



City of Dublin

**LAND USE & LONG  
RANGE PLANNING**

November 15, 2012

# Minor Project Review

## 12-077ARB - MPR – BSC Historic Core District

### Temptation Yarn – 35 South High Street

This is a request for sign, site, and architectural modifications to an existing building in Historic Dublin. The site is located at the northwest corner of the intersection of South High Street and Spring Hill. This is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review in accordance with Zoning Code Section 153.066(G) and under the review standards of Zoning Code Section 153.170 and the Historic Dublin Design Guidelines.

#### **Date of Application Acceptance**

Thursday, October 25, 2012

#### **Date of ART Recommendation**

Thursday, November 1, 2012

#### **Date of Architectural Review Board Determination**

Thursday, November 15, 2012

#### **Case Manager**

Eugenia M. Martin, ASLA, Landscape Architect | (614) 410-4650 | emartin@dublin.oh.us

## PART I: Application Overview

<i>Zoning District</i>	BSC Historic Core District
<i>Use</i>	Retail (Permitted in BSC Historic Core District)
<i>Building Type</i>	Historic Cottage Commercial (Permitted in BSC Historic Core District)
<i>Review Type</i>	Minor Project Review
<i>Development Proposal</i>	Sign, site and architectural modifications to an Existing Structure
<i>Administrative Departures</i>	Roof Type: To permit a flat roof in the Historic Core.  Building Material: To permit the use of stucco as a primary building material.  Transparency: To permit the non-street ground story transparency along the north building elevation to be 10%, the street façade upper story transparency along the east building elevation to be 23%, the non-street façade upper story transparency along the north and south building elevations to be 0% and 6%.  Setbacks: To permit a fence to be located within the side yard setback.
<i>Waivers</i>	None
<i>Property Address</i>	35 South High Street
<i>Property Owner</i>	Thomas Bassett
<i>Applicants</i>	Heidi Bolyard, AIA NCARB; Bolyard Studio
<i>Case Manager</i>	Eugenia M. Martin, ASLA, Landscape Architect   (614) 410-4650   emartin@dublin.oh.us

## Application Review Procedure: Minor Project Review

The purpose of the Minor Project Review is to provide an efficient review process for smaller projects that do not have significant community effects. The Minor Project Review is necessary to ensure that applications for development meet the requirements of Chapter 153 of the Dublin Zoning Code.

Following acceptance of a complete application for Minor Project Review, the Administrative Review Team shall make a recommendation to the Architectural Review Board to approve, deny, or approve with conditions the application based on the criteria of §153.066(F)(5) applicable to Site Plan Reviews. A determination by the Administrative Review Team is required not more than 14 days from the date the request was submitted. The Architectural Review Board shall make a decision on the application not more than 28 days from the date of the Administrative Review Team's recommendation.

## Zoning Code Analysis

### *Proposal Overview*

The site has a house (35 South High Street) and a small addition at 39 South High Street that front South High Street to the east. The structure is the former Butler House, listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The two-story residential building was built in 1880 and was formerly used for retail and professional offices. An existing projecting sign is on at the southeast corner of the 39 South High Street addition. Parking is to the rear of buildings and is shared with the two existing 1½ story units behind 35 and 39 South High Street toward Mill Lane.



The applicant is proposing a one-story, 500-square-foot expansion to the existing 2,386-square-foot building which is connected to the northwest portion of the 35 S. High Street unit. Proposed site modifications include the installation of two new concrete landings and sidewalk connections to provide access to the proposed addition. Three new signs are proposed with two signs located to the rear of the building and one sign to the front along S. High Street. A new cedar fence is along proposed along a portion of the northern property line.

#### *Zoning Requirements*

The Bridge Street Code identifies building type requirements for new and renovated structures within the BSC Districts with the intent to provide a range of high quality building options to reinforce the character of each district. The Administrative Review Team determined the requirements for the Historic Cottage Commercial building type were most applicable to this proposal:

#### *§153.0062 – Building Types*

The following building type requirements apply to this site:

Roof Type Requirements	This Flat Roof Type is not a permitted roof type in BSC Historic Core. The applicant is requesting an Administrative Departure for the flat roof on the addition.
Materials	Proposed primary building material on the addition is stucco which is not a permitted façade material. Wood panels are proposed below the windows on the east and west elevations. The applicant is requesting an Administrative Departure for the use of stucco as building material.
Color	The proposed paint colors, Sherwin-Williams Sole (SW 6896), Sherwin-Williams Khaki Shade (SW 7533), and Sherwin-Williams Creme (SW 7556) are not from an historic color palette, but are from a complementary color palette.
Entrances & Pedestrianways	The existing principal building entrance faces High Street. There are two existing entrances from the rear parking lot on the west building façade. The applicant is proposing two entrances on the addition; one on the south façade and one on the north façade. All entrances are pedestrian in scale, effectively address the street and parking lot with a sidewalk connection as well as meet all Code requirements.
Windows, Shutters, Awnings, Canopies	The proposed windows are vinyl-clad wood with divided-light clear glass and projecting sills, meeting all Code requirements for windows.
Signs	The proposed building-mounted signs facing High Street on the east elevation and the parking lot on the west elevation are placed above the entrances and are integrated into the architecture of the building.
Individual Building Type Requirements	Refer to the attached Individual Building Type Requirement Table. <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ The side yard setback requirement is not met on the north side of the building (3 feet required, 11-inches proposed for the fence).</li><li>▪ The non-street ground story transparency requirement along the north building elevation is not met (15% transparency required, 10% provided).</li></ul>



- The street façade upper story transparency requirement along the east building elevation is not met (25% transparency required, 23% provided).
- The non-street façade upper story transparency requirement along the north and south building elevations is not met (15% transparency required, 0% provided on the north and 6% provided on the south).

*§153.065(B) – Site Development Standards – Parking & Loading*

The two parking spaces required for the addition on this property are provided by on-street parking spaces that are counted toward this building's requirement.

*§153.065(D) – Site Development Standards – Landscaping & Tree Preservation*

Foundation Landscaping                      The applicant is proposing eleven Boxwood and ten English Ivy along portions of the north and west sides of the building not otherwise occupied by sidewalk.

*§153.065(E) – Site Development Standards – Fencing, Walls, and Screening*

The applicant is proposing a fence, located 10 inches from the northern property line and in alignment with the façade of the coach-house buildings, which will connect the existing coach-house buildings to the new addition. The 3 foot high cedar picket style fence will be painted Sherwin-Williams Crème (SW 7556) to match the trim color used on the principal structure. A gate is proposed approximately 15 feet east of the coach-house building, connecting to an existing walkway on the adjacent parcel. The applicant is requesting an Administrative Departure for the location of the fence which would be required to be located three feet from the property line per the side yard setback requirements of the Zoning Code.

*§153.065(H) – Site Development Standards – Signs*

This single-tenant building is permitted a combination of two different sign types, including ground and building-mounted sign, per each street frontage and an additional building-mounted sign for entrances facing an off-street parking lot. The applicant is proposing two projecting signs on the west and east building elevations, and a wall sign on the west building elevation. None of the signs will be illuminated.

<b>Proposed Wall Signs</b>			
	Permitted	Proposed	Requirement
<i>Size</i>	Max. 8 sq. ft.	4.5 sq. ft.	Met
<i>Location</i>	Within 6 feet of the common public entrance; on walls facing a public street	Installed above the parking lot entrance on the existing structure, centered over the door	Met
	An additional building-mounted sign is permitted for tenants with a dedicated public entrance facing an off-street parking lot		
<i>Height</i>	15 ft. or not extending above the roofline	11 ft. 8 in. overall height above grade	Met
<i>Colors</i>	3	3 total – Black (#199), white (#101), and MP Brilliant Gold (1-Shot! And Matthews)	Met



Proposed Projecting Sign			
	Permitted	Proposed	Requirement
<i>Size</i>	Max. 8 sq. ft.	4.5 sq. ft.	Met
<i>Location</i>	Within 6 ft. of the common public entrance; on walls facing a public street	East Façade - within 4 ft. of the main entrance West Façade - within 4 ft. of the entrance to the addition	Met
	An additional building-mounted sign is permitted for tenants with a dedicated public entrance facing an off-street parking lot		
<i>Height</i>	15 feet or not extending above the sill of the second story window.	East Façade – 12 ft., 2 in. height above grade West Façade – 10 ft. 1 in. height above grade	Met
<i>Colors</i>	3	3 total – Black (#199), white (#101), and MP Brilliant Gold (1-Shot! And Matthews)	Met

## PART II: APPLICABLE REVIEW STANDARDS

The full text of the Minor Project Review standards and the Architectural Review Board standards is attached at the end of this Report.

### Minor Project Review Criteria

The Administrative Review Team reviewed this application based on the review criteria for Minor Projects and made the following findings:

(a) **Similarity to Approved Basic Plan**

*Not applicable*

(b) **Consistency with Approved Development Plan**

*Not applicable*

(c) **Meets Applicable Zoning Regulations**

*Met.* The proposed signs meet the sign provisions of the Bridge Street District.

(d) **Safe and Efficient Pedestrian, Bicycle, & Vehicular Circulation**

*Met.* The proposed sidewalk and concrete landings will provide additional pedestrian connections to the proposed addition.

(e) **Coordination and Integration of Buildings and Structures**

*Met.* The proposed addition is behind the existing structure and is integrated well. The architectural design and material of the proposed addition are compatible with the existing building.

(f) **Open Space Suitability and Natural Features Preservation**

*Not applicable*



- (g) **Adequate Provision of Public Services**  
*Not applicable*
- (h) **Appropriate Stormwater Management**  
*Not applicable*
- (i) **Development Phasing**  
*Not applicable*
- (j) **Consistency with Bridge Street Corridor Vision Report, Community Plan, and other Policy Documents**  
*Met.* The proposed addition, sign, and site improvements contribute to the character of the BSC Historic Core District.

### **Administrative Departure Review Criteria**

The Administrative Review Team has reviewed this application based on the review criteria for administrative departures, which include the following:

- (a) Caused by unique site conditions, conditions on surrounding properties, and/or otherwise complies with the Bridge Street Corridor Vision Report.  
*Criterion Met.* The requested Administrative Departures to permit a flat roof in the Historic Core is appropriate as it simplifies the overall design and gives the appearance of the addition as a standalone portion of the building. The request to use stucco as a primary building material is consistent with the existing building materials and design. The request for the reduction of transparency on the elevations is necessary to meet the Building Code regarding fire suppression given the proximity to adjacent buildings. The request for the location of a fence within the side yard setback is appropriate given the existing site constraints.
- (b) Does not authorize any use, sign, building type, or open space type not otherwise permitted in the BSC zoning district.  
*Not applicable.*
- (c) Does not modify any numerical zoning standards related to building dimensions, lot dimensions or coverage, open space, landscaping, parking, fencing, walls, screening, or exterior lighting by more than 10% of the requirement.  
*Criterion Met.* The requested Administrative Departures do not modify the zoning requirements in excess of 10%, as applicable.
- (d) The Departure, if approved, will ensure that development is of equal or greater development quality.  
*Criterion Met.* The requested Administrative Departures will not diminish the quality of development established in the District.

### **Architectural Review Board**

The Administrative Review Team reviewed this application based on the review criteria for proposals within the Architectural Review District Boundaries, and made the following findings:

#### **General Review Standards**

- 1) Character and Materials Compatible with Context  
*Criterion met:* The proposed modifications are compatible with the character and design of the existing building.



- 2) Recognition and Respect of Historical or Acquired Significance  
*Criterion met.* The proposal is to the rear of, and is subordinate to, the existing building. The minimal modifications proposed to the existing building do not alter the historic significance.
- 3) Compatible with Relevant Design Characteristics  
*Not Applicable*
- 4) Appropriate Massing and Building Form  
*Criterion met.* The proposal is subordinate to the main building and smaller in scale at one-story.
- 5) Appropriate Color Scheme  
*Criterion met:* The proposed colors are appropriate to the architecture and match the existing scheme of the building.
- 6) Complementary Sign Design  
*Criterion met.* The proposed signs meet the provisions of the Bridge Street District.
- 7) Appropriate Landscape Design  
*Criterion met.* The proposed landscape material is appropriate for the proposal and softens the north and west sides of the building.
- 8) Preservation of Archaeological Resources  
*Not Applicable*

#### **Alteration to Buildings, Structure, and Site Standards**

- 1) Reasonable Effort to Minimize Alteration of Buildings and Site.  
*Criterion met.* The proposed addition and modifications are integrated into the existing architecture. A connection will be provided from the site to the existing public sidewalk on the north side of the building.
- 2) Conformance to Original Distinguishing Character.
- 3) Retention of Historic Building Features and Materials.
- 4) Alteration Recognizes Historic Integrity and Appropriateness.
- 5) Recognition and Respect of Historical or Acquired Significance.
- 6) Sensitive Treatment of Distinctive Features.
- 7) Appropriate Repair or Replacement of Significant Architectural Features.
- 8) Sensitively Maintained Historic Building Materials.  
*Not Applicable*

#### **Additions to Existing Buildings, Structure, and Site**

- 1) Use of Traditional Materials on Additions.  
*Criterion met.* The proposed addition uses building materials that are complementary to existing building. The proposed addition is to the rear of the existing building and is clearly distinguishable from the original structure.
- 2) *Contemporary Design of Additions Compatible with Existing Structures.*  
*Criterion met.* The design of the proposed addition and modifications are compatible with the existing building and adjacent structures. Modifications complement and enhance the architecture of the existing building.



3) *Additions are Distinguishable and Subordinate to Original Structure.*

*Criterion met.* The proposed addition is to the rear of the building and is clearly distinguishable from the original structure. The proposed addition does not adversely affect the existing architecture or character of the building.

4) *Addition Recognizes Historic Integrity.*

*Not applicable.*

### **PART III: ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM RECOMMENDATION**

This proposal complies with the Minor Project Review criteria and the applicable development standards of the Zoning Code. The Administrative Review Team recommends approval to the Architectural Review Board for this Minor Project Review application, as submitted with four administrative departures.

- 1) To permit a flat roof in the Historic Core.
- 2) To permit the use of stucco as a primary building material.
- 3) To permit the non-street ground story transparency along the north building elevation to be 10%, the street façade upper story transparency along the east building elevation to be 23%, the non-street façade upper story transparency along the north and south building elevations to be 0% and 6%.
- 4) To permit a fence to be located within the side yard setback.



### MINOR PROJECT REVIEW CRITERIA

The following outlines the full text of the review criteria (summarized above) for all Minor Project Review applications as outlined in Section 153.066(G) of the Dublin Zoning Code.

- (a) The Site Plan shall be substantially similar to the approved Basic Plan.
- (b) If a Development Plan has been approved that includes the property, the application is consistent with the Development Plan.
- (c) The application meets all applicable requirements of §153.059 and §§153.062 through 153.065 except as may be authorized by Administrative Departure(s) pursuant to §153.066(H).
- (d) The internal circulation system and driveways provide safe and efficient access for residents, occupants, visitors, emergency vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians.
- (e) The relationship of buildings and structures to each other and to other facilities provides for the coordination and integration of the development within the surrounding area and the larger community and maintains the image of Dublin as a high quality community.
- (f) The application is consistent with the requirements for types, distribution, and suitability of open space in §153.064 and the site design incorporates natural features and site topography to the maximum extent practicable.
- (g) The scale and design of the proposed development allows the adequate provision of services currently furnished by or that may be required by the City or other public agency including, but not limited to, fire and police protection, public water and sanitary sewage services, recreational activities, traffic control, waste management, and administrative services.
- (h) Stormwater management systems and facilities will not cause alterations that could increase flooding or water pollution on or off the site, and removal of surface waters will not adversely affect neighboring properties.
- (i) If the development is to be implemented in phases, each phase is able to be considered independently, without the need for further phased improvements.
- (j) The application demonstrates consistency with the BSC Vision Report, Community Plan and other related policy documents adopted by the City.

### ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD CRITERIA

The following outlines the full text of the review criteria (summarized above) for all Architectural Review Board applications as outlined in Section 153.174(B) of the Dublin Zoning Code.

(3) *General Character*

- (a) The design of new structures and of additions to existing structures, including new site improvements, shall take into account the architectural style, general design, arrangement, texture, materials and color of other structures and site within the District and immediate vicinity.
- (b) Where changes have taken place in the course of time as evidence of the history and development of adjacent or nearby buildings, structures or sites, if these changes are deemed to have acquired significance and would be compromised by the proposed new development, then this significance shall be recognized and respected in the design of the new development.



- (4) *Architectural Style.* There are a number of intermixes of architectural styles, as well as a larger number of buildings of such modest nature or so extensively remodeled to effectively lose all architectural importance. It is with reference to the basic architectural character of the key buildings noted above that the need for compatibility in the future construction in the District should be made. Compatibility does not infer imitation, but rather an appropriate design in terms of scale, building materials and detail. The architectural character of the various areas of the District consists mainly of four themes:
- (a) Simple rectangular commercial buildings with exterior construction of rubble or random Ashlar limestone, one, one and one-half, or two stories high with gable roof and ridgeline parallel to the street, mainly of the era of 1820 to 1890.
  - (b) Simple rectangular commercial buildings and outbuildings with exterior construction of frame with horizontal siding and corner trim, one, one and one-half, or two stories high with gable roof and ridgeline parallel to the street, mainly of the era of 1820 to 1890.
  - (c) Residential buildings with exterior construction of rubble or random Ashlar limestone, or red brick laid up in common bond, or frame with horizontal siding and corner trim, mainly of the era of 1820 to 1890.
  - (d) Residential buildings with stone on facades, one to one-half stories, mainly of the era 1950-1970.
- (5) *Massing and Building Form.* Massing of new buildings shall be generally similar to those in adjacent and nearby buildings. Building forms should generally reflect those of the architectural style of the building and the Historic District. Variations of gabled roof forms are preferred. Window to wall ratios should be appropriate to the type and use of building constructed.
- (6) *Color.* Traditional colors and combinations of those colors that are both identified with the origin or the era in which the structure or property was originally built and approved by the Architectural Review Board shall be used for exteriors for all new structures to be built, and reconstruction, remodeling and exterior maintenance of existing structures within the Architectural Review District. Fluorescent or luminescent colors are prohibited.
- (7) *Signs.* Signs should be designed to complement the nineteenth century Early American character of the district by incorporating design features common to signs from the 1800s. Materials should complement the architectural character of the District and colors should consistent with the era of the building. Sign types consistent with the character of the Historic District include wall, projecting, window, awning, and sandwich boards.
- (8) *Landscaping.* The landscape design of the site should be consistent with the overall architectural and historic character of the structures on the site. Plant material and methods for installation shall be selected respecting the nature of the urban environment and the survivability and diversity of the plan species. Non-plant material shall be of a type associated with the origin or era in which the structure was originally built. Significant features of the original landscape, e.g., stone walls, shall be preserved.
- (9) *Archaeological.* Every reasonable effort shall be made to record, protect and preserve archaeological resources affected by, or adjacent to, any project.
- (C) *Alterations to Buildings, Structure and Site.* In addition to the General Review Standards, the following shall be met by applications for alterations to existing buildings, outbuildings, structures, and sites prior to approval of a Board Order.
- (1) Every reasonable effort shall be made to ensure that the use of the property will involve minimal



alteration of an existing building, structure or site and its environment.

- (2) The alteration shall conform to the distinguishing, original exterior qualities or character of the structure, its site, and its environment.
  - (3) The distinguishing original qualities or character of a period building, structure, site and/or its environment shall not be destroyed. The removal or alteration of any historic material or distinctive architectural or environmental features should be avoided when possible.
  - (4) All buildings, structures and sites shall be recognized as products of their own time. Alterations that have no historical basis and which seek to create an earlier appearance inconsistent or inappropriate to the original integrity of the building shall be discouraged.
  - (5) Whereas changes which may have taken place in the course of time are evidence of the history and development of a building, structure or site and its environment, if these changes are deemed to have acquired significance, then this significance shall be recognized and respected.
  - (6) Distinctive stylistic features or examples of skilled craftsmanship which characterize a building, structure or site shall be treated with sensitivity.
  - (7) Significant architectural features which have deteriorated should be repaired rather than replaced, wherever possible. In event replacement is necessary, the new material should match the material being replaced in composition, design, color, texture and other visual qualities whenever possible. Repair or replacement of architectural features should be based on accurate duplication of the feature, and if possible, substantiated by historic, physical or pictorial evidence rather than on conjectural designs or the availability of different architectural elements from other buildings or structures.
  - (8) The surface cleaning of structures, if provided as part of the application, shall be undertaken with methods designed to minimize damage to historic building materials. Sandblasting and other cleaning methods that will damage the historic building materials should be avoided.
- (D) *Additions to Existing Buildings, Structures, and Site.* In addition to the General Review Standards, the following shall be met by applications for additions to existing buildings, outbuildings, structures, and site prior to approval of a Board Order.
- (1) Materials for additions should be traditional to the District, but need not match those of the original structure to which the addition is attached.
  - (2) Contemporary design for additions to existing properties shall not be discouraged when they do not destroy significant historical, architectural or cultural materials, and the design is compatible with the size, scale, color, material and character of the property, neighborhood or environment. Roofline additions are discouraged or should be placed and designed to have the least amount of visual impact.
  - (2) Additions should be clearly distinguishable from the original structure by keeping additions at a smaller scale where appropriate or other similar measures. The intent of an addition should be that if the additions or alterations were removed the essential form and integrity of the original structure would be unimpaired. Additions should generally be located to the rear of the original building so that the most significant and visible faces of historic properties are given priority. Additions to the front should be clearly separated from the original building and simplified in design to not detract from the historic



aspects of the structure.

- (3) All buildings, structures and sites shall be recognized as products of their own time. Additions with no historical basis and which seek to create an earlier appearance inconsistent or inappropriate to the original integrity of the building shall be discouraged.

