



# Minor Project Review

## 13-065ARB-MPR – BSC Historic Residential District

### 137 South Riverview Street

This is a request for site and architectural modifications for an existing single-family residence on the west side of South Riverview Street, south of the intersection with Pinney Hill. This is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review application review in accordance with Zoning Code Sections 153.063(B) and 153.070, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

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

Wednesday, July 3, 2012

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

Thursday, July 18, 2013

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

Wednesday, July 24, 2013

#### **Case Manager**

Jennifer M. Rauch, AICP, Planner II | (614) 410-4690 | jrauch@dublin.oh.us

## **PART I: Application Overview**

<i>Zoning District</i>	BSC Historic Residential District
<i>Use</i>	Single Family Residential (Permitted Use in BSC Historic Residential District)
<i>Building Type</i>	Single Family Detached (Permitted Building Type in BSC Historic Residential District)
<i>Review Type</i>	Minor Project Review
<i>Development Proposal</i>	Architectural Modifications to an Existing Structure
<i>Administrative Departures</i>	None
<i>Waivers</i>	None
<i>Property Address</i>	137 South Riverview Street
<i>Property Owner</i>	Greg and Paula Sharpin
<i>Applicants</i>	Brian Zingleman, architect
<i>Case Manager</i>	Jennifer M. Rauch, AICP, Planner II   (614) 410-4690   jrauch@dublin.oh.us

## **Application Contents**

The proposal includes a 432-square-foot, one-story addition located to the rear of the existing 1,264-square-foot house. The proposed addition will be located to retain the existing patio area and underground cistern at the southwestern corner of the house, and an existing tree located in the northwestern portion of the lot. The one-story addition will include a single window along the southern elevation, a series of new windows along the northern elevation, and a new door and windows along the western elevation, which will incorporate wood trim. The overall proposal includes cedar shake shingle siding, which will be painted to match the existing home and a new asphalt shingle roof.

## **PART II: ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM COMMENTS**

### **Land Use and Long Range Planning**

#### **Minor Project Review**

##### *§153.062(E) – Materials*

The proposed cedar shake siding, asphalt shingle roof, and proposed paint colors meet Code. The applicant will be required to provide an asphalt shingle which meets the 300lb requirement.

##### *§153.062(H) – Windows*

The proposed windows are aluminum-clad with clear glass and wood trim, which meet Code. The windows are proposed as a one-over-one style on the three elevations. No window divisions are proposed, as the window styles on the original structure and a previous addition

vary. The applicant's intent was to match the previous addition and continue to differentiate the original home from the newer portions.

*§153.063(B) – Historic Residential District  
Lot Area, Width, Coverage, Building Height*

There are no changes affecting lot area or width requirements. The proposed addition results in a lot coverage of 21%, where 50% is permitted. The height of the proposed addition is 14 feet, where 35 feet is permitted.

*Minimum Setbacks*

The required setbacks for the Historic Residential District are based on the named street. The proposal meets the requirements for properties along the west side of South Riverview Street, including a 20-foot front yard, 3-foot side yard with a total of 12-foot, and a 15-foot rear yard.

*Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*

The *Guidelines* state additions should be located toward the rear of the original building, keeping the appearance of the original structure unchanged. Additions should be subordinate to the original building and be an obvious difference between the original and the addition, which can be accomplished by keeping the addition at a smaller scale. This proposal is in keeping with those guidelines.

**Building, Engineering, Parks and Open Space, Fire, Police, Economic Development**

No comments.

**PART III: APPLICABLE REVIEW STANDARDS**

**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 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.

**Applicable Administrative Review Team**

**Minor Project Review Criteria**

The Administrative Review Team has reviewed this application based on the applicable review criteria related to this proposal for Minor Projects, which include the following:

**(c) Meets Applicable Zoning Regulations**

*Criterion Met with Condition:* The proposal meets the Code with the condition that the applicant uses a 300lb asphalt shingle for the roof.

**(j) Consistency with Bridge Street Corridor Vision Report, Community Plan, and other Policy Documents**

*Criterion Met.* The proposed modifications maintain the character desired within the Historic Residential District.

**Architectural Review Board Review Criteria**

Section 153.174 of the Zoning Code identifies criteria for the review and approval of a Board Order for proposals within the Architectural Review District Boundaries. Following is an analysis by Planning based on those criteria.

**General Review Standards**

1) Character and Materials Compatible with Context.

*Criterion Met.* The proposal incorporates design elements from the original building architecture and uses similar form, roof shape, window proportions and building ornamentation.

2) Recognition and Respect of Historical or Acquired Significance.

*Criterion Met.* The proposal does not modify the historic portion of the house.

3) Compatible with Relevant Design Characteristics.

*Criterion Met.* The proposal design of the addition is compatible with the original house and the previous addition.

4) Appropriate Massing and Building Form.

*Criterion Met.* The massing and location of the proposed addition in relationship to the existing structure is appropriate and has limited effect on the character of the existing cottage-style home.

5) Appropriate Color Scheme.

*Criterion Met.* The addition will incorporate the same material and colors as the original house and the previous addition.

7) Appropriate Landscape Design.

*Criterion Met.* The location of the addition was sited as to preserve an existing tree within the back yard.

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

1) Reasonable Effort to Minimize Alteration of Buildings and Site.

*Criterion Met.* The proposal makes minor alterations to the site by locating the small scale addition to the rear of the existing house.

2) Conformance to Original Distinguishing Character.

*Criterion Met.* The modifications retain the design and character established with by the original structure and site design.

3) Retention of Historic Building Features and Materials.

*Criterion Met.* The proposal does not alter the historic building features and materials.

4) Alteration Recognizes Historic Integrity and Appropriateness.

*Criterion Met.* The design of the addition is appropriate and recognizes the historic design of the original house.

5) Recognition and Respect of Historical or Acquired Significance.

*Criterion Met.* The proposal recognizes the historic house and designed the addition appropriately.

6) Sensitive Treatment of Distinctive Features.

*Criterion Met.* The proposal retains the existing cistern and existing tree.

8) Sensitively Maintained Historic Building Materials.

*Criterion Met.* The proposal does not alter the historic building materials.

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

1) Use of Traditional Materials on Additions.

*Criterion Met.* The proposal uses cedar shake shingles as the primary building material, which matches the material of the existing house.

2) Contemporary Design of Additions Compatible with Existing Structures.

*Criterion Met.* The design of the addition is compatible with the existing structure, given its scale, size and character.

3) Additions are Distinguishable and Subordinate to Original Structure.

*Criterion Met.* The addition is subordinate to the original structure due to its smaller scale and size, and location to the rear of the original house.

4) Addition Recognizes Historic Integrity.

*Criterion Met.* The proposal does not alter the historic structure and retains a large existing tree and the underground cistern.

**PART IV: ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM RECOMMENDATION**

Recommendation of approval with one condition.

- 1) The applicant be required to provide an asphalt shingle which meets the 300lb requirement.