



MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, October 26, 2022

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Alexander, Chair, called the October 26, 2022, 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, Mr. Cotter, Mr. Jewell, Ms. Cooper, and Ms. Damaser
Staff present: Ms. Holt, Mr. Hounshell, and Ms. Mullinax

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Damaser moved, Mr. Cotter seconded, to accept the documents into the record and to approve the minutes from the meeting held on September 21, 2022, as well as the minutes from the Joint Session held on August 31, 2022.

Vote: Mr. Jewell, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; and Ms. Damaser, 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. There were no cases eligible for the Consent Agenda. 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.

INFORMAL CASE

1. 112 S. Riverview Street, 22-146INF, Informal Review

The Chair stated this application was a request for the construction of a new two-story, residential building on a 0.26-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic Residential. The site is located southeast of the intersection of Pinneyhill Lane and S. Riverview Street.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Hounshell presented an aerial view of the site with a significant grade change from the west to the east of the property along the Scioto River, which is to the east. There are also flood plain limitations. The lot was split in May 2021, following approval of the demolition of an existing duplex at 110-112 S. Riverview Street to create 112 S. Riverview Street. A Minor Project was approved for 110 S. Riverview Street, also. Photographs of homes in the immediate area were shown for context (134-136 S. Riverview Street, 84 S. Riverview Street, 109 S. Riverview Street, and 129 S. Riverview Street).

The proposed site plan reflected the lot split and the footprint for a ±2,500-square-foot, single-family home with a front-loaded garage and front patio that leads to S. Riverview Street, consistent with what was previously approved. There was a Waiver approved for a front-loaded garage on 110 S. Riverview Street, due to the topography and challenge to meet the required setback. If this project moves forward a similar Waiver would be requested as part of the Minor Project Review. The application meets all required setbacks except for the total north and south side yard setbacks, which deviates from the Zoning Code ±6 inches, which would require a separate Waiver. There is a line on the site plan that shows where the property severely slopes off, limiting the developable area between S. Riverview Street and the slope down to the Scioto River.

The proposed front elevation [drawing shown] has a side and front gabled roof system with 24 feet to the peak of the gable, which meets the Code requirements. There are a number of different styled muntined windows and the building materials include: stone; board and batten; and vertical or horizontal siding. The proposed side elevations north and south [drawing shown] differ in design and choice of materials. The proposed rear elevation [drawing shown] as viewed from the Scioto River showed a 3 to 3.5-story height as it followed topography. Three balconies were proposed, two of which were true balconies and the third is more of a Juliet style balcony.

Discussion Questions

- 1) Does the Board support the proposed site layout, including Waivers for the garage location and the side yard setback?
- 2) Does the Board support the proposed mass and scale of the home, including the massing's response to the topography?
- 3) Does the Board support the conceptual architectural character and details of the home, including roof lines and window placement?
- 4) Does the Board support the variety and use of materials proposed for the home?

Applicant Presentation

Dave Johnson, architect, 111 W. Henderson Road, Columbus, OH, presented a 3-dimensional massing study to better illustrate the rear façade. The adjacent house being constructed was also included for context. A Waiver would be needed for the rear height. From the rear, the two houses are compatible with each other. A ranch plan did not allow the architect to get the master bedroom *en suite* on the first floor prompting a second floor. All bedrooms and a study are on the second floor. The front character is eclectic using stone elements from Historic Dublin. The picturesque front façade would add to the streetscape. The house next door is a colonial style, more fitting with Worthington, Ohio.

Questions for Staff and the Applicant

Mr. Cotter – He asked the relative height for the houses on 110 S. Riverview and 136-138 S. Riverview Street.

Architectural Review Board
Meeting Minutes of October 26, 2022
Page 3 of 11

Mr. Johnson – Both houses are 24 feet to the ridge as determined from scaled drawings.
Mr. Hounshell – He did not have access to that information at present.

Mr. Jewell – He asked about the side yard setbacks.

Mr. Hounshell – The requirement is a minimum of 12 feet combined and currently the plans show 11 feet, 6 inches.

Mr. Alexander – Since this is a virgin site where the applicant can start from scratch, there should be no need for a Variance for the side yard.

Mr. Johnson – This was a request to include all of the client's requests/needs, and he did not think 6 inches was a drastic request but the plans can be adjusted to be in compliance.

Ms. Damaser – She inquired about the shed dormer on the side of the house over the garage and if it was set back.

Mr. Johnson – That is to provide ceiling height for that room since the roof pitch is 12:12 and allows the front gable to have a larger presence.

Mr. Jewell – It appears the garage setback is in line with the others.

Mr. Johnson – The garage setbacks are within 2 to 3 feet of each other.

Mr. Cotter – This house looks quite different than the other single-story or 1.5-story houses on the street. He asked the applicant why he thought the proposed character fit.

Mr. Johnson – There is not a consistent style across the street. There is a full brick house and then more cottage/bungalow style houses. This design is his interpretation of old Dublin using stone in strategic places, possibly built on a stone foundation.

Mr. Cotter – He was concerned more with the massing.

Mr. Johnson – He liked vernacular rather than Colonial or Georgian. The Razors/client like an asymmetrical appearance with the front porch having a gable and an arch. This design is a combination of elements the Razors liked and melds the Dublin Historic District aesthetic.

Public Comment

Ms. Holt – There have been no comments submitted online but there is a person in the audience that is interested in addressing the Board on this case.

Denise Frantz King, 170 S. Riverview Street, said photographs in the Board's packets are aerial views taken in the winter from the river of the trees from quite a distance up. She presented photographs of the variety of trees during autumn to illustrate the arboreal context they would have on the homes at 110 and 112 S. Riverview Street. The mass and habitat they create are valuable to wildlife and stream health and contribute to the neighborhood especially to their mature height of over 50 feet. They contribute to the value of the lot and the residents' quality of life. The Dublin Historic District Code requires trees to be safeguarded during construction and preserved. Traditionally, a fence is installed around the drip line of the tree to safeguard the root zone from compaction. This was not done at 110 S. Riverview Street. Instead 24 – 30-inch limestone boulders surround mature trees and an arborist would have to speak to the impact on the longevity of the trees. She urged all to implement the Code and monitor the sites, and tree preservation measures should remain in place during construction on all lots. Landmark trees and stands of mature trees are amenities and should be preserved to the maximum extent feasible. This has been a cause of much angst in the neighborhood. Hiring a certified arborist to come up with a preservation plan is a notable expense, nevertheless, there is a way around this. She suggested monies be allocated in the next budget to create a tree preservation plan for all of the Historic District. Trees are being lost at a fast rate due to their age. There are electric lines that could be buried. We cannot plant street trees; we do not have them.

Architectural Review Board
Meeting Minutes of October 26, 2022
Page 4 of 11

Changes to grade, moisture, and stormwater should be a part of all discussions of construction requests in the Historic District and information provided with every case so the Board knows where the trees are.

Mr. Alexander – Every house that we have reviewed, not on the conceptual level like we are this evening, but Staff has indicated in the Planning Report, the Landmark trees and we have had lengthy discussions about our efforts to save the trees contrary to some of the residents' beliefs in the community. We sympathize and your suggestions are very good about the City having a survey done. When construction starts, it is beyond this Board's purview to monitor what is done. That is really the building official's responsibility and maybe there is a way to strengthen that. He asked Staff if there was some way to communicate internally and see if that can be done in a more diligent way.

Ms. Holt – She will be asking about that tomorrow.

Board Discussion

The Chair – He began the discussion with the questions from the Planning Report.

(Q1) Does the Board support the proposed site layout, including Waivers for the garage location and the side yard setback?

Mr. Cotter – He was generally fine with the layout. The Waiver for the garage is okay because they granted one for the north house. He would prefer the applicant comply with the side yard setbacks. Mr. Jewell, Ms. Cooper, and Ms. Damaser agreed.

Mr. Alexander – He had a concern with the layout and asked if the applicant could flip the design. As is, the three-story mass and garage is right next to the adjacent house. There is a lot more space on the south side. To be a good neighbor, flip the plan. He agreed on compliance with the side yard setback, too.

Ms. Cooper – She asked the applicant if the plan to flip as suggested from Mr. Alexander was considered.

Mr. Johnson – The garages were kept on the same side. He asked the Razors if having the garage on the right would be objectionable.

Scot Shively, Corinthian Fine Homes, said during the initial walk of the lot, he found challenges for placing the garage to the left versus the right were a lot less detrimental. They understand the sensitivity surrounding Dublin's love and protection of trees.

Mr. Alexander – The Board would like to see photographs of trees the applicant is trying to protect, if that is the case.

Mr. Shively - The trees are lower on the property.

Mr. Alexander – The drawings suggest the garage is being elevated, anyway. If the garage is on the north or the south side, there will still be the issue of building under the slab. These are just suggestions.

Mr. Shively - He will discuss with the client to consider.

Bill Razor, 6857 Holbein Drive, Dublin, garages side by side provide mutual privacy for both properties. The neighbor's house is three feet from the lot line. Our house will be four feet from the lot line. They are also excavating under their garage, creating a storage space above. If we flipped, we would look into the neighbor's house.

Mr. Alexander – The Board may go through a series of suggestions.

(Q2) Does the Board support the proposed mass and scale of the home, including the massing's response to the topography?

The Chair – The Code states the rear should step down to the rear.

Mr. Cotter – The front mass is quite large compared to the streetscape and especially the houses to the south. Appears to have too many different rooflines when viewed from the street and too many different materials intersecting on the front.

Architectural Review Board
Meeting Minutes of October 26, 2022
Page 5 of 11

Ms. Cooper – The dormer area above the garage takes away from the front view and makes the garage end seem extreme.

Mr. Johnson – That could be minimized by creating multiple small dormers.

Mr. Alexander – The flat roof on the back and those created by shed dormers will require Waivers by not meeting roof-pitch requirements of which he would not support. The house is so massive and the shed dormer over the garage creates a massive wall, it does not pull back from the façade. The house next door does not have living space up that high. All the non-compliant roofs result in a massive structure. He would have trouble supporting all of the Waivers that would be needed. The mid-level of this design aligns with the upper level of the house next door, creating a level above the adjoining property.

Mr. Jewell – He would not support what is coming off the back side.

(Q3) Does the Board support the conceptual architectural character and details of the home, including roof lines and window placement?

Mr. Alexander – Mr. Cotter had touched on this earlier about the character not fitting in with the residential section of the district.

Ms. Damaser – Upon first look, she saw a Tudor Style home, which seems out of place. She suggested the Tudor Style be minimized.

Ms. Cooper – Agreed.

The Chair – The *Historic Design Guidelines* are clear. Houses in the District are vernacular, which are simplistic in massing and material use. The house next door and across the street have a simple design; this is not. This design does not meet the Zoning Code for all those reasons.

Mr. Cotter – He inquired about the placement of the windows.

Mr. Johnson – The windows were driven by the interior plan, room by room.

Mr. Jewell – Getting the design to fit better in the neighborhood should include a plan for the windows, of a pattern and consistency.

The Chair – When the house next door was reviewed and approved, the Board had stated that was a perfect size for the lot after the split. This house could be larger than that house, but needs to meet all the characteristic design elements. He asked if any other members of the team had additional questions for the Board, for clarity. He suggested the applicant consider putting the bedrooms on the entry level.

Ms. Cooper – The front entry creates a castle-esque approach to the structure. That would not be found in the Historic District; more of a front porch aesthetic would be preferred.

The Chair summarized the points:

- The Board would support the Waiver for the garage.
- The rationale for the Waivers for side yard setbacks have not been provided.
- There are questions about the site layout as to its effect on the neighbor.
- The Board has concerns with the mass and scale of the home and the response to the topography.
- The home design needs to slope down with the hill.
- As of now, the Board would not support the Waivers needed for the roof pitch variations.
- The Board is concerned with the character and the details. Simplification would be more appropriate. A vernacular design would reflect more of the homes in the community. Use fewer materials, especially on the front.

NEW CASE

2. 114 S. High Street, 22-138MPR, Minor Project Review

Architectural Review Board
Meeting Minutes of October 26, 2022
Page 6 of 11

The Chair stated this application was a request for exterior modifications for a commercial building on a 0.20-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic South. The site is located ±85 feet southeast of the intersection of Pinneyhill Lane with S. High Street.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Mullinax presented an aerial view of the site that is surrounded by businesses to the north, south, and west, and single-family homes to the east. The existing 1,605-square-foot, commercial building was built in 1948 in the Colonial Revival style and was the office of Dr. Harry Karrer. The building is recommended contributing to the Historic District as mentioned in the 2017 Historic and Cultural Assessment. Since 2016, a couple of Master Sign Plans have been approved by the ARB for various tenants. Earlier this year, basement excavation and restoration of the rear elevation was approved administratively by Staff. The building permit remains open for this on-going work due to proposed exterior modifications, which require ADA access to the commercial building.

Existing conditions of the site [3 photographs], revealed the site is still under construction due to the basement excavation and restoration. The southeast view showed the location of the proposed deck. The northeast view showed the existing ground story windows proposed to be replaced. The conditions of the existing ground sign and landscaping at the base were included.

The proposed site plan met the permitted lot coverage and setbacks and include: a 468-square-foot deck addition and ADA ramp along the north elevation with the ramp to connect to the existing sidewalk that runs east/west; the roof and the door on the north elevation will be replaced; the HVAC units will be relocated to the south elevation with new HVAC units to be added; new paint for the wood siding and trim; a new sign panel will be added on the existing ground sign pole; and windows are to be replaced. Additional documentation is needed to determine the extent of the window deterioration and if complete window replacements are necessary, or if window repairs, and/or storm windows may be a more appropriate solution.

The proposed materials include: wood siding paint color SW Colonial Revival Gray, and Classical White for the trim; Jeld-Wen, AuraLast pine windows; Certainteed Landmark Pro dimensional asphalt shingles in Georgetown Gray; TimberTech composite material for the deck with a black aluminum railing; and a Pella steel door was proposed to replace the door near the deck but a wood door is required.

The applicant proposed a 5.5-square-foot sign panel for an existing ground sign pole, which will be painted Colonial Revival Gray to match the proposed paint color for the building. The location of the ground sign pole will not change as it was previously approved with a Master Sign Plan to be less than the required 8 feet from the right-of-way. The existing evergreen landscaping at the sign base will remain. Graphics on the sign panel are not Code compliant as proposed. The applicant proposed 4 sign colors: white, orange, black and the logo whereas Code permits a maximum of 3 sign colors. Staff requested additional details: lettering/logo dimensionality which are required to provide a ½-inch relief; the sign panel material; and color details.

Note, conditions are proposed for the Board's consideration for the applicant to continue to work with Staff to ensure the sign meets the Zoning Code and *Historic Design Guidelines*.

The application was reviewed against the Minor Project Review Criteria. Staff recommended approval of the Minor Project with nine (9) conditions:

- 1) That the applicant revise the proposed six-over-six and four-over-six windows to be like-for-like replacements consistent with the existing windows on the front façade, and provide dimensions for

Architectural Review Board
Meeting Minutes of October 26, 2022
Page 7 of 11

- all existing windows to ensure window openings are not enlarged, subject to Staff review and approval prior to revision of existing building permit;
- 2) That the applicant submit glazing specifications for all windows without window film for Staff review and approval prior to revision of existing building permit;
 - 3) That the applicant revise the size of the deck to create an 18-inch offset with the rear of the building prior to revising building permits, subject to Staff review and approval;
 - 4) That the applicant revise the proposed steel man door on the north elevation to a wood door and paint the door to coordinate with the approved siding or trim colors, subject to Staff review and approval prior to revising building permits;
 - 5) That the applicant submit a future MPR application for all landscaping, mechanical unit screening, and deck underside screening within three months of this meeting date, and that all plantings and screening are installed no later than three months from approval of that application;
 - 6) That the applicant revise the sign such that "JBM" is black to meet the maximum permitted number of colors, subject to Staff review and approval prior to applying for a sign permit;
 - 7) That the applicant revise the sign to provide ½-inch dimensional lettering and logo, subject to Staff review and approval prior to applying for a sign permit;
 - 8) That the applicant revise the sign plan to indicate sign panel material, material of the text and logo, and color specifications of all elements, subject to Staff review and approval prior to applying for a sign permit; and
 - 9) That the applicant revise the sign front setback noted on all applicable plan sheets to reflect the existing approved setback.

Questions for Staff

Mr. Cotter – He asked what was just the logo.

Ms. Mullinax – She clarified the name is separate from the logo.

Mr. Alexander – On the company's literature, the letters and graphic appeared as one.

Applicant Presentation

Jeff Baur, JBM Development, LLC, 114 S. High Street, Dublin, OH, stated all of the parties are Dublin residents and they love it here. Our business is a real estate company and plan to have headquarters here. We are currently renting space above the Dublin Barber Shop. We purchased the building at 114 S. High Street one year ago. The only reason we are here submitting the building plans for approval is because ADA access became an issue. We did not want to do a ramp in front as that is the coolest area of their building. We found a way to enter at the side door and then wanted a deck. It was determined at that point an ARB review was necessary. Due to construction, we were not able to get into the building for close to 90 days. The excavation of the basement turned into more of a challenge than anticipated due to the bedrock found. The genesis of being here was the deck. We basically agree with everything Staff has presented except for one minor issue. We are fine bringing in 18 inches of the deck from the rear but still struggling with the 18 inches from the sidewalk. There is a substantial grade problem there. The architect produced a new design to take the ramp completely off the deck and have a switchback off the deck using

Architectural Review Board
Meeting Minutes of October 26, 2022
Page 8 of 11

the same railing with a safer concrete ramp rather than the Timber tech material. He respected the submission dates and understands that he cannot present new information. He was ready to share the new design, which allows the deck to be 18 inches lower and provide proper screening. He plans to provide the window reports that were requested this morning. The windows on the second level were all replaced in 2020. He did not know if the ARB reviewed an application to replace the Jeld-Wen wood windows. The applicant did not own the building at the time. The replacement windows selected for this project are the exact same windows purchased in 2020.

Board Discussion

Mr. Alexander – He recalled the submission in 2020 but could not recall if window replacement was part of that project.

Mr. Baur - Double-hung, wood windows were purchased and more expensive than they would like but are exactly what is there. He said they want to replace the windows as they have deteriorated beyond repair.

Mr. Alexander – He walked the site and asked if all of the windows on the rear were gone.

Mr. Baur – He attested to same.

Mr. Alexander – Preserving windows at the lower level is not an option now. Windows are a significant issue in the Historic District. The Board asks that they review any window destruction/replacements before action is taken. It is odd here because some will be kept at the upper level and ones at the lower level have already been removed. All the windows were subsequently discussed.

Mr. Baur – He questioned next steps.

Mr. Alexander – He asked if Staff could review the windows so the applicant could move forward instead of waiting until December as the November agenda is already full.

Ms. Mullinax – The applicant will need to bring back landscaping plans to the Board for approval, anyway. Preferably in January in time for spring planting. The windows could be submitted with that Minor Project Review application.

Mr. Alexander – The building can be sealed up temporarily. The Board is not making this business non-operational by asking for the proper next steps.

Ms. Holt – Tonight we learned the back wall had to be removed along with the windows. This was not what was anticipated.

Ms. Cooper – She asked to see the windows before they were removed for excavation.

Ms. Mullinax – She did not have those pictures to provide this evening.

Mr. Alexander – He clarified Staff approved the windows below because they did not believe they were original to the house so the Board would not have to review and approve.

Ms. Holt – Based on recollection, at the time of the Administrative Approval, there were two man doors, the understanding was those openings would be enlarged for the basement to be excavated down another couple of feet to create the ceiling height the applicant was after.

Mr. Baur – They never misled anyone. None of the materials in the back were original. The original house had a two-car garage. The entire back of the house and the stone we are being asked to be put back was not original to the house, either. It was stone veneer and not added in 1948. The basement level windows have been approved in order to meet Code and for us to occupy our building. Those 4 windows and the one man door we can find pictures for and those have been ordered.

The Chair – The Board is not going to ask the applicant to do something different, there.

Ms. Damaser – None of the basement windows will be changed. Those are considered done. She asked if the applicant could live with the other existing windows for three months until he can return to the Board.

Mr. Baur – Technically, there is wood and glass there but he is spending more than \$100,000 on renovations and there is water coming in. He received an email at 10:30 am this morning that windows were even going to be an issue. The windows are rotted. The windows upstairs look so good.

Architectural Review Board
Meeting Minutes of October 26, 2022
Page 9 of 11

Mr. Alexander – At the site visit, the windows from the outside looked pretty good but he did not enter the building. The Board should have approved the windows at the lower level and need to follow due diligence and require what we have required of other applicants. The Board should see evidence of these windows.

Mr. Baur – He had some photos with him that he shared at the dais but he was not prepared to have an extensive discussion with the Board about windows this evening.

The Chair – Some of the windows appear to date back to when the building was first built. Staff looked for permits on the auditor's website showing windows being changed. Some of the earlier assumptions may not have been accurate.

Mr. Baur – If he could come back next month, he would not have such pain and frustration with this discussion but being told to wait until December or possibly January because the November agenda is full is a problem. Windows are leaking and yet new drywall, paint, and floors are ready.

Brandon Dominski, JBM Development, but resides 2250 Muirfield Court, Dublin, said he had an original, 1948 floor plan for the south elevation that clearly shows a different set of windows than what Staff shows on the south elevation. **Conversation at dais not recorded.**

The Chair – They were looking at the original blueprint of the building, shared by one of the applicants:

- North/side elevation – There is a grouping of three windows on the original drawing, subdivided in a similar way. It is possible that is an original window.
- West elevation/front – On the first floor, there is a bay window, subdivided the same way as now so potentially that is an original window. On the right of the front door, opening in the same location. Three windows could potentially be original.
- South/side elevation – The window furthest to the west and the window furthest to the east there are openings where there are windows are in these drawings, which could be original. The three windows in the middle are probably not original, they are not shown on the drawings.

From the photographs the Board has seen so far, only one of those windows is not operable, which is not unusual. That is not always a reason to replace the window. Only one of the windows shown to the Board were terribly deteriorated.

Mr. Cotter – He asked if the process could be completed in a shorter period.

Ms. Holt – She suggested conditions could be modified.

Ms. Damaser – Plans will need to be verified and submitted.

The Chair – He verified the Board needs to review further documentation. Staff needs time to write a report and actually review what the applicant submits.

Mr. Baur – There is one window falling out and completely deteriorated; the window could be boarded up, if necessary, for the applicant to occupy the space before approval.

Ms. Holt – Staff will know for certain in a couple of days if the November docket is full. It would be a quick turnaround time given the meeting was moved up to the 16th, due to Thanksgiving.

Ms. Mullinax – She shared the amended conditions.

Ms. Holt – Clarified the conditions for the applicant.

Ms. Damaser – The condition re: the sign colors were discussed. She asked if text can be included in a logo.

Ms. Mullinax – Her experience has not included seeing text/business name as part of a logo/image.

Ms. Damaser – Some companies make the name part of their logo.

Mr. Alexander – On all the drawings, the text and logo appeared to be one; he could be a little flexible.

Ms. Damaser – She asked if logo was defined in the Code. She thought the sign design was cohesive.

Mr. Baur – They had the exact same questions the Board was raising. He provided his business card; the logo had not been changed. He noted the sign for the pop-up shop across the street had multiple colors approved.

Mr. Cotter – He considered the logo as containing the company name.

Ms. Damaser – She noted the State of Ohio. The text around the outside is all part of the logo.

Architectural Review Board
Meeting Minutes of October 26, 2022
Page 10 of 11

Mr. Jewell – He was fine having the text be part of the logo.
The Chair – He requested that condition be deleted from the record.
Mr. Baur – He expressed his appreciation for getting on the November agenda.

Ms. Cooper moved and Mr. Jewell seconded, to approve the Minor Project with nine (9) amended conditions:

- 1) That the applicant revise the proposed six-over-six and four-over-six windows to be like-for-like replacements consistent with the existing windows on the front façade, and provide dimensions for all existing windows to ensure window openings are not enlarged, as applicable, subject to Staff approval, prior to revising existing building permits;
- 2) That the applicant submit glazing specifications for all windows without window film, as applicable, for Staff approval, prior to revising existing building permits;
- 3) That the applicant revise the size of the deck to create an 18-inch offset with the rear of the building, for Staff approval, prior to revising existing building permits;
- 4) That the applicant revise the proposed steel man door on the north elevation to a wood door painted to coordinate with the approved siding or trim colors, subject to Staff approval, prior to revising building permits;
- 5) That the applicant submit a future Minor Project Review application to the ARB for all landscaping, mechanical unit screening, and the underside of the deck screening within three months of this meeting date, and installed no later than three months from approval of that application;
- 6) That the applicant revise the sign to provide ½-inch dimensional lettering and logo, subject to Staff approval, prior to sign permit submittal;
- 7) That the applicant revise the sign plan to indicate sign panel material, material of the text and logo, and color specifications of all elements, subject to Staff approval, prior to sign permit submittal;
- 8) That the applicant revise the sign front setback noted on all applicable plan sheets to reflect the existing approved setback; and
- 9) That the applicant provide additional documentation for the deterioration of the windows including a letter from the window contractor describing the condition of and removal of the existing windows, installation of the new windows, pictures, and descriptions for all windows to be replaced. The applicant shall present window repairs and/or utilizes the use of interior or exterior storm windows. All information is to be presented with the next Minor Project Review application within three months.

Vote: Ms. Damaser, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Jewell, yes; and Ms. Cooper, yes.
[Approved 5 – 0]

Communications

- Ms. Holt stated the City of Dublin and McBride Dale Clarion are among recipients of the 2022 State Historic Preservation Office Awards for the production and implementation of the revised Dublin Historic Code and *Dublin Historic Design Guidelines*.

Architectural Review Board
Meeting Minutes of October 26, 2022
Page 11 of 11

- Mr. Alexander stated he may have misspoken earlier when he referred to a past case as he may have noted the wrong case.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 8:31 p.m.

DocuSigned by:

Gary Alexander

8949DEEC04F0435

Chair, Architectural Review Board

DocuSigned by:

Laurie Wright

8949DEEC04F0435

Administrative Assistant II, Recorder