



MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, February 22, 2023

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Alexander, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and welcomed everyone to the February 22, 2023 Architectural Review Board. He stated that the meeting could also be accessed at the City's website. Public comments on the cases were welcome from meeting attendees and from those viewing from the City's website.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. Alexander led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Board Members present: Mr. Alexander, Mr. Cotter, Ms. Damaser
Board Members absent: Ms. Cooper, Mr. Jewell
Staff present: Ms. Holt, Ms. Mullinax, Ms. Singh

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS

Mr. Cotter moved, Ms. Damaser seconded acceptance of the documents into the record.

Vote: Mr. Cotter, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Damaser, yes.
[Motion carried 3-0]

Mr. Alexander stated that the Architectural Review Board is responsible for review of construction, modifications or alterations to any site in the Review District or area subject to Architectural Board Review under the provision of Zoning Code Section 153.170. The Board has the decision-making responsibility on these cases.

The Chair swore in staff and applicants who planned to address the Board on any of the cases during the meeting.

CASES

1. 114 S. High Street, 22-173MPR, Minor Project Review

Exterior modifications to an existing building located within the Historic District. The 0.20-acre site is zoned HD-HS, Historic South District and is located approximately 85 feet southeast of the intersection of Pinney Hill Lane and S. High Street.

CASE PRESENTATION

Ms. Mullinax stated that this is a request for review and approval of exterior modifications to an existing commercial building located within the Historic District including:

- a new front door tread/stoop;
- screening for the underside deck addition and HVAC units; and
- landscaping for the site and ground sign.

The site is located ±85 feet southeast of the intersection of Pinney Hill Lane and S. High Street and is zoned HD-HS: Historic District- South. It is surrounded by businesses to the north, south, and west and single-family homes to the east. The 0.20-acre site features an existing ±1,605-square-foot one-and-one-half-story building that was built in 1948 and is historically known as the Dr. Harry Karrer office. The building was built in the Colonial Revival style and contains a stone foundation, and its exterior walls are clad with stone and clapboard wood siding. According to the 2017 Historic and Cultural Assessment (HCA), the building is in good condition, has excellent integrity, and is recommended contributing to the District.

On October 26, 2022, the Architectural Review Board (ARB) approved a Minor Project for exterior modifications to the building with nine conditions. To fulfil one of those conditions, the applicant is required to provide underside deck screening and landscaping. Due to limited space between the approved deck and the existing sidewalk and steps, the proposed underside deck screening includes a Jakob GreenGuide metal wire trellis system along the north and east sides of the deck addition with Boston Ivy planted to grow up the trellis. ARB has approved similar trellises within the District, including those at 38 W. Bridge Street and the Library garage. The applicant is proposing landscaping along both the east and south elevations. Staff is supportive of the proposed site landscaping and screening. Building foundation plantings along the rear (east elevation) cannot be accommodated since the existing parking lot terminates at the building foundation and is an existing condition, which would negatively affect their parking if incorporated. On November 16, 2022, the ARB approved a Minor Project for window replacements and modifications to an approved deck addition and ADA ramp with four conditions. One of the conditions required the applicant to provide erosion and sedimentation control measures for the site after the landscaping was removed. The previously existing landscaping and front door stone stoop were removed by the applicant prior to the November 16, 2022 ARB approval to improve the safety of the principal entrance. The approved deck on the north elevation has yet to be constructed. Staff has reviewed the request against the applicable criteria and recommends approval of the Minor Project with five (5) conditions.

Board Questions for Staff

Mr. Alexander inquired if with plant screening, accommodation is allowed for growth of the plants. In other words, is only a percentage of the ultimate opacity goal required for new plants to allow opportunity for plant growth?

Ms. Mullinax responded that neither the Code nor Guidelines provide a recommended percentage of opacity at installation.

Ms. Holt stated that screening shrubs and ornamental grasses need to be at least 24 inches in height at installation. A City landscaping inspector reviews all landscape projects.

Mr. Alexander inquired if that is evaluated with the application.

Ms. Holt responded that it is evaluated at installation, but landscape plans are evaluated with those goals in mind.

Applicant Presentation

Brandon Dubinsky, JBM Development, 5420 Muirfield Court, Dublin, OH, stated that in regard to Mr. Alexander's question, under the windows, 24-inch boxwoods with hydrangeas behind would be planted under the windows, with the intent not to block the view of the exterior from the interior. He is concerned about the recommendation that the HVAC units be fully screened to the top of the units. With the plants chosen, that will be a challenge, as the HVAC units are 36-42 inches in height. Their proposed plant height of 24 inches will not meet that requirement, so they may need to change the coniferous species used.

Mr. Alexander requested clarification of the expectation related to the HVAC initial screening coverage versus anticipated screening coverage.

Ms. Holt responded that the zoning inspector would ensure the plants installed would perform as required by Code.

Mr. Alexander stated that if it is a condition, and initially, they will not meet that condition, the wording of the condition "fully screened to the top of the units by evergreens" should be changed to reflect what is expected.

Mr. Dubinsky stated that the intent is that the plants would grow to fully screen the units; however, the proposed boxwood shrub would not fully screen at installation.

Mr. Alexander recommended that the language of the condition be revised to clarify the full screening is anticipated after growth.

[Discussion continued regarding the revised wording.]

Mr. Alexander inquired if the applicant had any objection to the revised wording.

Mr. Dubinsky indicated he had no objection.

Mr. Alexander inquired if he had any objection to the other conditions.

Mr. Dubinsky requested clarification of condition #4 that the plantings at the base of the underside deck screening refer only to the east elevation; on the north elevation, there would be insufficient room. He pointed out that the available space is only 18 inches, but they would make their best effort to provide the plantings, hoping that there will be sufficient sunlight and irrigation for plant growth.

Ms. Mullinax clarified that the intent is that the condition for additional grasses or suitable plantings along the base of the deck on the east elevation would be required only if room permits for the plants to thrive. If the zoning inspector determines that there is insufficient room, that requirement would not apply.

Mr. Alexander inquired if the 18 inches is measured from the edge of the deck to the edge of the building.

Ms. Mullinax responded affirmatively.

Mr. Alexander stated that it appears the actual screen is set back past the edge of the deck; therefore, on the east elevation, the available space would be greater than 18 inches.

Mr. Dubinsky responded that the intent of the screening is to create a perimeter secured to the bottom of the deck. They should have 18 inches. He is comfortable with the condition

Public Comment

No public comments were received for this case.

Ms. Damaser moved, Mr. Cotter seconded approval of the Minor Project with the following conditions:

- 1) The applicant update their existing building permit after ARB approval to reflect these changes, subject to staff review and approval;
- 2) All existing shrub, tree species, and sizes be labeled on the landscape plan to be submitted at building permitting;
- 3) The HVAC units be fully screened to the top of the units by evergreens in time, to be field verified by staff at building permitting;
- 4) Additional grasses or other appropriate plantings be provided at the base of the underside deck screening along the east elevation, room permitting, finalized by staff at building permitting; and
- 5) Additional evergreen shrubs be added to complete the 360-degree plantings around the ground sign pole, finalized by staff at building permitting.

Vote: Mr. Cotter, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Damaser, yes.
[Motion carried 3-0]

2. 87 S. High Street, 23-006INF, Informal Review

Informal review and feedback for a rear addition and restoration of an existing two-story building in the Historic District. The 0.12-acre site is zoned HD-HS, Historic South District, and is located approximately 150 feet northwest of the intersection of Pinney Hill Lane and S. High Street.

Case Presentation

Ms. Singh stated that this is a request for an Informal Review for 87 S. High Street. The 0.12-acre site is zoned HD-HS, Historic South District, and is located approximately 150 feet northwest of the intersection of Pinney Hill Lane and S. High Street. The site has 30 feet of frontage on S. High Street and Mill Road. The existing use of the building is commercial, but it was originally designed as a residential building. The owners wish to convert the building to a personal residence and are requesting permission to add an addition to the rear of the existing structure. The applicant applied for an Informal Review in January 2021 to demolish the existing well house, modify the existing building, and construct a 2,000 SF addition on the 0.11 acre site. The ARB reviewed and provided the following non-binding feedback:

- Support for retaining the historic character of the existing building;
- Concern regarding demolition of the existing well house, encouraging that it, rather, be incorporated into the proposed design;
- Concern regarding the massing and scale of the new addition, particularly as seen from the alley;
- Not supportive of the connection between the existing structure and the proposed structure; preference for detached structures.

In response to the Board's input, the applicant has revised the plan as follows:

- Retained more of the historic character of the building;
- Restored the well house within the breezeway, which will connect the existing historic building to the new proposed addition;
- Simplified the form as a sensitive connection to the existing historic building;

- Proposed creation of a transparent breezeway.

The 4,950-square-foot lot is located approximately 55 feet northwest of the intersection of Pinney Hill Lane and S. High Street. The site has 30 feet of frontage on S. High Street and Mill Road. The site contains an existing building built c. 1840. The existing building is Greek Revival with characteristics of American Vernacular. The building has front-facing low-pitched gables and an emphasized cornice line. It is two rooms deep with double entry, originally designed to be residential. The decorative dentil frieze board along the front façade is not original to the structure but remains a distinctive feature of the current building. The Historic and Cultural Assessment (HCA) notes that this is a contributing front gable roof vernacular structure constructed during the period 1820-1880. The surrounding properties to the north and south contain buildings reflecting Victorian architecture.

The applicant is proposing to construct a 2,000 SF addition to the existing 1,091 SF historic structure with a single-story breezeway joining the historic building to the new addition. The proposal includes removing the parking lot connection between the properties located at 83 S. High Street and 91 S. High Street and re-establishing 87 S. High Street as an insular site. The Code requires that no single building in this District exceed 1,800 SF. The total lot is approximately 3,123 SF, including a patio and water feature, meeting the allowable lot coverage. There is a small, detached well house located directly to the rear of the existing building on the northern elevation, which the applicant is proposing to deconstruct/reconstruct within the new breezeway to highlight its historic influence. The applicant is proposing to reconstruct the chimney in the well house, using the same bricks. The proposed connector/breezeway will be glass on both sides. The well from the well house will be located near the proposed water feature in the open courtyard. [Building elevations, including a proposed two-story addition were reviewed.]

Staff has provided the following discussion questions:

- 1) Does the Board support the deconstruction/reconstruction of the existing well house?
- 2) Does the Board consider this a demolition that would require specific review and approval?
- 3) Does the Board support the updated mass and scale of the home and its response to the Guidelines?
- 4) Does the Board support the waivers to the building area maximum and building roof pitches?
- 5) Does the Board support the updated conceptual architectural character and details of the home, including rooflines and series of dormer windows?
- 6) Other considerations by the Board.

Board Questions for Staff

Mr. Cotter inquired if the proposed two-story addition would be 2,000 square feet (SF). The maximum permitted by Code is 1,800 square feet. Is 20% the maximum waiver permitted by Code?

Mr. Alexander responded that it is limited to 20%, so the addition could be a maximum square footage of 2,160SF.

Ms. Singh responded that each individual building cannot exceed 1,800 SF, and the total square footage cannot exceed 3,000 square feet. Therefore, a waiver would be required.

Mr. Alexander noted that the Board has considered waivers for similar projects in the past.

Mr. Cotter inquired if it is necessary to have two separate, detached structures to achieve a total of 3,000 SF.

Ms. Holt responded that there can be two structures, but no structure can be over 1,800 SF. Lot coverage is a separate requirement. With a single structure of 1,800 SF, a waiver could permit 120%, if approved.

Mr. Cotter inquired if two separate buildings would be permitted if the total SF does not exceed 3,000 SF.

Mr. Alexander responded that if there are two structures, then one must be primary; the other would be accessory. Is there a SF limitation for an accessory structure?

Ms. Singh responded that at the previous Informal Review discussion, the second building was referred to as a subordinate structure. The definition of a subordinate structure does not provide a size limitation.

Ms. Holt clarified that a detached accessory structure can be no greater than 25% of the primary structure's square footage.

Ms. Damaser pointed out that because of the breezeway, the addition is not an accessory structure. It is all one building.

Applicant Presentation

Brad Schoch, Architect, 6800 MacNeil Drive, Dublin stated that the building is currently a live/work structure, and the applicant is interested in making this their primary residence. In accordance with the Board's comments at the previous review regarding the detached structure on the rear of the property, they have revised the plan to use it as a primary feature of the project. A previous comment was that perhaps relocating the structure would give it its proper importance on the property and enable a more usable project. They followed up on that idea, and now have used it as a feature in connecting "old Dublin" with "new Dublin." They have referred to it as the well house, as it once housed a water pump. They have tried to keep the subordinate building similar to that of the primary building, but distinguish it sufficiently, so that it does not feel like a "near miss." For that reason, they selected board and batten versus siding, which is used on the existing building. The roof forms are sufficiently different to distinguish the primary building.

Board Questions for Applicant

Mr. Cotter inquired about the intended reconstruction.

Mr. Schoch responded that the existing shed is in poor condition. They will attempt to recapture the building to the extent possible, certainly the brickwork that created a flue probably for a cooking area separate from the main house. They will reuse the brickwork and the siding to the extent possible. It will be difficult to save the existing doors and windows of the shed.

Mr. Alexander stated that it appears that they have changed the direction of the gable and fenestrations, so it will have a different appearance.

Mr. Schoch agreed that it would have a different appearance. The intent is to make reference to the historic structure that existed in a different location on the lot. He believes it will be interpreted in that way, based on its materials being different from the surrounding materials, particularly those of the glass breezeway.

Mr. Cotter inquired about the dormers on the new addition. Their pitch does not conform, and they look more modern than historic.

Mr. Schoch responded that they debated that element, and if asked to reconsider the shape of the dormer, they would consider it. However, the current configuration is simple, clean and intended to distinguish the addition from the primary structure. In addition, it makes the second floor of the new structure functional. Without the dormers, there would be little usable space. Although it has the height, there is only attic space in the primary structure.

Mr. Cotter stated that per the Code, the size of the proposed new edition exceeds the maximum square footage of 1,800 SF (one building) of liveable space by approximately 1,000 square feet. The proposed square footage is 3,000 SF+/-.

Mr. Schoch responded that they would be requesting a waiver. They were concerned about the lot coverage more than building footprint.

Mr. Alexander responded that the building size will be a greater barrier than the lot coverage. The Architectural Review Board is unable to grant a waiver to increase the square footage more than 20%.

Mr. Cotter pointed out that with the waiver, the maximum floor plan could be no more than 2,160 SF.

Mr. Schoch stated that this was not something of which his team had been made aware.

Ms. Singh stated that the total building area would be 3,000 square feet. The existing structure is approximately 1,050 or 1,090 SF. The proposed addition is approximately 2,200 SF. The addition is permitted to be 1,800 SF, and a waiver would add 360 SF to the 1,800 SF. That would give a total of 3,000+ square feet.

Mr. Alexander indicated that is incorrect. If the two buildings are connected, it is one building. The total building coverage must be used, which can exceed 1,800 SF by only 20%.

Mr. Cotter stated that with the Code restriction, the building square footage cannot be more than 2,160 SF.

Mr. Alexander stated that the applicant would need to consider different strategies. Although the building connector is a nice space, it adds square footage. Two separate buildings would be an option. The property to the south added a detached office structure, for example.

Mr. Cotter stated that he is dealing with a Code restriction.

Mr. Schoch stated that the barrier seems to be whether the entire building is attached or whether it is two separate structures.

Mr. Alexander stated that connection could be underground.

Ms. Damaser pointed out that if there are two buildings, the accessory building can be only 25% of the primary structure. That would significantly decrease the square footage possible. She requested clarification of the possible amount of square footage.

Mr. Alexander responded that with the waiver, the total footprint could be 2,160 SF. Lot coverage is different from building coverage, and their proposed lot coverage is fine.

Public Comment

There were no public comments on the case.

Board Discussion

Mr. Alexander stated that, assuming the applicant will come back with a revised plan, the Board should provide input on the other discussion questions. Does the Board support the deconstruction/reconstruction of the existing well house?

Mr. Cotter stated that as described, the reconstructed well house would be completely different. He is not totally opposed to relocating it, but it is preferable not to take down accessory buildings. Mr. Alexander stated that what the Board had in mind was incorporating the outbuilding. What is unique about the outbuildings is that they are isolated, smaller, secondary buildings to the primary structures. Their historic character makes them unique. If they are taken apart and integrated, the historic character has been compromised in a number of ways. As an Architectural Review Board, it would be difficult to support their proposed treatment of that historic structure. Moving it or giving it another use would be fine, but if it is incorporated into the structure, its identity disappears.

Mr. Cotter stated that it essentially would be a demolition and a reconstruction.

Mr. Alexander stated that there are ways to move it on the lot.

Ms. Damaser stated that as proposed, the reconstructed well house would essentially be subservient to the breezeway. It would no longer be a free-standing well house, which is what made it unique and historic. She is not supportive of using the well house to provide an element of interest in a breezeway.

Mr. Alexander referred to Question #3 – Is the Board supportive of the updated mass and scale of the home and its response to the Guidelines?

Mr. Cotter responded that as proposed, both the mass and scale are too much. The size of the footprint is inconsistent with Code.

Ms. Damaser stated that she is not opposed to the scale; it is not that massive. The roof pitch lines look odd, but that is a different issue.

Mr. Alexander stated that because it is set so far back, the addition could even be slightly taller, but what is unusual is the shed dormer. The Code requires traditional and vernacular architectural forms. A shed dormer is not a vernacular architectural form. If the sections are drawn accurately, he believes they should still be able to have the rooms on the second level. Multiple dormers could be used, and a steeper pitch could achieve more headroom. He is less concerned with the height than the shed dormers.

Ms. Damaser agreed that a shed dormer with a flat roof is not appropriate in this District.

Mr. Cotter agreed that a slightly greater height would be possible, as it would not be seen from the street.

Ms. Damaser stated that multiple dormers would look appropriate in this area.

Mr. Schoch stated that they would be able to address the dormers in a revised plan per the Board's guidance.

Mr. Alexander stated that the Board could be supportive of a waiver regarding the pitch for a smaller shed dormer.

Mr. Alexander referred to Question #5 concerning the updated conceptual architectural character and details of the home.

Mr. Cotter responded that adding the new porch element was a positive improvement to the front elevation.

Mr. Alexander noted that there should probably be a cap on the brick wall. He would question the use of limestone on one side of the structure and brick on the other, and the continuity of material use in different locations. He believes the more significant issues are the form, which should be vernacular, and the treatment of the well house.

Tom Hospel, property owner, 9995 Allen Drive, Dublin, OH requested clarification of the permitted size with the 20% waiver.

Mr. Cotter responded that the permitted square footage of 1,800 SF could be increased with the waiver to a total of 2,160 SF.

Mr. Alexander stated that the primary structure is 1,090 square feet, so they would be able to add 1,070 SF. The second floor is not factored into the building footprint/coverage.

Mr. Cotter inquired if the maximum building footprint refers to the building ground coverage or to the SF of living area.

Ms. Holt responded that it is the area of the building touching/covering the ground.

Mr. Alexander stated that the Board wants to preserve the well house. Perhaps if it were preserved on another site, the applicant would gain an additional 190 SF. He would urge them to look at creative solutions. It is possible to revise the current concept to meet the required square footage and still have the two bedrooms. The square footage is based on a percentage of the lot size.

Mr. Hospel stated that the building SF limitation was not brought up during the January 2021 Informal Review discussion or in pre-planning meetings. The change associated with that is significant, and he wants to avoid presenting a plan to the Board in the future that does not meet expectations.

Mr. Alexander responded that he believes the previous Informal Review discussion focused primarily on architecture, not building area. He cannot speak to what was addressed in planning meetings, but the issue relates to a Code requirement, and the Board must review projects in view of the Code.

Mr. Schoch stated that according to his calculations, they are approximately 280 square feet away from the permitted square footage, so they will give that some thought. He requested clarification of the suggestion to move the well house offsite.

Mr. Alexander responded that in the past, a log cabin on a Dublin property was disassembled and rebuilt on the Dublin Art Council property. Keeping it in its preferred location would not contribute to the applicant's liveable space; however, if it could be donated and preserved, the applicant would gain 190 square feet. Along with that, they would still need to revise the design to reduce the building coverage.

Mr. Schoch stated that they would follow up with staff and identify what party to contact regarding the opportunity to donate the well house, should they wish to pursue that suggestion.

Ms. Damaser noted that two ARB members are absent tonight, so the applicant is receiving the input of only three members.

Mr. Schoch thanked the Board for their input and information.

3. Riverview Village, 40 E. Bridge Street, 17, 27, 37, 45, 53, and 62 N. Riverview Street, and PID 273-005564, 23-14INF, Informal Review

Informal review and feedback for a walkable commercial village in the north section of the Historic District. The 2.85-acre site is zoned HD-HR and HP, Historic District - Historic Residential and Historic Public. This site is located northeast of the intersection of N. Blacksmith Lane and E. Bridge Street.

Case Presentation

Ms. Holt stated that the 2.85-acre, multi-parcel site is located on both sides of N. Riverview Street, north of E. Bridge Street. Currently, the site contains seven contributing single-family residences on eight individual lots. The City purchased these properties in early 2021 with the goal of redevelopment. Approval of a future rezoning and Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) would be necessary for the project to proceed. At this point, all existing buildings are legal with their setbacks and lot coverage, based on their pre-existing conditions prior to adoption of the current Code. The uses envisioned for this project would fit within the Historic District – Historic Core zone, rather than the existing Historic Residential and Historic Public zones. New buildings and additions will have to conform to Code requirements. With the PDP, each lot would need to be surveyed to determine exact locations, setbacks, and lot coverages. The existing lots range in size; potential lot coverage if rezoned to Historic Core would be 85 percent. [Description of existing site conditions and structures was given.] The proposal is for the creation of Riverview Village, a mixed-use development for all properties within the project area. Envisioned is a walkable district that has a mix of makers and artists, restaurants, educators, start-up businesses, and growing small businesses.

There are two development options: one is a minimum density and one is a maximum density. The minimum density proposal includes: parking on Blacksmith Lane; pedestrian access on Wing Hill Lane; a new 10,400 SF office building on the currently vacant lot south of 62 N. Riverview; potential removal of the three south properties from the project; addition of decks/eating areas to 62 N. Riverview for a restaurant or outdoor venue; potential to remove 53 N. Riverview Street; addition of new outbuildings. The maximum density proposal includes the same features, plus additions to 40 E. Bridge Street, 17 N. Riverview and 37 N. Riverview Street, and a new structure located between 45 and 53 N. Riverview Street. If the site is rezoned to Historic Core, the minimum lot sizes would be 21,000 SF. The proposed COhatch office building located south of 62 N. Riverview is conceptually shown as a series of three interlocking boxes with off-set gables, located along the uppermost lot edge adjacent to N. Riverview Street. Conceptual materials include vertical board and batten siding and possibly a standing seam metal roof. It is anticipated that the architecture would be similar to the existing COhatch building on North Street, which could be appropriate given the campus-like nature of the project, proximity to the river and the Link Bridge, and screening with natural vegetation.

Staff has provided the following discussion questions:

- 1) Does the Board support the proposed design concept for the N. Riverview Street area?
- 2) Does the Board support the rezoning from Historic Residential and Public to Historic Core? Would the Board support 17 and 19 N. Riverview Street and 40 E. Bridge Street being kept as Historic Residential as an option?
- 3) Does the Board support the addition of a 10,400 SF office building south of 62 N. Riverview, and what is the Board's reaction to potential scale and massing?

- 4) Does the Board support the proposed inspiration material palette? Would the Board support the new office building to appear similar to the existing COhatch building?
- 5) Does the Board support the proposed infill building options for location, scale, massing, and number?
- 6) Does the Board support the potential demolition of the historic outbuildings along N. Blacksmith Lane to allow for vehicular traffic and parking?
- 7) Would the Board support the potential demolition of the house at 53 N. Riverview?

Applicant Presentation

Matt Davis, 4620 Hickory Rock Drive, Powell, OH and Tim Li, 401 W. Town Street, Columbus, OH were present.

Mr. Davis stated that they submitted this project last July in response to a City RFP for a walkable district, highly community engaging and interfacing with the park. Their project is conceptual only at this point, so they are seeking the Board's input. To date, they have had several meetings with City staff. 70-80% of their proposed plan is very flexible, but some elements are necessary for the plan to move forward. The most important element to make this project work is the view from The Link Bridge. Additionally, the view of the red house at 62 N. Riverview from the bridge would be an attractive entrance into this district. There must be sufficient critical mass and desirability for people to be attracted to this area, as there will be limited parking. The new office building on the cliff overlooking the river would also be essential to make the project feasible. He believes the 53 N. Riverview structure is essentially unusable. Due to its small footprint and low ceiling, it is the least useful building on the site. He is interested on having the Board's feedback on the proposed massing and the options concerning 53 N. Riverview Street.

Board Questions for Applicant

Mr. Cotter requested clarification of the critical pieces of the development to the applicant.

Mr. Davis responded that the critical pieces are the office building, the view from The Link Bridge and the red house at 62. N. Riverview. He suggested possible uses for the other homes within the project area.

Public Comment

Scott Haring, 3280 Lily Mar Ct. Dublin, OH stated that he was unaware that a future rezoning of this area was being considered. He is concerned about the proposed density. A proposed 85% lot coverage would spoil the character of this street, which has contained individual houses for many decades. The potential rezoning is the greater question here.

Mr. Alexander stated that the position the City is in is that there is no market for these structures as single-family homes, so another option for this area must be considered.

Board Discussion

Mr. Alexander directed the Board's comments to the discussion questions.

- 1) Does the Board support the proposed design concept for the N. Riverview Street area?
- The Board indicated support for the proposed design concept.

- 2) Does the Board support the rezoning from Historic Residential and Public to Historic Core? Would the Board support 17 and 19 N. Riverview Street and 40 E. Bridge Street being kept as Historic Residential as an option?

The Board was supportive of rezoning the entire area as opposed to keeping three structures as Historic Residential. Rezoning the entire area would present more coverage opportunities.

- 3) Does the Board support the addition of a 10,400 SF office building south of 62 N. Riverview Street, and what is the Board's reaction to the potential scale and massing?

Mr. Alexander inquired if in this case, the square footage does not apply to the building footprint, but to the total building area of multiple floors.

Mr. Davis responded affirmatively.

The Board indicated support for the addition of the 10,400 SF office building south of 62 N. Riverview, depending on its proposed design.

- 4) Does the Board support the proposed inspiration material palette? Would the Board support the new office building to appear similar to the existing COhatch building?

Mr. Li clarified that they would not be proposing a structure similar to the existing COhatch building. There were specific reasons for the design of their existing building. This site does not have the same site constraints. They would be suggesting a material palette that would fit into the neighborhood.

The Board indicated that they were tentatively supportive of a more flexible design.

- 5) Does the Board support the proposed infill building options for location, scale, massing, and number?

The Board indicated greater support for the minimum density proposal, although they could support a hybrid of the minimum and maximum density options.

- 6) Does the Board support the potential demolition of the historic outbuildings along N. Blacksmith Lane to allow for vehicular traffic and parking?

Ms. Holt indicated that one of the outbuildings is a duplex privy.

The Board indicated support for demolition for two of the outbuildings; discussion of the historical significance related to the duplex privy would occur with any proposal for demolition. The Board indicated they had no objection to the proposed use of N. Blacksmith Lane, if that is the recommendation of Engineering staff.

- 7) Would the Board support the potential demolition of the house at 53 N. Riverview?

Board members indicated varying support for the potential demolition, noting that there is demolition criteria that must be met for approval.

Mr. Davis inquired if the Board had any objections to extending the brand of Riverview Village up Wing Hill Lane establishing a connection point, using similar light posts, sidewalks and signage. The Board indicated that they were supportive; it would have the potential of helping the businesses on High Street. The proposed connections in the concept seem appropriate.

COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Holt shared the following:

- The Historic District Commercial Façade Improvement Grant Program will be reinstituted with the formation of a City Commercial Improvement Corporation (CIC). Properties within the Historic District would be eligible to receive grants for proposed projects of 50% of the project costs, not to exceed \$25,000. The grants would be approved by the CIC, but the projects would require ARB approval.
- This Summer 2023, the Parks Department will be rebuilding the perimeter stonewall of the main cemetery on Bridge Street, using existing materials. The intent is to ensure the stonewall has a consistent elevation, and the entry columns will be positioned wider to provide easier access.
- Inquired if there is a need to continue to make proposed landscape materials available at the Development Building for the Board's review. Building materials, however, would continue to be brought to the Board for their review.

Board consensus was that staff notify the Board when landscape material samples are provided for staff's review, and if the Board is interested, they can review the material within the same timeframe as staff.

- The next regular meeting of the ARB is scheduled for Wednesday, March 15, 2023.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:46 p.m.


Chair, Architectural Review Board


Assistant Clerk of Council