



## PLANNING REPORT

# Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, February 21, 2024

## 119 S. HIGH STREET OUTBUILDING DEMOLITION – BACKGROUND 23-116DEMO

<https://dublinohiousa.gov/arb/23-116>

### Case Summary

Address	119 S High Street, Dublin, OH 43017
Proposal	Demolition of a Background outbuilding at 119 S. High Street.
Request	Request for demolition of an existing outbuilding located within Historic Dublin. The 0.18-acre lot is zoned HD-HS, Historic South District and is located approximately 95-feet northwest of the intersection of South High Street and John Wright Lane.
Zoning	HD-HS: Historic District – Historic South
Planning Recommendation	<u>Approval of Demolition/Background with Conditions</u>
Next Steps	Upon review and approval of the Demolition by the Architectural Review Board (ARB), the applicant may obtain a demolition permit through Building Standards.
Applicant	Nancy Davis, KRG Richard Toberen and Karan Adolph, Owners
Case Manager	Sarah Tresouthick Holt, AICP, ASLA , Senior Planner (614) 410-4662 <a href="mailto:sholt@dublin.oh.us">sholt@dublin.oh.us</a>

Site Location Map

23-116DEMO | 119 S. High Street



**Site Features**

1 Structure requested for demolition



## 1. Background

### Site Summary

The site is located southeast of the intersection of South High Street and Pinneyhill Lane, and is zoned HD-HS, Historic South. The site contains an existing commercial structure that sits on a 0.18-acre parcel. The subject structure is at the rear of the property directly adjacent to Mill Lane.

The 2017 Historic and Cultural Assessment (HCA) notes that one and a half story main structure was built ca. 1890 as the Paulus House. This structure is a Vernacular/Gabled Ell with brick masonry wall construction and a cross-gable asphalt roof, all resting upon a stone foundation. The front of the building has a wood porch with square wood columns supporting the roof. The 1976 Ohio Historic Inventory (attached) notes that there is a wellhouse in the back yard and a carriage step inscribed with "Paulus" at the front. Samuel Paulus is noted as a local bricklayer. 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. Per the owner, it was constructed in 1927 and used as a chicken coop or garage. The Franklin County Auditor's website indicates construction in 1900. The Dublin Historical Society notes that this structure is likely a chicken coop, with the smaller ell being the described wellhouse, based on the OHI. For clarity, this report will refer to the larger structure as the "chicken coop", and the smaller structure being the "wellhouse" or ell to the east.

### Request History

#### *Initial Contact*

The owners' representative first contacted the Planning office on the 2<sup>nd</sup> of December 2022 and then on the 24<sup>th</sup> of July 2023, wanting to demolish the structure due to disrepair. She was encouraged to repair the entire structure per district vision and goals. Code Enforcement became involved on July 13, 2023 and September 1, 2023 (see attached). Currently, the structure is secure. Planning staff met with applicants on the 16<sup>th</sup> of October 2023 regarding the demolition process.

#### *November 2023*

A request for demolition was tabled by the Architectural Review Board, due to lack of required information.

#### *December 2023*

Tabled, due to lack of information. The Board specifically commented that the cost estimates needed to be divided into line-item costs. The Board also discussed that the "wellhouse" may be beyond saving, due to original construction techniques, whereas the "chicken coop" was impacted by lack of maintenance. The applicant was encouraged to analyze the two buildings separately, which they have now done.

### Process

The 2017 HCA did not address outbuildings in its analysis, so these structures are largely neither Landmark nor Background. Today, it is most appropriate to determine that this structure is Background, due to its lack of listing as specifically Landmark.

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

## 2. Zoning Code

### *HD-HS: Historic District – Historic South*

This district applies to the smaller-scale buildings on the south end of High Street. The district focus is for sensitive infill and redevelopment, providing an improved environment for walkability, yet still accommodating vehicles. The Code provides zoning requirements that shall be met.

### *Historic Design Guidelines*

The Guidelines provide desired outcomes that are discretionary on the part of the Board. Section 3.2 of the Guidelines states that Background structures are “those structures that do not add to the historic associations, historic architectural qualities, or archaeological value of the area as expressed in the HCA.” Section 4.13 of the Guidelines specifically notes:

1. Original outbuildings such as garages, sheds, outhouses, and barns should be repaired and retained.
2. When outbuildings need repair or replacement of deteriorated elements, new materials should match the old.

## 3. Project

### **Site Layout**

Based on Dubscovery information, the total structure is approximately 560 square feet in size. It appears to be adjacent to the Mill Lane right-of-way, but not within it. Both buildings are surrounded by gravel parking on the south and east, grass on the north, and the Mill Lane pavement to the west. These buildings add character, charm, and a greater sense of history to the district.

An invasive ailanthus tree had grown within the corner of the ell, and the owner has recently removed it. Since this tree species is aggressive, future management steps will be needed to ensure that it does not grow back. Whether the demolition is approved or disapproved, the applicant will need to manage this, and she has been provided with methods to do so.

### **Details**

Over the past fourteen months, there have been opportunities to physically address the structure’s deterioration. Section 153.178 of the Historic District Code requires that any structure within Historic Dublin be provided sufficient care, maintenance, and upkeep to prevent destruction by deterioration.

The applicant affirmed the owner’s desire to demolish the entire structure. She states that the drainage patterns are such that the “chicken coop” will continue to be affected by water, and that it poses a safety risk to vehicles exiting the parking lot. Staff has suggested creating a small swale around the “coop” to direct water away from it and also installing a convex mirror to improve visibility for exiting vehicles. The applicant stated she would install the mirror immediately; however, none was seen as of the 8<sup>th</sup> of February.

Two memos from Karen Bokor, the City’s preservation architect, are attached. She confirms that the structure may be practically beyond repair and could be considered for demolition.

Since the last hearing, the applicant has supplied three additional cost estimates; the analysis is below.

*#946: Restoration of Both Buildings*

- There are line items for the replacement of footers and the concrete slab, including removal of the existing concrete. These may not be necessary and are beyond what the City would expect for normal maintenance. They equal approximately one third of the proposed total cost. Even removing these items, the cost would be significant.

*#953: Demolition of Both Structures*

- This is also significant expense; however, all line items appear appropriate.

*#956: Restoration of "Chicken Coop"*

- Staff questions whether the removal of the concrete slab, pouring of a new slab, and replace footer costs are necessary.
- If concrete removal is necessary, a line item for a concrete dumpster should be included, as with the other scenarios. The applicant was requested to clarify, but no new information was provided. The cost difference would not be significant.

*#957: Demolition of "Wellhouse"*

- If this approach was employed, details of how the larger building would be protected should be provided.
- All line items appear appropriate.

The supplied Profit and Loss for 2023 indicates a net income of \$17,586.95 for the year. The cost of each of these proposals is relatively high, compared to the annual income.

*Parking Lot and Lot Coverage*

The applicants have discussed that they would like to either convert the structure's square footage to additional parking or replace the area with grass and landscaping. The current parking lot is legal, non-conforming for a variety of reasons, including but not limited to, lack of required: paving, 5-foot rear pavement setbacks, landscaping, ADA designations/routes, wheel stops and striping, and bike parking. Additionally, based on the provided information, it is not clear whether the maximum lot coverage of 65 percent is met, or if that would be exceeded by additional paving. Should the parking lot be expanded, current Code must be met in all cases, and a Minor Project Review and approval through the ARB is required. Both the owner and the applicant have been made aware of this requirement.

For now, the owner wishes to grass the area, although no landscape plans have been provided. If the smaller building is a historic wellhouse, any remaining well would need to be filled in properly for safety. If both buildings are demolished, Code Section 153.173(H)(4) requires buffering to adjacent residential. Just grass would not comply.

Staff recommends that, should the demolition be approved, the area shall be properly landscaped according to Code, including up to: street trees every 40 feet, a 6-foot tall evergreen hedge, steel edging, and mulch. Any remaining well features, if they exist, should be incorporated into the design. Sight distance triangles shall be maintained, and the overall area shall require regular maintenance for proper growth and aesthetics. An acceptable landscape plan shall be submitted for staff approval in conjunction with a demolition permit, and

installation shall be accomplished, to staff’s satisfaction, no later than May 31, 2024, including complete ailanthus mitigation. This is a recommended condition of approval.

### 3. Plan Review

Demolition/Background Review Criteria	
Criteria	Review
1. By credible evidence the property owner will suffer economic hardship if the request to demolish is not granted. In determining whether the property owner has demonstrated economic hardship, the Board shall consider the factors established in Section 153.176(J)(5)(a).	<b>Criteria Not Met:</b> 153.176(J)(5)(a)(4)(d) references evidence of deliberate neglect or inadequate maintenance, which has occurred over the past fourteen months. A Profit and Loss statement has been provided, along with itemized cost estimates. The applicant has failed to consider other low-cost options for protecting both the buildings and the users of the site; however, repair estimates are relatively high compared to annual income.
2. The structure contains no features or architectural, historic, or archeological significance to the character of the area in which it is located.	<b>Criteria Met:</b> The building has been determined to be beyond repair by the City’s historic preservation architect consultant.
3. The location of the structure impedes the orderly development of the District, substantially interferes with the purpose of the District, or detracts from the historical character of its immediate vicinity; or, the proposed construction to replace the demolished structure significantly improves the overall quality of the Architectural Review District without diminishing the historic value of the vicinity or the District.	<b>Criteria Not Met:</b> The structure is outside of the right-of-way, so does not impede development or purpose within the district. Concerns about vehicular safety and visibility can easily be addressed with the addition of a mirror. If maintained, the structure would add to the character of the district and immediate vicinity, as well as providing storage for the property.

### Recommendations

**Planning Recommendation:** Approval of the Demolition/Background request with the following conditions:

- 1) The applicant shall provide to staff, in conjunction with the demolition permit application, a scaled landscape plan for the previous area of the shed. Required items include, but are 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) 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. If no features exist, this condition shall not apply.