



Planning

5800 Shier Rings Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236

phone 614.410.4600

fax 614.410.4747

www.dublinohiousa.gov

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

MEETING MINUTES

JULY 27, 2016

AGENDA

1. **BSD HR** **73 S. Riverview Street**
16-049ARB-MPR **Demolition – residence (Disapproved 2 – 3)**
Demolition – detached garage (Approved 4 – 1)
2. **BSD HC** **30–32 S. High Street**
16-050ARB **Demolition (Postponed prior to the meeting)**
3. **BSD HC – Seel Residence** **83 S. High Street**
16-053ARB-MPR **Minor Project Review (Approved 5 – 0)**

The Chair, David Rinaldi, called the meeting to order at 6:31 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Board members present were: Shannon Stenberg, Jane Fox, Thomas Munhall, and Everett Musser. City representatives were: Jennifer Rauch, JM Rayburn, Nick Badman, Cameron Roberts, and Laurie Wright.

Administrative Business

Motion and Vote

Mr. Musser moved, Ms. Fox seconded, to accept the documents into the record. The vote was as follows: Ms. Stenberg, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Munhall, yes; Mr. Musser, yes; and Ms. Fox, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Ms. Fox moved, Ms. Stenberg seconded, to accept the May 25th meeting minutes as amended. The vote was as follows: Mr. Munhall, yes; Mr. Musser, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; and Ms. Fox, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

The Chair announced the second case that was on the agenda this evening (16-050ARB) had been postponed prior to the meeting at the request of the applicant. He briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Architectural Review Board [the minutes reflect the order of the published agenda.] He swore in anyone planning to address the Board during this meeting.

1. **BSD HR** **73 S. Riverview Street**
16-049ARB-MPR **Demolition/Minor Project Review**

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following application is a request for the demolition of an existing single-family residence and accessory structure and the construction of a new single-family dwelling for a property at the southeast corner of South Riverview Street and Eberly Hill Lane. He said this is a request for a review and approval of a Demolition and a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.176, §153.063(B), and §153.170 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

JM Rayburn clarified the original application included a new-build component pending the demolition approval but just the demolition portion would be reviewed this evening.

Mr. Rayburn presented an aerial view of the site and a close range view of the single-family structure and detached garage. He explained the City enlisted the services of a preservation consultant, Christine Trebellas, to analyze the architecture and historic significance of the existing structures as part of the demolition review. He said additionally, the City is undergoing a historic and cultural assessment and this included a brief, preliminary assessment of this property as well. He reported the applicant enlisted the services of Michael J. Richardson, PE, Richardson Engineering Consulting, LLC to determine the general condition of the house and detached garage to determine the feasibility of repair.

Mr. Rayburn read the review criteria for a demolition as follows:

- (A) Applicant must demonstrate economic hardship or unusual or compelling circumstances, or at least two of the following conditions:
- 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.

Mr. Rayburn demonstrated that none of the criteria were met for the single-family structure, therefore recommended disapproval but the detached garage met the criteria and therefore recommended approval for a demolition. The assessment is as follows:

Criteria #1: He said despite several additions and alterations, Staff agrees with the historic consultant's assessment that the single-family home retains several character defining features, which reflect the era in which it was built. However, the garage has limited historic significance.

Criteria #2: He said the Engineer's report does not state the house is unsound or at risk of structural failure. Furthermore, he said neither the applicant nor the Engineer's report fully addresses the economic feasibility of restoring the dwelling. He said the applicant has provided graphics to show the current conditions but Staff finds the documentation submitted as a result of the site visit insufficient to demonstrate the demolition is the only alternative. He noted the site and structure have been deemed historic and Staff believes the loss of any historic structure that is irreversible should be made to ensure its preservation. He said Staff recognizes that restoring historic structures would be a labor of love and can be a challenge.

Criteria #3: He restated that the applicant hired an engineering consultant to perform a visual inspection and presented the findings of the interior conditions as documented. He said the purpose of the inspection was to determine the general condition of the house and the garage and to determine the feasibility of repairs. He pointed out the photos show long-term lack of maintenance, water damage, and moisture related deterioration. He noted the narrative states: the moisture related deterioration continues and mold is prevalent; the electrical system is

outdated; and interior finishes, fixtures, floor joists, and subflooring are deteriorated and need to be replaced as well as the wood posts in the basement. Additionally, he noted the basement walls and foundation drainage system may need to be replaced along with mold remediation. He said a new HVAC and plumbing system is needed and none of the windows meet current energy standards per the engineer's report.

Mr. Rayburn said Staff recommends the garage be considered separately for demolition given its severe deterioration, structural instability, and potential public safety hazard. However, he said the economic feasibility of the house has not been fully addressed, therefore the criteria has not been met.

Criteria #4: Mr. Rayburn said Staff finds that with the retention of the existing home, it would not impede the development of the area given ongoing historic preservation efforts happening within Historic Dublin. He reported Planning and Building Standards find the proposed demolition to remove a historic structure would diminish the unique historic character of the area.

Mr. Rayburn stated the applicant is present to answer any questions.

Andrew Navarro, designer, said he believes the main house should be demolished as it exists today. He said he disagrees with the City's consultant report where she cited three significant architectural features that are relevant in maintaining the house. He noted the eyebrow dormer located on the north side of the house is minimal with no ventilation, deteriorating from the inside out so it would need to be rebuilt and not retained as is. He said for that feature for a 1930s bungalow has merit but it would need to be rebuilt. He said the second significant architectural element she referenced was the chimney that is easily visible from the street. He explained it is split and would need to be rebuilt as it is not sound and resting on a foundation that the construction engineer can speak to that has been reworked over the years to raise the basement height that also caused significant damage to the posts in the basement and the floor joists are rotted. He indicated that reconstructing all of that would be a significant investment. He said the third element of architectural significance that the consultant referenced was the mutton pattern in the windows, which is a three-over-one pattern. He said that is a historically relevant detail but the proposal is for a two-over-two pattern, which is traditionally found in the Dublin Historic District. However, if the Board finds the window pattern significantly relevant, they would entertain the three-over-one pattern.

Mr. Navarro concluded that of the three architectural elements identified as significant, two of them would need to be rebuilt and the third would be something replicated with new windows as those windows are degraded and have to be replaced.

David Rinaldi asked if a cost estimate had been prepared to rehab this house.

Mr. Navarro asked if Mr. Rinaldi was asking for a cost comparison between what it would cost for a renovation versus a new build. He said that is not an unreasonable request but that is a lot of upfront investment in an uncertain future to have the applicant develop two complete separate proposals including a renovation specialist, foundation work, all new systems, and those bids can pile up and is a lot to ask when there are no certainties of the future. He said it is clear from the photos and the interior that the foundation would have to be rebuilt, floor lifted, posts redone, and the vinyl siding reskinned without knowing what is inside the walls that could potentially be hazardous materials. He said there are a lot of unknowns within the building that could lead to increased cost for a renovation to occur.

Mr. Rinaldi asked if the house was vacant when purchased. Floyd Tackett, Tackett Custom Carpentry, LTD., said hoarders had inhabited the home and had not been in the basement in years. He said he found water and feces upon a site visit and the house was in an unfit condition for living. He

indicated the smells could never be removed if rebuilt and the subfloors are rotted out. He stated he originally wanted to restore it but that is not feasible in its current condition. He said a new-build would be a lot easier and a lot cheaper to reincorporate the architectural features.

Jane Fox indicated she knew the applicant was aware of what was in the Historic District when he purchased the property. She asked him if he was aware there would be strong criteria for demolition. Mr. Tackett said he planned to rebuild until he went inside and found that was not possible.

Ms. Fox stated the Board has to go by the four criteria. She said the Board needs to understand if the house is salvageable, given the fact that the historic consultant felt there were some true possibilities at salvaging it for a renovation. She explained in the Historic District there are so few of these properties still remaining. She said she wanted to know the cost of renovation.

Mr. Tackett said he was not sure how that could be done.

Ms. Fox said a waiting period could be considered. She said if a new house is built because it is economically unfeasible to renovate, then she said the Board needs to compare the cost of the new build versus restoration of a structure deemed historic.

Mr. Tackett said, as carpenter/builder, it would cost more money to restore it than a new build. He explained the house has two foundation walls; the basement was dug after the fact so there is an exterior footing and then they went inside and dropped it down eight feet and added another footer. In order to dry the basement out, he said he had to go below the exterior footing and at that point there would not be anything to hold it. He said the house would need to be jacked up and with rotten floor joists and unknowns behind the walls he is uncertain if it could be lifted up in order to replace the foundation. He said this is beyond a house that needs a little attention.

Tom Munhall asked if a cost cannot be determined until the applicant got into the project. Mr. Tackett answered he did not know how it could be done. He said he would have to enlist foundation people and people that lift houses just to get prices on that and he is not interested.

Everett Musser asked the applicant what made him believe he could restore it when it was purchased. Mr. Tackett said he never entered the house as it was full. He said he built a house just down the street on High Street and likes the area a lot and wanted to do another house similar.

Mr. Musser asked if the historic report took into account the condition of the house. Mr. Tackett said nobody went into that house. Jennifer Rauch said the assessment was made strictly from the exterior.

Mr. Tackett said the front porch posts are all rotten and the porch encroaches in the setback and should have never been built, which was later finished and turned into a room. He indicated that everything the historic consultant mentioned is not salvageable; it could be rebuilt.

Mr. Munhall inquired about the rear portion of the house. He asked how much of that section is an addition from a different time period. Mr. Tackett said from the flat roof to the small gable, it has all been added onto from the 60s or 70s. He explained the flat roof corner is on a slab and the other is on a crawl space without access. He said there is a stone foundation on the front section and from the inside it is light block and is not certain where the stone goes to.

Mr. Munhall asked if the original foundation was stone and a block foundation was added later, to which the applicant answered affirmatively.

Michael J. Richardson, PE, Richardson Engineering Consulting, LLC. 263 Fox Glen Dr., Columbus, Ohio, 43147, said he wrote the visual assessment report. He said the house appears to have been originally built on a crawl space so the foundation went down two to three feet below grade and later dug out the basement and erected a small wall that does not support anything. He indicated the wall just basically holds back the soil.

Mr. Munhall confirmed the wall did not go underneath the original stone. Mr. Richardson said there cannot be waterproofing because of that configuration. He stated this was an unsafe way to add a basement after the fact.

Mr. Richardson said he agreed with Mr. Tackett; from outside appearances, the house looks typical in the area but once inside, the extent of the deterioration can be found on all the elements. He indicated the architectural consultant must have come to the same conclusion just assessing it from the outside. He said if she would have entered the house, she would have had a better understanding of the request for demolition. He said mold was found on all levels of the house and water continues to enter the basement without any waterproofing system. He said water intrusion is evident on all the wood elements including the posts that support the first floor and the mechanical equipment is all rusted that is sitting on a small concrete slab. He said if renovation were to occur, the basement would need to be repaired and if it is not possible to waterproof it, renovation would be difficult.

Mr. Musser asked Mr. Tackett if he had performed other work in the Historic District. Mr. Tackett answered he has a property at 200 S. High Street.

Mr. Musser said he is surprised the applicant would buy a house without looking at the interior and assume he could remodel it or even fix it up. Mr. Tackett said he always thought that if he could not fix it up he could rebuild. He said his first thoughts were to remodel it and add on.

Shannon Stenberg inquired about the City's consultants' concern about the percentage of damage. She asked the applicant to provide more detail about the floor joists and the water damage.

Mr. Richardson referenced the pictures and pointed out the long-term water damage, which covers 40% - 50% of the basement area. He said pressure cannot be put on the floor joists to lift the house because they are rotted. He pointed out the wood posts that support a bunch of wood beams that support the wood floor joists, which is a primary load-bearing element and the bottom four inches is completely deteriorated and would not be surprised if it begins to crush down at some point due to the amount of water found in that basement. He also pointed out the foundation for the chimney that was determined to be a significant architectural element. He said during his site visit, there was standing water in several areas and it is being absorbed in all the wood creating mold throughout due to the moisture. He stated in order to renovate or rehabilitate this house, it would have to be taken down to bare bones to abate all of this mold seen throughout the house. At that point, he said proper basement walls would need to be built.

Mr. Munhall indicated there are a lot of correspondence from surrounding neighbors showing approval of the demolition. He asked if there were any neighbors that were opposed or had any issues. [None were provided.]

The Chair asked the Board if they had any further questions before opening the discussion up to the public.

Ms. Fox asked the engineer if he had done historic preservation or been asked to review historic renovation like this before. Mr. Richardson answered he had not; his specialty is the assessment of existing conditions and determining the extent of damage.

Ms. Fox asked Mr. Tackett if he spoke to anyone in historic preservation knowing he would need to come before this Board and resides in the Historic District. She asked if he consulted anyone about cost or difficulties he might find in a property like this.

Mr. Tackett said he would not ask anyone to go into the structures. He said you have to see it to know what he is talking about.

Ms. Fox indicated that might be something that is necessary for her. She acknowledged that the applicant provided some very credible evidence. She explained that the Board's criteria has to follow the Code and in doing so, there are some factors about the house that are worth exploring to be sure something precious to the Historic District is not lost. According to what the applicant proposed, she indicated he would not be replacing this home with something similar to what was there and that is the problem. She said in the Historic District, the Board tries to maintain the character of the area but they cannot do that just because they want to; they have to review what was there and consider whether or not some of these things that are possible to restore, could be restored. She concluded that she does not have enough evidence yet to assure her that this is not restorable.

Mr. Tackett said he was not sure who could provide that evidence.

Ms. Fox said the consultant was one because first of all she gives the Board a decision to whether the property is contributory or not and if there are elements that are so, they may need to look at the possibility of getting expert advice from a historic preservationist or possibly do a site visit. She said pictures do not always tell the whole story.

The Chair invited anyone from the public to speak in regards to this case.

Tom Holton, representative of the Dublin Historical Society, 5957 Roundstone Place, suggested the Board consider there are some similarities to the Thompson builder/Heron property but on a different property, a smaller scale, and not as pretty. He said the Board has the opportunity to step back with less pressure of making a decision. He said this application can be tabled. He suggested getting a different assessment from a different engineer.

Mr. Holton asked if the property is in character with what is on S. Riverview now in the Historic District compared to a new build. He indicated that within the last four years or so, 93 S. Riverview is a new build. He said the original structure was lost due to neglect. He said the structure at 143 S. High is still standing but it will be demolished due to neglect as approved by the ARB. He added part of 30-32 S. High may be lost because there is neglect. He asked if we are going to lose 73 S. Riverview because of neglect. He noted the pattern that needs to be addressed. He said he is concerned about losing the character and rhythm of properties in the Historic District. He said Biddies could be next because every day that property seems to get worse and worse. He restated this application can be tabled to obtain more information.

Mr. Musser asked Mr. Holton what he would propose be done to those properties that are deteriorating.

Mr. Holton said it is a Code Enforcement issue and he knows there is only so much that can be done. He suggested we be more proactive. He said the inhabitant of 73 S. Riverview was definitely a hoarder. He said he was in the house twice and witnessed terrible conditions; the house was awful. He indicated the neighbors were very reluctant to talk with others about the conditions in which these people were living. He said nobody should have to live like that in Dublin, Ohio, in this day and age.

Mr. Musser asked if Code Enforcement would have been able to help. Mr. Holton said they could not do anything about the interior but there were obvious feral cats living outside, which would indicate something was wrong with that property. He questioned whether that is a Code issue, a social services issue, etc.

Mr. Musser asked how we can force someone to upgrade or maintain a property if the homeowner does not have the economic resources to do that.

Mr. Munhall said there is no answer on the table yet but a solution needs to be sought for the future. Ms. Rauch said that is part of the historical assessment that includes determining contributing/non-contributing properties. She explained we are also looking at ways to provide financial opportunities for residents with historic properties. She said Code Enforcement is engaged with property maintenance. She said this property was one where they were concerned with what was happening and took collaborative efforts to help the residents. She added the City is working to be more proactive regarding historic properties and the Code will be updated accordingly but this all takes time.

Ms. Stenberg asked how the current owner could be helped. She said one of the suggestions was to table this to enable further review but if there is constant water damage it is only going to get worse.

Ms. Rauch said part of Staff's alternative recommendation is as follows:

Should the Board reach a different finding, a one year waiting period provided in §153.176 (C) could be imposed to allow the owner the ability to better secure the property from further neglect and investigate alternatives to demolition. After that period, the proposed demolition could be reviewed again by the ARB.

Ms. Fox said from an ARB standpoint, when one purchases property in the Historic District, properties do not necessarily fall into the same criteria as they would outside the district. She said the ARB is tasked with preserving and maintaining the character of the district. She said there are only a few remaining historic properties in the district so the Board needs to see if there is any possible way to save these properties. She said if it is replaced with something brand new the character of the district is forever changed. She said the Board wants to see new development and improvements to the properties but before they would approve demolition, she would like to see a lot of evidence that addresses the criteria specifically that the ARB is bound by. Renovation she said has to be more important than a new build or there is no point to the ARB. She concluded she wanted to visit the site, obtain information from a historic preservation builder, and obtain a cost comparison between renovation and a new build (proposal).

Mr. Tackett said he has already spent enough on the property. He said to rebuild it just to rebuild that particular house is not what he would want to do anyway. He said all the historical elements that the City's consultant remarked on would need to be rebuilt or replaced.

Ms. Fox said the ARB can only address the exterior so whatever happens on the inside is up to the owner. She said the Board would like to see a true restoration but it is not always reasonable. She asked the applicant if he would consider changing the design to be more in character with what was there before. She said if this is not salvageable, the character of the Historic District cannot be changed to the point that it is no longer recognizable as the Historic District. She explained the massing, the character, and the distance between properties all has to be considered for a new build.

Ms. Rauch said discussion about the details of the proposed new build has happened amongst Staff and several modifications have been identified, should this move forward. She said the scale they are proposing at least from S. Riverview is appropriate.

Mr. Munhall asked if there are hundreds of different designs that fall under the Bungalow umbrella. Mr. Tackett responded there are numerous designs.

Mr. Tackett said this design is not out of a magazine. Mr. Munhall asked if the design is considered a certain style.

Mr. Navarro said the initial concept could be a bungalow but there are very few details that point to that period of time. He indicated there may have been, before the various additions. He described the proposed new build elevation one that appears to have been built over time.

Mr. Musser said he would like to see this deferred for another meeting or so but not a year and have the property deteriorate further. He said he is not sure it is feasible to renovate this property.

Mr. Navarro indicated there is potential for finding asbestos in the walls or concealed in the foundation over time, which would cause a significant amount of time and money to be spent.

Michael Carroll, 190 S. High Street, Dublin, Ohio, said he is the applicant's neighbor. He said he understands Mr. Tackett's position that he purchased the property sight unseen, had plans, and is stating now he is in a corner and the ARB needs to get him out. He said he is making his problem the ARB's problem. He said no matter how much the new build looks historic, it will not actually be historic. He said the ARB needs to decide if they want a historic area filled with historic buildings or new very nice buildings. He said nobody has said this is impossible, it is just expensive. He indicated it appears the City is willing to put huge amounts of money towards new development but nothing for historic preservation. He said there are various ways the City could encourage historic development. He noted one of the Board members said the City is going to end up with a lot of rotting historic structures because it is not economically feasible for the owners to renovate or restore them. He said unless the City is willing to come up with money to help owners of historic structures, it is always going to be uneconomical to renovate as the cost is unbelievable. He said he understands what the ARB is doing but it is unreasonable for the City to assume there are going to be that many good Samaritans that are going to take huge amounts of their own money to restore buildings. He suggested in this case, the City at least fund the cost of the estimate to have the house restored. He noted that Mr. Tackett already said getting an estimate is too expensive.

Mr. Rinaldi suggested the Board review the four criteria against the information provided. He said he understands the historic features noted. He said the scale of the building helps the fabric of the neighborhood and that in itself is a feature. Whether it has any economic use, he said if it is restored as a smaller home, there is a lot of desirability. He indicated that deterioration beyond reasonable repair is not in question but there is nothing to compare it to, to determine feasibility compared to a new build. He said impeding development in the area does not come into play.

Ms. Fox addressed each of the four criteria: 1) the street has a variety of styles on it and this house contributes to the character; 2) the property was purchased without going first on the open market so there is a possibility that someone may be able to affordably restore/renovate it; 3) she would like the City to help Mr. Tackett with the cost for a restoration estimate; and 4) it does not impede the orderly development.

Ms. Stenberg said she completely agrees with the exception of the third criteria and being able to help determine if it is economically feasible. She said we keep comparing a new build to a restoration rather than comparing a restoration to a restoration. She agreed that restorations and renovations are going to be more expensive. She said she believes there is a possibility that not just the City could help with the cost but there is potential from the community such as a "Go Fund Me" or a "Kick-starter" to help with the cost of the engineering aspect.

Mr. Munhall said he agrees with everyone. He said there is a process started to help resolve some of these issues but it is not going to happen today. He said the longer we wait, the condition of this house is just going to worsen. He stated that criteria 2 & 3 are mostly likely met but he would not mind going inside of it as he has been inside some really bad houses. He said the other issue he has with this house is 30% of it is from 1970 and the foundation wall is from 1950 or 60. He said the issue is not "pretty" versus "ugly"; it is more of a contributory issue, which he believes is subjective. He said criteria 1 could be argued.

Mr. Musser said the structure to him is not really a historic structure as it has so few elements and is certainly no crown jewel of the Historic District. He said criteria 2 & 3 are met. He stated he would not agree with anything that is going to take a long time to decide. He said he would consider reviewing this at the next meeting after receiving more information but he is not sure what the cost estimate is really going to do for the Board. He said he agreed with Ms. Stenberg, that restoration/renovation is expensive and you find problems you do not know you are going to find until you start the process and have to redo them; a cost estimate is going to be inflated.

Ms. Fox said she is concerned with the purchasing of properties in the Historic District sight unseen thinking it is a rundown piece of property and if it cannot be fixed it can be demolished. She noted this is a dilemma that is going to come before the Board often and because of that, she wants to "slow the train down" just a little bit. She said the Board needs to consider not only meeting the Code but demolition as the ARB's mission is to preserve, protect, and maintain the Historic District. She said that is just as important as deciding whether or not the four criteria for demolition are met. She emphasized that once you knock something down, it is gone forever. Even though Mr. Tackett finds himself in a difficult spot, she said the house never did go on the open market and he had already determined that if he could not fix it he could demolish it. She asked if this property would become more historically accurate in the neighborhood after peeling back 30%. She requested the Board have more time and opportunity to conduct a further review.

Ms. Stenberg suggested waiting one meeting rather than one year. Mr. Munhall asked what a reasonable timeframe is for any further analysis from either the engineers or the historic consultant.

Ms. Rauch confirmed a timeframe for further analysis could take months. She said the Board could table the case and then work with the applicant; if they are agreeable, to try and gather some of this additional information and they can come back after and then a timeframe does not have to be set.

Ms. Fox asked if the City would pay for information and the work of the historic consultants.

Ms. Rauch said the consultant the City hired is looking at the historic fabric of the district. She noted the way the Code is written, it is incumbent on the applicant to provide information for staff to review. She said she does not know if the City would pay for a different consultant.

Ms. Fox moved that the case be tabled to obtain information from the City of what can be done to look at more evidence that would provide a more balanced idea of the cost of renovation and the possibility of restoration instead of demolition.

The Chair said before they table the case, he would like to have clarification on the type of information Ms. Fox is seeking from the applicant. He stated there is no reason to table if the applicant is not willing to do that, which then would make more sense to make a motion to vote this evening.

Ms. Fox said she would like to see the cost estimates on what it would be for a new build versus what it would take to restore it and peel away the 1970s portion to what it was originally.

The Chair said that may determine criteria 3, but they need to meet two of the four.

Ms. Fox explained this is why she asked for an independent appraisal because estimates are estimates and all kinds can be sought from one builder to another. She restated she would also like to see the inside of the property.

Ms. Rauch restated that based on the information provided by the applicant, the consultants, and on professional opinion, Staff finds the applicant does not meet the review criteria.

Mr. Musser questioned where this leaves Mr. Tackett, if the case is tabled.

Mr. Munhall restated that timing is an issue.

Ms. Fox explained the reason she asked to table was because in the Code §153.177, it states for showing that no other reasonable means exists for saving the property; a copy of the condemnation or housing order based on deteriorated condition of property, a structural analysis by a licensed architect, engineer, or contractor experienced in alterations to historic properties as to the structural soundness of the property or of potential feature accompanied by the individual or firms call or vocations for making such analysis. Documentation that the property has been offered for sale.

Ms. Rauch said the Code outlines an either/or process for demolition versus economic hardship, unusual or compelling circumstances. She said these are two completely different applications. She restated this request is for demolition, which is based on the four criteria. She said if they are submitting an application that addresses economic hardship, unusual or compelling circumstances, then the other information would be required. She said moving forward, Staff would like to ensure the Code is clearer.

Mr. Holton said the definitions of restoration and renovation need to be clear. He said the Board should really be concerned about the exterior as the interior is not the Board's concern. He encouraged the Board to consider outbuildings that may contribute to the rhythm and character of the Historic District. He cited the example of the outhouse behind Biddies, old chicken coops, sheds, and the garage behind 73 S. High Street. He suggested we take care of these structures as well, rehabilitate if not restore them. He clarified that restore means to try and make them what they used to be and rehabilitate means rebuilding them in some fashion to reuse them in a way that makes sense for current day.

The Chair said he does not see a point in tabling this case.

Ms. Fox asked Mr. Tackett for his final thoughts.

Mr. Tackett said to put the house back as it was when it was built, it would go back to a 900-square-foot house and he is not sure that is feasible; it would not be economical for him to do anything like that.

Ms. Fox asked the applicant if he would consider rehabilitating the home for modern day use or restoration.

Mr. Tackett said if the Board goes into the house, there will not be a question of whether it can be fixed. He said even if he rebuilds it to the original specs, he cannot afford to do that for a 900-square-foot house.

Mr. Musser asked the applicant what he would propose to do with the house if the application was denied.

Mr. Tackett said he would put it on the market for sale. He asked if there is anything the Board of Health can do because nobody should be in there. He indicated he cannot rebuild it to what the Board is asking for.

Mr. Navarro said he has no idea what was on the exterior before the vinyl siding was added to rebuild the house as it was before in 1940; he would need photo documentation of what was there. He said if we were to strip it down to its studs and dress it up again we would be adding something new that looks old.

Ms. Rauch said there has been a lot of discussion related to additions that bring significance to properties over time. She indicated the applicant could be asked to restore it to the 1970s when the additions were built to preserve it from a historic perspective. She said this property has acquired significance over time and that is one of the criteria for ARB when reviewing alterations and additions.

Mr. Munhall said he brought up the additions because when they were done over time, the historic nature of the house in general was changed.

Ms. Fox said there are so few precious places in the Historic District that the Board needs to take enough time to obtain enough evidence so they will never look back and say maybe they could have restored that.

The Chair reminded the Board that the Code has to be followed as it is currently written and the decision has to be defensible by the City. He said if someone still wants to table this, he wants to know specifically what is being asked of the applicant and have the applicant agree.

Ms. Fox explained that if the applicant returns to say he has to demolish the house because there is nothing else he can do with it, then she believes he would not meet the other three criteria: 1) it has architectural historical significance; 2) it can be used as a house if someone fixed it up and restored it; and 3) the location does not impede the orderly development. She said even if the Board approves a demolition, the applicant could come back and say this is an economic hardship; then information would need to be provided that she is asking for now.

The Chair said he would rather bring this to a vote because he believes they are going to end up back here anyway, given the direction this has taken. Ms. Fox agreed that the applicant would need to come back with documentation about economic hardship.

Mr. Musser said criteria 2 & 3 are met and he questions whether criteria 1 is met.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Munhall moved, Mr. Musser seconded, to approve a request for the Demolition of the single-family structure. The vote was as follows: Ms. Fox, no; Ms. Stenberg, no; Mr. Rinaldi, no; Mr. Munhall, yes; Mr. Musser, yes. (Disapproved 2 – 3)

Motion and Vote

Ms. Stenberg moved, Mr. Munhall seconded, to approve a request for the Demolition of the detached garage. The vote was as follows: Mr. Musser, yes; Ms. Fox, no; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Munhall, yes; and Ms. Stenberg, yes. (Approved 4 – 1)

3. BSD HC – Seel Residence 16-053ARB-MPR

83 S. High Street Minor Project Review

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following application is a request for the construction of a new porch on the front elevation of an existing single-family residence for a property on the west side of South High Street, approximately 67 feet south of the intersection with Eberly Hill Lane. He said this is a request for a review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066 and §153.170 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Jennifer Rauch presented an aerial view of the site and a front elevation of the house. She noted that pictures of the surrounding structures on the street were included in the packet to provide context. She presented a photograph of the porch as it was built in 1860 and explained the applicant is requesting to replicate that porch. She said there is an existing concrete pad and stairs that will remain and no alterations will be made to the size. She presented graphics of the proposed porch from the street view and side view, highlighting the details that include a standing seam metal roof that matches the house, traditional spandrels along the top of the porch with Sun Ray brackets at the corners, and picket style running trim between the brackets. She said the posts, brackets, running picket trim, and the spandrels will be painted Downing Sands; the trim of the spandrels painted Rookwood Shutter Green; and the edges of the trim in Rookwood Dark Red, which all coordinate with the current color palette of the home.

Ms. Rauch reported the ART recommended approval of this request and at the meeting, the applicant requested an alternative to include a railing on the bottom portion of the proposed porch. She said railing did not appear to have been there before from the photograph so the ART was reluctant to approve something that was not historically there and left that decision to the ARB. She said the applicant has provided character images of other porches within the area that include a railing for the Board's consideration. She stated Staff and the ART recommended approval as originally submitted (without the railing) with no conditions.

David Rinaldi said he appreciated that the applicant found the photo. He asked what the elevation difference is between the porch and the adjacent grade.

Julie Seel, 83 S. High Street, said there is an existing porch foundation, which is approximately 10 inches above grade. Mr. Rinaldi said therefore, a railing is not required.

Jane Fox said she understands the applicant would not like a fence like shown in the picture but if they wanted a railing that is not unlike anything you would find in the District, it is just a matter of choice. She commended the applicant for wanting to put something back the way it was. She said she likes the idea of the railing.

Mr. Rinaldi asked if there was any further evidence that the porch possibly extended further because the photograph appears to have been cropped. Ms. Seel said they assumed that was the size according to the placement of the posts.

David Kirkly, 83 S. High Street, said per the location of the concrete porch and the windows, it is appropriate where the posts were placed.

Mr. Rinaldi indicated it was a little unusual that it is an asymmetrical porch on a symmetrical elevation. Ms. Seel said that is why they changed it because the three posts were odd. She said she sought the opinion of several architects and they agreed four posts would look better in addition to not finding any other porches with just three posts in the neighborhood.

Mr. Kirkly noted the main front door is not centered on the front elevation.

Everett Musser said he liked the alternative proposal.

Tom Munhall clarified the Board would need to make a motion for a change to approve.

The Chair invited the public to speak with regards to this case.

Tom Holton, 5957 Roundstone Place, said he represented the Dublin Historical Society. He presented a picture to the Board of a Federal Style building from 1980. He said he was against the proposed porch because this is also a Federal Style building and they were built without porches. He said the house next

door has a great porch but the house was originally a one-story building and the porch was added when the second story was added. He referenced another picture showing several houses from N. High Street, one with a very detailed porch that was added to be a very integral part of the structure and one that was more modern where the porch was added just 10 years ago. In conclusion, he agreed with Ms. Seel that the proposed porch is very decorative, but he believes it breaks up the classic Federal Style building.

Mr. Munhall asked Mr. Holton if the trim on the front door was original because he thought it might have been added in 1920 or so. Mr. Holton responded it probably was not original and is uncertain when that trim was added.

Mr. Munhall noted the windows were not original. Mr. Holton agreed these were a much more updated version of the windows.

Ms. Fox confirmed the applicant's photograph was of the original house from 1860. She indicated the controversy was whether the home should be restored to what it was transformed into or back to the original. She said it appears the applicant has tried very hard and spent a lot of money to bring the home back to the 1860s.

Ms. Seel said the pediment above the door is plastic, not original and added after the aluminum siding was added to cover the shadow of the walnut beam underneath.

Mr. Munhall said he supports the proposed porch and recognized how the porch was added in the late 1800s and the architecture changed a bit over the years.

Ms. Rauch reported the ART's discussion included that the building acquired significance over time and met the Secretary of Interior's standards. She agreed the porch is not indicative of a Federal Style home.

The Chair asked the Board if they had a preference over the railing. He said they are kind of setting a precedence that the porch does not fit the original style but based on historical evidence, this was there and the railing is attractive.

Ms. Fox said a railing on a porch is one of those things that one would choose to put on and it is historically accurate. She said it might not have been there but the Board is permitted to approve properties in maintaining historic character. She indicated that if the applicant wanted to put a wrought iron railing there she would not support it but because it is within the character. She said even in 1860, if the owner did not have a picket fence there, they may have added a railing. She concluded it is historically accurate, it is not unusual to see in the area, and it would have been a choice for the owner whether they opted for a railing or not.

The Chair asked the applicant if her preference was for the railing to be added. Ms. Seel said the house is close to the street so she would like the railing because it would provide more privacy.

The Chair called for any other comments. [Hearing none.]

Motion and Vote

Mr. Munhall moved, Ms. Fox seconded, to approve a Minor Project Review that included the additional request for a railing as part of the new porch. The vote was as follows: Ms. Stenberg, yes; Mr. Musser, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; and Mr. Munhall, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

Communications

Jennifer Rauch noted an update had been provided in the drop box regarding the consultant's historic/cultural assessment and findings of inventory. She estimated the research should be concluding fairly quickly. She said resolution will be sought with Staff and then reported to the Board. She reported

stakeholders within the community have been identified as part of this assessment. She said answers will be sought as to how to truly help people that own historic properties.

Ms. Rauch said there is a page on the City's website that highlights this project and more information will be added to the City's GIS layer so it can be more interactive.

Ms. Rauch said Staff is also reviewing updates for the Historic Core regulations within the Bridge Street District Code to address the scale and character issues that have come up with recent proposals; it should not be one size fits all, especially as it pertains to properties south of Bridge Street. The updates or changes to the Code she said would be discussed in the fall.

Ms. Rauch said the applicant is working through the proposal for the buildings at 76 & 78 S. High Street but in the meantime, they are going to do ordinary maintenance that will include painting and cosmetic changes but they will be identical to what currently exists.

Jane Fox inquired about the public notice on the front of 32 S. High Street. Ms. Rauch said the applicant was investigating the structure and the flooring and floor joists were removed, which cause a concern of the structural stability of that building and how it would be remedied. She stated Building Standards posted the notification. She clarified the request for demolition was not for that building but rather the building at 30 S. High Street.

Ms. Fox inquired about the stakeholders meeting and who the interested parties are. Ms. Rauch said she did not have a list with her but there was a list provided to the consultants for who to talk to. She explained this will be a targeted conversation and various representatives of the Historic District will be represented. She said the Code changes will be part of a public meeting where anyone can attend.

Everett Musser asked for clarification when the applicant's request was defeated. Ms. Rauch answered the applicant can demolish the garage. She said he would need to submit a different application and provide additional information if he felt compelled to do so. She said he may be able to come back and request a reconsideration of the proposal or go to the BZA.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 8:26 pm.

As approved by the Architectural Review Board on September 21, 2016.