



MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, May 26, 2021

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Alexander, Chair, called the May 26, 2021 virtual meeting of the Architectural Review Board to order at 6:30 p.m., noting that due to the current pandemic, public meetings are being held online and live streamed on YouTube. The meetings can be accessed at the City's website.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. Alexander led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

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

Staff present: Ms. Martin, Mr. Ridge, Mr. Hounshell

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Kownacki moved, Ms. Kramb seconded acceptance of the documents into the record and approval of the April 28, 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.

1. 40 N. High Street, 21-072INF, Informal Review

Request for an Informal Review of the proposed preservation, rehabilitation, or demolition of a stonewall associated with a future application for development on a 0.21-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic Core, on a site located east of N. High Street, approximately 125 feet south of North Street.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Martin stated that this is a request for Informal Review of a 0.21-acre site located on the east side of North High Street. On January 27, 2021, the Architectural Review Board (ARB) informally reviewed

and provided nonbinding feedback on a conceptual proposal to construct a second story addition to the existing, one-story building and to construct a new 2.5-story two-unit townhouse building. The applicant is requesting feedback on the preservation, rehabilitation, or demolition of the stonewall that bisects the site north to south. The Board's feedback will guide future site planning for additional development. In exploring possible site layouts, the applicant has indicated that there are several scenarios that could be explored including: 1) demolition and replacement with a modern wall, 2) removal and reconstruction in an alternate place, 3) removal and reconstruction in the same place, or 4) preservation in place without significant modifications. Options one and two would more easily accommodate additional development on the site. The applicant has also considered whether a portion of the stonewall could be incorporated internal to a new structure or if a new structure could interrupt (remove) a portion of the wall. The wall is drylaid stone running approximately 70 feet north to south and running 23 feet east to west. The wall is a variable six (6) feet in height. The Engineer estimates based on the construction method, that the wall dates to late 1800s to early 1900s. When originally built, the drylaid construction method allowed water to percolate through the wall. The drylaid stonewall was originally built by the Wing family who were stone masons and for whom Wing Hill is named. On 36-38 N. High Street, a historic two-story outhouse (privy) is located along the southern boundary of the wall. The outhouse was originally built by Forrest Wing in 1934. Should the wall be modified, the privy will be impacted. The southern boundary of the wall is adjacent to a shared property line, and largely located on the parcel to the south. The property owner of 36-38 N. High Street will need to be a joint applicant party to any future application for development. Today, vegetation and a sewer line penetrate the wall. With the installation of the sewer line, portions of the wall were mortared, which has limited the ability for water to percolate through the wall and exacerbated the effects of seasonal expansion and contraction. [Photographs of property and property lines viewed.]

Ms. Martin noted that the following questions were provided to facilitate the Board's discussion:

- 1) Does the Board support demolition of the historic stonewall and construction of a modern retaining wall?
- 2) Does the Board support partial demolition of the historic stonewall to accommodate future development?
- 3) Does the Board support removal and rehabilitation of the wall in the same location or an alternate location?
- 4) Does the Board support or recommend preservation of the wall in place?
- 5) Other considerations by the Board.

Applicant Presentation

Dan Morgan, AIA, Behal Sampson Dietz, 990 W 3rd Ave, Columbus, OH 43212, stated that the wall is an internal site wall, rather than a boundary wall, as is more common in Old Dublin between adjacent properties. At this point, it is essentially a landscaping feature. They consulted with a structural engineer from Korda/Nemeth Engineering, who provided information on dismantling/reassembling the historical wall appropriately. The wall limits the site, rather than benefitting the site. [Described existing condition and concerns for the wall and the stability of the overhead parking lot].

Mr. Alexander inquired if the site were not being developed in the proposed manner, would repair of the wall still need to be addressed in some fashion.

Mr. Morgan responded affirmatively.

Ms. Cooper stated that she noticed a large amount of scrub vegetation at the top of the wall. Would removing that vegetation impact the wall?

James Lapierre, DDS, owner, 40 N. High Street, Dublin, Ohio, stated that when he purchased the property in 2001, along the south side of the wall there were overgrown shrubs extending from the outhouse east to the corner of the wall. The owner before Mr. Lombardy had trimmed them, but the roots of the overgrown plants were likely the reason the southern portion of the wall collapsed. His insurance company advised him to place plants at the top of the wall to prevent drivers from driving off the end of his driveway after dark. He planted arborvitae along the eastern wall approximately 15 years ago. Although site maintenance was done earlier this spring, root damage and the freezing/thawing cycle over many years has resulted in the existing condition of the wall.

Mr. Kownacki inquired if there were conceptual ideas to incorporate the wall, either fully or partially. Mr. Morgan responded that with the previous Informal Review of the site, they were proposing replacing the central portion of the wall with a section of the basement foundation of the new structure on the east side of the lot. Per the Board's earlier feedback, however, it was necessary to disassemble and accurately reassemble that section of the wall. Consequently, they engaged an engineer to determine how to make the wall structurally sound. Essentially, the parking lot will need to be excavated and the stonewall removed and re-structured with gravel against the wall, rather than soil. It would be more of a landscape wall than a retaining wall for any structure. Because they intend to develop the site by expanding the existing building and building a secondary structure along the boundary next to Blacksmith Lane, they would like to do so in sync with City goals.

Mr. Alexander stated that it appears the intent of the development proposal is to minimize what occurs on the High Street elevation and minimize the future load on the wall. The parking is being repositioned, and the second floor addition will be cantilevered, restricting its load to a distance from the stonewall. The only exception would be the new structure along Blacksmith Lane, which could engage the wall.

Mr. Morgan stated that was their intent. Although the southern corner of the wall needs to be addressed, they would attempt not to impact the section of the wall that meets and extends onto the adjoining 32 N. High Street property. The wall on the north end, which abuts the CoHatch property is not visible. They have discussed incorporating a private outdoor courtyard into that space.

Public Comment

No public comments were received on the case.

Board Discussion

Mr. Alexander invited members to respond to the discussion questions. He noted that the consultant recommended preservation of the wall in place.

- 1) Does the Board support demolition of the historic stonewall, and construction of a modern retaining wall?
- 2) Does the Board support partial demolition of the historic stonewall to accommodate future development?
- 3) Does the Board support removal and rehabilitation of the wall in the same location or an alternate location?
- 4) Does the Board support or recommend preservation of the wall in place?
- 5) Other considerations by the Board.

Mr. Cotter stated that although the stonewall is structurally unsound, he is not supportive of demolition and replacement with a modern retaining wall, nor is he in favor of its removal and rehabilitation in an

alternate location. Although challenging, he would be supportive of removal and rehabilitating it in place.

Mr. Kownacki stated that he would be supportive of a hybrid of #3 and #4 – removal and rehabilitation within the same location.

Ms. Kramb stated that she also is not supportive of demolition. True preservation is not possible due to the wall's current structural issues. However, as much of the existing stone as possible should be preserved and used to rebuild the wall in place. Because the parking lot above will need to be excavated, in addition to incorporating gravel, there may be opportunity to bury another type of architectural support in the center of that parking lot. That could also take some of the structural load of the second story, cantilevered addition. She noted that she conducts tours for the Historical Society, and the privy in this wall is always on that tour. It is a very unique feature that needs to be preserved.

Ms. Cooper stated that she is in agreement with fellow board members' comments.

Mr. Alexander expressed agreement with the preceding comments, as well. As the historical consultant pointed out, the wall is unique and significant to this community. He would suggest that the portion of the proposed condominium structure not engage the wall. It could be moved off the wall and instead of setting the second-story back on Blacksmith Lane, the square footage could occur on top of the garages. The lateral view of the stonewall could be retained across the rear of those units. The structure along High Street would be independent of the wall. There are ways to have the desired development and retain the historic stonewall. He concurs with the hybrid solution of #3 and #4, as recommended by fellow Board members.

Mr. Cotter expressed support of Mr. Alexander's suggestion.

Mr. Morgan stated that they are less concerned about the vertical load on the wall than the horizontal hydrostatic pressure of the ground, which is causing the wall to bow and buckle. A drylaid stonewall constructed downslope is not expected to support any load and is not advisable. As he interprets the Board's comments, they would be supportive of removing the wall and reconstructing it, keeping new development separate from the wall.

Mr. Kownacki stated that the wall should remain in the same location and appear as closely as possible to the original wall.

Mr. Alexander invited other Board members to respond to his suggestion to avoid engaging the new structure with the wall.

Ms. Kramb responded that she agrees with that suggestion. What she did not like about the original proposal was its intent to abut and utilize the wall. She would prefer the wall be separate and visible.

Mr. Cotter concurred. If a section of the wall is covered up, as suggested, it is lost.

Mr. Morgan noted that CoHatch constructed their new building against the wall, which now cannot be seen from the north. Would the Board similarly permit another building to be constructed to the south that could block public view of this wall, which will cost him over \$150,000 to reconstruct?

Ms. Kramb responded that a future applicant would be asked the same questions as the present applicant. Although future Board members may be different, the process will be the same.

Mr. Alexander pointed out that preserving this historic stonewall and privy will restrict how close future construction south of the wall will be permitted.

Dr. Lapierre stated that if public view is necessary, he does not believe anything can be constructed in front of the wall.

Ms. Kramb responded that would be part of the Board's review of whatever future site plan he might propose. Her preference is that the public will remain able to see the wall.

Mr. Alexander stated that until the Board sees a proposed layout, it is impossible to address it. However, it will be important to remember that this is a very important archaeological feature to this community. In some historic districts, any future development must occur around any important archeological features. It is the practice to maintain features that are unique to a community, and essentially, that is the mission of this Board – to preserve the history of this community. How that wall is restructured, however, can be a consideration; perhaps it would not be drylaid. Perhaps there could be more structure behind it than gravel. There may be some engineering to offset the weaknesses of a drylaid wall and deal with the surcharges referenced by Mr. Morgan. However, the applicant would be permitted to take down the wall, if it is rebuilt.

Mr. Morgan inquired if they could construct a concrete support wall and re-stack the stonewall as a veneer in front of it.

Mr. Alexander inquired members' feedback. Does the stonewall need to function as a typical, drylaid wall if it is rebuilt?

Mr. Kramb responded that it should function as such to some extent. She does not believe simply dry laying the stone in front of a concrete wall will work. There is a difference between rehabilitation and restoration; the difference is the extent of change.

Mr. Morgan stated that the process would be to take a photograph of the existing wall, mark the stones with chalk when the wall is disassembled and reassemble it in the same manner to look the same as the original.

Ms. Kramb stated that rebuilding the stonewall in the same design in front of a concrete wall might be acceptable, although its function would be different.

Mr. Cotter stated that he would be supportive of that suggestion.

Ms. Kramb stated that the element that would be lost is integrity of design. However, integrity of the materials and workmanship must be maintained. This wall was created many years ago by a community stone mason using locally quarried stone. Those are the important integrity aspects to be retained. It will be necessary to obtain a quote from a skilled stone mason. Would a rebuilt structure be stable if erected in front of a concrete wall? There are many questions associated with this consideration.

Mr. Morgan stated that there are only a few stone masons who can do this type of work, which will add significant cost to the project.

Mr. Alexander stated that if another structural system is provided behind the stonewall and the appearance of the drylaid stone wall is preserved uninterrupted in its present location, he would be supportive.

Dr. Lapierre inquired how much space in front of the stonewall would be necessary.

Ms. Kramb responded that there is no specific number of feet. It is based on how the site plan would incorporate the wall into the site.

Mr. Morgan stated that it would be helpful to have some idea of the space limitation, as they must be able to make this plan feasible.

Ms. Kramb responded that in her opinion, the farther the distance from the wall, the better, as it will be more visible. Access to that wall should be retained.

Mr. Cotter pointed out that with sufficient space, it might be possible to have seating space.

Mr. Morgan stated that if it is only three feet, it would be space for a window well, which could provide outdoor air to the units. If it were five feet, perhaps there would be outdoor space that could be used. This will only be a two-unit building.

Dr. Lapierre stated that since the wall will initially be removed, could it be reconstructed three feet deeper into the existing parking lot – an additional three feet to the west?

Ms. Krumb stated that would not be possible, as they are not changing the wall on the southeast corner. This section of the wall could not be rebuilt three feet further back and still adjoin the wall on the corner. The reconstructed southern wall must match the existing wall.

Mr. Morgan stated that they have discussed this with the adjoining property owner to the south. Any reconstruction of this wall would also impact their portion of the wall, so perhaps they could work with the adjoining property owner and move the wall back three feet on both properties.

Ms. Cooper pointed out that the north end of the wall juts out next to the property to the north. If the wall on this particular property were to be re-constructed three feet back, it could result in a straight wall.

Mr. Alexander stated that if the wall would align with that northern jog, he would be willing to grant some latitude to shift the wall back, assuming they have the agreement of the adjacent property owner. He requested Board members' input.

Mr. Cotter, Mr. Kownacki and Ms. Cooper expressed agreement with the suggestion.

Ms. Krumb stated that she does not favor the suggestion because it changes the location and the design, but she would be willing to look at a proposed plan.

Mr. Alexander inquired if the applicant requested further input.

Dr. Lapierre thanked the Board members for their input and time. The next step is to develop a site plan that incorporates the Board's comments and will be a compromise between historic preservation and the proposed project.

2. James Davis Residence at 5707 Dublin Road, 21-045ARB-MPR, Minor Project Review

Installation of replacement windows and a new entry door for an outlying historic property on a 0.75-acre site zoned Planned Unit Development, Llewellyn Farms, located approximately 300 feet north of the intersection of Dublin Road with Hertford Lane.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Ridge stated that this a request for a Minor Project Review of the proposed installation of replacement windows and doors at the property located at 5705 Dublin Road. The .75-acre site is situated west of Dublin Road and north of the intersection with Hertford Lane. The site is unique within the ARB's purview, as it is zoned Planned Unit Development District, Llewellyn Farms. The property is located outside the Historic District but is within the purview of the ARB. Today, the site contains a two-story, single-family, stone-masonry home with a rectilinear footprint. A small barn is located to the rear of the home. The home was constructed circa 1840. It experienced a major fire in 1974, and as a result, all windows and doors were replaced at that time. The windows and doors were replaced

with single-pane wood sash windows. This home is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The Historic Design Guidelines recommend that original windows be retained and repaired unless the windows are extensively deteriorated. The applicant has provided an assessment of the existing windows for the Board's consideration, which notes significant rotting, delamination and inoperability. [Photographs shown.] Seven six-over-six wood sash windows are located on the east façade (front, Dublin Road), three six-over-six wood sash windows are located on the north façade (side), and five six-over-six wood sash windows are located on the west façade (rear). There are no windows on the south (side) elevation of the home. There is a main entry on the east façade (front, Dublin Road), which contains a transom and sidelites. Additionally, there are two other doors on the home: one is located on the west (rear) elevation, and one on the south (side) elevation. The applicant is proposing the replacement of all windows and doors on the home. The proposed replacement windows are Marvin, wood windows clad in extruded aluminium, double-hung with a six-over-six pattern in an off-white color (Stone White). The windows are full simulated divided lites with interior and exterior muntins and a spacer bar. Three fixed windows are proposed around the front door, forming the transom and sidelites. Staff recommends that the sidelites on either side of the front door be revised to match the existing pattern and size. In order to achieve adequate contrasts between the stone exterior of the home and the new windows and doors, staff recommends that the applicant select a blue color (Cascade Blue) for the windows and doors, more similar to what exists on the home today and that all trim and shutters be repainted to match the new windows and doors. The Code requires that windows have a projecting sill, which is fulfilled by the building. The existing door on the east (front) elevation is proposed to be replaced with a door that is comparable in character, with the same panel pattern. The proposed door is a Marvin aluminium-clad wood door with clear glass. Additionally, the two other doors on the home are proposed to be replaced with doors to match the front entry door. The application was reviewed against applicable criteria, and staff is recommending approval of the Minor Project review with three conditions.

Applicant Presentation

David Rippe, Dublin Design, 4379 John Shields Pkwy, Ste 101, Dublin, OH 43017, stated that his client has requested that the window sash openings be a white color. Historically, white is more appropriate for a building constructed circa 1800s. He has representative photos he would be willing to show.

Ms. Martin responded that, typically, new material may not be introduced during a meeting that staff and the Board have not received and reviewed prior to the meeting. However, the Board can determine to entertain new material, if they would like to do so.

Mr. Rippe responded that the point he was intending to make is that, historically, homes circa 1880s had white sash windows with black shutters and trim. The blue-gray color would have been unusual within that earlier era. An additional concern with introducing the color staff suggests is that this is a Kynar finish aluminium-clad window. With that window, the color is produced in the factory, similar to an automotive product finish. It would be very difficult to alter the color. Committing to a federal blue gray color would not be consistent with the history of the home. The oldest photo of this home he was able to identify is from 1974, which reflects a white sash, black shutter and trim. Is the desire to reflect a color palette from a later time period or a color palette reflective of the age of this home?

Mr. Alexander inquired if the Board members would like to table the case to permit opportunity to review the additional photographs Mr. Rippe has.

Ms. Krumb stated that she does not believe the Board should regulate that color. She disagrees, respectfully, with staff on that issue. She prefers the white color. As Mr. Rippe stated, white is more historically accurate. She had intended to recommend the blue gray color requirement be removed.

Mr. Alexander inquired if Board members would prefer the case discussion to proceed.

Mr. Cotter stated that he would prefer to proceed; he does not need to see photos that reflect the white color.

Mr. Alexander inquired the name of the door manufacturer. There were no cut sheets or documentation of the door details in the packet materials.

Mr. Ridge responded that it was staff's understanding that the manufacturer was Marvin, and that the door components were extruded aluminium.

Mr. Rippe confirmed that information was correct. The sidelites and door transom are a Marvin product. Marvin does not produce entry doors, however, so that would be a solid wood door painted to match.

Mr. Alexander inquired how staff arrived at the recommended colors.

Mr. Ridge responded that staff's recommendation was based upon the intent to preserve the existing character of the home. The white color did not seem to add sufficient contrast, so staff recommended the existing color be retained.

Ms. Krumb inquired what color the trim around the windows, doors and the brackets under the eaves would be painted.

Mr. Rippe responded that, presently, the trim and the shutters are the federal blue color. That color will be retained.

Ms. Krumb inquired if what will be retained would remain blue. Will only that which is being replaced be white?

Mr. Rippe clarified that only the window sashes would be white.

[Photograph of the elevation shown.]

Ms. Krumb inquired if the brackets under the eaves, the shutters and the trim around the door will remain the existing color; only the window sashes will be white.

Mr. Rippe confirmed that is correct.

Mr. Alexander inquired if the sidelites would be white and the door be blue.

Mr. Rippe responded that only the window sashes will be white. The homeowner would be able to alter the color of the door in the future, if desired, because it will be wood rather than aluminium clad.

Ms. Cooper inquired if the wood door would be painted, and if so, would it be painted to match the existing blue.

Mr. Rippe responded that it would be painted white. However, he needs to correct his earlier response regarding the sidelites. Actually, both the door and the sidelites will be painted white, matching the window configuration. The shutters will be blue, as will the brick mold.

Public Comment

No public comments were received on the case.

Board Discussion

Ms. Krumb stated that she is supportive of the white windows. However, she believes the wood door and the wood trim of the sidelites should be the same blue as the shutters and other trim. She would like to ensure all the window components are white and all the door components a consistent color.

[Color discussion continued.]

Mr. Alexander inquired if the members were in agreement with the window components being all white, and the entryway door and trim colors being one color, which could be either blue or white. The applicant would then work with staff to determine which of those two colors would be used for the entryway.

Board members expressed agreement.

Ms. Kramb moved, Mr. Kownacki seconded to approve the Minor Project with four conditions, as revised:

- 1) That the sidelites on either side of the front entry door be revised to match the size and pattern of the existing sidelites, subject to staff approval.
- 2) That the entirety of the entryway be one color, either Stone White or blue, to match the existing trim and shutters, subject to staff approval.
- 3) That the applicant provide a complete as-approved plan to staff.
- 4) That all existing wood trim remain the existing blue color.

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

3. 185 S. Riverview Street, 21-067ARB-MPR, Minor Project Review

Minor exterior modifications to a single-family home on a 0.41-acre site located west of S. Riverview Street, approximately 375 feet north of the intersection with Short Street, zoned Historic District, Historic Residential.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Martin stated that this is a request for exterior modifications to a previously approved application for a new single-family home on a 0.41-acre site located on the west side of S. Riverview Street. The ARB reviewed and approved a Minor Project Review (MPR) on January 27, 2021 for the construction of a new 3,400-square-foot, single-family home on this site, which is currently under construction. With that approval, the Board approved all elevations and material selections. As the design has been further refined, and due to the availability of materials, the applicant is requesting review and approval of a MPR for minor architectural modifications, material changes and final design details. The applicant is requesting the following material selection changes:

Windows

All windows would include one vertical and one horizontal grid equating to 4 lights instead of the 6 lights approved. On the west elevation, the previously approved second-story window has been removed. The removal of the window is located on the rear elevation and is not visible from the neighboring properties or the right-of-way. On the south elevation, the previously approved double window is proposed to be increased to a triple window, and the master bathroom window is proposed to be shifted toward the front of the home.

Doors

On the east elevation, the previously approved double entry door is proposed to be replaced with a single entry door with a more rustic design. On the south elevation, the previously approved double sliding door is proposed to be replaced with a single hinged door; the screened porch door has been replaced with a screen panel; and the triple sliding door is shown as a glass overhead door. The north elevation includes a simplified door style for the overhead garage door and the porch door is proposed with a three-quarter light door.

The following material and color changes are proposed:

- Siding – Replacement of the previously approved vertical siding with board and batten siding on all elevations. Board and batten, SW 7547 Sandbar (all house and trim) and SW 7069 Iron Ore (garage and trim)

- Cultured Stone/Mortar – Provia Custom mix of Old Dominion/Fieldstone (no reds or oranges) with Soft White smear application
- Slate Roof – Greystone Slate, Spanish Black
- Standing Seam Roof – Pre-weathered galvanized
- Gutters/downspouts – Tuxedo Gray
- Windows – Sierra Pacific H3 aluminum clad casement window in TW black
- Front Door/Side Porch Door – Stained SW 3522 Banyan Brown
- Porch Columns – Stained SW 3521 Crossroad

Staff has reviewed this application against all applicable criteria and recommends approval with no conditions.

Board Questions for Staff

Ms. Kramb inquired if the overhead door that was proposed for the gym on the backside of the garage is the same as is being used for the garage doors.

Ms. Martin responded that the sliding glass door at the rear of the home is being modified to be similar to a garage door. Although, it will appear similar to a window, it will be a glass door with a black metal frame.

Applicant Presentation

Paul Ghidotti, property owner, 185 S. Riverview Street, Dublin, OH, stated that the exercise room door has been a significant matter of discussion due to the difficulty in identifying a door that rolls but looks like a window and due to the cost of the materials. They are still trying to determine the right door configuration.

Richard Taylor, Architect, 48 S. High Street, Dublin, OH, stated that they appreciate the opportunity to discuss the proposed revision of materials on this project. The proposed door has the best appearance of those the Board has seen.

Public Comment

No public comments were received on the case.

Board Discussion

Ms. Cooper inquired if the garage would be painted black.

Ms. Martin responded that the garage will be painted "Iron Ore."

Mr. Alexander noted that color was included in the original submission.

Board members had no additional questions or discussion.

Mr. Kownacki moved, Ms. Cooper second approval of the Minor Project with no conditions.

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

[Motion carried 5-0]

4. 110-112 S. Riverview Street, 21-059ARB, Demolition

Demolition of a contributing two-family home to facilitate construction of a new, single-family home on a 0.59-acre site located east of S. Riverview Street, approximately 75 feet south of the intersection with Pinneyhill Lane, and zoned Historic District, Historic Residential.

Applicant Presentation

Mr. Hounshell stated that this is a request for two applications for this site, the first for Demolition and the second for a Minor Project. The site has an existing two-foot storm easement located on the north side of the property. The site also has significant grade change from west to east, moving toward the Scioto River. Because of its proximity to the river, there are significant floodplain and floodway limits. Along the river, there are mature trees located within the designated floodplain. These natural features limit development on the eastern half of the site. [Photos of adjacent sites viewed for context.]

Case History

On March 24, 2021, the Architectural Review Board informally reviewed an application for a potential demolition and new construction of a new 2,900-square-foot single-family home. The applicant proposed to split the 0.589-acre site into two lots and develop the northern lot with the proposed cottage-style home. The Board was generally supportive of a proposed demolition request, but requested additional documentation of either the financial liability of the property or documentation and analysis of how the building is not contributing to the Historic District. In November 2018, the Architectural Review Board informally reviewed an application for a potential demolition and new construction of a new 3,000-square-foot single-family home. The proposed ranch home was generally within the footprint of the existing home. The Board was supportive of a proposed demolition and construction of a new home; however, no further application was made for demolition or new development.

Proposal

The applicant is proposing to demolish the existing 3,400-square-foot, 1966 two-family, brick ranch home on the site. In the City's 2017 Historic and Cultural Assessment (HCA), the existing structure was recommended contributing to the Dublin Historic District. The Assessment assessed the structure to be in good condition, possessing all seven integrity markers. The City's architectural consultant has provided a detailed review of the existing structures and pointed out that the HCA was based on the exterior of the structure. The applicant has provided photos of the deteriorating balcony, cracking and deteriorating foundation, uneven floors and openings, and unstable roof framing. [Photos shown.] In addition, the applicant has provided a number of supporting documents for demolition including a statement addressing the criteria, a structural engineer's report, financial assessment for the existing structure, cost estimates for rehabilitation of the existing structure and for construction, and a letter from Fifth Third Bank.

As discussed at the prior Informal Review, the applicant had two options. One was to justify why the site should be considered Non Contributing; the other was to pursue an analysis and provide documentation regarding the financial liability of the site. The applicant has pursued the latter. Contributing structures have three criteria that must be met to demonstrate economic hardship, as a basis for demolition. The applicant provided three options for the property that do not involve complete demolition of the structure: A) Keep the structure as is and rent at current value, B) Renovate the structure as a two-dwelling home and rent at current market rates, and C) Convert the two-family home into a single-family home.

Option A: They are currently renting the two units at \$1,800 per month (\$900 per side) with no option to increase the rent unless significant improvements are made to the structure. Based on current principal, interest, taxes and insurance, the property currently creates a negative cash flow of \$4,800 per year. Due to the negative cash flow of the existing conditions of the property, this option is not financially viable for the applicant.

Option B: The second option would be to restore and update the existing structure to meet current Code requirements and rent the two units at current market rate rent, which might be approximately \$3,600 per month (\$1,800 per side). To restore and update the structure, the applicant has provided a project cost estimate of approximately \$400,000. The estimated costs are determined based on the structural and cosmetic improvements required for the existing structure, as defined in the engineering report. The proposed improvements and associated costs are also based on the owner's opportunity to gain a return on their investment in terms of the amount of rent that could be charged to support the cost of improvement. The current lien holder and bank lender will not finance renovations of this magnitude for the existing structure. Due to the bank's inability to fund the renovations and the negative cash flow of an updated structure, this option is not financially viable for the applicant.

Option C: The third option would be to convert the structure into a single-family unit. To renovate the structure, the applicant has provided a project cost estimate of approximately \$896,000. This cost, combined with the purchase price of \$425,000, would equate to \$1.325 million dollars invested in the property. The renovation of the building to a single-family unit would cost significantly more than new construction on the site, and would not appraise near the \$1.325 million dollars invested into the site. Additionally, as stated in option B, the current lien holder and bank lender will not finance renovations of this magnitude for the existing structure. Due to the bank's unwillingness to fund the renovations and the significant cost of renovation, this option is not financially viable for the applicant. The letter provided by the bank/lien holder states that they would not provide any financing for renovations of the existing structure. They would be willing to provide financing for new construction, should the existing structure be demolished.

Staff has reviewed the demolition request against the applicable criteria and recommends approval of the Demolition with one condition;

- That the order to allow a demolition not be issued by the City until the ARB has approved a Minor Project Review application for new construction of one of the two lots.

Board Questions

Mr. Cotter requested clarification of the reason Option C was not considered acceptable. Is it because the costs of the renovation with the existing investment would exceed the anticipated appraisal?

Applicant Presentation

Marc Frient, property owner, 110-112 S. Riverview Street, Dublin, OH, stated that the bank is looking at two things: existing structure and the resulting value after renovations. They do not believe it will appraise high enough to justify the \$900,000 renovations to a single-family home.

Mr. Cotter stated that he was attempting to understand the reason the bank was unwilling to finance renovating the property to Code versus financing new construction to Code.

Mr. Frient responded that he believes the bank's decision was based on appraised value.

Mr. Kownacki stated that, typically, the bank looks at the investment from the perspective of if they financed that amount, then the property owner disappeared and the property reverted to the bank, would the bank be able to recoup their investment.

Rodney Arcaro, 50 McCoy Avenue, Worthington, Ohio 43085, stated that they could dictate and control the costs up front with a new build. With renovations, they could not predict or control the ultimate costs, particularly due to the foundation issues identified by the engineer. Those costs would be too open-ended.

Mr. Cotter stated that he understands that the bank is unwilling to take that risk.

Public Comments

Mr. Hounshell indicated that 8 public comments were received and included with the packet materials. Mr. Alexander inquired if any Board member desired the comments to be read into the record. No Board member requested they be read.

Mr. Alexander noted that all of the public comments were in support of the requested demolition. One was supportive of the demolition but opposed to the division of the site into two lots. They also wanted verification that new construction would not encroach into the stormwater easement.

Ms. Cooper clarified the stormwater easement on this site is 24 feet, and the proposed construction on the site will not encroach into that easement.

Board Discussion

Board members indicated consensus for approval of demolition.

Ms. Cooper moved, Mr. Kownacki seconded to approve the demolition with one condition:

- 1) That the order to allow a Demolition shall not be issued by the City until the ARB has approved a Minor Project application for new construction of one of the two lots.

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

5. 110-112 S. Riverview Street, 21-060ARB-MPR, Minor Project Review

Construction of a new, approximately 3,000-square-foot, single-family home on a 0.589-acre site located east of S. Riverview Street, approximately 75 feet south of the intersection with Pinneyhill Lane, zoned Historic District, Historic Residential.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Hounshell stated that with the approval of the demolition, the applicant is requesting approval of a request for construction of a new, 3,000-square-foot, single-family home. Newly-created lots within the Historic District are required to be a minimum of 8,700 square feet in size with a minimum lot width of 60 feet. Both lots meet the required minimum lot standards. The applicant is proposing to develop the northern lot, while selling the southern lot for a future single-family home. The lot split is an administrative application that is reviewed and approved by Planning and Engineering staff. A 24-foot storm water easement is required in the northern portion of the applicant's lot. The applicant will need to work with staff to execute the 24-foot easement with the submittal of the proposed lot split. The applicant is proposing the construction of a one-and a-half-story, cottage-style, single-family home. The proposed siting of the home on the lot meets all the applicable setback and lot and building coverage criteria. However, Zoning Code requires that the attached, front-loaded garage be set back a minimum of 20 feet from the front building façade. The garage is currently set back three feet from the west, front façade along S. Riverview Street. Consistent with input the Board provided at the preceding Informal Review, the applicant has moved the main structure forward from the garage as opposed to moving the garage further to the rear. That has created the 3-foot separation. The proposed siting does meet the 0-foot front setback requirement. A waiver is requested to permit the 3-foot setback where a 20-foot setback would be required. A number of other modifications have been made to the original plan, including: changes to the stone foundation lines on the north and south elevations and revising the sunroom to a covered porch. Within the covered porch, the applicant is proposing an additional stone fireplace to match the proposed stone chimney on the south side of the home. The

form of the home is primarily defined by a 10:12-pitched, side-gabled roofline interrupted by a 10:12-pitched, front-gabled, two-car garage and a center, front-gabled dormer over the main portion of the home. A secondary 4:12-pitched, side-gabled roofline connects the primary side-gabled roofline and the front-gable roofline. Roof pitches within the Historic District are required to be greater than 6:12 pitch and less than 12:12 pitch. A Waiver is required to allow the less steep pitch. The front porch will be recessed into the front elevation and will be clad in a board and batten vertical siding; the remainder of the elevation will be clad in horizontal siding. The siding is constructed of an engineered wood. Although it is not a permitted material within the District, it has been approved for previous projects in the District. A waiver will be required to permit it to be used. The consultant recommends the proposed board and batten siding located on the front of the home be replaced with horizontal siding to provide a cohesive front elevation. Staff recommends the plans be revised to reflect this change in material. The applicant is proposing two types of window styles, including two-over-three white aluminum-clad wood casement windows (Pella Lifestyle Series) on the first floor, and two-over-two white aluminum-clad wood casement windows (Pella Lifestyle Series) on the second floor. The consultant recommends the replacement of the proposed fixed and casement windows with a traditional sash window to maintain the historic context of the District and that the rear windows' style and design be modified to match the windows on the front of the home to create a cohesive structure] The applicant is providing a composite gable vent within the side gable form of the main structure; staff recommends it be revised with wood gable vents.

Staff has reviewed the application against all the applicable criteria and recommends approval of four (4) waivers and approval of the Minor Project with eight (8) conditions.

Applicant Presentation

Andy Melaragno, Melaragno Design Company, 4138 Greensview Dr, Columbus, OH 43220, stated that the homeowner would prefer to use the board and batten siding on both the front porch and the hyphen. The consultant had no objection to it being used on the hyphen, so he requests it be permitted there, at a minimum. Another issue is the stone under the covered porch. That area of the house will not be seen by the public from any angle. The only possible view would be from the river, looking upward. They would prefer to use siding underneath the covered porch and not extend the chimney foundation down to the grade there. An internal prefabricated fireplace is being installed under the porch. The chimney foundation is not needed either for structural support or for aesthetics in that location, which cannot be seen by the public. Additionally, installing casement windows without grids, so as not to obstruct the view of the river, is preferred.

Board Discussion

Board members indicated they had no objection to the four requested waivers.

Ms. Kramb moved, Mr. Kownacki seconded approval of five (5) Zoning Code waivers:

Waiver Request 1

Requirement: §153.173(E)(3)(a) Attached Garages. Front loaded garages shall be a minimum of 20 feet behind the front façade of the home.

Request: To allow an attached front-loaded garage to be set back 3 feet behind the front façade of the building.

Waiver Request 2

Requirement: §153.173(C) General Development Standards – Maximum Building Height = 24 feet.

Request: To allow a height of approximately 29.5 feet from grade to the mid-point of the eaves on the rear elevation of the home.

Waiver Request 3

Requirement: §153.174(J)(1) Exterior Building Materials Standards – Façade Materials. Permitted building materials shall be high quality, durable materials including but not limited to stone, manufactured stone, full depth brick, brick veneer, wood siding, glass, and fiber cement siding.

Request: To permit the use of engineered wood as a primary material.

Waiver Request 4

Requirement: §153.174(B)(4)(c) Roof Type Requirements – Pitch Measure. 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.

Request: To permit a pitch of 4:12 for a side-gabled roof.

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

Following discussion regarding extension of the northern chimney to grade, Board consensus was that the extension was unnecessary; consequently, a waiver to that Code requirement also would be needed.

Ms. Cooper moved, Mr. Cotter seconded approval of a fifth waiver to Zoning Code, that:

Waiver Request 5

Requirement: §153.174(i)(2) Chimneys – Chimneys on exterior walls shall extend full height from the ground and vertically past the eave line and must be finished in brick or stone.

Request: To eliminate the extension to grade of the northern chimney.

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

Board members discussed the proposed conditions for Minor Project approval.

Mr. Hounshell noted that the 24-foot stormwater easement does exist, but it was not reflected on the survey included with the application submission. The condition has been added that would require it to be documented on the survey.

Mr. Frient clarified that to the best of his knowledge, the stormwater easement no longer exists. At an earlier time, Pinneyhill Lane was expected to be extended over the river; therefore, an easement existed. The surveyor indicated to him that the easement had expired; however, they are not opposed to including it with the lot split.

Ms. Martin stated that, as part of the process, the lot split will need to be re-recorded with Franklin County. It is the City's expectation that the stormwater easement be provided and recorded. Therefore, that condition for approval should be delineated.

Ms. Cooper stated that should the easement not be needed, and the City not require it as part of the lot split, it would affect where the home could be sited on the northern lot.

Mr. Alexander responded that is correct, because the most logical location for a home on properties with a significant grade change is horizontally, paralleling the street. If there were 12 additional feet on each lot, the property owner might want to take advantage of that opportunity. It would be possible

to build more to grade, and less excavation on the property would be necessary. It would make a significant difference in the design of the house.

Mr. Hounshell clarified that there is an existing stormwater gravity line on the site. Engineering staff has stated that it is required and requested the condition be added. This has been discussed with the applicant from the outset and is the reason the house has been sited as proposed.

Mr. Melaragno confirmed Mr. Hounshell's information. There is a stormsewer pipe that runs through the property. It has not yet been recorded, because the lot split has not been recorded. However, the easement will be finalized with the lot split.

Mr. Frient stated that, for the record, he agrees. The easement will be provided as required.

The majority of Board members indicated they had no objection to the board and batten on both the hyphen and the front porch.

Discussion occurred regarding requiring cultured stone under the covered porch on the rear façade.

Mr. Frient inquired if that would also be the north-facing wall.

Ms. Kramb clarified that the stone would be only on the east-facing façade, not the north-facing wall.

Ms. Kramb indicated that she would have no objection to eliminating the condition to extend the stone foundation on the rear façade.

Mr. Alexander stated that he agrees with the consultant – it helps the design to extend that design.

Ms. Kramb inquired if the requirement is that the stone extend all the way up the facade.

Mr. Alexander responded that it would be only up to the cantilever structure – the entire bump-out area. It makes sense because it will be continuing the line seen on the south elevation, past the chimney and around the rear façade. It will tie in better with the column.

Ms. Kramb noted that she had confused the location.

Mr. Melarango stated that a sketch of the rear elevation is on p. 10 of the consultant's report. The sketch depicts the use of stone under the covered porch, but not on the walkout wall; that area under the cantilever reflects siding. Where the foundation resumes, the stone foundation begins again. Therefore, his design shows the foundation under the basement slab clad in stone, while the framed wall of the rear walkout is covered with siding.

Mr. Cotter and Ms. Kramb stated that the materials on the north wall are "stepped."

Mr. Hounshell stated that the condition requires that the stone be on the rear, east façade up to the bottom of the covered porch.

Ms. Martin noted that the intent is that the main core of the home would have a fully-clad stone foundation.

Ms. Kramb clarified that the condition is that the north end of the east-facing façade under the covered porch will be stone.

Board consensus was to retain said condition.

Mr. Frient inquired the purpose of requiring the stone element on a wall that will not be visible to the public. He asks because stone is more expensive than regular siding.

Mr. Alexander responded that there appears to be a stone foundation on the building, and that appearance should be consistent. Typically, wood siding would not extend to the ground. Costs are a concern, but aesthetics are also an issue.

The applicant indicated he had no objection to the revised conditions.

Ms. Kramb moved, Mr. Kownacki seconded approval of the Minor Project with six (6) conditions:

- 1) That the drawings be revised to include a gap at the bottom of the porch panel to allow for drainage and the porch floor to be extended over the band board;

- 2) That the applicant provide a wood gable vent in-lieu-of the proposed vent, subject to staff approval;
- 3) That the applicant modify the stone foundation to extend to the bottom of the closed porch on the east-facing wall, subject to staff approval;
- 4) That the applicant work with staff to select an appropriate chimney cap detail;
- 5) That the applicant execute the 24-foot stormwater easement with the submittal of the proposed lot split; and
- 6) That the applicant work with staff to choose an appropriate patio lighting fixture, subject to staff approval.

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

[5-minute break.]

6. 181 S. High Street, 21-073ARB, Demolition

Demolition of a non-contributing, single-family home to facilitate construction of a new, single-family home on a 0.47-acre site located northwest of the intersection of S. High Street with Waterford Drive, zoned Historic District, Historic Residential.

7. 181 S. High Street, 21-069ARB-MPR, Minor Project Review

Construction of a new, single-family home on a 0.47-acre site located northwest of the intersection of S. High Street with Waterford Drive, zoned Historic District, Historic Residential.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Martin stated that this is a request for demolition of a non-contributing, single-family home to facilitate construction of a new, single-family home on a 0.47-acre site located northwest of the intersection of S. High Street with Waterford Drive, zoned Historic District, Historic Residential. The Board has provided two prior Informal Reviews on this site. Most recently, in February 2021, the Board expressed support for demolition of the existing single-family home provided that demolition criteria are met. The Board supported the proposed site layout and architectural design, scale and massing of the proposed home. The existing structure, built in 1967, is recommended "non-contributing" to the Historic District due to the age, materials, and workmanship of the home. The Code provides two sets of review criteria for demolition requests within Historic Dublin: one for contributing structures, and one for non-contributing structures. 181 S. High Street is subject to the latter, which states that *one* of three criteria outlined in the Code must be found to be met for approval of a demolition request: The applicant has indicated that the existing structure "impedes the orderly development of the District" and "detracts from the historical character of its immediate vicinity," which meets demolition criteria number three. The applicant notes that the home detracts from the historic value of the Karrer homestead to the north and Karrer barn to the south. Additionally, the existing condition of the home detracts from the established character of the District. The applicant asserts that retaining the existing structure impedes development that would positively contribute to the overall character of the District furthering the goals and objectives of Historic Dublin.

Staff recommends approval of the proposed demolition.

Proposal

The proposed site plan provides for a new 1.5-story, ±3,500-square-foot, single-family home on a .47-acre site. The proposed home is centrally located on the site with the front door addressing S. High Street. An attached garage is sited along the north property line. The existing detached garage, sited along Waterford Drive, is proposed to be retained. Outdoor amenities including patio and greenspace located to the west of the home. A historic stonewall runs along the S. High Street frontage. The proposal maintains vehicular access from Waterford Drive. The driveway will be shifted toward the west property line, and with that access modification, the existing driveway and curb cut will be removed. Although the applicant will need to coordinate efforts with City Engineering on the design details, Engineering has indicated acceptance of the general configuration depicted. The new drive will access a rear-loaded garage, which is sited along the north property line. The home and garage have significant setbacks from the front and rear property lines. The garage is located 4 feet from the north property line; 49.6 feet from the west property line; setback 39 feet from the front right-of-way and 72 feet from the east property line (S. High Street). The proposed lot coverage is 29 percent, which meets the Code requirement. The maximum permitted building coverage is 25 percent, and the proposed building coverage is 17 percent, meeting this requirement.

Architecture

The architectural character is similar to the character previously proposed. This is a side-gable, vernacular cottage with a front-gable, stone-clad projection, and a low hip, wraparound porch with roof. It will have a double-door entry with windows on both side. In addition to the stone cladding, the dominant exterior material will be a vertical board and batten siding. A waiver for approval of this synthetic wood material will be necessary. [Elevations reviewed.]

Applicant Presentation

Timothy Bergwall, property owner, 181 S. High Street, Dublin, OH, stated that they have reviewed staff's report and have no objections other than the recommended color of the garage. They would prefer not to lose the continuity to the main house. Other than that, they will be able to work with staff's conditions.

Richard Taylor, Architect, 48 S. High Street, Dublin, OH, stated that they have made a number of small changes, including a couple that the Board previously suggested:

- Provision of additional stone veneer on the front gable and along the sides of the central mass; They are not proposing the use of both stone samples shown in the materials, but either flagstone or cultured stone.
- Removal of the small "hood" over the windows on the front gable;
- The home is entirely within the developable area of the site and meets all setback requirements;
- Regarding condition #1, they have engaged a surveyor to locate the trees in question.
- Regarding condition #4, they disagree that the garage and the house should have different siding materials. That will create false historicism; they do not want to pretend that the house and garage are being connected. The location of the masses on this project create sufficient separation, without the need for two different materials.
- Regarding condition #7, they are confirming that the spacer bar on the selected windows exists.

Board Questions/Discussion

Mr. Alexander requested clarification of staff's concern about the proposed color palette.

Ms. Martin responded that the reservations about the color palette stem from the stone selection. Staff has not seen a sample of the white birch stone. The color of the stone appears so light that it may not

be appropriate in the historic context. Combining it with a dark color of cladding could make the stone appear even lighter, due to the level of contrast. Staff is supportive of the black window frames, as it would have a diminished contrast.

Board members indicated they had no objection to the proposed demolition of the existing structure.

Mr. Alexander expressed agreement with the applicants. He also would prefer that the material not be changed for the garage. The proposed low connector already provides a sufficient level of differentiation between the two masses. Increasing the amount of materials can make a project appear too busy. He appreciates the continuity provided along with variety.

A majority of Board members were not supportive of a condition for a material change for the garage.

Mr. Alexander inquired if there was a need for the Board to require a final decision on the materials and color palette.

Ms. Martin responded that would not be necessary. Based on the information provided at this time, staff was not comfortable making a recommendation. They will continue to work with the applicant and forward those to the Board for final approval.

Mr. Taylor stated that they would prefer to obtain final approval of their application at this time, enabling them to apply for a building permit while the material selections are being finalized.

Mr. Alexander noted that he appreciates what the applicant is attempting with the color palette. Too many of the structures in the District are looking the same. Some differentiation can enrich the District and the streetscape. He does agree with staff's concern about the potential contrast between very dark and very light; that will need to be addressed.

Mr. Kownacki moved, Ms. Cooper seconded approval of the demolition of a non-contributing, two-family home with the following condition:

- 1) That the order to allow a demolition shall not be issued by the City until the ARB has approved a Minor Project Review application for new construction.

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

Ms. Kramb moved, Mr. Cotter seconded approval of one waiver to Zoning Code:

Requirement: §153.174(J)(1)(a) Exterior Building Materials Standards – Façade Materials. Permitted building materials shall be high quality, durable materials including but not limited to stone, manufactured stone, full depth brick, brick veneer, wood siding, glass, and fiber cement siding.

Requested: Permit use of engineered wood.

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

Mr. Cotter moved, Mr. Kownacki seconded approval of a Minor Project with six (6) conditions:

- 1) That the applicant provide Planning documentation that the critical root zone of the tree on the adjacent property at 167 S. High Street will not be impacted by the foundation, and that the adjacent property owner has been notified, prior to issuance of building permits;

- 2) That the applicant continue to work the City of Dublin to finalize the modified access point along Waterford Drive, subject to approval of the City Engineer;
- 3) That the applicant update the site plan to reflect the new development standards, effective in March 2021, prior to building permit submittal;
- 4) That the applicant submit a complete materials/color palette with physical samples, and final doors and light fixture selections, subject to ARB for approval, at the earliest practicable date prior to installation;
- 5) That the applicant work with staff to review the paint color and stone selection, prior to ARB review; and
- 6) That the applicant confirm the simulated divided lite option includes a spacer bar between the panes of glass.

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

The applicant thanked the Board members for their consideration and approval.

COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Martin reported the following:

- City Council approved the Historic Design Guidelines at their May 24, 2021 meeting. The Guidelines were effective immediately. Professionally printed copies will be provided to the Board members.
- The City will be returning to in-person meetings in July; the July 21 ARB meeting will be at 5200 Emerald Parkway; the August ARB meeting will be held at the new City Hall at 5555 Perimeter Drive.
- The next regular meeting of the ARB, its last virtual meeting, is scheduled for June 23, 2021.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:12 p.m.

Gary Alexander

Chair, Architectural Review Board

Judith K. Beal

Assistant Clerk of Council