



# BOARD DISCUSSION

## Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, July 21, 2021 | 6:30 pm

The Architectural Review Board took the following action at this meeting:

**1. Kuraly Residence at 179 S. Riverview Street  
21-095INF**

**Informal Review**

Proposal: Exterior modifications to a single-family home on a 0.36-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic Residential.  
Location: West of S. Riverview Street, ±400 feet south of the intersection with Pinneyhill Lane.  
Request: Informal review with non-binding feedback under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.176 and the *Historic Design Guidelines*.  
Applicant: Taylor Pfeffenberger, His & Hers Architects  
Planning Contacts: Zachary Hounshell, Planner I  
Contact Information: 614.410.4652, zhounshell@dublin.oh.us  
Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/21-095

**RESULT:** The Board reviewed and provided informal feedback on a proposal for exterior modifications to an existing single-family home. Board members expressed support for the proposed paint colors, as well as for the board and batten. Board members were split on the appropriateness of shutters. Members were generally supportive of the proposed modifications to the front entry, although some members expressed that it may be more appropriate to relocate the front door to be in line with the front of the porch.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Gary Alexander Yes  
Amy Kramb Yes  
Sean Cotter Yes  
Martha Cooper Yes

**STAFF CERTIFICATION**

DocuSigned by:

B1056D11513A490...

Zachary Hounshell, Planner I





# MEETING MINUTES

## Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, July 21, 2021

### CALL TO ORDER

~~Mr. Alexander, Chair, called the July 21, 2021, meeting of the City of Dublin Architectural Review Board (ARB) to order at 6:30 p.m. and noted this is the last in-person meeting of the ARB to be held in the Council Chamber at 5200 Emerald Parkway. This meeting was also live-streamed on the City's website; public participation and comments relayed to the Board by the meeting moderator using an online form. Beginning in August, all the Board and Commission meetings will be held at 5555 Perimeter Drive in the new Council Chamber in the new City Hall location.~~

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

~~The Chair led the Pledge of Allegiance.~~

### ROLL CALL

~~Board Members present: Mr. Alexander, Mr. Cotter, Ms. Kramb, and Ms. Cooper.  
Staff present: Ms. Holt, Mr. Ridge, Ms. Rauch, Mr. Hounshell, Ms. Richard, and Ms. Capka~~

### ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

~~Ms. Kramb moved, Mr. Cotter seconded, to accept the documents into the record and to approve the Board Minutes, as submitted, from the meetings held on May 26 and June 23, 2021.~~

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

### 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.~~

~~The Chair briefly explained the rules and procedures of the ARB. He swore in anyone planning to address the Board on any of the cases reviewed this evening.~~

### INFORMAL REVIEW CASES

#### 1. Kuraly Residence at 179 S. Riverview Street, 20-095INF, Informal Review

The Chair stated this application is a request for exterior modifications to a single-family home on a 0.36-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic Residential. The site is west of S. Riverview Street, ±400 feet south of the intersection with Pinneyhill Lane. Mr. Hounshell will be our presenter.

### **Staff Presentation**

Mr. Hounshell presented an aerial view of the site and photographs of the four adjacent properties to provide context. This two-story, single-family structure with a three-car attached garage was built in 1997. The majority of the existing house is beige, to be repainted a green color (SW - Seaweed Wrap). The 1.5-story front entry feature is proposed to be more enclosed, requiring the construction of two small vertical board and batten walls on the north and south sides of the existing front porch, between the columns, matching the vertical board and batten over the two-car garage door. The single front door will be replaced with a double-door stained a dark color with the transom window above, remaining. New wood shutters are proposed for the front elevation, stained to match the front door entry. New, dark bronze lighting fixtures for the front entry and garage door entries, matching the new gutters and downspouts were proposed. The horizontal siding on the front of the home will be replaced with a vertical board and batten painted a beige color (SW – Natural Choice). All existing trim will be painted white (SW – Pearly White or similar). Existing garage doors will be replaced with new overhead garage doors with a similar design to the existing but will contain glazing across the top. New charcoal, dimensional-asphalt shingles are proposed for the roof, and the existing roof returns will be removed for a simpler design, which is more in line with the majority of the home.

### **Board Discussion Questions**

The following discussion questions have been provided for the Board to consider during the review:

1. Is the Board supportive of the proposed front entry modifications?
2. Is the Board supportive of the installation of board and batten siding and shutters on the home?
3. Is the Board supportive of the proposed paint colors?
4. Are there additional considerations by the Board?

### **Applicant Presentation**

Taylor Pfeffenberger, His & Hers Architects, stated her client is not fond of the two columns at her front entry that take up too much of the small porch [shown.] They are proposing a wall around to provide more room for the entry way and lessen the appearance of large massing. The house in general is bland so they are proposing new colors to give more dimension: a historical green, a light beige for the board and batten, and white for trim.

### **Board Questions**

Mr. Cotter inquired about past modifications proposed that do not appear to have been completed. He asked if those modifications were abandoned.

Mr. Hounshell clarified in 2019, this site was approved for massive building modifications but the applicant did not move forward with that application. This application is entirely separate. There was a discussion with that case that the board and batten was approved. Ms. Pfeffenberger said they plan to use cedar for the board and batten to match the house.

Ms. Krumb asked if they were proposing to remove the base and columns at the front entry and not just filling in the gaps to create a solid wall.  
Ms. Pfeffenberger answered affirmatively.

Mr. Alexander recalled staff has made comments in the past about certain door styles. He requested staff's position on this door re: glass.

Mr. Hounshell indicated that comments about the type of door that will be appropriate here will be provided in the final application for review. Tonight's focus is on the shell of the building.

Ms. Pfeffenberger added they are not changing the color of the grids in the windows.

Mr. Alexander asked why the applicant is bringing focus to the gutters and downspouts with a dark bronze color as opposed to allowing them disappear into the trim color.

Ms. Pfeffenberger answered they are using bronze for the lights and thought it would be nice if they tied in a warm color to complement the green.

Mr. Cotter asked why a dark wood color is now proposed instead of black.

Ms. Pfeffenberger confirmed the dark stain would be closer to brown than black.

Ms. Cooper inquired about the location of the double door.

Ms. Pfeffenberger said the door is staying where it is; it is not being pushed forward on the front of the porch.

Ms. Cooper clarified the board and batten wraps around to the front of the porch but the door is staying flush against the house. She asked why shutters are just for the windows in the center of the façade and not for the windows to the left of the porch.

Ms. Pfeffenberger clarified there will still be a porch and the double door will be wider than the current transom. Shutters for the windows on the left would be a challenge to make them appear like they could cover the windows since the windows are a completely different type and style.

Mr. Alexander said since the door is staying where it is, he asked what the interior of the porch walls were going to look like.

Ms. Pfeffenberger indicated the interior with the wrapped walls had not been definitively decided but leaning towards a lighter stained wood than the shutters and door.

The Chair requested a floor plan of that area when the applicant returns for review and stipulated it does not have to be a rendering in color.

### **Board Discussion**

Mr. Cotter said he was supportive of the front entry as proposed. He is interested to see the intended design for the interior of the 'alcove'.

Ms. Kramb said she would have preferred to have the door forward so it could be visible. Presently, it is hidden and believes it will become more concealed when the porch is blocked off from the north and south. This is a more modern home that is not very decorative; she could be supportive of the modification. A darker door will be even less visible. She wants to see all the details at the next review.

Ms. Pfeffenberger said the door is currently beige, lined up and matching the beige siding so there is no current contrast.

Ms. Cooper said she is supportive of the modifications proposed. She suggested lighting could enhance the interior of the alcove, as it will be absent of sunlight.

Mr. Alexander concurred with everything that was stated by his colleagues. The front modifications will help the look for an older house. He could be supportive, if the door is still recessed but would prefer that the door be pushed forward, in line with the front of the porch.

Ms. Kramb said she was fine with the board and batten modifications. Both Mr. Cotter and Ms. Cooper agreed these changes would aid contrast. Mr. Alexander suggested looking at all the homes in the area that have board and batten siding, as that material was approved a significant number of times and it is very trendy. This material was supported in the past and it appears everyone would support that design today.

Ms. Kramb said her preference is no shutters because one would not put shutters on some windows and not the others, on a house.

Mr. Cotter said the dark shutters would aid the contrast.

Ms. Cooper said she has no specific objections to the shutters.

Mr. Alexander said he was okay with the shutters, reluctantly. The Board has approved designs on the newer houses proposing some shutters while not requiring all the windows to have shutters. He does not like that practice but in this instance, it helps break up the wall and the applicant is at a disadvantage of not building a new house. Visually, there is some value to that shutter being added to the center of the facade. As noted in the staff report, the guidelines are that the shutters have to appear as they are able to cover the window.

Ms. Kramb said she has no objection to the proposed paint colors.

Mr. Cotter said he could not distinguish between the beige and the white colors, online.

Ms. Pfeffenberger said it was a very light contrast; she did not want three different paint colors to be apparent on the structure.

Mr. Cotter clarified there is the fourth color with the dark stained shutters and doors.

Mr. Alexander requested actual paint chips, to which the applicant provided.

### **Summary of the Board's Comments**

The Chair stated the Board is supportive of the changes to the front entry.

There is some desire to see the doors moved forward.

All members are comfortable with the board and batten and the paint colors.

There is some disagreement on the shutters but the applicant may have enough support for that plan to be accepted.

### **Public Comment**

There were no public comments received.

## **2. Fairy Garden at 28 N. High Street, 21-100INF, Informal Review**

~~The Chair said this is a request for site modifications for an open space associated with an existing commercial building on a 0.15-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic Core. The site is east of N. High Street, ±175 feet north of the intersection with Bridge Street. Mr. Ridge will be our presenter on the behalf of Ms. Martin.~~

### **Staff Presentation**

~~Mr. Ridge presented an aerial view of the overall site, as well as a zoomed-in view of the layout and the existing conditions. The zoomed-in aerial provided context to the focus area of this application - located between the primary structure on 28 N. High Street and bound by the neighboring structure on 24 N. High Street. There was a photograph of the vacant open space that is ±275 square feet in size, surrounded by concrete walls of the buildings on three sides [shown] with a gravel surface. Unlike residential landscaping in the Historic District, commercial landscaping is regulated by the standard landscape Code.~~

~~The proposed character [shown] includes: a three-foot tall, wrought-iron fence on either side of a concrete paver path; a wrought-iron tree bench; artificial ivy privacy screens along the concrete walls; and outdoor LED string lights; all with the focus on showcasing fairy houses intermingled with stumps, river rocks, and artificial succulents, etc. The standard Code prohibits artificial plants. Detail of specific materials proposed for the area [shown.]~~



## BOARD ORDER

# Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, September 25, 2019 | 6:30 pm

The Architectural Review Board took the following action at this meeting:

**5. 179 & 185 S. Riverview Street  
19-076ARB-MPR**

**Minor Project Review**

**Proposal:** Exterior modifications and building additions for an approximately 3,800-square-foot, one and a half-story, single-family, home with an attached one and a half-story, three-car garage on a 0.24-acre site zoned Bridge Street District Historic Residential.

**Location:** On the west side of S. Riverview, approximately 350 feet north of the intersection with Short Street.

**Request:** Review and approval of the Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.176.

**Applicant:** Heidi Bolyard, Simplified Living Architecture and Design

**Planning Contact:** Nichole M. Martin, AICP, Planner II

**Contact Information:** 614.410.4635, nmartin@dublin.oh.us

**Case Information:** www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/19-056

**MOTION:** Ms. Bryan moved, Ms. Stenberg seconded, to approve the Minor Project with four conditions:

- 1) That the applicant update the plans to eliminate the front door sidelites, reduce the shed porch roof to be limited to only above the front door, and the depth of the porch reduced, subject to Staff approval;
- 2) That the applicant revise the design to eliminate HardiShingles on all elevations, and continue the predominate façade material in lieu;
- 3) That the applicant update the proposed color palette to colors other than a white body and black accents, subject to Staff approval; and
- 4) That the applicant provide details for window trim and sills, columns, and board and batten siding, subject to Staff approval.


**VOTE:** 3 – 1

**RESULT:** The Minor Project was conditionally approved.

**RECORDED VOTES:**

Shannon Stenberg	Yes
Gary Alexander	Yes
Andrew Keeler	Recused
Kathleen Bryan	Yes
Robert Bailey	No

**STAFF CERTIFICATION**



Nichole M. Martin, AICP, Planner II



~~Ms. Martin stated that this a demolition request for a property located within the Architectural Review District. The property is approximately .37 acres. The home is set back approximately 150 feet from the right-of-way, and there are a number of mature trees on the lot. The site contains a one-story, 1,200-sq. ft., single-family home with one-car attached garage that is accessed by a gravel driveway. This home was built in 1960 and has a modern, horizontal character. The construction is a combination of wood framing and concrete block and is in significant disrepair. This home was designated as recommended contributing in the City's Historic and Cultural Assessment, which was completed in 2017. Because the assessment was conducted as a field assessment with a view only from the public right-of-way, the findings would be less certain than those of a home significantly closer to the right-of-way. The applicant has provided an interior assessment, which was completed upon purchase of the home. The home inspection cites a number of interior conditions of which the City's consultant would have been unaware, including: a deteriorating roof, moisture damage from the damaged gutters and exposed flashing, and a number of plumbing, heating and electrical concerns. Upon review of the demolition criteria, staff found that Criteria #1 and Criteria #4 were met. Therefore, staff recommends approval of the request for demolition with a condition that the demolition not occur until an approved project is in place for both Lots #175 and #185, which is the next case on the agenda.~~

~~There was no public comment.~~

### **~~Board Discussion~~**

~~Ms. Bryan stated that she has no objection to the requested demolition.~~

~~Ms. Stenberg stated that the applicant has provided a thorough evaluation with images as supporting information.~~

~~Ms. Bryan moved, Mr. Bailey seconded approval of the demolition request with one condition:~~

- ~~1) That the order to allow a demolition not be issued by the City until the ARB has approved improvements to the lot as part of an associated application, and a Building Permit has been issued for the improvements.~~

~~Vote: Ms. Bryan, yes; Mr. Bailey, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Stenberger, yes.  
(Motion approved 4-0 with one recusal)~~

### **5. 179 & 185 S. Riverview Street – Construction, 19-076ARB-MPR, Minor Project Review**

Ms. Stenberg stated that this is a proposal for exterior modifications and building additions for an approximately 3,800-square-foot, 1.5-story, single-family home with an attached 1.5-story, 3-car garage on a 0.24-acre site zoned Bridge Street District Historic Residential.

### **Staff Presentation**

Ms. Martin stated that this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review application for extensive exterior modifications, as well as a number of additions. The two sites are 179 and 185 South Riverview. The site to the south, 185 S. Riverview, is the one on which the Board just approved a request for demolition. The site to the north, 179 S. Riverview, is the subject of the

improvements. Given the extent of the additions, the lots are proposed to be combined into a .74-acre parcel. With that combination, the proposed additions will fall within the buildable area of the lot, and conform to Zoning Code requirements. Three of the neighboring homes are 1-story ranches and the home to the south is a 2-story home. The 2-story, 2,000 sq. ft. home at 179 S. Riverview was built in 1997 and is of a typical suburban character with numerous front end gables and a 1.5 story front entry. With this improvement, the 3-car, front-loaded garage will be converted into livable space, and a garage addition will be located to the south of the existing home.

On the west elevation, the enclosed sunroom will be removed. The asphalt driveway that provides access to the home will be removed, due to the conversion of the garage into livable space, and relocated to the south of the home. With the proposed additions, the total size of the home and attached garage will be approximately 3,800 square feet. The total proposed lot coverage is approximately 20 percent, while 50 percent is permitted. The additions include a mudroom and 3-car, side-loaded garage. On the front elevation, the garage will be converted to livable space and will be finished in a combination of vertical HardiePanel Siding with HardieTrim Batten Boards. The center of the home will also be modified with a vertical HardiePanel Siding. The applicant is proposing shake in the peak of the gable roof and a new front porch with a standing seam roof and Craftsman-style front door with sidelights. A stone watertable is proposed to extend across the middle three-fifths of the home to create a focal element at the center of the home. Vertical Batten Board siding is proposed on the street-facing elevation, and horizontal siding is proposed for the rear elevation. The consultant recommended that the applicant consider addition of a shed roofline between the attached garage and proposed addition to mimic the front elevation. That recommendation has been deferred to the Board for consideration tonight.

Staff had some concerns with the mass and scale of the garage, as well as the shed dormer details, of which the applicant was made aware. Although the applicant reduced the location of the shed dormers on the garage roof, it remains a visible mass. The applicant has chosen to address this by using an alternate color on the proposed garage. The garage will be a rich espresso color, and the remainder of the home will be Arctic White. The windows will be a combination of Arctic White and black windows. This is a style that has been seen recently in Historic Dublin. Because it is trend-driven, there is concern about the timelessness of that color palette, as well as its proliferation across the District. Staff provided a number of color palettes that are traditional to the Farmhouse style, and recommended that they pursue an alternate color palette. The window and garage door styles mimic those that have been previously approved for 156 and 158 S. High Street. The applicant has updated the light fixture to be different for this home, per staff's recommendation.

Staff has recommended approval with the following four conditions:

- 1) The applicant update the plans to eliminate the front door sidelights, and to reduce the shed porch roof to be limited to only above the front door;
- 2) The applicant revise the design to eliminate Hardishingles on all elevations, and in lieu to extend the HardiePanel Siding and Hardie Batten Boards with a horizontal trim bar to mask the seam;
- 3) The applicant update the proposed color palette to colors other than a white body and black accents, subject to staff approval; and,
- 4) The applicant provide details for window trim and sills, columns, and board and batten siding, subject to staff approval.



### **Applicant Presentation**

Heidi Bolyard, Simplified Living Architecture and Design, 6065 Frantz Road – Suite 205, Dublin, stated that her only comment is in regard to the front porch. Because the existing garage extends quite far from the front wall, the intent was that a longer front porch would break up the length of that wall. In terms of the color palette, although staff has suggested other Farmhouse colors, such as blue and yellow, there are only two other white houses on the street. There are also two blue houses and two yellow houses.

### **Public Comment**

Bob Dyas, 180 S. Riverview Street, Dublin, stated that they live across the street from 185 S. Riverview, and are thankful that the house, which is in poor condition, will be demolished. They are excited with the very nice project proposed for the site.

### **Board Questions**

Mr. Alexander inquired if staff's proposal for the front porch would reduce both the length and depth.

Ms. Martin responded that it would reduce only the length, not the depth. The intent was to create more unadorned space to simplify the front elevation.

Mr. Alexander stated that staff has also suggested that all of the gables have board and batten, no shingles.

Ms. Martin responded affirmatively. Although this would require a seam line to exist, it would result in simplification, a reduction of materials, and differentiation from the design of 158 S. High Street.

Mr. Alexander stated that he supports the idea of reducing the length, because it will create more hierarchy on the front elevation. The vertical axis will be seen through the two windows. Because it will pull the eye to that point, the house will benefit. However, if the porch remains this deep, there will be a distinctive slot between the edge of the porch and garage. Because there is a good amount of living space, the porch is probably a gesture to the street. However, there will also be a new porch on the rear elevation. Perhaps if the length is reduced, the depth should be reduced, as well.

Ms. Bolyard responded that if the length were reduced, they would also have to reduce the depth. Otherwise, it would protrude 10 feet.

Mr. Alexander stated that the roof to the left could be combined by moving the fascia slightly higher. Even though there would be a change in plane, more continuity would be achieved.

Ms. Bolyard responded that they were not contemplating a change in the roof on that side.

Mr. Alexander stated that the addition is new. He is not suggesting this as a condition, just suggesting that it would give more continuity along that surface. He likes staff's recommendation to achieve more prominence at the front door. He has no objection to the change in color. One color unifies and the second color breaks up the massing. He noted that there was no recommendation that the horizontal siding be eliminated.

Ms. Martin responded that recommendation was not made.

Ms. Bolyard stated that they were remaining consistent with the existing horizontal siding. However, because the existing vinyl siding will be replaced, there would be an opportunity to use board and batten instead.

Mr. Alexander responded that he concurs with staff's recommendation to leave it as horizontal siding, which results in the use of three materials.

Ms. Stenberger concurred with staff's recommendation, as well. Her view was that either the shingles or the horizontal siding could be retained, but she did not have a preference. Her concern was that only three materials were used. She inquired if a depth reduction should be included in the condition for length reduction of the front porch, although the applicant has already indicated they would do so.

Ms. Martin responded that condition could be updated accordingly.

Ms. Bolyard inquired if it is appropriate to put horizontal in the gable ends.

Mr. Alexander responded that because continuity is the goal, it would benefit the elevation to extend the vertical all the way up; otherwise, it would look too similar to the other homes they are constructing.

Ms. Bryan stated that the three houses that the builder is constructing are beginning to look alike, which is not what is preferred in the neighborhood.

Ms. Stenberg inquired if it is the similarity to which she objects.

Ms. Bryan responded affirmatively.

Ms. Stenberg referred to the condition regarding the color palette change. Was the concern that the black and white palette was too trendy?

Ms. Martin responded that the white Farmhouse is a character typically seen in Jerome Village in Jerome Township and in Dublin neighborhoods. Replicating the trend in the Historic District is a concern. Staff's recommendation is that black windows not be used and that an alternative color for the siding be proposed.

Mr. Bailey inquired how many houses on the street have black windows.

Ms. Martin responded that 158 S. High Street has black windows. An application for 109 S. Riverview was recently approved for a master suite addition with vertical white batten board siding and black windows.

Mr. Bailey responded that he has no objection to the proposed black windows.

Mr. Alexander stated that he has no objection to staff's recommendation to revise the color palette. The black and white color palette trend is creating monotony.

Ms. Bryan concurred that diversity in color is needed. Pillars also are being repeated along High Street. The Board is seeing repetitive designs and colors in a neighborhood that is highly diverse. She is concerned about the size and scale of this project, which does not fit in with the surrounding homes. Options are available to make the house feel less like a large mansion. It is essential to consider the integrity of the neighborhood.

Ms. Bolyard responded that much of the massing is already there, so they are working with what exists. It is also due to the size of the new garage, over which living space will be added. Because the existing house is on a slab and has no basement, storage space is needed. Part of the second floor over the garage will be storage space.

Ms. Stenberg reviewed the recommended conditions, and inquired if the Board is in agreement with staff's recommendation for a revised color palette.

Mr. Bailey inquired if the applicant is being asked to make their house blue.

Ms. Stenberg stated that staff has provided examples of other color palettes to the applicant. The applicant would work with staff on identifying an alternative color palette, and staff, not the Board, would approve the selection.

Mr. Bailey stated that the suggestion is that the Board require the applicant to use another color palette without knowing what those colors are. This is recommended, although there are no other black and white homes next to this property, only the one further down the street.

Ms. Bolyard stated that the house at 156 S. High Street is all white. The other previously white Farmhouse will be painted gray.

Mr. Bailey stated that he does not understand the reason the applicant cannot be permitted their choice of a white house when there is no other adjacent white house.

Mr. Alexander inquired if white was in the color palette of the homes the Board just approved.

Ms. Rauch responded that the color for 158 S. High was altered to a more beige-gray color, per staff's recommendation. However, the nearby Tackett house is white. Staff's concern was with the proliferation of the Farmhouse style with the black and white color palette along S. Riverview and S. High Street.

Mr. Alexander stated that there are different shades of white, but the white and black contrast is the current trend.

Mr. Bailey responded that if the Board is stating that they cannot approve the applicant's color palette because it is becoming a trend in Historic Dublin, there are only two other such houses within the District. He would not call a third house a trend.

Mr. Alexander responded that it is based upon a trend that exists everywhere else in the City

Mr. Bailey responded that he understands that is the case, but the Board's focus is the Historic District.

Ms. Stenberg stated the concern is that the Historic District not become trendy. The intent is to preserve its historic character, which means maintaining variety. These homes should not reflect what is trending now.

Mr. Alexander stated the goal is to work with the palette of historic colors, which is available.

Ms. Stenberg inquired if the applicant would like to comment.

[Because they had not been previously been sworn in, Ms. Stenberg swore in the applicants.]

Ms. Stenberg inquired if the applicants were agreeable to the recommended condition regarding

the color palette.

### **Applicant's Comments**

Kent Underwood, 181 S. High Street, Dublin, responded that he agrees with the statement that three houses do not make a trend. The historical color palettes that they reviewed with staff all contained the color white. It does not need to be Arctic White, but white is what they have envisioned for their Farmhouse design. They also prefer black windows, and that color could be changed in the future.

Amy Underwood, 181 S. High Street, Dublin stated the colors could be changed in the future; however, this is their color choice and what they really desire.

Ms. Stenberg responded that there is value in allowing a homeowner their color preference for their home. They have worked diligently with the architect to achieve a beautiful house, which the Board appreciates. However, the Board also has worked to make sure that each house in the District is unique. Although three houses is not a large number of homes to be the same color, there are only 17 homes here. Perhaps a slight modification of color could be agreed upon.

Ms. Underwood requested that another color be suggested. She objects to both yellow and blue, and there is a blue home next to this lot and a yellow house across the street.

Mr. Underwood stated that staff provided them with the Sherwin-Williams list of historical colors. Because that is a large palette, they would prefer to have some suggestions to which staff would have no objection.

Ms. Martin responded that staff's suggestion is that they work with their architect to establish some alternatives. Their architect could work with staff's consultant, and the consultant and staff would review their selection.

Ms. Bolyard stated that it would be easier to work with a list of approved colors.

Ms. Rauch responded that the City's color approval is based upon the historic timeframe of their home. Staff is attempting to make this home fit into the Historic District, although their home is not truly historic. Staff did recommend some color palettes, which the applicant indicated they did not like.

Mr. Underwood responded that, currently, there are more homes in the District that have used the other colors in the recommended palette than have used white. For that reason, they wanted to have the opportunity for this discussion with the Board.

Ms. Stenberg stated that the majority of Board members are in agreement with the recommended conditions.

Mr. Underwood stated that their application contained the Arctic White color. As has been pointed out by the Board, there are other shades of white. Is the Arctic White color the issue?

Ms. Bryan responded that she believes it is the combination of white with black.

Mr. Alexander stated that color combination is seen everywhere. The Code requirements are based upon the intent to make newer additions appear consistent with the older homes in the District. Although white itself could be considered a traditional color, it is the combination with black that

makes it an issue.

Ms. Bryan moved, Ms. Stenberg seconded to approve the Minor Project with the following four conditions:

- 1) The applicant update the plans to eliminate the front door sidelights and to reduce the shed porch roof to be limited to only above the front door, and the depth of the porch be reduced, subject to staff approval.
- 2) The applicant revise the design to eliminate the HardiShingles on all elevations and continue the predominate façade material in lieu.
- 3) The applicant update the proposed color palette to colors other than a white body and black accents, subject to staff approval.
- 4) The applicant provide details for window trim and sills, columns, and board and batten siding, subject to staff approval.

Vote: Ms. Bryan, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Bailey, no.  
(Motion approved 3-1 with one recusal.)

#### **~~6. 16-22 N. High Street, 19-078ARB-MPR, Minor Project Review~~**

~~Ms. Stenberg stated that this is a proposal for exterior and site modifications for two existing commercial buildings on a 0.26-acre site zoned Bridge Street District Historic Core.~~

#### **~~Staff Presentation~~**

~~Mr. Hounshell stated that this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review for 16 and 22 N. High Street. He clarified that signs are not included in this application. The Architectural Review Board (ARB) is the final reviewing body for this application. Upon approval from the ARB, the applicant may apply for building permits. The .26 acre site is located northeast of the intersection of North High Street and Bridge Street within the Bridge Street District – Historic Core District. The project is unique in that both buildings are located on the same parcel. In regard to the four surrounding buildings, two are considered contributing to the Historic District, another was built in 1962 and the other was built circa 1900.~~

#### ~~Site:~~

~~16 North High Street was built in 1843 as a single-family house, which later was converted to commercial use. The stone building has a rectilinear footprint with a 1.5-story core, and a one-story addition spanning the width of the rear (east) elevation. A mortared stone wall encircles the patio at the front of the building. The stone wall was part of the original structure encircling a courtyard. In 2010, the Board approved its replacement with a patio. 22 North High Street is a commercial building that was built for commercial use circa 1900. The Queen Anne-style building has a rectilinear footprint.~~

#### ~~Proposal:~~

~~The applicant is proposing many different minor changes to the site. The largest change is the proposed brick-paved path and courtyard where the existing private alley is located. With this improvement, the curbcut would be removed and the alley would be closed to vehicular access.~~