



MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, December 13, 2023

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Alexander, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and welcomed everyone to the December 13, 2023 Architectural Review Board. He stated that the meeting could also be accessed at the City's website. Public comments on the cases are 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, Gary Alexander, Michael Jewell

Board members absent: Martha Cooper

Staff members present: Sarah Holt, Rati Singh, Bassem Bitar

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Jewell moved, Ms. Damaser seconded acceptance of the documents into the record and approval of the 11-15-23 ARB minutes.

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

[Motion carried 4-0]

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.

CASE REVIEWS

- **Case 23-116ARB – 119 S. High Street, Demolition**

Request for demolition of an existing outbuilding located within the Historic Dublin on a 0.18-acre lot zoned HD-HS, Historic South District and located approximately 95 feet northwest of the intersection of South High Street and John Wright Lane.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Holt stated that this is the second time this case has come before the Board; it was tabled at the 11-15-2023 meeting. The site is located southwest of the intersection of S. High Street and Pinneyhill Lane, and is zoned HD-HS, Historic South. The site contains an existing commercial principal structure that sits on a 0.18-acre parcel. The subject accessory structure is at the rear of the property directly adjacent to Mill Lane. Residential development is located directly to the west. The 2017 Historic and Cultural Assessment shows that the one and a half story main structure was built ca. 1890 as the Paulus House. The owners' representative states this was the home of the Moffitt family, and today it continues to be owned by descendants of the same family. The subject outbuilding is an ell-shaped structure with shed roofs. The ell is toward the interior of the site. The Franklin County Auditor's website indicates the structure was constructed in 1900. The Dublin Historical Society states that the larger portion of the structure is likely a chicken coop, with the smaller ell being a well house.

The 560-sq. ft. building appears to be adjacent to the right-of-way for Mill Lane, but not within it. An invasive ailanthus tree had grown adjacent to the north side of the ell, which the owner has recently removed. Because this tree species is aggressive, future management steps will be needed to ensure that it does not grow back. The applicant has provided photos of the deterioration of the interior of the structure and the well or cistern at the rear of the main house. The applicants have indicated that, eventually, they would like to convert the area of the structure to additional parking; however, grass and landscaping would be installed in the interim period. As noted, the site is adjacent to a residential area to the west. The Code requires screening of commercial property parking lots; therefore, a condition of approval is recommended to address that requirement. If part of this structure is a historic well house, any remaining well would need to be filled in properly after demolition for safety purposes. The demolition criteria for a non-contributing structure, requires that one of the criteria must be met. Staff has reviewed the application and recommends approval of the demolition request with two conditions:

- 1) The applicant shall provide to staff, in conjunction with the demolition permit application, a scaled landscape plan that is adequate for a residential buffer, including, but not limited to: a street tree, a 6-foot tall evergreen hedge, steel edging, and mulch. Sight distance triangles shall be maintained. Installation of this landscape shall be no later than May 31, 2024, including complete ailanthus eradication.
- 2) Based on owner site investigation and coordination with staff prior to demolition, if there are remaining well features, they shall be incorporated into the landscape design at grade. Any well remnants shall be properly mitigated for safety.

Board Questions

Ms. Damaser inquired what the screening would entail.

Ms. Holt responded that it would include a mulched area of evergreens with a height of six feet. The intent is to screen the vehicles from residential view. The entire parking lot would not need to be screened, only the area of the building removal.

Mr. Alexander inquired if any itemization was provided for the cost estimation.

Ms. Holt responded that only the total cost of the demolition was provided.

Mr. Alexander that he is interested in the contractor's distribution of the costs across the two buildings. There are two buildings of very different conditions.

Applicant Presentation

Nancy Davis, Property Manager, 1480 Dublin Road, Columbus, noted that after the submission deadline, they received a second cost estimate of \$37,000, which was \$10,000 lower than the first estimate. The first estimate, which they have provided to the Board, was from Christopher Construction. She does not have an itemized estimate. Restoring the property to the appropriate condition would be an economic hardship for the applicant; therefore, they are requesting approval from the Board to demolish the structure.

Mr. Cotter inquired what the contractor was asked to provide.

Ms. Davis responded that he was asked to provide the cost of restoring the structure to a safe condition. She also explained that they were hopeful to have the opportunity to demolish the structure. The contractor indicated that to restore the structure, it would be necessary to remove/replace the roof and rebuild some of the framing.

Mr. Jewell stated that the details in the cost estimate provided are not clear. He cannot differentiate the cost of repairing the structure versus demolishing it.

Mr. Alexander stated that the two structures are in very different condition. The foundation of the well house is seriously deteriorated and the structure is unstable. That condition is not due to lack of maintenance but due to the way in which it was built. The concrete slab in the interior needs to be replaced. However, the foundation and the slab of the second structure does not show any cracking. The roof and framing are in terrible shape, but it is due to lack of maintenance. The Board cannot reward lack of maintenance by permitting demolition. The slab in the second structure would not need to be replaced.

Public Comment

There were no public comments.

Board Discussion

Mr. Cotter stated that there will be costs involved for the applicant whether the structure is demolished or restored.

Ms. Damaser noted that without clarification of the costs, the Board would have to rely on assumptions.

Mr. Alexander stated that because the wellhouse would need to be demolished, there is a clearer indication of a financial hardship. The cause was not lack of maintenance. He would not need more detail on that structure. However, he has difficulty seeing a need for demolition of the other structure. If the larger structure on this lot were used for a single-family home, rather than a hair salon, the "chicken coop" structure could be used for storage. There is a big market for sheds or storage facilities at the rear of homes. Across from this site, the home located at the terminus of the alley has two original sheds that were re-sided, re-roofed and saved; as a result, they appear to be in good shape. The issue with the chicken coop has been created by lack of maintenance of the roof.

Ms. Damaser inquired if a new roof is more expensive than demolition, that would make it a hardship.

Mr. Alexander requested clarification of the Code requirement in regard to lack of maintenance.

Ms. Holt stated that the Code states that lack of maintenance is not permitted to be justification for demolition. Demolition requirements of a non-contributing structure have a lower threshold than for a contributing structure. In addition, Section 153.178 requires that any structure be provided sufficient care, maintenance and upkeep to prevent destruction by deterioration. Section 4.13 of the Historic Design Guidelines states that original outbuildings should be repaired and retained.

Discussion continued regarding the history and condition of the structures and the Code requirements.

Mr. Alexander stated that the Code states that the Board cannot consider the repair costs that are due to neglect/lack of maintenance.

The majority of members present indicated that if the Board had been provided more detailed information, making a decision would be easier.

Mr. Alexander inquired if the applicant wished to table the application to permit time to provide a more detailed cost breakdown and possibly to have the contractor present at the hearing.

Ms. Davis indicated the applicant requests the application be tabled.

Mr. Cotter moved, Ms. Damaser seconded to table the case to the February 21, 2024 meeting.

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

[Motion carried 4-0]

- **Case 23-117AFDP - 30-32 S. High Street, Amended Final Development Plan and Parking Plan**

Request to amend a previously approved Final Development Plan and Parking Plan on a 0.25-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic Core and located approximately 35 feet north of the intersection of S. High Street and Spring Hill Lane.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Holt stated that the project site, located at 30-32 S. High Street, is comprised of one lot with two buildings. Both buildings are on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), and have been vacant for at least twelve years. 30 S. High Street is one of the few remaining log cabins in Historic Dublin, built ca. 1840 and was previously used as a pharmacy. 32 S. High Street, a frame building with a false front, also from ca. 1840, was originally a grocery store. The 0.25-acre site is located on the east side of S. High Street, north of Spring Hill Lane and is zoned Historic District – Historic Core. The site was previously two lots, until recently combined into for legal and permitting purposes. 30 S. High Street is located to the north; 32 S. High is located south; adjacent residential properties exist to the east. In 2018, a Minor Project application was submitted from a previous property owner for a bakery/office was reviewed; however, the project did not proceed. In August 2021, the Board approved a Concept Plan, and in December 2021, the Board approved a combined PDP/FDP for the project, the demolitions of the 30 S. High Street addition, a waiver regarding foundation plantings between existing buildings, a waiver to allow Boral in certain locations, and 8 conditions of approval. The applicant seeks to remove the previously approved parking lot and ADA ramp at the rear of the site and replace it with lawn, low retaining walls around the pavilion, a path to the trash enclosure, and various perimeter plantings. The parking plan for this project was

approved with the Concept Plan. Based on the square footage requested, 41 parking spaces were required, including 32 off-site spaces, 3 on-street spaces and 6 on-site spaces. With the FDP, the total building square footage was reduced to 3,588 square feet, and the number of parking spaces were reduced to 36 parking spaces. With this proposed revised Parking Plan, the applicant is requesting only one additional off-site parking space. [Ms. Holt reviewed differences between the approved FDP and the requested amendment.]

Ms. Holt noted that on the S. Blacksmith Lane frontage, Engineering is determining if the previously presumed historic fire hydrant is actually just a sewer clean-out. If it is a fire hydrant, it must be saved; if not, it can be eliminated. Staff has reviewed the application against the applicable criteria, and recommends approval of the Amended Parking Plan and approval of the AFDP with 4 conditions.

Board Questions

Mr. Jewell stated that the records of the June 23, August 25 and December 15, 2021 meetings consistently show the intent that the fire hydrant on S. High Street would be retained. The staff report for this meeting indicates that it now must be removed. What is the reason for that change? When he walked the site area between the fire hydrants, they seemed to be consistent. The plans indicate a proposed Fire Department Connection (FDC). He assumes the change related to the fire hydrant was driven by the City, not the applicant. Does a historic fire hydrant now need to be removed based on something the City is imposing on the developer?

Ms. Holt responded that the applicant can respond with greater detail, but her understanding is with the new fire service changes, there is not room to retain the historic fire hydrant on the site. She believes the property owner intends to conserve and retain the historic object with the property.

Mr. Jewell responded that the fire hydrant is a significant historic element in the Historic District; it is included on several walking tours of the District. The fire hydrant below on the S. Blacksmith frontage is connected to it. In years past, an engine was located down at the nearby Scioto River, which would be fired up to pump water up to connection at S. Blacksmith Lane, which is also connected to the fire hydrant on Riverview Street. That was the village's earliest fire hydrant system to respond to any fires within the village. The pipe that extends from Blacksmith Lane to the river still exists. Because of its significant history in Dublin, he is passionate about the City's need to work with the developer to keep the historic fire hydrant in place on S. High Street.

Mr. Cotter stated that there was originally a sidewalk to the privy on the property. The staff report indicates that it will be eliminated.

Ms. Holt responded that the intent is that it will be replaced with a step in front of the privy. Staff had considered the possibility of a pathway connection to the privy, but the applicant preferred to have only a lawn.

Applicant Presentation

Dan Morgan, Behal, Sampson, Dietz, 5584 Windwood Drive, Dublin stated that they had initially planned to keep the current historic fire hydrant on S. High Street. With the development of this property, they are required to have a fire sprinkler. The Fire Department is very particular with regarding FDCs. The Fire Department indicated that it must be located in a prominent location between the two buildings on the property. They fought very hard to keep it from being mounted

to the face of the building, which they believe would have been even more detrimental to the historic fabric of the neighbourhood. Their initial response was to keep the historic fire hydrant in its existing location on S. High Street, and salvage the one on S. Blacksmith Lane, retaining it with a descriptive placard perhaps within the establishment. Later, to meet the Fire Department's FDC requirement, they reversed course, keeping the historic fire hydrant on S. Blacksmith Lane in place and salvaging the S. High Street historic fire hydrant.

Mr. Jewell stated that the historic fire hydrant on S. High Street is not functional; it is small with an attractive brass connection. He does not understand why it cannot continue to exist as a non-functioning artifact in its existing historic location but also add the required FDC connection in the desired area. He believes it should remain in place, perhaps with the support of the City. We are trying to retain the historic integrity of the Historic District. He was surprised that this change was proposed.

Mr. Alexander inquired if it would be possible to create a dummy site and reposition the historic fire hydrant somewhere else along S. High Street.

Mr. Morgan responded that it would not be a problem for the property owner. In the site's landscape plan, there are planting areas to the north of 30 S. High Street and to the south of 32 S. High Street. Perhaps the historic fire hydrant could be anchored in some concrete there.

Mr. Jewell stated that there is very interesting history associated with the fire hydrant. If it is placed in a museum or another location, it will lose its significance. Its history is part of the discussion in the Historic District walking tours. If it is not in its current historic location, it should be within close proximity, so that people understand its story – the clever creation of a fire hydrant before the village had fire hydrants. Ironically, there was never a need to use it to extinguish a fire! He believes there is a need for a compromise to keep it close to its historic location on S. High Street.

Board Discussion

Mr. Alexander inquired if the applicant had received the ADA requirement information he had requested regarding a handicapped parking space.

Mr. Morgan responded that he had not.

Ms. Holt responded that ADA requirements do not require an onsite, handicapped parking space be provided, if there is no onsite parking. If all of the parking on the site is eliminated, no handicapped parking space is required. All on-street parking are City parking spaces, so no change is required.

Mr. Alexander inquired if the applicant has been in contact with the neighbors regarding their proposed plan.

Mr. Morgan responded affirmatively. They are working to formalize agreements with the neighbor to the south and the neighbor to the north.

Mr. Alexander inquired the reason there will be no path to the privy.

Mr. Morgan stated that the intent was to let the landscape remain in its historic nature to the extent possible. Much of it is lawn, and crossing it with a walking path did not make sense. Adding a simple limestone step seemed adequate.

Public Comment

There were no public comments.

Ms. Damaser moved, Mr. Jewell seconded approval of the Amended Parking Plan and approval of the Amended Final Development Plan with 4 conditions:

- 1) The colored lighting option not be used for this project;
- 2) The bike racks be black;
- 3) The S. Blacksmith Lane "hydrant" be investigated to determine its use. If determined to be a historic fire hydrant, it should remain in place; otherwise, it may be removed.
- 4) The S. High Street hydrant be relocated on the S. High Street frontage to continue to function as a story for early firefighting.

Vote: Mr. Cotter, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Damaser, yes; Mr. Jewell, yes.
[Motion carried 4-0]

DISCUSSION

- **Historic District Alternative Materials Update**

Staff Presentation

Ms. Singh provided an update on the Historic District Alternative Materials Project. The request for this document developed from the HD Paint Colors project, which was approved in March 2022. Staff has been working with a consultant to develop a draft, and an Alternative Materials draft was reviewed to the Board at its August 2023 meeting. The draft was revised per the Board's feedback and a sample chapter was reviewed by the Board at their September 2023 meeting. The document was well received by the Board, and a complete draft document is presented tonight for the Board's consideration. The goal of the document is to list all alternative materials that have been previously approved in the Historic District with use of a waiver under the 2021 Code. The intent is to update the document annually. [Detailed description of the document was provided.] Staff has provided the following discussion questions:

- 1) Does the draft document meet the Board's vision?
- 2) Are there additions or modifications that should be further explored?
- 3) Other considerations by the Board.

Board Discussion

The Board members indicated that the revised structure of the document made it much more usable; the accompanying photos, sites and reasons for approval were helpful; the guidance for types of professionals that should be hired is valuable.

Ms. Singh stated that the final formatting would be completed and the document would be provided to the Board for approval in early 2024, potentially the February meeting. The Board requested that the final draft be forwarded at least a week before the next meeting to provide members time for a thorough review.

COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Holt:

- Thanked the ARB members for their service throughout the year and presented them with a copy of "Dublin's Journey."
- Reported that Council approved the proposed ARB Code update (Ordinance 65-23) and the Historic Dublin Guidelines (Resolution 90-23) at their December 11, 2023 meeting. The Code and Guidelines will be updated online, and the Board will be provided with printed copies of the revised Code.
- The ARB website page has been improved to include additional resources, such as the Building Doctor and the drylaid stonewall conservancy.
- Planning staff initiated "office hours" in the Historic District for residents today, which was well attended. Office hours will be scheduled monthly in 2024 on the same days as the regular ARB meetings occurs.

The next regular ARB meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, January 24, 2023.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:52 p.m.



Chair, Architectural Review Board



Assistant Clerk of Council