



MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, March 24, 2021

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Alexander, Vice Chair, called the March 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

Mr. Alexander led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Board Members present: Mr. Alexander, Mr. Cotter, Mr. Kownacki, Ms. Kramb.
[Ms. Bryan resigned as of 03-04-2021]

Staff present: Ms. Martin, Mr. Hounshell

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Kramb moved, Mr. Cotter seconded acceptance of the documents into the record and approval of the February 24, 2021 Board minutes as submitted.

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

[Motion carried 4-0]

Mr. Alexander stated that the Architectural Review Board is responsible for review of construction, modification or alteration to any site in the Review District or area subject to Architectural Board Review under the provision of Zoning Code Section 153.170. The Board has the decision-making responsibility on these cases.

The Vice Chair swore in staff and applicants who planned to address the Board on any of the cases during the meeting

Mr. Alexander stated that Case 3 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.

CONSENT CASE

3. COHatch Dublin – Signs, 21-012MPR, Minor Project Review

A request for the installation of two signs for a tenant space on a 0.27-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic Core, located southeast of the intersection of N. High Street with North Street.

Public Comment

No public comment was submitted for this case.

Mr. Alexander inquired if the applicant had any objections to the conditions of approval.

Oliver Holtsberry, 1640 Harmon Avenue Columbus, OH 43223, applicant, indicated he was unaware of the conditions for approval.

Ms. Martin read the two proposed conditions.

Mr. Holtsberry indicated he had no objection to the two conditions.

Mr. Kownacki moved, Ms. Kramb seconded approval of the Minor Project with the following 2 conditions:

1. That the applicant apply for and successfully obtain permanent sign permits through the Building Standards Division prior to installation of the signs.
2. That the applicant provide light fixture specifications to ensure a high quality fixture is used, subject to staff approval.

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

[Motion carried 4-0]

INFORMAL REVIEW CASE

1. 110-112 S. Riverview Street, 21-019INF, Informal Review

A request for an informal review and feedback to demolish a two-family residence and construction of ±3,000-square-foot, single-family residence. The 0.589-acre site is proposed to be subdivided into two lots, zoned Historic District, Historic Residential. The site is east of S. Riverview Street, ±75 feet south of the intersection with Pinneyhill Lane.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Hounshell stated that this is a request for an Informal Review with non-binding feedback for 110 and 112 S. Riverview Street. The 0.589-acre site, which is zoned HD-HR, Historic Residential, is located southeast of the intersection of S. Riverview Street and Pinneyhill Lane. The site has a significant grade change moving west to east from S. Riverview Street to the Scioto River and contains a number of mature trees. The eastern portion of the site lies within a floodplain, and a 24-foot storm easement extends along the northern portion. Consequently, the only developable land on the site is the western half -- where the existing structure is located. [Photos of adjacent properties shown for site context.]

History

In November 2018, the Architectural Review Board informally reviewed an application for a potential demolition and new construction of a new 3,000-square-foot single-family home. The proposed ranch home was generally within the footprint of the existing home. The Board was supportive of a proposed demolition and construction of a new home. They were not supportive of the proposed 3-car attached garage on the northern portion of the site, as they believed it was not appropriate within the District. Subsequent to that review, no formal application was made for the demolition or development. On February 22, 2021, City Council approved amendments to the Architectural Review Board section of the Zoning Code, which removed the Historic District from the Bridge Street District and established updated zoning requirements; that legislation became effective March 23, 2021. The Code provides specific guidelines for development within the Historic District. At the same meeting, City Council also approved an area rezoning, removing Historic Districts from the Bridge Street District, including the Historic Transitional District on the northern portion of the Historic District. The Code amendment also provided more requirements for demolition.

Approval of demolitions within the District are now based on whether a structure is designated Contributing or Non-Contributing by the 2017 Historic and Cultural Assessment. The applicant is seeking Commission feedback regarding a potential demolition request and the construction of a single-family home. The site currently contains a 1966 two-family, brick ranch duplex. Although the structure is not included on the Ohio Historical Inventory, it was considered Contributing by the Historic and Cultural Assessment. The applicant will be required to provide documentation that the structure meets the demolition criteria before pursuing future demolition approval by the ARB.

Site Plan

The applicant is proposing to split the existing lot into two developable lots, with the approval of demolition of the existing home. The lot split can be approved administratively by Planning and Engineering staff, as long as it meets the requirements of the Historic District Guidelines for new lots. Both lots will meet the required minimum lot standards. The applicant is proposing to develop the northern of the two lots, which will be approximately 0.33 acres in size, and located immediately south of the 24-foot storm easement. The proposal is for an approximately 2,900-square-foot, cottage-style home with a 1.5-story mass along S. Riverview Street. The proposed structure will be set back approximately 10 feet from S. Riverview Street, meeting the minimum front yard setback requirement for homes on the east side of that street. It will also have a 4-foot side setback from the southern property line where 3 feet is the minimum requirement. The form of the home is a multi-pitched, side-gabled roofline interrupted by a front-gable, two-car garage; a center front gable for the main portion of the home; and a front door recessed into the front elevation. The primary materials will be horizontal siding, vertical board and batten and a stone foundation. Window selections throughout the home contain two-over-two windows, two-over-three windows, one-over-three windows and single panel windows. The new Code requires attached, front-loaded garages to be set back 20 feet from the front elevation of the home. Currently, the location is aligned with the front elevation, which would require ARB approval of a Waiver with the Minor Project application. The east elevation of the home will have a street level balcony and a lower level balcony within the same footprint. The south elevation reflects a stone-clad chimney and a step-down stone foundation from the front to the rear of the home. Per the new Historic District Code, the maximum height for homes within this district has been lowered from 35 feet from grade to 24 feet from grade. Due to the significant grade change, the height of the rear elevation likely will exceed the height requirement; therefore, a waiver would need to be approved with the Minor Project application.

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

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

Applicant Presentation

Heather Frient, property owner/applicant, 110-112 S. Riverview Street, Dublin, stated that their intent is to build a house that is in alignment with other homes within the neighbourhood in regard to size and architecture. They are interested in giving someone else the opportunity to build in this neighbourhood, as well. For that reason, as well as economic purposes, they would like to split the lot for two homes.

Board Questions

Mr. Cotter stated that he reviewed the history provided on the case. The Cultural Assessment was completed in 2017, and in the ARB's 2018 review of a previous application for this site, the structure was

identified as Non-Contributing but eligible to be considered Contributing. What has changed from 2018 to now?

Ms. Martin responded that nothing has changed since 2018, other than staff's experience in reviewing and administering the Cultural Assessment, which lists the property as recommended "Contributing." The reason that a designation of "recommended" was used at the time was to provide the City some latitude in administering the document. Ultimately, City Council did adopt the document and affirmed the recommendations. All of the integrity markers are met for this property. Essentially, the main difference is staff's understanding of the administration of the document; the property now is considered Contributing.

Ms. Kramb stated that 2018 was a transition year. This report made a general recommendation to expand the years of significance for the Historic District property assessment up to 50 years -- including homes up to 1967, thereby including Mid-Century Modern homes. In her assessment, the Mid-Century Modern ranches in the older section of the District are not contributing, although Mid-Century Modern ranches within the Monterey Drive area would more accurately be considered Contributing.

Mr. Alexander stated that the staff report identifies issues with asbestos, lead paint, windows and foundation issues. To what extent are those issues?

Ms. Frient responded that based on the year in which the house was built, their assumption is that lead paint and asbestos is present. They did not have that tested, however. Their assessment of the windows is a visual assessment.

Andy Melaragno, Melaragno Design Company, 4138 Greensview Dr, Columbus, OH 43220, commented on issues of disrepair. If the intent was to occupy the house long-term, there are several issues of disrepair that would need to be addressed. Overall, the house is not in good condition. Repairing the foundation alone would be significant.

Public Comments

Mr. Alexander stated that the Board received three letters of support from people within the vicinity. He does not believe they need to be read publicly; he inquired if any Board member preferred they be read. [No member requested they be read.]

No additional public comments were received, subsequent to the letters.

Board Discussion

1) Does the Board support demolition of the existing home?

Mr. Alexander stated that because the structure is identified as Contributing, the applicant would need to meet the following criteria for demolition:

- o providing credible evidence of economic hardship; or
- o evidence that this is a Non-Contributing structure.

Mr. Hounshell stated that because the structure has been assessed as Contributing to the District, the applicant could request a waiver or present a case for considering it Non-Contributing.

Ms. Kramb stated that as an architectural historian, her opinion is that it is not a Contributing structure. However, if the applicant proceeds with the designation of Contributing, she believes they should be able to meet the criteria for demolition.

Mr. Cotter stated that he read the document concerning the criteria for a designation of Contributing, and he had difficulty identifying any of the necessary markers. Providing evidence of being Non-Contributing would seem to be the best way forward.

Mr. Kownacki stated that this house is not an outstanding example of Mid-Century Modern. He would be supportive of a waiver for demolition.

Mr. Alexander stated that if the applicant can meet one of two criteria, the option exists for demolition; however, he does not yet see credible evidence of economic hardship. The Board hears cases regularly for renovation projects. He believes it is a usable building, and demolishing it would be a waste of materials and an unnecessary addition of building product to the landfill. This building could have another life. The current structure is actually better sited and utilizes the topography better than the proposed building. It also has more in common with the houses that are built along that ridge. There are some positive aspects of the structure, as well as the fact that it is considered Contributing by the City's guiding documents. However, he is willing to look at evidence of economic hardship.

Mr. Cotter inquired if it would be necessary for the applicant to hire a professional to identify elements validating that the structure should be considered Non-Contributing.

Mr. Hounshell responded affirmatively. That would be necessary, if they were requesting a waiver. However, they would also need to meet the criteria for obtaining demolition approval.

Mr. Cotter inquired if the ARB would be the reviewing body for both a waiver and a demolition request.

Mr. Hounshell responded affirmatively.

2) Does the Board support the proposed site layout?

Mr. Cotter inquired if the lot were split, would there be sufficient space on the second lot for a similar building.

Mr. Hounshell responded that the proposed lot split would meet the minimum requirements of the Historic District. However, he does not know if the same footprint would fit on the second lot.

Ms. Kramb inquired if the southern lot would be slightly smaller than the northern lot.

Mr. Hounshell responded affirmatively. The northern lot contains the entirety of the 24-foot storm easement, so the developable area is less than the southern lot.

Ms. Kramb inquired if three feet is the minimum sideyard setback, would the second home be permitted to build within three feet of either side property line.

Mr. Hounshell responded that the minimum sideyard setback is three feet and there must be a combined minimum between homes of 12 feet.

Mr. Kownacki inquired about the waiver that would be necessary for the garage as it is currently aligned with the front elevation. It would not be possible to set the garage back because the topography is so severe.

Mr. Alexander responded that in his previous experience with a home next to the river having an even greater grade drop, a precast concrete plank was used on the garage floor. Although it was an atypical residential structure and costly, it did provide the opportunity to have usable, accessible space at that level, without the use of gravel. Another option would be to build a retaining wall for the back wall of the garage and fill up the difference with gravel or compacted fill on which to build the garage slab. Although the topography is a challenge, there are ways in which to address it. If this were to remain one lot, it would be possible to separate the garage visually to a greater extent. The spirit of the Code could be met, not by pushing the garage back, but by creating greater separation. Either a connector or a detached garage would be an option.

Mr. Kownacki inquired the required garage setback from the front of the house.

Mr. Hounshell responded that front-loaded garages are required to be 20 feet from the front elevation of building.

Mr. Cotter stated that the location of the house on the site is reasonable. He is not sure if the home meets the 24-foot height requirement; due to the grade, it would appear that the rear elevation will require a height waiver. The garage location will be a challenge.

Ms. Kramb stated that she is concerned about splitting the lot. She is unsure how usable the southern lot would be. It will be difficult to find anyone who will want to build on that lot due to the size limitation. There would be approximately 72 feet frontage for the southern lot, and it will be necessary to meet the requirement for combined 12-foot sideyard setbacks. That would result in a home approximately 60 feet in width, and it cannot be deep, due to the slope of the lot. The second home will be quite close to the home on the northern lot. Therefore, if the applicant proceeds with an application for consideration, it should include a feasibility analysis regarding what could be built on the southern lot, including the possible square footage of the structure. Her preference would be that it remain one lot with one house and more space; however, she might be able to support a lot split with more information provided.

Mr. Kownacki stated that a positive element about the potential lot split is that it would reduce the potential size of the homes that could be placed there. Smaller homes on that street would be preferable.

Mr. Kownacki stated that he is unsure if the financial feasibility of constructing a home on the southern lot would be within the purview of the ARB.

Mr. Alexander stated that the only item of concern to him is the garage. The goal is to emphasize the front of the house and de-emphasize the garage. Since a 20-foot setback of the garage from the front façade is not possible on this site, de-emphasizing the garage in some way is a possibility.

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

Mr. Cotter stated from the front, the mass looks good. The garage is a separate issue. The front elevation of the 1.5-story home should be less than the 24-foot minimum height, but the rear elevation will exceed the height requirement. The pylons/pillars do not look sufficiently substantial. He believes the height issue can be addressed, so he has no issue with the mass and scale.

Ms. Kramb stated that she is supportive of the mass and scale. She appreciates that it is a small house, and she could support a rear height waiver due to the slope.

Mr. Kownacki stated that what he appreciates about the house is that its size is not obvious from the front. Although it is almost 3,000 square feet, it does not appear to be that large from the front. He wonders if the home were sited closer to the front property line, if it would be possible to push the garage back just a few feet to achieve more separation.

Mr. Alexander stated that he also would support a height waiver for the rear elevation. It is not fair to apply that criteria on steeply sloping sites. If it meets the height requirement at the front, it is fine. He is generally fine with the mass and scale.

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

Mr. Alexander suggested the elevations be discussed individually.

West and north elevations

Mr. Alexander stated that he agrees with most of the comments in the consultant's report about the elevations. West elevation: he appreciates the attempt to separate the house into two sections: the larger, primary living space; and the smaller garage and connector with a window. However, the materials do not

provide differentiation. The board and batten siding blurs any distinction of the area inside the porch and the space beyond the porch. He does not agree with the consultant's recommendation to eliminate the board and batten completely, but it would be more complementary if the board and batten was just within the porch itself. On the north elevation: he has concerns about the change in fenestration. He would recommend a structural engineer be involved in the design process before final drawings are submitted. He also is concerned about the columns. The column in the corner may change, and the other columns may not be necessary. If they are retained, they should have relationship to the division up above. The pieces do not seem to work together as well as they could; the elevations need to be more unified.

Mr. Cotter stated that he likes the two materials on the west, front elevation, including the board and batten. Perhaps, they could be handled in a slightly different manner architecturally. On the north elevation, the stepdown of the stone foundation looks strange. He agrees that the siting of the pillars does not look correct. In addition, the windows do not line up; they should be more synergistic with the remainder of the structure. If the stone material extended all the way across the elevation, the home would appear to be set on a sturdy base.

Mr. Kownacki stated that he is not qualified to speak to the structural matters, but most of the north and south elevations will not be visible. While it would be preferable if the stone lined up, he has no issue with the proposed stepdown. He has no issue with the use of the board and batten; he likes the appearance of the house.

Ms. Kramb stated that she has no concerns with the west, front elevation, although it would be preferable to offset the garage slightly. She cannot detect how the windows are different, so has no issues with those on the west elevation. On the north elevation, she does not believe the pillars will be sufficient; something much more substantial will be needed at the corner to hold the weight. One way of continuing the stone, could be to make that a stone pillar. However, the pillar issue will be resolved during the design stage as they define something more substantial to accommodate the weight. The window configuration on the porch does not need to be the same configuration as on the house, as long as it clearly looks like a porch. A complementary window type is fine.

East and south elevations

Ms. Kramb stated that it is difficult to tell how wide the rear porches will be; those issues will be worked out during design. Her preference would not be the stepped stone foundation; she would prefer a consistent line across. She does not believe the cantilever is a problem. The window in that small section seemed large compared to the others on that elevation. However, these minor items can be worked out; she likes the architecture.

Mr. Kownacki stated that he has no issue with the stepped foundation of the south elevation and likes the continuation of the board and batten on the east/rear elevation.

Mr. Cotter stated that while he also prefers a straight line for the stone foundation, overall, he likes the proposed architecture.

Mr. Alexander stated that he also agrees with the consultant in regard to continuing the stone straight across; it would help break up the mass on that side elevation. He also agrees with the suggestion to bring the stone of the chimney down, marrying it into the stone at the base, and thereby breaking up the solid mass at the corner. He would suggest that if grids are used in the windows on the front and sides, they also should be used on the entire house, with the porch being the exception. Applying the grids in one area, alluding to something historic, resembles false historicism, which the Code prohibits.

Mr. Alexander inquired if the applicant had any questions.

Mr. Melaragno stated that he would like to seek clarification regarding some of the Board members' comments. In regard to the board and batten – would it be acceptable to use it on the hyphen and use horizontal siding on the porch, thereby distinguishing the hyphen from the rest of the house?

Mr. Alexander stated that the Board has provided suggestions only. However, Mr. Melaragno's suggestion would address the issue of differentiating the hyphen from the porch itself. Although the Board has provided some suggestions, they are not requirements.

Mr. Melaragno stated that, at this point, the proposed columns were conceptual placemarkers. He would be consulting with a structural engineer, focusing on the size, shape and details of the columns. In regard to the garage setback, the proposed front setback is 10 feet from the right-of-way. Due to the slope, the foundation, cantilevers and garage depth, there is a need to keep the foundation as reasonable as possible; farther back, the slope on the site becomes more steep. The intent was to keep the rear elevation as close as possible to the street and within the reasonable grade. Perhaps the front elevation could be pulled forward slightly and the garage location could remain where it is proposed.

Ms. Krumb responded that she would be supportive of that suggestion; it would be helpful to provide one to two feet of separation.

Mr. Kownacki stated that he has not visited the site, but the grade drop in that area is steep. The applicant can decide if the suggestions that have been offered are feasible. Moving the house forward slightly would provide the illusion of separation; however, he would not vote to disapprove if that is not possible.

Ms. Krumb stated that a waiver will be necessary, regardless, as the garage is not set back 20 feet from the front elevation. She is supportive of a waiver.

Mr. Melaragno stated that the porch windows have been addressed. The original intent was to match what they now have in their sunroom – quadruple-hung, which maximizes the opening space but permits some winterization. They have since determined that the windows will be eliminated, and this will be a screened porch. The columns will be appropriate for the foundation space below. The consultant's report recommended sash or double-hung windows as opposed to casement windows. At the back of the house, they are attempting to maximize the view. Eliminating the grids on those windows was to provide an unobstructed view. Because the rear of house is visible only from the ravine, hopefully, that is acceptable. He inquired the Board consensus on the cantilevers. The cantilevers facilitate their effort to keep the foundation as small as possible.

Mr. Alexander stated that he has no objection to the cantilevers. While he does prefer consistent grids, he does not agree with the consultant's recommendation against the use of casement windows. There are many examples of historic homes with casement windows. In fact, he believes the casement window is a good choice for a smaller window type.

Mr. Cotter and Mr. Kownacki indicated that they have no objection to the cantilevers or casement windows. Mr. Kownacki inquired the reason they suggested grids for the front of the home.

Mr. Melaragno responded that it was to create a more homey, less sterile look. Little details make a house more interesting.

Ms. Krumb stated that she has no objection to their use of casement windows.

Mr. Melaragno thanked the Board for their very helpful input.

NEW CASE

2. 53 N. High Street, 21-007MPR, Minor Project Review

A request for replacement windows for a building on a 0.22-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic Core. The site is southwest of the intersection of N. High Street with North Street.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Martin stated that this is a request for review and approval of a proposal for new windows for 53 N. High Street. The site is southwest of the intersection of N. High Street with North Street, immediately south of the Dublin branch of the Columbus Metropolitan Library. The site is .22 acres in size and contains a historic structure with a building addition to the rear. The historic portion of the structure, which is sited along N. High Street, was originally built in 1845 and functioned as the Dublin Christian Church until the late 1800s. According to the City's Historic Cultural Assessment, this property is recommended Contributing to the Historic District. The property is also identified on the National Register of Historic Places. The existing one-story vernacular-style building has undergone modifications over time including a front porch on the N. High Street elevation and a rear building addition facing N. Darby Street. The addition is well-integrated with the character of the historic structure, although it is separated by a connector with a cross-gable roof. The historic building and building addition are clad in stone, and the entire roof sheathed in metal standing seam.

Proposal

The applicant is proposing the replacement of all windows on the historic section of the building. Three two-over-two wood sash windows are located on the north façade (facing North Street), three two-over-two wood sash windows are located on the south façade (interior property line), and two two-over-two wood sash windows are located on the east façade (facing N. High Street). Today, there are storm windows that cover the historic windows. The north entry door, located on the non-historic section of the building, is proposed to be replaced. All the trim is proposed to be repainted to match the new windows. The existing windows on the structure are of a consistent size and scale and are two-over-two windows; one window on the south elevation is significantly smaller in size and differs in character from the other seven windows. The proposed replacement windows are a Renewal by Andersen, Series One wood composite window (Fibrex) clad in extruded acrylic. The Historic Dublin Preservation Design Guidelines recommend preservation of existing wood windows, unless deterioration beyond repair can be demonstrated. In such cases, replacement windows may be acceptable, if they simulate the character of the original wood windows. The proposed replacement wood composite window is fabricated of wood fiber bound with a resin and then clad in acrylic. The recently revised Code requires windows be made of wood, metal-clad wood, or vinyl-clad wood; therefore, approval of the proposed window would require the Board's approval of a Waiver to the window materials requirement. The proposed windows are double-hung with a flat sill and grilles between the glass with a two-over-two pattern in a Terratone color (gray-brown). Staff has recommended a condition that a full simulated divided lite window with interior and exterior muntins and spacer bar be included if the Andersen Series One window is approved. All building and window trim is proposed to be painted to match the windows. The existing door on the north elevation is proposed to be replaced with a ProVia Legacy smooth steel door with clear glass and sidelites and brass hardware. Staff has reviewed the application against the criteria and due to deterioration of the existing wood windows, recommends approval the requested waiver and approval of the Minor Project Review application with one condition.

Board Questions

Mr. Cotter inquired the age of the existing windows.

Ms. Martin responded that staff has no specific knowledge of their age, although they are single-pane and appear to be quite old.

Tim Cistone, Bottom Line CPA, applicant/property owner, 53 N. High Street, Dublin, OH 43017, stated that the windows are not original but have been in place for a long time.

Ms. Kramb stated that in her estimation, the windows date from the turn of the century, approximately 1900. They are likely the second set of windows in the building.

Mr. Cotter inquired if consideration was given to rehabilitation of the existing windows. Mel Richards, Renewal by Andersen, product representative, 5850 Sawmill Rd, Dublin, OH 43017, stated that was Mr. Cistone's initial approach, as rehabilitation would be less expensive than replacement. However, if the windows were rehabilitated, they would remain single pane and single-hung, with only the bottom sash being movable. The proposed replacement window would be double-hung, both sashes movable, and they have a full screen, not a bottom half screen. Their screens are color-matched to the exterior of the windows.

Applicant Presentation

Mr. Richards stated that he has re-worked the proposal to meet the requirement for the muntins. He noted that the same wood composite is used for the exterior portion of the mullions as is used for the window frames, so they also will not be vulnerable to the weather.

Board Questions/Discussion

Ms. Kramb inquired if the applicant has looked into rehabilitation or only replacement.

Mr. Cistone stated that a couple of years earlier, he had looked into rehabilitation, as it would be less expensive. Because he was told that was not feasible, replacement seemed to be a less tedious direction to take. It would be beneficial from an efficiency perspective. Storm windows are essential; the current windows have no energy efficiency. Having energy efficient windows are essential for the comfort of the existing tenants.

Ms. Kramb stated that the Code requests restoration over replacement, so before replacement could be approved, it would be necessary to provide documentation of cost quotes for window restoration. There are ways to make older windows more efficient, and some of those methods are less expensive than window replacement. Evidence must be presented of considering restoration first.

Mr. Richards stated that the major issue with re-storing an older wood window is that it will remain a wood window. The City's Code states that "a wood window, a metal-clad wood window or a vinyl-clad wood window is required." The problem with that requirement is that regardless of how a wood window is clad, it remains a wood, which can in many cases, eventually rot. Andersen's Windows has existed since 1903, and in the early years, their wood windows came from 100-year old trees with 100-year growth rings. That lumber was impermeable to the weather. Even though they may be single-pane, wood windows from those years have no trace of rot. In the 1950s, government regulations were enacted prohibiting use of Ponderosa Pine and certain fir trees. Since then, companies have been producing lumber from their own forest lands, and due to growth enhancement, they have been growing trees faster. New-growth lumber may have only 15 growth rings and is highly susceptible to rotting. That was the genesis of the cladding era in the 1980s. The difficulty with cladding is that there is new growth lumber underneath and there are a myriad of circumstances where moisture can compromise the wood. With metal-clad windows, the sun heats up the metal causing the wood to swell, essentially, creating a worse problem. Any metal-clad window is subject to rotting from the inside out.

Ms. Kramb clarified that she has no issue with clad windows. Her question is if the existing windows are hardwood, is it rotting? What would it take to re-glaze and reseal the windows to make them more efficient? More information is needed about the existing windows. It is necessary to justify replacing them.

Mr. Alexander stated that when Historic Districts specify the kind of windows as Dublin does with its Guidelines, there are many issues involved. Mr. Richards is presenting one point of view, but there are

other points of view with Historic Districts. What is in Dublin's Code is not unique; it is common language in most Historic Districts for replacement windows.

Mr. Alexander stated that the proposed windows do not meet City Code. He inquired if Mr. Cistone had explored replacement windows that do meet the Code.

Mr. Cistone stated that his exploration was limited to a discussion with a professional two years earlier and most recently, with Mr. Richards.

Mr. Alexander inquired if he had not looked at any other product line, perhaps even offered by Andersen Windows, that would meet City Code.

Mr. Cistone responded that Andersen's was not the first company he contacted, but he has remained with Andersen's because he was convinced of the quality of their product and warranty. From there, they attempted to meet the requirements for Dublin's Historic District. Currently, they are unable to remove the storm windows on the windows facing High Street, because of the cracks at the top. In regard to the question regarding rotting, there is some rotting of the windows. However, if it is necessary to conduct some initial investigations into the ability to repair versus replace, he is hopeful the process for that replacement does not become lengthy. He understands there is a Code for the Historic District, but who are the correct people to contact for such an evaluation? He is willing to take the Board's suggestions, but his goal is to have a quality window, no additional storm windows, and a solution that will also retain the building's historic look.

Mr. Alexander stated that when he visited the site and looked at the existing windows, they did appear to be potentially repairable. However, if he were to present a case for replacement, there are additional Code requirements that the dimensions and profile of the sash elements and muntins meet the current profile. That information would need to be included with the application, including a cut that shows the profile. Some of the other replacement window products offer a different profile, including smaller, curved elements and the ability to customize to match the existing profile. Before this Board can consider a window that does not meet the City's Code, it will be essential to have much more information than has been provided.

Mr. Richards indicated that he would be able to provide diagram of the cuts.

Mr. Cotter stated that he agrees that more information must be provided before removing existing older elements in a historic building. If there is evidence that the windows cannot be restored, any replacement window would need to meet the current profile, consistent with the spirit of the Code.

Mr. Kownacki stated that he is in agreement with fellow members' comments and has nothing additional to add.

Ms. Krumb stated that the applicant can contact the Ohio State Historic Preservation Office. They have a large amount of information about preservation of windows, including contractors that handle historic windows, who might be able to provide an assessment regarding the possible of restoration of the current windows and quotes for the works. Because this building is listed on the National Register and it is an income-producing building, historic tax credits at both the state and federal level that help subsidize the cost of restoration versus replacement. There are also state grants available for window restoration. Depending on the condition of the windows, restoration may be less expensive than replacement.

Mr. Richards stated that another key element in energy efficient windows is how the argon gas is added between the two panes. With their process, they are able to effect better than a 99% fill of the argon. As a result, after 20 years, the fail rate on their seals is less than .5%. In terms of energy efficient, window rehabilitations are always a "bandaids." As a result, in 10 years, the property owner is applying to repeat the process. To correct the terminology, their product is not a "Fibrex clad window with extruded acrylic." Their windows are not clad. They use a process called co-extrusion. As the Fibrex composite is being

extruded through dyes, the acrylic is extruded at the same time. The acrylic is not applied as a coating to the Fibrex; the color bonds and fuses with the Fibrex, hence the warranty that the acrylic will not chip, crack, peel, blister or flake for 20 years. In summary, the energy efficiency life of a rehabilitated window will not be the same as that with a replacement window.

Mr. Alexander stated that Andersen's has an outstanding replacement and a very good product. However, there are certain steps required by Code for this Board to follow in their reviews. Those steps have not yet been taken. The Board appreciates his time and presentation. Because the request cannot be approved at this meeting, would the applicant prefer to table the request?

Mr. Cistone inquired the length of time involved for rescheduling the request for review.

Mr. Martin responded that typically materials must be provided to staff four weeks before a meeting. The next meeting is April 28, which would provide a week to obtain the information to be submitted for that meeting.

Mr. Cistone stated that he would attempt to obtain the necessary assessment and price quote as quickly as possible.

Ms. Krumb stated that a door was also included in the application; she has no issue with the proposed door, as it was replacing like for like.

Mr. Alexander inquired if there was a need to approve the door at this time and table the window consideration.

Ms. Martin stated that although the door was included with the windows, there was no need for it to go before the Board. Because it is considered a maintenance item, it can be removed from the application. Staff will work with the applicant so that he can proceed with the door replacement; it will not be part of the application when it comes back for consideration.

Mr. Alexander confirmed that the case would not be tabled to a date specific. The applicant would have the flexibility to request it be scheduled. He inquired if the applicant wished for the case to be tabled.

Mr. Cistone indicated that he would like the case to be tabled as stated.

Mr. Kownacki moved, Ms. Krumb seconded to table the Minor Project Review.

Vote: Mr. Kownacki, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Krumb, yes.

[Motion carried 4-0]

Ms. Krumb suggested that Mr. Cistone also contact Heritage Ohio, which provides a list of window restoration companies at its website.

Mr. Cistone thanked Ms. Krumb for her suggestion; he would reach out to them immediately.

GOAL SETTING

Ms. Martin stated that City Council has prioritized training for its Board and Commission members. To assist in identifying education topics for 2021, PZC, ARB and BZA members have been requested to provide their recommendations for education topics. The following questions were provided in the meeting packet to facilitate the Board's discussion:

- What training and educational topics would the Board like to participate and learn more about in 2021?
- What format should these trainings take (self-paced, group discussion, presentations, virtual conference sessions, articles, combination)?
- What planning projects would the Board like more information about?
- What is the preferred format for staff to provide updates to the Board?

- What information or assistance can staff provide the Board members in preparation for the meeting?

The Board discussed and recommended the following training and education topics to pursue in 2021:

- A forum on the case review process, including evaluation components of staff's review, and guidance on how Board members individually and holistically might approach the review with more commonality.
- Information be provided regarding any studies in process or completed that might impact the Historic District. These could be studies conducted by other boards, committees, consultants. Information should also be provided regarding any negotiations occurring for the purchase of property within the District that might impact the Board review process; for example, the recent purchase of six properties within the District. The Board was unaware that purchase would be occurring, the reason for it and the plans for the property. On occasion, the City has involved the Historical Society in their planning process, but the ARB was not made aware, although it involved the Historic District. A recent example was the Council initiative establishing the Historic Dublin Task Force and their subsequent meetings.
- Packet materials should continue as currently provided with the inclusion of:
 - regular updates concerning Council initiatives and projects.
 - case information concerning any items on which there was difficulty reaching resolution during staff's review process.
- Preference for both a self-paced training format, including education topics the members may pursue by choice, and group education provided at the regular meetings having lighter agendas.
[Note: all group education/training must be provided within a noticed public meeting setting. While members may meet socially, no City business may be discussed.]
- Walking tour of Historic Dublin existing projects and historic buildings.
- Provide a specific location at the City website with source information regarding historic building renovation and preservation issues for both members and potential applicants.

Ms. Martin thanked the ARB members for their recommendations and noted that staff would incorporate the suggestions into a proposed quarterly strategy, which will be provided for the April meeting.

COMMUNICATIONS

- The next regular meeting of the ARB is scheduled for April 28, 2021.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:05 p.m.

Gary Alexander

Vice Chair, Architectural Review Board

Judith K. Beal

Assistant Clerk of Council