



ARB Board Order for Demolition

14-028ARB – BSC Historic Residential District

143 South High Street

This is a request for a recommendation from the Administrative Review Team to the Architectural Review Board for a request for a Board Order to permit the demolition of an existing single-family house and accessory structures on the west side of South High Street, south of the intersection of John Wright Lane, to permit the construction of a new single-family residence. This proposal is to be reviewed under the provisions of the Dublin Zoning Code related to the Architectural Review Board, §153.173 and §153.176-177 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Date of Application Acceptance

Tuesday, April 8, 2014

Date of ART Recommendation

Thursday, April 17, 2014

Date of Architectural Review Board Determination

Wednesday, April 23, 2014

Case Manager

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

PART I: Application Overview

<i>Zoning District</i>	BSC Historic Residential District
<i>Use</i>	Dwellings, Single-Family
<i>Building Type</i>	N/A
<i>Review Type</i>	Demolition
<i>Development Proposal</i>	Future redevelopment with a single-family residence
<i>Administrative Departures</i>	N/A
<i>Waivers</i>	N/A
<i>Property Address</i>	143 South High Street
<i>Applicant</i>	Noriko Lemoto Stevens; represented by Heidi Bolyard, Bolyard Architecture and Design Studio, LLC
<i>Case Manager</i>	Jennifer M. Rauch, AICP, Senior Planner (614) 410-4690 jrauch@dublin.oh.us

Part II: Application Review Procedure: Board Order for Demolition

No building permit or Certificate of Zoning Plan Approval may be issued by the Chief Building Official or Director and/or their designees for any proposal which is subject to review by the Architectural Review Board unless a Board Order has been issued in accordance with the requirements of Chapter 153: Zoning Regulations. Board Orders are required for requests for demolition of a structure in accordance with the requirements of Section §153.176.

§153.176 – Demolition

In cases where an applicant applies for a Board Order to demolish a structure within the Architectural Review District, the application may be approved when the applicant is able to demonstrate economic hardship or unusual and compelling circumstances, or at least two of the following conditions prevail:

- (1) The structure contains no features of architectural and historic significance to the character of the area in which it is located.*
- (2) There is no reasonable economic use for the structure as it exists or as it might be restored, and that there exists no feasible and prudent alternative to demolition.*
- (3) Deterioration has progressed to the point where it is not economically feasible to restore the structure and such neglect has not been willful.*
- (4) The location of the structure impedes the orderly development, substantially interferes with the Purposes of the District, or detracts from the historical character of its immediate vicinity; or, the proposed construction to replace the demolition significantly improves the overall quality of the Architectural Review District without diminishing the historic value of the vicinity or the District.*

PART III: Description of the Property

Ohio Historic Inventory

The subject property is listed on the Ohio Historic Inventory (OHI) through a City-sponsored initiative in March 2003. The inventory provides a brief description of the location, background, and architecture of a building, site, structure, or object of architectural or historical significance. Inclusion on the OHI is not a form of protection for a historic resource, nor does it provide owners with a list of restrictions.

The inventory noted that the existing structure was constructed as a single-family residence between 1880 and 1900, featuring a single-story residence with a gable roof that incorporates an early 20th century front porch design. The stucco exterior and one-story wing were later additions. The structure is noted to be one of the background buildings that retain the scale and character of the historic district. The complete OHI form for the property is included with this report.

PART IV: Analysis of Applicable Review Standards

The Review Standards for Demolition of Section §153.176 provide two options for an applicant to request a Board Order for Demolition from the ARB. An applicant may either demonstrate an economic hardship or unusual and compelling circumstances to support the demolition, OR the applicant may demonstrate compliance with at least two of four Conditions for Demolition in that section.

The information provided by the applicant as part of the application materials describes that the Conditions for Demolition portion of the criteria and how they have been met. The following is an analysis by the Administrative Review Team based on those Review Standards and the information provided by the applicant.

At least two of the following Conditions for Demolition prevail:

(1) The structure contains no features of architectural and historic significance to the character of the area in which it is located.

Condition met. The applicant asserts that although the original structure was built sometime between the 1880s and the 1900s, significant modifications to the home, including the application of stucco material to the main structure, the removal of the brick chimney from the exterior, and additions to the north and rear, have diminished the character of the original structure and it is now inconsistent with the historical architectural style of the area. Further, the home was not considered for the National Register of Historic Places.

The City enlisted the services of an architectural consultant, Todd Parker, to analyze the architectural and historic significance of the existing structure. Mr. Parker agrees with the applicant's assessment that the existing home displays minimal features of architectural or historical significance to the character of the area with the exception of its age. A copy of his assessment is included with this report.

(2) There is no reasonable economic use for the structure as it exists or as it might be restored, and that there exists no feasible and prudent alternative to demolition.

Condition Not Met. The applicant states that significant cost would be necessary to bring the existing building into compliance with modern building codes, in addition to the cost associated with more cosmetic upgrades and modernizations required to make the home marketable, either for rent or for sale. Although significant expense may be necessary to ensure that the residence is structurally sound, it is reasonable to expect that the existing structure could continue to be used as a residence without requiring complete demolition.

(3) Deterioration has progressed to the point where it is not economically feasible to restore the structure and such neglect has not been willful.

Condition Met. The applicant enlisted the services of George Fraker, PE at Fraker Engineering, LLC, to conduct a structural assessment of the property to document its current structural conditions and to identify the rehabilitation necessary to improve the home to a livable and structurally sound condition.

The structural assessment concludes that, due to a lack of maintenance over many years by previous owners, the home is in poor condition, with the following improvements necessary to improve the structure to current code standards.

- Substantial replacement and addition of building framing and structural members due to rotting and insect damage.
- Foundation reconstruction due to cracking, insect damage, and age.
- Window, trim, soffit and overhang replacement due to rotting.

The consultant identified that while technically possible, repairs required to restore the home to a condition of occupancy may not be economically feasible or justifiable given its age and condition. Overall, it is the applicant's and their consultant's opinion that renovating the existing home is not a viable economic option.

(4) The location of the structure impedes the orderly development, substantially interferes with the Purposes of the District, or detracts from the historical character of its immediate vicinity;

OR, the proposed construction to replace the demolition significantly improves the overall quality of the Architectural Review District without diminishing the historic value of the vicinity or the District.

Met by Condition. This standard may be satisfied by demonstrating either of these components, and the applicant's statement responds to both.

With respect to the first component, the applicant states that the home's deterioration and non-contributing additions over the years have diluted the original structure's historic significance and does not presently add to the architectural or historic character of the area.

If the existing structure were to remain, its location would not be an impediment to orderly development, as no redevelopment is contemplated for this area of the District in the City's adopted plans. The Purposes of the District are outlined in several adopted plans, including the Bridge Street Vision Report and the recently adopted Dublin Community Plan, both of which emphasize the preservation and enhancement of the historic residential neighborhoods. While the existing structure may lack architectural and historic significance, the OHI Inventory notes that as a background structure it does contribute to the scale and residential character of the area.

In the applicant's opinion, a new residential structure would enhance the character and value of the neighborhood, provided the new home respected the historic village scale and architectural character. The applicant has provided conceptual drawings of the proposed construction to replace the demolition. The proposed two-story single-family residence includes an attached one and a half-garage to rear of the home and accessed off John Wright Lane.

Constructing a new home could contribute to the advancement of the Community Plan and Bridge Street District objectives, provided the project is designed in keeping with the applicable development standards and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Todd Parker, the City's architectural consultant in his review with respect to Condition (4) provided preliminary comments regarding the conceptual design that the applicant should address, including:

- 1) Reduce the massing of the secondary story design to conform with the story and a half structures that dominate the area;
- 2) Consider the use of a detached garage to fit better within the context of the district;
- 3) Modify the second story massing along the north and the double window separation to fit within the surrounding properties in the district;
- 4) Thoughtful application of exterior building materials.

In addition to the preliminary comments outlined by the City's architectural consultant, the applicant should modify the site plan to represent the correct setback lines for properties fronting on South High Street, as required by the Zoning Code.

As conditioned, this project can ultimately improve the overall quality of the Architectural Review District without diminishing the historic value of the vicinity or the District.

PART V: ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM RECOMMENDATION

Approval of the request for Board Order for Demolition is recommended, having effectively demonstrated at least two of the four standards for Demolition, with the following conditions:

That demolition will not occur until:

- (a) Architectural Review Board approval of a proposed design for the new single-family residence;
and
- (b) Building permits issued.



F5 Design/Architecture Inc.

PO Box 86
New Albany, OH 43054

614.224.4946 Tel
www.f5design.com

16 April 2014

Ms. Jenny Rauch
City of Dublin
5800 Shier Rings Road
Dublin, OH 43016

Re: 143 South High Street
Stevens Residence

Dear Jenny,

I have performed a review for the merits of the proposal for demolition and new construction for the Stevens Residence at 143 South High Street. I have considered the application and several items in this process.

Item 1: "The (existing) structure contains no features of architectural and historic significance to the character of the area in which it is located".

In my opinion, the existing structure contains minimal features of architectural and historic significance other than its age. In seeing the report and photographs of the structure and its existing condition, I would agree with the applicant. The proposed schematic design would need to be reworked to conform with the surrounding urban fabric.

Item 4: "The location of the (existing) structure impedes the orderly development, substantially interferes with the purposes of the District, or detracts from the historical character of the immediate vicinity; or, the proposed construction to replace the demolition significantly improves the overall quality of the Architectural Review District without diminishing the historic value of the vicinity or the District".

I feel that the proposed new residence *could* greatly improve the district. The existing structure, in my opinion, did not contribute greatly to the area as it exists. With that being said, I offer the following comments based on the applicants schematic submission with recommendations:

1. The site plan seems adequate. The consideration of a detached garage may fit within the district a bit better.
2. The east elevation fronting High Street illustrates a nice front porch, however, the second story mass does not conform well with the story and a half structures that dominate the area. Reducing this mass down is a necessity.
3. The north elevation again, illustrates some nice detailing. The second story mass from the north should be modified, as well as the double window separated to fit in well with the surrounding district.
4. Moving forward, we must understand the exterior materials.

Please let me know if you have any questions regarding this design review.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Todd M. Parker', with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Todd M. Parker, President
F5 Design/Architecture Inc.