



BOARD ACTION

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, June 28, 2023 | 6:30 pm

The Architectural Review Board took the following action at this meeting:

**1. 112 S. Riverview Street
23-021MPR**

Minor Project Review

Proposal: Construction of a new, two-story, residential building on a 0.26-acre site zoned Historic District – Historic Residential.
Request: Review and approval of a Minor Project under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.176 and the *Historic Design Guidelines*.
Applicant: Kevin Koch, Corinthian Fine Homes
Planning Contact: Rati Singh, Assoc. AIA, Planner I
Contact Information: 614.410.4533, rsingh@dublin.oh.us
Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/23-021

MOTION: Ms. Damaser moved, Mr. Jewell seconded, to table the Minor Project, which included Waivers and Conditions, at the request of the applicant.

VOTE: 5 – 0

RESULT: The request to table the Minor Project, which included Waivers and Conditions, was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Gary Alexander	Yes
Sean Cotter	Yes
Martha Cooper	Yes
Michael Jewell	Yes
Hilary Damaser	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Sarah Tresouthick Holt, AICP, ASLA
Senior Planner





MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, June 28, 2023

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Alexander, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and welcomed everyone to the June 28, 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: Sean Cotter, Hilary Damaser, Martha Cooper, Gary Alexander, Michael Jewell

Staff members present: Sarah Holt, Rati Singh

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Cotter moved, Ms. Cooper seconded acceptance of the documents into the record and approval of the 05-24-23 ARB minutes and 04-17-23 and 05-10-23 Joint Work Session minutes.

Vote: Mr. Jewell, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Ms. Damaser, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes.
[Motion carried 5-0]

Mr. Alexander 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 Chair swore in staff and applicants who planned to address the Board on any of the cases on the agenda.

CASES

1. Case 23-021, 112 S. Riverview Street, Minor Project Review

Construction of a new, two-story, residential building on a 0.26-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic Residential. The site is located southeast of the intersection of Pinneyhill Lane with S. Riverview Street.

Staff Report

Ms. Singh stated the 0.26-acre site is located southeast of the intersection of S. Riverview Street and Pinneyhill Lane, and is zoned HD-HR, Historic District – Historic Residential. This site is located along the western bank of the Scioto River and experiences a significant change in grade from west to east, with floodplain on the eastern half of the lot. The western portion is the only developable area. The site has frontage along S. Riverview Street, with no sidewalks. The lot was created in 2021, when 110-112 S. Riverview Street was approved for demolition, and the single lot was split into two lots. The northern lot is a 0.58-acre site located at 110 S. Riverview and is currently under construction. The Board provided Informal Review on the proposed project in October 2022 and January 2023. The Board expressed concerns about the conceptual character, mass and scale, complex roof form, height and building materials. Staff consulted with Preservations Design Ltd. (PDL) regarding the Board's comments. The applicant's response to the Board's review and further details are provided on page 3 of the staff report.

The applicant is requesting review and approval of a Minor Project Review (MPR) for the construction of a two-story, single-family home. Staff consulted with PDL to provide feedback regarding the updated proposal. This report includes recommendations from the consultants, which align with staff recommendations. The proposed site layout remains consistent with the January proposal. The applicant proposes a new ±3,050-square-foot home on the east side of S. Riverview Street. Due to the site's topography, the home is largely located toward the front of the lot, as steep grade change and floodplain hazards occupy the site's eastern half. The Cape Cod style home is proposed with a two-story mass in front and three-story mass at the rear. The proposed structure is now approximately 18 feet 8 inches tall in the front, from grade to the center of the gable, and 32 feet 5 inches tall at the rear. The height of the home from the rear elevation exceeds the height requirement of 24 feet maximum. A height waiver would be required to permit the proposed height at the rear of the home. PDL suggests modifying the massing of the building to align more with the Historic Design Guidelines and recommends reducing the size of the garage to a two-car garage rather than a four-car garage, further simplifying the rear roofline to create a cohesive structure. Staff concurs with this recommendation. At their Informal Review, the Board expressed concerns about varying roof pitches and complex roof forms and suggested reducing the overall garage pitch and complexity of rear roof pitches. The applicant has addressed front dormers and has modified the garage roof, although the complexity of the rear roof remains a concern. The Board requested that the ceiling heights be lower than the overall building height at the front and rear. The applicant has reduced overall building height in the front; the rear of building remains the same. The Board suggested using only two materials and possibly a third as an accent. The applicant has reduced the number of materials to two. The Board requested the applicant to organize windows on elevations in such manner that they line up and create continuity in patterns. The right elevation still needs to be addressed. The form and layout of the proposed home remains consistent since the Informal Reviews. The applicant has successfully modified the front elevations to address previous concerns; however, the rear elevation remains largely the same. The roof plan reflects a massive, complex roof with numerous dormers. Staff recommends a simplified design, with equal width of all three dormers at the rear and aligning the left rear and right rear dormers in the same plane and at the same offset from the side for consistency and simplicity. Currently, the roof plan does not match the floor plans as submitted; this needs to be addressed per a recommended condition of approval. Staff also recommends that the revised roof

plan show all roof pitches and direction. Any roof pitch that does not meet the Code Section 153.174 (B)(4)(C) will require a separate Waiver and approval from the Board, since this information was not provided for this review. The west elevation is the front-facing façade of the home, with the slightly recessed hyphen connecting the main house to the garage. The house features a simplified main door and three front gable dormer windows, with front and side gables with 10:12 pitches. Here, the applicant has made significant changes to address the Guidelines. The front façade now features consistent roof pitches with heights more responsive to the surrounding properties. The Board suggested increasing the depth of the hyphen from the front façade; the applicant chose to align the garage and main house instead by bringing the garage to the front. The applicant has removed previous faux historical elements and minimized the number of materials to two. The north elevation faces the single-family home at 110 S. Riverview Street currently under construction and transitions from two-story to three-story at the rear of the house. The applicant has removed the dormer windows on the north façade, thus reducing the mass on the second floor. The four-car garage is pushed to the front with decks now added at the rear. PDL recommends reducing the size of the garage to a two-car garage and its overall depth by adding two-car parking in the driveway instead. The roof form needs to be simplified; staff recommends a condition of approval to reduce the height of the rear roof to match the front gable and the width, creating a more cohesive elevation. The height of the roof at the rear appears out of scale and adds to the complexity of the roof forms. The roof pitch of 10:12 is consistent in the front. Additionally, the stepped stone foundation does not align with the internal sections of the house. The consultant and staff recommend a stepped foundation reflecting both the interior floor level and maintaining consistency externally on the north and the south elevations. The stone water table is not consistent with the left side elevation, and staff recommends a consistent stone water table on both elevations, as previously noted. The rear elevation faces the Scioto River. The massing of the rear elevation shows a three-story home with numerous decks and various gable fronts. It combines cantilevered rooms, enclosed porches, decks, and dormers. The large massing and fluctuating dormers adds to the complexity of the elevation. Staff recommends using a matching gable front and size on all three dormer openings and removing the Juliet balcony on the left side for a more symmetrical façade. Staff recommends aligning the master bath and bedroom two walls (top left and top right), creating a more balanced composition at the rear as well as on both the north and south elevations. This will impact the character of the rear elevation by creating consistency within the subforms around the central mass. This design change will also add to the internal space, which could create a better internal structural layout.

PDL is concerned about the structure below the garage and its accessibility from the interior space, as the lower level floor plan is not provided. The rear concrete block retaining wall, clad in siding as shown, which supports the garage should reflect the structural requirements; it is likely that the windows will not be permitted. This needs to be more thoroughly inspected at the building permitting stage as a recommended condition of approval addresses this. The proposed façades are clad in horizontal Hardie lap siding in a smooth texture. The siding shall be painted Anonymous (SW7046) and Shoji White (SW7042) for trim and soffit. A beige stone water table is proposed along the foundation of the building, completed in Casi Di Sassi (Terracina Blend and Tennessee Buff mortar). The proposed windows are Fibrex windows (Anderson 100 Series) in white color, made up of reclaimed wood fiber and thermoplastic polymer. These windows have been disapproved in the past by the Board for a historic structure. A Waiver would be required for this material. The applicant did not provide a material sample, so full evaluation of sheen, texture, and color is not possible at this time. Staff recommends a condition of approval to use a window

material as listed in the Code Section 153.174 (D); this would apply to whatever window is chosen, including if the Board votes to approve the Fibrex option. The applicant proposes to use Tamko Heritage Asphalt shingles in Weathered Wood color. The half round aluminium gutters will match the trim (Shoji White). The garage doors are carriage-style (Clopay Canyon Ridge Carriage House, walnut color). The doors are composite and will require a waiver. The applicant proposes a Therma Tru front door in Caviar (SW 6990), which will also require a waiver. The proposed deck is composite (TimberTech in Sandy Birch color). A waiver will be required. Guidelines Section 6.7 (A and B) recommends light fixtures that are scaled appropriately to the use and character of the surrounding properties, with simple designs avoiding large ornate styles.

Staff recommends approval of the 4 waiver requests regarding front-loaded garage setback; maximum building height; use of a composite garage door and front door; and use of a TimberTech deck. Staff recommends disapproval of the waiver for Fibrex windows (reclaimed wood fiber and thermoplastic polymer). Staff recommends approval of the Minor Project with 6 conditions.

Commission Questions

Mr. Cotter stated that the build exceeds the 20% building height threshold. Have we approved buildings in excess of that 20% threshold previously?

Ms. Holt responded that the Board has done so in this area, where the topography is so steep.

Mr. Alexander stated that earlier in the presentation, Ms. Rati pointed out that on the side elevation, the dormers were not compliant with the Code because they are taller than the shed dormer. They are extending out of the steeper roof pitch and actually above the shed dormer. Is that the reason that they are indicated as not being compliant with that section of the Code?

Ms. Rati responded affirmatively. The Guidelines would recommend stepping it down to the topography of the site. The pitch of the roof has not been provided; however, it appears to be taller than or equal to the front façade.

Applicant Report

David Johnson, 8965 Coe Drive, Plain City, Ohio stated that he is the architect of record. He believes staff can appreciate the progression that they have gone through with the first two Informal Reviews of a large structure that the Board believed to be Victorian in nature. They tried to simplify the front façade to be more characteristic of old Dublin. In scale, it is consistent with the adjacent home under construction. The roofline has been simplified. The rear facade is more complicated because it adheres to the requirements of the homeowner's desire to have more glazing at the back, where there is a view of the river. Smaller dormers would not be able to accommodate the homeowner's preferences. Because it is on the backside of the house, this is not an item that detracts from the public street view. Perhaps some adjustments could be made on the back that would be acceptable for both parties. Setting the dormers equally on the back would be possible. He would like to have a primary gable on the front façade off the master bedroom with potentially secondary matching dormers on either side. Regarding the recommendations concerning window spacing on the right elevation – he does not see an issue with making all four windows the same size and height. He has no issue with evening out the step on the stone foundation on the left side by the garage. Per staff's recommendation, with the re-design they have attempted to have the massing a step down with grade. With the changes, the house is simple and straightforward.

Mr. Jewell stated that there previously was a question about chimneys and fireplaces. On the Preliminary Plan, no chimneys or vents were shown for the fireplace.

Mr. Johnson responded that there is a self-venting electric fireplace.

Mr. Cotter inquired what is below grade beneath the garage....only fill?

Mr. Johnson responded that they are going to attempt to add a flexi core type of planking system, so they can have some storage area under, at a minimum, the back part of the garage. They will be exploring the possibilities with the final construction focus. The door would be accessible to the space; it would not be a faux door.

Mr. Cotter stated that he referred to extra glazing; would that mean more window?

Mr. Johnson responded affirmatively. The windows would be made larger than the front windows.

Mr. Alexander stated that they would review the proposed conditions. He requested clarification of Condition 1.a regarding roof plan inconsistencies.

Ms. Singh responded that the current roof plan does not match the submitted plans. The documents need to be consistent.

Mr. Alexander stated that Condition 1.b requires the design be changed to align the 2nd floor master bath and bedroom 2. Is the applicant able to make that change to the plan?

Mr. Johnson responded that he believes that bringing that gable back toward the center of the house could complicate the construction. Currently, it walks out onto a flat area. Pulling that back in would cut out more of the roof. He would like to explore making that a primary element on the back and adding two matching dormers on either side of bedroom 2 and the master bath.

Mr. Alexander stated that for ARB to approve the plan, the plan would need to show that at this time. Clarification is needed. The dormer on the right side is not a dormer, but a clip to the hipped roof. To match the left side with the right, the roof would need to be brought forward and clipped in the same manner. Additionally, the footprint of the space below would need to be brought out accordingly.

Mr. Johnson responded that in light of that, he would bring the dormer of bedroom 2 out to match the master bedroom, possibly moving the master bedroom back slightly and bringing out bedroom 2. In that way, they would match. In the Informal Review, there was much discussion regarding the massing of the garage. This new design reduces the feel of the mass of the rear of the garage.

Mr. Alexander responded that is apparent, and staff has not made it a condition of approval that the massing of the garage be further reduced. He wants to confirm that the applicant understands making the design changes that are required would change the floor plan.

Mr. Johnson responded that they do understand that and are able to do as Condition 1.b requires.

Mr. Alexander inquired if the applicant would be able to fulfil Condition 1. B – Uniform size of all the gable windows at the rear of the 2nd floor.

Mr. Johnson responded that he can make the windows similar in scale. Although not lined up in the plan, the windows are all similar in elevation, slope and size.

Mr. Alexander responded that "scale wise" is not as precise as the language dictates.

Mr. Cotter stated that if the dormer is pulled forward, it would extend beyond the first floor.

Mr. Alexander responded that is what he was pointing out, but that would be fine; it would actually improve the design. He wants to avoid trapping the applicant into something that would be difficult to do. It seems the applicant is not sure he can meet Condition 1.c.

Mr. Johnson responded that at this point he is unsure.

Mr. Alexander inquired if the applicant had any objection to Condition 1.d and 1.e. although he, personally, does not understand the reason 1.e is necessary.

Mr. Johnson responded that the homeowner does want access to the area below the garage.

Mr. Alexander responded that they would have that access, and the windows would improve the appearance, but if the Building permit review determines the windows cannot be added, they would have to eliminate them.

Mr. Johnson responded that they would not object to 1.e.

Mr. Alexander stated that Condition 2 relates to the dormer pitches.

Mr. Johnson responded that all are a minimum of 6:12. They have no objection to Condition 2 and no objection to Conditions 3 through 6.

Public Comment

Mr. Alexander stated that a letter of support from the neighbour was received and included in the meeting packet. Have any other public comments been received on this case?

Ms. Holt indicated none were received.

Mr. Jewell inquired about the relevance of the notes about the electrical easement. Is there something that needs to be addressed?

Ms. Singh stated that once staff receives all the utility plans and inspected the engineering, they would have the clarification needed. That item would not come back to the Board for review.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Cotter stated the proposed design changes seem complex. He is concerned because the Board should see those design changes. Additionally, he is concerned about the height, which exceeds the 20% overage...20% more than 24 feet. We do not want to permit our buildings to be made significantly higher. It needs to be very clear that the grade of the site is the only reason the height can be greater than 20%. We want to avoid setting a precedent.

Mr. Jewell stated that he has no objection to the other proposed conditions. However, Conditions 1b and 1c would be a significant difference to the rear elevation. He would prefer the revised design be brought back to the Board for review.

Ms. Damaser and Ms. Cooper expressed agreement. This would be a major design change.

Mr. Alexander stated that the Board members have indicated that they need to see how that rear elevation would look before they can be comfortable with approving. Some of the design changes would decrease the 2nd floor footprint and increase the middle floor footprint. The homeowners may not be supportive of those changes being made to the plan. He suggested that the applicant run the proposed design changes by staff to get their input first before a future hearing. That would give them an opportunity to make any refinements to their design.

Mr. Johnson stated that the homeowners are anxious to get this project underway. Would tabling the case delay the next review to the August meeting?

Ms. Holt responded that if the applicant could expedite the provision of revised plans to staff, the case could be scheduled for a July hearing. Additionally, if any of the currently proposed conditions for approval could be addressed in that revised plan, they could be removed from the approval conditions.

Mr. Cotter suggested that clarification be provided for Conditions 1b and 1c, so the July meeting will be successful.

Mr. Alexander stated that the goal of Condition 1b is to get to 1c. The suggestion of Condition 1b is one way that could be achieved, but another solution could be used. Keep in mind that some of the dormers do not comply with the Code. He noted that a height waiver may also have been granted for the house that is being completed on S. High Street, because of the rear slope of that site. A height waiver to address the rear grade is not that unusual.

Mr. Cotter responded that may be the case, but we want to address this issue consistently, not allowing any excessive heights.

Mr. Alexander inquired if the applicant wished to request the case be tabled.

Mr. Johnson responded affirmatively.

Ms. Damaser inquired if it would be advisable to vote on the waivers at this time and the Minor Plan at the next meeting.

Ms. Holt responded that staff would advise keeping the Minor Project and the associated waivers together.

Mr. Damaser moved, Mr. Jewell seconded tabling the case to a future meeting.

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

[Motion carried 5-0]

~~COMMUNICATIONS~~

- ~~• Overview of Envision Dublin Interim Land Use Principles provided.~~

~~Staff Presentation~~

~~Ms. Holt recapped the status of Community Plan update and provided an overview of the Interim Land Use Principles adopted by City Council to be used by City Boards and Commission as part of their project analysis while the Community Plan update is underway. The principles are:~~

- ~~1. Think comprehensively. Plan for the Bigger Picture
Ensure that each individual development contributes in a complementary manner to the larger district vision and plan by using a guiding framework and vision for land use patterns, activity nodes, open spaces, parking and connectivity.~~
- ~~2. Start with the Public Realm
Ensure development incorporates thoughtful and purposeful public spaces for all people to gather, socialize and recreate that reinforce the public realm.~~
- ~~3. Balance the Mix of Uses
Create neighborhoods and districts, which provide a balanced and integrated mix of land uses to support the daily needs for both the residents and business community. Maintain~~



BOARD DISCUSSION

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, January 25, 2023 | 6:30 pm

The Architectural Review Board took the following action at this meeting:

**1. 112 S. Riverview Street
22-182INF**

Informal Review

Proposal: Construction of a new two-story, residential building on a 0.26-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic Residential.
Location: Southwest of the intersection of Pinneyhill Lane with S. Riverview Street.
Request: Informal review and non-binding feedback for a future Minor Project under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.176 and the *Historic Design Guidelines*.
Applicant: Kevin Koch, Corinthian Fine Homes
Contact: Zachary Hounshell, Planner II
Contact Information: 614.410.4652, zhounshell@dublin.oh.us
Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/22-182

RESULT: The Board heard a second Informal Request on this project, based on feedback provided in October of 2022. The Board indicated that some improvements had been made, but noted that the rear massing still needs to be reduced. The front façade detail was considered too busy with both rooflines and materials and should be more vernacular in character. The number of materials should be reduced to two, with perhaps an accent of a third. Finally, the windows should be organized in a more historic pattern, with discernable exterior patterns.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Gary Alexander Yes
Sean Cotter Yes
Martha Cooper Yes
Michael Jewell Yes
Hilary Damaser Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:

Zachary Hounshell, Planner II



~~The procedures of the meeting were stated and included that anyone who addresses the Board will need to provide their full name and address for the record.~~

~~The Chair swore in anyone planning to address the Board on any of the cases to be reviewed.~~

NEW CASES

1. 112 S. Riverview Street, 22-182INF, Informal Review

The Chair stated this application was a request for the construction of a two-story, residential building for a 0.26-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic Residential. The site is located southeast of the intersection of Pinneyhill Lane with S. Riverview Street.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Holt presented an aerial view of the site which was split in 2021 following the approved demolition of 110-112 S. Riverview Street. The property at 110 S. Riverview Street is currently under construction, just north of this property. The Scioto River is directly to the east where there are grade changes and a flood plain.

Photographs were shown for context and character of homes on the same side of the street and across, and the gross square footage for each structure has been noted for reference.

The property was reviewed informally by the ARB in October 2022. At that time, the Board made the following comments:

- The Board supported the layout on lot, as long as side yard setbacks were met;
- The Board was concerned about the massing and scale of the structure;
- Concerned about the complexity of rooflines;
- Concerned about the character and context;
- Made recommendations for a simpler, more vernacular, design; and
- Made a recommendation to relocate the garage to south side of the lot.

The site plan is largely the same as before.

- The four-car garage is still located on the north side of the building;
- There is a request for a Waiver for the front yard setback due to the existing grade similar to what was already approved for adjacent property at 110 S. Riverview Street; and
- The site plan now meets all required setbacks.

At the Minor Project Review, a survey will be required to confirm lot lines and any easements, and floodplain bounds will also need to be provided.

The elevations from the October 2022 review were presented in direct comparison with tonight's proposal. The design has been updated to a Cape Cod style, 1.5-story home. The midpoint of the roofline is 20 feet, four inches. The front façade now has a simplified form with new dormer windows and reduced number of materials used. The gutters section the home into different bays. The application is still showing some liveable space above the garage.

Preservation Designs, Ltd. (PDL) recommended the different material usage be minimized, to increase setbacks in the hyphen area, and to minimize faux historicisms, such as the ornate front entry detail on the west elevation/front.

For the north elevation/side there is now a stepped stone foundation; a reduction in the width of the shed dormer over the garage; and horizontal siding is the primary material.

PDL made recommendations that the stone foundation should be one height and that the ±16-inch stone front façade should wrap around the house and be more substantial.

The south elevation/side was updated for the massing to better reflect the natural slope of the site, the stepped stone foundation was added, horizontal siding again is the primary material and windows were provided in a more functional manner but not a traditional pattern. Staff recommends more consistent window placements.

PDL recommended the consistent wrap of stone foundation with no stair stepping effect.

The east elevation/rear massing appears to be driven somewhat by the four-car garage and this elevation was updated for the massing to better reflect the natural slope of the site. The stepped stone foundation was added, horizontal siding again is the primary material and windows were provided in a more functional manner with better traditional groupings.

PDL recommended the consistent wrap of stone foundation with no stair stepping effect.

Staff is still concerned with the 3.5-story mass on the rear elevation that exceeds height requirements, which would require a Waiver, which Staff is reluctant to support. A Waiver was granted for 110 S. Riverview but the massing was different. This is still essentially a rectangular, boxy form with multiple roof forms and slopes.

The front elevation for 110 S. Riverview Street was compared with the proposed elevation for 112 S. Riverview Street. The eave heights at 112 were greater and taller in size, with a greater emphasis on the half-story windows and living space. She noted 110 was approved under the new Code and Guidelines.

Ms. Holt presented the following discussion questions:

1. Does the Board support the updated mass and scale of the home, including the massing's response to the topography?
2. Does the Board support the updated conceptual architectural character and details of the home, including roof lines, window placement, and front entry detail?
3. Does the Board support the variety and use of materials proposed for the home?

Questions for Staff

Ms. Damaser – She inquired about Staff's reasoning for not supporting a roof height Waiver as it related to the massing in the rear.

Ms. Holt – The boxy forms and the very vertical forms at 3.5 stories tall on the rear does not attempt to step down the slope as much as it could.

Applicant Presentation

David Johnson, 8965 Cove Drive, Plain City, Ohio, presented other houses shown in the neighborhood. PDL had comments for the steepness of the roof and at 185 S. Riverview Street, it illustrates a 12:12 or 14:12 main roof that appears more massive. Another house was shown with a more ornate treatment of the entry, similar to what was in their proposal, but the client would be willing to do a simpler stone entry with a limestone lintel. PDL noted the height of the floors in the proposal. At 97 S. Riverview Street, there is clearly a 10-foot floor height with a 2-story main floor in this larger home within 500 – 600 feet of this site. The house did not even address the corner it sits upon. He wanted to compare the size of the footprint to his design. The dormers are engaged and flush with the wall at 84 S. Riverview Street. The client agreed to drop the roof pitch to 12:12 and go to a nine-foot first floor plate, allowing the main living areas to step down. Part of the simplification of the front façade is a stone front with engaged dormers and not set back on the roofline similar to 16 N. Dublin Road. The front presentation would be lower in scale and bring the roofline down another 2 – 3 feet. Parking on that side of the street is a big issue. This design presents as a two-car garage, even though it manages four cars. This helps get 2 cars that might otherwise be parked on the street. One story in the rear is technically a crawl space due to topography. They tried to reduce the flat roof and create more of a Cape Cod style on the rear. The main gable off the main roof is the Master Bedroom. There is also a second bedroom. The intent was to get both bedrooms up higher for a great view of the river. The Board suggested moving them to a lower level but the client wants to keep them higher/top floor.

Questions for the Applicant

Mr. Jewell – He asked if the lower level floor plan was available.

Mr. Johnson – The client would like a family room, exercise room, and maybe an additional bedroom as well as the unfinished portion for utilities on that level.

Mr. Cotter – He verified the pitch of the garage is 12:12.

Public Comment

No public comment has been received.

Board Discussion

The Chair began with the discussion questions:

(Q1) Mr. Cotter – This is a nice improvement from October’s plan; it softened and dampened the whole view. The garage pitch overwhelms the house and dropping it will reduce the mass. The dormers fit with the other homes in the area. He asked to discuss the wraparound stone.

Mr. Johnson – The client is willing to drop the water table.

Mr. Alexander – Historic homes have a constant stone water table level. The applicant is trying to suggest they have a stone foundation, therefore it should be detailed appropriately, which is standard in preservation guidelines. This presents problems with breaking up the scale on the rear as there will be a lot of stone.

Mr. Jewell – He shared the same thoughts as Mr. Cotter.

Ms. Cooper – The stone will provide a simpler appearance like the other homes in the area. She asked about the hyphen being set back farther.

Mr. Johnson – He could bring it back another 2 – 3 feet without changing the plan too much.

Mr. Alexander – The front elevation was never his greatest concern. This is an improvement over the last time. We are looking for a greater shadow line to articulate between the house and the garage. Because the garage is so long, there is so much mass against the neighbor's house, blocking the potential for light. As stated at the last meeting, flipping the plan will allow more light into that house over a deck, and the projection will not be so deep on that side of the neighbor's house. It is still a three-story wall against the neighbor's house.

Mr. Johnson - The Razors had spoken with the neighbor, who prefers their garage to be on the left. Mr. Alexander – The Board is here to respond to architectural issues and how they respond to the Code. Whether someone likes something or not is outside the Code issues. And the consultant suggested reducing the depth of the garage. Changes will need to be made to get this project approved. The consultant made a lot of suggestions.

Mr. Johnson – There could be compromises made.

Mr. Alexander – The shed dormer on the upper floor against the neighbor contributes to the wall.

Mr. Johnson – He suggested smaller dormers instead of one large one.

Mr. Jewell – The northeast corner is the issue of additional mass and the dominance it projects. The design does not allow for the appearance that the house is coming down the slope; it is coming straight out to that side. There is very little space between the two houses because of the small lots. Mr. Johnson – No matter what is there, it will feel larger due to the nature of the topography.

Ms. Cooper – There is a lot less massing to the southeast of the property with the double decks that are open, if the plan was flipped. The whole garage area could be reduced in size. The rear elevation appears out of place to the community due to its size and square shape.

Mr. Cotter – Guidelines state to follow the contour of the topography. The focus is still on the northeast corner and how it appears as one large mass not broken up at all. It appears more than three stories, which is outside what this Board would normally approve and needs to be softened and dampened down. The middle section even appears large.

Mr. Johnson – The function of the rear is to fulfil the client's desire and the front can be reduced. He was looking for a compromise as this is the Razors' dream home.

The Board offered many design changes.

(Q2) Mr. Cotter – Suggested simplifying the front detail.

Mr. Alexander – He referred to the report. Wood details added to a stone building should be stone. The house across the street with that amount of detail was never approved by this Board. That is a great example of what is not acceptable. Strip out some of the detail; it is not found in a vernacular building.

Ms. Cooper – She had agreed to many of the comments from PDL in their report. There is still too much activity of the rooflines. She asked if anyone had spoken to the neighbor about switching the garage to the other side.

Bill Razor, 6857 Holbein Drive, Dublin, 43016, said he spoke with the neighbor after the last meeting about the garage. There is a privacy issue and the neighbors do not want to have to look at each other. Both would have more privacy with both garages together in between the living spaces. The neighbor offered to send his comments directly to the Board. He was the one that split the lot and

they bought the lot from him. The neighbor wants the process expedited and the street to get back to normal. He stated he was not an architect but the design is pretty cool. He understands the driving forces of the historic nature of the neighborhood but it is a river view lot and would like to take advantage of that. Most of the houses there have decks and such and maximize the number of windows that face the river. He said it is to be historic looking on the front but a river view feel on the back. It does not seem to be a typical lot.

Mr. Johnson – For context, the rear façade at 134 - 136 S. Riverview Street, next door, appears clearly as a three-story house based on the topography.

The Chair – The Board does not dispute the rear is going to be taller, more open, with the amount of windows proposed; there are more sensitive ways it can be handled.

(Q3) Mr. Cotter – The stone in the front is fine. He wanted to better understand the wraparound.

Ms. Damaser and Mr. Jewell had the same concern.

Mr. Alexander – Stepping should be simpler.

Mr. Johnson – He suggested adding a chimney to connect to.

Ms. Holt – Chimneys cannot project into a setback.

Mr. Johnson – To limit materials, all board and batten would be removed and just have stone and horizontal siding.

Mr. Cotter – He inquired about the window size and placements on the south side.

Mr. Alexander – The consultant commented on the variety of windows and grid pattern changes.

Ms. Holt – She agreed there is a variety and interpreted the comments of wanting traditional forms and groupings, not randomly placed on the exterior as dictated by the interior.

Ms. Cooper – She inquired about the little window that appears between floors.

Mr. Johnson – A small eye window in a bathtub/shower area in the bathroom.

Ms. Cooper – She asked about the one above by the gable.

Mr. Johnson – There's a switchback stairway and the landing is dropped down from the second floor.

The Chair summarized the Board's comments:

- The mass and scale is related to the articulation of the rear elevation. The 3.5 story mass on the one plane in the rear needs to be reduced.
- Simplify the conceptual character and detail to be more appropriate using vernacular detail for a traditional home.
- Simplify rooflines.
- Reduce the number of materials to two but a third might be permitted if used as an accent.
- Organize the windows on the elevations where the windows do not appear to line up. Create some continuity in the grid patterns in the windows, themselves.

~~2. Franklin Street Extension Project - Landscaping at 50 W. Bridge Street 22-179MPR, Minor Project Review~~

~~The Chair stated this application was a request for modifications to landscaping on private property in association with the Franklin Street Extension Project from the City of Dublin Department of Engineering.~~

~~Staff Presentation~~

~~Ms. Holt stated just the improvements on private property were going to be discussed. An aerial view was shown of the proposed road extension with the associated project site within two different zones. The~~



BOARD DISCUSSION

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, October 26, 2022 | 6:30 pm

The Architectural Review Board took the following action at this meeting:

**1. 112 S. Riverview Street
22-146INF**

Informal Review

Proposal: Construction of a new two-story, residential building on a 0.26-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic Residential.
Location: Southwest of the intersection of Pinneyhill Lane and S. Riverview Street.
Request: Informal review and non-binding feedback for a future Minor Project under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.176 and the *Historic Design Guidelines*.
Applicant: Kevin Koch, Corinthian Fine Homes
Contact: Zachary Hounshell, Planner II
Contact Information: 614.410.4652, zhounshell@dublin.oh.us
Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/22-146

RESULT: The Board provided non-binding feedback on a new single-family, residential home at 112 S. Riverview Street. The Board generally supported the site layout, but recommended moving the garage to the south end of the home. The Board expressed concern regarding the massing profile of the home. The Board recommended a simpler, more vernacular design for the home to be consistent with the recommendations of the *Historic Design Guidelines*. The Board was not supportive of Waivers to the total side yard setback and roof pitch requirements, but were supportive of a front-loaded, garage setback.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Gary Alexander Yes
Sean Cotter Yes
Martha Cooper Yes
Michael Jewell Yes
Hilary Damaser Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:

B1050D11513A490
Zachary Hounshell, Planner II





MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, October 26, 2022

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Alexander, Chair, called the October 26, 2022, meeting of the City of Dublin Architectural Review Board (ARB) to order at 6:31 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Chair led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

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

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Damaser moved, Mr. Cotter seconded, to accept the documents into the record and to approve the minutes from the meeting held on September 21, 2022, as well as the minutes from the Joint Session held on August 31, 2022.

Vote: Mr. Jewell, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; and Ms. Damaser, yes.
[Motion carried 5-0]

CASE PROCEDURES

The Chair stated the Architectural Review Board is responsible for review of construction, modifications or alterations to any site in the area subject to Architectural Board Review under the provision of Zoning Code §153.170. This Board has the final decision-making responsibility on cases under their purview. Anyone who intends to address the Board on any of the cases this evening will be sworn in. There were no cases eligible for the Consent Agenda. The agenda order is typically determined at the beginning of the meeting by the Chair, who also stated the procedures of the meeting. The cases in the minutes follow the order of the published agenda. Anyone who addresses the Board will need to provide their full name and address for the record.

The Chair swore in anyone planning to address the Board on any of the cases to be reviewed.

INFORMAL CASE

1. 112 S. Riverview Street, 22-146INF, Informal Review

The Chair stated this application was a request for the construction of a new two-story, residential building on a 0.26-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic Residential. The site is located southeast of the intersection of Pinneyhill Lane and S. Riverview Street.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Hounshell presented an aerial view of the site with a significant grade change from the west to the east of the property along the Scioto River, which is to the east. There are also flood plain limitations. The lot was split in May 2021, following approval of the demolition of an existing duplex at 110-112 S. Riverview Street to create 112 S. Riverview Street. A Minor Project was approved for 110 S. Riverview Street, also. Photographs of homes in the immediate area were shown for context (134-136 S. Riverview Street, 84 S. Riverview Street, 109 S. Riverview Street, and 129 S. Riverview Street).

The proposed site plan reflected the lot split and the footprint for a ±2,500-square-foot, single-family home with a front-loaded garage and front patio that leads to S. Riverview Street, consistent with what was previously approved. There was a Waiver approved for a front-loaded garage on 110 S. Riverview Street, due to the topography and challenge to meet the required setback. If this project moves forward a similar Waiver would be requested as part of the Minor Project Review. The application meets all required setbacks except for the total north and south side yard setbacks, which deviates from the Zoning Code ±6 inches, which would require a separate Waiver. There is a line on the site plan that shows where the property severely slopes off, limiting the developable area between S. Riverview Street and the slope down to the Scioto River.

The proposed front elevation [drawing shown] has a side and front gabled roof system with 24 feet to the peak of the gable, which meets the Code requirements. There are a number of different styled muntined windows and the building materials include: stone; board and batten; and vertical or horizontal siding. The proposed side elevations north and south [drawing shown] differ in design and choice of materials. The proposed rear elevation [drawing shown] as viewed from the Scioto River showed a 3 to 3.5-story height as it followed topography. Three balconies were proposed, two of which were true balconies and the third is more of a Juliet style balcony.

Discussion Questions

- 1) Does the Board support the proposed site layout, including Waivers for the garage location and the side yard setback?
- 2) Does the Board support the proposed mass and scale of the home, including the massing's response to the topography?
- 3) Does the Board support the conceptual architectural character and details of the home, including roof lines and window placement?
- 4) Does the Board support the variety and use of materials proposed for the home?

Applicant Presentation

Dave Johnson, architect, 111 W. Henderson Road, Columbus, OH, presented a 3-dimensional massing study to better illustrate the rear façade. The adjacent house being constructed was also included for context. A Waiver would be needed for the rear height. From the rear, the two houses are compatible with each other. A ranch plan did not allow the architect to get the master bedroom *en suite* on the first floor prompting a second floor. All bedrooms and a study are on the second floor. The front character is eclectic using stone elements from Historic Dublin. The picturesque front façade would add to the streetscape. The house next door is a colonial style, more fitting with Worthington, Ohio.

Questions for Staff and the Applicant

Mr. Cotter – He asked the relative height for the houses on 110 S. Riverview and 136-138 S. Riverview Street.

Architectural Review Board
Meeting Minutes of October 26, 2022
Page 3 of 11

Mr. Johnson – Both houses are 24 feet to the ridge as determined from scaled drawings.
Mr. Hounshell – He did not have access to that information at present.

Mr. Jewell – He asked about the side yard setbacks.

Mr. Hounshell – The requirement is a minimum of 12 feet combined and currently the plans show 11 feet, 6 inches.

Mr. Alexander – Since this is a virgin site where the applicant can start from scratch, there should be no need for a Variance for the side yard.

Mr. Johnson – This was a request to include all of the client's requests/needs, and he did not think 6 inches was a drastic request but the plans can be adjusted to be in compliance.

Ms. Damaser – She inquired about the shed dormer on the side of the house over the garage and if it was set back.

Mr. Johnson – That is to provide ceiling height for that room since the roof pitch is 12:12 and allows the front gable to have a larger presence.

Mr. Jewell – It appears the garage setback is in line with the others.

Mr. Johnson – The garage setbacks are within 2 to 3 feet of each other.

Mr. Cotter – This house looks quite different than the other single-story or 1.5-story houses on the street. He asked the applicant why he thought the proposed character fit.

Mr. Johnson – There is not a consistent style across the street. There is a full brick house and then more cottage/bungalow style houses. This design is his interpretation of old Dublin using stone in strategic places, possibly built on a stone foundation.

Mr. Cotter – He was concerned more with the massing.

Mr. Johnson – He liked vernacular rather than Colonial or Georgian. The Razors/client like an asymmetrical appearance with the front porch having a gable and an arch. This design is a combination of elements the Razors liked and melds the Dublin Historic District aesthetic.

Public Comment

Ms. Holt – There have been no comments submitted online but there is a person in the audience that is interested in addressing the Board on this case.

Denise Frantz King, 170 S. Riverview Street, said photographs in the Board's packets are aerial views taken in the winter from the river of the trees from quite a distance up. She presented photographs of the variety of trees during autumn to illustrate the arboreal context they would have on the homes at 110 and 112 S. Riverview Street. The mass and habitat they create are valuable to wildlife and stream health and contribute to the neighborhood especially to their mature height of over 50 feet. They contribute to the value of the lot and the residents' quality of life. The Dublin Historic District Code requires trees to be safeguarded during construction and preserved. Traditionally, a fence is installed around the drip line of the tree to safeguard the root zone from compaction. This was not done at 110 S. Riverview Street. Instead 24 – 30-inch limestone boulders surround mature trees and an arborist would have to speak to the impact on the longevity of the trees. She urged all to implement the Code and monitor the sites, and tree preservation measures should remain in place during construction on all lots. Landmark trees and stands of mature trees are amenities and should be preserved to the maximum extent feasible. This has been a cause of much angst in the neighborhood. Hiring a certified arborist to come up with a preservation plan is a notable expense, nevertheless, there is a way around this. She suggested monies be allocated in the next budget to create a tree preservation plan for all of the Historic District. Trees are being lost at a fast rate due to their age. There are electric lines that could be buried. We cannot plant street trees; we do not have them.

Architectural Review Board
Meeting Minutes of October 26, 2022
Page 4 of 11

Changes to grade, moisture, and stormwater should be a part of all discussions of construction requests in the Historic District and information provided with every case so the Board knows where the trees are.

Mr. Alexander – Every house that we have reviewed, not on the conceptual level like we are this evening, but Staff has indicated in the Planning Report, the Landmark trees and we have had lengthy discussions about our efforts to save the trees contrary to some of the residents' beliefs in the community. We sympathize and your suggestions are very good about the City having a survey done. When construction starts, it is beyond this Board's purview to monitor what is done. That is really the building official's responsibility and maybe there is a way to strengthen that. He asked Staff if there was some way to communicate internally and see if that can be done in a more diligent way.

Ms. Holt – She will be asking about that tomorrow.

Board Discussion

The Chair – He began the discussion with the questions from the Planning Report.

(Q1) Does the Board support the proposed site layout, including Waivers for the garage location and the side yard setback?

Mr. Cotter – He was generally fine with the layout. The Waiver for the garage is okay because they granted one for the north house. He would prefer the applicant comply with the side yard setbacks. Mr. Jewell, Ms. Cooper, and Ms. Damaser agreed.

Mr. Alexander – He had a concern with the layout and asked if the applicant could flip the design. As is, the three-story mass and garage is right next to the adjacent house. There is a lot more space on the south side. To be a good neighbor, flip the plan. He agreed on compliance with the side yard setback, too.

Ms. Cooper – She asked the applicant if the plan to flip as suggested from Mr. Alexander was considered.

Mr. Johnson – The garages were kept on the same side. He asked the Razors if having the garage on the right would be objectionable.

Scot Shively, Corinthian Fine Homes, said during the initial walk of the lot, he found challenges for placing the garage to the left versus the right were a lot less detrimental. They understand the sensitivity surrounding Dublin's love and protection of trees.

Mr. Alexander – The Board would like to see photographs of trees the applicant is trying to protect, if that is the case.

Mr. Shively - The trees are lower on the property.

Mr. Alexander – The drawings suggest the garage is being elevated, anyway. If the garage is on the north or the south side, there will still be the issue of building under the slab. These are just suggestions.

Mr. Shively - He will discuss with the client to consider.

Bill Razor, 6857 Holbein Drive, Dublin, garages side by side provide mutual privacy for both properties. The neighbor's house is three feet from the lot line. Our house will be four feet from the lot line. They are also excavating under their garage, creating a storage space above. If we flipped, we would look into the neighbor's house.

Mr. Alexander – The Board may go through a series of suggestions.

(Q2) Does the Board support the proposed mass and scale of the home, including the massing's response to the topography?

The Chair – The Code states the rear should step down to the rear.

Mr. Cotter – The front mass is quite large compared to the streetscape and especially the houses to the south. Appears to have too many different rooflines when viewed from the street and too many different materials intersecting on the front.

Architectural Review Board
Meeting Minutes of October 26, 2022
Page 5 of 11

Ms. Cooper – The dormer area above the garage takes away from the front view and makes the garage end seem extreme.

Mr. Johnson – That could be minimized by creating multiple small dormers.

Mr. Alexander – The flat roof on the back and those created by shed dormers will require Waivers by not meeting roof-pitch requirements of which he would not support. The house is so massive and the shed dormer over the garage creates a massive wall, it does not pull back from the façade. The house next door does not have living space up that high. All the non-compliant roofs result in a massive structure. He would have trouble supporting all of the Waivers that would be needed. The mid-level of this design aligns with the upper level of the house next door, creating a level above the adjoining property.

Mr. Jewell – He would not support what is coming off the back side.

(Q3) Does the Board support the conceptual architectural character and details of the home, including roof lines and window placement?

Mr. Alexander – Mr. Cotter had touched on this earlier about the character not fitting in with the residential section of the district.

Ms. Damaser – Upon first look, she saw a Tudor Style home, which seems out of place. She suggested the Tudor Style be minimized.

Ms. Cooper – Agreed.

The Chair – The *Historic Design Guidelines* are clear. Houses in the District are vernacular, which are simplistic in massing and material use. The house next door and across the street have a simple design; this is not. This design does not meet the Zoning Code for all those reasons.

Mr. Cotter – He inquired about the placement of the windows.

Mr. Johnson – The windows were driven by the interior plan, room by room.

Mr. Jewell – Getting the design to fit better in the neighborhood should include a plan for the windows, of a pattern and consistency.

The Chair – When the house next door was reviewed and approved, the Board had stated that was a perfect size for the lot after the split. This house could be larger than that house, but needs to meet all the characteristic design elements. He asked if any other members of the team had additional questions for the Board, for clarity. He suggested the applicant consider putting the bedrooms on the entry level.

Ms. Cooper – The front entry creates a castle-esque approach to the structure. That would not be found in the Historic District; more of a front porch aesthetic would be preferred.

The Chair summarized the points:

- The Board would support the Waiver for the garage.
- The rationale for the Waivers for side yard setbacks have not been provided.
- There are questions about the site layout as to its effect on the neighbor.
- The Board has concerns with the mass and scale of the home and the response to the topography.
- The home design needs to slope down with the hill.
- As of now, the Board would not support the Waivers needed for the roof pitch variations.
- The Board is concerned with the character and the details. Simplification would be more appropriate. A vernacular design would reflect more of the homes in the community. Use fewer materials, especially on the front.

NEW CASE

2. 114 S. High Street, 22-138MPR, Minor Project Review



BOARD ORDER

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, May 26, 2021 | 6:30 pm

The Architectural Review Board took the following action at this meeting:

**4. 110-112 S. Riverview Street
21-059ARB**

Demolition

Proposal: Demolition of a contributing two-family home to facilitate construction of a new, single-family home on a 0.59-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic Residential.

Location: East of S. Riverview Street, approximately 75 feet south of the intersection with Pinneyhill Lane.

Request: Review and approval of an Architectural Review Board request for Demolition under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.176 and the *Historic Design Guidelines*.

Applicant: Marc and Heather Frient

Planning Contact: Zachary C. Hounshell, Planner I

Contact Information: 614.410.4652, zhounshell@dublin.oh.us

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/21-059

MOTION: Ms. Cooper moved, Mr. Kownacki seconded, to approve the Demolition of a contributing, two-family home with the following condition:

- 1) That the order to allow a Demolition shall not be issued by the City until the ARB has approved a Minor Project Review application for new construction of one of the two lots.

VOTE: 5 – 0

RESULT: The Demolition was conditionally approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Gary Alexander	Yes
Amy Kramb	Yes
Sean Cotter	Yes
Frank Kownacki	Yes
Martha Cooper	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:

81050D11513A490...
Zachary C. Hounshell, Planner I





BOARD ORDER

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, May 26, 2021 | 6:30 pm

The Architectural Review Board took the following action at this meeting:

**5. 110-112 S. Riverview Street
21-060ARB-MPR**

Minor Project Review

Proposal: Construction of a new, approximately 3,000-square-foot, single-family home on a 0.589-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic Residential.
Location: East of S. Riverview Street, approximately 75 feet south of the intersection with Pinneyhill Lane.
Request: Review and approval of a Minor Project under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.176 and the *Historic Design Guidelines*.
Applicant: Marc and Heather Frient
Planning Contact: Zachary C. Hounshell, Planner I
Contact Information: 614.410.4652, zhounshell@dublin.oh.us
Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/21-060

MOTION 1: Mr. Kownacki moved, Ms. Kramb seconded, to approve five Waivers as amended:

1. §153.173(E)(3)(a) Attached Garages. Requirement: Front loaded garages shall be a minimum of 20 feet behind the front façade of the home.
Request: To allow an attached front-loaded garage to be setback 3 feet behind the front façade of the building.
2. §153.173(C) General Development Standards. Requirement: Maximum Building Height is 24 feet.
Request: To allow a height of approximately 29.5 feet from grade to the mid-point of the eaves on the rear elevation of the home.
3. §153.174(J)(1) Exterior Building Materials Standards – Façade Materials. Requirement: Permitted building materials shall be high quality, durable materials including but not limited to stone, manufactured stone, full depth brick, brick veneer, wood siding, glass, and fiber cement siding.
Request: To permit the use of engineered-wood as a primary material.
4. §153.174(B)(4)(c) Roof Type Requirements – Pitch Measure. Requirement: The principal roof shall have a pitch appropriate to the architectural style of the building. Roofs shall not be sloped less than a 6:12 (rise:run) or more than 12:12, unless otherwise determined to be architecturally appropriate by the ARB.
Request: To permit a pitch of 4:12 for a side-gabled roof.
5. §153.174(i)(2) Chimneys. Requirement: Chimneys on exterior walls shall extend full height from the ground and vertically past the eave line and must be finished in brick or stone.
Request: To eliminate the extension to grade of the northern chimney.



**5. 110-112 S. Riverview Street
21-060ARB-MPR**

Minor Project Review

VOTE: 5 – 0

RESULT: The five Waivers were approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Gary Alexander	Yes
Amy Kramb	Yes
Sean Cotter	Yes
Frank Kownacki	Yes
Martha Cooper	Yes

MOTION 2: Ms. Kramb moved, Mr. Kownacki seconded, to approve the Minor Project with six conditions as revised:

- 1) That the drawings be revised to include a gap at the bottom of the porch panel to allow for drainage and the porch floor to be extended over the band board;
- 2) That the applicant provide a wood gable vent in-lieu-of the proposed vent, subject to Staff approval;
- 3) That the applicant modify the stone foundation to extend to the bottom of the closed porch on the east-facing wall, subject to staff approval;
- 4) That the applicant work with Staff to select an appropriate chimney cap detail;
- 5) That the applicant execute the 24-foot stormwater easement with the submittal of the proposed lot split; and
- 6) That the applicant work with staff to choose an appropriate patio light fixture, subject to staff approval.

VOTE: 5 – 0

RESULT: The Minor Project was conditionally approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Gary Alexander	Yes
Amy Kramb	Yes
Sean Cotter	Yes
Frank Kownacki	Yes
Martha Cooper	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:

 B1050D11513A490...
 Zachary C. Hounshell, Planner I



- Cultured Stone/Mortar – Provia Custom mix of Old Dominion/Fieldstone (no reds or oranges) with Soft White smear application
- Slate Roof – Greystone Slate, Spanish Black
- Standing Seam Roof – Pre-weathered galvanized
- Gutters/downspouts – Tuxedo Gray
- Windows – Sierra Pacific H3 aluminum clad casement window in TW black
- Front Door/Side Porch Door – Stained SW 3522 Banyan Brown
- Porch Columns – Stained SW 3521 Crossroad

Staff has reviewed this application against all applicable criteria and recommends approval with no conditions.

Board Questions for Staff

Ms. Kramb inquired if the overhead door that was proposed for the gym on the backside of the garage is the same as is being used for the garage doors.

Ms. Martin responded that the sliding glass door at the rear of the home is being modified to be similar to a garage door. Although, it will appear similar to a window, it will be a glass door with a black metal frame.

Applicant Presentation

Paul Ghidotti, property owner, 185 S. Riverview Street, Dublin, OH, stated that the exercise room door has been a significant matter of discussion due to the difficulty in identifying a door that rolls but looks like a window and due to the cost of the materials. They are still trying to determine the right door configuration.

Richard Taylor, Architect, 48 S. High Street, Dublin, OH, stated that they appreciate the opportunity to discuss the proposed revision of materials on this project. The proposed door has the best appearance of those the Board has seen.

Public Comment

No public comments were received on the case.

Board Discussion

Ms. Cooper inquired if the garage would be painted black.

Ms. Martin responded that the garage will be painted "Iron Ore."

Mr. Alexander noted that color was included in the original submission.

Board members had no additional questions or discussion.

Mr. Kownacki moved, Ms. Cooper second approval of the Minor Project with no conditions.

Vote: Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Kownacki, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes.
[Motion carried 5-0]

4. 110-112 S. Riverview Street, 21-059ARB, Demolition

Demolition of a contributing two-family home to facilitate construction of a new, single-family home on a 0.59-acre site located east of S. Riverview Street, approximately 75 feet south of the intersection with Pinneyhill Lane, and zoned Historic District, Historic Residential.

Applicant Presentation

Mr. Hounshell stated that this is a request for two applications for this site, the first for Demolition and the second for a Minor Project. The site has an existing two-foot storm easement located on the north side of the property. The site also has significant grade change from west to east, moving toward the Scioto River. Because of its proximity to the river, there are significant floodplain and floodway limits. Along the river, there are mature trees located within the designated floodplain. These natural features limit development on the eastern half of the site. [Photos of adjacent sites viewed for context.]

Case History

On March 24, 2021, the Architectural Review Board informally reviewed an application for a potential demolition and new construction of a new 2,900-square-foot single-family home. The applicant proposed to split the 0.589-acre site into two lots and develop the northern lot with the proposed cottage-style home. The Board was generally supportive of a proposed demolition request, but requested additional documentation of either the financial liability of the property or documentation and analysis of how the building is not contributing to the Historic District. In November 2018, the Architectural Review Board informally reviewed an application for a potential demolition and new construction of a new 3,000-square-foot single-family home. The proposed ranch home was generally within the footprint of the existing home. The Board was supportive of a proposed demolition and construction of a new home; however, no further application was made for demolition or new development.

Proposal

The applicant is proposing to demolish the existing 3,400-square-foot, 1966 two-family, brick ranch home on the site. In the City's 2017 Historic and Cultural Assessment (HCA), the existing structure was recommended contributing to the Dublin Historic District. The Assessment assessed the structure to be in good condition, possessing all seven integrity markers. The City's architectural consultant has provided a detailed review of the existing structures and pointed out that the HCA was based on the exterior of the structure. The applicant has provided photos of the deteriorating balcony, cracking and deteriorating foundation, uneven floors and openings, and unstable roof framing. [Photos shown.] In addition, the applicant has provided a number of supporting documents for demolition including a statement addressing the criteria, a structural engineer's report, financial assessment for the existing structure, cost estimates for rehabilitation of the existing structure and for construction, and a letter from Fifth Third Bank.

As discussed at the prior Informal Review, the applicant had two options. One was to justify why the site should be considered Non Contributing; the other was to pursue an analysis and provide documentation regarding the financial liability of the site. The applicant has pursued the latter. Contributing structures have three criteria that must be met to demonstrate economic hardship, as a basis for demolition. The applicant provided three options for the property that do not involve complete demolition of the structure: A) Keep the structure as is and rent at current value, B) Renovate the structure as a two-dwelling home and rent at current market rates, and C) Convert the two-family home into a single-family home.

Option A: They are currently renting the two units at \$1,800 per month (\$900 per side) with no option to increase the rent unless significant improvements are made to the structure. Based on current principal, interest, taxes and insurance, the property currently creates a negative cash flow of \$4,800 per year. Due to the negative cash flow of the existing conditions of the property, this option is not financially viable for the applicant.

Option B: The second option would be to restore and update the existing structure to meet current Code requirements and rent the two units at current market rate rent, which might be approximately \$3,600 per month (\$1,800 per side). To restore and update the structure, the applicant has provided a project cost estimate of approximately \$400,000. The estimated costs are determined based on the structural and cosmetic improvements required for the existing structure, as defined in the engineering report. The proposed improvements and associated costs are also based on the owner's opportunity to gain a return on their investment in terms of the amount of rent that could be charged to support the cost of improvement. The current lien holder and bank lender will not finance renovations of this magnitude for the existing structure. Due to the bank's inability to fund the renovations and the negative cash flow of an updated structure, this option is not financially viable for the applicant.

Option C: The third option would be to convert the structure into a single-family unit. To renovate the structure, the applicant has provided a project cost estimate of approximately \$896,000. This cost, combined with the purchase price of \$425,000, would equate to \$1.325 million dollars invested in the property. The renovation of the building to a single-family unit would cost significantly more than new construction on the site, and would not appraise near the \$1.325 million dollars invested into the site. Additionally, as stated in option B, the current lien holder and bank lender will not finance renovations of this magnitude for the existing structure. Due to the bank's unwillingness to fund the renovations and the significant cost of renovation, this option is not financially viable for the applicant. The letter provided by the bank/lien holder states that they would not provide any financing for renovations of the existing structure. They would be willing to provide financing for new construction, should the existing structure be demolished.

Staff has reviewed the demolition request against the applicable criteria and recommends approval of the Demolition with one condition;

- That the order to allow a demolition not be issued by the City until the ARB has approved a Minor Project Review application for new construction of one of the two lots.

Board Questions

Mr. Cotter requested clarification of the reason Option C was not considered acceptable. Is it because the costs of the renovation with the existing investment would exceed the anticipated appraisal?

Applicant Presentation

Marc Frient, property owner, 110-112 S. Riverview Street, Dublin, OH, stated that the bank is looking at two things: existing structure and the resulting value after renovations. They do not believe it will appraise high enough to justify the \$900,000 renovations to a single-family home.

Mr. Cotter stated that he was attempting to understand the reason the bank was unwilling to finance renovating the property to Code versus financing new construction to Code.

Mr. Frient responded that he believes the bank's decision was based on appraised value.

Mr. Kownacki stated that, typically, the bank looks at the investment from the perspective of if they financed that amount, then the property owner disappeared and the property reverted to the bank, would the bank be able to recoup their investment.

Rodney Arcaro, 50 McCoy Avenue, Worthington, Ohio 43085, stated that they could dictate and control the costs up front with a new build. With renovations, they could not predict or control the ultimate costs, particularly due to the foundation issues identified by the engineer. Those costs would be too open-ended.

Mr. Cotter stated that he understands that the bank is unwilling to take that risk.

Public Comments

Mr. Hounshell indicated that 8 public comments were received and included with the packet materials. Mr. Alexander inquired if any Board member desired the comments to be read into the record. No Board member requested they be read.

Mr. Alexander noted that all of the public comments were in support of the requested demolition. One was supportive of the demolition but opposed to the division of the site into two lots. They also wanted verification that new construction would not encroach into the stormwater easement.

Ms. Cooper clarified the stormwater easement on this site is 24 feet, and the proposed construction on the site will not encroach into that easement.

Board Discussion

Board members indicated consensus for approval of demolition.

Ms. Cooper moved, Mr. Kownacki seconded to approve the demolition with one condition:

- 1) That the order to allow a Demolition shall not be issued by the City until the ARB has approved a Minor Project application for new construction of one of the two lots.

Vote: Mr. Cotter, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Kownacki, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Ms. Krumb, yes.
[Motion carried 5-0]

5. 110-112 S. Riverview Street, 21-060ARB-MPR, Minor Project Review

Construction of a new, approximately 3,000-square-foot, single-family home on a 0.589-acre site located east of S. Riverview Street, approximately 75 feet south of the intersection with Pinneyhill Lane, zoned Historic District, Historic Residential.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Hounshell stated that with the approval of the demolition, the applicant is requesting approval of a request for construction of a new, 3,000-square-foot, single-family home. Newly-created lots within the Historic District are required to be a minimum of 8,700 square feet in size with a minimum lot width of 60 feet. Both lots meet the required minimum lot standards. The applicant is proposing to develop the northern lot, while selling the southern lot for a future single-family home. The lot split is an administrative application that is reviewed and approved by Planning and Engineering staff. A 24-foot storm water easement is required in the northern portion of the applicant's lot. The applicant will need to work with staff to execute the 24-foot easement with the submittal of the proposed lot split. The applicant is proposing the construction of a one-and a-half-story, cottage-style, single-family home. The proposed siting of the home on the lot meets all the applicable setback and lot and building coverage criteria. However, Zoning Code requires that the attached, front-loaded garage be set back a minimum of 20 feet from the front building façade. The garage is currently set back three feet from the west, front façade along S. Riverview Street. Consistent with input the Board provided at the preceding Informal Review, the applicant has moved the main structure forward from the garage as opposed to moving the garage further to the rear. That has created the 3-foot separation. The proposed siting does meet the 0-foot front setback requirement. A waiver is requested to permit the 3-foot setback where a 20-foot setback would be required. A number of other modifications have been made to the original plan, including: changes to the stone foundation lines on the north and south elevations and revising the sunroom to a covered porch. Within the covered porch, the applicant is proposing an additional stone fireplace to match the proposed stone chimney on the south side of the home. The

form of the home is primarily defined by a 10:12-pitched, side-gabled roofline interrupted by a 10:12-pitched, front-gabled, two-car garage and a center, front-gabled dormer over the main portion of the home. A secondary 4:12-pitched, side-gabled roofline connects the primary side-gabled roofline and the front-gable roofline. Roof pitches within the Historic District are required to be greater than 6:12 pitch and less than 12:12 pitch. A Waiver is required to allow the less steep pitch. The front porch will be recessed into the front elevation and will be clad in a board and batten vertical siding; the remainder of the elevation will be clad in horizontal siding. The siding is constructed of an engineered wood. Although it is not a permitted material within the District, it has been approved for previous projects in the District. A waiver will be required to permit it to be used. The consultant recommends the proposed board and batten siding located on the front of the home be replaced with horizontal siding to provide a cohesive front elevation. Staff recommends the plans be revised to reflect this change in material. The applicant is proposing two types of window styles, including two-over-three white aluminum-clad wood casement windows (Pella Lifestyle Series) on the first floor, and two-over-two white aluminum-clad wood casement windows (Pella Lifestyle Series) on the second floor. The consultant recommends the replacement of the proposed fixed and casement windows with a traditional sash window to maintain the historic context of the District and that the rear windows' style and design be modified to match the windows on the front of the home to create a cohesive structure] The applicant is providing a composite gable vent within the side gable form of the main structure; staff recommends it be revised with wood gable vents.

Staff has reviewed the application against all the applicable criteria and recommends approval of four (4) waivers and approval of the Minor Project with eight (8) conditions.

Applicant Presentation

Andy Melaragno, Melaragno Design Company, 4138 Greensview Dr, Columbus, OH 43220, stated that the homeowner would prefer to use the board and batten siding on both the front porch and the hyphen. The consultant had no objection to it being used on the hyphen, so he requests it be permitted there, at a minimum. Another issue is the stone under the covered porch. That area of the house will not be seen by the public from any angle. The only possible view would be from the river, looking upward. They would prefer to use siding underneath the covered porch and not extend the chimney foundation down to the grade there. An internal prefabricated fireplace is being installed under the porch. The chimney foundation is not needed either for structural support or for aesthetics in that location, which cannot be seen by the public. Additionally, installing casement windows without grids, so as not to obstruct the view of the river, is preferred.

Board Discussion

Board members indicated they had no objection to the four requested waivers.

Ms. Kramb moved, Mr. Kownacki seconded approval of five (5) Zoning Code waivers:

Waiver Request 1

Requirement: §153.173(E)(3)(a) Attached Garages. Front loaded garages shall be a minimum of 20 feet behind the front façade of the home.

Request: To allow an attached front-loaded garage to be set back 3 feet behind the front façade of the building.

Waiver Request 2

Requirement: §153.173(C) General Development Standards – Maximum Building Height = 24 feet.

Request: To allow a height of approximately 29.5 feet from grade to the mid-point of the eaves on the rear elevation of the home.

Waiver Request 3

Requirement: §153.174(J)(1) Exterior Building Materials Standards – Façade Materials. Permitted building materials shall be high quality, durable materials including but not limited to stone, manufactured stone, full depth brick, brick veneer, wood siding, glass, and fiber cement siding.

Request: To permit the use of engineered wood as a primary material.

Waiver Request 4

Requirement: §153.174(B)(4)(c) Roof Type Requirements – Pitch Measure. The principal roof shall have a pitch appropriate to the architectural style of the building. Roofs shall not be sloped less than a 6:12 (rise:run) or more than 12:12, unless otherwise determined to be architecturally appropriate by the ARB.

Request: To permit a pitch of 4:12 for a side-gabled roof.

Vote: Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Kownacki, yes.
[Motion carried 5-0]

Following discussion regarding extension of the northern chimney to grade, Board consensus was that the extension was unnecessary; consequently, a waiver to that Code requirement also would be needed.

Ms. Cooper moved, Mr. Cotter seconded approval of a fifth waiver to Zoning Code, that:

Waiver Request 5

Requirement: §153.174(i)(2) Chimneys – Chimneys on exterior walls shall extend full height from the ground and vertically past the eave line and must be finished in brick or stone.

Request: To eliminate the extension to grade of the northern chimney.

Vote: Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Kownacki, yes.
[Motion carried 5-0]

Board members discussed the proposed conditions for Minor Project approval.

Mr. Hounshell noted that the 24-foot stormwater easement does exist, but it was not reflected on the survey included with the application submission. The condition has been added that would require it to be documented on the survey.

Mr. Frient clarified that to the best of his knowledge, the stormwater easement no longer exists. At an earlier time, Pinneyhill Lane was expected to be extended over the river; therefore, an easement existed. The surveyor indicated to him that the easement had expired; however, they are not opposed to including it with the lot split.

Ms. Martin stated that, as part of the process, the lot split will need to be re-recorded with Franklin County. It is the City's expectation that the stormwater easement be provided and recorded. Therefore, that condition for approval should be delineated.

Ms. Cooper stated that should the easement not be needed, and the City not require it as part of the lot split, it would affect where the home could be sited on the northern lot.

Mr. Alexander responded that is correct, because the most logical location for a home on properties with a significant grade change is horizontally, paralleling the street. If there were 12 additional feet on each lot, the property owner might want to take advantage of that opportunity. It would be possible

to build more to grade, and less excavation on the property would be necessary. It would make a significant difference in the design of the house.

Mr. Hounshell clarified that there is an existing stormwater gravity line on the site. Engineering staff has stated that it is required and requested the condition be added. This has been discussed with the applicant from the outset and is the reason the house has been sited as proposed.

Mr. Melaragno confirmed Mr. Hounshell's information. There is a stormsewer pipe that runs through the property. It has not yet been recorded, because the lot split has not been recorded. However, the easement will be finalized with the lot split.

Mr. Frient stated that, for the record, he agrees. The easement will be provided as required.

The majority of Board members indicated they had no objection to the board and batten on both the hyphen and the front porch.

Discussion occurred regarding requiring cultured stone under the covered porch on the rear façade.

Mr. Frient inquired if that would also be the north-facing wall.

Ms. Kramb clarified that the stone would be only on the east-facing façade, not the north-facing wall.

Ms. Kramb indicated that she would have no objection to eliminating the condition to extend the stone foundation on the rear façade.

Mr. Alexander stated that he agrees with the consultant – it helps the design to extend that design.

Ms. Kramb inquired if the requirement is that the stone extend all the way up the facade.

Mr. Alexander responded that it would be only up to the cantilever structure – the entire bump-out area. It makes sense because it will be continuing the line seen on the south elevation, past the chimney and around the rear façade. It will tie in better with the column.

Ms. Kramb noted that she had confused the location.

Mr. Melarango stated that a sketch of the rear elevation is on p. 10 of the consultant's report. The sketch depicts the use of stone under the covered porch, but not on the walkout wall; that area under the cantilever reflects siding. Where the foundation resumes, the stone foundation begins again. Therefore, his design shows the foundation under the basement slab clad in stone, while the framed wall of the rear walkout is covered with siding.

Mr. Cotter and Ms. Kramb stated that the materials on the north wall are "stepped."

Mr. Hounshell stated that the condition requires that the stone be on the rear, east façade up to the bottom of the covered porch.

Ms. Martin noted that the intent is that the main core of the home would have a fully-clad stone foundation.

Ms. Kramb clarified that the condition is that the north end of the east-facing façade under the covered porch will be stone.

Board consensus was to retain said condition.

Mr. Frient inquired the purpose of requiring the stone element on a wall that will not be visible to the public. He asks because stone is more expensive than regular siding.

Mr. Alexander responded that there appears to be a stone foundation on the building, and that appearance should be consistent. Typically, wood siding would not extend to the ground. Costs are a concern, but aesthetics are also an issue.

The applicant indicated he had no objection to the revised conditions.

Ms. Kramb moved, Mr. Kownacki seconded approval of the Minor Project with six (6) conditions:

- 1) That the drawings be revised to include a gap at the bottom of the porch panel to allow for drainage and the porch floor to be extended over the band board;

- 2) That the applicant provide a wood gable vent in-lieu-of the proposed vent, subject to staff approval;
- 3) That the applicant modify the stone foundation to extend to the bottom of the closed porch on the east-facing wall, subject to staff approval;
- 4) That the applicant work with staff to select an appropriate chimney cap detail;
- 5) That the applicant execute the 24-foot stormwater easement with the submittal of the proposed lot split; and
- 6) That the applicant work with staff to choose an appropriate patio lighting fixture, subject to staff approval.

Vote: Mr. Cotter, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Mr. Kownacki; Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes.
[Motion carried 5-0]

[5-minute break.]

6. ~~181 S. High Street, 21-073ARB, Demolition~~

~~Demolition of a non-contributing, single-family home to facilitate construction of a new, single-family home on a 0.47-acre site located northwest of the intersection of S. High Street with Waterford Drive, zoned Historic District, Historic Residential.~~

7. ~~181 S. High Street, 21-069ARB-MPR, Minor Project Review~~

~~Construction of a new, single-family home on a 0.47-acre site located northwest of the intersection of S. High Street with Waterford Drive, zoned Historic District, Historic Residential.~~

Staff Presentation

~~Ms. Martin stated that this is a request for demolition of a non-contributing, single-family home to facilitate construction of a new, single-family home on a 0.47-acre site located northwest of the intersection of S. High Street with Waterford Drive, zoned Historic District, Historic Residential. The Board has provided two prior Informal Reviews on this site. Most recently, in February 2021, the Board expressed support for demolition of the existing single-family home provided that demolition criteria are met. The Board supported the proposed site layout and architectural design, scale and massing of the proposed home. The existing structure, built in 1967, is recommended "non-contributing" to the Historic District due to the age, materials, and workmanship of the home. The Code provides two sets of review criteria for demolition requests within Historic Dublin: one for contributing structures, and one for non-contributing structures. 181 S. High Street is subject to the latter, which states that one of three criteria outlined in the Code must be found to be met for approval of a demolition request: The applicant has indicated that the existing structure "impedes the orderly development of the District" and "detracts from the historical character of its immediate vicinity," which meets demolition criteria number three. The applicant notes that the home detracts from the historic value of the Karrer homestead to the north and Karrer barn to the south. Additionally, the existing condition of the home detracts from the established character of the District. The applicant asserts that retaining the existing structure impedes development that would positively contribute to the overall character of the District furthering the goals and objectives of Historic Dublin.~~

~~Staff recommends approval of the proposed demolition.~~



BOARD DISCUSSION

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, March 24, 2021 | 6:30 pm

The Architectural Review Board took the following action at this meeting:

**1. 110-112 S. Riverview Street
21-019INF**

Informal Review

Proposal: Demolition of an existing, two-family residence and construction of ±3,000-square-foot, single-family residence. The 0.589-acre site is proposed to be subdivided into two lots, zoned Historic District, Historic Residential.

Location: East of S. Riverview Street, ±75 feet south of the intersection with Pinneyhill Lane.

Request: Informal review providing non-binding feedback of a potential future development under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.170 and the *Historic Design Guidelines*.

Applicant: Marc and Heather Frient, Property Owners

Planning Contact: Zachary Hounshell, Planner I

Contact Information: 614.410.4652, zhounshell@dublin.oh.us

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/21-019

RESULT: The Board reviewed and provided informal feedback on the proposal to demolish an existing, two-family residence and the construction of a new, single-family residence. The Board discussed the demolition, stating that the applicant will be required to meet the applicable criteria for demolition. The Board was split on the appropriateness of demolition, with one member stating that they would prefer to see the building preserved and renovated. Board members provided additional comments on the new construction. Members were generally supportive of the mass and scale of the proposed new construction home, suggesting that they would be supportive of a Waiver to building height, given the significant grade change along the east portion of the site. Board members generally were supportive of the proposed materials, but expressed a desire to see additional differentiation between the primary portion of the home and the garage portion, and to see a simplified application of materials at the rear of the home.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Gary Alexander Yes
Amy Kramb Yes
Sean Cotter Yes
Frank Kownacki Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Zach Hounshell, Planner I



Public Comment

~~No public comment was submitted for this case.~~

~~Mr. Alexander inquired if the applicant had any objections to the conditions of approval.~~

~~Oliver Holtsberry, 1640 Harmon Avenue Columbus, OH 43223, applicant, indicated he was unaware of the conditions for approval.~~

~~Ms. Martin read the two proposed conditions.~~

~~Mr. Holtsberry indicated he had no objection to the two conditions.~~

~~Mr. Kownacki moved, Ms. Kramb seconded approval of the Minor Project with the following 2 conditions:~~

- ~~1. That the applicant apply for and successfully obtain permanent sign permits through the Building Standards Division prior to installation of the signs.~~
- ~~2. That the applicant provide light fixture specifications to ensure a high quality fixture is used, subject to staff approval.~~

~~Vote: Mr. Kownacki, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes.~~

~~[Motion carried 4-0]~~

INFORMAL REVIEW CASE

1. 110-112 S. Riverview Street, 21-019INF, Informal Review

A request for an informal review and feedback to demolish a two-family residence and construction of ±3,000-square-foot, single-family residence. The 0.589-acre site is proposed to be subdivided into two lots, zoned Historic District, Historic Residential. The site is east of S. Riverview Street, ±75 feet south of the intersection with Pinneyhill Lane.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Hounshell stated that this is a request for an Informal Review with non-binding feedback for 110 and 112 S. Riverview Street. The 0.589-acre site, which is zoned HD-HR, Historic Residential, is located southeast of the intersection of S. Riverview Street and Pinneyhill Lane. The site has a significant grade change moving west to east from S. Riverview Street to the Scioto River and contains a number of mature trees. The eastern portion of the site lies within a floodplain, and a 24-foot storm easement extends along the northern portion. Consequently, the only developable land on the site is the western half -- where the existing structure is located. [Photos of adjacent properties shown for site context.]

History

In November 2018, the Architectural Review Board informally reviewed an application for a potential demolition and new construction of a new 3,000-square-foot single-family home. The proposed ranch home was generally within the footprint of the existing home. The Board was supportive of a proposed demolition and construction of a new home. They were not supportive of the proposed 3-car attached garage on the northern portion of the site, as they believed it was not appropriate within the District. Subsequent to that review, no formal application was made for the demolition or development. On February 22, 2021, City Council approved amendments to the Architectural Review Board section of the Zoning Code, which removed the Historic District from the Bridge Street District and established updated zoning requirements; that legislation became effective March 23, 2021. The Code provides specific guidelines for development within the Historic District. At the same meeting, City Council also approved an area rezoning, removing Historic Districts from the Bridge Street District, including the Historic Transitional District on the northern portion of the Historic District. The Code amendment also provided more requirements for demolition.

Approval of demolitions within the District are now based on whether a structure is designated Contributing or Non-Contributing by the 2017 Historic and Cultural Assessment. The applicant is seeking Commission feedback regarding a potential demolition request and the construction of a single-family home. The site currently contains a 1966 two-family, brick ranch duplex. Although the structure is not included on the Ohio Historical Inventory, it was considered Contributing by the Historic and Cultural Assessment. The applicant will be required to provide documentation that the structure meets the demolition criteria before pursuing future demolition approval by the ARB.

Site Plan

The applicant is proposing to split the existing lot into two developable lots, with the approval of demolition of the existing home. The lot split can be approved administratively by Planning and Engineering staff, as long as it meets the requirements of the Historic District Guidelines for new lots. Both lots will meet the required minimum lot standards. The applicant is proposing to develop the northern of the two lots, which will be approximately 0.33 acres in size, and located immediately south of the 24-foot storm easement. The proposal is for an approximately 2,900-square-foot, cottage-style home with a 1.5-story mass along S. Riverview Street. The proposed structure will be set back approximately 10 feet from S. Riverview Street, meeting the minimum front yard setback requirement for homes on the east side of that street. It will also have a 4-foot side setback from the southern property line where 3 feet is the minimum requirement. The form of the home is a multi-pitched, side-gabled roofline interrupted by a front-gable, two-car garage; a center front gable for the main portion of the home; and a front door recessed into the front elevation. The primary materials will be horizontal siding, vertical board and batten and a stone foundation. Window selections throughout the home contain two-over-two windows, two-over-three windows, one-over-three windows and single panel windows. The new Code requires attached, front-loaded garages to be set back 20 feet from the front elevation of the home. Currently, the location is aligned with the front elevation, which would require ARB approval of a Waiver with the Minor Project application. The east elevation of the home will have a street level balcony and a lower level balcony within the same footprint. The south elevation reflects a stone-clad chimney and a step-down stone foundation from the front to the rear of the home. Per the new Historic District Code, the maximum height for homes within this district has been lowered from 35 feet from grade to 24 feet from grade. Due to the significant grade change, the height of the rear elevation likely will exceed the height requirement; therefore, a waiver would need to be approved with the Minor Project application.

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

- 1) Does the Board support demolition of the existing home?
- 2) Does the Board support the proposed site layout?
- 3) Does the Board support the proposed mass and scale of the home?
- 4) Does the Board support the conceptual architectural character and details of the home?

Applicant Presentation

Heather Frient, property owner/applicant, 110-112 S. Riverview Street, Dublin, stated that their intent is to build a house that is in alignment with other homes within the neighbourhood in regard to size and architecture. They are interested in giving someone else the opportunity to build in this neighbourhood, as well. For that reason, as well as economic purposes, they would like to split the lot for two homes.

Board Questions

Mr. Cotter stated that he reviewed the history provided on the case. The Cultural Assessment was completed in 2017, and in the ARB's 2018 review of a previous application for this site, the structure was

identified as Non-Contributing but eligible to be considered Contributing. What has changed from 2018 to now?

Ms. Martin responded that nothing has changed since 2018, other than staff's experience in reviewing and administering the Cultural Assessment, which lists the property as recommended "Contributing." The reason that a designation of "recommended" was used at the time was to provide the City some latitude in administering the document. Ultimately, City Council did adopt the document and affirmed the recommendations. All of the integrity markers are met for this property. Essentially, the main difference is staff's understanding of the administration of the document; the property now is considered Contributing.

Ms. Krumb stated that 2018 was a transition year. This report made a general recommendation to expand the years of significance for the Historic District property assessment up to 50 years -- including homes up to 1967, thereby including Mid-Century Modern homes. In her assessment, the Mid-Century Modern ranches in the older section of the District are not contributing, although Mid-Century Modern ranches within the Monterey Drive area would more accurately be considered Contributing.

Mr. Alexander stated that the staff report identifies issues with asbestos, lead paint, windows and foundation issues. To what extent are those issues?

Ms. Frient responded that based on the year in which the house was built, their assumption is that lead paint and asbestos is present. They did not have that tested, however. Their assessment of the windows is a visual assessment.

Andy Melaragno, Melaragno Design Company, 4138 Greensview Dr, Columbus, OH 43220, commented on issues of disrepair. If the intent was to occupy the house long-term, there are several issues of disrepair that would need to be addressed. Overall, the house is not in good condition. Repairing the foundation alone would be significant.

Public Comments

Mr. Alexander stated that the Board received three letters of support from people within the vicinity. He does not believe they need to be read publicly; he inquired if any Board member preferred they be read. [No member requested they be read.]

No additional public comments were received, subsequent to the letters.

Board Discussion

1) Does the Board support demolition of the existing home?

Mr. Alexander stated that because the structure is identified as Contributing, the applicant would need to meet the following criteria for demolition:

- providing credible evidence of economic hardship; or
- evidence that this is a Non-Contributing structure.

Mr. Hounshell stated that because the structure has been assessed as Contributing to the District, the applicant could request a waiver or present a case for considering it Non-Contributing.

Ms. Krumb stated that as an architectural historian, her opinion is that it is not a Contributing structure. However, if the applicant proceeds with the designation of Contributing, she believes they should be able to meet the criteria for demolition.

Mr. Cotter stated that he read the document concerning the criteria for a designation of Contributing, and he had difficulty identifying any of the necessary markers. Providing evidence of being Non-Contributing would seem to be the best way forward.

Mr. Kownacki stated that this house is not an outstanding example of Mid-Century Modern. He would be supportive of a waiver for demolition.

Mr. Alexander stated that if the applicant can meet one of two criteria, the option exists for demolition; however, he does not yet see credible evidence of economic hardship. The Board hears cases regularly for renovation projects. He believes it is a usable building, and demolishing it would be a waste of materials and an unnecessary addition of building product to the landfill. This building could have another life. The current structure is actually better sited and utilizes the topography better than the proposed building. It also has more in common with the houses that are built along that ridge. There are some positive aspects of the structure, as well as the fact that it is considered Contributing by the City's guiding documents. However, he is willing to look at evidence of economic hardship.

Mr. Cotter inquired if it would be necessary for the applicant to hire a professional to identify elements validating that the structure should be considered Non-Contributing.

Mr. Hounshell responded affirmatively. That would be necessary, if they were requesting a waiver. However, they would also need to meet the criteria for obtaining demolition approval.

Mr. Cotter inquired if the ARB would be the reviewing body for both a waiver and a demolition request.

Mr. Hounshell responded affirmatively.

2) Does the Board support the proposed site layout?

Mr. Cotter inquired if the lot were split, would there be sufficient space on the second lot for a similar building.

Mr. Hounshell responded that the proposed lot split would meet the minimum requirements of the Historic District. However, he does not know if the same footprint would fit on the second lot.

Ms. Kramb inquired if the southern lot would be slightly smaller than the northern lot.

Mr. Hounshell responded affirmatively. The northern lot contains the entirety of the 24-foot storm easement, so the developable area is less than the southern lot.

Ms. Kramb inquired if three feet is the minimum sideyard setback, would the second home be permitted to build within three feet of either side property line.

Mr. Hounshell responded that the minimum sideyard setback is three feet and there must be a combined minimum between homes of 12 feet.

Mr. Kownacki inquired about the waiver that would be necessary for the garage as it is currently aligned with the front elevation. It would not be possible to set the garage back because the topography is so severe.

Mr. Alexander responded that in his previous experience with a home next to the river having an even greater grade drop, a precast concrete plank was used on the garage floor. Although it was an atypical residential structure and costly, it did provide the opportunity to have usable, accessible space at that level, without the use of gravel. Another option would be to build a retaining wall for the back wall of the garage and fill up the difference with gravel or compacted fill on which to build the garage slab. Although the topography is a challenge, there are ways in which to address it. If this were to remain one lot, it would be possible to separate the garage visually to a greater extent. The spirit of the Code could be met, not by pushing the garage back, but by creating greater separation. Either a connector or a detached garage would be an option.

Mr. Kownacki inquired the required garage setback from the front of the house.

Mr. Hounshell responded that front-loaded garages are required to be 20 feet from the front elevation of building.

Mr. Cotter stated that the location of the house on the site is reasonable. He is not sure if the home meets the 24-foot height requirement; due to the grade, it would appear that the rear elevation will require a height waiver. The garage location will be a challenge.

Ms. Kramb stated that she is concerned about splitting the lot. She is unsure how usable the southern lot would be. It will be difficult to find anyone who will want to build on that lot due to the size limitation. There would approximately 72 feet frontage for the southern lot, and it will be necessary to meet the requirement for combined 12-foot sideyard setbacks. That would result in a home approximately 60 feet in width, and it cannot be deep, due to the slope of the lot. The second home will be quite close to the home on the northern lot. Therefore, if the applicant proceeds with an application for consideration, it should include a feasibility analysis regarding what could be built on the southern lot, including the possible square footage the structure. Her preference would be that it remain one lot with one house and more space; however, she might be able to support a lot split with more information provided.

Mr. Kownacki stated that a positive element about the potential lot split is that it would reduce the potential size of the homes that could be placed there. Smaller homes on that street would be preferable.

Mr. Kownacki stated that he is unsure if the financial feasibility of constructing a home on the southern lot would be within the purview of the ARB.

Mr. Alexander stated that the only item of concern to him is the garage. The goal is to emphasize the front of the house and de-emphasize the garage. Since a 20-foot setback of the garage from the front façade is not possible on this site, de-emphasizing the garage in some way is a possibility.

3) Does the Board support the proposed mass and scale of the home?

Mr. Cotter stated from the front, the mass looks good. The garage is a separate issue. The front elevation of the 1.5-story home should be less than the 24-foot minimum height, but the rear elevation will exceed the height requirement. The pylons/pillars do not look sufficiently substantial. He believes the height issue can be addressed, so he has no issue with the mass and scale.

Ms. Kramb stated that she is supportive of the mass and scale. She appreciates that it is a small house, and she could support a rear height waiver due to the slope.

Mr. Kownacki stated that what he appreciates about the house is that its size is not obvious from the front. Although it is almost 3,000 square feet, it does not appear to be that large from the front. He wonders if the home were sited closer to the front property line, if it would be possible to push the garage back just a few feet to achieve more separation.

Mr. Alexander stated that he also would support a height waiver for the rear elevation. It is not fair to apply that criteria on steeply sloping sites. If it meets the height requirement at the front, it is fine. He is generally fine with the mass and scale.

4) Does the Board support the conceptual architectural character and details of the home?

Mr. Alexander suggested the elevations be discussed individually.

West and north elevations

Mr. Alexander stated that he agrees with most of the comments in the consultant's report about the elevations. West elevation: he appreciates the attempt to separate the house into two sections: the larger, primary living space; and the smaller garage and connector with a window. However, the materials do not

provide differentiation. The board and batten siding blurs any distinction of the area inside the porch and the space beyond the porch. He does not agree with the consultant's recommendation to eliminate the board and batten completely, but it would be more complementary if the board and batten was just within the porch itself. On the north elevation: he has concerns about the change in fenestration. He would recommend a structural engineer be involved in the design process before final drawings are submitted. He also is concerned about the columns. The column in the corner may change, and the other columns may not be necessary. If they are retained, they should have relationship to the division up above. The pieces do not seem to work together as well as they could; the elevations need to be more unified.

Mr. Cotter stated that he likes the two materials on the west, front elevation, including the board and batten. Perhaps, they could be handled in a slightly different manner architecturally. On the north elevation, the stepdown of the stone foundation looks strange. He agrees that the siting of the pillars does not look correct. In addition, the windows do not line up; they should be more synergistic with the remainder of the structure. If the stone material extended all the way across the elevation, the home would appear to be set on a sturdy base.

Mr. Kownacki stated that he is not qualified to speak to the structural matters, but most of the north and south elevations will not be visible. While it would be preferable if the stone lined up, he has no issue with the proposed stepdown. He has no issue with the use of the board and batten; he likes the appearance of the house.

Ms. Kramb stated that she has no concerns with the west, front elevation, although it would be preferable to offset the garage slightly. She cannot detect how the windows are different, so has no issues with those on the west elevation. On the north elevation, she does not believe the pillars will be sufficient; something much more substantial will be needed at the corner to hold the weight. One way of continuing the stone, could be to make that a stone pillar. However, the pillar issue will be resolved during the design stage as they define something more substantial to accommodate the weight. The window configuration on the porch does not need to be the same configuration as on the house, as long as it clearly looks like a porch. A complementary window type is fine.

East and south elevations

Ms. Kramb stated that it is difficult to tell how wide the rear porches will be; those issues will be worked out during design. Her preference would not be the stepped stone foundation; she would prefer a consistent line across. She does not believe the cantilever is a problem. The window in that small section seemed large compared to the others on that elevation. However, these minor items can be worked out; she likes the architecture.

Mr. Kownacki stated that he has no issue with the stepped foundation of the south elevation and likes the continuation of the board and batten on the east/rear elevation.

Mr. Cotter stated that while he also prefers a straight line for the stone foundation, overall, he likes the proposed architecture.

Mr. Alexander stated that he also agrees with the consultant in regard to continuing the stone straight across; it would help break up the mass on that side elevation. He also agrees with the suggestion to bring the stone of the chimney down, marrying it into the stone at the base, and thereby breaking up the solid mass at the corner. He would suggest that if grids are used in the windows on the front and sides, they also should be used on the entire house, with the porch being the exception. Applying the grids in one area, alluding to something historic, resembles false historicism, which the Code prohibits.

Mr. Alexander inquired if the applicant had any questions.

Mr. Melaragno stated that he would like to seek clarification regarding some of the Board members' comments. In regard to the board and batten – would it be acceptable to use it on the hyphen and use horizontal siding on the porch, thereby distinguishing the hyphen from the rest of the house?

Mr. Alexander stated that the Board has provided suggestions only. However, Mr. Melaragno's suggestion would address the issue of differentiating the hyphen from the porch itself. Although the Board has provided some suggestions, they are not requirements.

Mr. Melaragno stated that, at this point, the proposed columns were conceptual placemarkers. He would be consulting with a structural engineer, focusing on the size, shape and details of the columns. In regard to the garage setback, the proposed front setback is 10 feet from the right-of-way. Due to the slope, the foundation, cantilevers and garage depth, there is a need to keep the foundation as reasonable as possible; farther back, the slope on the site becomes more steep. The intent was to keep the rear elevation as close as possible to the street and within the reasonable grade. Perhaps the front elevation could be pulled forward slightly and the garage location could remain where it is proposed.

Ms. Krumb responded that she would be supportive of that suggestion; it would be helpful to provide one to two feet of separation.

Mr. Kownacki stated that he has not visited the site, but the grade drop in that area is steep. The applicant can decide if the suggestions that have been offered are feasible. Moving the house forward slightly would provide the illusion of separation; however, he would not vote to disapprove if that is not possible.

Ms. Krumb stated that a waiver will be necessary, regardless, as the garage is not set back 20 feet from the front elevation. She is supportive of a waiver.

Mr. Melaragno stated that the porch windows have been addressed. The original intent was to match what they now have in their sunroom – quadruple-hung, which maximizes the opening space but permits some winterization. They have since determined that the windows will be eliminated, and this will be a screened porch. The columns will be appropriate for the foundation space below. The consultant's report recommended sash or double-hung windows as opposed to casement windows. At the back of the house, they are attempting to maximize the view. Eliminating the grids on those windows was to provide an unobstructed view. Because the rear of house is visible only from the ravine, hopefully, that is acceptable. He inquired the Board consensus on the cantilevers. The cantilevers facilitate their effort to keep the foundation as small as possible.

Mr. Alexander stated that he has no objection to the cantilevers. While he does prefer consistent grids, he does not agree with the consultant's recommendation against the use of casement windows. There are many examples of historic homes with casement windows. In fact, he believes the casement window is a good choice for a smaller window type.

Mr. Cotter and Mr. Kownacki indicated that they have no objection to the cantilevers or casement windows.

Mr. Kownacki inquired the reason they suggested grids for the front of the home.

Mr. Melaragno responded that it was to create a more homey, less sterile look. Little details make a house more interesting.

Ms. Krumb stated that she has no objection to their use of casement windows.

Mr. Melaragno thanked the Board for their very helpful input.

NEW CASE

2. 53 N. High Street, 21-007MPR, Minor Project Review