



MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, March 15, 2023

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Cotter, Vice Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and welcomed everyone to the March 15, 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. Cotter led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Board Members present: Mr. Cotter, Ms. Damaser, Ms. Cooper

Board Members absent: Mr. Alexander, Mr. Jewell

Staff present: Ms. Holt, Mr. Shamp, Ms. Peuser

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Cooper moved, Ms. Damaser seconded acceptance of the documents into the record and approval of the January 25, 2023 and February 22, 2023 minutes.

Vote: Mr. Cotter, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Ms. Damaser, yes.

[Motion carried 3-0]

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

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

Mr. Cotter stated if no board member had an objection to hearing Case 2 first, as Case 1 has a higher degree of complexity, he would request a motion to revise the agenda accordingly.

Ms. Cooper moved, Ms. Damaser seconded a revision to the agenda moving the review of 64 S. Riverview Street, Case 22-161MPR, Minor Project Review, to first on the agenda.

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

CASES

2. 64 S. Riverview Street, 22-161MPR, Minor Project Review

A request for exterior modifications to an existing building on a 0.23-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic Residential, located northeast of the intersection of S. Riverview Street with Eberly Hill Lane.

Case Presentation

Ms. Peuser stated that this is a request for a Minor Project Review (MPR) of a proposed project for exterior modifications including a multi-level deck and a new spiral staircase on an existing residence located at 64 S. Riverview. The home was constructed in 1994 and is not considered contributing to the Historic District. The home sits on a steep grade that backs up to the Scioto River. The home is vertical in nature due to the steep grade change, with three levels visible from the rear and one level visible from the front elevation along South Riverview Street. The previously existing multi-level deck built with the home was demolished in Fall 2022. A new, replacement deck was constructed without Planning staff review or ARB approval, although an approved permit was obtained from Building Standards on September 21, 2022. To provide a clear record, the applicant is seeking ARB's review and approval of the constructed deck in addition to a new spiral staircase. Ms. Peuser reviewed the existing site conditions, noting that the deck is not visible from the public right-of-way on S. Riverview. The original deck was two levels, leading to the second and third floors of the home. The applicant added an additional 154-square foot ground level to provide below grade storage. The deck footers replaced the original deck footers in the same holes, and the deck maintains the same footprint. The 166-square-foot second level of the deck is screened, and staff has determined that the screening is not opaque, thus it complies with Historic Dublin Design Guidelines. The third level is the same depth and width as the second level, creating an overhang and a cover for the second level. The multi-level wood deck on the rear elevation of the existing home is constructed of pressure-treated wood planks with a stainless steel cable rail system. A proposed spiral staircase, 11 feet, 3 inches in height, will connect the ground and second levels of the deck. Staff has reviewed the submitted lot survey and determined that the project was not within the scope of the Special Flood Hazard area and does not disrupt the site grade. The proposed staircase is a paragon black steel spiral staircase. In May 2013, the ARB approved a similar case at 134 S. Riverview Street, which also was considered non-contributing to the District. The railing is composed of Feeney stainless steel cable. Cable railing was disapproved by the ARB for 94 Franklin Street in February 2022, with a determination that cable railing was too contemporary for that style of house. However, 94 Franklin Street is considered contributing to the Historic District, while 64 S. Riverview is considered non-contributing. Therefore, staff has no concerns with the cable rail system. Additionally, the decks are not visible from the front or sides of the house.

Staff has reviewed the application against all applicable criteria and recommends approval of the Minor Project with the following two conditions.

- 1) Applicant stain or seal all wood surfaces;
- 2) Applicant apply for the appropriate building permitting for the spiral staircase upon approval from the ARB.

Board Questions for Staff

Mr. Cotter requested clarification of the need for a building permit.

Ms. Peuser responded that the building permit for the deck was already approved, and the deck is built. The spiral staircase was not part of that building permit approval, so an additional building permit for the staircase is required.

Board Discussion

Mr. Cotter stated that the Board has previously disapproved the type of deck railing used on a contributing structure (94 Franklin Street). What is the Board's position on future proposals for cable railing on non-contributing structures?

Ms. Cooper inquired if the ARB had reviewed or approved cable railing on previous non-contributing properties.

Ms. Peuser responded that she was unable to locate any precedent.

Mr. Cotter stated that in regard to potential future cases, he believes the railing is too modern for the District.

Ms. Damaser responded that the use on this site is not a concern because it is a non-contributing structure and also because it is located on the rear of the structure and is not visible from the street. During the kayaking season, the trees should be fully leafed, so it would not be visible from the river.

Ms. Cooper requested clarification of the Board's purview with the application, since the structure is already constructed.

Ms. Damaser responded that since the railing was never approved, the Board is reviewing it as an application for approval. If the Board disapproved it tonight, the applicant would be required to remove it.

Ms. Cooper noted that tonight, the Board is correcting the currently missing review and approval/disapproval.

Mr. Cotter inquired if the application had come before the Board in the proper manner, what would have been the Board's recommendation on this type of railing? This clarification will provide valuable guidance for future applications. In a normal review process, would the Board guard against this type of railing?

Board consensus was that the Board would guard against it, as it is inconsistent with the traditional type of materials in the Architectural Review District.

Ms. Damaser stated that she is not comfortable with approving a material tonight that the Board would disapprove in the future. We should look at this application as if the deck had not yet been built.

Ms. Cooper inquired the date of construction.

Ms. Peuser stated that she is unsure of the construction date, but the building permit was approved in September 2022.

Ms. Damaser stated that if the Board approves it, the next applicant will refer to this approval as an argument for their request for approval.

Mr. Shamp responded that the applicant certainly could state that, but with ARB or BZA reviews the specific factors matter. In this case, the deck is out of the sight line at the rear of the property, and the view of it is shielded by leaves. If this case were to be approved tonight, it does not necessarily constrain the Board's review of future cases.

Ms. Cooper stated that there was decking on this house before it was replaced with the new deck. From that perspective, a deck was a pre-existing condition. This was not a new-build project, as a future project likely would be.

Mr. Cotter stated that in regard to future project reviews, as the Assistant Law Director has pointed out, the circumstances will matter.

Public Comment

There were no public comments.

Mr. Cotter inquired if the applicant had any objections to the two conditions for approval. He requested clarification of the building permit.

Applicant Comment

Norman Senhauser, property owner, 64 S. Riverview Street, Dublin, Ohio stated that they had already applied for the building permit. They are waiting the required year, then will be sealing the deck. He noted that their idea for their railing came from the City's suspension bridge. The railing on their previous deck had metal railings; it is being replaced with smaller metal railing. Additionally, two doors down from them, the deck on the rear of the home has cable railing facing the river. The current project was for maintenance, as the previous deck was deteriorating.

Ms. Damaser responded that the fact that the deck and metal railing with the same footprint was pre-existing makes it easier to approve as a replacement project.

Ms. Damaser moved, Ms. Cooper seconded to approve the Minor Project with the following conditions:

- 1) Applicant stain or seal all wood surfaces;
- 2) Applicant apply for the appropriate building permitting for the spiral staircase upon approval from the ARB.

Vote on the motion: Mr. Cotter, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Ms. Damaser, yes.
[Motion approved 3-0]

1. 36-40 N. High Street – Stone Wall, 23-015INF, Informal Review

Informal review and feedback for the repair and replacement of stones within a historic retaining wall on shared lots totalling 0.46 acres. The site is zoned Historic District, Historic Core and is located northeast of the intersection of Wing Hill Lane with N. High Street.

Case Presentation

Ms. Holt stated that this is an approximately 102-foot long historic stonewall that straddles three separately-owned lots, 38 and 40 N. High Street and 25 North Street, zoned Historic District, Historic Core. The applicant is seeking non-binding feedback regarding proposed repair of a deteriorating portion of the wall that spans 36 to 40 N. High Street. The portion behind 25 North Street, the COhatch site, appears to be in stable condition. Various options are available for consideration, some of which would set a precedent within the District. An MPR was submitted for

repair of this wall, spanning the 36-40 N. High Street addresses, on November 29, 2022. After a round of reviews, the project stalled with differing opinions about how to repair the wall and to what extent. In order to keep the project moving forward, Staff suggested that the Informal process be used to gain direction from the Board. The stonewall was constructed in approximately 1934 by Ticky Wing, for which Wing Hill Lane is named. Part of the wall system has the two-story privy behind 36-38 N. High Street. It is constructed of dry laid stones capped with a larger row of blocks. Some of the capstones are missing and the blocks are discoloured by water damage. The applicant is proposing approximately 26 linear feet (20 feet south-facing, and 6 feet east-facing) of wall repair on the south and east sides. This would address the portion that is immediately adjacent to the previously approved 36-38 N. High Street project, but would leave the issues behind 40 N. High unaddressed. This wall functions as a total system based on it being pervious to water infiltration, and staff has concerns that repairing some of the wall to be impervious/mortared does not address the wall system as a whole. Staff requests the Board's comments on the desired approach to the wall repair.

Ms. Holt provided the case history. In early 2020, the owner of 40 N. High Street, James Lapierrre, DDS, submitted an Informal Review application for the proposed expansion of his building on the property, the addition of town homes, partial demolition of the historic wall, and full demolition of the historic privy under previous Code. The Board expressed unanimous support for preserving both wall and privy but did acknowledge the potential for wall dismantling and rebuilding. That proposal did not move forward. In May 2021, the City requested its consultant, Preservation Designs Limited (PDL) to evaluate the historic stonewall. PDL hired Korda/Nemeth Engineering to conduct a structural assessment. The report noted the original wall functioned because a free-draining material backfilled behind the interlocking face stones allowed natural drainage to percolate through the structure. Since the wall's construction, mortar-filled joints from alterations and repairs had trapped water behind the wall, leading to areas of compromise. The study recommended a professional stonemason be consulted to provide additional options for preservation and prevention of further deterioration, including limiting parking surcharges at 40 N. High Street, drainage, and invasive tree growth. On November 29, 2022, an MPR was submitted for repair of this wall at 36-40 N. High Street, but that project ultimately stalled due to differing opinions about the extent of repair needed. In order to keep the project moving forward, staff suggested an Informal Review to obtain Board direction. In December 2022, a Final Development Plan (FDP) for 36-38 N. High was approved by the Board with a condition of approval that a Minor Project Review (MPR) demonstrate how to stabilize the stonewall prior to any demolition work on the 36-38 N. High Street project. This was necessary as the anticipated excavation for utilities in close proximity to the wall would endanger it.

Ms. Holt reviewed the specific areas of concern. The existing wall between 36 and 40 N. High Street shows a number of areas of deterioration, as noted in PDL's latest report and photographs. Areas of bulging are seen on the south-facing portion of the wall at 36-38 N. High Street. Currently, 40 N. High Street uses the area at the top of the walled area as customer parking, which adds an unanticipated surcharge to the structure. Additionally, drainage from 40 N. High has been directed to the side of the wall facing 36-38 N. High Street via a flexible pipe, directly above the deformation on the south side of the wall. The Korda assessment also indicated that invasive Ailanthus trees on top of and below the wall at 40 N. High Street are contributing to its condition. Additionally, the sanitary sewer pipe running through the wall, with a surrounding mortared area, is likely contributing to the corner condition.

PDL has provided three different options for the Board's consideration.

(1) No action:

Without some kind of remediation, the wall will continue to deteriorate. A photographic comparison of the wall over the last two years indicates potential movement on the south elevation. Precautions such as roping off the top and bottom parking areas to prevent injury are recommended. No action ultimately would risk losing the historic wall by demolition due to neglect.

(2) Replace the wall with a modern structure:

A concrete footer and wall covered with an historic-appearing veneer of native stone and hidden mortar would replace the actual historic structure and its attributes, setting a precedent within the Historic District and creating a false sense of history. It could allow a more convenient location of the wall on each lot, however, or replacement of the wall with a series of lower walls or other creative solution to accommodate the grade change. How this would preserve the two-story privy at 36-38 N. High Street would have to be determined.

(3) Repair and preserve the existing wall:

This is the most preservation-oriented scenario and would best accommodate the structure's attributes as a contributing object within the district. The existing wall would remain in its current location. This option would be possible only by using stonemasons and structural engineers experienced with historic dry stone masonry.

Additionally, the City recently reinstituted the Façade Improvement Grant program in the Historic District, which could provide an opportunity for this project. Lot owners are eligible to receive grants for historic façade and site improvements, and preservation of historic walls could qualify. Individuals are able to apply for up to \$25,000 of financial assistance and up to 50 percent of the total project cost. Each application is reviewed and determined by Dublin's Community Improvement Corporation, separate from the development review process. \$100,000 is available per year. Projects receiving grant awards would need to come before the ARB for project approval.

Staff has provided the following questions to guide the Board's discussion:

- 1) Does the Board support a holistic approach of repairing the entire wall system vs. individual repairs?
- 2) What recommendation does the Board have regarding the proposed design and structural approaches for the wall?
 - a. No action
 - b. Structural reconstruction of the wall using concrete footers and a false wall that would be faced with the historic stone and perhaps allowing the wall to be relocated in a more convenient place on the site.
 - c. Structural reconstruction using only the historic materials and techniques
- 3) What additional information would the Board need to make a determination on one of these solutions?
- 4) If the Board supports historic reconstruction, would the Board support the use of historic mortar that is not visible, if it improved the structural strength of the wall?
- 5) Other Board considerations.

Board Questions to Staff

Ms. Damaser inquired if the holistic approach would involve 200 linear feet of wall, including the northern section that is less of an issue.

Ms. Holt responded that the holistic approach would involve approximately 100 feet. The applicant is proposing to address 20 linear feet of the south wall and 8 feet of return. Potentially, more repairs may be needed, however. Some of the reports have indicated that the wall system needs to be considered comprehensively.

Ms. Damaser inquired the number of property owners impacted.

Ms. Holt responded that two property owners would be impacted at this time. The property at 36-38 N. High Street belongs to one owner, and the property at 40 N. High Street is owned by another individual. The property to the north on which COhatch is located is in good condition.

Ms. Damaser inquired if a holistic approach were to be taken, the COhatch property owner would be involved, as well.

Ms. Holt responded affirmatively.

Mr. Cotter inquired if the stonewall were to be considered for removal, would it be subject to the demolition criteria. That particular section of Code refers to properties and structures. A wall might not be considered a structure.

Applicant Presentation

Bryan Lundgren, Osborn Engineering, 130 E Chestnut St Suite 401, Columbus, Ohio stated that his firm is representing the owner. They are working on the multi-family project on the property impacted by this stonewall.

Jim Cox, Vic Art Masonry, 1577 East Fifth Avenue, Columbus, Ohio stated his interest in the project is the 20 linear feet on the privy section on the south end of the wall and approximately 7-8 feet of return on the east side, a total of 30 linear feet of stonewall on that corner. The rest of the wall is in good shape. The long section of the wall is constructed of higher quality stones.

Mr. Cotter inquired if he is proposing to repair said section to structural soundness.

Mr. Cox responded affirmatively, indicating that the method and approach has yet to be defined. He is not particularly supportive of using the original historic method used in 1939. Although they can repair it using an entirely dry laid method, that method is not ideal. Due to the parking area located above, he would prefer to construct a concrete wall with a stone face. He has done dry laid work, however.

Ms. Damaser inquired if the decision were made to repair the wall utilizing the original construction method, how that would be done. Would the wall be taken down, and then re-laid?

Mr. Cox responded that on the side of the privy, it would be taken down and re-laid. There is an exposed sewer pipe in that area. They would construct a thick wall, backfilled with gravel to accommodate the drainage.

Ms. Cooper inquired if the wall were not restored by using dry laid stone, what method would be utilized.

Alpesh Chavda, Senior Structural Engineer, Osborn Engineering, 138 E Chestnut St., Suite 401, Columbus, Ohio stated that they would not be changing the loading on the wall. The wall deterioration was due to water seepage, not the loading. Parking blocks would be used at the top in the parking spaces. The wall would be replaced with a wall of the same height. They would backfill the wall with gravel, which will reduce the pressure on the wall, and drains would be placed behind the wall. Currently, a large amount of water is running down and through the dry laid stone. Over time, that has caused the wall to bulge out. They can rebuild the wall, perhaps using some mortar in the joints to strengthen it, which would not be visible from the outside.

Ms. Cooper inquired if there would be parking blocks in the area at the top of the wall and in the area below, as well.

Mr. Chavda responded affirmatively.

Mr. Cox stated that there are a number of large stone blocks existing on the site.

Ms. Damaser noted that in one of the reports, there was a suggestion that those blocks might be those missing from the top of the wall. If so, they could be returned to the top of the wall.

Mr. Cotter stated that there appears to be the ability for the wall to be re-laid in a manner that does not trap water behind the wall. What are the thoughts about the sewer line located at the 40 N. High Street property?

Mr. Lundgren responded that their project is limited to the southern portion of the wall.

Mr. Cotter referred to Question #1: Does the Board support a holistic approach of repairing the entire wall system vs. individual repairs?

Ms. Cooper responded that, typically, a holistic approach is advisable, if all property owners are supportive of it. However, the necessary project area for the property owner of 36-38 N. High Street is the repair of the south-facing wall. The rest of the wall is in good shape on the east-facing side.

Ms. Damaser stated that while the Board is supportive of the historic wall being addressed for all the properties, the Board cannot require all the property owners to participate. Perhaps all the property owners could take advantage of the façade improvement grant program.

Ms. Cooper stated that each of the property owners would be eligible for a grant, assuming they met the criteria.

Mr. Cotter stated that the major concern is at the corner. If only part of the wall is addressed, the corner, which is deteriorating, could fall. A holistic approach would be preferred.

Ms. Damaser suggested that the Board express support of a holistic approach and ask staff to facilitate the participation of the respective parties.

Ms. Holt responded that staff has been attempting to do just that. Dr. Lapierre is present tonight to hear this discussion, and staff is hopeful the two parties will work together.

Mr. Cotter stated that the concern is that if this is not handled appropriately, it will end up with secondary challenges. Perhaps staff could reach out to City Council regarding any other available opportunities of mutual benefit to all parties.

Ms. Cooper inquired about the potential use of the existing historic stones on site, as it is important not to lose those. Perhaps the stones could be used somewhere else. When the wall is re-laid, it may be possible to mix some of those stones with the new stones achieving a more consistent appearance. The missing information is the cost involved.

Mr. Cotter summarized that the Board is supportive of a holistic approach, but that would require coordination between the property owners. For this project, it is important that the impacted length of wall be addressed.

Mr. Cotter referred to Question #2: What recommendation does the Board have regarding the proposed design and structural approaches for the wall?

- a. No action
- b. Structural reconstruction of the wall using concrete footers and a false wall that would be faced with the historic stone and perhaps allowing the wall to be relocated in a more convenient place on the site.
- c. Structural reconstruction using only the historic materials and techniques.

Ms. Cooper noted that if it is not cost prohibitive, Option C would be preferred.

Mr. Shamp clarified that the Board's determination should not be based upon the project costs. However, if the property owners were to agree on pursuing a holistic approach, the property owners would need to be aware of the costs. The Board's role is not to consider the cost but to determine the best way to capture the historic appearance.

The Board expressed support of Option C, structural reconstruction using only the historic materials and techniques, which is most consistent with the Historic District Code.

Mr. Cotter referred to Question #3: What additional information would the Board need to make a determination on one of these solutions?

Board consensus was that it would be important to know:

- if the structure is able to support the upper parking area of 40 N. High Street;
- what property owners are involved and if the owners are willing to participate; if the intersections of those properties are appropriately addressed;
- if there is anything that would prevent/prohibit a holistic solution;
- if the existing stones on the property are suitable for use.

Mr. Cox stated that while some of the stones on the site are beginning to de-laminate and deteriorate – others are still good. There are 5-6 tons of this material around the parking lot. All the stones are from the same quarry, so they have a similar appearance.

The Board was supportive of using the historic materials already present on the site.

Mr. Cotter referred to Question #4: If the Board supports historic reconstruction, would the Board support the use of historic mortar that is not visible if it improved the structural strength of the wall?

The Board was supportive of the use of mortar that is not visible if necessary to ensure the structural strength of the wall.

Public Comment

No public comments were received on the case.

Bernie Coy, Structural Engineer, 900 Foxcreek Road, Sunbury, Ohio, inquired if with Option C, they would not be able to place drainage behind the wall, or would they be able to use modern drainage techniques to avoid future problems.

The Board expressed support for use of modern drainage techniques, such as pea gravel or tile, if not visible, to stabilize and preserve the wall.

Mr. Cotter summarized the guidance. The Board is supportive of a holistic approach, understanding that there are some challenges. Staff will attempt to facilitate that approach, perhaps by encouraging the property owners to pursue the façade improvement grant opportunity. There may be some options available to City Council. The Board is supportive of Option C, structural reconstruction using only the historic materials and techniques, using the existing stones on site, and ensuring the wall is structurally sound, using appropriate drainage and mortar, if not visible.

Mr. Cotter inquired if the applicant needed any additional clarification to move forward with the project.

The applicant requested no additional clarification.

COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Holt shared the following dates:

- The Envision Dublin, Community Plan Update joint workshop of Council, PZC and ARB will be held at 6:00-8:00 pm, Monday, April 17, 2023 in Council Chamber.
- The Envision Dublin, Community Plan Update public kick-off meeting will be held at 6:00-8:00 pm, Tuesday, April 18, 2023 in Council Chamber.
- The next regular ARB meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, April 26, 2023.

ADJOURNMENT

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


Vice Chair, Architectural Review Board


Assistant Clerk of Council