

Parcel 273-000129 **Address** 94 Franklin St **OHI** N/A

Year Built: 1950	Map No: 128	Photo No: 1967-1970 (7/12/16)
Theme: Domestic	Historic Use: Single family house	Present Use: Single family house
Style: Minimal Traditional	Foundation: Concrete block	Wall Type: Frame
Roof Type: Cross gable/asphalt shingle	Exterior Wall: Vinyl	Symmetry: No
Stories: 1.5	Front Bays: 3	Side Bays: 2
Porch: Front-gable roof over façade entrance supported by decorative brackets	Chimney: 1, Exterior, off ridge on north elevation	Windows: Double-hung replacements with faux muntins

Description: The one-and-one-half-story Minimal Traditional-style house has a rectilinear footprint, resting on a concrete block foundation. The cross-gable roof is sheathed in asphalt shingles and the exterior is clad in vinyl siding. The front door is sheltered by a small gable roof supported by decorative brackets. Windows on the house are double-hung sashes with six-over-six faux muntins. They are flanked by fixed shutters. A multi-light fixed window is adjacent to the door. A detached garage is east of the house.

Setting: The property is located on the east side of Franklin Street. The lawn is shaded by mature trees and floral foundation plantings encircle the house.

Condition: Good

Integrity: Location: Y Design: Y Setting: Y Materials: N
 Workmanship: N Feeling: Y Association: Y

Integrity Notes: The house has good integrity, diminished by replacement materials.

Historical Significance: The property is within the boundaries of the City of Dublin's local Historic Dublin district. The Franklin Street neighborhood, with this property as a contributing resource, is recommended for inclusion within the recommended Dublin High Street Historic District, boundary increase. Relevant eligibility criteria are Criterion A, for mid-century residential growth in the village of Dublin, and Criterion C, for its architectural character.

District: Yes Local Historic Dublin district **Contributing Status:** Recommended contributing
National Register: Recommended Dublin High Street Historic District, boundary increase **Property Name:** N/A



94 Franklin St, looking northeast



94 Franklin St, looking southeast



BOARD ORDER

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, December 15, 2021 | 6:30 pm

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

**1. Crone Residence at 94 Franklin Street
21-140MPR**

Minor Project Review

Proposal: Construction of ±1,300-square-foot addition to the rear of an existing home on a 0.35-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic Residential.

Location: East of Franklin Street, ±275 feet north of the intersection with John Wright Lane.

Request: Review and approval of a Minor Project under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.176 and the *Historic Design Guidelines*.

Applicant: Hylas Stemen, RDS Home Design

Planning Contacts: Zach Hounshell, Planner I

Contact Information: 614.410.4652, zhounshell@dublin.oh.us

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/21-140

MOTION 1: Ms. Kramb moved and Mr. Cotter seconded, to approve three Waivers as follows:

1. §153.174(J)(1) Exterior Building Materials Standards – Façade Materials – Engineered Wood. 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.
2. §153.174(J)(1) Exterior Building Materials Standards – Façade Materials – Thin-brick. 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 a thin-brick watertable as a secondary material.
3. §153.174(J)(1) Exterior Building Materials Standards – Façade Materials – Fiberglass. 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 fiberglass as a permitted door material.

VOTE: 4 – 0

RESULT: The Waivers were approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Gary Alexander	Yes
Amy Kramb	Yes
Sean Cotter	Yes
Martha Cooper	Yes
Michael Jewell	Absent



**1. Crone Residence at 94 Franklin Street
21-140MPR**

Minor Project Review

MOTION 2: Ms. Cooper moved and Mr. Cotter seconded, to approve the Minor Project with six conditions as amended:

- 1) That the applicant include functioning hardware with the installation of new shutters;
- 2) That the applicant remove the proposed flat panels and pilasters on the north elevation of the garage;
- 3) That the applicant shall preserve the original brackets at the front door;
- 4) That the applicant provide wood gable vents, subject to Staff approval;
- 5) That the applicant receive approval from the Architectural Review Board for the future instalment of the deck and terrace; and
- 6) That the applicant remove the proposed glass block windows and propose a window style consistent with the existing foundation windows on the home, subject to Staff approval.

VOTE: 4 – 0

RESULT: The Minor Project was conditionally approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Gary Alexander	Yes
Amy Kramb	Yes
Sean Cotter	Yes
Martha Cooper	Yes
Michael Jewell	Absent

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:

Zach Hounshell

Zach Hounshell, Planner I





MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, December 15, 2021

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Alexander, Chair, called the December 15, 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.

ROLL CALL

Board Members present: Mr. Alexander, Ms. Cooper, Mr. Cotter, and Ms. Krumb
Board Members absent: Mr. Jewell
Staff present: Ms. Holt, Mr. Ridge, Mr. Hounshell, and Mr. Hendershot

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

~~Mr. Cotter moved, Ms. Krumb seconded, to accept the documents into the record and to approve the November 17, 2021, meeting minutes.~~

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

~~[Motion carried 4-0]~~

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 intended to address the Board on any of the cases this evening was 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 cases in the minutes follow the order of the published agenda. Anyone who addresses the Board will need to provide their full name and address for the record.~~

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

NEW CASES

1. Crone Residence at 94 Franklin Street, 21-140MPR, Minor Project Review

The Chair stated this application was a request for construction of ±1,300-square-foot addition to the rear of an existing home on a 0.35-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic Residential. The site is east of Franklin Street, ±275 feet north of the intersection with John Wright Lane.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Hounshell presented an aerial view of the site with a closer view of the two access points – one on Franklin Street and the other on Mill Lane. The applicant has proposed to remove the vehicular access off of Franklin Street. There is a significant grade change across the property from west to east and a number of mature trees (crab apple and white pine) in the rear, south of the existing home. Properties surrounding this property were shown for context. The existing conditions for the west/Franklin Street elevation and the north/side yard elevation were shown. The Minimalist Traditional home was built in 1950 and the structure was found to be contributing. Minimal Traditional style is from the mid-20th century and typically was 1 – 1.5 story buildings, with pitched or gabled roofs (simple), and a small covered front porch. The house has vinyl siding, a brick chimney, an aluminium sunroom, and sash windows with fixed shutters. The brackets on the porch are original to the home. Views of the existing conditions for the detached garage were shown as typical for those structures in that era.

In October, 2021, the ARB informally reviewed a proposal and comments were provided from the Board: any additions to the home should be subordinate and complementary to the Minimal Traditional style of the home; vinyl materials should not be used; and the roofline should be simplified.

Mr. Hounshell - The applicant has since updated the plans to reflect the comments made. The proposed site plan now shows a ±1,225-square-foot building addition, future terrace and deck, removal of the front driveway, and removal of the split-rail fence. The footprint of the building addition was decreased, extending ±6.7 feet from the façade of the home - pushed back and made narrower to hide behind the home to preserve the northeast and southeast corners. The previous and current graphics of the west elevation were shown to highlight the proposed changes but are not final, as yet. The applicant proposed to replace the vinyl siding with a white, engineered-wood horizontal siding in a smooth finish, but this would require a Waiver as this material is not permitted in the district. Additional updates include: 4-over-4 and 6-over-6, black aluminium-clad, double-hung wood windows for the addition, garage, and home; composite, black wood shutters with hardware to appear operable; and a 6-pane, fiberglass front door, which will require a Waiver as fiberglass is not a permitted door material. The previous and current graphics of the north elevation were shown to highlight the proposed changes. The applicant proposed to remove the shed dormer addition; simplify the rooflines (majority front gable/minor side gables); and increase the height in lieu of the wider footprint. Engineered Wood Board and Batten (smooth) will be used on the addition with a burgundy, thin-brick water table and glass-block windows within the brick water table. Pilasters and engineered-wood, flat trim panels will be used on a portion of the garage to frame a planting wall. Staff did not recommend the use of pilasters or flat panels on the garage as they are not typical with Minimal Traditional homes. The previous and current graphics of the south elevation were shown but the changes replicate the north elevation. The previous and current graphics of the east elevation were shown to highlight the multiple changes made to the roofline and footprint. There were three fiberglass doors proposed with transom windows above. Fypon gable vents have been proposed for use throughout the addition and existing home. Staff recommended a wood gable vent to be consistent with previous recommendations. The proposed materials were presented with a closer view.

Three Waivers were reviewed against Waiver Criteria, and approval was recommended for the Waivers:

1. §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.

2. §153.174(J)(1) Exterior Building Materials Standards – Façade Materials.
Request: To permit the use of a thin-brick water table as a secondary material.
3. §153.174(J)(1) Exterior Building Materials Standards – Façade Materials.
Request: To permit the use of fiberglass as a permitted door material.

The Minor Project was reviewed against the review criteria and approval was recommended for the Minor Project with seven conditions:

- 1) That the applicant include functioning hardware with the installation of new shutters;
- 2) That the applicant provide a material detail of the board and batten based on the suggestions provided by the Board, subject to Staff approval;
- 3) That the applicant remove the proposed flat panels and pilasters on the north elevation of the garage;
- 4) That the applicant shall preserve the original brackets at the front door;
- 5) That the applicant select traditional lighting fixtures, subject to Staff approval;
- 6) That the applicant provide wood gable vents, subject to Staff approval; and
- 7) That the applicant receive approval from the Architectural Review Board for the future instalment of the deck and terrace.

Questions for Staff

Mr. Cotter asked how thin brick and brick veneer differ as one is allowed and one is not.
Mr. Alexander – Veneer is not load bearing like conventional brick. This product is like thin cut stone.

Ms. Kramb inquired about the configuration of the existing picture window that would be on one side of the front door.

Mr. Hounshell referred to the applicant.

The applicant answered from the audience, which was not picked up by the recorder. The applicant replied from the microphone that it is one big picture window with divided lites and shared a picture of the window from her phone.

Public Comment

Mr. Hounshell reported staff received public comments. The Chair requested to hear from the applicant, first.

Applicant Presentation

Shannon Crone, property owner of 94 Franklin Street; and Hylas Steman, Residential Design Solutions appeared before the Board. Ms. Crone requested to review the conditions for her added comments.

Condition 2 - The board and batten and flat panels are a LP Smartside product.

Condition 3 – The massing of the house was discussed in October. The terrace and deck have since been moved back so the terrace is beside the garage now. She spends a lot of time outdoors and if that is the location of the terrace, she wants to make it feel as though it is not right next to the garage and rather a nice courtyard. This home was built in the 50s when more ornamentation was added, hence the panels and pilasters proposed on the north elevation of the garage but she was open to suggestions.

Condition 5 – She presented a more traditional style, black light fixture with the model number.

Condition 6 – She requested to use the Fypon product instead of the wood for the gable vents as they are designed for any historic style of the home with an authentic wood appearance. Once the Fypon is painted or stained, there is no distinguishing a difference to wood. Because of the height of the gables, pedestrians and people driving by will not view them as out of place. Wood being a porous product, will require more upkeep due to moisture.

Ms. Crone requested to discuss the hardware for the shutters and gain feedback on the future proposed terrace and deck.

The Chair – The Board can only act on the application as presented. Condition 7, as such, needs to be removed from consideration but the Board can provide feedback.

Ms. Crone – The location of the master bedroom is at the back edge of the existing home to show distinction from the addition but it makes the room “wonky”, and she would like to make the room more functional. Currently the distance of the addition is 16 inches behind the home, and she requested to make it flush with the existing home. The board and batten would start at the addition for distinction from the home. She also requested to keep a sunroom as it has been her haven in the cold weather months. The best location for the sunroom is on the north side of the house for sunrise and sunset, understanding this cannot be considered as part of this application but only for a future consideration.

Public Comment

Ms. Holt read aloud the two emails received:

1. Mr. Gerald Tout - Several neighbors were in full support of the revised proposal.
2. Ms. Janet Wages – The revised plans preserve the original charm of the home and was excited about the renovation.

Mr. Alan Sutter, 80 Franklin Street, echoed other neighbors’ comments. This is a great opportunity to make changes to a property that has been in need for several years and full support was provided.

Mr. Andrew Christianson, 56 Franklin Street, stated he fully agreed with the proposal this evening and mimics his home in a lot of ways, three doors down. As a contractor, he replaces wood products from homes, every single week and Fypon is a great option for the gable vent.

Mike Strang, 75 Franklin Street, expressed his supports for the proposed improvements. The terrace and sunporch would bring a sense of community as many neighbors gather at outdoor spaces.

Board Discussion

Mr. Cotter asked why Staff opposes Fypon products.

Mr. Hounshell – Fypon was on a previous application for S. Riverview Street that also had a condition whereas wood was required. A Waiver would be needed to permit Fypon material for the gables.

Ms. Kramb thanked the applicant for following the Board's requests made for revisions and is very happy with the new configuration. Replacing a picture window with three double-hung windows will decrease window space, and she requested a picture window instead. Glass block proposed for the basement windows is not permitted in the Historic District, and she recommended single-pane windows.

Ms. Cooper asked the applicant if she were amenable to using a single-picture window, to which the applicant answered affirmatively.

Mr. Alexander – Glass block was used plenty in the 20's and 30's with Art Deco architecture but has only been used in the 80's and 90's for basement windows.

Ms. Kramb - The garage should remain plain but when returning in the future for an application for a terrace, a decorative feature such as a trellis or an arbor, should be included. Plant material detached from the garage will diminish the appearance of a garage façade.

Mr. Cotter and Mr. Alexander agreed with Ms. Kramb's suggestions for the garage. They added that what the applicant proposed would make the garage more prominent than the front of the house.

Mr. Cotter also thanked the applicant for incorporating their suggestions from the last review. He agreed with consistency for the basement windows and not using glass block.

Mr. Cotter inquired about the foundation.

Ms. Kramb said it would be concrete block as the load bearing material and thin brick veneer added to the concrete blocks.

Ms. Crone confirmed this material is just for the water table as suggested by the Board to coordinate with the chimney.

Mr. Alexander – The Code permits thin cut stone and in this case, it will be mortared on. In some instances, the gray concrete blocks were required to be covered with a material.

Ms. Cooper – Many of the houses in the neighborhood have brick.

Mr. Steman reiterated the grade change that would allow for more exposed concrete blocks for the addition, and they chose to clad the addition foundation.

Mr. Alexander – Brackets, like on the front of the house could be used as a decorative item to connect the house with the garage.

Ms. Kramb asked the other Board members if they agreed with her suggestion about the picture window.

Mr. Alexander – The gridding on the current window is pretty dense.

Ms. Cooper asked to see the photograph on the applicant's phone. Two larger double-hung windows could be an option and closer to the historic nature of the home, and she understands the desire to open the window. Ms. Kramb agreed that would be better, but if no other Board members had an issue with the window, she would be fine with the applicant's proposal.

Ms. Kramb asked the Board about the fiberglass doors proposed.

Mr. Alexander – Fiberglass doors have been permitted in some cases.

Ms. Cooper – Two addresses were permitted fiberglass for doors.

Ms. Kramb asked how the Fypon material should be determined (Waiver or Condition?).

Mr. Alexander said Fypon has been used for many different elements and some of the ornaments have foam inside.

The decision from the Board was to leave the condition as is but when the applicant returns in February to discuss the patio and terrace, they can present an exact Fypon product they would like to use for the gable vents.

Ms. Cooper inquired about the proposed option of the applicant to remove the 16-inch setback for the master bedroom addition, making it flush with the outside wall of the home, which would be a significant change.

The Board determined they need to see more information about how this part of the addition would be connected, what the elevation would look like, and how it would affect the roof pitch.

Mr. Alexander – There are options for the inside instead of simply correcting the offset. Details of alterations are warranted so this cannot be decided upon this evening. That could also be included when the applicant returns and decided then.

Ms. Cooper clarified the Board can only decide on what has been presented this evening so when the applicant requests building permits, the plans must include the 16-inch offset.

Ms. Kramb moved, Mr. Cotter seconded, to approve the three Waivers:

1. §153.174(J)(1) Exterior Building Materials Standards – Façade Materials.
Request: To permit the use of engineered-wood as a primary material.
2. §153.174(J)(1) Exterior Building Materials Standards – Façade Materials.
Request: To permit the use of a thin-brick water table as a secondary material.
3. §153.174(J)(1) Exterior Building Materials Standards – Façade Materials.
Request: To permit the use of fiberglass as a permitted door material.

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

The first condition of the seven conditions to be approved for the Minor Project was discussed just prior to the vote.

Ms. Crone – All of her comments regarding the first condition were not recorded as she was off mic.

Mr. Hounshell – The Code states the appearance of functioning hardware is required with new shutters throughout Dublin.

Public Comment

The Chair allowed for more public comment.

Melanie Strang, 75 Franklin Street, asked if the applicant kept the existing shutters and did not replace them, if hardware would be required.

Mr. Alexander – The shutters will need to be removed for the siding to be changed but this is a fair question.

Ms. Cooper – From the perspective of 'are the shutters being replaced', and the existing shutters are being put back on, hardware would not be required.

The Board made the determination that Condition 1 stands with the addition of 'new' for shutters.

Ms Crone – Condition 2 has been met.

Condition 4 – The applicant never planned to remove the brackets but they are significantly rotted and need some work.

Mr. Ridge stated significant disrepair was not noticed on Staff's site visit but repainting should be considered.

The Chair – Condition 5 has been completed. Condition 6 – The Board needs proof that the Fypon piece to be used to replace the wood gables is not foam covered in plastic.

The Chair asked if there was a motion for the Minor Project approval.

Ms. Cooper moved, Mr. Cotter seconded, to approve the Minor Project with six conditions as amended:

- 1) That the applicant include functioning hardware with the installation of new shutters;
- 2) That the applicant remove the proposed flat panels and pilasters on the north elevation of the garage;
- 3) That the applicant shall preserve the original brackets at the front door;
- 4) That the applicant provide wood gable vents, subject to Staff approval;
- 5) That the applicant receive approval from the Architectural Review Board for the future instalment of the deck and terrace; and
- 6) That the applicant remove the proposed glass block windows and propose a window style consistent with the existing foundation windows on the home, subject to Staff approval.

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

Ms. Holt clarified that the 16-inch extension, the sunroom, deck, and terrace are not part of this application and the applicant will need to return to the ARB for further review on these items. The Fypon vent is also not being approved this evening, as more information is needed.

The Chair – The sunroom and the 16-inch off set could be discussed as the applicant requested feedback on those items.

Mr. Cotter asked for the height of the proposed sunroom.

Mr. Steman replied the same height as the great room.

Ms. Kramb – She was supportive of the sunroom, if it is fairly transparent with almost all windows.

Mr. Cotter – He was supportive of the sunroom, if it does not overwhelm that side of the building.

Mr. Steman provided a rendering of the proposed sunroom.

Ms. Kramb said that rendering did not help her to visualize the sunroom. The Board will need to see how it will appear from the front of the home. The sunroom will need to appear as an outdoor space.

Ms. Cooper – She was not opposed to the sunroom addition but would like to see more detail and how the sunroom will be situated as related to the original house.

Mr. Alexander – He wanted to see a site plan and how close the sunroom would be to the adjacent home. Even though it is in a buildable area and will not require a Waiver, he wanted to see how it would affect the next door neighbor.



BOARD DISCUSSION

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, October 20, 2021 | 6:30 pm

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

**1. 94 Franklin Street
21-140INF**

Informal Review

Proposal: Construction of a ±1,300-square-foot addition to the rear of a home on a 0.35-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic Residential.

Location: East of Franklin Street, ± 275 feet north of the intersection with John Wright Lane.

Request: Informal Review to provide non-binding feedback under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.176 and the *Historic Design Guidelines*.

Applicant: Hylas Stemen, RDS Home Design representative for Shannon Crone, Home Owner

Planning Contact: Zach Hounshell, Planner I

Contact Information: 614.410.4652, zhounshell@dublin.oh.us

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/21-140

RESULT: The Board generally supported the proposal for a new building addition connecting the existing home and garage, and removing the driveway providing access from Franklin Street. The Board indicated that the addition should be subordinate to the existing home in massing and size, and that vinyl materials should not be used on the addition. The Board suggested that the addition should complement the Minimal Traditional design of the home by simplifying the roofline of the addition.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:

Zach Hounshell

B1050D11513A490...

Zach Hounshell, Planner I





MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, October 20, 2021

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Alexander, Chair, called the October 20, 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.

ROLL CALL

Board Members present: Mr. Alexander, Ms. Kramb, Mr. Cotter, Ms. Cooper, and Mr. Jewell
Staff present: Ms. Holt, Mr. Ridge, Mr. Hounshell

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Kramb moved, Mr. Jewell seconded, to accept the documents into the record and to approve the September 29, 2021, meeting minutes.

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

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 case order was changed to first - case 3, case 4, case 1, and lastly, case 2. The cases will follow the original agenda order in these minutes.

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

NEW CASES

1. 94 Franklin Street, 21-140INF, Informal Review

The Chair stated this application was a request for the construction of a ±1,300-square-foot addition to the rear of a home on a 0.35-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic Residential. The site is east of Franklin Street, ± 275 feet north of the intersection with John Wright Lane.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Hounshell presented an aerial view of the site with two vehicular access points, both from Mill Lane and Franklin Street. The Mill Lane access point acts as the access to the existing garage, and Franklin Street leads into an asphalt parking area to the rear of the home. Two crab apple trees are to be removed with this proposal; the mature white pine tree to the south of the building could potentially be impacted. Adjacent homes were shown for architecture and massing context.

Photographs were presented of the existing conditions of the west elevation/Franklin Street and the north elevation/side yard. The home was built in 1950 as a Minimal-Traditional home that was popular in the 20th century of 1 to 1.5 stories in height, a simple roofline design, sash windows with shutters, a small covered front porch, vinyl siding, a burgundy thin brick water table, a brick chimney, an aluminium sunroom to the rear of the home, and a detached garage.

The proposed site plan and an existing footprint of the home were highlighted. The proposal included a 1,300 square-foot building addition clad in vinyl siding to connect the existing home and detached garage, 501 square-foot terrace, a 98-square-foot deck, vinyl replacement windows, the removal of two sections of existing split-rail fence, and the removal of the front driveway on Franklin Street, leaving one access point off of the garage to Mill Lane. The west and south elevations were shown that highlighted what was existing and what was proposed. On the south elevation, there were a number of different rooflines with a variety of slopes proposed. The addition would not exceed the height of the original home but expands out from the existing footprint on the sides. One side included an 11-foot bump-out for a new sunroom and match materials on the existing home. The proposed addition wraps around the existing home, eliminating part of the existing walls and window openings of the original. The black awnings would be removed, keeping shutters on the southern-most window. Perspective renderings were presented to show the context of massing from the southwest and northeast views.

Historic Design Guidelines recommended replacement of windows should duplicate the appearance of the originals, as closely as possible, in the number of panes and material.

As a result of the Historic Architectural Assessment completed in 2017, the home was identified as contributing to the Historic District.

The historic architectural consultant recommended the addition not be visible whereby contained within the current footprint, behind the home. Materials should be consistent with those on the original structure by using black asphalt for the roof and to minimize the variety of rooflines to be complementary to the district. The original siding for this home would have been wood, not vinyl, and wood sash windows with simple trim would have been used. Shed dormers with a standing-seam, metal roof that was proposed would not be appropriate for this type of home. A variety of window types and sizes were found across each portion of the home. The consultant recommended the same building style be used for the addition to provide consistency.

Questions were provided to facilitate a discussion with the Board as follows:

1. Is the Board supportive of the proposed massing of the building addition?
2. Is the Board supportive of the variety of rooflines for a minimalist, traditional home?
3. Is the Board supportive of vinyl siding? [*Vinyl siding is not considered for the Historic District*]
4. Is the Board supportive of the removal of two existing windows, and the variety of window styles on the building addition?
5. Is the Board supportive of the removal of mature trees on the site?

The applicant requested clear and concise feedback from the Board in order to move forward in the best manner.

Board Questions for Staff and Applicants

Ms. Kramb asked what was identified as the existing foundation material.
Mr. Hounshell answered a concrete block foundation.

Mr. Alexander requested clarity on the type of windows proposed. Vinyl clad is permitted but vinyl is not. He asked if there have been prior approvals for this site to allow vinyl siding.
Mr. Hounshell answered there were no records found for vinyl for this site. Staff determined the vinyl was probably installed prior to the records kept by the City.
Ms. Kramb asked if Staff knew what material is underneath the vinyl. (clapboard, wood siding, or aluminium?) The Historic Assessment did not identify the material. The Consultant suggested there would be wood siding underneath but Staff has not confirmed the identification of the material, either way.

The Chair invited the applicant to address the Board.
The applicant, Hylas Stemen, Residential Designed Solutions, 7844 Flint Road, Columbus, Ohio 43235, did not offer a presentation beyond Mr. Hounshell's but was available for questions and requested direction from the Board. He confirmed the windows were vinyl, not vinyl-clad wood windows.

Mr. Jewell inquired about mature trees.
Ms. Holt answered there was a substantial white pine identified by Staff during a site visit. Concern was with the possibility of the addition pushing into the tree's root zone.
Mr. Jewell - The trees on the east side were safe.
Ms. Cooper asked if the large pine on the south side of the house would be disturbed to which Mr. Stemen answered it would not as the pine was up near the front corner of the existing home (near the guest room). Only the two crab apple trees between the house and the garage would be disturbed.

Mr. Cotter - One of the guiding principles is for the home to retain its original character.
Mr. Stemen - Tried to protect the front side of the house by pushing as much of the addition as possible to the rear while satisfying the client with the additional square feet requested. He understood the comments regarding overlapping forms.

Ms. Cooper inquired about the foundation and the slope down where the garage was on the south side. On the east side there was an egress and wanted to know if it lead to a basement or a cellar.
Mr. Stemen - The first floor level runs from the front back into the addition. Due to the grade dropping towards the garage, a short set of stairs was proposed to be added.
Ms. Cooper asked if the stairs would be inside the addition to which Mr. Stemen answered affirmatively.
Mr. Stemen - The set of stairs next to the laundry room on the floor plans led from the great room on the first floor level. The bathroom was not part of the existing home; it was a proposed master bathroom.

Board Discussion

The Chair stated Mr. Cotter's question referenced the massing. The consultant had issues with the massing as it appeared to overwhelm the house. A common strategy seen in this district and other historic areas is the desire to add much more square footage but any additions cannot overwhelm the existing structure. By keeping the addition narrower, three sides of visibility are provided so the corners on the original structure help define the original structure as opposed to the addition, which was the goal. The floor plan is somewhat deceptive and the applicant needs to rework the plans. The space for the terrace could be shifted back adjacent to the garage to allow for plenty of room for all the square footage. This would preserve the volume of the original house, reduce the apparent massing from the street view, and would

have less of an impact on the trees. Even though the applicant does not need to seek a variance on setbacks, the one side is still pretty close to the neighbor's residence.

Ms. Kramb agreed with Mr. Cotter, Mr. Alexander, and the Consultant's comments about the massing. She reiterated the addition should only be on the rear of the original structure in this case. The guidance from City Council for the ARB was that the additions have to be subordinate to the house so the original house is visible and pronounced.

Mr. Stemen requested clarification that the complete addition has to fall within the north and south edges of the main house.

Ms. Kramb answered affirmatively and the addition has to be inset on the rear side of the house. She suggested a perpendicular gabled addition on the back.

Mr. Alexander - If the applicant did that, they might have to hip it to gain some height but either way, there would be a flat roof, keeping it below the original house roof ridge line.

Ms. Kramb - The garage can be modified by building upwards.

Mr. Alexander - The Board's task is not to design the house but provide only suggestions. The addition could be bumped out, if it was further back from the front corners of the original structure.

Ms. Kramb - By wrapping the addition in the current proposal, original windows were eliminated.

Mr. Jewell noted the amount of depth on the property.

Mr. Stemen - Wanted to avoid impacting the garage, in any way.

Ms. Kramb did not support vinyl siding and it was likely that the original home had aluminium siding as it was very popular on the Cape Cod style homes in the 40s or it could have been wood. Vinyl siding can remain on the original structure but vinyl cannot be used on the addition.

The Chair - Vinyl siding is never permitted in the Historic District, especially when determined to be a contributing structure per the Code, which evolved from the Secretary of Interior's Standards. The Code allows for some synthetic materials.

Mr. Stemen received confirmation that Hardie-Plank products were permitted.

Ms. Kramb - The windows on the home are probably vinyl replacement windows now and they could remain but vinyl replacement windows are not permitted on the addition, as it is not an acceptable product for the district.

Mr. Cotter remarked on the design variety of the windows proposed.

Ms. Kramb did not have a preference on the windows and just asked the applicant to select one instead of five different types. Any multi-lite window that matched top and bottom would have been very common. The members agreed the one window on the rear of the building could be eliminated to allow for an attached addition.

Ms. Kramb - A metal, standing-seam roof would have pre-dated this house style. Asphalt shingles were used; a metal roof on the addition would make it appear older than the original house.

The members agreed a metal roof could be used to add variety the client requested, if it was facing the rear, close to the garage

Ms. Kramb - The addition should have the same foundation all around so it appears as all being built after the 50s and at the same time but may differ from the original structure.

The Chair requested feedback from the Board regarding trees on the site.

Mr. Stemen - All the trees were overgrown.

Mr. Hounshell - Staff found most of the trees in poor condition during a site visit.

Ms. Holt accompanied the City's landscape inspector and they found many trees not to be in good health. If the large tree on the south side was going to be affected, Staff would have had a concern. Replacement of removed trees is not a requirement on private residential properties.

The members agreed that since the addition was going to be moved further back from the original structure, the large white pine tree would not be impacted.

Summarized Comments

- Reduce the massing of the addition; narrow the width to be within the width of the original structure.
- Simplify the roofline.
- The garage can be extended up and out as it will not impact the appearance of the original house but should not become overwhelming.
- Vinyl siding and vinyl windows on the addition will not be approved.
- A metal roof could be a consideration but it depends on the location.
- Additions must appear to be subordinate to an original structure.

Staff is always available for guidance.

Mr. Stemen clarified next steps in order to return to the ARB in December for the Minor Project Review.

~~2. 36 38 N. High Street, 21 1492NF, Informal Review~~

~~The Chair stated this application was a request for the redevelopment of two existing buildings and a parking lot into a +5,400-square-foot, mixed-use building and a +3,200 square-foot, 2-unit residential building. The 0.25-acre lot is zoned Historic District, Historic Core and is located northeast of the intersection of N. High Street with Wing Hill Lane.~~

Staff Presentation

~~Mr. Ridge stated this is a request for non-binding feedback through an Informal Review. Aerial views of the site included the building built in 1960 with parking to the rear, an existing privy, and an existing stone wall that weaves through the site. Existing conditions showed context of the contributing structure. The applicant had provided a structural analysis and photographs that documented the shifting of the building. A Demolition request will be required shall this proposal of development move forward in a formal capacity. A photograph taken up close of the stone wall and privy in May of 2021. Preservation designs were included in a historical assessment for any historical or cultural value, which it possessed in Historic Dublin without significant modification and met historic integrity markers for location, design, setting, workmanship and material. The *Historic District Guidelines* state that the wall remains and to not be modified, the degraded wall should be rehabilitated without compromising integrity, character, and replacement of new walls was discouraged. The applicant proposed retaining the stone wall and privy on this site. The applicant will be required to provide credible evidence that they will incur economic hardship, if the request for Demolition is not granted. The applicant has provided some preliminary information for the Board's consideration.~~

~~The proposed site plan showed the construction of a two-story, mixed-use building at 5,400 square feet in size, a separate two-story, two-unit residential building, and 11 parking spaces (9 on site, 2 on street) for this site. Depending on the final mix of uses, 20-38 parking spaces are required. Approval of a Parking Plan will be required. Lot coverage numbers are not provided but will be required with a formal submittal. Multiple renderings provided by the applicant, both structures as viewed from the south/Wing Hill Lane; view from N. High Street highlighted the front porch element and two exterior primary materials (vertical siding and stone); and views from the southwest and northwest corners/N. High Street.~~

Questions were identified to help facilitate a discussion with the Board:

- 1) Does the Board support demolition of the existing structure to facilitate redevelopment?