



MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, March 27, 2024

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Alexander, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and welcomed everyone to the March 27, 2024 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: Michael Jewell, Martha Cooper, Hilary Damaser, Gary Alexander
Board members absent: Sean Cotter
Staff members present: Sarah Holt, Bassem Bitar, Javon Henderson

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS & APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Ms. Cooper moved, Ms. Damaser seconded acceptance of the documents into the record and approval of the 02-21-2024 ARB minutes as amended.

Vote: Mr. Jewell, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Jewell, 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.

AGENDA CHANGE

Ms. Damaser moved, Mr. Jewell seconded a change to the published agenda, moving Case 24-017ARB-Demo and Case 24-014-MPR to be heard first.

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

[Motion carried 4-0]

CASE REVIEWS

The following two cases were heard together as they relate to the same site.

- **Case #24-017ARB-DEMO - Kne Residence - 55 S. Riverview Street, Demolition**

Proposal for demolition of a Landmark outbuilding, with Waiver request to reclassify as Background. The 0.38-acre site is zoned HD-HR, Historic Residential District, and is located southwest of the intersection of Spring Hill Lane and S. Riverview Street.

- **Case 24-014-MPR - Kne Residence – 55 S. Riverview Street, Minor Project Review**

Proposal for the construction of an attached garage with living space. The 0.38-acre site is zoned HD-HR, Historic Residential District, and is located southwest of the intersection of Spring Hill Lane and S. Riverview Street.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Holt stated that the 0.38-acre site is located at the intersection of S. Blacksmith Lane, Spring Hill Lane and S. Riverview Street and is zoned HD-HR, Historic District – Historic Residential. Historic South zoning is located to the west and Historic Core is located to the northwest. The 2017 Historic and Cultural Assessment (HCA) identifies the historic house on the site facing S. Riverview Street, built c. 1900 in a vernacular style and gabled ell form. The house has one-over-one windows with broad stone lintels and narrower stone sills. A front porch with spindle details and ornamental brackets was added in 1991. In 2008, a one and one-half story family room with board and batten siding and a stone chimney was added to the rear of the house. The double lot contains large trees, a metal fence and a garage, the latter of which is the subject of the Demolition request. The garage, which faces S. Blacksmith Lane, was built between 1947 and 1956. The HCA lists the garage as a landmark building, which staff believes is a misclassification. The property owners are requesting a waiver that the structure be reclassified as a background building and that the structure be demolished to make room for a new addition to the home.

Ms. Holt stated that with the Minor Project Review (MPR) request, the applicant proposes installation of an additional matching column and brackets on the front porch of the historic home. They are proposing the construction of an addition with a one-story hyphen and a two-story, three-car garage and bonus room space. The project would include the 1,233 square-foot addition, a 32.5 square-foot covered patio at the rear of the existing home, and additional uncovered patio space. The proposed addition has a cross-gabled form, allowing light and head room for a bonus area above the garage. The major gable parallels S. Blacksmith Lane, and the hyphen's gabled roof connects to the existing house through an existing stone chimney. The tallest portion of the addition is the garage/bonus-room, shown at 21 feet, 2 inches to the top of the gable. The hyphen that connects the two portions of the house is a single story with a gable roof at 13 feet, 1 inch tall.

Ms. Holt described the proposed building materials. The entire house is proposed to be re-roofed. The applicant is suggesting two roofing materials for consideration: GAF Timberline HDZ in Appalachian Sky, or their preferred alternative, ArtLoc (a diamond pattern) in Charcoal Black. Staff has no objection to either choice. Roof accents on the existing bay window on the 2008

addition and the new man door awning are to be standing seam metal from Coated Metals Group in Matte Black. The supports for the man door awning are to be made from black aluminum with simple brackets as noted on the awning information. Siding is proposed to be board and batten to exactly match the 2008 addition using Hardie Panel smooth vertical siding and trim boards. Paint for all body and trim on the addition will be SW7004, Snowbound to match the remainder of the house. The proposed windows are Pella Lifestyle series, wood construction clad in Poplar White aluminium, which also will match the 2008 addition. The windows will be double-hung with 2-over-2 simulated divided lights with spacers, per the Historic District Design Guidelines. Three Velux fixed skylights are proposed on the south and east elevations; they are approximately 2 feet by 4 feet and finished in matte dark bronze. The garage doors are proposed as Clopay Coachman composite doors in Design 21 with the window configuration outlined on the attached brochure. The composite material requires a Waiver, which has been recently approved on other projects within the district. The man door is Thurma-Tru Traditions smooth steel door with solid panels. Typically, textured doors have been approved via a Waiver; however, this location sits far back from the road, where a texture will not be visible. All doors will be painted the same Snowbound color. The proposed lighting is five Kichler Forestdale fixtures in a textured black finish. Additional fencing will be installed to match the existing fence on the property, and the proposed stamped concrete patio extension will match the existing patio.

Ms. Holt reviewed the Waiver requests. The first waiver request is for the reclassification of the garage from Landmark to Background. The criteria were either met or not applicable. The second waiver request is to permit the use of composite garage doors and a steel man door, where wood or clad wood is required by Code. Criteria 1 and 4 are not met; however, staff has no objection due to their ease of maintenance and lack of visibility. All other criteria are met or not applicable.

If the Board approves the reclassification of the garage as a background building, one of three demolition criteria must be met to permit a background building to be demolished; staff has determined that two of the three criteria are met. Additionally, staff has reviewed the MPR project against the applicable criteria and have determined that the criteria are either met, met with conditions or not applicable. One criterion is met with both the waiver and the proposed conditions.

Staff recommends approval of the requested waivers, approval of the Demolition request and approval of the Minor Project with conditions.

Applicant Presentation

Jim Wright, Residential Design Solutions, 7844 Flint Road, Worthington stated that he has no additional presentation but is available to answer the Board's questions.

Public Comment

There were no public comments.

Board Discussion

Mr. Alexander inquired if the Board members had any objection to the requested waivers. Members indicated they had no objections.

Mr. Alexander inquired if Board members had any objection to the Demolition request. Members indicated they had no objections.

Mr. Alexander inquired if the applicant had any objection to the proposed conditions for Minor Project approval.

Mr. Wright indicated that they had no objections.

Ms. Cooper moved, Ms. Damaser seconded approval of a waiver to § 153.176(L) (5)(i) Waivers – Review Criteria: “In the event of waivers from determinations of contributing or noncontributing status, the provisions in § 153.175(J)(c) shall also apply,” to reclassify the garage from Landmark to Background.

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

[Motion carried 4-0.]

Mr. Jewell moved, Ms. Damaser seconded approval of the request to demolish the Background Building (garage).

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

[Motion carried 4-0.]

Ms. Cooper moved, Ms. Damaser seconded approval of a waiver to § 153.174(D)(1): “Windows and doors shall be wood, metal-clad wood, or vinyl-clad wood,” to permit use of composite garage doors and a steel man door.

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

[Motion carried 4-0.]

Mr. Jewell moved, Ms. Damaser seconded approval of the Minor Project Review with two conditions:

- 1) Applicant to provide utility plans detailing the scope of work at the time of building permit submission.
- 2) Applicant may use either GAF Timberline HDZ in Appalachian Sky or Art-Loc in Charcoal Black for roofing materials.

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

[Motion carried 4-0.]

The next two cases were heard together as they relate to the same properties.

- **Case 23-132ARB-DEMO - Riverview Village at 37, 45, 53, and 62 N. Riverview Street, and PID 273-005564, Demolition**

Request for review and approval of the demolition of three Background structures. The 0.11, 0.12, and 0.16-acre sites are zoned HD-HR, Historic District-Historic Residential and are located southeast of the intersection of North Street and N. Blacksmith Lane.

- **Case 23-131ARB-CP - Riverview Village, 37, 45, 53 and 62 N. Riverview Street, and PID 273-005564, Concept Plan**

Request for review and approval of a Concept Plan for a mixed-use development. The combined 2.152-acre sites are zoned HD-HR, Historic District-Historic Residential and HD-P, Historic District-Public. The sites are located on both sides of N. Riverview Street, south of North Street and north of Wing Hill Lane.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Bitar stated that the 2.16-acre, multi-parcel site has approximately 195 feet of frontage along the west side of N. Riverview Street and 228 feet along its east side. It also has frontage of approximately 64 feet along North Street, 186 feet along N. Blacksmith Lane, and 120 feet along Wing Hill Lane. The site consists of five parcels. Three parcels are located on the west side of N. Riverview Street, zoned Historic Residential, each contain a Landmark single-family residence and a Background outbuilding. The other two parcels located on the east side of N. Riverview Street, are zoned Historic Public and extend to the Scioto River. The proposal is to rezone all the sites to Historic Core, which will match the adjacent zoning to the west.

On February 22, 2023, COhatch presented an Informal Review request to the ARB. The proposal included all eight parcels and envisioned the creation of Riverview Village, a mixed-use walkable community of makers' space, office buildings, and eating/drinking establishments. The project included the renovation of all Landmark structures, except for the one at 53 N. Riverview Street, and the construction of a new 10,400 square-foot office building on the east side of N. Riverview Street. The Board was generally supportive of rezoning the project area to Historic Core, and of the proposed new building (depending on final design). The Board offered greater support for the "minimum density" option relative to the number and size of buildings. There was also general support for the demolition of some of the outbuildings along N. Blacksmith Lane in order to accommodate greater use of that street (depending on recommendations of Engineering). The Board noted that the demolition of 53 N. Riverview Street would need to be justified per the applicable Code standards for Landmark structures.

In July 2023, through further discussion with COhatch, and consistent with their proposal which indicated an option for others to own the three parcels south of Wing Hill Lane, City Council authorized the City Manager to dispose of those three properties on July 31, 2023 (Ordinance 24-23). All three have been sold through an auction. On September 5, 2023, City Council authorized the execution of a Development Agreement with COhatch for the development of the Riverview Village concept (Ordinance 33-23). Per this agreement, public improvements associated with the project (including street and utility improvements, traffic impact and parking studies, and coordination with the adjacent Riverside Crossing Park improvements) will be undertaken by the City. Several economic incentives have been coordinated by the City. Typically, when a proposal is presented to the Commission, the parking, access, traffic and utilities are the responsibility of the applicant. In this case, the development agreement splits the responsibility between the City and the applicant. Certain streets within the area are being examined for anticipated improvements. Concept designs will determine the character of the streets, accommodation of different modes of transportation, emphasis on pedestrian friendliness and outdoor activities, potential utility burials, street lighting and potential on-street parking. The park improvements, as well, are at a conceptual stage at this time, but will be coordinated with the project.

The Riverview Village project mixed-use development is intended to create a walkable district with a mix of start-ups and growing businesses, non-profits, hybrid companies, restaurant and event spaces, and active outdoor plazas. The existing COhatch building and North High Brewing Company would be integrated into the village, and the site would become COhatch's national headquarters. The proposal is largely consistent with the concepts presented during the Informal Review, except for the exclusion of the three parcels south of Wing Hill Lane. The three landmark residential structures at 37, 45 and 53 N. Riverview Street would be renovated and converted to private office

suites, while the one at 62 N. Riverview Street would be retrofitted for restaurant use. A new public plaza is proposed north of 53 N. Riverview Street and is intended to accommodate arts and craft fairs, makers markets, start-up pitch competitions, public entertainment and others. A new COhatch building, proposed on the east side of N. Riverview Street, would house additional office and meeting space. The existing buildings on the west side of N. Riverview Street are intended to be renovated mostly within their existing footprints, thus maintaining the village atmosphere and the City's main goal of preserving the character of N. Riverview Street. The outbuildings behind these houses, along N. Blacksmith Lane, are proposed to be removed, facilitating the possible addition of a small number of on-street parking spaces. The structure at 62 N. Riverview Street, proposed to be converted to a restaurant, would maintain its current form with outdoor patios with pergolas added to the east and north sides. A new 15,460-square-foot building, which will be located on the parcel south of 62 N. Riverview Street, will include a large deck facing the Scioto River. This building would be used for office, co-working and small event space. At this point, the parcels are being considered as they extend all the way to the river, but once the details are finalized, there would be a lot split that would convey to the applicant only the portion that the buildings sit on. The remainder will become part of the park and retain the Historic Public zoning. Because the lot coverage percentage cannot be determined at this time, they will be provided with the Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) and Final Development Plan (FDP) phases. However, in the Historic Core, lot coverage can be up to 85%. Currently, the existing structures meet that requirement. There may be some setback variations, but all are existing, non-conforming. At this time, the house at 37 N. Riverview encroaches slightly into the Wing Hill Lane right-of-way, which is legal, nonconforming at this point. The City is currently studying the traffic and parking component. If needed, a full Traffic Impact Study (TIS) will be provided with the PDP. Based on the proposed uses and square footage, 71 parking spaces would be needed. Parking in the Historic District is permitted on site, on the adjacent street or within public parking lots within 600 feet of the site. That building sits on the floodplain and floodway on the east side of the site, and mitigation measures will be presented with the PDP.

Mr. Bitar reviewed details of the proposed project related to each structure and the site, including possible incorporation of existing stone foundation remains and rebuild of historic stone walls. [details included in the staff report].

Mr. Henderson presented an ArcGIS walkthrough video of the images and topography of the proposed Riverview Village project and the proposed 17 and 27 North Riverview Street project. The Board expressed appreciation for the presentation.

Mr. Bitar reviewed the details of the Demolition request. The applicant is requesting approval of the immediate demolition of three Background outbuildings at 37, 45 and 53 N. Riverview Street. All structures are located along N. Blacksmith Lane, and two of them encroach into its right-of-way. It is likely that some of these outbuildings were constructed at the same time as the principal structures, but all are dilapidated, especially the one behind 45 N. Riverview Street. Unfortunately, after the application was initially filed, the applicant discovered the small 3'x3' shed at 37 N. Riverview Street had tipped on its side and broke; it was removed for safety reasons.

Demolition requests for Background structures must meet one of the three demolition review criteria. Staff believes that the request meets the criterion in Code §153.176(J)(5)(b)(3) that the structures impede the orderly development of the District. The proposed Riverview Village development and improvements to N. Blacksmith Lane will significantly improve the quality of the

District without diminishing the overall historic value of the area. For that reason, staff recommends approval of the Demolition request with a condition that a site restoration plan be provided at the demolition permit stage to the satisfaction of staff per Code §153.176(J)(3)(g). If the demolition is approved, the applicant may proceed at any time.

Additionally, staff has reviewed the proposed Concept Plan against the Concept Plan criteria and found that the proposal either meets the criteria or meets it with conditions. Therefore, staff recommends approval with 5 conditions.

Board Questions for Staff

Mr. Alexander noted that the bridge is not shown in the renderings, and any anticipated changes in that bridge could have a significant impact on the stakeholders in the project. He does not believe that many are aware that, potentially, the bridge will be rebuilt.

Mr. Bitar responded that the City's consulting engineer, who is working with the City on its plans for that area, is taking that possibility into account.

Mr. Alexander stated that it is important for the applicants to be aware of its anticipated appearance and possible connection issues either through the bridge or down from the bridge.

Mr. Alexander inquired if the site restoration plan would be needed only if the applicant wanted to conduct demolition before construction occurs.

Mr. Bitar responded affirmatively. We anticipate that for safety reasons, the applicant will choose to demolish the background buildings immediately.

Applicant Presentation

Tim Lai, architect, 401 W. Town Street, Columbus stated that he is present to answer any questions.

Public Comment

No public comments were received on the project.

Board Discussion regarding Demolition

Mr. Alexander inquired if the board members had any questions or issues with the Demolition request.

Board members indicated that they had no concerns with the Demolition request.

Mr. Jewell moved, Ms. Damaser seconded approval of the Demolition of the 3 Background Buildings at 37, 45 and 53 N. Riverview Street with the following condition:

- 1) That a site restoration plan be provided at the Demolition permit stage to the satisfaction of staff.

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

Board Discussion regarding Concept Plan

The Board members discussed the individual proposed changes to each structure and indicated that they had no objections to the proposed changes.

Mr. Alexander inquired if the applicant requested additional clarification from the Board. Mr. Lai requested the Board's input on the potential cladding of the new building. They have used wood cladding on other projects within the District and could continue it here; however, they have considered the use of brick, which lends detailing opportunities. Board members indicated that they had no objection to the potential use of other natural materials.

Mr. Alexander inquired if the applicant had any objections to the recommended conditions. Mr. Lai indicated that they had no objection to the conditions.

Mr. Jewell moved, Ms. Damaser recommended City Council approval of the Concept Plan with the following conditions:

- 1) That access and parking details, including a Parking Plan and bike parking be provided at the PDP stage.
- 2) That site infrastructure details, floodplain mitigation impacts/plan, and tree survey be provided at the PDP stage.
- 3) That building and site design details, including, but not limited to colors, textures, roof screening and trash enclosures, be refined and presented at the PDP stage.
- 4) That the applicant address any new encroachment into the Wing Hill Lane right-of-way in coordination with staff.
- 5) That the applicant be authorized to undertake, in coordination with staff, selective removal/uncovering of building materials at the various structures in order to investigate the original materials or conditions.

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

- **Case 24-029ARB-MPR - 17 N. Riverview Street, Minor Project Review**

Proposal for additions to a residence in the Historic District. The 0.18-acre site is zoned HD-HR, Historic Residential District, and is located approximately 70 feet southwest of the intersection of Wing Hill Lane and N. Riverview Street.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Holt stated that this site is located between N. Blacksmith Lane and N. Riverview Street, south of Wing Hill Lane within HD-HR, Historic Residential District and adjacent to the HD-Historic Core District and the HD-Public District. The house is a Craftsman-style Bungalow built in 1927. The 2017 Historic and Cultural Assessment (HCA) classifies it as a Landmark Building. There is a Landmark outbuilding located at the rear of the property with access to N. Blacksmith Lane, which the applicant proposes to demolish.

The Board provided non-binding, informal comments on this project at their January 24, 2024 meeting. The Board was generally supportive of the demolition but expressed concerns with the proposed amounts of the lot coverage waiver, building footprint variance, and rear-yard setback variance. The Board expressed concern that a canyon effect would be created along N. Blacksmith by the proposed three-car garage, but had no objections to the second story above the garage

Since the Informal Review hearing, the applicant has revised the plan. He does not seek a lot coverage variance. He seeks a building footprint variance for an amount less than previously anticipated, and the rear yard variance will be less due to the agreed-upon five-foot distance between the highway easement and the building. The applicant now proposes a two-car garage, but the elevations have changed significantly, removing much of the historic forms.

The applicant seeks the Board's review on the proposed scale, massing, and the proposed variances. He requests that the project be tabled tonight in order to pursue BZA approval of the variances at their April meeting. Subsequently, he would seek formal of the Minor Project Review (MPR) at ARB's May meeting. The applicant is intending to request BZA variances to the building footprint and rear setback standards that are over the 20 percent that may be authorized by ARB in Code Section 153.176(L)(5)(h). The applicant is required to gain approval from the BZA for those specific requests, per Section 153.176(O)(5); however, the project approval remains with the ARB.

The historic house is approximately 19 feet tall at mid-gable. The addition joins the historic house via a one-story, 12-foot, 2-inch hyphen that is inset +/-3 feet, 9 inches on the south side and +/-3 feet on the north side. The kitchen/dining portion of the addition remains at approximately one story tall. The garage and master bedroom portion increases to two stories, 20-feet, 10 inches at mid-gable, at the rear of the building and along N. Blacksmith Lane. The topography rises to the west, so the rear addition height is emphasized. With the MPR, all building height information is required.

Ms. Holt stated that the Code requires the City to preserve the ability to install public parking and/or public sidewalks along with other necessary improvements within the highway easement. Staff has determined that the building should be five feet back from the easement, which will allow the owner maneuverability and design flexibility but also ensure the easement is preserved to accommodate future improvements along Blacksmith Lane, including sidewalks. The rear setback will be revised accordingly for the BZA and MPR applications. Another option is to create a shared driveway with 27 N. Riverview; this will minimize the number of curb cuts along Blacksmith Lane, allowing a maximum number of parallel public parking spaces and uninterrupted sidewalk. City Code states that the City Engineer may require shared driveways, if it would improve traffic flow or safety. As staff works toward the design of N. Blacksmith Lane, this may be necessary to preserve parking options within the highway easement.

Ms. Holt reviewed the proposed massing and elevation details, noting that staff is concerned that the additions are not subordinate to the original structure, as required by Code. The height of the addition is greater than the 1.5-story original house, and the eaves on the original house are not reflected on the addition.

Ms. Holt stated that the MPR criteria are not met at this time, but additional work on the design is anticipated. Staff's recommendation is to table this application until the BZA provides a determination on the required variances and the applicant provides complete MPR and Demolition information. Prior to resubmittal for formal MPR approval, the following 5 steps are recommended:

- 1) Significantly revise the architectural design to address the Code requirements and Historic Design Guidelines goals as described herein.

- 2) Obtain approval of Variances from the BZA. If these requests are not granted, the applicant shall redesign the project using the criteria in the Historic District Code.
- 3) Adjust the rear building setback to accommodate the 5-foot distance between the highway easement and the structure.
- 4) Continue to coordinate with staff to determine if a combined driveway with the adjacent lot is necessary; adjust the proposal accordingly.
- 5) Provide a Demolition – Landmark request for the outbuilding, with the required submittal information listed in Code.

Board Questions for Staff

Mr. Alexander inquired if the City Engineer would make a determination regarding the potential shared driveway before the designs of the 17 and 27 N. Riverside projects advance significantly. Ms. Holt responded that the City Engineer is aware, and a study has been conducted that indicates parallel parking along Blacksmith Lane would be possible, if the driveways are combined. The goal is to achieve additional parking for these residences and for Riverview Village.

Applicant Presentation

Rich Taylor, architect, 48 S. High Street, Dublin stated that he had a very brief conversation with staff about a shared driveway months ago. In the meantime, they have had extensive discussions with Councilmember Krumb, Planning Director Rauch and Transportation Director Willis regarding having these proposed driveways pass through the easement. Their response was that the driveways would be acceptable as long as the faces of the garages are 5 feet back from the easement. Due to those discussions, he does not believe further discussion about a shared driveway is warranted. The only unresolved item is the driveway for the 27 N. Riverview Street house, which requires the Planning Director's approval. He is in discussion with Ms. Rauch about that, as she is authorized to approve it.

Mr. Taylor stated that an item was missing from the drawings they originally submitted. Although he re-submitted the drawings by the deadline of March 11, and they subsequently were uploaded to the meeting site on the City's website, they were not included in the presentation tonight. The revised 3D drawings reflect a different color scheme and building materials than were shown. He shared a printed copy of the most recent images with the ARB members.

Mr. Taylor stated that his comments tonight would apply to both the 17 and 27 N. Riverview projects. Since the last meeting, they have been working on the driveways and reached an agreement with the City. It will be necessary to eliminate 3.5 feet from both buildings to achieve the 5-foot compromise. That will change the massing and reduce the building footprint and lot coverage calculations. The design of the building additions are intentionally different in style for the purpose of highlighting the difference from the original structure. Mimicking the original building with a new addition can devalue the original structure. The massing was discussed at the January ARB meeting and this massing is similar, although the style is different. They have kept the original building intact, adding a low connector between the original building and the new, larger addition at the back. They have taken cues from the more modern aspects of the existing COhatch building. Consistent with ARB's guidance at the January meeting, they have reduced the addition on 17 N. Riverview from a proposed footprint of 40% excess square footage to 35.9% in excess. They have also reduced the lot coverage SF of 49.6% exceeding Code to 41.8% SF in excess. They seek the ARB's input on the overall project so they can have the site plan prepared for BZA consideration. ARB's comments on the requested variances will be needed for BZA's review. They have requested

that the Concept Plan be tabled to the May ARB meeting. They will have the Demolition request ready at that time, as well.

Public Comment

There were no public comments.

Board Discussion

Mr. Alexander stated that if the parcel had been rezoned, the coverage variance would not be an issue.

Mr. Taylor stated that City staff was not supportive of rezoning. They indicated the waiver/variance process would be more expeditious than a full rezoning.

Mr. Jewell inquired if the intent is to change the foundation on 27 N. Riverview and move that building, there would be a possibility to turn the driveway, as well.

Mr. Taylor stated that Planning staff was not supportive of that idea.

Mr. Alexander pointed out that the City Engineer's recommendation for a shared driveway would require a radical re-design. The garages would have to be rotated 90 degrees and moved back, although it potentially could reduce coverage.

Mr. Taylor stated that if the garages were facing each other, providing 30 ft. between garage doors for maneuvering ability plus the width of 2-car garages would take up a greater area than the two driveways that they have proposed.

Mr. Alexander noted that they would have to share pavement; however, he is not advocating for that, as it could impact the properties' value. He was attempting to identify a way to reduce the coverage.

Mr. Alexander noted that both projects have large covered patios in addition to front porches, Removing the roof from the patio would reduce the building footprint SF, bringing the footprint within reach of the possible 20% ARB waiver. He does not believe there is a hardship need associated with the building footprint variance; he does believe a hardship argument exists for the rear yard setback, because the houses are set back and the buildable area is reduced. The Board does not want to set a precedent of approving more than a 20% waiver.

Ms. Damaser expressed agreement. Other properties are not permitted to exceed Code. The intent is to maintain the character of small houses within this District. The three houses in the Riverview Village project are maintaining their original footprint, and that project is adjacent to this one.

Mr. Alexander requested that the chart of required/permitted SF for 17 N. Riverview Street be shown.

Ms. Holt displayed the following chart for 17 N. Riverview:

Lot Coverage: Code Permits - 3,811SF; 20% ARB Waiver – 4,572SF; Requested: 3,364SF.

Building Footprint: Code Permits – 2,117SF; 20% ARB Waiver – 2,540SF; Requested: 2,848SF.

Rear Setback: Code Permits – 39.75Ft.; 20% ARB Waiver – 31.8Ft.; Requested: 16Ft.

Mr. Alexander stated that the 17 N. Riverview lot is smaller than 27 N. Riverview Street. If the same square footage is needed for both houses, he would be supportive of BZA granting a variance for the smaller lot to enable the same square footage on it. He is also supportive of the rear setback variance.

Ms. Cooper inquired if he is suggesting a 20% building footprint waiver for 27 N. Riverview, and to permit the same square footage for 17 N. Riverview, which would be in excess of the 20% waiver permitted by ARB.

Mr. Alexander responded affirmatively. It would permit 17 N. Riverside to have a 2,757SF building footprint, which would require a total variance of 32.5%.

Ms. Cooper stated that she does not believe there is a need for equivalency between the two properties. She is concerned with the excessive mass of the addition proposed for 17 N. Riverview Street; it should be reduced in scale. A 20% waiver from ARB would then be sufficient, and there would be no need for a BZA variance.

Three of the four board members expressed support for a building footprint variance of 32.5% and the requested 16-foot rear setback variance.

Mr. Taylor clarified that because of the 5-foot agreement, the correct number would be 19.5 feet.

Ms. Cooper noted that they would be asking for a 12-foot variance instead of a 16-foot variance. The existing outbuilding is small. As proposed, it would be replaced with a very large mass.

Board members expressed support for the 19.5-ft. setback variance for both 17 and 27 N. Riverview Street.

Mr. Alexander directed the discussion to the building elevations.

Ms. Cooper stated that she is concerned with the proposed addition, as it will not be subordinate to the historic house. The proposed addition needs to be more cohesive, less disjointed. The garage height is excessive, towering over the house, and an irregular component is located south of the garage.

Mr. Alexander noted that it is important to consider the grade change, as well. Although the buildings appear tall, they are lower than the buildings on the other side of the alley.

Ms. Damaser stated that the three houses to the north are the original, traditional houses. Next to them, a massive structure is proposed. It is not cohesive with the adjacent homes.

Mr. Jewell stated that the original homes appear subordinate to the proposed additions.

Mr. Alexander stated that the connector has a low roof and makes a clear distinction between the original house and the addition. The roof on the addition is taller and the gable parallels the alley. He understands other members have expressed concern about the "canyon effect."

He noted that the intent is that the primary suite will be in the 2nd story. There is a need for adding square footage in these homes. Additionally, the architectural style is quite different.

Ms. Cooper stated that perhaps dormers could be used to bring down the height.

Mr. Alexander stated that he believes 27 N. Riverview is lower than 17 N. Riverview, as it has less square footage in the 2nd story.

Ms. Damaser noted that there are two bedrooms in the existing historic home and one bedroom in the new addition.

Discussion continued on the proposed building elevations and excessive mass.

Board members expressed consensus that the proposed addition does not appear sufficiently subordinate to the existing historic house. Additionally, the contemporary style exaggerates the volume, as it lacks details and interest.

Mr. Taylor stated that he has noted the Board's issues with the massing, scale and architectural detail. He requested confirmation that the Board was supportive of a 19.5 ft. rear setback variance and a 32.5% variance for the building footprint.

Board members indicated support.

Ms. Damaser moved, Mr. Jewell seconded a motion to table the Minor Project Review with the following recommendations:

- 1) Significantly revise the architectural design to address the Code requirements and Historic Design Guidelines goals as described herein.
- 2) Obtain approval of Variances from the BZA. If these requests are not granted, the applicant shall redesign the project using the criteria in the Historic District Code.
- 3) Adjust the rear building setback to accommodate the 5-foot distance between the highway easement and the structure.
- 4) Continue to coordinate with staff to determine if a combined driveway with the adjacent lot is necessary; adjust the proposal accordingly.
- 5) Provide a Demolition – Landmark request for the outbuilding, with the required submittal information listed in Code.

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

- **Case 24-030ARB-MPR - 27 N. Riverview Street, Minor Project Review**

A proposal for additions to a residence in the Historic District located on a 0.21-acre site zoned HD-HR, Historic Residential District, located southwest of the intersection of Wing Hill Lane and N. Riverview Street.

Staff Report

Ms. Holt stated that the site is located at the intersection of Wing Hill Lane and N. Riverview Street and is zoned HD-HR, Historic Residential District. 27 N. Riverview Street is a two-story gabled-ell house with original decorative porch posts, brackets and a spindle frieze. It is identified as a Landmark building in the Historic and Cultural Assessment (HCA) of 2017. There is also a Landmark outbuilding at the rear of the property, for which the applicant intends to submit a Demolition request. The applicant is seeking variances to the building footprint and rear setback standards that are over the 20 percent that may be authorized by the Board in Code Section 153.176(L)(5)(h). The lot coverage requirements are met. A building footprint variance of 32.6% is requested. Code permits 2,297 SF and 2,999 SF are proposed. ARB is permitted to approve a 20% waiver, which would be 2,757 SF. A rear setback variance of 16 feet is requested.

Ms. Holt stated that the addition is in the same plane as the original house. She displayed drawings of and described the proposed elevations. She noted the proposal is to move the house onto a new foundation. Staff has some concerns regarding the proposed relocation of the house: the structure's ability to withstand the movement; should the structure be raised, it would affect its relationship with the street; and if the site is comprised of bedrock, it would prevent moving the house. She displayed the view from N. Blacksmith Lane, noting the amount of visible roof compared to the historic house. As noted with the 17 N. Riverside property, multiple driveway cuts are not permitted. Therefore, the City Engineer is likely to request a shared driveway.

She summarized that most of the MPR criteria are not met at this point, and similar to the previous case, the applicant is requesting that the case be tabled in lieu of the BZA's decision on requested variances. Staff recommends the case be tabled with 8 recommendations (noted in the staff report).

Applicant Presentation

Mr. Taylor stated that they have had professional house movers look at the project and they have confirmed that the house can be moved. In regard to the potential for bedrock, he has remodelled and built houses along both sides of the river for 35 years, and he is confident that there is bedrock on the site. That is probably the reason the existing house does not have a foundation beneath it. However, the bedrock does not prevent an unsurmountable impediment. With the 143 S. High and 181 S. High Street projects, the site conditions were similar. The house will be raised, although the amount is not yet unknown. Currently, the framing sits almost on the ground. The house will be raised to be consistent with City Code requirements regarding wood structures, approximately 8 inches.

Board Discussion

In regard to the requested waivers/variances, Board members confirmed that they had no objection to a 19.5FT variance for the rear setback. Additionally, they were supportive of a 20% building setback waiver. They indicated that they were not supportive of a variance granting greater than the 20%.

Board members discussed the proposed design and architecture by elevation.

Mr. Alexander requested clarification of staff's concerns with the side addition.

Ms. Holt responded that the Code and the Guidelines address subordinate additions. The Guidelines indicate that additions should not be added to the side of original structures. The second issue is the roof form of the original house has minimal details and a lightness. The proposed additions have much greater roof exposure and different details.

Mr. Alexander stated that with the COhatch project, that applicant is adding a second window to create a pair of windows in the original structure; there were no objections to that. There is a similar window proposal here, and there is a concern. What is the rationale?

Ms. Holt stated that on the 53 N. Riverview elevation (COhatch project), the window is offset, which looks awkward and untraditional. COhatch is addressing that irregular window placement. On the 27 N. Riverview elevation, there is only one window, and for modern living, more than one window on that elevation is desired. Due to the available space on this façade, the windows could be arranged regularly, per the Guidelines. What is proposed is not a traditional pattern.

Mr. Alexander stated that the other concern pointed out in the staff report is that the addition at the back of the front portion of the house looks like the original house, because there is no break in the plane. The roof plane continues, as well. He requested Board members to comment.

Mr. Jewell responded that there needs to be distinction between the original structure and the addition. Previously, we have required additions not to extend from the front elevation of the original house.

Mr. Alexander noted that with the Kne project reviewed earlier tonight, the Board requested the opposite.

Mr. Jewell responded that there it was necessary to address a particular issue. With past projects, however, the Board has required that the addition be subordinate to the original structure. The addition should look like the original structure.

Mr. Alexander agreed. However, if we require that there be a break in the roof and wall, there could be a concern about too many rooflines.

Mr. Jewell stated that he prefers the design of 27 N. Riverview over 17 N. Riverview. The layout is more balanced; everything flows better. Although the design and the materials do not work well, the layout works well with the alley.

Discussion of the proposed architecture and building materials continued. Members expressed concern with the placement of siding on the chimney; indicated they had no issue with the proposed fascia trim; expressed concerns with the materials of the 1-story gable near the 2-story gable, which should not match the existing house.

Mr. Jewell pointed out that the plan proposes an additional single-car garage with an additional driveway.

Mr. Alexander noted that ARB could approve the separate garage, but the additional driveway is the issue.

Ms. Damaser inquired if Code prevents two driveways, one wider driveway would be permitted.

Ms. Holt stated that the maximum driveway width at the right-of-way is 20 feet. A driveway with a 3-car width could be permitted if it tapered down to meet that criterion.

Mr. Alexander requested clarification of staff's concern about lentils and sills.

Ms. Holt responded that a distinctive feature of the house is the unique lentils on the windows. The question is whether that form should be repeated or emphasized in some way on the addition.

Mr. Alexander noted that there appears to be aluminium coil stock over what could be trim. We do not know the condition of what lies beneath. Typically, applicants are told not to duplicate the features of the historic structure. A stronger relationship would be appropriate but not duplication.

Ms. Holt concurred that it is a unique detail that differentiates this house from others. Although it should not be duplicated, it would be appropriate to honor it in some manner.

Mr. Alexander inquired if the applicant needed additional feedback.

Mr. Taylor requested clarification concerning location of the extrusions to the house.

Mr. Alexander stated that he had no objection to the locations, but it should not look like the original house. He has no objection to the use of three materials, but the additions should be differentiated from the original house.

Mr. Taylor stated that he would revise the window pattern as recommended. He thanked the Board for their input.

Ms. Damaser moved, Mr. Jewell seconded a motion to table the Minor Project Review with the following recommendations:

- 1) Obtain approval of Variances from the BZA. If these requests are not granted, the applicant shall redesign the site using the criteria in the Historic District Code.
- 2) Adjust the rear building setback to meet the five-foot distance between the highway easement and the building.
- 3) Reduce the number of driveways to one and maintain compliance with the maximum driveway width, per Code.
- 4) Continue to coordinate with staff to determine if a combined driveway with the adjacent lot is necessary; adjust the proposal accordingly.
- 5) Modify the architectural design to better address the Code requirements and Historic Design Guidelines as described herein.
- 6) Provide a Demolition – Landmark request for the outbuilding, with the required submittal information listed in Code.

- 7) Provide a detailed plan for moving the house to ensure that the Landmark structure is not damaged.
- 8) Provide a contingency plan for moving the house, should bedrock be found on the site, including an explanation about how the basement window retaining walls, positive drainage, and final elevation of the floor plate will be addressed.

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

DISCUSSION ITEM

- **Case 23-081 - Alternative Materials**

Ms. Holt stated that comments were received from Board Member Cotter on the draft Alternative Materials document. She inquired if other members had comments to offer on the draft document. Members indicated that they would forward their comments to staff within the next week.

Ms. Holt stated that members' guidance would be incorporated into a final draft to be scheduled on the April 17 Special Meeting agenda for consideration and adoption.

COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Holt reminded members of the upcoming meetings:

- An ARB Special Meeting is scheduled for April 17, 2024, 6:30 p.m. for approval of the Alternative Materials document and an Envision Dublin Community Plan Update, including the Historic Dublin Special Area Plan; Consultant Greg Dale presenting.
- An Envision Dublin Community Plan public meeting is scheduled for April 2, 2024, 5:00-7:00 p.m. in Council Chamber. Members are invited to attend.
- The next regular ARB meeting is scheduled for April 24, 2024, 6:30 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:05 p.m.


Chair, Architectural Review Board


Assistant Clerk of Council