

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

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

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

Condition: Good

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

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

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

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



36-38 N High St, looking east



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

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

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

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

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

Condition: Good

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

Integrity Notes: The building has excellent integrity.

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

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



40 N High St, looking southeast



40 N High St, looking northeast



BOARD DISCUSSION

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, March 15, 2023 | 6:30 pm

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

**1. 36-40 N. High Street – Stone Wall
23-015INF**

Informal Review

Proposal: Repair and replacement of stones within a historic retaining wall on shared lots totaling 0.46 acres. The site is zoned Historic District, Historic Core.

Location: Northeast of the intersection with Wing Hill Lane.

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: Wes Davis, Osborn Engineering

Planning Contact: Sarah Holt, AICP, ASLA, Senior Planner

Contact Information: 614.410.4662, sholt@dublin.oh.us

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/23-015

RESULT: The Board heard an Informal Request on this project, based on complexity of engineering and because the wall spans numerous properties. Resolution of how to address this wall was part of an approved condition of approval for the related project at 36-38 N. High Street. Overall, the Board supported a holistic approach to repairing the wall, involving both property owners. Structural reconstruction using historic techniques was the most-favored repair method by the Board. The Board was also supportive of using mortar that is not visible, if that helped to address structural issues. The Board encouraged the applicant to seek Façade Grant assistance.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:

Sarah Tresouthick Holt

89A2805342A848D...
Sarah Tresouthick Holt, AICP, ASLA
Senior Planner



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

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

Public Comment

~~There were no public comments.~~

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

Applicant Comment

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Case Presentation

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

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

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

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

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

(1) No action:

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

(2) Replace the wall with a modern structure:

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

(3) Repair and preserve the existing wall:

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

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

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

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

Board Questions to Staff

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

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

Ms. Damaser inquired the number of property owners impacted.

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

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

Ms. Holt responded affirmatively.

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

Applicant Presentation

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Chavda responded affirmatively.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Board consensus was that it would be important to know:

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

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

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

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

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

Public Comment

No public comments were received on the case.

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

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

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

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

The applicant requested no additional clarification.

COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Holt shared the following dates:

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

ADJOURNMENT

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



Vice Chair, Architectural Review Board



Assistant Clerk of Council

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

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

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

INFORMAL REVIEW CASES

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

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

Staff Report

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

Site Layout

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

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

Parking

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

Architecture

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

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

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

Board Questions/Discussion

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

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

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

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

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

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

Ms. Kramb inquired if that structure is 3 stories.

Mr. Alexander responded that it is 2.5 stories.

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

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

Applicant Presentation

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

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

Board Questions/Discussion

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4) Does the Board support the proposed site layout?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Morgan indicated that they had sufficient direction.

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

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

Staff Presentation

Background

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

Proposal

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