



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

AUGUST 24, 2016

AGENDA

1. **BSD HC – Building Modifications** **35 S. High Street**
16-059ARB-MPR **Minor Project Review (Approved 5 – 0)**
2. **BSD HR** **73 S. Riverview Street**
16-049ARB **Demolition (Approved 5 – 0)**
3. **Presentation - History of Dublin**
Tom Holton, Dublin Historical Society

The Chair, David Rinaldi, called the meeting to order at 6:33 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Board members present were: Jane Fox, Thomas Munhall, Everett Musser, and Shannon Stenberg. City representatives were: Jennifer Rauch, JM Rayburn, and Laurie Wright.

Administrative Business

Motion and Vote

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

The Chair 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 HC – Building Modifications** **35 S. High Street**
16-059ARB-MPR **Minor Project Review**

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following application is a request to paint the exterior on the original two-story portion of an existing commercial building on the west side of South High Street at the intersection with Spring Hill. He said this is a request for a review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code §154.066 and §153.170 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

JM Rayburn presented an aerial view of the site and the front elevation of the building. He said the intent is to paint the stucco on the original two-story portion of the building a darker color of Westchester Gray. He said the remainder of the structure will remain Roycroft Gray, which is lighter shade of gray. He explained the Ohio Historic Inventory establishes the date of construction for 35 S. High Street as circa 1880. Based upon this, he said the proposed color scheme with a darker color for the main structure meets the intent of the *Guidelines*.

Mr. Rayburn said approval is recommended with no conditions.

Tom Bassett, the applicant, provided the Board with paint samples. He said they are adding new wood windows and will have white trim.

David Rinaldi asked if any analysis had been conducted to see what the original paint color was. Mr. Bassett explained the building was a wood structure and originally had wood siding but about the 1940s, it was covered in stucco so it is hard to tell what the original color may have been.

Motion and Vote

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

2. BSD HR 16-049ARB

73 S. Riverview Street Demolition

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following application is a request for the demolition of an existing single-family residence for a property at the southeast corner of South Riverview Street and Eberly Hill Lane. He said this is a request for a reconsideration, review, and approval of a Demolition under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.170-6 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

JM Rayburn stated this is a reconsideration of a previously denied application for the demolition of this historic structure. He presented an aerial view of the site and the site layout that shows a single-family residence set back approximately 20 feet from Eberly Hill Road and approximately 25 feet from South Riverview Street and a detached two-car garage, approved for demolition, along the rear property line in the northwestern corner of the site. He presented more elevations of the residence.

Mr. Rayburn said the Board reviewed this request on July 27, 2016, and denied the request for the residence demolition based on the determination that not all required criteria were met. He said the Board requested additional information to address rehabilitation potential of the historic property. He said the applicant provided additional information regarding costs for:

- ✓ Foundation and walls
- ✓ Chimney repair
- ✓ Window replacement
- ✓ Structural movement
- ✓ Sanitation and mold removal
- ✓ Overall renovation

Mr. Rayburn said a site visit was conducted.

Mr. Rayburn explained the applicant has requested the Board move to reconsider this application as the applicant has provided additional information (as stated above) to be reviewed. He said The Rules and Regulations of the Architectural Review Board permit the reconsideration of a previously considered application by its own motion or for a good cause shown. He noted any member who voted on the prevailing side (denial of the demolition request) may move to reconsider any action of the Board, provided that such a motion is made no later than the second regular meeting after the original action from which reconsideration is being requested. He said reconsideration shall be granted by a majority vote of the members in attendance after a determination that there are new facts or a change in circumstance from the original decision.

David Rinaldi asked to read the demolition requirement in the Code for the benefit of the Board.

In cases where an applicant applies for a Board Order to demolish a structure within its architectural review district the application may be approved when the applicant is able to demonstrate economic hardship, or unusual and compelling circumstances, or to up these four criteria.

Jane Fox asked for public input. Jennifer Rauch said the Board needs to determine if enough information has been provided to reconsider the case first. She explained if the Board were to approve the reconsideration request, then the application would be formally reviewed and include public comment.

Motion and Vote

Ms. Fox moved, Mr. Rinaldi seconded, to approve a request for reconsideration to review a Demolition of the single-family structure. The vote was as follows: Mr. Munhall, yes; Mr. Musser, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes, Mr. Rinaldi, yes; and Ms. Fox, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

Mr. Rayburn restated a site visit was conducted on Monday, August 22nd, 2016, and four of the five members of the Board participated with the applicant. He explained the Board Members were staggered into groups due to size constraints of the structure. He said the Board Members directed the following questions to the applicant and the answers provided:

Q1: Is the rear kitchen part of the later addition?

A1: Yes.

Q2: Are the doors original?

A2: They could be; they are pine wood doors.

Q3: Was the concrete poured in the basement after the fact?

A3: Yes.

Q4: Is the chimney base in the basement original?

A4: No. The brick enclosure was laid after the concrete was poured.

Q5: Is the newer basement wall for support?

A5: No, it is for cosmetic purposes.

Q6: Is there any salvageable wood under the siding?

A6: The deterioration is extensive. Insulation is found on the outside of the wall and it will need to be removed.

Q7: Does the basement flood when it rains?

A7: No, but moisture does come in.

Q8: Which room has the most floor damage?

A8: The bathroom.

Andrew Navarro, said he is the architectural consultant who did the design and the research to determine the site's historical value. He said he did not have any supplemental information beyond what was submitted. He referred to his note that illustrated point by point how the review criteria have been met.

Criteria #1:

Mr. Navarro said the structure has been renovated and added onto over the years with sub-par additions and material choices. He said it has very little architectural relevance to the adjoining neighborhood.

Criteria #2:

Mr. Navarro said there is no reasonable use for the building as it stands today.

Criteria #3:

Mr. Navarro said it is not economically feasible to restore the structure considering the structure is only 1,000 square feet and the second floor is unusable. He said the cost to restore would be upwards of \$400,000. He indicated that if it was a stone structure, there might have been a way to salvage it but the structure has been allowed to deteriorate beyond saving from the previous owners and the wood has rotted.

Criteria #4:

Mr. Navarro said the reconstruction will improve the overall quality of the neighborhood. He said he understands the Board does not want an area filled with newly constructed homes to appear old for the sake of looking historic but when a house does not contribute significantly, and it is so far gone that it does not make any economic sense to renovate it, he recommends replacing it with something that respects the neighborhood and the adjoining properties.

Mr. Rinaldi inquired about the estimates provided as dollars were attributed to certain components and wanted to know what that was based on. He noted \$14,000 for a kitchen but did not find any drawings or designs.

Floyd Tackett said he would be the contractor on the job so the numbers are probably adjusted as he does not think it is safe for anyone to work in there and he will not be certain of the cost until he actually starts working in there.

Mr. Rinaldi said his point was that a lot of numbers are very specific. Mr. Tackett said the numbers he did for the house are correct and the numbers to repair the foundation is all correct. He said anything else that would come up would be cosmetic but it would cost a minimum of \$50,000 for the foundation. He said putting that kind of money into a foundation is not what he wants to do.

Ms. Fox said the Board requested expert testimony from an engineer or an architect that has expertise in historic renovation to base a determination for demolition.

Mr. Navarro said he has been practicing architecture for about five years in Columbus, and worked on a number of historic homes.

Ms. Fox said in demolition cases the Board is asked to look for whether or not the evidence provided by the applicant can be balanced against what would be put in its place. She said they need to balance what the restoration costs are versus what would be spent for a new build. She said the Board does not know the amount paid for the property, were provided somewhat with what renovation cost could be, and provided a sketch of a proposed new build but needs to know if something is being torn down just to build something bigger and more expensive. She noted quite a few neighbors are in support of a demolition but she would like to know why this particular property impedes orderly development.

Mr. Navarro said when considering renovation versus new build, they are not looking at it as a like-for-like new build. He said one could not get their money back after spending \$400,000 for a 1,000-square-foot home as it would not sell for that in this neighborhood. He said that goes more to the argument for

it not being economically feasible.

Mr. Tackett said a new build could be done at \$150 per foot, building a nice house with the correct materials and the inside could be \$250 - \$300 a square foot.

Ms. Fox said it is not the Board's role to ensure the investor makes a profit. She asked if there is another way this house can be repurposed. She said in a historic district a new build versus a renovation is not apples-to-apples.

Ms. Fox asked if the house has been considered a safety hazard, condemned, or deemed structurally unsound. Ms. Rauch said the Chief Building Official has reviewed the materials and he did not provide that recommendation at this point.

Shannon Stenberg said the Board understands the applicant is trying to make a profit or at least break even. She asked what changed his mind from what he looked at originally in order to be able to do that. She asked him if he knew it was 1,000 square feet to begin with.

Mr. Tackett said if it was a perfect little house they could add on, do something, but there is too much cost involved in putting it back into a quaint little house. He said this is a Sears Roebuck type house. He said if they were to try and add on to this house, whatever they did would destroy what is there now. He reiterated the second floor is useless.

Mr. Navarro said it would be difficult to add to the house and have it historically accurate as a four-square bungalow. He said a house that small is meant to be a quaint small house.

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

Tom Holton, 5957 Roundstone Place, said he is from the Historical Society. He asked the Board to consider a comparison to 30 – 32 S. High St. where there is a stop on that activity right now. He asked where the line should be drawn. He said 30 S. High is a log structure underneath the siding. He said just because it is made of wood does not make it less significant.

Mr. Holton said when this structure was built in the 30s, Dublin was a very poor village. He said it is hard to describe the style when the owners probably used whatever materials they could at the time to build a very small structure and over the years added on haphazardly to fit whatever needs they had. He said the scale is what is important to this building and it fits the lot. He said if the add-ons were stripped off, there would be a wonderful little house. He asked the Board to consider what happened at 93 S. Riverview, which is a very large massive building on a little lot without hardly any grass anymore. He said to consider the scale as that home overtook the lot.

Denise Franz King, 170 S. Riverview Street, said she was on this Board several years ago and respects that criteria-based decisions are made. She asked the Board to take into consideration the character of the district. She said after speaking to a lot of neighbors, they all bear some responsibility for allowing this house to deteriorate to the point it had. She said the lesson learned is that if we think someone needs some help that maybe we need to be more aggressive. She said the previous owner was moved to a much better situation, which was a social service. In the meantime, she said the eyesore is left on the street. She asked the Board to permit the current owner the opportunity to remove the home because it is past rehabilitation so we can get on with making this residential district as fine as it can be while maintaining the lot coverage and the scale.

Kathy Lannan, 37 S. Riverview Street, said she seconded what Denise said. She said the house has fallen into this condition over decades. She said several neighbors have referenced the house that was taken down at Pinney Hill and Riverview Street noting it was in a lot better condition than this one. She said there is not much there that can be saved and all the neighbors were surprised when the demolition was denied.

Kurt Schmitt, 97 S. Riverview St., said he agreed with Ms. King as this house got away from the community. He said Mr. Tackett would be doing the community a favor by removing the house. He said he has been a contractor for 43 years; the smell can never be removed. He said all the wood has to go because every time it is damp, it will smell as it is saturated with cat urine. He asked Ms. Fox to restate her inquiry about the City not owing the investor a profit.

Ms. Fox said when it comes to case law and architectural review boards, they are trying to balance the cost of restoration versus what someone would put into a new build. She said anywhere else when there is a house that needs to be torn down because it would be easier to build, in most cases, that is a reasonable decision. In the Historic District, it has to be viewed a different way because restoration is what the Board is trying to do. In every instance, she said the Board would prefer to have something old preserved and restored than built new because that is their job.

Mr. Schmitt said he made a presentation to the Board about two years ago and when he looks at the criteria they presented and compared it to the situation Mr. Tackett has presented, it seems like Mr. Tackett is being held to a different standard. He concluded the house is irreparable, Mr. Tackett is doing the neighborhood a favor with this proposal, and he has met criteria #2, 3, & 4.

Ms. Stenberg said she observed from the site visit that each room looked different and she found styles from the 30s, 50s, and 70s; there was no consistency. Before the visit, she said she thought the upstairs could be converted to a usable space but the visit changed her mind as she found small spaces and only seven-foot-high walls.

Ms. Fox said if it seems like Mr. Tackett is being held to a different standard, she was not on the Board when Mr. Schmitt made his proposal. She thanked Mr. Tackett for bringing additional information. She indicated that as the BSD comes under a lot of new pressures to develop in the historic neighborhoods, the ARB is going to have to become more observant and careful about when a structure is permitted to be demolished and what gets put in its place. She said Mr. Schmitt may be witnessing more intense reviews of these types of cases because those pressures are becoming extremely difficult and are coming quite quickly. She restated the Board has to really take a look at preserving the Historic District. She said when Mr. Tackett presented the first time, not enough information was provided for the Board to make a lasting decision for the neighborhood. She said not only is she appreciative of the measures Mr. Tackett has taken but also the neighbors because in the end the Historic District will become the kind of place that the neighbors want it to be because the neighbors want it to be that way, not because there is a Code. She said taking these steps ensures we are protecting the neighbors in and around the area and are not making a mistake. Not only does the Board have to consider the demolition but the Board also has to consider what is being put in its place. She said they have to consider the scale, the character, and the way it affects the neighbors whether they lose the sunlight in the backyard or their site lines down all green space.

Tom Munhall said the additional information and the site visit made it more present. He said as a CPA, he looked at the numbers. He said \$650,000 could be spent and there would be no garage and no air-conditioning. He said we should not guarantee a profit but at the same time, the test is, is it a reasonable economic use. He said the definition of reasonable is subjective. He noted the neighbors said it best when they stated the structure detracts from the neighborhood, currently. He said if the Board asks the

applicant to rebuild, they are making a copy; there is nothing preserved.

Mr. Rinaldi inquired about when a property in the Historic District goes for sale. He asked if the option of demolition has to be determined before making the purchase. He said if specific zoning requirements have to be met before demolition, the prospective buyer needs to be made aware of that.

Ms. Rauch said staff is not going to know every property that changes hands. She said this property did not even go on the market; it was sold between two individuals. She said people know what is required and there is a typical review process. She said this is the private property owner's responsibility, not the City's.

Mr. Rayburn said this sale was done through the owner and if this sale occurred with a realtor there would have been a Property Disclosure Form that is required.

Ms. Fox asked if the City's consultant had reviewed Riverview Street yet and determined whether this is a contributing or non-contributing property. Ms. Rauch said the consultant considered this to be contributing and both consultants made the same determination.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Rinaldi moved, Mr. Munhall seconded, to approve a request for the Demolition of the single-family structure with two conditions:

- 1) That the demolition does not occur until the Architectural Review Board approves a proposed design for the new single-family residence; and
- 2) That the demolition does not occur until building permits are issued.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Musser, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; Mr. Munhall, yes; and Mr. Rinaldi, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

3. Presentation - History of Dublin

Tom Holton, Dublin Historical Society presented a sample of Dublin's history via a visual tour of historic sites and properties. His intent he said was to provide a feeling that was described in the City of Dublin's 2007 Community Plan. "A community's character is shaped by both physical and intangible elements. It is the essence of a place and what one remembers long after leaving and that of which is described by others." He added "The pedestrian-scaled character of Historic Dublin is defined by the tight pattern of streets, a mix of uses, the size and scale of historic buildings, and the relationship of structures to the street."

Communications

Jennifer Rauch said a public meeting is scheduled for October 4, 2016, to gain input about the Bridge Street Code as it relates to the Historic District. She said this will be held from 5 pm – 8 pm at the Dublin Community Church.

Jane Fox said she attended the City Council meeting where they discussed the Zoning Code and an overlay. She asked if there will be any other meetings prior to the October 4th meeting on this topic. Ms. Rauch said there were not any other public meetings at this point.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 8:18 pm.

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