



MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, April 28, 2021

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Alexander, Vice Chair, called the April 28, 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.

OATH OF OFFICE

Vice Mayor De Rosa administered the Oaths of Office to Architectural Review Board re-appointees, Gary Alexander and Sean Cotter and to new Board appointee, Martha Cooper.

ROLL CALL

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

Staff present: Ms. Martin, Mr. Ridge

ADJOURNMENT TO EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. Cotter moved, Mr. Kownacki seconded to adjourn to executive session for the following purpose:

- To consider the appointment of a public official.

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

[Motion approved 5-0.]

MEETING RECONVENED

Mr. Kownacki moved, Ms. Kramb seconded to reconvene the meeting.

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

[Motion approved 5-0.]

[The meeting was reconvened at 6:52 p.m.]

ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR

Mr. Cotter moved, Ms. Cooper seconded to elect Ms. Kramb to serve as ARB Vice Chair for April 2021 through March 2023.

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

Mr. Kownacki moved, Mr. Cotter seconded to elect Gary Alexander to serve as ARB Chair for April 2021 through March 2023.

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

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

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

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

Mr. Alexander stated that the Architectural Review Board is responsible for review of construction, modifications or alterations 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 Chair swore in staff and applicants who planned to address the Board on any of the cases during the meeting.

INFORMAL REVIEW CASE

1. 37 W. Bridge Street, 21-043INF, Informal Review

A request for an Informal Review and feedback for exterior modifications to a historic structure located on a 0.22-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic Core, located southwest of the intersection of W. Bridge Street with Mill Lane.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Ridge stated that this is a request for an Informal Review for proposed exterior modifications to an existing historic structure located at 37 W. Bridge Street. The site has two components -- an existing single-story front gable core located centrally at the northern end of the site with a two-story, flat-roof addition at the rear. The original core of the building is of stone masonry construction with a roof sheathed in slate and a stone foundation. The addition is a concrete block structure. The original structure was constructed in 1944 and housed both the Dublin and Perry Township fire departments. An existing paver sidewalk leads from the existing concrete patio to the sidewalk along W. Bridge Street. There are two stonewalls adjacent to the patio. There is a large trim piece over the existing storefront system.

Proposal

The applicant is proposing to enclose the existing concrete patio on the north side of the structure with a traditional black wrought iron fence immediately adjacent to an existing stonewall. The

remainder of the site will remain largely unchanged. More details, such as height and dimensions will need to be provided, should the Board be supportive of the fence. The applicant is proposing to install a new storefront system on the north elevation of the building, replacing the existing four-panel system and associated trim. The new storefront system would mimic a glass overhead garage door. The storefront would be painted black and contain a double-door entry on the easternmost portion, providing access to the existing concrete patio from the interior. The double-door entry will match the design of the storefront system. The existing storefront system on the west elevation will be retained and painted black to match that on the north elevation. The applicant is proposing to install new wood trim casing around the existing 1-over-1 fixed metal windows on the south, north and west elevations. The existing trim around the 6-over-9 windows will be painted a beige color to match the new trim. In addition to the window trim, a trim piece would be added on the two-story addition to break up the elevations and provide interest. The existing awnings on the building would be replaced with new arched fabric awnings in a black color to complement the repainted storefront system. In addition to the new paint for the trim, the two-story portion of the building will be repainted a sawdust brown color.

The following discussion questions have been provided for the Board's consideration:

- 1) Is the Board supportive of the proposed storefront modifications?
- 2) Is the Board supportive of the proposed trim details?
- 3) Is the Board supportive of the proposed awnings, awning colors and proposed paint colors?
- 4) Is the Board supportive of the proposed wrought iron fence?
- 5) Other considerations by the Board.

Applicant Presentation

Beth Rihl, Darin Ranker Architects, 5925 Wilcox Pl Suite E, Dublin, OH 43016, stated that the front storefront capitalizes on the original use of the building, which was a firehouse. The storefront mimics an overhead door, although it will not be a door.

Board Questions

Mr. Cotter inquired the purpose of the fence.

Ms. Rihl responded that the only purpose is decorative, to make that space more appealing to a future tenant. The fence opening to the patio on one side would be open; on the other side, a fence opening will have a gate, which would permit access to the brick paver walkway.

Mr. Cotter inquired if the stonewall would remain.

Ms. Rihl responded affirmatively.

Ms. Cooper inquired how the fence would be positioned in relation to the stonewall.

Ms. Rihl responded that those details have not been finalized; however, the expectation is that the fence would be installed behind the stonewall, closer to the building.

Ms. Cooper inquired the anticipated height of the fence.

Ms. Rihl responded that the fence height would be 3 feet.

Mr. Alexander inquired if the new awnings would be the same shape as the existing awnings.

Ms. Rihl responded affirmatively. The existing frames would remain, but be covered in new material.

Mr. Alexander inquired how the wood trim would be secured to the existing concrete block. Ms. Rihl stated that she is unsure of that detail, but she would anticipate the trim could be added through a tap connection.

Mr. Cotter inquired if framing would be added to the existing rear vinyl windows. Ms. Rihl responded that there is no trim on those windows; there is only a limestone sill. Their intent is to create more architectural interest at the rear of the building.

Public Comment

No public comments were provided.

Board Discussion

Ms. Krumb stated that she likes the proposed storefront, and appreciates that it mimics its earlier firehouse history. She has some hesitations regarding the trim, because, as Mr. Alexander questioned, it is not typical to adhere wood trim to cinderblock, particularly after the fact. She would be interested in seeing the finishing details when this project returns for formal review. She has no objection to the look of the trim, as a concrete block is not a historic component. She has no issue with changing the color and fabric of the awning, the proposed paint colors or the fence. She noted that the stonewalls are not historic stonewalls of the District; they were re-created when the building no longer served as a fire station and the drive was removed.

Mr. Cotter stated that he likes the front storefront, including its black color, and he has no objections to the awnings. Although the position of the fence appears out of place next to the stonewall, he has no other issue with it. He has some concerns about the trim being added at the rear. Will water get behind the trim, and will its appearance deteriorate over time? He recognizes that the rear is nondescript, but questions whether adding wood trim to that side will improve its appearance long term.

Mr. Kownacki stated that he likes the proposed change to the garage door. All other items have been addressed by fellow Board members.

Ms. Cooper stated that she, also, has concerns about the proposed wrought iron fence, due to its close proximity to the stonewall. She requested clarification of what would be added to the window frames at the rear of the structure.

Ms. Rihl responded that trim would be added to the outside of the windows.

Ms. Cooper inquired if trim would be added on all sides of the windows.

Ms. Rihl responded that the trim would be added on three sides and meet with the lower sill.

Ms. Cooper noted that one of the sills appears to be damaged; would it be repaired?

Ms. Rihl responded that they would investigate their condition.

Ms. Cooper stated that she would be interested in the other Board members' thoughts about adding trim around the windows versus leaving them plain.

Mr. Alexander stated that he agrees with fellow Commissioners regarding addition of the wood trim. It is not typical to surface mount a trim to block, particularly after the fact, because it is not possible to flash the top to prevent water from getting behind the trim. After a short period of time, the boards will begin to cup and the appearance will deteriorate. There is an easier solution to add detail to the windows. Each of the windows has a precast concrete lentil that spans the window. It is 8 inches tall, the same height of the block and is continuous across the windows. The lentils could be painted, and they would stand out visually. They would be articulating one element around the windows. Trim may look awkward, if it is cutting off the lentil halfway up. He also agrees with the concern about the relationship of the fence with the stonewall. If both remain, should they be so close to each other?

Mr. Alexander inquired if the applicant had any questions about the Board's comments.
Ms. Rihl responded that she had no questions.

NEW CASES

2. Begley Residence at 6199 Dublin Road, 21-027MPR, Minor Project Review

A request for the construction of an addition and associated site improvements for a single-family residence on a 1.32-acre site zoned Limited Suburban Residential District, located southwest of the intersection with Dublin Road with Short Street.

Ms. Cooper stated that in the interest of full disclosure, she was a member of the Board of Zoning Appeals, which recently approved a waiver for the Begley property.

Mr. Alexander thanked her for sharing the information and inquired if she was comfortable voting on the case.

Ms. Cooper indicated that she was.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Ridge stated that this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review for construction of an addition and detached garage and associated site improvements at an existing single-family home located within Historic Dublin. The 1.32-acre site is zoned R-2, Limited Suburban Residential District and is located southwest of the intersection of Dublin Road and Short Street. This case is unique in that it is not located in a Historic District. The site, zoned R-2, Limited Suburban Residential district, is required to have a minimum rear yard setback of 20 percent of the lot depth, up to 50 feet and a lot coverage maximum of 45%. The proposal meets those requirements. [Site photos shown for context.] There is an existing, two-story, single-family home on the site. The site has significant grade change from east to west and contains a significant number of mature trees, as well as a stream that runs through the rear of the property.

Site Plan

The proposed site layout remains consistent with the December proposal. The applicant is proposing an addition to the north side of the home. The proposal also includes the addition or expansion of several patio and deck spaces located on both the front and rear of the home, and the addition of a detached garage forward of the primary structure. The applicant received approval of a Variance from the BZA at their March 25, 2021 permitting the proposed location of the detached garage forward of the primary structure. A waiver for parking is also required and

will require the Board's approval. The proposed addition is a single-story, side-gable master bedroom and bathroom expansion to the north side of the home. The addition is connected to the two-story mass of the existing structure by a shorter single-story hyphen. The addition will be clad in a combination of shake siding and board and batten to match the conditions of the existing structure. New windows will be added in a pattern that matches the existing pattern. Architectural recesses and a covered patio on the north side of the addition will add additional interest. The roof of the hyphen connector is sheathed in a standing metal seam to match the covered porches and decks on the home. The significant change in grade from east to west presents an opportunity for a walkout level under the master bedroom addition, which matches the character of the existing structure. New Timbertech decking and railing system are proposed. The single-story detached garage will have three vehicle bays. It is approximately 16 feet in height, consistent with Code requirements. Due to the grade change from east to west, the south elevation of the structure is integrated into the hillside, which will camouflage view of the structure from Dublin Road. The application has been reviewed against all applicable criteria, and staff recommends approval of three waivers and approval of the Minor Project Review with two conditions:

- 1) The applicant replace the existing pedestrian door immediately north of the attached garage with a door that matches the other single pedestrian doors on the home, subject to staff approval.
- 2) The applicant work with staff to select appropriate lighting fixtures for the home and detached garage, subject to staff approval

Board Questions

Ms. Cooper inquired the reason for the condition that the existing pedestrian door be replaced. Mr. Ridge responded that it was the only door not being replaced; the recommendation is for continuity purposes.

Mr. Alexander requested that a correction be made in the meeting documents that the roof pitch is 2.5:12. In addition, the staff report indicates extruded aluminium windows, yet the packet materials indicate a Sierra Pacific material and cut sheets showing structurally wood windows clad with extruded aluminium. He requested clarification.

Mr. Ridge deferred the question to the applicant.

Dave Stock, Stock and Stone Architects, 686 N High St, Columbus, OH 43214 referred to sheet 10 in the materials, which provides the window detail. The intent is that the casing around the window would be 5/8-inch wood, consistent with the other windows in the house. Only the window unit would be a clad material.

Mr. Alexander requested, for clarity purposes, that the applicant confirm that clad means the wood structure is covered with aluminium on the exterior.

Mr. Stock confirmed that is correct.

Mr. Alexander inquired if the applicant had any issue with the recommended conditions for approval.

Applicant Presentation

Lori Begley, 6199 Dublin Road, Dublin, OH stated that she has no objection to the replacing the pedestrian door. Are other changes requested?

Mr. Ridge stated that the only other item was to work with staff on the selection of appropriate lighting fixtures for the home and the detached garage.

Ms. Begley responded that they were looking at a gas lighting type of lantern, but had not finalized a choice.

Mr. Alexander stated that staff would like the opportunity to review what the applicant ultimately proposes.

Ms. Begley indicated they would be willing to do so.

Board Discussion

Mr. Kownacki stated that the pattern of windows on the house is sets of threes; however, on the east elevation, the existing window in the center of the house has been changed, which results in a set of four. What was the reason for that change?

Mr. Stock stated that the additional window is to provide better balance to that facade, minimizing the solid look of that facade.

Ms. Krumb stated that she appreciates the relocation of the patio to the north side. She likes the new design and has no objection to the proposed waivers.

Mr. Alexander stated that now that this type of window is recommended by our Guidelines -- a wood clad window, he assumes that a waiver for that item is not needed.

Ms. Martin responded that no waiver is needed, as the applicant is meeting Code.

Mr. Alexander stated that the packet information indicated that the deck railing type and style remained under discussion; however, the presentation indicated the material would be a Timbertech product.

Mr. Stock stated that the intent is an aluminum metal railing.

Ms. Begley clarified that the decking would be Timbertech, not the railing.

Mr. Alexander inquired if a condition would be needed for staff to review and ensure that the railing is an appropriate system.

Mr. Cotter responded that to him, the material appears to be metal; if it is not, then there would be a need to ensure it would not look out of place.

Mr. Ridge clarified that the deck would be a Timbertech material, not the railing.

Ms. Krumb stated that if information was provided in the packet that clarifies that the railing is metal, a condition would not be necessary. If that is not in the packet materials, the condition would be appropriate.

Ms. Martin stated that she would prefer a condition be added for clarity purposes.

Ms. Begley responded that the materials they provided specifies metal railing would be used.

Mr. Cotter pointed out that the "Exterior Materials" identifies metal railing. There is no need to clarify what already has been specified.

Mr. Alexander indicated that what is shown in the packet is appropriate.

Ms. Krumb stated that the table of Exterior Materials specifically states, "new metal railing, black." Therefore, it is covered.

Public Comment

No public comments were received on the case.

Ms. Martin requested separate motions on the waivers.

Mr. Cotter moved, Ms. Kramb seconded approval of a Waiver Zoning Code Section 153.174(b) Roof Type Requirements – Roof Pitches. The principal roof shall have a pitch appropriate to the architectural style of the building. Roofs shall not be sloped less than a 6:12 (rise:run) or more than 12:12, unless otherwise determined to be architecturally appropriate by the ARB, to:

- 1) Permit a roof pitch of 2.5:12 for the covered decks.

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

Mr. Kownacki moved, Ms. Cooper seconded approval of a Waiver to Zoning Code Section 153.173(F)(7) Parking Requirements – Number of required spaces. Single-family dwellings must provide a minimum of 2 parking spaces and a maximum of 2 parking spaces:

- 1) to permit a 3-car detached garage.

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

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

- 1) The applicant replace the existing pedestrian door immediately north of the attached garage with a door that matches the other single pedestrian doors on the home, subject to staff approval.
- 2) The applicant work with staff to select appropriate lighting fixtures for the home and detached garage, subject to staff approval.

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

3. Bechert Residence at 156 S. High Street, 21-041MPR, Minor Project Review

A request for the construction of a two-story, single-family residence on a 0.24-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic Residential and located east of S. High Street, ±100 feet south of the intersection with John Wright Lane.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Ridge stated that is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review for construction of a new single-family home in the Historic District on a site located on the east side of S. High Street, southeast of the intersection of S. High Street with John Wright Lane. [Photos shown of neighboring structures for site context.] The site is currently undeveloped as the previous two-family home on the site was demolished in 2020 following the approval of two single-family homes on the associated lots of 156-158 S. High Street. Two Informal Reviews of proposed projects for this site have been reviewed by the Board previously, in October 2020 and most recently, in December 2020. The Board appreciated the site layout, including the open rear yard. The Board was generally supportive of a two-story home, although had some concerns with the scale and height of the proposed structure and recommended that the applicant refer to nearby homes for comparable heights. They appreciated the simplification of elevations since the

October 2020 proposal. The applicant has continued to work with staff to address the items of concern.

Proposal

This site is required to have a minimum side yard setback of 4 feet, and a total side yard setback of 16 feet. The proposed home is set back 4 feet from the south property line and exceeds a 12-foot setback from the north property line, meeting these requirements. It is also required to have rear yard setback of 20% of the lot depth, which in this case would be approximately 35 feet. The proposal well exceeds that. Front yard setbacks for properties along High Street (North and South) are required to be set back 15 feet from the right-of-way/property line. The home is proposed to be set back 23.5 feet from the right-of-way/property line. The maximum permitted lot coverage in the HD-HR zoning district is 45 percent. The proposal, including all impervious surfaces, calls for a 44 percent lot coverage. Building coverage, which Code limits to 25 percent, is proposed to be 25 percent, meeting this requirement. Language in the newly adopted Historic District Code requires that single-family dwellings provide a minimum of 2 parking spaces, and a maximum of 2 parking spaces. However, this section was not intended to limit parking for residential properties. A Waiver is requested to allow for a three-car garage, which is consistent with recent approvals in the District.

The proposal is for an approximately 3,300-square-foot home designed in an 'L' shaped form, with a full two-story mass along S. High Street. The proposed height of the home is approximately 23 feet, 8 inches, measured from established grade to the midpoint of the eaves. The new construction home is proposed to be clad primarily in a combination of stone and Hardi-panel materials in a largely white and beige palette. The design of the home has been significantly simplified since the Informal Reviews, with modifications including the removal of roof finials, gable vents, simplified window placement and style, and simplified material application. The applicant is proposing single. two-over-two windows (Anderson 400 Series casement windows) on the first and second stories. An oval bullseye window is located in the second story above the arched front entry. The first story is clad in a mix of stone (Creative Mines Craft Orchard Limestone – Alpaca (beige)) and shake siding (Hardi Straight Edge Panel), painted white (Benjamin Moore - China White OC-141). The majority of the roof is sheathed in a dimensional asphalt shingle (Certainteed Landmark Designer Shingles) in a grey color (Georgetown Grey). The roof of the porch on the west façade is sheathed in a metal standing seam material (Rogers Roofing) in a Charcoal color. An elevated, Timbertech deck is proposed at the rear of the home. Since the Informal Review, the applicant has simplified the application of windows on this elevation. The design retains a stone water. Staff recommends that the stone water table be revised to provide a consistent treatment across each of the three main forms of the home. On the north elevation, that includes raising the stone watertable up to meet the sill of the two-over-two window on the westernmost side gable. Staff also recommends that the plans be revised to remove the proposed cupola, which increases the perceived height on the rear portion of the home. To further simplify the elevations, staff is recommending that the plans be revised to minimize the roof returns on the gable ends.

Staff has reviewed the application against all applicable criteria and recommends approval of the Minor Project Review with 5 conditions.

Board Questions

Mr. Alexander inquired if the cupola would have extended the height beyond the permitted roof height in that location.

Applicant Presentation

Greg Bechert, 156 S. High Street, Dublin stated that he and his wife, Amy are anticipating the opportunity to move into the community. They have been working with the City to identify a design that works for everyone. They have no objection to the recommended conditions for approval, although they would prefer to have the cupola.

Public Comment

Mr. Alexander stated that three letters of support from neighbors were provided in the packet materials. He inquired if any Board member requests that they be read into the record. No Board member requested they be read. Staff indicated that no additional public comments have been received on this case.

Board Discussion

Mr. Cotter stated the applicants have taken the Board's previous constructive comments and made revisions that have addressed the issues, including the height at the front. He has no further concerns. They have done a nice job with the revised plan.

Ms. Kramb stated that she also appreciates the reduction in height and removal of the cupola. She agrees with the need to revise the use of stone, including the stone watertable. The only concern she has in regard to the materials is the proposed railing, which is a composite material with a vinyl or plastic appearance. A material with a wood appearance would be an improvement. With the conditions, she has no further concerns.

Mr. Kownacki stated that he likes the revised plan, particularly the front façade.

Ms. Cooper stated that from the staff report, she can see the amount of work that has been invested in this project. She has no additional questions or comments.

Mr. Alexander stated that he is in agreement with most of the comments shared with one qualification. He actually likes the "stepping up" of the stone on the front elevation, although he would appreciate a continuous watertable. The stone that steps up to midway on the façade helps break down the elevation into two smaller segments. The color change between the stone and the siding also helps diminish the mass. The way in which it has been used is of value to the structure. In regard to the cupola, if the Board had approved it, a zoning variance would have been required. The difficulty with acquiring a zoning variance is the need to prove a hardship or unusual condition outside the applicant's control. It might be difficult to achieve support from that particular Board.

Mr. Begley stated that they would be proceeding with the plan as approved tonight.

Mr. Kownacki moved, Ms. Kramb seconded approval of a Waiver to Zoning Code Section 153.173(F)(7) Parking Requirements – Number of required spaces. Single-family dwellings must provide a minimum of 2 parking spaces and a maximum of 2 parking spaces to:

- permit a 3-car garage.

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

Ms. Cooper inquired if the previous comment about the composite deck railing was an observation or a proposed condition for approval. Is the proposed material consistent with the Guidelines?

Mr. Ridge responded that composite decking materials are permitted, including railing materials. Additionally, the Commission previously has approved the Timbertech material. In this case, both Timbertech decking and railing are proposed.

Ms. Martin stated that when this project was initially reviewed by the Board, a more modern, low profile railing was proposed. The applicant was requested to use something more traditional, given the architecture character of the home.

Mr. Alexander noted that his comment on the use of Timbertech with the previous case was simply stylistic in nature. The previous home was a more contemporary home, and massive deck posts would have been inappropriate with that design aesthetic. This home is a different style, so he has no objection to Timbertech posts here. However, the proposed product does have significant gloss.

Ms. Kramb stated that this is not an issue on which the project should be dependent. However, because of the glossy appearance, it will look like a vinyl fence. She does not find that appropriate. It should look like wood.

Mr. Kownacki agreed that the shine would detract from the home's appearance. This will not affect his vote, however.

Ms. Kramb inquired if a matte finish on the product was available.

Mr. Bechert responded that he is not aware of it at this time. However, what the Board has expressed will certainly be kept in mind, and if they can find an alternative, they would do so.

Tim Walton Carr, T. Walton Carr Architects, 1985 Henderson Road #1007, Columbus, Ohio, 43220 stated that he completely agrees with the Board's comments. He also would prefer a product with a matte finish, which would appear more like wood. He would ensure that happens; it can be specified on the plans. Timbertech offers many more attractive options.

Mr. Kownacki moved, Ms. Kramb seconded approval of a Minor Project with the following 5 conditions:

- 1) The applicant revise the trim detail for the dormer windows to provide a consistent detail around the entirety of the window, subject to staff approval.
- 2) The design be revised to eliminate the copula.
- 3) The applicant work with staff to provide a consistent stone water table, subject to staff approval.
- 4) The applicant remove the roofline returns in the gable ends, subject to staff approval.
- 5) The applicant work with staff to select an appropriate chimney flue detail, subject to staff approval.

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

LEGAL TRAINING

- **ARB Role, Code of Ethics and Public Records**

Mr. Boggs stated that he serves as an Assistant Law Director for the City. He works predominantly with the Planning Division and attends all Planning and Zoning Commission meetings and other Planning-related boards and commissions as needed. Jennifer Readler is the Law Director and attends

City Council meetings. Together, they attempt to ensure there is a solid legal foundation for everything the City does within the Planning and Zoning area. The general authority of the Board comes from Section 153.170 of the City's Code. This Board's focus is on the Historic District and also on those other historic sites within the City but outside the District that fall under the Board's purview. The Board reviews cases related to construction and preservation of architectural features within the District and serves as a recommending body to City Council for City ordinances that affect either the District or individual sites. Most of the Board's review consists of administrative actions, applying existing law rather than creating new law. That function occurs by using a quasi-judicial process. Mr. Boggs reviewed the distinctions between legislative versus administrative actions; and Ohio law regarding open meetings, public records, conflict of interest and ethics. He encouraged Board members to contact him or staff if any questions arise in the performance of their duties.

COMMUNICATIONS

- **Request for Special Meeting**

Ms. Martin stated that staff has received a request for the Board to conduct a site visit at 72 – 84 N. High Street. An Informal Review of a proposal for this site was conducted by the Board in February 2021. There is an anticipation that the project will come back to the Board for consideration, and the applicant believes it would be beneficial for the Board and staff to view the site from various vantage points and view the existing development and conditions of the existing buildings. Staff would like to identify a date for that meeting. The anticipation would be that the meeting would start at 6:00 p.m. The Board would spend 30 minutes with the applicant on that site, after which the Board would visit various sites along North and South High Street and potentially S. Riverview St. that have been approved by the Board within the last two years and the projects subsequently completed. She has identified four potential dates; Ms. Cooper has responded that she would be unavailable for two of the four dates. The potential dates are: Wednesday, May 12; Thursday, May 13; Wednesday, May 19; and Tuesday, May 25. Following discussion, May 19 was identified as the preferred date.

Ms. Krumb inquired about the precedent for doing a site visit with the applicant. This seems extremely unusual, and she is not comfortable doing it. She has never experienced this in her previous service on any boards or commissions, nor has she requested or experienced it in an applicant position. It seems highly unusual, so she must question where this originated.

Ms. Cooper stated that it raises a couple of legal issues. The meeting would require a public notice. If all members are present, it would be a quorum. She does not feel comfortable doing the site visit with the applicant present. If he would be willing to grant the Board permission to visit and walk the site, that would be acceptable. Otherwise, because there would be a quorum, provision would have to be made for recording the Board's comments.

Ms. Kramb stated that this does not seem right to her. Basically, the applicant is selling his position to the Board. It is a public meeting, if all Board members are there. She is not comfortable doing this. She has no objection to participating in a walking tour of Old Dublin and viewing existing projects on sites. However, she is uncomfortable with the applicant participating in the visit to show Board members around the site.

Mr. Kownacki stated that the applicant should be able to provide everything he wants to show the Board in a regular public meeting; it is the purpose of those meetings.

Ms. Martin stated that any walking tour of the Board is a public meeting, and a notice of that meeting must be provided to the community and an agenda must be published. Any member of the community who would like to attend the site visit or walking tour is welcome. Although the meeting would not be video/audio recorded, in the past, staff has prepared summary minutes, highlighting the sites visited and the discussion. The Board is asked not to deliberate on the case; it would be for observation purposes only. However, the Board has raised some very valid points concerning the applicant being present. She will reach out to the Law Director's office, and get a determination on that question. The development director and the City Manager have been instrumental in coordinating this effort. She would share the Board's concerns. Potentially, the Board to be provided a written statement in advance, and the members could do self-guided site visits.

Ms. Kramb stated that she would anticipate the applicant to press his position regarding what he wants to do on the site. It is not appropriate for the Board to be in that position, where essentially, the applicant can sell his project to them. This is particularly so because of the controversy that already exists with this project.

Mr. Kownacki stated that he is in agreement with Ms. Kramb. The appropriate time for the applicant to sell his project to the Board is at a regularly-scheduled Board meeting. He works in government, as well, and it is common for applicants to request special meetings. We cannot grant those, because we would be playing favorites. Why would we grant that applicant a special meeting and not everybody else?

Ms. Kramb stated that the Board would be setting a precedent of holding a special meeting for one applicant. As a result, every applicant will ask for the same.

Ms. Martin stated that although the precedent is very limited, she believes the Board did conduct a previous site visit of 30-32 S. High Street to look at the condition of the vacant structures.

Mr. Alexander stated that he was on the Board at that time. The members were very guarded, looking at the buildings only. The Board did not grant the demolition request, and eventually, the applicant submitted an application using the buildings, which was approved. Perhaps that case is being used as the precedent for this; however, he also has concerns about the legal basis for what is proposed. He believes that at the earlier Informal Review of this project, Ms. Kramb made it very clear that the new Code has very distinct steps for demolition approval and making a case for a Contributing or Non-Contributing historic structure. The point also was made concerning the importance of hiring consultants to provide that factual information. The Board would expect that information to be much more thorough than what can be derived from walking through a site and viewing deteriorating beams, for example. Even if this meeting were to occur,

he trusts the applicant understands that the Board would not make a decision based on that. The decision must be based on the facts and according to Code. Documentation of the needed facts would probably require outside consultants.

Ms. Martin responded that staff would obtain a determination from the Law Director's office on this case, but going forward, the public hearing for any future application would follow the regular public meeting review process.

Ms. Cooper suggested that staff also ask the Law Director if legal counsel should be present for that special meeting.

Ms. Martin responded that she would inquire.

Mr. Kownacki stated that he just opened up staff's email communication about the proposed meeting. After recognizing the case and recalling the direction of that first meeting, he is even more uncomfortable with setting a precedent for the Board providing special treatment for an applicant, and that would be any applicant.

Mr. Cotter stated that this is a special property within the City, however, which, occasionally, can be handled differently.

Mr. Kownacki responded that we are not private industry. As a government entity, we must be able to show that everybody has equal access to the same thing. If we give one applicant this type of access, we would need to provide similar access to the next applicant.

Ms. Kramb stated that her preference is for the Board to do a general walking tour, but the applicant must not be present.

Ms. Cooper stated that, consistent with her usual practice, she would be willing to visit the site on her own and look at any items on a list that might be provided in advance, but she is very uncomfortable conducting the site visit as a Board, as it does not seem correct.

Mr. Kownacki stated that it is every Board member's practice to visit the sites beforehand on their own time and view every building related to the case.

Ms. Cooper stated that, typically, the agenda and packet information for the cases is provided the Friday before a meeting. Could the agendas be provided earlier, which might make it easier for all the members to find time to visit the sites beforehand?

Mr. Martin responded that agendas are published on the Friday two weeks before the meeting, and the packet is published the Friday before the meeting.

Ms. Cooper thanked her for the clarification.

- **Historic Design Guidelines Update**

Ms. Martin reported that the Historic Design Guidelines are scheduled for a second hearing of the Planning and Zoning Commission on May 6. At the Commission's first review, there were some substantive comments on the Natural Features section. Subsequently, more information has been provided regarding brick work; flora and fauna; the Indian Run Falls and ravine; cemeteries and stone walls. She will be sharing the final draft with the Board, as well. Following adoption, professionally printed documents will be provided to the Board members for their use.

Ms. Kramb noted that she would look forward to replacing her outdated 1986 document.

- The next regular meeting of the ARB is scheduled for May 26, 2021.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:46 p.m.

Gary Alexander

Chair, Architectural Review Board

Judith K. Beal

Assistant Clerk of Council