



MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, September 29, 2021

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Alexander, Chair, called the September 25, 2021, meeting of the City of Dublin Architectural Review Board (ARB) to order at 6:31 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Chair led the Pledge of Allegiance.

OATH OF OFFICE

Michael Jewell was introduced by Sarah Holt; he provided additional information about himself and his background. Mayor Amorose-Groomes performed the Oath of Office for the appointment of the new member, Michael Jewell.

ROLL CALL

Board Members present: Mr. Alexander, Ms. Kramb, and Mr. Jewell
Board Members absent: Mr. Cotter and Ms. Cooper
Staff present: Ms. Martin, Ms. Holt, Mr. Ridge, Mr. Will, and Ms. Mullinax

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Kramb moved, Mr. Jewell seconded, to accept the documents into the record and to approve the August 25, 2021, meeting minutes.

Vote: Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Jewell, yes; and Ms. Kramb, yes.

[Motion carried 3-0]

CASE PROCEDURES

The Chair stated the Architectural Review Board is responsible for review of construction, modifications or alterations to any site in the area subject to Architectural Board Review under the provision of Zoning Code §153.170. This Board has the final decision-making responsibility on cases under their purview. Anyone who intends to address the Board on any of the cases this evening will be sworn in. The agenda order is typically determined at the beginning of the meeting by the Chair, who also stated the procedures of the meeting.

The Chair swore in anyone planning to address the Board on any of the cases to be reviewed.

NEW CASES

1. Modern Male Salon at 24 Darby Street, 21-136MPR, Minor Project Review

The Chair stated this application was a request for exterior modifications to a building on a 0.09-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic Core. The site is southeast of the intersection of Darby Street with Wing Hill Lane.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Ridge presented an aerial view of the site and photographs of the existing conditions from various views of the brick portion of the building and noted the main entry on Darby Street. The building was constructed in 1939 and the entire structure was recommended as contributing. The existing copper gutters and siding were called out as part of the addition on Wing Hill Lane [shown] built in 1970 as a concrete-block structure clad in a horizontal HardiePlank siding. The existing conditions of the south elevation were shown with a graphic of the proposed modifications. These included: new engineered wood siding (LP Smartside product requiring a Waiver); painted siding and brick on the entire exterior of the building; painted trim and doors (Benjamin Moore, Mopboard Black); and replacement, galvanized aluminium gutters and downspouts. Staff was concerned about the proposal to paint the brick façades. The *Historic Design Guidelines* indicate that masonry that has remained unpainted over time should remain unpainted, and masonry that has been painted should remain painted. Staff was also concerned about the white and black proposed color scheme; it is more indicative of modern, farmhouse trends. Staff was concerned that by removing the copper gutters, some of the unique character would be lost. Staff suggested the applicant repair the gutters but could replace the downspouts. The proposed materials and colors were presented both on screen and as actual samples.

One Waiver was recommended for approval:

1. §153.174(J) — Exterior Building Material Standards: Requirement: 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 an engineered wood (LP SmartSide Lap Siding – Smooth Finish) for a horizontal siding element on the building.

The application was reviewed against the Minor Project Review Criteria and the Minor Project was recommended for approval with four conditions:

- 1) That the brick portion of the building remain unpainted;
- 2) That the applicant explore tuck-pointing the brick as a means to remedy some of the cosmetic flaws on the brick;
- 3) That the copper gutters remain intact and be repaired, while only the aluminum downspouts are replaced; and
- 4) That the applicant continue to work with Staff to select an appropriate paint color for all trim, doors, flashing, downspouts, and casings.

Board Questions for Staff and Applicants

Ms. Kramb asked if the gutters are only on the concrete-block addition of the building to which Mr. Ridge answered in the affirmative.

Ms. Kramb inquired about the trim for the windows and if all the divided lites would be painted white.

Allen Bornstein, Williams Shepherd Architects, 1500 W. 3rd Avenue, Columbus, OH 43212, stated all the existing wood windows were trimmed in wood but since the applicant has applied, they found all the sills

have rotted, therefore, not in good shape. What to be done with the windows has not yet been established but confirmed all would be painted white.

Mr. Jewell inquired about the wall with the ivy growing on it and asked about the condition of the brick behind the ivy. Ms. Kramb added the ivy will need to be removed, if the brick is to be painted.

Mr. Bornstein stated the brick and mortar is not in good condition and much of it has been patched in multiple areas all over the exterior of the building through the years and getting a close color match of mortar had previously not been a concern by the installers.

Ms. Kramb asked if the applicant had requested quotes for inserting matching mortar.

Brenda Kocak, owner of Modern Male Salon, 24 Darby Street, Dublin, OH, asked to share additional photographs with the Board of extreme disrepair. The contractor had stated to tuck point, the mortar of the entire building would need to be removed, which would be a lengthy process and expensive. The walls have been patched several times. The contractor recommended painting, instead, using a masonry paint to lock in the mortar.

Ms. Kocak said she has occupied this building for 18 years and the gutters have been repaired multiple times in that period. The copper is 50 years old and beyond repair, now. Water leaks from the gutters onto the steps at the entry way and in the winter, ice forms, which is a safety hazard. On both sides, the gutters have been pieced together.

Applicant Presentation

Brenda Kocak stated the window sills on the south side were rotted below the window frame to the point she could push her finger through the wood so she needs to move forward with these repairs, soon.

Mr. Alexander inquired about the condition of the brick surface behind the ivy on the north side wall, if the ivy was removed and the bricks exposed.

Ms. Kocak stated the ivy has been cut back a couple of times during the year.

Public Comment

There were no public comments received.

Board Discussion

The Chair stated the Board Members would all probably support the Waiver for exterior siding per the earlier comments.

The Chair affirmed Staff had reviewed the proposal against the Secretary of Interior Standards and the *Historic Design Guidelines*. If tuck-points were completed, the applicant would never have to paint the building again, if it were painted now.

Ms. Kramb asked if the glazed brick would hold paint. If the applicant chooses to paint, a report from a structural engineer would be required, if the walls are in too much disrepair. The applicant would not have to tuck-point all of the brick and could paint the mortar. This would be a tedious process but the building is not huge. She suggested the applicant obtain quotes from other contractors to better weigh her options.

Ms. Kocak thought painting the brick would be more in line with the neighboring buildings that are painted.

Mr. Jewell stated there may have been an attempt to do tuck-points in the past.

Ms. Kramb agreed but added the person that did the work did not bother to match mortar colors.

Mr. Alexander recommended the cost of painting be evaluated.

Ms. Kramb suggested the building be thoroughly cleaned. If other means are to be found totally cost prohibitive, the Board would consider painting the building, but the applicant would need to return with that information for the Board's review.

The Chair stated Staff's recommendation was to retain and repair the gutters. The applicant made the point the gutters have been repaired too many times over the years and now are beyond repair.

Ms. Kramb recommended the existing gutters be eliminated. The gutters are not technically historical gutters on this concrete-block building.

Mr. Alexander stated the gutters look older than 1970 when the building addition was constructed. He too approved the removal of the gutters.

Mr. Jewell recommended the applicant consider different paint color combinations.

Ms. Kocak asked if she could paint all the trim black.

Ms. Kramb explained black trim and dark windows would appear as a big black square.

Ms. Kocak asked if the mullions could be painted black to make the window appear more expansive.

Ms. Kramb explained how the design of the windows would not be distinguishable, if the trim was all black.

A lighter color is needed to accent the divided lites of the window and recommended all one color be used.

The Chair asked Staff if there was particular language regarding color in the *Historic Design Guidelines* to which Mr. Ridge answered there was no paint language pertaining to this.

The Chair stated both Staff and the Board are uncomfortable with the current selection of colors. The condition is written "That the applicant work with Staff to come up with appropriate paint colors" and the Board can support this condition. If the applicant cannot reach an agreement with Staff, they may come back, and the Board will review paint color schemes. He inquired about process as he did not want to 'close the door' on further discussions.

Ms. Martin suggested the application could be tabled, allowing the applicant to provide more information.

Ms. Kocak did not want to table everything as time is an issue with obtaining building materials and with winter coming, she needs to have the maintenance completed.

Ms. Kramb suggested striking the mention of 'painting the brick' so the applicant could come back and request that modification to the building, later.

Ms. Martin stated that would require a new application. The applicant has the opportunity to do like-for-like maintenance for now on the existing exterior windows (use wood.) If the applicant decides they prefer to change the window material (synthetic options) they could return for further review to request permitted and more sustainable materials instead of all wood windows and trim.

Ms. Holt stated windows were not part of this application but the applicant could request window material changes when they return to discuss the brick.

Ms. Kramb moved, Mr. Jewell seconded, to approve the following Waiver:

1. §153.174(J) — Exterior Building Material Standards: To permit the use of an engineered wood for the horizontal siding element on the building.

Vote: Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Jewell, yes; and Mr. Alexander, yes.

[Motion carried 3-0]

Ms. Kramb moved, Mr. Jewell seconded, to approve the Minor Project with two amended conditions:

- 1) That the applicant continue to work with Staff to select an appropriate paint color for all trim, doors, flashing, downspouts, and casings for the building addition; and
- 2) That all exterior modifications associated with the 1939 portion of the building, including brick, windows, trim, and paint colors return to the Board, prior to modification.

Vote: Mr. Jewell, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; and Ms. Kramb, yes.

[Motion carried 3-0]

2. 181 S. High Street, 21-139MPR, Minor Project Review

The Chair stated this application is a request for modifications to a recently approved, single-family home on a 0.47-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic Residential. The site is northwest of the intersection of S. High Street with Waterford Drive.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Holt presented aerial views of the site. This project was started in October 2020 with a proposal to retain the existing residence with extensive exterior modifications. The proposal was not well received by this Board. In February 2021, informal feedback was provided by the Board on a revised proposal. The Architectural Review Board (ARB) approved demolition of the existing structure in May 2021 along with the plans for a new home. Today, the applicant is requesting minor house and site plan modifications along with approval of a different window color. The existing conditions were shown of the house on S. High Street to be demolished. The view from Waterford Drive showed the shed that is to remain now but the driveway that is to be removed.

In May 2021, the approved site plan included a $\pm 3,500$ -square-foot, single-family home, in a one-and-a-half story cottage style, covering 29% of the lot, and all setbacks were met at that time on the ± 0.47 -acre site.

The new proposed site plan moves the kitchen wall out 38 inches, the entire house slides 24 inches south in order to improve drainage, the shed would be renovated, lot coverage remained close to 29%, and all setbacks would still be met. The elevation comparison on what was approved previously versus the new extended kitchen area plan, makes the front façade symmetrical now. Shed elevations reveal access for the garage door that would be moved from the east to the north with an overhead door. An existing window would replace the existing east door. All other windows would remain in place, and all materials would match the house, which are yet to be finalized. Proposed materials discussed in May 2021 were shown. Tonight, the applicant has requested to change the color of the window frames from black to bronze to provide a softer appearance. The conditions from the May 2021 review still apply.

The application was reviewed against the Minor Project Review Criteria. The Minor Project was recommended for approval with the following condition:

- 1) That the applicant submit a drawing showing the revised driveway location and geometry to Planning and Engineering staff in order to avoid the two landmark maples and stand of white pines to the greatest extent possible, prior to obtaining a building permit.

Board Questions

Ms. Kramb requested clarification on the location of the three maple trees Ms. Holt referred to.

Ms. Holt confirmed the three maples (Landmark trees) to the west. The tree furthest north is in very good condition, which would be in the middle of the driveway as proposed. Staff has a design idea to save that tree, which has not been discussed with engineering or the applicant yet but could be worked out with building permitting.

The Chair stated this would need to be discussed with the applicant during this review, while the Board is reviewing the relocation of the house and the paint color change now requested for window frames. He asked if tree approval was part of this review.

Ms. Holt answered the trees were not part of the application as the condition of approval is working with Planning and Engineering Staff to devise a plan.

The Chair stated that could impact the design.

Applicant Presentation

Rich Taylor, AIA, RTA, 48 S. High Street, Ste. B, Dublin, OH stated several minor changes were before the Board to consider. Working off the previously approved site plan, they proposed to move the kitchen wall, move the house slightly south to allow for proper drainage on the north side, and changed the use of the shed. Originally, the shed was intended to be used as a garage but now the intended use for the shed is for storage. The new proposal disconnected the little stub of a driveway. Modifications for the shed were explained including none of the windows were going to be new.

The proposed driveway overlaps the location of the three maple trees some but the driveway as proposed, completely avoids the pine trees at the western edge of the property. There are two spectacular maple trees in the front yard and he preferred to avoid losing those. There was a dispute over the size of one of the trees. The tree measured 18 inches and not 24 inches as Ms. Holt claimed, to make it a landmark tree. To avoid all three maple trees, designing a location for a driveway would be impossible. The site plan was approved in May 2021 and the trees were not an issue. The proposal today does not change the relation of the three trees to the driveway. He asked the Board to approve what was requested and disapprove Staff's condition.

Additional graphics provided by Mr. Taylor were reviewed.

The Chair asked if the Board votes to approve the application with the condition, and Mr. Taylor changed the design, he would need to return for a fifth time.

Ms. Holt stated Mr. Taylor would not need to return as they would only be changing the driveway location and nothing else to do with the house. Staff's intent is to save these trees to the greatest extent possible. However, it is not a hard requirement.

Mr. Taylor disagreed. He said they would have to change the house and the garage, not just the driveway to save all three maple trees. The applicant could proceed without these requests.

Mr. Alexander asked Staff how the design of the driveway could be revised with that tree as it is in the middle of the pad with two garage doors. He requested to hear about Staff's design.

Ms. Holt suggested the shape of the driveway be Y-shaped instead of a square shape to work around that tree.

Mr. Alexander stated there would be an issue with the dripline of the tree approximating what the root structure was. In this case, the protected tree area would be seemingly enormous.

Ms. Kramb stated she did not see how the driveway could be redesigned. Losing that tree might have to be considered. She did not understand how one measurement could be 18 inches and the other 24 inches. The house was moved to accommodate three trees on the east side; losing one decent tree for the driveway was not an issue for her.

Mr. Alexander said the plan made sense on the site; it was very logical. The house cannot be moved forward toward the street or the street trees would be compromised. There is no way he can see to save that one tree and still have a driveway.

Public Comment

There were no public comments received.

The Chair said Mr. Taylor was present this evening to hear the earlier discussions (previous case) about white and black facades and these windows are being changed to look a little less black because of that information received. Staff had an issue with the preliminary stone selection because it was so white.

Mr. Taylor said they will probably make a different selection other than that really white stone.

Debbie Bergwall, 181 S. High Street, stated they intend to keep everything else that was approved in May; nothing is changing with the color scheme except for possibly changing the color of the stone. The builder is putting together other sample stones to select from.

Ms. Holt stated the materials proposed in May have not been approved. There was a condition of approval that stated once the materials were chosen, the applicant was to return to the ARB to have the proposed materials approved.

Ms. Bergwall stated the reason they were hoping for approval now was due to the lead time on building supplies. Obtaining the windows is the most concerning. Her impression was that Staff was favorable of all the materials with the exception of the stone.

All the Board members were fine with the proposed materials.

Ms. Kramb moved, and Mr. Jewell seconded, to approve the Minor Project without conditions.

Vote: Mr. Jewel, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; and Ms. Kramb, yes.

[Motion carried 3-0]

COMMUNICATIONS

Sarah Holt, Senior Planner, introduced two new employees within the Planning Department: Chris Will, Planner II and Taylor Mullinax, Planner I.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 7:45 p.m.

Chair, Architectural Review Board

Administrative Assistant II, Recorder