



MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, February 23, 2022

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Alexander, Chair, called the February 23, 2022, meeting of the City of Dublin Architectural Review Board (ARB) to order at 6:30 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Chair led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

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

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Cotter moved, Mr. Jewell seconded, to accept the documents into the record and to approve the January 26, 2022, meeting minutes.

Vote: Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Jewell, yes; and Mr. Cotter, 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 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, 22-007MPR, Minor Project Review

The Chair stated this application was a request for the construction of a ±198-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

Ms. Holt presented aerial views of the site between Franklin Street and Mill Lane. There is a historic house and a detached garage on the property. The addition to link the two structures has been approved. Front and side elevations of the existing home were shown as an example of Minimalist Traditional architecture, built in 1950.

In December 2021, Board approved a ±1,225-square-foot building addition between the house and garage that required a Waiver to permit engineered wood, thin brick, and fiberglass doors. The approval came with seven conditions, including the need for the ARB to approve at a later date, a deck, terrace and Fypon gable vents. Since that time, the applicant added a sunroom to the project. The gable vents are the subject of the Waiver tonight. A site plan included the proposed sunroom, deck, and terrace. Details are found in the Planning Report. The addition of the sunroom entails removal of the bump-out in the previously-approved plan at the great room location. Various elevations were shown for comparison from earlier versions approved in December. The proposed sunroom appears in the front/west elevation. The location of the Fypon gable vent was highlighted. The side/north elevation was shown as previously approved to compare to the proposed, which has a different window between the sunroom and original home and the area for the proposed vertical lattice being requested as part of a condition of approval. The side/east elevation included more lattice material and the Fypon gables were highlighted. The proposed materials shown on a slide included: Timber tech deck edge; Impression Rail System with the cables; terrace and patio stone, brick design in the gravel, and an example of the Fypon material sample for the gables was presented to the Board.

The following Waiver was requested:

1. §153.174(J)(2) – Exterior Building Materials Standards – Façade Materials. Requirement: Other high quality synthetic materials may be approved by the required reviewing body with examples of successful, high quality installations in comparable climates.
Request: To permit the use of wood-textured Fypon for all the gable vents

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

- 1) That the applicant work with Staff to finalize the lattice material selection, prior to submittal of a building permit, and subject to Staff approval.

Applicant Presentation

The applicant was only going to answer questions; no presentation to be provided.

Board Discussion

Shannon Crone, 94 Franklin Street, and Hylas Stemen, Residential Design Solutions, came forward.

Mr. Jewell – More information regarding the sunroom was requested.

Ms. Crone – The sunroom was originally presented for feedback. The Board said the sunroom came too far out from the house and appeared too massive. The applicant has since pulled it in.

Mr. Alexander – On the previous elevation, glass block windows were proposed and now they are shown as blank. He asked what was going to be used there.

Mr. Stemen – Yes a window, not glass block.

Mr. Alexander – He asked about the size of the vents.
Mr. Stemen – There are two sizes.

Mr. Alexander – The cable rail system is contemporary as was proposed for another project, not yet built, for a non-contemporary home. Timber tech makes other railing systems. A more compatible rail system would be appropriate for this style of this house, also.

Ms. Crone – The point of view was understood. This cable rail system with the black caps, etc. was selected because that was the preferred design but a different rail system could be selected.

Mr. Alexander – This was selected for another project and the applicant was encouraged to make a change, which was fairly recent. It would be unfair, if the Board permitted the cable rail now, for this project. He had questioned the Fypon material before but now it is fine because there is enough thickness.

Mr. Jewell – The material is dense so he is also fine with using that product.

Mr. Cotter – Agreed.

Ms. Holt – Introduced a second condition of approval for the Board to consider.

The Board members and the applicant were fine with the second condition that was added: That the applicant work with Staff to finalize the deck railing system, subject to Staff approval.

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

1. §153.174(J)(2) – Exterior Building Materials Standards – Façade Materials. Requirement: Other high quality synthetic materials may be approved by the required reviewing body with examples of successful, high quality installations in comparable climates.

Request: To permit the use of wood-textured Fypon for gable vents

Vote: Mr. Jewell, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; and Mr. Alexander, yes.
[Approved 3-0]

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

- 1) That the applicant work with Staff to finalize the lattice material, prior to submittal of a building permit, subject to Staff approval; and
- 2) That the applicant work with Staff to finalize the deck railing system, subject to Staff approval.

Vote: Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Jewell, yes; and Mr. Cotter, yes.
[Approved 3-0]

2. 53 N. High Street, 22-012MPR, Minor Project Review

The Chair stated this application was a request to repaint a building on a 0.22-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic Core. The site is southwest of the intersection of N. High Street and North Street.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Mullinax stated this request is to approve proposed exterior paint colors for an existing building at 53 N. High Street being used to accommodate multiple tenants including office and a medical office. She presented aerial views of the site. The one-story, vernacular-style building was built as a church in 1845 and has undergone various modifications over time. A front porch was constructed as well as a rear addition. The building is on the National Register of Historic Places. In October of 2021, the ARB approved a Minor Project that consisted of replacing wood windows with bronze, aluminum-clad wood windows. A condition of that approval was that the applicant work with Staff to finalize the selection of a beige color

for the window trim, prior to any painting activities. The paint color for the double hung, two-over-two windows was considered. Photographs were presented to show the existing conditions as viewed from the northeast of 53 N. High Street and the northwest view of Darby Street. Since the previous ARB request, the applicant has elected to repaint all wood surfaces on the building, beyond the window trim. The front porch ballisters and window trim are proposed to be a dark bronze color to match the color of the previously approved windows. 'Urbane Bronze' has been approved by the ARB in the Historic District (previously at 181 S. High St). The applicant also proposed two additional colors: 'Sheraton Sage' for all wood siding; doors and door trim; and half-moon windows; and 'Classical White' for all trim (except doors), front porch columns and ceiling, and the south elevation side door cove and upper sill.

The application was reviewed against the Minor Project Review Criteria. Approval was recommended without conditions.

Board Questions for Staff and Applicants

Mr. Alexander asked for clarification on the location of certain colors. The color scheme proposed is essentially opposite to what is there, currently; the dark will become light and the light will become dark.

Applicants Tim Cistone and Javier Piquero, 53 N. High Street came forward. Mr. Piquero confirmed the windows would remain bronze. Any trim that touches the window will be bronze.

Mr. Jewell – In past cases, matching the trim to the window color was discouraged and the Board should be consistent. The previously proposed color of beige would have fit that criteria. There was a property on Darby where the ARB expressed the trim should not match the window.

Mr. Cotter – Whatever is not going to be the window will be Classic White.

Mr. Piquero – There are only three colors. There is a supporting piece to the windows that is going to be bronze, the surrounding color of the window. Trim beyond that will be white.

Mr. Alexander – The cladding for the window will be bronze. The area between the cladding and the stone is considered the wood trim.

Mr. Piquero – There is not much exposed wood trim around the windows. Just bronze will be seen next to the stone. There is a lighter part to the windows that is not trim and it will be painted sage.

Mr. Jewell – The Board needed that clarification.

Mr. Piquero – The prefinished color is coming from Marvin.

Public Comments

No public comments were received.

Board Discussion

Mr. Jewell moved, Mr. Cotter seconded, to approve the three proposed colors for this Minor Project.

Vote: Mr. Cotter, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; and Mr. Jewell, yes.

[Approved 3-0]

3. James Davis House at 5707 Dublin Road, 22-015MPR, Minor Project Review

The Chair stated this application was a request for the removal of a deck and the installation of a stone and gravel patio on a 0.75-acre site zoned Planned Unit Development, Llewellyn Farms. The site is ±300 feet north of the intersection of Dublin Road and Hertford Lane.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Mullinax presented aerial views of the 0.75-acre site surrounded by single-family residences. The property contains the James Davis House/Farm, which is located outside the Architectural Review District and is an outlying historic property that is within the ARB's purview. The rear yard once contained a spring house and a chicken coop but were demolished by the previous owner, without City approval. The main house was constructed in 1840 and is listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

In May of 2021, the ARB approved a Minor Project for the replacement of windows and a new entry door. In November of 2021, the ARB approved a Minor Project for a 72-square-foot shed. An aerial view and ground view of the existing patio from the southwest were presented. The site plan of the exterior site modifications proposed included removal of a deteriorating wooden deck to be replaced with a 652-square-foot patio in its exact location. The patio included a 32-inch stone wall to enclose the patio space on the north and east sides and a gravel space for seating furnishings. Flat fieldstone walkways branch off the patio space to the north and east. The applicant is modifying the design of the existing brick with 510-square-foot, basket-weave walkways to accommodate the new patio. The stone wall will contain repurposed stone from the site and the proposed Shoreline Stone to match the existing site stone. The remainder of the patio area will be bordered by Lang Stone Cobblestones.

The Historic District Code does not regulate lighting for single-family residences. Overhead hanging lights were proposed and shown in a crisscross formation across the patio. The lighting meets the recommendations outlined in the *Historic District Guidelines*.

The proposed materials included: Ottawa irregular flagstone (buff-grey, natural product); Lannon tumbled cobblestones (buff-grey, natural limestone); decomposed granite gravel (honey); Shoreline stone wall (buff-grey, Lang Stone Co.); re-purposed clay brick (orange-red); and overhead string lights.

The Planning Report called out the close proximity of the proposed stone walls to critical root zones of mature trees. The distance of the patio from existing mature trees was presented.

The application was reviewed against the Minor Project Review Criteria. Approval was recommended with one condition:

- 1) That the applicant applies for a Certificate of Zoning Plan Approval prior to construction, subject to Staff approval.

Applicant Presentation

Emily Lukasik, 5707 Dublin Road, Dublin; and Troy Richards did not have a presentation but would address any concerns.

Board Questions for Staff and the Applicants

Mr. Cotter – Asked how the old stone will be integrated into the new stone.

Mr. Richards – The new wall will be faced front and back, using the old stone; however, most will be new Shoreline stone, locally sourced in Central Ohio. The historic stone walls at the front of the house will be left alone, and will be replicated with the proposed seating wall and retaining wall that supports the patio that drops in elevation.

Mr. Jewell – There is a concern about the Spruce Trees and the watershed being protected.

Mr. Richards – That is the logical space for the patio; it is where it has been. The existing deck has pilings that are already there. They have made an adjustment to the new patio taking the tree roots into consideration. During construction, they will be “tip-toeing” and making adjustments, more like a dry-laid approach, where the footers will not be mortared together. This will allow for flexibility for both frost depth and tree roots. Normally, Spruce Trees do not spread very far.

Public Comments

No public comments were received.

Board Discussion

The Chair called for a motion.

Mr. Jewell moved, Mr. Cotter seconded to approve the Minor Project with one condition:

- 1) That the applicant applies for a Certificate of Zoning Plan Approval prior to construction, subject to Staff approval.

Vote: Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; and Mr. Jewell, yes.
[Approved 3-0]

4. Rules and Regulations, 22-017ADMO, Administrative Request - Other

The Chair stated this application was a request for a review and recommendation to City Council for proposed updates to the Architectural Review Board Rules and Regulations.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Holt stated the purpose of the Rules and Regulations for each Board and Commission are to: identify powers/duties of the Boards and Commission; describe membership requirements; provide for officer elections; set forth meeting procedures; discuss ex-parte contact; and define conflicts of interest. The last update to these Rules and Regulations was in 2015 and since that time, there have been substantial changes in the way business is conducted. The Planning Division name has changed, there have been many personnel changes, City locations have changed; and the City became more reliant on the website as a key information source. The Covid-19 pandemic brought changes to how meetings were conducted with specific requirements for virtual meetings/attendance from City Council and also the City Manager. City Council requested pandemic measures for meetings with specific language to be included in all the Boards and Commission Rules and Regulations. Each operated under the same criteria.

The bulk of changes reflect virtual meeting requirements, as directed by City Council, via the Law Director.

Section IIIC now stipulates in-person attendance is preferred for all members. Only in the case of an emergency, which relates only to pandemic situations, could the Mayor allow a member to attend virtually. Virtual meetings for an entire Board or Commission may be determined by the Mayor with a 48-hour notice and it is critical that the public has an opportunity to hear/observe the meeting.

Section VIII - Applicants could attend virtually in the event of an emergency, again only applicable to a pandemic type of situation.

The Board was provided with the 2015 version of the Rules and Regulations, the 'track changes' copy that included everyone's language input, a clean copy of the 2022 version; and the Planning Report. Staff requested a recommendation of adoption of the 2022 Rules and Regulations to be forwarded to City Council for a formal adoption.

Board Questions for Staff

Mr. Cotter – In Section VIII, an applicant is permitted to meet virtually. What would be the mechanism for notifying the Chair for that to work?

Ms. Holt - The applicant would make the request to Staff at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting because of a Covid-related emergency and Staff would make the request to the Mayor. If applicant's virtual participation is granted by the Mayor, Staff would notify the Chair and the Board. IT would have to consider the options for logistics. Staff can recommend to City Council that the timing for all parties is made clear.

Mr. Cotter – The definition of 'emergency' to only be Covid-related is ambiguous.

Mr. Alexander – To the public, emergency is not made clear.

Ms. Holt – An 'emergency' having to be a Covid-related event only was determined by the Law Director. There cannot be any other type of emergency that would allow participation, virtually.

Mr. Alexander – He asked if this was determined mainly from a law perspective because it would be too difficult to define other emergencies.

Ms. Holt – She did not want to speculate.

Mr. Alexander – He could see the benefit of virtual meetings; the City has become much better at conducting virtual meetings. If a person could not physically attend for a non-Covid-related emergency, he would not have an issue with permitting virtual participation.

Mr. Alexander and Mr. Cotter requested that this updated document be as clear as possible.

Ms. Holt – A request could be made to clarify that virtual participation of the applicant can only be for an event Covid- related requiring a 48-hour notice. All emergencies having to be Covid-related, only, should be clearly defined.

The Board recommended that anywhere emergency was mentioned, it needed to be clear 100 percent that 'emergency' entails only a Covid-related issue.

Ms. Holt – Staff will make those requests to be relayed back to City Council.

The Board believed the only new content added to this document was Covid-related but appreciated the updated verbiage throughout.

Mr. Alexander – Council met with all of the members of the Boards and Commission to discuss virtual meetings. There was more comfort with the members to broadcast these meetings virtually and asked why virtual participation could not be opened up for other reasons.

Ms. Holt – The Law Director's email made it clear that Council wants everyone that can possibly participate to attend in person.

Mr. Alexander – He understood that from the perspective of having the Board Member's commitment to participate. However, to be more user-friendly to the people we serve, it seems the citizens could benefit from more opportunities for virtual meetings.

Ms. Holt – The recommendation from this Board to have more opportunities for virtual meetings could be relayed back to City Council.

Mr. Alexander – This recommendation would be from the perspective of providing more services to the City and making government more accessible.

Mr. Cotter – On the other hand, if the Board meets with all persons face-to-face, the meeting becomes more civil and dialogue is much easier to understand when body language can be witnessed also.

Ms. Holt requested a recommendation of approval to City Council for the Administrative Request for updates to the Architectural Review Board Rules and Regulations.

The Chair – All the Board members in attendance are comfortable in spirit but would like to see more clarification that this is just Covid-related.

Mr. Jewell – If the definition of 'emergency' is not clear, "a whole can of worms" could be opened up for what constitutes an emergency and would be so subjective.

Mr. Cotter – Asked if the Board should move to approve.

Ms. Holt – It would make the process nice and neat and a motion to recommend approval would be greatly appreciated.

Mr. Cotter moved, Mr. Jewell seconded, to adopt the 2022 Rules and Regulations with a caveat that 'emergency' is clearly defined as a Covid-related issue only and requires a notice of 48 hours to conduct the meeting virtually.

Vote: Mr. Cotter, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; and Mr. Jewell, yes.

[Approved 3-0]

COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Holt informed the Board of an exciting project that has been started for properties on N. Riverview Street purchased by the City in the Historic District, as an opportunity for redevelopment and long-term economic health and vibrancy. She presented the seven properties included with a brief statement of why they were eligible for this project. The area would be adjacent to Riverside Crossing Park and will be visible from the Dublin Link Pedestrian Bridge. An advisory committee was formed in December 2021, of which Mr. Alexander is a part of. The next step is the Request for Proposals (RFP) process. The committee has requested ideas on how to activate this space and any and all proposals will be considered. The plan may come down to a conglomeration of several proposals. The ARB consists of the experts for the Historic District and are being asked to participate in the review of the draft RFPs. Mr. Cotter and Mr. Jewell were present and stated they would be happy to help, understanding first the tight time frame per City Council.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 7:35 p.m.


Chair, Architectural Review Board


Administrative Assistant II, Recorder