



MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, March 23, 2022

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Alexander, Chair, called the March 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, Mr. Jewell, and Ms. Cooper
Staff present: Ms. Holt and Ms. Martin

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Cotter moved, Mr. Jewell seconded, to accept the documents into the record and to approve the February 23, 2022, meeting minutes.

Vote: Ms. Cooper, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Jewell, 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 *(Cases 1 and 2 were heard together)*

1. 36-38 N. High Street, 22-019ARB, Demolition

The Chair stated this application was a request for the Demolition of an existing commercial building on a 0.25-acre lot zoned Historic District, Historic Core and located northeast of the intersection of N. High Street with Wing Hill Lane.

2. 36-38 N. High Street, 21-175CP, Concept Plan

The Chair stated this application was a request for a Concept Plan review and feedback on redeveloping an existing building and 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

Ms. Holt presented aerial views of the site between N. High Street to the west, Wing Hill on the south, and Blacksmith Lane to the east. This project was informally reviewed in October 2021. The Concept Plan was reviewed in December 2021 and was tabled pending more information on the Demolition Criteria. Photographs of existing conditions were shown. Photographs of the buildings on the west side included Bri-Hi, Tucci's, Harvest Pizza, and the Community Church for scale and context. Jacob Stout Gallery and Toy Emporium were shown for context on Wing Hill Lane. A graphic depicted the proposed elevation within the context and scale of the surrounding buildings on the east side.

The proposed Site Plan included a 2-story, mixed-use building, a 2-story, 2-unit residential building, the location of the stone wall and privy. There is <85% lot coverage with ADA access required between the parking lot and the building entrances at the mixed-use buildings, trash enclosure, bike parking, and 9, on-site parking spaces. There are two additional parking spaces on the street, and steps on the south are outside the lot line today. The applicant is proposing to rebuild the stone wall and steps, and preserve the privy. There is a debate about the age of the wall at the southeast corner. The site slopes significantly from west to east.

Graphics were presented and discussed for each individual elevation of each building on this site, which included screened depictions of the large trees and buildings that would be seen from behind for better context. All of those comments can be found in the Staff Report and heard in the live-stream video on the City's website. Stated were the following proposed materials: dark-stained, vertical cedar siding; standing seam metal roof; aluminium window frames, aluminium storefront; rusticated limestone veneer; rustic, white brick veneer; smooth limestone cladding; and painted concrete masonry units (CMU). Since the elevations appeared simplified and very flat, exterior inspirational photographs of beautiful modern structures were shown to help tell the story of this proposal. These designs may not be appropriate for the Historic District.

This structure has five of seven integrity markers noted to be contributing to the district. The demolition process for contributing structures must include: a demonstration by the applicant of credible evidence that the owner will suffer economic hardship, if the Demolition request was not granted; and an approved Demolition request, which provides assurance to the applicant to move forward with plans. While the applicant requested approval of the Demolition Request at the conclusion of this meeting, no physical demolition may begin without the Final Development Plan and building permits for new structures.

The application was reviewed against the Demolition Criteria for which the analysis was provided to the Board. Approval was recommended for the Demolition with the following condition:

- 1) That this approval does not permit early demolition, prior to approval of a Final Development Plan and building permits.

The Concept Plan was reviewed against applicable criteria and was recommended for approval with 11 conditions:

- 1) The applicant submit a Parking Plan with the Preliminary Development Plan submittal, ensuring all parking conforms to the requirements outlined in the Code, including bike parking and trash enclosure locations;
- 2) At the next submittal, the applicant shall provide an accessible path from the on-site parking to the mixed-use building and show that accessible entrances are provided for this same building;
- 3) The applicant shall preserve the historic stone wall, steps, stoops, handrail, and privy in situ. Provision of graphic details on how all these elements tie into the proposed building design shall be provided. Provision of photographs of the southeast wall, to help determine age, shall be provided if possible;
- 4) The applicant shall revise the proposed design of the mixed-use building such that it is no higher than 1.5 stories to be more compatible with the height surrounding buildings within the Historic District;
- 5) On both buildings, all window and door placement, size, materials, and trim details shall be historically appropriate (two-over-two or six-over-six, aluminum-clad over wood). Proposed metal panels within the window openings shall not be used, and header/sill details shall match adjacent cladding. Construction methods shall address fire-rating concerns to allow appropriate fenestration on the south property line;
- 6) All proposed white brick on both buildings shall be replaced by native-appearing stone or red brick. The proposed dark vertical wood siding on both buildings shall be replaced by horizontal siding in traditional colors;
- 7) Both buildings shall demonstrate greater dimension and detail regarding windows, window trim, and roof eaves;
- 8) Both buildings shall address concerns with water table materials, and their scale, at the next submittal. All proposed painted CMU shall be replaced by a more appropriate material;
- 9) All proposed steel awnings on both buildings shall be changed to fabric awnings, or shed/gable roof feature, to meet the *Guidelines*;
- 10) The residential building shall be revised to better respond to the adjacent single-family homes along N. Blacksmith Lane/N. Riverview Street in style and materials. If the water table on the residential buildings remains stepped, the siding materials shall have corresponding "addition" details; and
- 11) The proposed roof cut-outs on the residential building shall be removed in favor of a more sympathetic feature.

Questions for Staff

Mr. Cotter – One of the conditions for the Concept Plan is for the applicant to keep the height at 1.5 stories. Context was requested for that recommendation by Staff.

Ms. Holt – Three quarters of the buildings on the east side of N. High Street are one story. Single-story buildings exist across the street for the most part, with the exception of Bri-Hi. A one and a half story building would be a good compromise. There is a delicate balance between a "cottage feel" and taller buildings on the corners.

The Chair – Each condition needs to be discussed as a number of them will need revision.

Applicant Presentation

The applicant passed on giving a presentation but made clear they were available for questions.

Board Discussion

The Chair – The Demolition needs to be discussed, first.

Mr. Jewell – He appreciated the financial numbers provided to better review the request. There would be a significant financial cost that warrants consideration of a demolition.

Mr. Cotter – He understood the applicant's demonstration of the amount of money being put into the project and what would be needed to obtain a profit. He asked what the statement from the applicant was about risk.

Bob Lombardi, 4912 Visaro Way, Dublin, OH - Replacing the current building with a one-story structure would not be feasible.

Mr. Alexander – There are questions about how the stone retaining wall on the north side of the property should be treated.

Mr. Lombardi - Hanlin Rainaldi Construction stated that because of the condition of the existing wall, it would be quite expensive to secure it to prevent it from caving in.

Mr. Alexander – Agreed the wall is going to fall at some point.

Mr. Lombardi – This would not be a simple fix.

Mr. Alexander - Noted the surrounding walls that also need significant repair.

Mr. Lombardi – Only one section of the walls is in decent shape.

Mr. Alexander – Agreed with the recommendation for approval of the Demolition request. The applicant provided much better information than the Board has seen before.

The Chair – Requested a conversation about height for the proposed buildings. At the previous meeting, a few of the Board Members were fine with a two-story building. The rationale was one and a half stories for a commercial building does not work and would need to be only one story that would take up more of the site footprint. Smaller than a two-story building would be less appropriate for the street and the project would be less viable. There was confusion in the consultant's report regarding scale and size. Handling trim and treatments are a way to make the appearance of a building seem smaller.

Ms. Cooper – It would be an economic problem, if we limit the height to a story and a half. Looking further up the street going north, there are 2-story buildings. Heading south there are smaller buildings with the exception of the building on the corner. She was less concerned now about the height, which impacts the economic viability of the project. There is still work to be done in the details of the architecture to enhance this look. The building can be made to look unobtrusive.

Mr. Cotter – Reiterated from the last meeting that the appearance could be softened. He agreed with Mr. Alexander and Ms. Cooper about height. As the area transitions, the buildings could potentially become taller. He supported two stories.

Ms. Cooper – The square footage proposed is relatively small.

The Chair – Invited the applicant to respond to these comments.

Tim Lei, 400 W. Bridge Street, Columbus, OH – He appreciated the support for two stories after considering the context of the surroundings. He planned to work on the façade details once they receive the approval for Demolition. The proposal is different but not for the sake of just being different. Building a new structure in a Historic District in this day and age needs to be considered as to not be out of touch with reality. His proposal is to reflect appreciation for the area, respect what is there but also to create something that is unexpected. For that reason, they purposefully designed the windows to be different sizes and shapes but fitting with both building facades when right next to each other to create a rhythm, not just individual building facades. Their intent was more playfulness and less rigidity.

Mr. Alexander – The Code states that a new building should look like a new building and reflect the time period it is in. The Code also states there is a palette of materials and certain other practices; the challenge then is finding a balance. He appreciated the applicant's explanation of using a round window, for example.

The Chair – Requested that the details be discussed, one-by-one for each facade. He asked for input from the Board on a list he created to address the features that were noted in the Staff Report.

Q. The front of the north building. The eaves are extremely tight, siding is vertical instead of horizontal, there is a lack of trim, and metal panels; not typical of historic buildings.

Mr. Cotter - Needs to be softened; lighter colored horizontal siding; and prefers symmetrical windows

Ms. Cooper – Likes that this stands out and distinguishes itself with unique characteristics but the color and orientation make it appear institutionalized and very stark, whereas the building next to it is inviting. A change would soften the design and appear more historic. Align windows with doors.

Mr. Jewell – Echoed comments. Without hearing the architect's reasons for using the windows the way he did, he and others would not understand. Consistency would appeal to the normal population.

The Chair – We have a list of approved materials to be used in the District; metal panels may promote push back. Staff has worked two years at least just on colors while amending the Code. He advised the applicant to review all the approved materials and colors. There are materials that will work with your design and that would alleviate discussion.

Mr. Jewell – If the vertical siding was changed to horizontal in orientation, it might draw attention to the lack of trim for windows and prove more awkward.

- A. Mr. Lei – Sometimes materials are used because they 'make for a good story'. They are willing to be flexible and compliant. They need to have a masonry water table.

- Q. South Building - Some windows have trim, some not. Looking for more continuity.

Ms. Cooper – The southern-most window should be the same size as the one to the north.

Mr. Cotter – Agreed with Ms. Cooper.

- A. Mr. Lei – He saw how the various designs of the windows could be misunderstood. Stone buildings usually do not have trim around the windows. There is no trim for the middle of the window, which is the result of the covered porch coming too close to add trim. Trim for a rectangular window is straightforward but not so much for a circular window; that established the rhythm. Something should demark the doorway. We may just have trim on the doorway and no windows.

The Chair – Per the comments received through analysis, if there is no trim for windows, the building becomes sterile.

Mr. Alexander – Windows in stone have a brick mold and secondary trim to a sash window. There does not have to be a lintel but there needs to be a small amount of trim.

- Q. Using approved materials.

Ms. Cooper – She understood the applicant's reasoning for the materials selected. She asked if the applicant was willing to make a change to the material proposed for the water table. The smooth texture appears like an after-thought.

- A. Mr. Lei – That material was selected to separate the stone wall that will be at the base, beyond the water table. The client requested a stone building but wants to differentiate it enough from the wall to be restored. They will explore other options.

Ms. Cooper – She was in agreement to having a different material there but it needs to be an approved material for an appropriate distinction while appearing as it was meant to be there and not an add-on.

Mr. Cotter – Having distinction is good but requested a material more cohesive to the front and this side.

- Q. Appropriateness of the large round window.

Ms. Cooper – It is kind of cool and provides uniqueness. It is sitting on a façade facing an alley, which is probably best. Mr. Lei had already said they were the oldest style of windows. She liked how the round window was centered above the door.

Mr. Cotter – He is not a historical architect but does not find large round windows anywhere; not certain it is appropriate here.

Ms. Cooper – Is the round window prohibited?

Mr. Alexander – Hard to find language in the Code that is relevant; it is not prohibited. He advocated for keeping the door and stoop there because that side elevation will be as visible as the front. Trim around the door makes sense. He was not certain how a round window fits into the Code. The issue is scale. A circular window in a historic building is referred to as a bull's eye.

A. Mr. Lei – His vision for a window was the Rose Window in Notre Dame in Paris, France.

Q. Backside of the building.

Mr. Cotter – Asked for a reason for the blank wall in the middle.

Mr. Jewell – Asked if the wall and base have been reconstructed there.

Mr. Alexander – If there is to be a restaurant inside at that location, there will be a lot of equipment coming out of that back wall. Whatever the solution is, it will be compromised by fans/exhaust, etc. He is less concerned with the blank wall for these reasons.

A. Mr. Lei – They intend for this space to be a restaurant and that is where the kitchen would be. Windows there would not be conducive to the use of the space inside. That façade will not be highly visible; it is the back of the building they wanted simple and practical. The stone wall requires a lot of work but two-thirds of it is in good condition. More discussion is needed to decide how to shore the wall up.

Q. Mr. Alexander – Concerned about the changing foundation, digging to accommodate a new building and how that will affect the wall that is so close to the new building's intended foundation. The wall may need to be rebuilt.

A. Mr. Lei – Agreed that will be most challenging, structurally. Currently, that corner is settling and they will need to provide a solid foundation.

Q. Mr. Cotter – Back to the door and stoop, which is currently brick, you proposed a different material. If the stoop stays in place there should be a way to make it distinct.

A. Mr. Lei – The stoop is not part of the water table, which is a third element.

Q. Mr. Lei – Inquired about the limitation on color for bricks and why primarily red.

A. Ms. Holt – Planning receives many requests from residents in the Historic District to paint their red brick buildings, white, due to a current trend. The concern for using white-painted brick instead of the natural color of brick is that it will become a precedent.

Mr. Lei – They are not proposing to use a white brick here. A product they are using in other projects is a Beldon Brick, Yoken Blend and it is made that way; not a painted product. It is a limestone gray color with a variation of darker and lighter colors.

Ms. Holt – When seen from afar, it would not go with the traditional materials that are so strongly emphasised in the *Guidelines*.

Q. The Chair – Asked if the brick has to absolutely be red. It is clear white painted brick is not wanted but this proposed brick is a blend.

Ms. Cooper – We cannot determine if that color will work until the applicant chooses a different color for the siding.

A. Mr. Alexander – The Board may be open to a new color but white is not permitted nor a color that matches the mortar. And yet there might be some flexibility.

Ms. Cooper – Fascinated with how this brick is made. There are other materials proposed in the gray family so there is an opportunity that this might work.

Mr. Jewell – Agreed with Ms. Cooper to make a determination after a new siding color is proposed.

Ms. Cooper – The proposed brick is called Rustic White and she did not find that to appear white. If it is a naturally made material, it could work quite well there.

- Q. Ms. Cooper - Back to the round window, she has just now done some research on round windows and possibly an arched window could work. She presented an example to the Board Members of an Italianate window. She had more of a problem with the smaller window on the one side compared to the larger round window on the south side. In the Planning Report, gridded windows were recommended to better blend with the buildings currently in the area. That might be a better look with horizontal siding and certainly would match other windows used in the District. Those would provide more consistency but the proposed buildings would no longer look modern.

Mr. Alexander – Storefront windows typically are not gridded. The Board will need to review the overall look of the building before stating grid windows need to be on it. Without other adjustments, that may not look appropriate.

Mr. Alexander – The pertinent comment about shifting the vertical siding to the horizontal, using vertical windows with common widths would be a way to establish more continuity. There have not been large expanses of glass or windows found in the District (referring to the first floor).

- A. Mr. Lei – He understood and could go along with that.

The Chair - The Board is trying to provide as much feedback as possible and being the only project this evening, they are able to take more time so future visits here will be as productive as possible, which the applicant appreciated.

- Q. Townhomes facing east.

Mr. Jewell – Requested horizontal siding again. He asked for an explanation of the open roofs on the decks.

- A. Mr. Lei – There is a desire to have an open terrace on both sides on the second floor to relieve that street corner. Instead of having a massive cut in the massing, maintaining the massing of the gable was the intent, preserving the frame of it.

Mr. Lombardi – There are no grassy areas; they wanted to provide an area for fresh air.

Mr. Alexander – Terraces would be a nice amenity and it makes sense facing the park.

Mr. Cotter – While it is an interesting feature, it looks a little modern, just as the consultant had commented. He was still uncomfortable with round windows.

Mr. Lei – This is a smaller scale building compared to what is in the front. That is the reason for brick instead of stone as it is a smaller material.

- Q. The Chair – Asked for feedback on the cut-outs and the way the roof extended. Instead of being an uncovered terrace, the roof extends leaving a cut-out.

Mr. Jewell – The appearance is definitely more modern. For functionality, if someone is on the terrace they can still get wet; there is no real protection from the elements. He liked the idea of providing some deck space but suggested adding protection from the elements.

Ms. Cooper – Inquired about awnings providing protection and would that be more consistent within the District. She did not like the round window on this structure. She asked if a new material was being added here on the townhouse.

The Chair – On another façade, he asked if the Board liked the cut-outs.

Mr. Alexander - On the front of the buildings, particularly the one to the south, marks the center like a traditional building. The cut-out faces two sides. The roof stops and a story and a half wall is seen on the inside of that, creating a very different look. In both the Staff and Consultant's report, the terraces were not seen as a positive element.

- A. Mr. Lei – Good idea from Mr. Jewell. They both have cedar siding; one is stained a gray and the other just has a clear finish.

He asked Staff for a newer version of the cut-outs, in perspective, to better present them to the Board.
Mr. Cotter – Likes having a porch but this looks out of place here. He suggested a less modern approach.

Mr. Alexander – Nobody is adverse to the idea; it is the severity of the triangular cut-out at the front and the opening at the roof at the side. That is the perfect place for a deck. There are a number of ways to deal with that edge.

Mr. Cotter – Looks like modern art.

Mr. Jewell – With our climate, we do not have a lot of great days. The functional use for being totally exposed may play to a resident that they could only use it half the time due to the need to get out of the elements. Definitely a good solution to the lack of green space.

Mr. Lei – Would a full roof be a solution with the corner cut out?

Mr. Cotter – An awning would not box it in like a roof will.

Ms. Cooper – Offered a solution that would also provide storage space on top, which would be a positive feature.

- Q. Stepping of the water table generated some comments.

Mr. Cotter – With the grade change, this needs to be addressed and he was fine with the proposal.

Mr. Jewell – The material being proposed is the concern.

- Q. Mr. Jewell – Inquired about the steps leading down into the lot and the privy. He suggested finding an alternative access to the lot. It will open all kind of Code issues and the stairs could be a big animal there.

- A. Mr. Lei – Currently, those stairs are not safe. The height is wrong and there are no proper railings, which actually make them dangerous. The applicant is exploring how to make the stairs usable and safe. We could leave the stairs there but not allow anyone to use them.

Mr. Alexander – That comes back to the engineers and how the walls are being dealt with. Safety is very important along with reducing the owner's liability.

- Q. South building

Ms. Cooper – Trash has not yet been accounted for. The applicant will have to accommodate commercial trash collection of which they will have to back to the facility. The alley itself is not real wide. Even if a smaller dumpster is used, the trash company has to be able to get back there to lift the trash out. If she was in this residential area, she would not want it anywhere near there. That might force the applicant to look at the other side, by the commercial building.

Mr. Jewell – Advised the applicant to take into account the amount of trash from the commercial businesses including a restaurant that will accumulate.

Ms. Cooper – Inquired if there were going to be two parking spaces as shown on the plan.

- A. Mr. Lei – They will explore the idea of sharing the trash with the next door neighbor as well as investigating the logistics with the trash company.
Parking is currently in the conceptual phase.

Ms. Cooper moved and Mr. Cotter seconded, to approve the Demolition with the following condition:

- 1) That this approval does not permit early demolition, prior to approval of a Final Development Plan and building permits.

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

The Chair suggested reading and talking through each condition as follows:

- 1) The Chair – That was discussed earlier.
- 2) The Chair – The accessibility needs to be addressed
Mr. Lei – He had a problem with that. There is no obvious or easy solution due to the existing grade and slope of the alley.
The Chair – He asked for clarification on what is meant by this Accessible entrance condition.
Ms. Holt – There has to be an accessible path from parking to the mixed-use building. This includes the spaces on the street.
Mr. Lei – Could the space in front of our place on High Street serve as accessible parking to solve this?
- 3) The Chair – The applicant will preserve the historic stone wall, steps, stoops, and handrail. In situ means exactly as it is. Nobody knows if that is possible with developing the structure the way it was proposed.
Ms. Holt – If the City allows reconstruction of the stone wall, steps, handrail, and stoops, then the City has lost the character that Mr. Wing put into it back in 1934 or earlier, becoming something different.
The Chair – When the dentist came before us about that same wall. Their consultants and what the Board fell on was that they could rebuild it. Many times with these walls, there are conditions behind which would also need to be changed for it to still be a wall. The concern and attention cannot just be with the external part. Their consultants found there was a major retention wall that needs to be rebuilt behind it. The only way to keep that wall was to tear it all down, rebuild the retaining wall and then finish the exterior of the wall. He did not want to box someone in. Once they start digging the foundations for the one wall/south, they will be in so deep; that south wall would probably need to be rebuilt also. The east wall that wraps around the wing wall needs to be completely rebuilt. That information can be found in other documents. This Board told the other applicant, if they needed to move it a foot or two to work, they could.
Ms. Cooper – She had been at that site for the other applicant and the wall was bowing out then. Part of the problem were the scrub trees that are growing. The wall has been repaired, internal structure added, and it goes all around Lot 40 coming up to the building that is being built. She heard first hand that the wall was not structurally safe and could not be preserved as is; the wall would need to be removed, shored up and stable, and finally the stone added. Even then the places the concrete had been added and repaired in different places was visible. There is not a lot of room so in order to get equipment back there to first move it to put in footers, potentially the wall would be damaged. She recommended taking it down and rebuilding it. She would steer clear of the wall that runs along Lot 40 so the integrity is not affected.
Mr. Alexander – If the walls are not addressed now, it would be too hard to do after new buildings have been built.
Ms. Cooper – The Board would need to see an engineer's report to see what has been done to make the wall safe, without having to take it down.
Mr. Alexander – The applicant will have a structural engineer on the site working on other aspects of the project that would do that as a matter of course.

Mr. Cotter – The Board will want to know what the client has done to preserve the walls or leave them as they are and where that is not possible, the stone walls would be put back, as they were.

The Chair – Asked for the Board's input about the revised language for the conditions Ms. Holt was rewriting.

Ms. Cooper – The applicant has already stated the steps are not safe and not built with a standard building design. If we want to preserve the steps, we will need ropes around it to keep people from walking on it.

The Chair – Preferred to keep the language of condition 3, broad.

Mr. Jewell – Agreed as the walls would be a project of their own.

4) The Chair - 1.5 stories should be changed to 2 stories, to which the Board agreed.

5) The Chair – Condition should be less descriptive, again the Board Members agreed.

Mr. Lei – When the term/condition "Historically Appropriate" is used, it is very open-ended; and very difficult to objectively define as it is evolving and not static. The applicant will reconsider the original three round windows proposed; the Code does not specifically state round windows are not permitted.

The Chair – All of these conditions refer back to the Code, which evolves. The brick color needs to be addressed.

6) The Chair – This was discussed earlier.

7) The Chair – This is clear.

8) The Chair – This is already flexible.

9) The Chair – Address the materials.

10) The Chair – This was addressed earlier.

Mr. Jewell moved and Mr. Cotter seconded, to approve the Concept Plan with 10 conditions, as amended:

- 1) That the applicant submit a Parking Plan with the Preliminary Development Plan submittal, ensuring all parking conforms to the requirements outlined in the Code, including bike parking and trash enclosure locations;
- 2) That the applicant shall provide an accessible path from the parking lot to the mixed-use building and show that accessible entrances are provided for this same building, at the next submittal;
- 3) That the applicant shall work with Staff to preserve or rehabilitate the historic stone wall, steps, stoops, and handrail to the best extent practicable and demonstrate how the stone wall, steps, and privy tie into the proposed building design. The applicant shall provide photographs of the southeast wall to help determine age;
- 4) That all window and door placement, size, material, and trim details shall be historically appropriate. Proposed metal panels within the window openings shall not be used, and header/sill details shall be appropriate to the adjacent cladding, on both buildings. Construction methods shall address fire-rating concerns to allow appropriate fenestration on the south property line;
- 5) That all proposed brick shall be replaced by native-appearing stone or brick on both buildings. The proposed dark vertical wood siding on both buildings shall be replaced by another more appropriate material;
- 6) That the applicant shall demonstrate greater dimension and detail regarding windows, window trim, and roof eaves on both buildings;
- 7) That the applicant shall address concerns with water table materials and their scale for both buildings, at the next submittal. All proposed painted Concrete Masonry Unit materials (CMU) shall be replaced by a more appropriate material;

- 8) That all proposed steel awnings on both buildings shall be changed to fabric awnings or a shed/gable roof feature, to meet the *Guidelines*;
- 9) That the residential building shall be revised to better respond to the adjacent, single-family homes along N. Blacksmith Lane and N. Riverview Street in style and materials; and
- 10) That the proposed roof cut-outs on the residential building shall be removed in favor of a more sympathetic feature.

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

3. HD Paint Colors, 20-130ADMO, Administrative Request - Other

The Chair stated this application was a request for a review of proposed updates for the establishment of pre-approved paint colors for the Historic District and outlying historic properties.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Martin – As a result of the Historic District Code Amendments and the revisions to the *Historic Design Guidelines*, Staff was directed by City Council to add clarity, create predictability, and streamline the review process for residents and businesses in the Historic District to change paint colors. Staff will be able to administratively approve changes to paint colors, if the colors are selected from the pre-approved palette. Historically-appropriate color palettes have been recommended. The presentation was a request for the Board to provide input and feedback on the proposed, pre-approved, paint colors.

At the meeting on August 25, 2021, the ARB was supportive of the proposed document organization by time period; supportive of an array of neutral colors; and suggested that the bold, non-neutral colors be refined further.

Staff has clarified (pg. 3) the applicability and process for review and approval of paint colors; provided general guidance (pg. 4) regarding paint color selections; simplified the historical narrative; eliminated duplicative information; and refined the final paint color palette.

Approval is recommended for the Administrative Request to update the Historic District's pre-approved paint colors.

Board Questions for Staff

Mr. Jewell – New to this project but found the document easy to follow. It is nice to provide residents with site history. Overall, it was well done and he was impressed.

Mr. Alexander – It is great what Staff has accomplished. This is the third iteration. He pointed out a lot of work had gone into this document. He asked if there will be someone checking to see if these colors are still available on a yearly basis; sometimes the numbers change or something goes out of style.

Ms. Martin – It is written in the process section that this information will be updated as appropriate from time-to-time, at which time, the Board will be asked to review and approve the updates proposed. Administrative items like name changes would be updated by Staff and not require further review. The numbers tend to hold true longer than the names do.

Ms. Cooper – If you bring in a color that is no longer available, the paint stores or hardware stores will do a color match. She commended Staff on a job well done.

Mr. Jewell – He recalled an earlier Board Member that asked if there was to be a limit on paint colors.

Ms. Martin – In the general guidance section there is language that buildings should not exceed three colors unless determined to be architecturally appropriate. This would entail a body, trim, and accent color for the majority of our vernacular buildings. With this flexibility, if a Queen Anne style needed to be repainted, there could be more than 3 colors, for example.

Public Comment

Ms. Holt – Public Comment was received in late February from Denise King. All of her requests had been made or at least considered. They were mainly scribner's errors.

Ms. Cooper moved and Mr. Jewell seconded, to approve the Administrative Request to update the pre-approved paint colors for the Historic District.

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


Communications

Ms. Holt stated the following:

- Administrative Approvals were included in this packet and they will continue to be included on a quarterly basis.
- National Alliance of Preservation Commissions bi-annual meeting is being held in Cincinnati, OH this year. If interested in attending, please see Judy Beal in the Clerk's Office.
- On April 11, 2022, a reception is being held for outgoing and incoming Board and Commission Members. The incoming member for this Board is Hilary Damaser.
- On April 20, 2022, there will be an annual training with Greg Dale. From 5:00 – 6:00 pm he will meet only with the Chairs and Vice Chairs, dinner will be served from 6 – 6:30 pm, with the entire Board and Commission Members meeting from 6:30 – 8 pm in the Development Building.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 7:32 p.m.


Chair, Architectural Review Board


Administrative Assistant II, Recorder