

PLANNING REPORT

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, August 28, 2024

40 E. Bridge Street 24-022INF

<https://dublinohiousa.gov/arb/24-022>

Case Summary

Address	40 E. Bridge St, Dublin, OH 43017
Proposal	Remodel and construction of additions to 40 E. Bridge Street on a 0.31-acre site zoned HD-HR, Historic Residential District. The property is located northwest of N. Riverview Street and E. Bridge Street.
Request	Non-binding review and feedback for future development applications.
Zoning	HD-HR, Historic Residential District
Planning Recommendation	<u>Consideration of the Discussion Questions</u>
Next Steps	Subsequent to informal review and feedback, the applicant may apply for a Minor Project Review (MPR) with the Architectural Review Board.
Applicant	Kelly Burke, Owner David Knapp, Tandem North Design
Case Manager	Sarah Tresouthick Holt, AICP, ASLA , Senior Planner 614.410.4662 sholt@dublin.oh.us



Community Planning and Development



5200 Emerald Parkway
Dublin, Ohio 43017



614.410.4600
dublinohiousa.gov

Sustainable | Connected | Resilient

1. Background

Site Summary

40 E. Bridge Street has a +/- 13,180-square-foot lot zoned HD-HR, Historic Residential District. The lot is between N. Riverview Street, E. Bridge Street, and N. Blacksmith Lane. The lot has +/- 87 feet of frontage on N. Riverview Street, which was previously determined by the Board to be the front of the lot. Highway easements are present: 11-foot on N. Blacksmith Lane and 25-foot on N. Riverview Street.

The Landmark house is a vernacular style built ca. 1850, according to the 2017 Historic and Cultural Assessment (HCA). It has a cross-gabled ell form with a wrap-around porch facing E. Bridge Street, and numerous additions of unknown age are present. Originally, the wrap-around porch was at grade with E. Bridge Street; however, when the new bridge was constructed in the 1930s, the road grade was raised. There is a resulting continuous high stone wall along E. Bridge Street and N. Blacksmith Lane from this construction, allowing a relatively flat lot. A set of stone stairs leads from N. Blacksmith Lane down to the property.

The “duplex privy” is at the rear, anecdotally for use by this property and 17 N. Riverview. This Landmark structure and the 1930s wall and stairs are within the rear highway easement.

This property was purchased as part of the City auction in September of 2023 and was closed on in October of 2023. The rehabilitation goals, page 4 of the disclosure documents, attached, indicate the first goal is “preserve the historic nature and mass of North Riverview Street”. All performance stipulations of the original purchase remain in effect, such as maintenance and construction due dates.

2. Zoning Code

Historic District – Historic Residential District

The intent of the Historic Residential District per Code is to “encourage the preservation and development of homes on existing or new lots that are comparable in size, mass, and scale, while maintaining and promoting the traditional residential character of the Historic District”.

Further, Section 153.173(E)(2) provides specific requirements for additions: that they shall be subordinate to, and clearly separated from, the original structure. This applies to all zones within the district.

Historic Design Guidelines

Guidelines Section 4.12 recommends that additions need to be clearly distinguishable from, and subordinate to; generally at the rear of; and separated by a break or hyphen from the original structure. New rooflines should be below the original roofline. The Guidelines recommend that original outbuildings are to be repaired and retained.

Process

The next step before the ARB is a Minor Project Review (MPR) with Waivers for lot coverage, rear setback, and roof pitches. These shall be fully evaluated at MPR, including justifications for each as required in Code Section 153.176(L).

History

April 2024

Applicant proposed addition with separate Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) with size Waiver.
 Board comments included:

- Confirmation that front of house should be N. Riverview
- Concern about size and massing of addition; lack of subordinate character
- Lack of support for ADU size Waiver
- Concern about complexity of roof forms and materials

Since April, the applicant has:

- Relocated the front façade to N. Riverview
- Removed the ADU
- Narrowed the addition to be the same as the existing house, including the previous additions

3. Project

Site Layout

Prior to the auction, the City added easements for public highway and road purposes, including pedestrian facilities, utilities, storm drainage, and grading to the perimeter of this block of lots, as described on the attached materials. One of these easements, on the southeast corner of this lot is proposed for a public vehicular turnaround for the N. Riverview Street dead end.

Code Table 153.173A governs permissible lot coverage, building footprint sizes, and setbacks for all districts within Historic Dublin. For Historic Residential, the table indicates up to 45 percent lot coverage is permissible; the building footprint may be up to 25 percent of the lot size; and the rear setback is 20 percent of lot depth, not to exceed 50 feet. The existing lot area is 13,180 square feet. The average lot depth is 154.27 feet. A survey has been provided.

40 E. Bridge	<i>Permitted by Code</i>	<i>20% Waiver per ARB</i>	<i>Requested Amount August</i>
<i>Lot Coverage</i>	5,931 SF	7,117 SF	6,420 SF (8.2%) w/in Waiver
<i>Building Footprint</i>	3,295 SF	3,954 SF	3,049 SF No Waiver Req'd
<i>Rear Setback (N Blacksmith)</i>	30.85'	24.68	21.40' (31%) Not w/in current Waiver

Per Table 153.173C, the maximum number of parking spaces for a single-family dwelling is two, unless otherwise approved by the Board as noted in 153.173(F)(8). The goal in limiting the number of parking spaces is to minimize visual impacts from garage doors and pavement within the District. The applicant is proposing three garage bays, which only requires Board approval.

Scale, Mass, and Height

Staff has worked closely with the applicant over the past months to help address massing and form concerns noted by the Board in April. Since the original house is a gabled ell, it was suggested that the addition mirror this form. Staff has also encouraged preservation of as much historic fabric as possible, as required per Code, especially along the N. Riverview Street façade.

The applicant has reduced the width of the addition to equal the historic structure plus previous additions: additions are meant to be subordinate per Code Section 153.173(E)(2)(b) and (c) and Guidelines Section 4.12. The height of the addition is +/- 26 feet, 8 inches at mid-point versus the existing structure at +/- 21 feet, 11 inches at mid-point. 17's Riverview Street were provided dispensation for these criteria based on topography; this site is flat. 17's addition is +/- 6 1/2 half feet taller than the original house at 22 feet, 11 inches; 27's addition is +/- 3 feet lower than the historic house. Note that the proposed addition's roof lines are visible behind the historic house and compete with the simple lines of the original; the view from the street will not be as impactful as shown on the east elevation, but it is still a concern. A chimney is indicated on the floor plans and will be seen on this elevation too, adding to the complexity. The Board is requested to comment.

East Elevation

The east façade now shows more of the original house form, and the applicant has recently moved the new front door to the center of the façade at staff's request. This employs a more traditional front door location, while exposing the original stone foundation.

The right hand, single-story addition appears to have once been a porch, not original to the house, which was then enclosed at a later date. Staff had suggested the owner consider removing this addition, replacing it with something more in keeping with current Code and Guidelines. The applicant declined. Thus, keeping a suggestion of the porch form (keep the columns, inset the wall/window) could help add dimension to this façade, while keeping some of the evolutionary history of the house, and balancing the porch form on the opposite side.



East Elevation: historic in darker line weight, addition in lighter weight behind

West Elevation

Staff encouraged the applicant to break up the west elevation during interim reviews. A covered porch/entry on the northwest corner was the response. Staff had anticipated that this façade perhaps have notched corners or a small first-floor shed roof, allowing the second floor to step back slightly. This would be similar to approaches employed by 16-22 N. High Street and 36-38 N. Blacksmith Lane.



West Façade: facing N. Blacksmith, privy form in dark grey

North and South Elevations

On each of these elevations, the massing difference between the historic house and the addition is especially noticeable. These elevations show a suggestion of the historic ell form in the addition between the gables; however, staff was anticipating that these ells would be completely open, or at most, contain a single story element. The two-story approach, with pyramidal roof forms, is not appropriate and adds to the bulk of the addition. The Board is requested to comment.



North Elevation: historic on left, addition on right with pyramidal roof form adjacent to hyphen



South Elevation: addition on left, pyramidal roof form adjacent to the hyphen

Architectural Details

Window placement and form are generally meeting expectations of Code 153.174(D)(5) and Guidelines Section 4.8A; however, the north elevation's garage door/window alignment and placement need visual relief. The front façade shows new square windows on the second floor not typical of this style of building and are not necessary but desired for additional light. Window proportions, and trim and muntin details will be important at MPR. Two-over-two muntins are recommended based on the age of the structure.

The front door is modern in both form and detail, and the porch columns are undersized; however, this may be a function of conceptual graphic representation. These details should be appropriately sized and designed at MPR, taking cues from the original structure, rather than later additions. The existing original front door should be re-used facing N. Riverview Street.

The new front- and rear-facing porch additions would require roof pitch Waivers for less than 3:12 per Code 153.174(B)(c)(3). These forms repeat those of the existing porch facing Bridge Street. The Board is requested to comment.

Materials

Materials are preliminarily indicated on the elevations. The original house is constructed of lap and scalloped siding, much of which is covered by inappropriate siding, on a stone foundation. The siding types are separated by a horizontal band, corresponding with the eaves of the original porch. The stone foundation is a prominent feature on N. Riverview Street. Based on examination of the foundation and the existing brick porch, it appears the brick foundation is a later modernization.

The addition materials have been revised to include horizontal siding separated by a horizontal band to help mitigate height, per staff's direction. The stone foundation is now celebrated on the front façade, although the graphic detail shows brick. Further use of brick is discouraged.

4. Access and Utilities

Any improvements made within rights-of-way or easements shall be per the Historic District Section of the City of Dublin's Bridge Street District Streetscape Character Guidelines or as amended by the City during the Riverview Village design development activities.

Staff has requested that any utility connections or relocations shall be shown on the plan sheets at MPR. Staff also notes that any disturbance or replacement of sanitary and/or water connections will require permits.

5. Discussion Questions

- 1) Does the Board support the lot coverage and rear setback Waivers?
- 2) Is the addition successfully subordinate to the original building?
- 3) Does the addition's form respond well to the Code and Guidelines, especially the proposed roof lines?
- 4) Does the Board support the roof pitch Waivers on the new porches?
- 5) Other considerations by the Board.