



MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, June 23, 2021

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Alexander, Chair, called the June 23, 2021, virtual meeting of the Architectural Review Board to order at 6:30 p.m., noting this is the last virtual meeting of the City of Dublin Architectural Review Board. Beginning in July, the Board will resume in-person meetings. Over the last year, we have greatly appreciated the Ohio Legislature's actions to address the pandemic, including the ability for public entities to conduct virtual meetings. Tonight, the meeting can be accessed via the live-stream on the City's website. We welcome public comments on cases. In order to submit any questions or comments during the meeting, please use the form under the streaming video on the City's website. Questions and comments will be relayed to the Board by the meeting moderator.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Chair led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Board Members present: Mr. Alexander, Mr. Cotter, Ms. Kramb, and Ms. Cooper.
 Board Member absent: Mr. Kownacki
 Staff present: Ms. Martin, Mr. Ridge, and Ms. Holt

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Cotter moved, Ms. Cooper seconded, to accept the documents into the record and to approve the Board Minutes, as submitted, from the Special Meeting on May 19, 2021.

Vote: Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; and Mr. Cotter, yes.
 [Motion carried 4-0]

STAFF INTRODUCTIONS

The Chair gave Ms. Martin the floor to introduce Planning's newest Staff Member, Sarah Holt.

Ms. Martin stated the first vacancy out of several in Planning is Sarah Holt, hired as a certified Senior Planner. She comes to Dublin most recently as the Director of Planning from Greenville, South Carolina. She has worked in several states including Colorado, New Mexico, and California. She has been involved with academic research as well as experience with preservation.

Ms. Holt provided additional background. She assisted with several military installations, has served on a preservation commission and at one point, had her own renovation and preservation company.

CASE PROCEDURES

The Chair 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 §153.170. The Board has the decision-making responsibility on these cases. Anyone who intends to address the Board on any of these cases will be sworn in. The agenda order is typically determined at the beginning of the meeting by the Chair. There is one case eligible for the Consent

Agenda this evening: Case 4 – Psychic Readings by Lisa – Sign at 16 N. High Street. He asked if any member of the Board wished to pull the case from the Consent Agenda. [Hearing none.]

4. Psychic Readings by Lisa - Sign at 16 N. High Street, 21-054MPR, Minor Project Review

The Chair stated this application is a request for the installation of a wall sign and a projecting sign for a tenant space within a historic building on a 0.26-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic Core. The site is east of N. High Street, ±125 feet north of the intersection with Bridge Street. Mr. Rayburn from Staff and the applicant, Ms. George are here this evening to answer any questions. [Hearing none.]

Ms. Kramb moved, Mr. Cotter seconded, to approve the Minor Project by consent with four conditions:

- 1) That the applicant apply for and successfully obtain approval of a Permanent Sign Permit through Building Standards, prior to installation;
- 2) That all text on both the wall sign and projecting sign be metallic gold in color;
- 3) That the projecting sign be located between the primary entrance to the tenant space and the first window, immediately south of the primary entrance and within 6 feet of the primary entrance, subject to Staff approval; and
- 4) That the applicant remove all temporary signs, prior to the installation of the new permanent signs.

Vote: Ms. Cooper, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; and Ms. Kramb, yes.
[Motion carried 4-0]

The Chair swore in staff and applicants who planned to address the Board on any of the cases to be reviewed during this meeting.

INFORMAL REVIEW CASES

1. 72 – 84 N. High Street, 20-091INF, Informal Review

The Chair stated this application is a request for an Informal Review and feedback for redevelopment of a mixed-use site (former Oscar's site) zoned Historic District, Historic Core. The site is located northeast of the intersection of N. High Street with North Street.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Ridge presented an aerial view of the site that contains a number of parcels. He reviewed the history for this case, as follows:

February 2021 – Informal Review

The Architectural Review Board (ARB) reviewed and provided non-binding feedback on a proposal for the construction of a mixed-use building including residential units, an event center, restaurant space, retail space, 80 parking spaces and associated open space. Feedback included a general concern regarding massing, scale and height and interest was shown for saving a portion of the building (former Oscar's site).

May 2021 – Site Tour

The Board members toured the buildings inside and out at 72-84 N. High Street. They were informed of the general conditions of the buildings, along with construction and design.

Today, June 23, 2021 – Informal Review

The Applicant is seeking feedback on massing studies, not the previous proposal, which will guide potential future redevelopment of the site. Existing conditions for 72-84 N. High Street and 20 North Street to the south [shown.]

The Applicant had provided Staff with a massing study, which included the two phases of Old Dublin Town Center built in 1999 overlaid on the site in question where the height of 2.5 stories was measured totalling 25 feet from grade to the mid-point of eaves; the BriHi development built in 2009 contained 2.5 stories at ±30 feet in height, which was also overlaid on the site; and the CoHatch development, which is under construction to contain 1 – 3 stories at ±30 feet in height, that was also included in the massing study.

Board Discussion Questions

The following discussion questions [shown] have been provided for the Board to consider during this review:

1. Is the Board supportive of demolition of all or portions of the existing buildings on the site? If so, which ones should be considered for demolition?
2. Is the Board supportive of redevelopment of the site? If so, what scale of redevelopment would the Board find appropriate?
3. Based on the massing study, and if the Board is supportive of redevelopment of the site, what is an appropriate building height or number of stories along N. High Street? North Street?
4. Given the significant change of grade on the site from west to east, could the Board be supportive of additional height, in excess of what Code permits, along N. Riverview Street? If so, what maximum building heights or number of stories would be recommended?
5. If the Board is supportive of redevelopment, what considerations should be incorporated related to site layout, lot coverage, and open space?
6. Are there other considerations by the Board?

Board Questions for Staff

Mr. Cotter inquired about the possible height discrepancy noted in the various materials re: CoHatch. Mr. Ridge responded the correct height for CoHatch is 35 feet, not 30 feet.

Mr. Alexander asked if height on the buildings located on the alley side were measured to the mid-point of the roof. He noted the buildings closest to the former Brazenhead were much lower. Mr. Ridge answered affirmatively.

Mr. Cotter asked if a Waiver would be requested to allow 35 feet for height. Ms. Martin stated the ARB approved the building in January 2020. At that time, the BSD Code limited a certain number of stories and not maximum height depending on the building type. The building type was limited to 2.5 stories. Staff determined at the time that the lower level along Blacksmith Lane was not counted so it had 1.5 stories on top of that. One story made up the front of the building and 2.5 stories were on the back.

Mr. Alexander asked if the ARB had granted Waivers on that project at the time. Ms. Martin answered affirmatively but does not recall height being one of them. Mr. Alexander recalled the ARB showed flexibility on that project at that time.

Applicant Presentation

Dwight McCabe, The McCabe Companies, 7361 Currier Road, Plain City, Ohio 43064, indicated the reason for the request for this Informal Review is to extend an open dialogue as the land owner is desiring the ARB to revisit a proposal provided in vague terms and convey what is possible for height and mass. He suggested the Board forget past proposals as the land owner wanted to start anew.

He provided illustrations that compared their site to other buildings in the Historic District in a modern period, guided by the various iterations of the Historic District Code to see if there isn't some common thought to compare and contrast these buildings. A collection of historic buildings on the southeast corner of High Street and SR 161 are very similar so there are three good reflections of buildings that represent in context what the Historic District has been about and what it is today. Reflections were overlaid on this site to consider how it would be perceived, received, and possible given the current modifications in the Historic District Code. After the applicant listened to the feedback from the Board, in the last discussion and people in the area, they provided materials to be considered [shown.] Today, they are requesting a basic discussion of what is appropriate.

The applicant views the site as having three highlighted footprints A, B, and C [shown.] A is High Street frontage, B is North Street frontage, and C is the area considered the 'back of house' section of the property but is also the front of the pedestrian bridge landing. A High Street component for building massing was used as a model as well as frontage along North Street, where there is a significant drop off in grade. He noted the unique streetscape conditions on North Street with side alleys limited in width as they were created for a horse and buggy.

Beyond the footprint of the property are sections labelled as A1 and B1. Consider what those streetscapes and building façades are going to look like and what those corridors become in context to this property.

Current developments were overlaid onto the applicant's site for comparison [shown.] The back side overlay of those same developments [shown] there is a substantial amount of property that is left. Consider what is appropriate for that C area that has a slope to it. To replace the existing buildings with new buildings that sit on a similar footprint, similar parking conditions are left and does not change anything in terms of the perception. Discern what direction the applicant should head. The discussion today is to gather ideas for what is best for that area; what the best use is from a community and development perspective; and also considering the view from the pedestrian bridge, asking what is acceptable to this Board.

Mr. Alexander asked if an image of a conceptual thought was included in the package.

Mr. McCabe answered that they reviewed the prior proposal for a visual representation of scale differences. On the High Street side, scale has a lot of similarity to it - less mass and does not quite reach the corner. In the first proposal, the applicant wanted to make sure that corner had a good landing and a good relationship with the library.

With the applicant's permission, Mr. Alexander said he would consider the applicant's two specific questions, after the list provided by Staff was reviewed by the Board.

Public Comment

The Chair reported the Architectural Review Board had received and reviewed three public comments provided in advance of the meeting, greatly appreciating the public's participation in the process.

Mr. Alexander then asked the Moderator if any additional public comments were submitted during the course of this meeting.

Ms. Martin answered no further public comments were submitted.

Board Discussion

The Chair asked the Board to include any thoughts or comments they would like to share from the site visit and on demolition.

Ms. Krumb said the site visit did not provide any new information for her relating to demolition. The additions from the 70's and 80's can be demolished but she has not received enough information regarding the core of the main structure to sway her either way. That information will need to be provided with the demolition request/plan.

Mr. Cotter stated he could be supportive of demolishing all the buildings on this site with a demolition plan. Ms. Cooper stated she agreed with Ms. Kramb and Mr. Cotter; a full demolition is possible.

Mr. Alexander stated the same agreement that a full demolition was possible since the structures had been labelled non-contributing in the Historic District. The applicant must meet the criteria of a demolition request.

Mr. Alexander asked the applicant what they plan to build on the site in terms of size and mass.

Mr. McCabe answered he was acting under the advisement of Dublin's administration to start with scale and provide a conceptual image of how the structures would present themselves to the street. Their next step would be to determine how the structures would be programmed. The vision for Area C is going to dictate the program. They will limit lot coverage to the Code regulation of no more than 85% and will consider alternative parking considerations.

Mr. Cotter stated filling the backside of the property, Area C, is most difficult. The applicant should stay inside Code with a maximum height of 30 feet. If a 30-foot-high building is planned near the street, leaving more room in the front provides the illusion of less mass. To understand conceptual massing is a challenge but the first concepts look okay. Do not match with something down the street; make sure they are architecturally different.

Ms. Kramb stated she was in favor of getting the buildings figured out, and then applying a program or use. A building in the north end should not be any taller than those that are north of them and buildings on the south should not be any taller than buildings further south, limiting them to closer to ±25 feet in height. She views this contextually.

Ms. Cooper reported she was a new member to the ARB but had read the earlier materials. She agreed with Ms. Kramb to stick with a height limit and blend with structures directly adjacent. The buildings super imposed on the site with an open corner was appealing, as long as the building on North Street is not as tall.

Mr. Alexander stated he generally agreed with the comments made by his fellow Board Members. He reported the building to the north was reviewed under a different Zoning Code and the new Code requirements adopted a different height. Matching that height and scale is appropriate as he does not want to see the applicant penalized having to deal with the new standards and he would support a Variance request for height there. An open corner would allow buildings on the south side to be lower due to a natural break at that corner. Connect with the system of walkways that was created for the library and use that space as a transition to lower buildings. If the height ends up being comparable to what was approved for CoHatch, it would be okay, contextually. A U-shaped building with more mass to the opening of the north would be appropriate and the east elevation could be built up. Instead of having grade, elevation or façade along that surface would look good. This was a unique site and will have more visibility on the backside and suggested a podium building with parking underneath. He asked the applicant if they were considering smaller buildings or a singular element.

Mr. Cotter stated how the mass is to be broken up depends on the intended uses. He likes breaks in a façade for architectural character but there should not be three fronts for one use.

Ms. Kramb emphasized that the applicant not replicate what already exists and to divide the building logically; fake fire walls at BriHi do not look right. Ensure the east side is not taller and could slope down to the south. Stories do not matter like height does in context with the surroundings.

Mr. Alexander and Ms. Cooper like the open corner, whereas Mr. Cotter and Ms. Kramb want to see the building be built back further for a better streetscape. Mr. Cotter indicated he was not fan of open space if it has no use.

Ms. Kramb said the overlay with the plaza graphic helped break up the block and that is possible. The applicant does not need to fill all 85% of lot coverage just because they are permitted. Underneath parking with a plaza on top is a great way to use space instead of a surface lot.

Mr. McCabe indicated this discussion is what the applicant wanted at this point. They received productive feedback and gained a better understanding of what is permitted and desired of the Board and what the constraints are. This is an opportunity to be creative and drive what is programmatically possible. He tried to draw out specific answers for possible height limits.

Ms. Kramb stated the number of stories is not an exact measurement and a specific height is not important. Look at the site contextually and compare the proposal visually to the immediate surroundings.

Mr. McCabe considered what the scope of the project under the bridge could be and the two sites could be layered together to make a good launch point and provide a better bubble around the property.

Summary of the Board's Comments

The Board is supportive of demolition of all the existing buildings on the site, as long as the demolition criteria is met with documented evidence.

The Board is supportive of redevelopment.

The scale of the structures need to be comparable to adjacent structures. The Board is open to re-development on the east elevation.

The applicant must be sensitive to surrounding structures. The Board might not approve development if it is taller than CoHatch in terms of feet and the applicant must keep the height lower than the overall height on High Street.

The Board agreed, context is more important than the actual number of feet for height.

The entire site does not need to be developed, if it is not warranted.

An open corner enables open space in the public realm and if located on the southwest corner, it could be a benefit.

Ms. Cooper added she supports what will be done to create frontage on N. Riverview. Perhaps property is open from the High Street side and also made open. She agreed height change could conceal parking.

Mr. Alexander thanked Mr. McCabe.

2. The Apothecary at 30-32 S. High Street, 21-084INF, Informal Review

The Chair said this is a request for an Informal Review and feedback for renovations, additions, and associated site improvements to two historic buildings located on two parcels totaling 0.25 acres zoned Historic District, Historic Core. The site is east of S. High Street, ±75 feet north of the intersection with Spring Hill Lane.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Holt presented an aerial view of the site that includes two vacant properties to be considered with this application and both are on the National Register of Historic Places. 30 S. High Street is to the north and 32 S. High Street is to the south. Both historic places were reviewed using the new Zoning Code and *Historic Design Guidelines*. The uses are permitted and the size criteria are appropriate. Surrounding zoning is mostly the same.

Existing conditions [shown] at 30 S. High Street has one of the last remaining log structures in town; it was a former pharmacy. The structure on 32 S. High Street was built as a more traditional commercial building; it was a former grocery store. Both buildings date from the 1840s and are vacant. #30 has a side entry and an added dormer while #32 has a rear addition to remain with the proposal.

There is a shared stone wall in the rear yard, additions of a salt box and shed at #30 will be removed. Outbuildings for the rear yard of #32 [shown] included an old privy with a diamond window and a shed

along with a shared rock wall. The shed floor is in disrepair on a wood foundation. The privy has an operational door but holes in the roof. Some of the dry-laid stone wall has fallen and appears the upright stones were mortared.

Existing conditions map [shown] reveals what this proposal is all about. Many trees are a nuisance and a detriment to the historic structures. A tree survey is required with the formal submittal and Cash-in-Lieu could be approved given the tight site area.

Proposed site plan concepts [shown] for a 2,000-square-foot bourbon and cigar lounge are proposed for 30 S. High Street, a single story with a walkout basement addition and outdoor seating with a pergola. A 1,700-square-foot wine and charcuterie establishment is proposed for 32 S. High Street. An outdoor terrace and parking to be shared by both businesses (33% on-site and (66% off-site are proposed. The location of the existing stone wall will be dismantled, part of it moved and part of it replaced, due to the parking required (37 spaces). The two outbuildings will also be removed.

Surrounding parking opportunities [shown] for four off-site parking areas are available within the 600-foot-buffer requirement: Dublin Community Church; Franklin Street Lot; Visitors Bureau; and the Town Center Lot. Three additional parking resources are available to provide some parking: Darby Street Lot; John Wright Lot; and the Library Parking Garage, all are outside of the 600-foot-buffer and cannot be counted towards the parking requirement in the Zoning Code.

Staff has identified the following questions for discussion amongst the Board:

1. Does the Board support demolition of the following?
 - a. Two additions behind 30 S. High Street?
 - b. Two outbuildings (privy and shed) behind 32 S. High Street?
 - c. Partial demolition/relocation of the historic stone wall?
2. Does the Board support the site layout, including location and size of additions? Would the Board support a cover/roof over the terrace?
3. Would the Board support a Waiver to the on-site parking requirement in order to preserve historic elements on the site?
4. Are there other considerations by the Board?

Applicant Presentation

Dan Morgan, Behal, Sampson, Dietz, 990 W. 3rd Ave, Columbus, OH 43212, asked if anyone was on the Board when this site was reviewed in 2018. The plans the applicant are showing now are very much in keeping with what was once approved. The sale of these properties hinges on the plans for these properties. Tonight, the applicant is asking the Board if the concept of two, tavern-type establishments can be seriously considered. He asked if they will be able to develop these properties similar to what was previously approved. The architecture has not been developed yet past what was proposed in 2018. Leaning towards what was already approved with exception at #30, changing the two-story addition to a story and a half – a single-story but with a taller space. The outdoor terrace is very important and they would like a shared use for both spaces for people to co-mingle.

Board Questions

Mr. Cotter asked if they plan to repurpose the stone wall and what the applicant had in mind.

Mr. Morgan noted the wall demarks the property boundaries. Dry stack stones with mortar at the top. The applicant plans to use it to demark pathways through the site and a wall for the parking area. A dry-stacking wall is intended to be 30 inches in height in some areas and some 6 inches in height. If granted a larger parking reduction, the applicant could provide a third of the parking on-site.

Mr. Alexander reported he was on the Board when a proposal was previously submitted and they approved what was requested here, to approve removal of those structures and relocation of the wall.

Public Comment

There were no public comments submitted.

Board Discussion

Mr. Alexander noted the wall splits the property in half.

Mr. Cotter indicated he did not have an issue removing the later additions on #30 and the additions on #32 remain. If the walls were in relatively good shape, it would be a shame to lose them but understands the challenge of the location for parking, etc.

Ms. Krumb stated in order to be comfortable with the removal of the first addition on #30 (with the door), she needs to see structurally what was built. Over time, those are historic in their own right. The Architect said that was the footprint of the addition but she is not convinced of the other part/addition; she needs to know the date of that addition. Keep the privy incorporated as a feature, if possible, because it is a unique find and there are so few left in the city. Not concerned so much with the shed as there are more out there but would also like to see the wall remain. She would be in favor of parking Waivers, if these historic features were saved; they are just as important as saving trees.

Ms. Cooper asked if the privy was open and if it is a health concern.

Mr. Morgan answered the privy has been abandoned for its intended use and is now a home to cats, raccoons, and rodents in the City.

Ms. Cooper asked if the hole for the privy was still there. The structure is unique and asked if it can be relocated on the property.

Ms. Krumb indicated if the privy is in its original location with a pit dug into the ground, it has probably not been used as intended since the 1930s. The privy is a unique find and asked if it could be restored just as an example as every home had one. There have been others saved and relocated in this area.

Mr. Alexander agreed, he would like to see the privy reused.

Mr. Morgan said the lean-to addition on #30 is more recent than the log structure. A site tour was conducted in 2018 and there may or may be a foundation. The log structure contains repurposed rail road ties and tree bark on the roof rafters. As one steps out of the log structure out the old back door, and proceeds down the steps, a foundation is present prior to the next structure. When the addition was constructed, they made an attempt to resemble a salt box form but it does not line up; it slopes down to the lower shed addition. The log structure is the most important piece to save, not the other additions, as they would need to be fully rebuilt.

Mr. Morgan proposed coming up with a site plan for an outdoor patio while still keeping more of the site wall in place. Sections of the stone wall could stay in same place but cut out some openings for free flowing traffic between the two venues.

Mr. Alexander stated he supports the demolition for a couple of reasons. The demolition is more formalized, believes the applicant will meet the criteria. It is a bad practice once an approval is received to go back on the approval. The stone wall is so unique, others thought the wall could come down since there are so many walls around the city.

Ms. Krumb suggested that if the rear saltbox addition is demolished, and the log structure kept, she suggested removing the dormers and the other elements that were added later. The layout of the addition on #32 is fine. She has serious concerns on the addition of #30 as it is very large and not subordinate to original building; something has to be done to differentiate the two.

Mr. Morgan said a larger footprint was proposed but the roofline would be secondary to the original structure. It will have a low slope, nearly flat roof connector to the log structure. One will know they are in

a special space when in the log structure; it will not be a vanilla box with the same language on the inside as the outside.

Mr. Morgan said he likes the idea of removing the dormer and he would also like to remove the door that was found on High Street.

Mr. Cotter stated it must be clear the addition is subordinate to the original building.

Ms. Cooper and Mr. Alexander were in agreement with prior comments.

Ms. Kramb stated she supports a Waiver for parking but no parking is permitted in residential areas.

Ms. Cooper restated 37 spaces are required and only 9 are proposed. She asked which sections of the wall are to be removed.

Mr. Morgan clarified that any part of the stone wall that is removed will be repurposed around the site and not thrown into landfill or repurposed by another development team. Seven spaces will be provided on site. Three spaces are on the street, five spaces will be accessible for parking including a handicap space and one space will be used for trash enclosure.

Mr. Alexander stated if the wall is kept in place while trying to gain more spaces, drivers will run into that wall as these lots are so narrow, one cannot drive in and turn 90 degrees.

Mr. Morgan added the parking on Blacksmith Lane is head in only to the space; drivers back up into Blacksmith Lane.

Mr. Cotter said this is a safety issue and he does not see a big difference between offering nine spaces or four. If the applicant changes the configuration, they will probably run into other problems.

Ms. Kramb said the president of the Historic Society wanted to make sure the Planning Staff is aware that there is an original fire hydrant hook-up at the front of the building and another on the rear. These were the first ones in the city so he wants to ensure so special features are preserved. These two hydrants should appear on the site drawings so they are paid attention to. The one in the front is highly visible, right between the two buildings.

Public Comment

There was one public comment submitted during the meeting. The resident on South Riverview Street said this is a great idea and that the property desperately needs help.

Summary of the Board's Comments

Mr. Alexander stated some of us are definitely supportive of demolishing all the structures and some need documentation the Code requires to support demolition for all the structures requested.

Everyone is encouraging the applicant to reuse the privy in some way.

There is some variation of feelings on the Board concerning the stone walls. Alternatives to the site plan were requested.

The Board is generally supportive of the site layout.

Even though the footprint of the addition on #30 is larger, the applicant must make sure the addition is subordinate to the original structure.

It is clear that the Board will support some sort of Waiver for parking; that will depend on how the wall is utilized with the final site plan.

Applicant Questions

Mr. Morgan asked if an outdoor terrace could be a covered pavilion structure, open on the sides, as this was recently being considered. He asked if that would increase their site coverage and if it would be worth pursuing as they develop the architecture for the site.

Ms. Kramb noted the building is getting really long east/west wise so something that is detached is more favorable but will need to see more details detaching it from the other roofline.

Mr. Cotter agreed with Ms. Kramb and Ms. Cooper did as well.

Mr. Alexander stated, depending on the design, the more independent of the building mass the better. He concluded the Board is qualifying the covered pavilion but is generally supportive of it.

NEW CASES

3. Firehouse at 37 W. Bridge Street, 21-075MPR, Minor Project Review

The Chair said this application is a request for exterior building and site modifications for a historic property on a 0.22-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic Core. The site is southwest of the intersection of W. Bridge Street with Mill Lane.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Ridge shared two aerial views of the site location that included two small stone walls, a concrete patio, and the original 1940s firehouse structure with an addition from the 1980s on the southern portion of the site.

Existing conditions of the view of the stone firehouse structure from W. Bridge Street [shown] and a view from Mill Lane of the original stone structure connected to the two-story addition [shown.] Proposed site plan of the northern portion of site only [shown] as the rest of the site is to remain unaltered. The applicant is proposing a new wrought-iron fence to enclose the existing concrete patio, ±one foot from the existing stone walls. All modifications are proposed outside of the right-of-way.

The proposed north elevation of an aluminium storefront system [shown] is to be painted a Tricorn Black color to replace the four-panel, storefront and trim piece; a double-door entry and the two-story portion of the building is to be painted a Sawdust color. For reference, the wrought-iron fence would also be visible on this elevation, not shown on the graphic to provide visibility of the other alterations.

The proposed east elevation of the proposed awnings with black, fade/UV/mold resistant Sunbrella to be installed on the existing framing and shape over the existing storefront system to be painted the Tricorn Black to match the storefront system on the north side of the building [shown.] The east view of the second story will be painted a sawdust color. The high wrought-iron fence was visible in this graphic proposed at three feet, six inches in height, similar to other wrought-iron fences in the area.

The proposed south elevation remains largely unaltered, mainly just painted the sawdust color, the same as the rest of this addition [shown.]

The proposed west elevation is the same as the rest. Any existing wood trim or window sills are to be painted an almost rice color [shown.]

All the proposed material colors and fence style were shown.

This application was reviewed against the Minor Project Review criteria, which was found to have met with one condition. Approval is recommended with the following condition:

- 1) That the entirety of the aluminum coping cap be painted Tricorn Black, subject to Staff approval.

Board Questions

Ms. Kramb asked if the existing concrete pad is actually clipped in the corners like shown in the graphic or a square pad, as it appears on the aerial and the Auditor's website.

Mr. Ridge confirmed the corners are clipped.

Ms. Kramb asked if the fence would follow the outline of the concrete to which Mr. Ridge answered affirmatively. She asked if the wrought-iron fence is being installed on the existing concrete pad or in the grass to the outside of the concrete.

The applicant, Ms. Rihl, Darin Ranker Architects, 5925 Wilcox Place, Suite E, Dublin, OH 43016, confirmed the fence would be installed on the concrete, a couple of inches off the edge to prevent the concrete from chipping when installed.

Mr. Cotter asked if the stone walls would be altered in any way. Ms. Rihl confirmed the stone walls will not be touched.

Applicant Presentation

Ms. Rihl said the applicant is wanting to bring back the original look of the firehouse with the new storefront to make it appear as operational overhead garage doors when the structure was used as a firehouse. They are keeping the awning structures as they are, just replacing the red material with a black material.

Public Comment

No public comment has been received for this application.

The Chair asked Ms. Rihl if she was comfortable with the condition of approval, as it was written in the Staff Report to which she answered affirmatively.

The Chair called for a motion.

Ms. Cooper moved, Mr. Cotter seconded, to approve the Minor Project with the following condition:

- 1) That the entirety of the aluminum coping cap be painted Tricorn Black, subject to Staff approval.

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

[Motion carried 4-0]

5. Vessels Residence 63 S. Riverview, Minor Project Review

The Chair said this application is a request for the installation of a new patio and walkways associated with an existing, single-family residence on a 0.25-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic Residential. The site is northwest of the intersection of S. Riverview Street with Eberly Hill Lane.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Holt presented an aerial view of the site and a graphic of the various Zoning Code boundaries.

The ARB previously approved construction for a house addition in 2018. This is being reviewed now under the new Zoning Code and *Historic District Guidelines*.

Contextual photos of the existing conditions around the site which included the original 1820s house façade on S. Riverview Street, the front walkway leading to the front door, the front walls, and the walkway on the left side of the house as viewed from S. Riverview Street [shown.] Next Eberly Hill addition and patio area [shown.] Existing condition photographs received from the applicant of the S. Riverview Street entry and the existing patio on Eberly Hill, which the applicant states because of the condition of patio, water draining back toward the addition of the house, and lastly, the south walkway was shown.

The proposed site plan [shown.] The request is for an increase of 450 square feet of this patio.

The proposed materials include: Square paver the color of walnut; Interlocking pavers for edge detail in Mocha; Fire Pit using simulated limestone in Salerno; and risers for the steps on the patio are Indiana stone pavers [shown.]

The perspective renderings submitted with the application of the original house on S. Riverview Street and the corner of S. Riverview and Eberly Hill [shown.] The front stoop and the historic perimeter wall are not

being affected. Eberly Hill patio with the new addition behind it and a view looking to Eberly Hill from the house focusing on the fire pit and step detail [shown.]

The application was reviewed against Minor Project Review criteria and *Historic Design Guidelines*, criteria. Details are in the Planning Report.

Approval is recommended with three conditions:

- 1) That the existing stoop (limestone slabs of indeterminate age) is not disturbed with this project;
- 2) That the walk to the front door on S. Riverview Street be paved using the original/existing brick, reset in a manner to provide a smooth walking surface; and
- 3) That the same original/existing brick be used to pave the newly created walk on the south side of the historic house, such that all walkways adjacent to the historic house are paved in the old brick.

Public Comment

Ms. Holt reported the Architectural Review Board had received and reviewed three public comments provided in advance of the meeting, which were all in favor of this application.

Board Questions

Mr. Cotter inquired as to what sections require repurposing.

Ms. Holt answered the bricks on the south, east, west, and the part on the street.

Applicant Presentation

Trevor Vessels asked to present and discuss what their plan was versus what came out of the Planning Report. Many variations of the patio have been considered over the past two years, which included seeking input from the Administrative Review Team (ART) of which they received three suggestions: Not to touch the front porch, which the applicant agreed to as the age was unknown; Cut new pavers to smaller sizes in the approach to the front porch to which the applicant agreed to mimic what was there before; and the third suggestion was not to retain the brick but to get a different color paver. They went back to the ART for approval when they got those pavers. Mr. Vessels stated the existing brick was in terrible condition. Prior to this meeting, he pulled up a brick from the site [shown] and half of it came up because it all falls apart when it is disturbed. The other half of the brick was dust in a bag [shown.] The brick is not in a condition suitable to walk on or much less, spend the money to pull it up and replace. Plus, there is not enough brick. The reason they are doing this is to expand the footprint of the patio, all within the guidelines. If they were to replace the existing brick with a larger footprint, they would not have enough brick. In 2018, the ARB approved demolishing and replacing that brick, as they went through a whole renovation of this project. The question at the time was whether the old brick in the driveway was historic or contributing in nature. The ART, the ARB, and the consultant all agreed that brick was not contributing to the district and reporting from the Historic Preservation Society, its poor condition. The brick in the driveway was the exact same brick that is currently being discussed. The condition of the brick is in worse condition, now. If the brick was not contributing to history then, it is not now. The applicant stated he understands and appreciates the importance and efforts to maintain character of the Historic District but this impossible to do as there is not enough brick and the brick has already been determined not to be safe.

Board Discussion

Mr. Cotter stated bricks you drive on need to be structurally different than those you would walk on but they still need to be safe and not fall apart.

Mr. Alexander recalled when this site was reviewed before, the ARB focused on other aspects of that application. Without going back and reading the minutes, he did not have a good recollection of that substantial project.

Mr. Alexander confirmed with the applicant that the current patio is brick. When he looked at the surface character of the brick on a site visit (he did not pick up any brick), it did not appear to be in great shape. He asked the applicant how many brick that are in decent shape that perhaps he could just add to. He clarified asking if this brick could be used just for the walks, excluding the patio.

Mr. Vessels questioned which walk he was referring to.

Ms. Holt reviewed the applicable graphic and confirmed just the south walk is to have reused brick. Staff has no concerns with the proposed new material adjacent to 2018 additions. To keep some historic context, staff recommends reusing the brick that is on the existing patio to improve the walkways.

Mr. Vessels said when he put the existing brick to be reused on the pathways next to the patio it looked terrible. If someone walks by, they would question why it is like that and if the homeowner ran out of brick. He could visualize that brick for the front walk but the side walk up to the patio would look bizarre and requested feedback.

Ms. Kramb stated she completely agrees with the applicant. The brick should not be used. From a historic standpoint, it has nothing to do with the original house; it is a modern brick in poor condition; and the mix of materials would not look right. The discussion would be different, if a brick from German Village was being repurposed that was used in the 1840s. These generic bricks were probably from the mid-century and do not need to be preserved. She is completely supportive of removing conditions 2 and 3.

Ms. Cooper agreed with Ms. Kramb. She said the brick in the back does not need to be restored as it is next to new materials and that there is nothing historic about the old brick.

Mr. Cotter said he would trust Ms. Kramb's historic brick knowledge. Only the front walk made sense but if it would not add anything to the neighbourhood; go with what the homeowner wants to do.

Mr. Alexander indicated there was a logic to the Planning Report to preserve materials but the direction the Board has moved differently.

Ms. Kramb moved, Mr. Cotter seconded, to approve the Minor Project with only the first condition:

- 1) That the existing stoop, limestone slabs of indeterminate age, are not disturbed with this project.

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

[Motion carried 4-0]

COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Martin stated the next regular meeting of the ARB is scheduled for July 21, 2021, and will be held (in person) at 5200 Emerald Parkway (old Council Chambers). The ARB meeting scheduled for August 25, 2021, will be held in person at the new, City Hall Council Chambers at 5555 Perimeter Drive. All Board and Commission meetings scheduled for July and August will meet at the locations noted above, as well.

Ms. Martin said Mr. Cotter is unable to attend the ARB meeting in September.

Ms. Martin stated Sarah Holt, AICP, Senior Planner, has joined the Planning Division and will be the lead Liaison for the ARB and Mr. Ridge will assist. Ms. Martin is stepping back to focus on the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC).

Ms. Martin reported concerns have been expressed of approved homes (re: mass and scale) as they are framed out. Staff reviewed the ARB approvals and compared them to the building permits. Inspectors confirmed construction is in accordance with the approved permits. The homes were in keeping with previous regulations and would not be permitted under existing regulations. The members said they have received complaints about construction in residential areas where there is little room for staging, resulting in vehicles or materials off site. Several strategies were considered as they all appreciate resident concerns. Staff will review procedures and provide follow-up.

Mr. Ridge informed the Board of the unapproved demolition that took place at 5707 Dublin Road. Two structures were demolished – a Historic Spring House and a Chicken Coop. Planning Staff and the Law Director’s Office are proposing amendments to the Code to modify the penalty for such actions. The Board was in agreement that amendments were needed. The property owners also installed a privacy fence without approval. To be compliant, they are required to remove the fence within 30 days. The Board members were concerned that these situations could occur repeatedly if there were not revisions to the provision in the law including stricter penalties. These resources need to be protected.

Ms. Martin informed the Board to expect upcoming training being offered through Cornerstone that entails Ethics Training and Diversity and Equity Training.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

Chair, Architectural Review Board

Assistant Clerk of Council