



MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, February 24, 2021

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Bryan, Chair, called the February 24, 2021 virtual meeting of the Architectural Review Board to order at 6:30 p.m., noting that due to the current pandemic, public meetings are being held online and live streamed on YouTube. The meetings can be accessed at the City's website.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Ms. Bryan led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

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

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Bryan requested a correction on pp. 3 and 4 where reference was made to Mr. Schneier as a board member.

Mr. Kownacki moved, Ms. Kramb seconded acceptance of the documents into the record and approval of the January 27, 2021 meeting minutes as amended.

Vote: Mr. Kownacki, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Ms. Bryan, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Kramb, 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 Case 4 was eligible for the Consent Agenda and inquired if any Board member wished to move it from the Consent Agenda to the regular agenda for discussion. No member requested the case to be moved.

4. 123 S. High Street, 21-005ARB-MPR, Minor Project Review

A request for the installation of a new roof and repainting of an existing building on a 0.11-acre site zoned Bridge Street, Historic South, located west of S. High Street, 80 feet north of the intersection with John Wright Lane.

Public Comments

No public comments were received on the case.

Ms. Bryan inquired if the applicant was in agreement with the condition for approval.

Kelly Burke, Redwood Financial Group, 112 S. High Street, Dublin OH, indicated that they had no objection to the condition.

Ms. Kramb moved, Mr. Alexander seconded approval of the Minor Project Review with the following condition:

- 1) That the applicant paint the window trim to match the horizontal siding, subject to staff approval.

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

CASES

1. 72-84 N. High Street, 20-191ARB-INF, Informal Review

A request for an Informal Review and feedback to construct a mixed-use building (redevelopment of the former Oscar's site), on an approximately 0.9-acre site, zoned Bridge Street District, Historic Core, located northeast of the intersection of North High Street with North Street.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Ridge stated that this is a request for an Informal Review, providing non-binding feedback on the redevelopment of the site located at 72-84 N. High Street in the Historic District. Informal Reviews allow applicants to seek feedback from the ARB on development proposals in regard to density, site layout and architecture. Informal Reviews are an optional step prior to a Concept Plan, Preliminary Development Plan, and a Final Development Plan.

Site

The site is unique in that it has a variety of building types and styles surrounding it, as well as a variety of uses. Images of adjacent and nearby buildings were shown for site context, including Building Z1, a mixed-use building containing residential units and commercial space, and Building Z2, a mixed-use building immediately north of this site, which also includes a mix of residential and commercial spaces. The pedestrian bridge is located northeast of the site; the Dublin branch of the Columbus Metropolitan Library is located across the street, on the west side of N. High Street; the new 3-story CoHatch building and the former Brazen Head sites are located immediately south of the site; and 1.0-story to 2.5-story, single-family residential units are located south and southeast of the site. The proposed structure will be located on the east side of N. High Street and wrap in a C-shape down to North Street. Pedestrian facilities will be provided along N. High Street and a portion of North Street. Vehicular access will be located in the southeast corner of the site and a parking lot immediately behind the buildings.

Proposal

The proposal is for a mixed-use development requiring the demolition of three buildings along N. High Street and North Street and the construction of a new 2.5 to 5.5-story, mixed-use building, containing residential, retail, restaurant and event space. It also includes a parking structure, which is primarily below grade, as well as open space in the form of a central courtyard. The proposal calls for the demolition of 72-84 N. High Street as well as 20 North Street, buildings that underwent significant modifications in the 1980s. Partly due to those modifications, the buildings have been designated non-contributing to the Historic District, with the Historic and Cultural Assessment indicating poor integrity indicators for design, feeling, workmanship and materials. The applicant is proposing to construct a single, U-shaped building, opening toward the Scioto River, and two primary wings connected via a centrally located, two-story connector. Patio dining is proposed along the west side of the site along N. High Street, as well as a public plaza. A courtyard would be located centrally on the site, between the two wings, to which the public would have access. An 80-vehicle, below-grade parking structure is proposed; however, preliminary calculations indicate that 110 spaces would be required by Code for the proposed uses, not including the 1 space per 6 individuals requirement for the event space.

Architecture

The proposed building is formed by a series of front and side gables with a number of dormers on the west elevation. The proposal is for a minimum 2.5-story building that increases to a greater height as it extends to the east, while Code permits a maximum of 2.5 stories. The building materials will be stone (on the first floor), brick and wood siding, which are permitted primary materials. The North Street elevation will be 3.0 stories in height, with the use of several forms, including architectural recesses and a series of dormers and residential balconies to break up the mass. A pedestrian entrance in the center of the building will provide access to the central courtyard. The rear, east façade on N. Riverview Street will be five stories in height, and will be clad in stone, brick and an undetermined third material. This elevation will provide an entrance to the underground parking and utility bays. The central courtyard, which would be accessible to the public, will have a series of stone-clad staircases leading from the higher N. High Street elevation down to a landing on the east end of the site. A mix of seating options and landscape elements will be located in the landing area. Several discussion questions have been provided to facilitate the Board's review.

Applicant Presentation

Dwight McCabe, Principal, McCabe Companies, 7361 Currier Road, Plain City, Ohio 43064, stated that he would like to provide a few more details, in addition to those provided in the Commissioners' meeting materials. They have been working on this proposal for almost two years, looking at the broader context with City staff, and this past year, focusing on the programming, site operation, and form of the redevelopment. This site is located at the crossroads of different elements, not only in terms of visibility, architecture and use, but also the vehicular and pedestrian traffic in this part of the Historic District and the nearby West Plaza. They have had conversations with staff, the adjacent condominium HOA Board and neighbors, and intend to meet in the near future with long-term residents. Helpful and supportive feedback has been received, and he would like to respond to some of the online comments. Because this site is at the northern edge of the Historic District and extends into another District, the site really does not contribute to the fabric of the Historic District itself. The rear view of this site from the pedestrian bridge is not the best, consisting of surface parking, utilities and dumpsters. They have attempted to pay attention to that view of the property, should it be redeveloped.

Board Discussion

Ms. Bryan stated that this area of the City was recently rezoned, intentionally placing it in the Historic District. The building size and scale of the proposal is not consistent with the Historic District.

Public Comments

Matt Davis, 4620 Hickory Rock Drive, Powell, Ohio:

"I am the building owner of 56 N. High Street. Continuing to make historic downtowns more vibrant, walkable, workable, and livable are critical to supporting the local economy and the future of Dublin. I support the redevelopment of 72-84 N High Street to continue to make Historic Dublin the anchor of the City. I believe the proposed uses add to the City."

Terry George, 105 North Riverview, Unit 414 Dublin, Ohio 43017:

"I am concerned that the number of proposed units will create an even worse traffic situation on High Street than currently exists. At times, High Street is already gridlocked. The pedestrian versus car interaction at the intersection, in addition to stopped and parked delivery vehicles, already are creating a dangerous situation. Adding more cars on N. High Street will make the situation even more dangerous. There are numerous opportunities for rental housing on the east side of the river. I would prefer to see any housing on the west side of the river be primarily owner-occupied."

Robert Massie at 105 North Riverview Street, unit 615 Dublin, Ohio 43017:

"There are many positive attributes to this plan, however, the negatives are greater. The 68 individual living units proposed are too small and would reduce the value of other residential units in the area. The density is an issue, and the expected price point would attract a change of demographics in this community. Traffic issues would be quite significant, necessity the widening of High Street and an installation of a traffic signal at the intersection of High and North streets. Safety and security may become major issues with the change in demographics, and a potential rise in crime in the area could present a safety issue near the library. He would recommend reducing the residential density with larger units, fewer people, and thereby less traffic."

Kathleen Murphy, 95 North Riverview Street, Unit 411, Ohio 43017:

"I am concerned that 6000 square feet of event center and 68 apartments is too high of a density for the area. The High Street Garage is already nearly full on weekends and the Getaway, although not open yet, will increase the number of vehicles. During the current pandemic, businesses are not at 100%. In the future, where would additional residents, visitors and event guests park? I love living at Bridge Park West, but not if friends and family are unable to find parking. I agree, however, that there is a need to update. Hopefully, the Oscar's restaurant remains."

Louis Lang, 105 North Riverview Street, unit number 117, Dublin, Ohio, 43017:

"Overall, we have no issue with the concept and design. However, we strongly object to the idea of 68, 650-square-foot apartments, for the following reasons: 1) this side of Bridge Park is nearly completely comprised of owner-occupied residences, both the Bridge Park West condominiums and the individual, single-resident homes. This development would be a major deviation and departure from the makeup of the neighborhood. We would support individually-owned dwellings. 2) The proposed size of 650 square feet per dwelling steers the development to the younger, single demographic and market. The most likely result will be an overburden of traffic and noise in the environment. In order for us to support this, the number one issue to be addressed is the size and number of family dwellings, and secondarily, the occupancy model, with ownership preferred over rental."

Gordon Troop, 95 North Riverview Street, Unit 514, Dublin, Ohio 43017:

"I support development on this piece of property but strongly oppose this development and use for the following reasons. Small apartments attract short-term, transient residents with little vested interest in the long-term viability of the community. Mixed use with condos or town homes would be a preferred solution, allowing pride of ownership, an individually committed tax base, and real long-term community involvement. New scale apartment complexes attract a younger and noisier party crowd. There are a sufficient number of these apartments on the other side of the river, along with retail establishments that cater to this clientele. The High Street elevation drawing and design with dormers is very unattractive, reminiscent of the design of 1970 apartment complexes or strip malls. Surely, the developer can do better than that. It does not have to be as modern as the library across the street but should incorporate a more modern design and materials to blend and bridge the gap. The proposed project does not meet any of Dublin's Code requirements, including the four-story height limitation and conference facility requirements. More retail and restaurants would be preferable. Alternatively, 20 - 25 larger condos or townhouses would significantly reduce the large increase in traffic that will come with 68 apartments, and also improve pedestrian safety on the narrow streets in this area."

Trevor Vessels, 68 South Riverview Street, Dublin Ohio, 43107 stated:

"I am writing today regarding the proposed redevelopment of the existing Oscar's site and surrounding buildings. I want to be clear that I am pro-development and support the applicant's plans to raze the existing properties on the site. I am also certainly not against resident apartments on this site. I do have concerns that the addition of so many units results in a property, particularly a four-story structure facing the new bridge that does not fit into the surrounding area. I recognize that the developer needs to build enough residential units to make the project financially viable; however, I hope that the board will take into account the size and scope of the project and how it would fit into the Historic District. I would argue that at a minimum, there should be close attention to the size of the building facing the bridge including whether it conforms to the area. I hope the board will ensure that there are enough parking spaces under the building for the residents, so the existing street and library garage parking can be used for visitors to the Historic District."

Ross Young, Unit 717, Dublin, Ohio 43017, stated:

"The look of the building seems very bland, shades of brown. I would like to see more architectural contrast. Parking is already a problem, so there is a need to consider the loss of public parking spaces."

Ms. Bryan asked Mr. McCabe if he wanted to add anything in response.

Mr. McCabe stated that he would like to address how the architecture fits within the surrounding area. The significant anchoring elements are the pedestrian bridge landing on the west side of the river, the 7.0-story condominium project adjacent to this site, and the retail at the left side of the bridge landing. He noted that the rhythm of the view from the bridge is that of buildings with breaks between. The CoHatch building on the south side of North Street is of a similar scale. Their challenge was creating a solution that encompasses the entirety of the site while respecting what occurs along North Street and the adjacent Historic District, and the existing mass and scale down to the north side of the bridge. Those elements determined the composition of the proposed building form. They also considered the need for a pedestrian access from High Street to the courtyard and a direct link from the courtyard to the bridge. Those adjacent elements, the need to maintain a 2.5-story face on High Street, recognition of the existing 3.0-story structure on North Street, and the need to maintain the existing height to the east resulted in the proposed form. He noted that the 2.5 story height at the

street level has been maintained as the building extends to the east; the additional stories to the east are due to the grade drop from the street level.

In regard to the public comments, their discussion with neighbors indicated there is support for redeveloping the site, as most people are not satisfied with what currently exists. From an architectural perspective, while some people prefer a more contemporary character, the Historic District guidelines do not allow that. Some concerns were expressed regarding public parking. There will be no loss of parking, as there is no public parking on the site today. The proposed underground parking would increase the amount of existing private parking on the site, accommodating most of what would be needed by the new residents. They would also use the existing public parking structure, consistent with the practice of other uses within the District, including the Pearl restaurant and some historic buildings with little or no parking. Regarding the proposed apartment use, staff was supportive of having a greater mix of housing stock within the Historic District, as it would provide patronage for businesses within the District. They have received significant feedback regarding the type and size of units; however, some of the larger units within the Bridge Street development have not been renting well. They could look at a potential shift to a few larger, two-bedroom units, but it would be necessary to conduct a market study to better understand the need. The units could be larger. The idea that there should be no apartments in this portion of the Historic District runs counter to the idea of providing equity in housing options.

Ms. Bryan responded that there is no question regarding a need for housing options; it is primarily the question of what is appropriate here.

Board Discussion

1. Is the Board supportive of the request to demolish the existing structures fronting N. High Street and North Street?

Mr. Alexander stated that, in reality, there are four buildings, as 84 N. High is actually two buildings. There is a firewall that separates Oscar's, and stylistically, Oscar's is extremely different from the buildings that were added to the left. He would have preferred that the consultant's report and other evaluations had looked specifically at each building, rather than as a group. He can understand the proposal to demolish most of the site; however, he has concerns about the demolition of Oscar's, which is in the middle of the plan. Oscar's is a small, well-composed building. The bays are centered in the gable and the door is centered between. The bays added later at the rear were aligned intentionally with the original bays. There is a continuity in that structure that does not exist in the others. The Oscar's building reflects the history of that particular property and the community, more so than the other three buildings. Additionally, the building has not outlived its usefulness, as the restaurant is continuing to function. Demolition of that building certainly would not be permitted in the other historic districts. He has no issue with the demolition of the other buildings, and the site could be redeveloped intensively without the demolition of the Oscar's building.

Ms. Kramb stated that the original 1930s section of the Oscar's building is unique and contributing to the district. The additions to the building could be removed. The applicant would need to meet the demolition criteria, including documentation of inability to remove the additions and reuse the original building and proof of economic hardship.

Mr. McCabe responded that they were working with what exists in Dublin's ordinance. The ordinance indicates that the building is not contributing. Many of the features of the building are not historic, such as the bays and the stained glass that were added later. It was their understanding that it would be permissible to demolish them.

Ms. Kramb stated that it would be necessary to submit documentation that it was not historic and meets the demolition criteria.

Ms. Bryan inquired if the applicant was familiar with the demolition criteria.

Mr. McCabe responded that they were. However, they would not have undertaken the proposed development, if there had been any concern about demolition of the building.

Ms. Kramb noted that it would be necessary to meet the criteria before obtaining a demolition permit.

Mr. McCabe responded that they were not apprised of that need for a non-contributing building.

Ms. Kramb inquired if the applicant had reviewed the Code and the guidelines for demolition.

Mr. McCabe responded that they had done so.

Mr. Cotter stated that he would be supportive of demolishing the buildings, except perhaps Oscar's, They would need a demolition permit, whether the building was contributing or non-contributing. If there are factors for keeping Oscar's, the burden is on the applicant to justify not keeping it.

Mr. Kownacki stated that he had no comments to add concerning the proposed demolition.

Ms. Bryan stated that, regardless of whether a building is contributing or non-contributing, they provide a broader picture of the fabric of the neighborhood. It will be necessary to meet two of the four criteria for demolition.

2. Does the Board support the proposed uses, which include multi-family, retail, restaurant, events center space, and open space?

Ms. Bryan stated that the Code permits commercial, retail and restaurant uses, and multi-family residential on upper floors within this District. The recently approved Code amendment allows for an event space up to 3,000 square feet in size; this application proposes a mix of uses for the site and 6,000 square feet of event space. A number of waivers would be required for the proposed use.

Mr. Alexander stated that he supports the proposed residential type, as there is a shortage of these units within the community, as well as nationally. The applicant would need to explain the hardship that would validate a variance for the proposed conference center, particularly when one exists across the river. The report suggests that a conference center was proposed because other uses would not work here.

Ms. Kramb stated that this proposal is for twice the amount of the 3,000 square feet permitted in this District for conference centers. Therefore, she could not support it, unless a very good cause or a very good plan were provided.

Mr. Cotter agreed that although more mixed-use residential is needed in the community, the number of units proposed is too many and the size of the units is too small in this District. The public comments express concerns that the proposed development is not appropriate in the District due to: existing traffic and parking issues; also, the demographics of rental versus ownership split between the east and west sides of the river -- maintaining the historic character on the west side, the Bridge Street character on the other. Although more retail would be appropriate, the large conference center would lead to another parking problem. He agrees that the site needs to be redeveloped in a manner to better anchor the area.

Mr. Kownacki observed that the Board prefers not to issue variances to the City's Zoning Code, particularly since it was only recently updated for this area. There would need to be a strong reason

for a variance. He agrees with the neighbors' concerns about increased traffic. While redevelopment of the site can occur, the proposed scope and scale cannot be accommodated within this area; it does not consider the homeowners who have a vested interest in the area.

Ms. Bryan stated that she is a resident of Historic Dublin, so is one of those with a vested interest. The proposed conference center is much larger than the maximum of 3,000 square feet only recently approved by Council; therefore, very compelling reasons for having 6,000 square feet would need to be provided. She has strong concerns about the safety, security and traffic impact of adding this number of small units. She is supportive of redevelopment of this site, but the proposed density poses a problem.

Public Comments [continued]

Terry Flanagan, 6767 Fallen Timbers, Dublin, Ohio 43017:

"I am in favor of the redevelopment of the Oscar's block in Historic Dublin. What about the City's need for workforce housing? Affordable housing reinforces Dublin's commitment to diversity and inclusion in the workforce and in housing. The idea that a younger workforce will contribute to noise violations is profiling of a younger demographic. Dublin decided it would be on board with redeveloping the block of N. High Street many years ago. There is a tasteful way to pay homage to the past while bridging development for the future. It is that quality that sets Dublin apart. We need to be supportive of investment in our community."

Board Discussion [continued]

Ms. Bryan inquired what is the occupation rate of the residential units on the other side of the river.

Mr. Ridge responded that staff has inquired but not yet received a response regarding the occupancy rate.

Ms. Bryan observed that she had noticed empty units within that area. She is concerned about turning this quaint neighborhood into something no longer historic. If that trend were to continue, there will be no future need for the Board.

3. Does the Board support the proposed site layout?

Mr. Kownacki stated that he did not have any objections to the U-shaped layout with a courtyard.

Mr. Cotter stated that he had no objections to the proposed layout. His concerns relate to the massing, which does not fit on N. High Street. Something more architecturally interesting would be preferable. The courtyard seems out of place. The open space is good, although it is confined between houses.

Ms. Kramb stated that the proposed massing and scale is an issue. In her opinion, the applicant should submit a new proposal for the building. She would not support a building of this mass, no matter how it were laid out.

Mr. Alexander stated that he has concerns with the courtyard. Typically, courtyards provided with apartments are limited to use of those residents, to create a sense of community. This courtyard would serve as a light well and an access point for the conference center. It does not benefit the City at all; in fact, it hurts the fabric by keeping people out on the street. Other nearby open spaces, such as the area in front of the bridge, receive a significant level of use and, consequently, activate the District. The proposed location of the pedestrian connection seems unnatural. Given that the buildings are close together, there may be issues with the level of sunlight within that area.

4. Is the Board supportive of the scale, massing and height of the building? If so, would the Board support future waivers to the development standards to allow these deviations? If not, what modifications are recommended to meet the requirements?

Ms. Bryan stated that the property is located within the Historic Dublin and is zoned Bridge Street Historic Core. The zoning district permits two commercial building types within this district. While a full building type analysis has not occurred, the historic mixed-use building type would be the most applicable, given its use, layout and form, which is limited to 2.5 stories in height. The Board should reference this building type and requirements along with the Historic District Design Guidelines when considering the appropriateness of this building.

Ms. Kramb stated that with the new Code, the building type is irrelevant; the building is limited to 2.5 stories on High Street. However, she is willing to consider more height at the rear elevation -- perhaps 3.0 stories, but not 5.0 stories. The entire building should be scaled down; it is much too massive for the Historic Core. People will be using the park along the riverfront, and they do not want to stand in the shadow of 5.0-story building.

Mr. Kownacki stated that he appreciates the attempt to maintain the roof ridgeline; however, the scale and massing are not appropriate in this District. The intent is to limit the building scale and massing within the area, which "steps down" to the river. It is noted that a parking variance would be requested; however, reducing the scope and scale of the building would also reduce the level of traffic and parking issues created by the development.

Mr. Cotter stated the building mass from the rear is significant. City Council has indicated the intent is that the Historic District should not look like the other side of the river. The entire structure should be reduced to 2.5 stories, and more architectural character added. From the Z1 and Z2 buildings, which are located at the entrance of Old Dublin, there should be a transition moving south into the Historic District.

Mr. Alexander stated that he could consider a height reduction of one story on the north facade. The portion of the structure to the south is treated more traditionally than the other buildings in close proximity. While CoHatch is 3.0 stories, the roofline has been lowered to the top of the second story, and a horizontal band or trellis separates the first floor from the second. That applicant invested effort to make the structure appear closer to 2.0 stories. Although he could accept the massing of the south façade at the rear, the massing of the north elevation at the rear must be lower.

Ms. Bryan stated that the proposal of 5.0 stories is much too massive. In regard to the CoHatch building, the Board and the building owner worked to reduce the building mass facing the alley. A larger building would have blocked the sunlight from the residences along N. Riverview Street.

5. Does the Board believe that the proposed architectural character and materials are compatible with the surrounding development?

Mr. Alexander stated that the Board previously has stated that there should be no false historic elements; traditional elements should only be used in a manner that combines appropriately. The building has a flat roof facing the courtyard, along with the exterior "skin" and roof slope of a traditional building. The primary volume of the nearby Z2 building has a traditional roof form. The front elevation of the proposed building is essentially a camouflage of what is occurring behind it. While they could have a flat roof, the way in which the historic element is applied must be appropriate and consistent

with the Historic Dublin Guidelines. If Oscar's were not an issue, a solution could be a lower scale, L-shaped building facing High Street and turning the corner, and a taller section along the north property line.

Mr. Cotter agreed that the flat and gabled roofs were dissimilar -- essentially, a modern and traditional building next to each other.

Ms. Kramb stated that the applicant should rework the design before submitting a formal application.

Mr. Kownacki and Ms. Bryan indicated that they had no additional comments to offer on the architecture.

6. Does the Board support the open spaces and proposed public access to the central courtyard?

Mr. Alexander referred to his previous comments on the courtyard and pedestrian elements.

Ms. Kramb stated that the revised proposal should provide easy access to the park and up to High Street.

Mr. Kownacki expressed support for the idea of providing a public access from High Street to the courtyard. He has no objection to the concept.

Mr. Cotter stated he has commented on the public access. The open, gathering areas at the front and corners are good.

Ms. Bryan inquired if the applicant understood the feedback given.

Mr. McCabe responded that he understood. He would like to clarify that the events center was not an after-thought. They had observed early in the process, that this would be a great location for an events center on the west side, due to the view of the river and bridge. Their intent is to provide a space for people to visit and take advantage of that view. However, there is no model for a 3,000-square-foot event space that would work as a business proposition. A 3,000-square-foot event center with kitchen facilities would be difficult to find in the marketplace. If that is the size limitation, there will be no events center.

Ms. Bryan noted that there are areas on the other side of the river where a larger event center could be provided.

Ms. Kramb noted that the 3,000-square-foot limitation was intended to limit the type of activities that could be in the Historic District.

Mr. McCabe noted that, additionally, if a 2.5 or 3.0-story limitation were to be required for the property, they would be unable to advance the project. They have spent two years considering alternatives for the site, and looked forward to proceeding in a collaborative manner. While they will regroup, with the limitations, he believes they will be unable to redevelop this property.

Public Comment

Matt Ratliff, 5964 Tara Hill, Dublin, Ohio, 43017, stated:

"This project is good for Dublin and good for our residents. In a pandemic, we continue to see investment in our historic core. If you want historic Dublin to continue to compete or even contribute to downtown Dublin you have to give this project a chance. A variety of housing needs to exist in Dublin. This Board needs to put their personal agendas to the side as it relates to apartment and younger residents and as it relates to their attitudes towards new development. Dublin needs investment and especially during a pandemic. The personality of North High is different than South High and that's okay, and some could argue by design."

Board Discussion [continued]

Mr. Alexander stated that the presentation put together by Mr. McCabe and his team was extremely thorough. He reminded him that he could come back with simple massing studies, or scale sketch concepts, so they could continue exploring other ways of developing the parcel without developing a detailed presentation.

Mr. McCabe responded that he appreciated the suggestion.

Ms. Bryan noted that although the proposal was thorough, proceeding would require many variances; it would be a difficult path forward.

2. 181 S. High Street, 21-006ARB-INF, Informal Review

A request for informal review and feedback for demolition of an existing structure and construction of a new single-family home on a 0.47-acre site zoned Bridge Street District, Historic Residential. The site is 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 a new proposal for 181 S. High Street, which is located northwest of the intersection of S. High Street with Waterford Drive. The site is the southernmost parcel on the 1818 Historic Dublin Plat. It is 0.47 acres in size and contains an existing single-family residence with vehicular access via Waterford Drive; public sidewalks extend along Waterford Drive and S. High Street. There are a number of mature trees on the west side. The Karrer Barn is immediately to the south on City-owned land, and the Karrer House, still owned by the Karrer family, is immediately to the north. Across the street are two homes that are new constructions within Historic Dublin; 182 and 190 S. High Street, which vary in character, are simple vernacular. The existing home is a two-story brick home with a detached garage. The project was reviewed by the ARB in October 2020 in a significantly different form. The previous proposal provided for retaining the existing home, making significant external modifications in a farmhouse character, and demolition of the detached garage. The Board expressed concerns with the faux farmhouse character and encouraged either an alternative style consistent with the form of the existing structure, or redevelopment of the site.

Proposal

The proposal is for the demolition and redevelopment of this single-family home. The current structure was built in 1967, and the Historic and Cultural Assessment designates this building as non-contributing. Partial demolition of the historic stonewall is proposed. The home is proposed to be centrally located, with the access point to Waterford Drive shifting to the west of the parcel. The existing shed and detached garage along Waterford Drive would be retained, and accessed in a rear-loaded manner. An additional, two-car attached garage is proposed. A proposed walkway would intersect with S. High Street and the historic stonewall. The proposed character is a simple vernacular cottage with farmhouse characteristics, including a popular farmhouse color palette. The home has a steeply pitched roof, which will be sheathed in asphalt shingles with a low pitch, and a standing-seam metal roof, closely mimicking the home at 190 S. High Street. There would be a wraparound porch as well as a double entry. A prominent dormer is located on the front facade. The attached two-car garage will be set back a significant distance from the front facade. The rear elevation provides access to the outdoor living space as well as the rear-loaded garage. The existing shed would mask a large

portion of the proposed attached garage from Waterford Drive. Some stone veneer was incorporated on both the front facade of the home as well as the chimney.

Applicant Presentation

Tim Bergwall, 181 S. High Street, Dublin, OH, noted that this project is a great opportunity to make this corner beautiful and a complement to the neighborhood. Highly visible, it provides an entrance to Waterford Village, is adjacent to the park and historic barn, and an entrance to the downtown commercial district. The existing structure detracts from the character of the adjacent homes, both the older homes and those built more recently. Due to the costs of renovating the current structure, they decided to follow the Board's suggestion and started over.

Richard Taylor, Architect, 48 S. High Street, Dublin, OH, stated that the decision to replace the structure was partly based on the economics, as the cost of renovation would have been exorbitant. The proposed home is a 1.5-story gabled vernacular cottage with a wraparound front porch, connected to a barn-like structure that contains a garage with a home office above. He explained that they had no further information regarding materials, other than what was provided; however, they would probably use asphalt shingles and a small amount of standing seam metal on the roof, probably painted clapboard siding and trim, and some stone veneer. The windows will be wood clad with simulated divided lights. The proposed location is similar to that of the existing home, retaining the existing trees to the east, along with the stonewall along S. High Street. A new sidewalk would be extended from the house through that wall to the brick walk along S. High Street. The driveway would be moved to the back of the property, so that the garage doors face west away from the public streets. The proposed attached garage structure will have a third garage door placed on the south side of the garage, which will give that facade more interest and the opportunity to use that part of the garage as part of the entertaining space in the backyard. The new house is located entirely within the existing setbacks and should require no variances to building lines. He noted that the comments in the consultant's report regarding the "farmhouse" style were not from them; their intent was to provide a simple vernacular cottage. There are numerous examples of walkways that extend through the stonewall. No trees would need to be removed from the west side of the property. The existing shed would be retained, as it works with the overall composition and massing, although it also would be renovated. Landscaping would be addressed at a later time. He noted that there were comments about the roof height in the consultant's report. As the Board is aware, elevation views of sloped-roof buildings exaggerate the vertical aspect of the roof in relationship to the walls. He believes the relationship was correct, which was why they included the 3D images to give a view of the roof in relationship to the walls and the dormer.

Public Comments

No public comments were received on the case.

Board Discussion

1. Does the Board support demolition of the existing home and a portion of the historic stone wall?

Mr. Kownacki inquired what the permit requirements would be for demolition of the historic stone wall.

Ms. Martin responded that the Board's approval for demolition would need to be shown as part of the building permit. The applicant could either do a site only permit to modify that specific portion, or he

could include it with the entire building permit. An additional level of information would be required to ensure the structural integrity of the wall would remain after modification.

Mr. Kownacki stated that, in general, he does not support altering the historic walls, but in this case it could benefit the house by permitting a walkway to connect to S. High Street, which it fronts.

Ms. Kramb stated that the application would meet the first demolition criteria, as the home has no architectural historic significance. It would probably meet the criteria for economic hardship and for providing a better appearance than the existing structure. Typically, she would not support impacting the historic stonewall; however, if the gap is narrow and the ends were finished appropriately, it would be possible. The project would require a historic stone mason and the ends would need to be finished with the type of pillars reflected elsewhere along the street.

Mr. Kownacki noted that the building permit would require that, as well. What is the estimated width of the gap that would result?

Mr. Taylor agreed that it would be as narrow as possible, but probably no greater than 30 inches. There are no Code requirements for private path widths. There would be no issue with finishing the ends appropriately.

Ms. Bryan inquired if there were ADA requirements related to the opening.

Mr. Taylor responded that there were not, as there are other ways to access the site.

Mr. Cotter stated that he also does not favor demolition of historic stonewalls; however, if they could meet the demolition criteria and the Code permits, he would have no objection.

Mr. Alexander stated that the demolition is warranted, as the existing building is not well composed; it has no significant details indicating that it should be retained; and it is not consistent with the scale and character of the Historic District. He is supportive of the proposed walk connection to the street, as connecting the front of a home to the street animates the streetscape.

Ms. Bryan stated that the Board typically considers any remaining stonewalls in the Historic District as sacred; however, she is supportive of the walk connection to S. High Street. The applicant would need to provide the necessary information and details to proceed with that.

2. Does the Board support the proposed site layout, including the home, garage, patio, and driveway locations?

Ms. Kramb stated that in general she is supportive of the proposed site layout. She inquired if the driveway was located as far west as possible, as it would be preferable to locate the shed on the other side.

Mr. Taylor responded that they did not have enough room to move the shed, although the driveway could go further west. However, the shed is fortuitously positioned to screen the backyard, which with some landscaping, could provide some privacy in the backyard, even although the site is located on a very busy corner.

Ms. Kramb stated that the entrance to the shed is on the east, but the driveway will now be on the west.

Mr. Taylor responded that it was; at this point, he assumes the door would be moved to the other side.

Mr. Alexander stated that he likes the current location of the shed and appreciates that it will be re-clad, as it has the potential to become a focal point from that direction. He noted that as proposed, a courtyard space would be created at the back of the house. It is consistent with the Board's attempts to encourage independent outbuildings within the district. The connection between the house and the attached garage provides a good sense of separation.

Mr. Kownacki noted that he liked the proposed layout. The appearance of the existing shed will be improved and add to the characteristics of the property. Moving the driveway further west could give them more room, if the property line permitted.

Mr. Cotter and Ms. Bryan expressed agreement with their colleagues' comments.

3. Does the Board support the conceptual farmhouse character including the materials and architectural details?

Ms. Bryan noted that there is some difference of opinion in the character designation. Mr. Taylor remarked that he was not identifying the character as "farmhouse."

Ms. Bryan noted that the Board was asked to consider whether the style might contribute to a false historicism as a historic farmhouse was located at 167 S. High Street, and the historic Karrer Barn was directly to the south. Per Code, all building structures and sites shall be recognized as products of their own time. Alterations that have no historic basis and seek to create an earlier appearance inconsistent or inappropriate to the original history of the building shall be discouraged.

Mr. Kownacki responded that he does not believe historicism is misappropriated. It is a modern new build home that takes the character of the neighborhood into consideration.

Ms. Kramb stated that she does not believe the proposed character is farmhouse; it is more consistent with an urban bungalow.

Mr. Cotter stated that the proposed character is consistent with that of the surrounding homes, so there should be no conflict from a Code perspective.

Mr. Alexander stated that the proportions of roof to wall were very different from a traditional farmhouse. He likes the simplicity of the composition. The consultant advised avoiding use of stone just as a surface on the front elevation. He disagrees with the suggestion of using it on the dormer, however, as that is never done. He is hopeful the application submitted retains the same level of simplicity.

Mr. Kownacki stated that he also likes the simplicity of the design, which is very pleasing to the eye. The architecture is a combination of bungalow and cottage.

Ms. Bryan noted that the proposed architectural character would be a great addition to the neighborhood.

4. Does the Board support the proposed conceptual composition of the home including mass and scale?

Board members indicated support of the proposed composition, including mass and scale.

The applicant expressed appreciation for the Board's helpful input.

3. Pearl Patio Canopy at 88 N. High Street, 20-141ARB-MPR, Minor Project Review

A request for the installation of a louvered canopy structure over an existing restaurant patio space in the Bridge Park West Development, Building Z2, on a 0.34-acre site zoned Bridge Street District, Historic Transitional Neighborhood. The site is east of N. High Street, 100 feet southeast of the intersection with Rock Cress Parkway.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Rayburn stated that the site, which is located east of N. High Street, 400 feet north of the intersection with North Street and adjacent to the West Plaza, is in close proximity to the Scioto River and the future Riverside Crossing Park. The tenant space is located in building Z2 of the Bridge Park West development and has frontage to the west along N. High Street. Building Z2 is a non-historic structure, designed to complement the vernacular style of architecture in the District through the use of materials, colors, and window details, as identified in the Historic Dublin Design Guidelines. The applicant is requesting review and approval of a Minor Project Review for external modifications for the patio space located on the east side of Building Z2. Modifications include the installation of a louvered canopy structure over an existing patio, as well as associated furniture and fixture details. The east elevation is proposed to have a patio canopy with a louvered system, 11 feet in height from the established grade of the patio to the top of the structure. The bottom of the trellis would align with the storefront transom framing on the Z2 Building. The existing storefront features a bronze finish. The frame and louvers of the patio canopy are pre-finished aluminum in a bronze color to complement the existing materials. Three outdoor ceiling fans would be placed on the bottom side of the canopy, also finished in an oil-rubbed bronze color. The existing patio space was programmed to serve as an outdoor lounge space with casual seating around fire pits. The applicant is proposing to convert the outdoor lounge space into a more typical outdoor dining configuration with the optional louvered canopy providing protection from the natural elements. The new outdoor configuration consists of eight square tabletops and one tabletop for the existing fire table, accommodating 32 patrons. The tabletops will have a plywood core with an exterior white Kashmir White Granite finish. The table bases are cast iron with a black finish and zinc coating. The dining chairs have a bronze antique finish. The applicant is also proposing outdoor heaters, but has not provided unit specifications. The applicant should work with staff to provide those details prior to applying for building permits. The applicant is providing lighting, as well, in the patio canopy, but as proposed, it exceeds what is permitted per Code. Given the significant public investment in the pedestrian bridge and other public spaces nearby, staff is concerned that the lighting as proposed will negatively compete with that infrastructure. Staff recommends that the applicant continue to work with staff to provide more appropriate lighting levels.

Staff has reviewed the application against all applicable criteria and recommends approval with two conditions.

Applicant Presentation

Carter Bean, Architect/Principal, J Carter Bean Architect, 4400 North High Street, Suite 401, Columbus, Ohio 43214, thanked the Board for their comments on the first case tonight, which if built, would have cast a shadow on this patio from midday on. The reason for their application is that the current lounge configuration is not conducive to this particular restaurant. Although there is a need for more outdoor dining space, an outdoor space without a covering is inadequate. In order to provide covering for their

customers without diminishing the view of the river view from the terrace, a louvered system was proposed. The louvers will remain open to the extent possible, being closed only in inclement weather. They will work with staff to identify an unobtrusive light solution. The photometric plan provided shows the maximum levels of the proposed fixtures, which would be controlled by dimmers, keeping the lighting low to create mood. The only time the lighting would be on the high setting would be for very short periods of time for cleaning. He is unsure what technical tests could be used to provide assurance of meeting Code requirements, but they have no objection to providing that assurance.

Board Questions

Ms. Kramb inquired if there was a height limit for patio roofs.

Mr. Rayburn responded that they had looked at comparable patios and structures and confirmed the height of this proposal is in alignment.

Ms. Martin clarified that it would not be, as proposed. If the canopy were detached, the height would be limited. Because it is considered an architectural feature of the structure, the Board has discretion.

Ms. Kownacki inquired if governors could be incorporated to limit the light level of the fixtures.

Ms. Martin responded that the recommended condition would require the applicant to work with staff to identify a resolution that would meet Code, either a governor or an alternate light bulb or distribution. As proposed, the light level exceeds Code.

Mr. Kownacki noted that while the current manager of the Pearl might be in agreement with a lighting limitation, a future manager might not be. What would be the enforcement mechanism?

Ms. Martin responded that most of their enforcement is reactive rather than proactive, and given the location, it would probably be brought to the City's attention. Light meters can be used to test it. The tenants and building owner have been very collaborative, so it is safe to assume that any issues would be addressed promptly.

Mr. Alexander stated that there are two types of exterior heaters, which are either ground level or mounted at a height on a ceiling or a structural element. Mounted heaters at the perimeter could completely change the look.

Mr. Cotter inquired if the lights were located on the beams or the fans.

Mr. Bean responded that the fixture on which they ultimately decided is a can light applied to the surface of a beam, which would keep the hotspot of the fixture from being seen at angles. There are two beam lines that run over the patio, which will hold twelve can lights, with fans mounted between.

Mr. Cotter noted that there should not be much scattering of light into the neighborhood.

Mr. Bean responded affirmatively.

Mr. Cotter inquired about the line over the windows.

Mr. Bean responded that it was located at the transom line of the windows on the building.

Public Comment

No public comments were received on the case.

Board Discussion

Ms. Kramb expressed concern that the height of the canopy was cutting off the top part of the window. These are not true transoms, but are light-divided. The width of the roof is actually wider than the

light division. It looks odd leaving part of the window exposed. Could they raise the canopy height to just above the window?

Mr. Bean responded that while they were trying to make the structure as transparent as possible, it will still diminish the amount of natural light entering the space. They attempted to leave some portion of the window unobstructed, allowing sight lines to the sky and the entrance of natural light.

Ms. Kramb noted that in a new build, a patio roof could not be placed three-quarters of the way up on a window, so her preference would be to place it above the window. Is there any intention to add enclosure or shades to the space? She would object to shades or use of a plastic enclosure to permit year-round use.

Wayne Schick, Senior VP of Restaurant Planning and Procurement, Cameron Mitchell Restaurants, 390 W. Nationwide Blvd., Columbus, Ohio 43215, responded that there was no intent to do so. They want to be very respectful of the amazing view and the amount of money invested to have that. Although the river patio was intended as a lounging area, their patrons want to use the patio for dining; so they have searched for and found this solution. The proposed system will not provide much weather protection, however. It will provide some sun and light rain/mist protection, heaters, and fans to move the air, all of which will add more comfort to the experience.

Ms. Kramb stated that her concern is that the current conditions do not adequately address potential actions of a future owner.

Ms. Martin responded that the Board could add a condition that would address their concerns. If a future owner wished to do otherwise, they would need to submit an application to a public body for consideration. This is the last time the ARB will review an application for this building, as it will no longer be within the Board's jurisdiction.

Ms. Kramb stated that she would like to add a condition that would prohibit the patio space being made into a three-season space. In addition, she would prefer the canopy height be raised.

Mr. Kownacki stated that in regard to the canopy height, initially, his reaction was the same. However, from inside the restaurant, diners will have more view, including that of the top of the bridge. He understands the reasoning for the proposed height.

Mr. Cotter stated that he also understands the reasoning for where the patio roof has been located. He would agree with a condition that would require an application to add shades or an enclosure to the patio.

Mr. Alexander expressed agreement for raising the canopy roof height. Where it is proposed, it is not respectful to the building.

Ms. Bryan stated that she agrees with the need for a condition regarding future "wrapping" of the patio. The Board has differing views regarding the roof height in relationship to the windows.

Mr. Schick stated that there is a practical reason for the proposed 11-foot height. The heaters will provide little warmth above that height. They know this from experience, as they previously have mounted them to the ceiling at 11.6 feet and at 12.6 feet. At any greater height than what they have proposed, the heaters will not provide sufficient heat for dining in fall and spring weather. That is one of the main reasons for the transom line in the design.

Ms. Kramb stated that she would object to heaters in the ceiling of the canopy.

Mr. Alexander indicated he also would object.

Ms. Kramb stated that she assumed they would be portable heaters.

Mr. Schick stated that the restaurant currently has ceiling-mounted heaters under the front entry canopy and under the north patio.

Mr. Alexander inquired where they would be mounted, relative to this particular system. Would they be tucked up sufficiently, so that their depth would match that of the beams, blocking view of the heaters?

Mr. Bean responded that the beam depth is only two inches. They would have to use deeper beams just inside the gutter on the east and west sides, so that the heaters can be recessed into the beams. They would not hang down from the ceiling. There is a beam and a gutter to capture the rain off the louvers. They would add another horizontal beam inside the gutter, which would be sufficiently deep to contain the housing of the heaters, which are approximately 5.6 inches deep.

Mr. Cotter inquired the type and color of the heaters.

Mr. Bean responded that they are electric heaters. The face and backing of the heating element is reflective.

Mr. Alexander requested that a condition be added to clarify that the heaters must be recessed into a housing with a finish that matches the rest of the patio structure. He understands the need for the heaters to function as needed, so he has no objection to the height.

The applicant indicated they had no objection to the proposed conditions.

Mr. Kownacki moved, Mr. Cotter seconded approval of the Minor Project with three conditions:

- 1) That the applicant work with staff to recess the outdoor heaters within housing with a finish matching the proposed structure, subject to staff approval, prior to submitting for building permits.
- 2) That the applicant work with staff to modify the photometric plan to comply with the Code requirement that the maximum lumens per square foot not exceed 9.7 and additionally, that the maximum lumens per square foot not exceed 1 lumen per square foot at the edge of the patio.
- 3) That the applicant be prohibited from creating a 3-season enclosure of the patio canopy through use of vinyl, glass, or similar material.

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

5. Historic District Guidelines, 18-037ARB-ADM, Administrative Request

A request for review and recommendation of approval to Planning and Zoning Commission of the revised Historic Design Guidelines for properties located within the Architectural Review District and its outlying historic properties.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Martin stated that the Architectural Review Board Code and the Historic Dublin area rezoning were approved by City Council on February 22, 2021. The Historic Design Guidelines would replace the existing guidelines, providing additional direction for application of the Code by staff and the ARB. It would also be provided to residents and property owners to provide guidance for redevelopment of or preservation of existing structures within the District. The Board reviewed the draft at their November 18 meeting and requested more differentiation between architectural styles and building types. Staff consulted Stephen Gordon's, *How to Complete the Ohio Historic Inventory*, and revised the Guidelines so that the document is now aligned with the building types and architectural styles recognized by the State Historic Preservation Office. This also fulfills the Board's objective of making the Guidelines a user-friendly document.

Board Discussion

Ms. Bryan stated that from her perspective, as neither an architect nor a preservationist, is that this document is an excellent layman's guide, which she believes other cities may want to emulate.

Public Comments

No public comments were received on the case.

Mr. Kownacki moved, Ms. Kramb seconded a motion to refer to the Planning and Zoning Commission for their recommendation of approval to City Council.

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

2020 ARB Annual Report

Ms. Martin provided an overview of the 2020 ARB Annual Report. In 2020, the Board accepted 45 new applications or new cases; reviewed 62 agenda items, of which a number where Informal Reviews; and issued 30 Board Orders. The report reflects that the type, volume, and quality of the Board's work shifted significantly the past five years.

Consensus of the Board was to forward to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a recommendation of approval to City Council.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

Gary Alexander

Vice Chair, Architectural Review Board

Judith K. Beal

Assistant Clerk of Council