



## PLANNING REPORT

# Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, January 25, 2023

## N. RIVERVIEW ST. ROOFS - 23-003MPR and 40 E. BRIDGE ST. CARPORT DEMO – 23-004DEMO

<https://dublinohiousa.gov/arb/23-003>

<https://dublinohiousa.gov/arb/23-004>

### Case Summary

Address	40 E. Bridge Street and 27, 37, 53, and 62 N. Riverview Street, Dublin, OH 43017
Proposal	Mothballing roofs on N. Riverview Street and demolition of the carport at 40 E. Bridge Street.
Request	Review and approval of a Minor Project Review and under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.176 and the <i>Historic Design Guidelines</i> .  Review and approval of a Demolition/Non-contributing under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.176.
Zoning	HD-HR: Historic District – Historic Residential
Planning Recommendation	<u>Approval of a Minor Project Review with conditions.</u> <u>Approval of a Demolition/Non-contributing.</u>
Next Steps	Upon review and approval of the Minor Project and Demolition by the Architectural Review Board (ARB), the applicant may proceed with both projects.
Applicant	Brian Ashford, Director of Facilities and Fleet Management, City of Dublin Tim Elmer, Operations Administrator, City of Dublin
Case Manager	Sarah Tresouthick Holt, AICP, ASLA , Senior Planner (614) 410-4662 <a href="mailto:sholt@dublin.oh.us">sholt@dublin.oh.us</a>

Site Location Map

**23-003 & 23-004**  
**40 E Bridge St**  
**& 27, 37, 53, and 62 N Riverview St**



Site Features

- 1 Roof mothballing
- 2 Carport demolition



## 1. Background

### Site Summary

There are a number of sites involved with this request, all of which are part of the N. Riverview Street redevelopment area that is currently owned by the City. Details are:

Address	Size	Zone	Request
40 E. Bridge St.	.32 ac	HD-Historic Residential	Demolition of carport; mothballing of house roof
27 N. Riverview St.	.20 ac	HD-Historic Residential	Mothballing of house roof
37 N. Riverview St.	.16 ac	HD-Historic Residential	Mothballing of house roof
53 N. Riverview St.	.11 ac	HD-Historic Residential	Mothballing of garage roof
62 N. Riverview St.	.59 ac	HD-Historic Residential	Mothballing of house roof

The City purchased the N. Riverview St. properties in early 2021 with a goal to redevelop the area for lively, pedestrian-oriented uses. Since purchase, the City has secured the buildings' windows and doors to ensure no trespassing, and utilities were disconnected; they are currently vacant. In 2022, the City issued an RFP for developers or individuals to propose how to meet these redevelopment goals. A conceptual proposal has been presented and is in the beginning stages of review to determine feasibility. In the meantime, however, the structures with the asphalt shingle roofs are experiencing leaks and infiltration of weather and water, which is causing damage to the structures. The City desires to mothball these structures in order to prevent further damage to these assets. The MPR addresses this request.

Additionally, the carport at 40 N. Bridge St. is in danger of falling down, with a main cross beam having split in two. Since this structure is non-contributing, the City desires to demolish it per the Demolition request.

All properties in the N. Riverview St. project area are recommended contributing as noted in the 2017 Historic and Cultural Assessment (HCA). No other site work or disturbance will occur with these requests.

### Development History

January 2021: The City purchased the N. Riverview St. properties.

April 2021: City Council appointed an Advisory Committee and indicated support to create an RFP for the project.

June 2022: RFP advertised.

September 2022: Advisory Committee made recommendation of proposal and developer to City Council for further consideration.

### Process

A Minor Project Review, Code Section 153.176(I)(1), within the Historic District is a single-step process for single-family dwelling units, including exterior modifications.

The Demolition/Non-contributing Request, 153.176(J)(5)(b), is also a single step process where one of the following criteria are demonstrated: financial hardship, no features of significance, the structure is in the way of development or hinders character.

## 2. Zoning Code

### *HD-HR: Historic District – Historic Residential*

The intent of the Historic Residential District as outlined in the Code, is to “encourage preservation and development of homes on existing lots while maintaining and promoting the traditional residential character.” All historic structures that are within Historic Dublin require the review and approval of the ARB for modifications.

### *Historic Design Guidelines*

The development standards are supplemented by the *Historic Design Guidelines*, which provide the Board additional direction on preservation, sensitive design, and complementary materials. The Guidelines are silent on mothballing, which is defined as closing up a building temporarily to protect it from weather while planning for the properties’ future, according to Preservation Brief 31, *Mothballing Historic Buildings*. A copy of the entire brief is included in the project packet.

## 3. Project

### **Details: MPR, Case 22-003**

The MPR requests roof repairs for the houses at 40 E. Bridge St and 27, 37, 53 (garage only) and 62 N. Riverview St. The City conducted an exhaustive structural analysis using CTL in 2020, prior to purchase, which noted that the majority of exterior conditions were in poor condition, with 27 N. Riverview St. being in fair condition. The executive summary is attached.

Proposed repairs, according to a bid by ACI Construction, attached, include covering the roof holes with aluminum coil stock and installing synthetic felt over the entire asphalt shingle roofs, securing with cap nails. It’s important to note that the roof repairs for 17 and 45 N. Riverview St. are not included in this request because they are metal roofs, where work will include maintenance only with like-for-like materials.

The proposed synthetic felt will cover the aluminum coil stock, and it will be black with grey manufacturer logos and nail guides. The material is from TriBuilt. The cap nails will be either green or orange for visibility at the worksite. Staff did ask if they are manufactured in black to be less visible; they are not. Figure 7 in Preservation Brief 31 states that non-historic materials are appropriate for mothballing projects. This solution is not intended to be a permanent one; the longevity of the synthetic felt is approximately six months, allowing the developer and the City to negotiate a development agreement and for the developer to apply for approvals through the Board.



*Roofing cap nail, typ.*

### *Lot Coverage*

Lot coverage is not affected by this request.

**Details: Demolition, Case 22-004**

The carport at 40 E. Bridge St. is not mentioned as a contributing structure in the 2017 HCA report. Upon examination, it has no architectural detailing or character value, being a very basic structure made of 4-by-4s with a flat roof. It appears to be built more recently, although no permit information has been found for it in the City’s records. The structure has not been well-maintained, and one of the structure’s central beam has failed.

*Lot Coverage*

Maximum lot coverage in this district is 45% and will not be affected by the removal of the carport; the existing concrete pad under the carport will remain for now.

**4. Plan Review**

**Minor Project Review Criteria, Case 22-003**

Criteria	Review
1. The MP shall be consistent with the Community Plan, applicable Zoning Code requirements, <i>Historic Design Guidelines</i> , and adopted plans, policies, and regulations.	<b>Criteria Met:</b> The MPR is consistent with applicable plans, policies, and regulations. This mothballing effort will help preserve the historic assets for later rehabilitation and use.
2. In cases where a MP is proposed within or as part of an approved PDP or FDP, the MP shall be consistent with such approved PDP or FDP.	<b>Not Applicable:</b> There is no PDP or FDP for this site.
3. The MP shall be consistent with the record established by the required reviewing body, the associated staff report, and the Director’s recommendation.	<b>Criteria Met:</b> The MP is consistent with the established record. Prior to construction of the MP, the applicant is required to apply for and obtain a building permit for the Minor Project.
4. The proposed land uses meet all applicable requirements and use specific standards of Section 153.172 Uses.	<b>Not Applicable:</b> The properties are currently vacant residential structures; the use will not change.
5. The proposed development is consistent with the <i>Historic Design Guidelines</i> .	<b>Criteria Met:</b> The proposed site improvements are appropriate for Preservation Brief 31 Goal 5: protect the exterior from moisture penetration. The Guidelines do not speak to mothballing.

Criteria	Review
6. The proposed MP is consistent with surrounding historic context, character, and scale of immediately surrounding area and the district as a whole.	<b>Criteria Met:</b> While the proposed synthetic felt is not what would be approved for a permanent installation, the greater goal of asset preservation is achieved.
7. The proposed buildings are appropriately sited and conform to the requirements of Section 153.173 Site Development Standards and the <i>Historic Design Guidelines</i> .	<b>Not Applicable:</b> No changes to siting or site development will occur with this request.
8. The proposed site improvements, landscaping, screening, signs, and buffering shall meet all applicable requirements of the Code and respond to the standards of the <i>Historic Design Guidelines</i> .	<b>Not Applicable:</b> No landscaping, screening, signs, or buffering are proposed with this request.

**Demolition/Non-Contributing Review Criteria, Case 23-004**

Criteria	Review
1. By credible evidence the property owner will suffer economic hardship if the request to demolish is not granted. In determining whether the property owner has demonstrated economic hardship, the Board shall consider the factors established in Section 153.176(J)(5)(a).	<b>Not Applicable:</b> Economic hardship is not a factor in this request.
2. The structure contains no features or architectural, historic, or archeological significance to the character of the area in which it is located.	<b>Criteria Met:</b> The structure is non-contributing and does not contain any architectural, historic, or archeological features.
3. The location of the structure impedes the orderly development of the District, substantially interferes with the purposed of the District, or detracts from the historical character of its immediate vicinity; or, the proposed construction to replace the demolished structure significantly improves the overall quality of the Architectural Review District without	<b>Criteria Met:</b> The structure detracts from the historical character of the immediate area and is in danger of falling down.

## Criteria

## Review

diminishing the historic value of the vicinity  
or the District.

## Recommendations

**Planning Recommendation:** Approval of the Minor Project Review with condition:

- 1) This temporary solution may be required for longer than six months, the projected lifespan of the proposed materials. At that time, the condition of roof felt shall be examined, and replacement may be necessary based on condition and the timeline of the N. Riverview Properties project.

**Planning Recommendation:** Approval of the Demolition/Non-contributing request.