

Parcel	273-000099	Address	36-38 N High St	OHI	N/A
Year Built:	1960	Map No:	116	Photo No:	1757-1763 (7/10/16)
Theme:	Commercial	Historic Use:	Commercial	Present Use:	Commercial
Style:	Vernacular	Foundation:	Concrete block	Wall Type:	Concrete block
Roof Type:	Front gable/asphalt shingle/flat	Exterior Wall:	Brick/concrete block	Symmetry:	No
Stories:	1	Front Bays:	5	Side Bays:	-
Porch:	Front gable over south half of façade	Chimney:	None visible	Windows:	Metal frame display windows

Description: The one-story concrete block building has a rectilinear footprint and two distinct sections. The south section, 36 N High St, has a front gable roof that extends to form a porch over the façade. The façade within the porch is bricked and features an entrance and display windows. The north half of the building, 38 N High St, has a flat roof and simple concrete façade. The storefront includes a pedestrian entrance and display window. East of the building is a two-story stone privy, constructed ca.1934. A distinctive stone privy is located in the rear of the property.

Setting: The building is located on the east side of N High St within the old village center of Dublin. It is one in a series of small commercial buildings that date from the late-nineteenth to mid-twentieth centuries.

Condition: Good

Integrity: Location: Y Design: Y Setting: Y Materials: N
 Workmanship: N Feeling: Y Association: Y

Integrity Notes: The building has good integrity, but is somewhat diminished by replacement materials.

Historical Significance: This building is within the boundary and recommended contributing to the City of Dublin’s local Historic Dublin district. The property is recommended to remain contributing to the recommended Dublin High Street Historic District, boundary increase, which is more inclusive of historic resources in the original village.

District: Yes Local Historic Dublin district **Contributing Status:** Recommended contributing
National Register: Recommended Dublin High Street Historic District, boundary increase **Property Name:** N/A



36-38 N High St, looking east



36-38 N High St, stone privy, looking northwest

Parcel 273-000100 **Address** 40 N High St **OHI** N/A

Year Built: 1956	Map No: 116	Photo No: 1764-1765 (7/10/16)
Theme: Commercial	Historic Use: Commercial	Present Use: Commercial
Style: Modernist Movement	Foundation: Concrete block	Wall Type: Concrete block
Roof Type: Front gable/asphalt shingle	Exterior Wall: Concrete block	Symmetry: No
Stories: 1	Front Bays: 3	Side Bays: -
Porch: Inset entry on façade	Chimney: None visible	Windows: Original casements

Description: The one-story mid-twentieth century dental office has a rectilinear plan and concrete block construction. The front-gable roof is sheathed in asphalt shingles and has broad overhanging eaves. The front entrance consists of a glazed door within a recessed porch on the building’s northwest corner. A string of casement windows on recessed on the south half of the façade. Windows on side elevations are also casements.

Setting: The building is located on the east side of N High St within in the old village center of Dublin. Floral plantings extend between the building and sidewalk.

Condition: Good

Integrity: Location: Y Design: Y Setting: Y Materials: Y
 Workmanship: Y Feeling: Y Association: Y

Integrity Notes: The building has excellent integrity.

Historical Significance: The building is within the boundaries of the City of Dublin’s local Historic Dublin district, and is recommended contributing to both the local district, and to the recommended Dublin High Street Historic District, boundary increase, which is more inclusive of historic resources in the original village.

District: Yes Local Historic Dublin district **Contributing Status:** Recommended contributing
National Register: Recommended Dublin High Street Historic District, boundary increase **Property Name:** N/A



40 N High St, looking southeast



40 N High St, looking northeast

~~Mr. Cotter moved, Mr. Kownacki seconded approval of the Minor Project Review with the following conditions:~~

- ~~1) The applicant select entry doors, consistent with the proposed elevations, and select light fixtures, subject to staff approval.~~
- ~~2) The applicant revise the window selection to a full-simulated divided light window with spacer bar and muntins, subject to staff approval.~~

~~Vote: Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Kownacki, yes; Mr. Alexander, no; Mr. Cotter, yes.
[Motion approved 3-1.]~~

INFORMAL REVIEW CASES

2. 40 N. High Street, 20-196INF, Informal Review

A request for an informal review and feedback to construct a second story addition to an existing, one-story building and a new three-story apartment building on a 0.21-acre site zoned Bridge Street District, Historic Core, located east of N. High Street, ±125 feet south of North Street.

Staff Report

Ms. Martin stated this a request for review and non-binding feedback for a future proposal for 40 N. High Street. The 0.21-acre site is located immediately south of North High Brewing and is adjacent to the Columbus Metropolitan Library – Dublin branch. An existing historic stone wall bisects the site; a portion of the wall is located beyond the bounds of this site and is on the property to the north, identified as Lot 129. This site is presently developed with a gravel parking lot and an existing one-story mid-century dental office building. The portion of the parking lot and drive aisle located south of this site is shared with Lot 129. Presently, the site circulation is one-way in from the south drive and one-way out from the north drive. On the east side of the stone wall that bisects the site, there is informal parking on a gravel lot. The existing building on the site was built in 1956 and is considered “contributing” to the local Historic District. The structure is a concrete block construction with a front gable, low-pitch roof, with overhanging eaves, horizontal casement windows and a recessed entry. There is significant grade change of approximately 17 feet across the site. While the office building and parking lot are located at grade with N. High Street, the additional separate parking is located at grade with N. Blacksmith Lane. The historic stone wall was originally built by the Wing family, who were stone masons and for whom Wing Hill is named. A historic two-story outhouse is located along the southern boundary of the south wall. The outhouse was originally built by Forrest Wing for his mother. The southern boundary of the wall is along a shared property line and primarily located on 36-38 N. High Street. The property owner of 36-38 N. High Street will need to be a joint applicant party to any future application for development. The integrity of the stone wall is presently compromised. This site is zoned Bridge Street District, and is located north of East Bridge Street. This zoning district identifies permitted uses and development standards. Development standards in commercial districts are regulated by building type. Each zoning district permits certain building types based on the location and surrounding development character. Based on the proposal, the applicable Building Type is Historic Mixed Use for the office building, and Single-Family Attached for the apartment building located at the rear of the site. Because the Single-Family Attached building type is not a permitted type in the Historic Core District, a waiver would be required. Due to the conceptual nature of the proposal, it is not possible to determine if all development standards would be met, although the size and scale are consistent with the maximum building height, and there may be opportunities to comply with lot coverage, provided that semi-pervious pavement is included.

Site Layout

The site layout is proposed largely to remain as the existing. The access and building location are proposed to be retained. Parking for the dental office is proposed to continue to be located to the rear of the structure. A new two-unit attached townhome building is proposed to be sited along N. Blacksmith Lane with separate

vehicular access. The existing historic stonewall is proposed to be modified to accommodate the proposed townhomes and the existing historic outhouse is proposed to be demolished.

Parking

The required vehicle parking is determined by use, and for the Medical Office and General Office building, 2.5 parking spaces/1,000 square feet is required. For townhouse dwellings, two parking spaces per dwelling unit are required. Presently, the site does not contain any formal parking spaces, as it is not paved, but with paving of the parking area, five spaces including an ADA accessible space will be provided for the office building, in addition to the one on-street parking space in front of the property. An additional four parking spaces (two per dwelling unit) will be provided for the townhomes. Because 10 parking spaces are proposed where 18 spaces typically would be required, approval of a Parking Plan will be necessary.

Architecture

The applicant has proposed building massing and inspirational architectural character for the Board's consideration. The proposed concept builds on the existing structure by creating a two-story, stair tower entrance providing access to a new second story addition. The second story extends over the improved parking area, creating a cantilevered appearance supported by structural beams. The second story will accommodate additional general office uses. Two attached, three-story townhomes are proposed to be constructed along N. Blacksmith Lane, with parking located on the first floor. The proposed architectural character would take cues from the Mid Century lines of the existing structure in an attempt to not apply a false history to the building or site. While no elevations, materials, or details are provided, the applicant has indicated a desire to apply a Usonian aesthetic, which most often emphasizes horizontal geometric forms and warm, natural exterior materials to blur the line between indoors and outdoors. Together, the inspiration images identify elements that a future design could incorporate, but are not intended to stand alone.

The following questions are provided to facilitate the Board's discussion:

- 1) Does the Board support demolition of the outhouse and partial demolition of the stonewall?
- 2) Does the Board support a Waiver to permit the Single-Family Attached building type?
- 3) Does the Board support a Parking Plan to permit 10 parking spaces where 18 are required?
- 4) Does the Board support the proposed site layout?
- 5) Is the Board supportive of the mass and scale of the building addition and new townhomes?
- 6) Is the Board supportive of the conceptual architectural character?

Board Questions/Discussion

Mr. Cotter inquired if the development occurring to the north of this site will be Residential.

Ms. Martin responded that it would not be Residential. The development to the north is the approved Co-Hatch project, which is a co-working space with opportunities for work-oriented gatherings.

Mr. Cotter stated that certainly, a permitted use in the District is live-work and multi-family, but determination of the permitted Building Type is unclear.

Ms. Martin responded that for multi-family, the Historic Mixed-Use Building Type would be appropriate, as is proposed here.

Ms. Kramb inquired the anticipated height of the building to the north.

Ms. Martin responded that she believes it is slightly less than 45 feet in height.

Ms. Kramb inquired if that structure is 3 stories.

Mr. Alexander responded that it is 2.5 stories.

Ms. Kramb stated that with the new Code revision and area rezoning, this site is being rezoned as Historic Core.

Ms. Martin confirmed that it would be rezoned from Bridge Street District-Historic Core to Historic District-Historic Core.

Applicant Presentation

Dan Morgan, AIA, Behal Sampson Dietz, 990 W 3rd Ave, Columbus, OH 43212, requested that the Board clarify its position in regard to considering the Blacksmith Alley building as Single Family Attached, which is not a Permitted Use, versus an apartment building, which is a Permitted Use. Originally, this was a simple, block office building with a flat roof, which later received a pitched roof. The permitted lot coverage in the District is 85%. This plan will provide impermeable, partially covered parking spaces. They are attempting to maximize the greenspace and provide pocket terraces for the apartment building. At this preliminary point, the design is conceptual only. To minimize the scale of the apartment building, the garages are pulled forward toward the street, so that the taller mass of the apartment building sets back from the street. As designed, the site plan will provide views of the tuck-pointed, restructured retaining wall, which is presently in a compromised condition. Dr. Lapiere has invested money in preventing the parking lot from sinking, but that is a losing battle when the foundation of the retaining wall is in this type of disrepair. The wall extends past this site and to the adjacent neighbor's property before making an 85-degree turn toward High Street to support the existing two-story outhouse. That portion of the wall is in the most disrepair, so they would be coordinating efforts to remedy with the neighbors to the south.

Ms. Martin stated that, in response to an earlier question from Ms. Krumb regarding permitted lot coverage in the proposed rezoning, the lot coverage would be reduced to 85% flat. Currently, it is 85% plus a semi-pervious allowance, for a total of 90%.

Board Questions/Discussion

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

1) Does the Board support demolition of the outhouse and partial demolition of the stonewall?

Ms. Krumb stated that she does not support partial demolition of the stonewall, unless they can provide proof of total disrepair and structural and cost analysis, justifying its demolition. She would much prefer to keep the stonewall.

Mr. Cotter stated that his position is essentially the same, although the building is on a hill and the upper parking area must be prevented from coming down.

Mr. Kownacki expressed agreement. The site has only one historic element, and it is the stonewall built by the Wing family, for which a street is named. Obviously, saving the wall is a priority.

Mr. Alexander expressed agreement. With some projects, a historic wall can be incorporated into the architecture. However, integrating the wall with the new construction here could be difficult. It may be necessary to dismantle and rebuild the wall to retain the parking area in a more stable manner. He requested the architect to respond.

Mr. Morgan responded that is the issue. They would have to take the wall down and then rebuild it. The stonewall is a significant feature of this site, and they are attempting to protect it as much as possible. If they were to dismantle the wall and restructure it into the design proposal, making it an interior wall or an element of the apartment building, would that be acceptable with the Board? They will be conducting a full structural investigation of the wall and also of the existing office building to ensure it is feasible to build another story above it.

Ms. Krumb stated that if their structural analysis meets the threshold for proving that a historic element in the Historic District must be demolished, then she will support the demolition. She is less concerned with whether it is incorporated into the future design. Her preference is that the wall remain a feature on the site as is.

James Lapiere, DDS, 40 N. High Street, Dublin, Ohio, stated that as the photos show, his sewer line extends through that area, and that part of the wall is 6-12 inches from the existing structure. The stones in the wall

are separating, some of which have loosened and fallen into the parking lot below. There is concern if the wall were to come apart to a greater extent, a vehicle in the top parking area could fall into the area below. The wall would need to be taken down and rebuilt just to retain the existing parking lot for his dental office, regardless of any addition.

Mr. Alexander stated that there is a process for demolition approval for cases in which the structure is in poor shape and cannot be retained or the cost of retaining it would be substantially overwhelming. If the desire is to replace it with something new, there is a process for receiving demolition approval. Such a process may be applicable in this case.

2) Does the Board support a Waiver to permit the Single-Family Attached building type?

Board consensus was support for a Waiver to permit the Single-Family Attached building type.

3) Does the Board support a Parking Plan to permit 10 parking spaces where 18 are required?

Board consensus was support for a Parking Plan to permit 10 parking spaces, if determined appropriate with the Concept Plan review.

4) Does the Board support the proposed site layout?

Board consensus was support for the proposed site layout, exclusive of the stonewall remedy, which is yet undetermined. Members noted that if the stonewall were to be removed, another retaining method would be necessary. The grade change warrants the building and use changes. The different streets support different uses and types of building.

Ms. Krumb noted that there is a large tree on the site next to the wall. The applicant should provide information on its size and condition. It is preferable to save the older trees in the Historic District, but in this case, it may not be practical to save it.

5) Is the Board supportive of the mass and scale of the building addition and new townhomes?

Board members expressed support for the mass and scale at this preliminary point.

Ms. Krumb stated that with the Concept Plan, the applicant should provide information on the height of the building, both from the front and from the alley, in relation to the adjacent buildings.

Mr. Alexander noted that the mass may change if the roof were to change.

6) Is the Board supportive of the conceptual architectural character?

Mr. Cotter stated that he believes that for the office addition, the architectural character is too utilitarian and stark; it appears out of place with the other structures. He has no objection to the proposed architectural character of the townhouses.

Mr. Kownacki indicated that he had no objections to the proposed architectural character of the structures.

Ms. Krumb stated that she likes the Mid Century Modern architecture, which is what currently exists on the office building, although the concrete structure could be enhanced with stone. She does not like the townhouse architectural views, particularly the middle image.

Mr. Alexander stated that the classification of an architectural style for the current office building is tenuous at best, but if the roof is removed, he believes the office building also becomes new construction. The Guidelines state that the operative principle should be "similar to existing contributing buildings in the District in which it is located." To him, this is more like the Library, which is not a contributing building. It also states that, "roof pitch and form should be similar to surrounding buildings." With the townhomes, he prefers the middle image, because it is a clear residential form; it is a simple gable in the center of windows. The modulation of the elevations is responsive to the scale of the small buildings across the street. There would be a nice transition from those

buildings to these and to the Co-Hatch building to the north. He likes the townhome images, but the concern is whether they are appropriate per the standards of this District. With a previous Concept Plan proposal within this same block, when questioned about the relationship of their proposal with contributing structures in the District, the applicant responded that the Historic District was gone. He is concerned about the message that might be communicated with this elevation in this setting.

Mr. Morgan stated that, per the Consultant's report, this building, which reflects a simple vernacular Mid Century construction and materials, is the contributing architecture, which they were attempting to continue. Their intent was to incorporate the same lines with a few more contemporary elements into the Blacksmith Alley structure. He hesitates to think of the dental office as new construction and would prefer not to attempt to make it look like something it is not.

Mr. Alexander responded that he understands his point. He noted that if a waiver were to be requested for coverage, the applicant would need to provide a strong case for the hardship justifying a variance. It is difficult to support a variance for coverage just to enable more square footage to be constructed.

Mr. Morgan responded that at this point, they are meeting the 85% maximum coverage. He would attempt to avoid a variance request, if possible.

Mr. Alexander inquired if the applicant would need any further direction.

Mr. Morgan indicated that they had sufficient direction.

3. Winan's Addition at 48-52 S. High Street, 20-217INF, Informal Review

~~A request for informal review and feedback regarding the construction of a one-story, 400-square-foot addition to a structure on a 0.25-acre site zoned Bridge Street District, Historic South, and located southeast of the intersection of South High Street with Spring Hill Lane.~~

Staff Presentation

Background

~~Mr. Rayburn stated that this a request for informal review and feedback on a proposed 400-square foot addition and exterior modifications to an existing building on a site located southeast of the intersection of South High Street and Spring Hill Lane, and zoned BSD-HS: Historic South District. The site is developed with a two-story commercial building constructed circa 1850. The 2,761-square-foot building has an irregular footprint, formed by a two-story, side-gable core and expanded by multiple additions on the east (rear) elevation. The original building has a stone foundation, a standing-seam metal roof, and is divided into two distinct parts by address. The north section of the building is 48 S. High Street, occupied by law offices and providing access to upper story tenants, and the south building section is 52 S. High Street occupied by Winan's Coffee. The site is located on a 10,890-square foot lot, which contains mature trees, landscaping and a decorative stone wall along the northern edge of the parking lot to the rear of the site. The surface parking lot has recently been resurfaced and is not currently striped. Should a formal application be pursued, the applicant will need to include a parking plan informed by the building uses. In 2017, the City of Dublin City Council adopted a Historic and Cultural Assessment, which documents a variety of community assets including homes, cemeteries, and stone walls. As part of the assessment, the structure on this site was listed as a contributing building to the High Street Historic District.~~

Proposal

~~The applicant is proposing to expand the existing tenant space for Winan's Coffee with an approximately 400-square-foot (20'-3" x 20'-6"), single-story addition to the east elevation of the building. The color and architectural style of the addition will match the existing drop siding. A metal standing-seam shed roof on the addition will be visible, and is proposed in a Slate Gray color to match the existing standing seam on the building. The addition extends the south building wall to the east, maintaining the existing side yard setback. It will allow the applicants to relocate bathrooms and service areas in order to free up more space for seating. It is important to note that the Code permits a maximum of 65% lot coverage with an additional 10% permitted for semi-pervious surfaces. The applicant has indicated that the existing site exceeds this limit with a total of 72%~~