



MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, January 26, 2022

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Alexander, Chair, called the January 26, 2022, meeting of the City of Dublin Architectural Review Board (ARB) to order at 6:29 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Chair led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

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

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Cotter moved, Ms. Cooper seconded, to accept the documents into the record and to approve the December 15, 2021, meeting minutes.

Vote: Mr. Jewell, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Cooper, 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. 181 S. High Street, 21-185MPR, Minor Project Review

The Chair stated this application was a request for exterior material selections for a recently approved, single-family home located within Historic Dublin. The 0.47-acre site is zoned Historic District, Historic Residential and is located northwest of the intersection of S. High Street with Waterford Drive.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Mullinax presented aerial views of the site. The Historic and Cultural Assessment found the previously existing home and shed to be non-contributing structures. Early in the project history, this case was brought before the ARB informally. In May of 2021, demolition of a previously existing home and plans for a Minor Project were approved. Exterior materials were discussed at the meeting, where Staff expressed concern regarding the conceptually approved light-colored stone that was noticeably lighter than stone used elsewhere in Historic Dublin. In September 2021, the applicant has appeared before the Board for various exterior material selections, including the majority of their exterior material selections before the Board today.

The existing conditions of the home being currently constructed were presented. The site plan that was approved in May 2021 was presented to show the home currently being constructed in relation to the existing shed. The plan included a $\pm 3,500$ -square-foot, one-and-a-half story, cottage-style, single-family residence on a 0.47-acre site. The site plan has been modified including the movement of the north wall 38 inches, the adjusted driveway design, and shed modifications.

Elevations approved in May 2021 and later modified in September of the same year were presented. The siding and trim material was approved for the home, garage, and shed via a Waiver for the LP engineered wood. The applicant has proposed to paint the following in Gauntlet Gray: siding, window and door casings, corner boards, rakes, rake friezes, soffits, skirts, bands, porch columns, brackets, and porch entablature.

The stone material was shown on the foundation of the home and the story-and-a-half projection on the front façade that were conceptually approved, but the color and manufacturer were unspecified at the time. The applicant proposed Hermitage Stone (19th Century Series) from Horizon Stone. The homeowner preferred a lighter colored stone for the exterior. The Hermitage Stone sample was featured in the comparison image with the Old Ohio Stone. Staff found that the proposed stone choice is a departure from other stone found in the Historic District. More specifically, Staff is concerned with the large stone piece in the upper right corner of the sample that is whiter in appearance than the other stones in the sample. Staff recommended a mid-tone stone color, which closely resembles other stone found in the area. A sample of a mid-tone stone has been provided for comparison with the proposed stone. The historic stone wall in front of the home along S. High Street was compared to the proposed stone sample that showed a significant contrast in color for the Board's consideration.

The proposed exterior materials were shown for the doors, roof, gutters, and downspouts as follows: Gutters and downspouts – prefinished aluminum stock made on site, ogee profile in dark bronze (Coated Metals Group); Front door – dark walnut stain on sapele wood; Asphalt shingle roof – GAF Timberline in Pewter Gray, primary roofing material for the home, garage, and shed; Standing seam metal roof (24ga) - Coated Metals Group in Dark Bronze, secondary roofing material for patio, box-bay window, and rear door overhang; and secondary exterior doors for the garage and shed – two panel, Therma-Tru S220 smooth fiberglass painted door in SW 7048 Urbane Bronze. Previously approved materials were also listed. The applicant proposed to paint the previously approved garage and the carriage-style doors on the shed will be painted Gauntlet Gray to match the home siding and trim color.

The applicant has not provided details regarding light fixtures and the front patio, overlay material; that information will be required to be submitted for approval to the ARB.

The application was reviewed against the Minor Project Review Criteria. Approval was recommended with two conditions:

- 1) That the applicant submits a Minor Project Review application for review and approval of all light fixtures and the porch overlay material; and
- 2) That the applicant proposes a mid-toned colored stone to be included with their next application for review and approval by the ARB.

Board Discussion

Mr. Cotter – He asked why the lighter color stone was selected.

Debbie Bergwall, 181 S. High Street - The company had been called about the stone and the response was it was a challenge to get that particular stone. If the Board would like a darker colored stone selected, another one would need to be found. The different types of stone come and go due to the limited supply chain. The lighter stone was preferred by the homeowner. If a darker stone was selected, the paint colors would need to be changed as the house would appear too dark. Once the stone color is selected, a paint color to coordinate would need to be selected.

Mr. Alexander – When a stone sample has different sized stones, it is hard to know the actual mix of sizes that will come in the box.

Ms. Bergwall – The supplier would need to be called. The solution could be to over order but the costs continue to increase, which is not a viable solution.

Ms. Holt – Staff is only showing the alternative stone as an example and not recommending that be the stone to be selected. This is just a comparison between what is proposed and what is typically found in the Historic District.

Mr. Alexander – He agreed with the homeowner, that all the colors would need to be considered.

Richard Taylor, the representative – There is not that much stone on the house. It is on the base and the gable on the front and part of the porch.

Mr. Jewell – He asked if the homeowner had asked the supply chain about the stone she had proposed.

Ms. Bergwall – The supplier currently has the stone proposed in stock.

Mr. Jewell – With the porch in shadow, the stone will not be as obvious.

Ms. Cooper – She agreed with Mr. Jewell's point. The porch is going to create a darker look, even with a lighter stone.

Mr. Cotter – The stone in the photograph appears lighter than it does under these lights. The contrast with the paint will be farther away.

Ms. Cooper – Matching the stone on the fence with the stone for the house is not a good idea.

Mr. Alexander – The original sample for the palette board was almost an 'Arctic White'. It is clear the applicant made an attempt to respond to the Board's comments.

The Chair – The Board seems to have a comfort level with the recently proposed selection of stone.

Mr. Cotter – The rest of the colors are fine.

Ms. Bergwall – The color for the floor on the patio has not been selected and asked for the Board's feedback for that element.

Mr. Cotter – He asked if the patio will be made of concrete.

Ms. Bergwall – The patio is going to be some type of stone.

Mr. Alexander – The patio color and material will have less of an impact as it is a horizontal surface, which will not be as visible from the street.

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

Ms. Cooper moved, Mr. Jewell seconded to approve the Minor Project with only one condition:

- 1) That the applicant submits a Minor Project Review application for review and approval of all light fixtures.

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

2. Tucci's Addition at 35 N. High Street, 21-194INF, Informal Review

The Chair stated this application was a request for an informal review of a building addition to an existing restaurant zoned Historic District, Historic Core. The 0.23-acre site is located northwest of the intersection of N. High Street with Wing Hill Lane.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Holt presented aerial views of the site that is south of the library off of N. High Street, Wing Hill Lane, and Darby Street and highlighted the patio area where the building addition is requested for the east side. The project history related to Covid was reviewed in November 2020. There was a previous request pertinent to this application - Lot coverage and parking variances were granted in 2002 that still apply today and will accommodate this request. In 2012, the Bridge Street District – Historic Core zoning was approved, encompassing this use/site to allow existing, non-conforming buildings to remain as fully legal and to allow these buildings to be expanded. In 2021, the Historic District's own zoning was approved and the same provisions have carried over. In November 2021, through a Concept Plan Review, the applicant requested to keep some form of the temporary structure. The request was generally well-received by the Board with acknowledgement that the details of meeting the *Historic Design Guidelines* would be paramount. Tonight, feedback on two options was requested through an Informal Review process to gain potential design solutions from the Board and request the combination of the Preliminary and Final Development Plans going forward. For clarity, Staff requested a memo from the Law Office, prior to this meeting to confirm the addition is not subject to the square footage limitations on accessory structures and not subject to the square footage limitations in the Historic District, Historic Core zoning district for eating/drinking facilities, if the addition does not extend beyond the footprint of the combined outdoor patio and primary structure.

For street context, views of the structure were shown looking south and north and photographs of the temporary structure over the patio as permitted by Executive Order on N. High Street were presented as the existing conditions. Photographs of the main entry on the north side of the public walkway and the south side entry that is not in use were also presented.

Two options submitted by the applicant were presented for a building addition:

Option 1: A new structure with brick columns; a wing wall on the south side; a flat roof at ±16 feet tall; and accordion windows with awning windows above. Additionally, the HVAC is housed in a proposed hyphen between the historic building and the addition; the entry is on the north elevation, and flat, metal awnings were proposed for the three exposed facades.

Option 2: Would keep the original temporary structure; with brick columns and a wing wall on the south side; a gable roof at ±20 feet tall; and the same hyphen connection that will be more visible in this configuration due to the angle of the roof. Visible skylights were proposed; the HVAC would be located on the top of the hyphen, along with bi-fold windows without an awning.

Ms. Holt presented questions to the Board to facilitate a discussion:

1. Does the Board generally support the scale, massing, and height of the proposed options?

2. Does the Board support one of the options over the other?
3. Does the Board support the architectural elements shown on the options?
4. Does the Board continue to support a true pedestrian entrance off of N. High Street, regardless of option?
5. Are there any other discussion items from the Board?

Board Questions for Staff

The Chair asked the Board if there were any questions for Staff, which there were none.

Applicant Presentation

Aaron Underhill, Underhill and Hodge, 8000 Walton Parkway, Suite 260 New Albany, OH – They are in a race against the clock since City Council has placed mandates on temporary structures. They will be lobbying Council for an extension and relief on the timing. The applicant requested meaningful feedback for options that may be worth pursuing. Option 1: A brand new, pergola structure that has merit but prefer Option 2: to keep the existing structure due to the significant investment in the neighborhood of \$400,000. That structure consists of 12 concrete footers providing some permanency to it of which will be modified to fit within the surroundings better.

Craig Barnum, owner of Tucci's, 35 N. High Street – Business has been decent as the temporary structure has been a huge asset, despite the pandemic. He received an email from Amy Kramb that basically stated she was not a huge fan of the proposal while she was still on the Architectural Review Board, but is now very much in favor of this new proposal. The applicant had addressed one of Ms. Kramb's major concerns, which was the floor. Steve Stirts, the architect in Carmel, IN, created these most recent designs, hoping the Board would like one of these options. Again, the preference is to use the existing structure as pulling out those 12 concrete footers for a new building is an anticipated cost of at least \$500,000. This is a long-term play so the applicant is willing to do that but it will also cause a long-term delay to get the existing structure out, materials ordered, delivered, for down time, and construction time. Changing the size of the roof on the existing structure is not going to be that difficult and the business could still operate, only needing to close down for a month or so to finish modifications. Discussing both options with the Board is the goal this evening.

Mr. Jewell – The renderings were beautiful.

Public Comments

The Board has heard from Ms. Kramb (a former ARB Board Member) as the letter was addressed to Mr. Underhill and not public channels and no other comments have come forth. Mr. Underhill read the email from Ms. Kramb dated January 11, 2022. Summarized here - She stated she was on City Council and withdrew from the ARB so there will not be an opportunity to comment on this project, hence the email. The new concept is excellent, the design is appropriate for the district using the existing building. This plan will help ensure the historic district retains its integrity.

Board Questions for the Applicant

Mr. Cotter – He asked about the floor being addressed.

Mr. Barnum – There is a 14-inch grade change, which now would be levelled out for a floor. The type of flooring has not been determined yet.

Mr. Cotter – He confirmed the floor would be similar to what would be used inside a building.

Mr. Barnum – Ms. Holt stated in her presentation that this was a historic building but it is not historic. The Chair – Your building has been identified as a contributing structure in the document we use. As a result, we applied standards that we do for older structures but some latitude was provided.

Board Discussion

The Chair started with the discussion questions provided by Ms. Holt.

The Chair – He asked Mr. Cotter if he had a preference for one option over the other.

Mr. Cotter – The flat roof for Option 1 looks better and massing is appropriate. He was not uncomfortable with the addition on the front.

Mr. Jewell – He agreed. With the addition being on the front of the building for Option 1 was fine. The only concern he had was that most of the buildings in the area were gabled and considered if this building should be consistent down the street for which Option 2 would fit better. There was only one building in the area with a flat roof. A gabled roof will allow for the hyphen to stand out from the north side, which is a drawback and the flat roof is built up to the hyphen, which is preferred.

Ms. Cooper – She asked if the gable roof was higher than permitted.

Ms. Holt – That limit was for an accessory structure but now an addition is being evaluated.

Ms. Cooper – She had pros and cons for both options. Yes, the gable roof matches the other structures in the Historic District. She agreed the massing on the flat roof appeared smaller and concealed the hyphen connection. A front door on the High Street entrance has not been included for either plan; the entrance is still coming in off the north side.

Mr. Barnum – That is the front door.

Ms. Cooper – The Board had requested a door with a connection to High Street and asked if it was not possible for that to be incorporated.

Michael Lusk, Lusk Architecture, 2011 Riverside Drive, Columbus, OH - There are a few issues, operationally. There are pedestrians you would like to capture on High Street but there is also a parking lot to the west, where patrons will be coming from. Currently, there is a hostess stand right there upon entering the building. In spite of wanting a door on the front of every building, there are customers coming from two different directions. The applicant has tried to create that 'front door' as a ceremonial way to get people to the hostess stand. Once the floor is raised there will be an accessibility issue, which will require some sort of ramp system. The proposal as is, allows the applicant to ramp up. They could do a better job of this if they create that more as part of the building so that one enters a space, albeit an exterior space, that takes them to the hostess stand.

Mr. Alexander – He asked if that would be possible as the Staff Report suggested part of that may be in the right-of-way at the side, which would require a Variance.

Ms. Holt – That would need to be demonstrated at the next submittal that all setbacks are met and there are no encroachments in the right-of-way.

Mr. Alexander – He did not know if the circumstances would allow that.

Mr. Lusk – This is the Concept Plan Review so a survey has not been completed or all the details worked out. Conceptually, as shown in the renderings, that is what the applicant is trying to achieve. There will be an entry gate that will serve that function of entering but also operationally, there cannot be two hostesses in there. As proposed, this is an architectural solution to address everything, including that being a front door. As an architect himself, he understands but it is a difficult situation.

Ms. Cooper – If the setbacks are being met, there could be a pathway from the front around the building for the entrance. Mr. Lusk made a good point earlier about the parking and the approach people will make to the restaurant from both sides; she could understand that. If the applicant plans to leave the structure in place, she asked how that would work, structurally.

Mr. Lusk – There will be a freestanding wall and the applicant will be able to solve structural problems.

Ms. Cooper – The proposed improvements incorporated much of what the Board has been suggesting.

Mr. Alexander – Both options have merit. He liked the flat roof better because it breaks the scale. With the transoms up above, it is reminiscent of old commercial buildings that had a mezzanine up above so it looks like commercial buildings. He and Staff were concerned about the issue of subordination to the original building. The height of the hyphen should be a subordinate element, down and depressed whereas other elements have greater prominence. He understood this is a mechanical issue and there is Code compliance too. If the hyphen were reduced, it would become more subordinate. It is not an 1890's building. Perhaps the front face of the original building could be kept and be visible coming through there. If an addition is removed, there needs to be a history of the site, visible. He suggested the applicant consider that connection a little differently and he could be more comfortable with where the plan is headed.

Mr. Lusk – The process has been Mr. Skirts developing these concepts while this local team put this together in a quick way. That connection between what we are adding and the existing building, is going to get complicated from a code perspective. There may have to be some fire separations, etc. and this still needs a lot of study. The hyphen in these renderings is probably the least thought out element in terms of a solid plan. The Board's input at this stage is very important; the Board requesting the hyphen be minimized is understood. This team will develop the design further.

The Chair - The Board is generally comfortable with scale and massing. There seems to be a little more comfort with the flat roof option over the gable roof option.

Mr. Alexander – The wing wall on the south side had been discussed. He had assumed that was an existing arch that was visible. He asked Staff if that is what is being referred to as the wing wall or some other element. In the renderings, he had found an arch on both sides.

Ms. Holt – She confirmed the arch is considered the wing wall.

Mr. Lusk – He took a lot of photographs. The arch is part of the connection and asked if that should remain or be removed. That connection needs study.

Mr. Barnum – He was not partial to that arch as it is on the side of the building they use for storage.

Mr. Cotter – The south/front is brick-faced.

Mr. Barnum – They matched the existing brick.

Mr. Cotter – He asked if the façade could look softer and less imposing.

Mr. Barnum – They could use a lot less brick.

Mr. Alexander – From a design standpoint, it is a typical device used to frame. He viewed it as successful. It is trying to hold the view between the piers like brackets, particularly when a building is as open as this. He liked it as it comes out as neo-classical style with the commercial base that tied the design all together.

Mr. Cotter – He liked it but thought if it appeared lighter, it would appear more subordinate.

Mr. Alexander – With this type of fenestration, operable doors and windows would require a Waiver for the Board to approve.

Ms. Holt – There are no percent requirements for glazing like in the Bridge Street District. There is a guideline to sort of match the traditional and the fenestration of adjacent buildings, but this is a little different kind of a building with a different purpose by enclosing a patio with a pergola effect.

The Chair – The idea is to use elements that would generally be seen in the District and asked the Board Members if they had any issue with that.

Mr. Cotter – The intent is an open effect, which is not standard but could be associated with a porch.

Ms. Cooper – She advocated for the windows to be allowed to be open.

Mr. Alexander – It animates the street. That is why Code requires doors on the front. But having activity right there, contributes to the liveliness of the street. He asked if the members had an issue with the door not being on the front face of the structure but rather through a gate leading to the entry.

Ms. Cooper – She was less concerned now as she understood the logistics. There is probably as much traffic coming from the west side rather than the east or more because the parking is located to the west

and northwest. Creating a path within the inside space is not a good use of space, which is not that large to begin with. The proposal makes it clear where the entrance is. And because the windows are significant, even when not open, there will be much visual activity to draw from the street.

Mr. Jewell – He liked the way the entry was proposed.

Mr. Jewell - He inquired about signage as it ties in the entry, well.

Ms. Holt – Signs can be submitted as part of the Preliminary and Final Development Plans or a separate application if upgrade, change or increase is proposed. It is up to the applicant.

The Chair – The general consensus is the Board is agreeable to what is shown through the gate and the side.

Both Mr. Cotter and Ms. Cooper asked to discuss the hyphen further.

Ms. Cooper – She was in agreement with prior comments that the scale of the hyphen needs to be decreased with the flat roof option so it does not distract or take-away from the appearance of the modifications on the front for the enclosure of the patio.

Mr. Cotter – The hyphen should stay inside of the footprint of the new structure.

The Chair – He called for any further comments from the Board [Hearing none.] He asked Staff if there was anything else the Board should address.

Ms. Holt – She answered it has been a very thorough and helpful discussion.

Mr. Underhill – Great progress has been made and the applicant received specific directions. He asked if the Board was fine if written communication with City Council stated this has been a positive step as part of their ask for an extension of time.

Mr. Alexander – All the comments will be included in the minutes and we have been told that Council reads them. Timing is not this Board's call but understands the dilemma the applicant is under.

The Chair summarized the meeting comments – The Board was generally supportive of the scale and mass. The Board's preference was for Option 1: The flat roof proposal over the gable roof option. There was still a concern with the massing of the connector/hyphen. The Board was supportive of the architectural elements, the gate, and the fenestration pattern shown. As the Staff Report pointed out, there was an issue with the awnings. That was one clear element that is not currently in compliance with the Code. The Board was agreeable with the piers. The entry was fine as long as the gate stays at High Street and does not migrate back to mid-block.

Mr. Lusk – Details will be worked out with Staff.

COMMUNICATIONS

- Mr. Ridge provided an overview of the Annual Report, which was created around a theme of the Historic Firehouse. The ARB's case load had increased from years prior. Staff appreciated the Board had submitted biographies to be included. This Annual Report will be shared with City Council at their next meeting. It was a pleasure for the Staff to work with this Board and appreciated their dedication.

Ms. Holt added expertise and enthusiasm has been brought forth to the City through these very detailed projects. The physical manifestations of those projects have become evident in the Historic District.

- Mr. Cotter noted some of the changes coming will really change the fabric of the District. He asked if there was a way to try and review projects less one-off. Ideas for one project could alter the ideas for the adjacent properties. It is not master planning because it belongs to the public and

not the City and these are all individual properties. How can projects be approved that are sensitive to the next person so the Board knows they have made the right choices as we change what the area will look like over the next few years.

Ms. Holt stated Staff struggles with this too. At pre-submittal meetings when Staff is aware of something due to happen next door we encourage the "neighbors" to talk to one another to share forces and perhaps come up with something more integrated or at least respectful but not much traction has happened with that approach.

Mr. Alexander suggested that on smaller parcels, that massing studies, etc. could be made for the adjacent properties too so that whenever those properties come forward, a plan for what would be best for the area, following Code, and could be shared.

Ms. Holt stated that for projects that combine several properties with the addition of adjacent properties proposing the maximum that could happen on their properties could quickly change the character of a wider area, which would be a huge impact to Historic Dublin.

Mr. Alexander said without foresight kind of thinking, the first person could potentially be penalized who takes a step forward.

- Staff is exploring a Special Area Plan for the Historic District and perhaps a proactive approach could be taken.

Mr. Alexander suggested including a three-dimensional, massing component; the ARB reviews more in 3-D approaches than even the Planning and Zoning Commission. The ARB would really benefit from 3-D mapping for scale, massing, and size.

Ms. Cooper asked if there had been any progress since visiting large project sites eight months ago. Ms. Holt answered there have been no further conversations.

- Ms. Cooper will be absent from the February meeting.

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



Chair, Architectural Review Board



Administrative Assistant II, Recorder