are proposing will add to the District's character in a positive manner. That is important in this location, which is a gateway to the Historic District.

Board Questions

Mr. Alexander inquired what are the plans regarding the shed.

Mr. Alexander responded that it would be painted; nothing more is planned.

Ms. Krumb stated that she does not have a question, but a comment that she believes is important to the rest of the discussion. As an architectural historian, who has been doing this work for 23 years, she has not previously encountered a home being identified a "raised ranch." It may be

another term for a 1.5 story structure, which in Ohio, is called a split-level or a bi-level. However, the consultant is identifying this a building type that it is not. It is a contemporary, two-story house. She also does not agree that this home is eligible for the National Register. It does not contribute to the District, although it is now 50 years old and could be evaluated for that purpose. The consultant believes that mid-century modern homes are eligible. However, this structure is not part of the City's mid-century modern district; it is not on Franklin, Marion or Longview streets. This is a two-story house, the first in the development of Waterford, which is a late 1970 contemporary development. It does not contribute to the City's Historic Core, even if it were expanded as a mid-century modern home. The fact that this building is not a contributing building and not eligible for the National Register greatly impacts what the applicant can do with the house. As part of her job, on a daily basis, she determines if buildings are eligible for the National Register. In her opinion, this building is not. She would recommend disregarding the consultant's report, as none of the restrictions should be applied.

Ms. Bryan stated that she has discussed with the staff the need for clarity regarding contributing and non-contributing structures, as that term is often being misused. That may be a discussion that could be held in more detail at another time.

Ms. Kramb stated that designation makes a difference in what can be done with this building.

Mr. Alexander stated his concerns are the same as Ms. Kramb's; he, also, is unaware of the raised ranch style. There is another way in which this can be evaluated. The Board can look at the precedents that have been established in regard to changing structures. What have we previously permitted or not permitted for an existing structure in the Historic District?

Ms. Kramb stated that the consultant has recommended that because it is a contributing structure, the existing structure should be left as is, and a historic addition could be added. A historic addition for this structure would be a 1967-style, not an 1850-style addition. In her opinion, it is better to consider if the proposed changes would be good, and disregard the consultant's recommendations. Ms. Bryan responded that she believes a few of the recommendations could be considered.

Mr. Kownacki stated that this is essentially a split-level. What has been proposed would completely change the dynamic of this house. In reality, we would be approving an entirely different building style.

Ms. Kramb stated that, actually, this is a standard two-story.

Mr. Kownacki responded that, even so, the proposal is to change it from a late 1960s design to something entirely different.

Ms. Kramb stated that because this is not actually a contributing structure, it is possible to completely change it. The issue is whether we believe the proposed changes are appropriate for a two-story building.

Public Comment

There were no public comments.

Board Discussion

- 1) Does the Board support the conceptual Farmhouse character?*

Ms. Bryan stated that she did agree with the consultant's comment on this item: "The popular Farmhouse style may contribute to a false historicism, as there is a historic Farmhouse located at 167 S. High Street and the historic Karrer barn is located immediately to the south. The ARB Code states in Section 153.174(C)4 that 'all building structures and sites shall be recognized as products of their own time. Alterations that have no historical basis and seek to create an earlier appearance inconsistent or inappropriate to the original integrity of the building shall be discouraged.' "

Mr. Kownacki stated that the question also is if we support the idea of completely changing what was originally built there.

Ms. Bryan responded that it is that and whether we support the change to a Farmhouse style, which currently, it is not.

Mr. Alexander stated that if the structure can be changed completely, it could also just be demolished. The current structure does not have a good relationship to a Farmhouse style. Farmhouses are not thick and deep, as is the original mass of this house, nor do they have pitches like the mass of the current structure. The original volume of this house will never look like a Farmhouse. Part of the rationale for painting the brick was that the intent is to move around many of the openings. The ARB has never permitted any applicant to change a house to this extent. The analogy is that the barn across the street justifies making this a Farmhouse style. That is not a valid argument, and the proposed style does not fit the existing house. Because there is a weak relationship between what is proposed and what exists, they could consider tearing down the current structure. He cannot support the imposition of a Farmhouse look in the manner proposed.

Ms. Kramb responded that it would be more appropriate to change it to a Colonial Revival style; the current form and mass could be easily converted to that style. If the front façade is changed, all of the facades should be changed. The windows on the north and south facades also would need to be changed to match. Either change the entire house, or do as little as possible to the existing mass and add an addition at the rear.

Mr. Cotter stated that changing the current structure to something completely different is not in keeping with the Code and the Historic Dublin Design Guidelines. Perhaps changing it to something more similar, even though it did not exist in 1967 – such as the Colonial Revival – would be more consistent with the Code's intent. A fundamental change is what the Code indicates should not occur.

Ms. Kramb stated that the existing structure is vernacular, but the closest style would be the Colonial Revival.

Mr. Alexander stated that the intent is that there should be no false historicism. A tradition that could pair better with the existing house would be a contemporary style. A substantial addition could be added to the existing structure.

Ms. Kramb stated that this home was built in 1967, which is past the mid-century modern period. A contemporary style would be appropriate.

Mr. Kownacki stated that the request is to re-define the structure. Instead of trying to "fake it" as a Farmhouse, they could consider modern contemporary, which would be more accurate. If the attempt is not to abide by the 1967 time period, more options are available.

Ms. Bryan agreed that the Farmhouse character would be too contrived, but other options are available.

2) Does the Board support the proposed garage demolition and providing a waiver for construction of a new garage?

Mr. Cotter inquired if the reason for demolishing the garage was to address the massing of the house.

Mr. Taylor stated that replacing it with a new garage would separate the masses properly. In addition, the existing shallow, one-door garage is insufficient for today's needs.

Ms. Kramb inquired if the reason for a waiver for the new garage was that there are two front-yard setbacks on a corner lot.

Ms. Martin responded that it is one reason, as there is frontage on two rights-of-way. In addition, this site was platted as part of Historic Dublin. Waterford Subdivision and Waterford Drive were platted later. The curvature of Waterford Drive and the lot lines for this parcel do not coincide.

Mr. Cotter stated if the house were to be demolished, he would be supportive of the garage also being demolished.

Ms. Kramb stated that the existing garage technically does not meet the setback requirements. A waiver would be needed, regardless.

Mr. Alexander stated that if enough of the existing house was visible and would be retained, then he would be supportive of removing the garage. The two masses on this site frame the potential view to the park. The existing roof profile of the house is an important design component that cannot be ignored when the rest is designed.

3) Does the Board support the proposed mass and scale of the additions?

Ms. Kramb stated that the mass and scale of the rear of the addition is appropriate. The deciding factor will be how the garage fits in, the view from Waterford Drive.

Mr. Alexander stated that it is possible to have a large addition when it is subordinate to the existing house, as it is here.

Board members were supportive of the proposed mass and scale of the additions.

4) Does the Board support exterior alterations including materials and architectural details?

Board members stated that at this time, the proposed style is undetermined. The exterior alterations, materials and details would need to be appropriate to that style.

Mr. Alexander noted that he is not entirely comfortable with the proposed painting of the brick. When the garage is removed, there will be sufficient brick for repairs. It may be necessary to tuck point an entire façade to achieve matched mortar, but doing so on one elevation only is not too substantial. Changing the openings, however, would create a larger problem with matching brick. Finally, board and batten material was common for American ranches; he has no objection to that material, although perhaps not a white color.

Ms. Bryan stated that she has concerns about painting the brick, as well.

Ms. Bryan inquired if the applicant had any questions.

Ms. Bergwall stated that the Board suggested two style alternatives. She is uncertain how to proceed in that regard.

Ms. Kramb responded that Mr. Taylor is very skilled and experienced. He would be able to provide expert advice.

Ms. Bergwall stated that, initially, they had contemplated demolition. Would that be the Board's preference?

Ms. Bryan responded that it is not the Board's preference; however, it would be dependent upon the architectural style selected. Mr. Taylor and Ms. Martin are very experienced and will be able to provide assistance.

Mr. Taylor stated that the existing structure is solid, particularly the cement block wall between the house and the garage. The asymmetrical issues of the front façade are important to address with the design. However, the Colonial Revival style is a broad genre of architecture that will allow them to address the applicant's desires and the symmetry issues.

Ms. Krumb noted that if they should prefer the contemporary style or to replicate what exists, there is a good example of how that can be nicely done. She would recommend looking at the circa 1980s contemporary, two-story at 4180 MacDuff Way, which recently was remodeled quite attractively with a large addition.

LEGAL TRAINING

Legal training was provided by Thaddeus Boggs, Assistant Law Director, regarding the Board's role, including: legislative versus quasi-judicial actions; ex parte communications; creating an appropriate record for potential appeals; open meetings; and Ohio public records and ethics laws. The planning and zoning process, of which ARB is a component, regulates private properties. Therefore, property owners must have procedural due process. This discussion will clarify the responsibilities and process.

COMMUNICATIONS

- The next regular meeting of the ARB is scheduled for November 18, 2020.
- There will be a joint Council, PZC, ARB and BZA meeting at 6:00 p.m. on December 14, 2020.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:40 p.m.

Kathleen Bryan
Chair, Architectural Review Board

Judith K. Beal
Deputy Clerk of Council