



# BOARD ORDER

## Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, May 26, 2021 | 6:30 pm

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

**4. 110-112 S. Riverview Street  
21-059ARB**

**Demolition**

**Proposal:** Demolition of a contributing two-family home to facilitate construction of a new, single-family home on a 0.59-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic Residential.

**Location:** East of S. Riverview Street, approximately 75 feet south of the intersection with Pinneyhill Lane.

**Request:** Review and approval of an Architectural Review Board request for Demolition under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.176 and the *Historic Design Guidelines*.

**Applicant:** Marc and Heather Frient

**Planning Contact:** Zachary C. Hounshell, Planner I

**Contact Information:** 614.410.4652, zhounshell@dublin.oh.us

**Case Information:** www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/21-059

**MOTION:** Ms. Cooper moved, Mr. Kownacki seconded, to approve the Demolition of a contributing, two-family home with the following condition:

- 1) That the order to allow a Demolition shall not be issued by the City until the ARB has approved a Minor Project Review application for new construction of one of the two lots.

**VOTE:** 5 – 0

**RESULT:** The Demolition was conditionally approved.

**RECORDED VOTES:**

Gary Alexander	Yes
Amy Kramb	Yes
Sean Cotter	Yes
Frank Kownacki	Yes
Martha Cooper	Yes

**STAFF CERTIFICATION**

DocuSigned by:  
  
81050D11513A490...  
Zachary C. Hounshell, Planner I





# BOARD ORDER

## Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, May 26, 2021 | 6:30 pm

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

**5. 110-112 S. Riverview Street  
21-060ARB-MPR**

**Minor Project Review**

Proposal: Construction of a new, approximately 3,000-square-foot, single-family home on a 0.589-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic Residential.  
Location: East of S. Riverview Street, approximately 75 feet south of the intersection with Pinneyhill Lane.  
Request: Review and approval of a Minor Project under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.176 and the *Historic Design Guidelines*.  
Applicant: Marc and Heather Frient  
Planning Contact: Zachary C. Hounshell, Planner I  
Contact Information: 614.410.4652, zhounshell@dublin.oh.us  
Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/21-060

**MOTION 1:** Mr. Kownacki moved, Ms. Kramb seconded, to approve five Waivers as amended:

1. §153.173(E)(3)(a) Attached Garages. Requirement: Front loaded garages shall be a minimum of 20 feet behind the front façade of the home.  
Request: To allow an attached front-loaded garage to be setback 3 feet behind the front façade of the building.
2. §153.173(C) General Development Standards. Requirement: Maximum Building Height is 24 feet.  
Request: To allow a height of approximately 29.5 feet from grade to the mid-point of the eaves on the rear elevation of the home.
3. §153.174(J)(1) Exterior Building Materials Standards – Façade Materials. Requirement: Permitted building materials shall be high quality, durable materials including but not limited to stone, manufactured stone, full depth brick, brick veneer, wood siding, glass, and fiber cement siding.  
Request: To permit the use of engineered-wood as a primary material.
4. §153.174(B)(4)(c) Roof Type Requirements – Pitch Measure. Requirement: The principal roof shall have a pitch appropriate to the architectural style of the building. Roofs shall not be sloped less than a 6:12 (rise:run) or more than 12:12, unless otherwise determined to be architecturally appropriate by the ARB.  
Request: To permit a pitch of 4:12 for a side-gabled roof.
5. §153.174(i)(2) Chimneys. Requirement: Chimneys on exterior walls shall extend full height from the ground and vertically past the eave line and must be finished in brick or stone.  
Request: To eliminate the extension to grade of the northern chimney.



**5. 110-112 S. Riverview Street  
21-060ARB-MPR**

**Minor Project Review**

**VOTE:** 5 – 0

**RESULT:** The five Waivers were approved.

**RECORDED VOTES:**

Gary Alexander	Yes
Amy Kramb	Yes
Sean Cotter	Yes
Frank Kownacki	Yes
Martha Cooper	Yes

**MOTION 2:** Ms. Kramb moved, Mr. Kownacki seconded, to approve the Minor Project with six conditions as revised:

- 1) That the drawings be revised to include a gap at the bottom of the porch panel to allow for drainage and the porch floor to be extended over the band board;
- 2) That the applicant provide a wood gable vent in-lieu-of the proposed vent, subject to Staff approval;
- 3) That the applicant modify the stone foundation to extend to the bottom of the closed porch on the east-facing wall, subject to staff approval;
- 4) That the applicant work with Staff to select an appropriate chimney cap detail;
- 5) That the applicant execute the 24-foot stormwater easement with the submittal of the proposed lot split; and
- 6) That the applicant work with staff to choose an appropriate patio light fixture, subject to staff approval.

**VOTE:** 5 – 0

**RESULT:** The Minor Project was conditionally approved.

**RECORDED VOTES:**

Gary Alexander	Yes
Amy Kramb	Yes
Sean Cotter	Yes
Frank Kownacki	Yes
Martha Cooper	Yes

**STAFF CERTIFICATION**

DocuSigned by:  
  
 B1050D11513A490...  
 Zachary C. Hounshell, Planner I



- Cultured Stone/Mortar – Provia Custom mix of Old Dominion/Fieldstone (no reds or oranges) with Soft White smear application
- Slate Roof – Greystone Slate, Spanish Black
- Standing Seam Roof – Pre-weathered galvanized
- Gutters/downspouts – Tuxedo Gray
- Windows – Sierra Pacific H3 aluminum clad casement window in TW black
- Front Door/Side Porch Door – Stained SW 3522 Banyan Brown
- Porch Columns – Stained SW 3521 Crossroad

Staff has reviewed this application against all applicable criteria and recommends approval with no conditions.

### **Board Questions for Staff**

Ms. Kramb inquired if the overhead door that was proposed for the gym on the backside of the garage is the same as is being used for the garage doors.

Ms. Martin responded that the sliding glass door at the rear of the home is being modified to be similar to a garage door. Although, it will appear similar to a window, it will be a glass door with a black metal frame.

### **Applicant Presentation**

Paul Ghidotti, property owner, 185 S. Riverview Street, Dublin, OH, stated that the exercise room door has been a significant matter of discussion due to the difficulty in identifying a door that rolls but looks like a window and due to the cost of the materials. They are still trying to determine the right door configuration.

Richard Taylor, Architect, 48 S. High Street, Dublin, OH, stated that they appreciate the opportunity to discuss the proposed revision of materials on this project. The proposed door has the best appearance of those the Board has seen.

### **Public Comment**

No public comments were received on the case.

### **Board Discussion**

Ms. Cooper inquired if the garage would be painted black.

Ms. Martin responded that the garage will be painted "Iron Ore."

Mr. Alexander noted that color was included in the original submission.

Board members had no additional questions or discussion.

Mr. Kownacki moved, Ms. Cooper second approval of the Minor Project with no conditions.

Vote: Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Kownacki, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes.  
[Motion carried 5-0]

## **4. 110-112 S. Riverview Street, 21-059ARB, Demolition**

Demolition of a contributing two-family home to facilitate construction of a new, single-family home on a 0.59-acre site located east of S. Riverview Street, approximately 75 feet south of the intersection with Pinneyhill Lane, and zoned Historic District, Historic Residential.

## **Applicant Presentation**

Mr. Hounshell stated that this is a request for two applications for this site, the first for Demolition and the second for a Minor Project. The site has an existing two-foot storm easement located on the north side of the property. The site also has significant grade change from west to east, moving toward the Scioto River. Because of its proximity to the river, there are significant floodplain and floodway limits. Along the river, there are mature trees located within the designated floodplain. These natural features limit development on the eastern half of the site. [Photos of adjacent sites viewed for context.]

### Case History

On March 24, 2021, the Architectural Review Board informally reviewed an application for a potential demolition and new construction of a new 2,900-square-foot single-family home. The applicant proposed to split the 0.589-acre site into two lots and develop the northern lot with the proposed cottage-style home. The Board was generally supportive of a proposed demolition request, but requested additional documentation of either the financial liability of the property or documentation and analysis of how the building is not contributing to the Historic District. In November 2018, the Architectural Review Board informally reviewed an application for a potential demolition and new construction of a new 3,000-square-foot single-family home. The proposed ranch home was generally within the footprint of the existing home. The Board was supportive of a proposed demolition and construction of a new home; however, no further application was made for demolition or new development.

### Proposal

The applicant is proposing to demolish the existing 3,400-square-foot, 1966 two-family, brick ranch home on the site. In the City's 2017 Historic and Cultural Assessment (HCA), the existing structure was recommended contributing to the Dublin Historic District. The Assessment assessed the structure to be in good condition, possessing all seven integrity markers. The City's architectural consultant has provided a detailed review of the existing structures and pointed out that the HCA was based on the exterior of the structure. The applicant has provided photos of the deteriorating balcony, cracking and deteriorating foundation, uneven floors and openings, and unstable roof framing. [Photos shown.] In addition, the applicant has provided a number of supporting documents for demolition including a statement addressing the criteria, a structural engineer's report, financial assessment for the existing structure, cost estimates for rehabilitation of the existing structure and for construction, and a letter from Fifth Third Bank.

As discussed at the prior Informal Review, the applicant had two options. One was to justify why the site should be considered Non Contributing; the other was to pursue an analysis and provide documentation regarding the financial liability of the site. The applicant has pursued the latter. Contributing structures have three criteria that must be met to demonstrate economic hardship, as a basis for demolition. The applicant provided three options for the property that do not involve complete demolition of the structure: A) Keep the structure as is and rent at current value, B) Renovate the structure as a two-dwelling home and rent at current market rates, and C) Convert the two-family home into a single-family home.

Option A: They are currently renting the two units at \$1,800 per month (\$900 per side) with no option to increase the rent unless significant improvements are made to the structure. Based on current principal, interest, taxes and insurance, the property currently creates a negative cash flow of \$4,800 per year. Due to the negative cash flow of the existing conditions of the property, this option is not financially viable for the applicant.

Option B: The second option would be to restore and update the existing structure to meet current Code requirements and rent the two units at current market rate rent, which might be approximately \$3,600 per month (\$1,800 per side). To restore and update the structure, the applicant has provided a project cost estimate of approximately \$400,000. The estimated costs are determined based on the structural and cosmetic improvements required for the existing structure, as defined in the engineering report. The proposed improvements and associated costs are also based on the owner's opportunity to gain a return on their investment in terms of the amount of rent that could be charged to support the cost of improvement. The current lien holder and bank lender will not finance renovations of this magnitude for the existing structure. Due to the bank's inability to fund the renovations and the negative cash flow of an updated structure, this option is not financially viable for the applicant.

Option C: The third option would be to convert the structure into a single-family unit. To renovate the structure, the applicant has provided a project cost estimate of approximately \$896,000. This cost, combined with the purchase price of \$425,000, would equate to \$1.325 million dollars invested in the property. The renovation of the building to a single-family unit would cost significantly more than new construction on the site, and would not appraise near the \$1.325 million dollars invested into the site. Additionally, as stated in option B, the current lien holder and bank lender will not finance renovations of this magnitude for the existing structure. Due to the bank's unwillingness to fund the renovations and the significant cost of renovation, this option is not financially viable for the applicant. The letter provided by the bank/lien holder states that they would not provide any financing for renovations of the existing structure. They would be willing to provide financing for new construction, should the existing structure be demolished.

Staff has reviewed the demolition request against the applicable criteria and recommends approval of the Demolition with one condition;

- That the order to allow a demolition not be issued by the City until the ARB has approved a Minor Project Review application for new construction of one of the two lots.

### **Board Questions**

Mr. Cotter requested clarification of the reason Option C was not considered acceptable. Is it because the costs of the renovation with the existing investment would exceed the anticipated appraisal?

### **Applicant Presentation**

Marc Frient, property owner, 110-112 S. Riverview Street, Dublin, OH, stated that the bank is looking at two things: existing structure and the resulting value after renovations. They do not believe it will appraise high enough to justify the \$900,000 renovations to a single-family home.

Mr. Cotter stated that he was attempting to understand the reason the bank was unwilling to finance renovating the property to Code versus financing new construction to Code.

Mr. Frient responded that he believes the bank's decision was based on appraised value.

Mr. Kownacki stated that, typically, the bank looks at the investment from the perspective of if they financed that amount, then the property owner disappeared and the property reverted to the bank, would the bank be able to recoup their investment.

Rodney Arcaro, 50 McCoy Avenue, Worthington, Ohio 43085, stated that they could dictate and control the costs up front with a new build. With renovations, they could not predict or control the ultimate costs, particularly due to the foundation issues identified by the engineer. Those costs would be too open-ended.

Mr. Cotter stated that he understands that the bank is unwilling to take that risk.

### **Public Comments**

Mr. Hounshell indicated that 8 public comments were received and included with the packet materials. Mr. Alexander inquired if any Board member desired the comments to be read into the record. No Board member requested they be read.

Mr. Alexander noted that all of the public comments were in support of the requested demolition. One was supportive of the demolition but opposed to the division of the site into two lots. They also wanted verification that new construction would not encroach into the stormwater easement.

Ms. Cooper clarified the stormwater easement on this site is 24 feet, and the proposed construction on the site will not encroach into that easement.

### **Board Discussion**

Board members indicated consensus for approval of demolition.

Ms. Cooper moved, Mr. Kownacki seconded to approve the demolition with one condition:

- 1) That the order to allow a Demolition shall not be issued by the City until the ARB has approved a Minor Project application for new construction of one of the two lots.

Vote: Mr. Cotter, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Kownacki, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Ms. Krumb, yes.  
[Motion carried 5-0]

### **5. 110-112 S. Riverview Street, 21-060ARB-MPR, Minor Project Review**

Construction of a new, approximately 3,000-square-foot, single-family home on a 0.589-acre site located east of S. Riverview Street, approximately 75 feet south of the intersection with Pinneyhill Lane, zoned Historic District, Historic Residential.

### **Staff Presentation**

Mr. Hounshell stated that with the approval of the demolition, the applicant is requesting approval of a request for construction of a new, 3,000-square-foot, single-family home. Newly-created lots within the Historic District are required to be a minimum of 8,700 square feet in size with a minimum lot width of 60 feet. Both lots meet the required minimum lot standards. The applicant is proposing to develop the northern lot, while selling the southern lot for a future single-family home. The lot split is an administrative application that is reviewed and approved by Planning and Engineering staff. A 24-foot storm water easement is required in the northern portion of the applicant's lot. The applicant will need to work with staff to execute the 24-foot easement with the submittal of the proposed lot split. The applicant is proposing the construction of a one-and a-half-story, cottage-style, single-family home. The proposed siting of the home on the lot meets all the applicable setback and lot and building coverage criteria. However, Zoning Code requires that the attached, front-loaded garage be set back a minimum of 20 feet from the front building façade. The garage is currently set back three feet from the west, front façade along S. Riverview Street. Consistent with input the Board provided at the preceding Informal Review, the applicant has moved the main structure forward from the garage as opposed to moving the garage further to the rear. That has created the 3-foot separation. The proposed siting does meet the 0-foot front setback requirement. A waiver is requested to permit the 3-foot setback where a 20-foot setback would be required. A number of other modifications have been made to the original plan, including: changes to the stone foundation lines on the north and south elevations and revising the sunroom to a covered porch. Within the covered porch, the applicant is proposing an additional stone fireplace to match the proposed stone chimney on the south side of the home. The

form of the home is primarily defined by a 10:12-pitched, side-gabled roofline interrupted by a 10:12-pitched, front-gabled, two-car garage and a center, front-gabled dormer over the main portion of the home. A secondary 4:12-pitched, side-gabled roofline connects the primary side-gabled roofline and the front-gable roofline. Roof pitches within the Historic District are required to be greater than 6:12 pitch and less than 12:12 pitch. A Waiver is required to allow the less steep pitch. The front porch will be recessed into the front elevation and will be clad in a board and batten vertical siding; the remainder of the elevation will be clad in horizontal siding. The siding is constructed of an engineered wood. Although it is not a permitted material within the District, it has been approved for previous projects in the District. A waiver will be required to permit it to be used. The consultant recommends the proposed board and batten siding located on the front of the home be replaced with horizontal siding to provide a cohesive front elevation. Staff recommends the plans be revised to reflect this change in material. The applicant is proposing two types of window styles, including two-over-three white aluminum-clad wood casement windows (Pella Lifestyle Series) on the first floor, and two-over-two white aluminum-clad wood casement windows (Pella Lifestyle Series) on the second floor. The consultant recommends the replacement of the proposed fixed and casement windows with a traditional sash window to maintain the historic context of the District and that the rear windows' style and design be modified to match the windows on the front of the home to create a cohesive structure] The applicant is providing a composite gable vent within the side gable form of the main structure; staff recommends it be revised with wood gable vents.

Staff has reviewed the application against all the applicable criteria and recommends approval of four (4) waivers and approval of the Minor Project with eight (8) conditions.

### **Applicant Presentation**

Andy Melaragno, Melaragno Design Company, 4138 Greensview Dr, Columbus, OH 43220, stated that the homeowner would prefer to use the board and batten siding on both the front porch and the hyphen. The consultant had no objection to it being used on the hyphen, so he requests it be permitted there, at a minimum. Another issue is the stone under the covered porch. That area of the house will not be seen by the public from any angle. The only possible view would be from the river, looking upward. They would prefer to use siding underneath the covered porch and not extend the chimney foundation down to the grade there. An internal prefabricated fireplace is being installed under the porch. The chimney foundation is not needed either for structural support or for aesthetics in that location, which cannot be seen by the public. Additionally, installing casement windows without grids, so as not to obstruct the view of the river, is preferred.

### **Board Discussion**

Board members indicated they had no objection to the four requested waivers.

Ms. Kramb moved, Mr. Kownacki seconded approval of five (5) Zoning Code waivers:

#### Waiver Request 1

Requirement: §153.173(E)(3)(a) Attached Garages. Front loaded garages shall be a minimum of 20 feet behind the front façade of the home.

Request: To allow an attached front-loaded garage to be set back 3 feet behind the front façade of the building.

#### Waiver Request 2

Requirement: §153.173(C) General Development Standards – Maximum Building Height = 24 feet.



Request: To allow a height of approximately 29.5 feet from grade to the mid-point of the eaves on the rear elevation of the home.

Waiver Request 3

Requirement: §153.174(J)(1) Exterior Building Materials Standards – Façade Materials. Permitted building materials shall be high quality, durable materials including but not limited to stone, manufactured stone, full depth brick, brick veneer, wood siding, glass, and fiber cement siding.

Request: To permit the use of engineered wood as a primary material.

Waiver Request 4

Requirement: §153.174(B)(4)(c) Roof Type Requirements – Pitch Measure. The principal roof shall have a pitch appropriate to the architectural style of the building. Roofs shall not be sloped less than a 6:12 (rise:run) or more than 12:12, unless otherwise determined to be architecturally appropriate by the ARB.

Request: To permit a pitch of 4:12 for a side-gabled roof.

Vote: Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Kownacki, yes.  
[Motion carried 5-0]

Following discussion regarding extension of the northern chimney to grade, Board consensus was that the extension was unnecessary; consequently, a waiver to that Code requirement also would be needed.

Ms. Cooper moved, Mr. Cotter seconded approval of a fifth waiver to Zoning Code, that:

Waiver Request 5

Requirement: §153.174(i)(2) Chimneys – Chimneys on exterior walls shall extend full height from the ground and vertically past the eave line and must be finished in brick or stone.

Request: To eliminate the extension to grade of the northern chimney.

Vote: Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Kownacki, yes.  
[Motion carried 5-0]

Board members discussed the proposed conditions for Minor Project approval.

Mr. Hounshell noted that the 24-foot stormwater easement does exist, but it was not reflected on the survey included with the application submission. The condition has been added that would require it to be documented on the survey.

Mr. Frient clarified that to the best of his knowledge, the stormwater easement no longer exists. At an earlier time, Pinneyhill Lane was expected to be extended over the river; therefore, an easement existed. The surveyor indicated to him that the easement had expired; however, they are not opposed to including it with the lot split.

Ms. Martin stated that, as part of the process, the lot split will need to be re-recorded with Franklin County. It is the City's expectation that the stormwater easement be provided and recorded. Therefore, that condition for approval should be delineated.

Ms. Cooper stated that should the easement not be needed, and the City not require it as part of the lot split, it would affect where the home could be sited on the northern lot.

Mr. Alexander responded that is correct, because the most logical location for a home on properties with a significant grade change is horizontally, paralleling the street. If there were 12 additional feet on each lot, the property owner might want to take advantage of that opportunity. It would be possible

to build more to grade, and less excavation on the property would be necessary. It would make a significant difference in the design of the house.

Mr. Hounshell clarified that there is an existing stormwater gravity line on the site. Engineering staff has stated that it is required and requested the condition be added. This has been discussed with the applicant from the outset and is the reason the house has been sited as proposed.

Mr. Melaragno confirmed Mr. Hounshell's information. There is a stormsewer pipe that runs through the property. It has not yet been recorded, because the lot split has not been recorded. However, the easement will be finalized with the lot split.

Mr. Frient stated that, for the record, he agrees. The easement will be provided as required.

The majority of Board members indicated they had no objection to the board and batten on both the hyphen and the front porch.

Discussion occurred regarding requiring cultured stone under the covered porch on the rear façade.

Mr. Frient inquired if that would also be the north-facing wall.

Ms. Kramb clarified that the stone would be only on the east-facing façade, not the north-facing wall.

Ms. Kramb indicated that she would have no objection to eliminating the condition to extend the stone foundation on the rear façade.

Mr. Alexander stated that he agrees with the consultant – it helps the design to extend that design.

Ms. Kramb inquired if the requirement is that the stone extend all the way up the facade.

Mr. Alexander responded that it would be only up to the cantilever structure – the entire bump-out area. It makes sense because it will be continuing the line seen on the south elevation, past the chimney and around the rear façade. It will tie in better with the column.

Ms. Kramb noted that she had confused the location.

Mr. Melarango stated that a sketch of the rear elevation is on p. 10 of the consultant's report. The sketch depicts the use of stone under the covered porch, but not on the walkout wall; that area under the cantilever reflects siding. Where the foundation resumes, the stone foundation begins again. Therefore, his design shows the foundation under the basement slab clad in stone, while the framed wall of the rear walkout is covered with siding.

Mr. Cotter and Ms. Kramb stated that the materials on the north wall are "stepped."

Mr. Hounshell stated that the condition requires that the stone be on the rear, east façade up to the bottom of the covered porch.

Ms. Martin noted that the intent is that the main core of the home would have a fully-clad stone foundation.

Ms. Kramb clarified that the condition is that the north end of the east-facing façade under the covered porch will be stone.

Board consensus was to retain said condition.

Mr. Frient inquired the purpose of requiring the stone element on a wall that will not be visible to the public. He asks because stone is more expensive than regular siding.

Mr. Alexander responded that there appears to be a stone foundation on the building, and that appearance should be consistent. Typically, wood siding would not extend to the ground. Costs are a concern, but aesthetics are also an issue.

The applicant indicated he had no objection to the revised conditions.

Ms. Kramb moved, Mr. Kownacki seconded approval of the Minor Project with six (6) conditions:

- 1) That the drawings be revised to include a gap at the bottom of the porch panel to allow for drainage and the porch floor to be extended over the band board;

- 2) That the applicant provide a wood gable vent in-lieu-of the proposed vent, subject to staff approval;
- 3) That the applicant modify the stone foundation to extend to the bottom of the closed porch on the east-facing wall, subject to staff approval;
- 4) That the applicant work with staff to select an appropriate chimney cap detail;
- 5) That the applicant execute the 24-foot stormwater easement with the submittal of the proposed lot split; and
- 6) That the applicant work with staff to choose an appropriate patio lighting fixture, subject to staff approval.

Vote: Mr. Cotter, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Mr. Kownacki; Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes.  
[Motion carried 5-0]

*[5-minute break.]*

#### **6. ~~181 S. High Street, 21-073ARB, Demolition~~**

~~Demolition of a non-contributing, single-family home to facilitate construction of a new, single-family home on a 0.47-acre site located northwest of the intersection of S. High Street with Waterford Drive, zoned Historic District, Historic Residential.~~

#### **7. ~~181 S. High Street, 21-069ARB-MPR, Minor Project Review~~**

~~Construction of a new, single-family home on a 0.47-acre site located northwest of the intersection of S. High Street with Waterford Drive, zoned Historic District, Historic Residential.~~

#### **Staff Presentation**

~~Ms. Martin stated that this is a request for demolition of a non-contributing, single-family home to facilitate construction of a new, single-family home on a 0.47-acre site located northwest of the intersection of S. High Street with Waterford Drive, zoned Historic District, Historic Residential. The Board has provided two prior Informal Reviews on this site. Most recently, in February 2021, the Board expressed support for demolition of the existing single-family home provided that demolition criteria are met. The Board supported the proposed site layout and architectural design, scale and massing of the proposed home. The existing structure, built in 1967, is recommended "non-contributing" to the Historic District due to the age, materials, and workmanship of the home. The Code provides two sets of review criteria for demolition requests within Historic Dublin: one for contributing structures, and one for non-contributing structures. 181 S. High Street is subject to the latter, which states that one of three criteria outlined in the Code must be found to be met for approval of a demolition request: The applicant has indicated that the existing structure "impedes the orderly development of the District" and "detracts from the historical character of its immediate vicinity," which meets demolition criteria number three. The applicant notes that the home detracts from the historic value of the Karrer homestead to the north and Karrer barn to the south. Additionally, the existing condition of the home detracts from the established character of the District. The applicant asserts that retaining the existing structure impedes development that would positively contribute to the overall character of the District furthering the goals and objectives of Historic Dublin.~~

~~Staff recommends approval of the proposed demolition.~~



# BOARD DISCUSSION

## Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, March 24, 2021 | 6:30 pm

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

**1. 110-112 S. Riverview Street  
21-019INF**

**Informal Review**

Proposal: Demolition of an existing, two-family residence and construction of ±3,000-square-foot, single-family residence. The 0.589-acre site is proposed to be subdivided into two lots, zoned Historic District, Historic Residential.

Location: East of S. Riverview Street, ±75 feet south of the intersection with Pinneyhill Lane.

Request: Informal review providing non-binding feedback of a potential future development under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.170 and the *Historic Design Guidelines*.

Applicant: Marc and Heather Frient, Property Owners

Planning Contact: Zachary Hounshell, Planner I

Contact Information: 614.410.4652, zhounshell@dublin.oh.us

Case Information: [www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/21-019](http://www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/21-019)

**RESULT:** The Board reviewed and provided informal feedback on the proposal to demolish an existing, two-family residence and the construction of a new, single-family residence. The Board discussed the demolition, stating that the applicant will be required to meet the applicable criteria for demolition. The Board was split on the appropriateness of demolition, with one member stating that they would prefer to see the building preserved and renovated. Board members provided additional comments on the new construction. Members were generally supportive of the mass and scale of the proposed new construction home, suggesting that they would be supportive of a Waiver to building height, given the significant grade change along the east portion of the site. Board members generally were supportive of the proposed materials, but expressed a desire to see additional differentiation between the primary portion of the home and the garage portion, and to see a simplified application of materials at the rear of the home.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Gary Alexander Yes  
Amy Kramb Yes  
Sean Cotter Yes  
Frank Kownacki Yes

**STAFF CERTIFICATION**

---

Zach Hounshell, Planner I



## **Public Comment**

~~No public comment was submitted for this case.~~

~~Mr. Alexander inquired if the applicant had any objections to the conditions of approval.~~

~~Oliver Holtsberry, 1640 Harmon Avenue Columbus, OH 43223, applicant, indicated he was unaware of the conditions for approval.~~

~~Ms. Martin read the two proposed conditions.~~

~~Mr. Holtsberry indicated he had no objection to the two conditions.~~

~~Mr. Kownacki moved, Ms. Kramb seconded approval of the Minor Project with the following 2 conditions:~~

- ~~1. That the applicant apply for and successfully obtain permanent sign permits through the Building Standards Division prior to installation of the signs.~~
- ~~2. That the applicant provide light fixture specifications to ensure a high quality fixture is used, subject to staff approval.~~

~~Vote: Mr. Kownacki, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes.~~

~~[Motion carried 4-0]~~

## **INFORMAL REVIEW CASE**

### **1. 110-112 S. Riverview Street, 21-019INF, Informal Review**

A request for an informal review and feedback to demolish a two-family residence and construction of ±3,000-square-foot, single-family residence. The 0.589-acre site is proposed to be subdivided into two lots, zoned Historic District, Historic Residential. The site is east of S. Riverview Street, ±75 feet south of the intersection with Pinneyhill Lane.

### **Staff Presentation**

Mr. Hounshell stated that this is a request for an Informal Review with non-binding feedback for 110 and 112 S. Riverview Street. The 0.589-acre site, which is zoned HD-HR, Historic Residential, is located southeast of the intersection of S. Riverview Street and Pinneyhill Lane. The site has a significant grade change moving west to east from S. Riverview Street to the Scioto River and contains a number of mature trees. The eastern portion of the site lies within a floodplain, and a 24-foot storm easement extends along the northern portion. Consequently, the only developable land on the site is the western half -- where the existing structure is located. [Photos of adjacent properties shown for site context.]

### History

In November 2018, the Architectural Review Board informally reviewed an application for a potential demolition and new construction of a new 3,000-square-foot single-family home. The proposed ranch home was generally within the footprint of the existing home. The Board was supportive of a proposed demolition and construction of a new home. They were not supportive of the proposed 3-car attached garage on the northern portion of the site, as they believed it was not appropriate within the District. Subsequent to that review, no formal application was made for the demolition or development. On February 22, 2021, City Council approved amendments to the Architectural Review Board section of the Zoning Code, which removed the Historic District from the Bridge Street District and established updated zoning requirements; that legislation became effective March 23, 2021. The Code provides specific guidelines for development within the Historic District. At the same meeting, City Council also approved an area rezoning, removing Historic Districts from the Bridge Street District, including the Historic Transitional District on the northern portion of the Historic District. The Code amendment also provided more requirements for demolition.

Approval of demolitions within the District are now based on whether a structure is designated Contributing or Non-Contributing by the 2017 Historic and Cultural Assessment. The applicant is seeking Commission feedback regarding a potential demolition request and the construction of a single-family home. The site currently contains a 1966 two-family, brick ranch duplex. Although the structure is not included on the Ohio Historical Inventory, it was considered Contributing by the Historic and Cultural Assessment. The applicant will be required to provide documentation that the structure meets the demolition criteria before pursuing future demolition approval by the ARB.

#### Site Plan

The applicant is proposing to split the existing lot into two developable lots, with the approval of demolition of the existing home. The lot split can be approved administratively by Planning and Engineering staff, as long as it meets the requirements of the Historic District Guidelines for new lots. Both lots will meet the required minimum lot standards. The applicant is proposing to develop the northern of the two lots, which will be approximately 0.33 acres in size, and located immediately south of the 24-foot storm easement. The proposal is for an approximately 2,900-square-foot, cottage-style home with a 1.5-story mass along S. Riverview Street. The proposed structure will be set back approximately 10 feet from S. Riverview Street, meeting the minimum front yard setback requirement for homes on the east side of that street. It will also have a 4-foot side setback from the southern property line where 3 feet is the minimum requirement. The form of the home is a multi-pitched, side-gabled roofline interrupted by a front-gable, two-car garage; a center front gable for the main portion of the home; and a front door recessed into the front elevation. The primary materials will be horizontal siding, vertical board and batten and a stone foundation. Window selections throughout the home contain two-over-two windows, two-over-three windows, one-over-three windows and single panel windows. The new Code requires attached, front-loaded garages to be set back 20 feet from the front elevation of the home. Currently, the location is aligned with the front elevation, which would require ARB approval of a Waiver with the Minor Project application. The east elevation of the home will have a street level balcony and a lower level balcony within the same footprint. The south elevation reflects a stone-clad chimney and a step-down stone foundation from the front to the rear of the home. Per the new Historic District Code, the maximum height for homes within this district has been lowered from 35 feet from grade to 24 feet from grade. Due to the significant grade change, the height of the rear elevation likely will exceed the height requirement; therefore, a waiver would need to be approved with the Minor Project application.

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

- 1) Does the Board support demolition of the existing home?
- 2) Does the Board support the proposed site layout?
- 3) Does the Board support the proposed mass and scale of the home?
- 4) Does the Board support the conceptual architectural character and details of the home?

#### **Applicant Presentation**

Heather Frient, property owner/applicant, 110-112 S. Riverview Street, Dublin, stated that their intent is to build a house that is in alignment with other homes within the neighbourhood in regard to size and architecture. They are interested in giving someone else the opportunity to build in this neighbourhood, as well. For that reason, as well as economic purposes, they would like to split the lot for two homes.

#### **Board Questions**

Mr. Cotter stated that he reviewed the history provided on the case. The Cultural Assessment was completed in 2017, and in the ARB's 2018 review of a previous application for this site, the structure was

identified as Non-Contributing but eligible to be considered Contributing. What has changed from 2018 to now?

Ms. Martin responded that nothing has changed since 2018, other than staff's experience in reviewing and administering the Cultural Assessment, which lists the property as recommended "Contributing." The reason that a designation of "recommended" was used at the time was to provide the City some latitude in administering the document. Ultimately, City Council did adopt the document and affirmed the recommendations. All of the integrity markers are met for this property. Essentially, the main difference is staff's understanding of the administration of the document; the property now is considered Contributing.

Ms. Krumb stated that 2018 was a transition year. This report made a general recommendation to expand the years of significance for the Historic District property assessment up to 50 years -- including homes up to 1967, thereby including Mid-Century Modern homes. In her assessment, the Mid-Century Modern ranches in the older section of the District are not contributing, although Mid-Century Modern ranches within the Monterey Drive area would more accurately be considered Contributing.

Mr. Alexander stated that the staff report identifies issues with asbestos, lead paint, windows and foundation issues. To what extent are those issues?

Ms. Frient responded that based on the year in which the house was built, their assumption is that lead paint and asbestos is present. They did not have that tested, however. Their assessment of the windows is a visual assessment.

Andy Melaragno, Melaragno Design Company, 4138 Greensview Dr, Columbus, OH 43220, commented on issues of disrepair. If the intent was to occupy the house long-term, there are several issues of disrepair that would need to be addressed. Overall, the house is not in good condition. Repairing the foundation alone would be significant.

### **Public Comments**

Mr. Alexander stated that the Board received three letters of support from people within the vicinity. He does not believe they need to be read publicly; he inquired if any Board member preferred they be read. [No member requested they be read.]

No additional public comments were received, subsequent to the letters.

### **Board Discussion**

#### *1) Does the Board support demolition of the existing home?*

Mr. Alexander stated that because the structure is identified as Contributing, the applicant would need to meet the following criteria for demolition:

- providing credible evidence of economic hardship; or
- evidence that this is a Non-Contributing structure.

Mr. Hounshell stated that because the structure has been assessed as Contributing to the District, the applicant could request a waiver or present a case for considering it Non-Contributing.

Ms. Krumb stated that as an architectural historian, her opinion is that it is not a Contributing structure. However, if the applicant proceeds with the designation of Contributing, she believes they should be able to meet the criteria for demolition.

Mr. Cotter stated that he read the document concerning the criteria for a designation of Contributing, and he had difficulty identifying any of the necessary markers. Providing evidence of being Non-Contributing would seem to be the best way forward.

Mr. Kownacki stated that this house is not an outstanding example of Mid-Century Modern. He would be supportive of a waiver for demolition.

Mr. Alexander stated that if the applicant can meet one of two criteria, the option exists for demolition; however, he does not yet see credible evidence of economic hardship. The Board hears cases regularly for renovation projects. He believes it is a usable building, and demolishing it would be a waste of materials and an unnecessary addition of building product to the landfill. This building could have another life. The current structure is actually better sited and utilizes the topography better than the proposed building. It also has more in common with the houses that are built along that ridge. There are some positive aspects of the structure, as well as the fact that it is considered Contributing by the City's guiding documents. However, he is willing to look at evidence of economic hardship.

Mr. Cotter inquired if it would be necessary for the applicant to hire a professional to identify elements validating that the structure should be considered Non-Contributing.

Mr. Hounshell responded affirmatively. That would be necessary, if they were requesting a waiver. However, they would also need to meet the criteria for obtaining demolition approval.

Mr. Cotter inquired if the ARB would be the reviewing body for both a waiver and a demolition request.

Mr. Hounshell responded affirmatively.

*2) Does the Board support the proposed site layout?*

Mr. Cotter inquired if the lot were split, would there be sufficient space on the second lot for a similar building.

Mr. Hounshell responded that the proposed lot split would meet the minimum requirements of the Historic District. However, he does not know if the same footprint would fit on the second lot.

Ms. Kramb inquired if the southern lot would be slightly smaller than the northern lot.

Mr. Hounshell responded affirmatively. The northern lot contains the entirety of the 24-foot storm easement, so the developable area is less than the southern lot.

Ms. Kramb inquired if three feet is the minimum sideyard setback, would the second home be permitted to build within three feet of either side property line.

Mr. Hounshell responded that the minimum sideyard setback is three feet and there must be a combined minimum between homes of 12 feet.

Mr. Kownacki inquired about the waiver that would be necessary for the garage as it is currently aligned with the front elevation. It would not be possible to set the garage back because the topography is so severe.

Mr. Alexander responded that in his previous experience with a home next to the river having an even greater grade drop, a precast concrete plank was used on the garage floor. Although it was an atypical residential structure and costly, it did provide the opportunity to have usable, accessible space at that level, without the use of gravel. Another option would be to build a retaining wall for the back wall of the garage and fill up the difference with gravel or compacted fill on which to build the garage slab. Although the topography is a challenge, there are ways in which to address it. If this were to remain one lot, it would be possible to separate the garage visually to a greater extent. The spirit of the Code could be met, not by pushing the garage back, but by creating greater separation. Either a connector or a detached garage would be an option.

Mr. Kownacki inquired the required garage setback from the front of the house.

Mr. Hounshell responded that front-loaded garages are required to be 20 feet from the front elevation of building.



Mr. Cotter stated that the location of the house on the site is reasonable. He is not sure if the home meets the 24-foot height requirement; due to the grade, it would appear that the rear elevation will require a height waiver. The garage location will be a challenge.

Ms. Kramb stated that she is concerned about splitting the lot. She is unsure how usable the southern lot would be. It will be difficult to find anyone who will want to build on that lot due to the size limitation. There would be approximately 72 feet frontage for the southern lot, and it will be necessary to meet the requirement for combined 12-foot sideyard setbacks. That would result in a home approximately 60 feet in width, and it cannot be deep, due to the slope of the lot. The second home will be quite close to the home on the northern lot. Therefore, if the applicant proceeds with an application for consideration, it should include a feasibility analysis regarding what could be built on the southern lot, including the possible square footage of the structure. Her preference would be that it remain one lot with one house and more space; however, she might be able to support a lot split with more information provided.

Mr. Kownacki stated that a positive element about the potential lot split is that it would reduce the potential size of the homes that could be placed there. Smaller homes on that street would be preferable.

Mr. Kownacki stated that he is unsure if the financial feasibility of constructing a home on the southern lot would be within the purview of the ARB.

Mr. Alexander stated that the only item of concern to him is the garage. The goal is to emphasize the front of the house and de-emphasize the garage. Since a 20-foot setback of the garage from the front façade is not possible on this site, de-emphasizing the garage in some way is a possibility.

*3) Does the Board support the proposed mass and scale of the home?*

Mr. Cotter stated from the front, the mass looks good. The garage is a separate issue. The front elevation of the 1.5-story home should be less than the 24-foot minimum height, but the rear elevation will exceed the height requirement. The pylons/pillars do not look sufficiently substantial. He believes the height issue can be addressed, so he has no issue with the mass and scale.

Ms. Kramb stated that she is supportive of the mass and scale. She appreciates that it is a small house, and she could support a rear height waiver due to the slope.

Mr. Kownacki stated that what he appreciates about the house is that its size is not obvious from the front. Although it is almost 3,000 square feet, it does not appear to be that large from the front. He wonders if the home were sited closer to the front property line, if it would be possible to push the garage back just a few feet to achieve more separation.

Mr. Alexander stated that he also would support a height waiver for the rear elevation. It is not fair to apply that criteria on steeply sloping sites. If it meets the height requirement at the front, it is fine. He is generally fine with the mass and scale.

*4) Does the Board support the conceptual architectural character and details of the home?*

Mr. Alexander suggested the elevations be discussed individually.

West and north elevations

Mr. Alexander stated that he agrees with most of the comments in the consultant's report about the elevations. West elevation: he appreciates the attempt to separate the house into two sections: the larger, primary living space; and the smaller garage and connector with a window. However, the materials do not

provide differentiation. The board and batten siding blurs any distinction of the area inside the porch and the space beyond the porch. He does not agree with the consultant's recommendation to eliminate the board and batten completely, but it would be more complementary if the board and batten was just within the porch itself. On the north elevation: he has concerns about the change in fenestration. He would recommend a structural engineer be involved in the design process before final drawings are submitted. He also is concerned about the columns. The column in the corner may change, and the other columns may not be necessary. If they are retained, they should have relationship to the division up above. The pieces do not seem to work together as well as they could; the elevations need to be more unified.

Mr. Cotter stated that he likes the two materials on the west, front elevation, including the board and batten. Perhaps, they could be handled in a slightly different manner architecturally. On the north elevation, the stepdown of the stone foundation looks strange. He agrees that the siting of the pillars does not look correct. In addition, the windows do not line up; they should be more synergistic with the remainder of the structure. If the stone material extended all the way across the elevation, the home would appear to be set on a sturdy base.

Mr. Kownacki stated that he is not qualified to speak to the structural matters, but most of the north and south elevations will not be visible. While it would be preferable if the stone lined up, he has no issue with the proposed stepdown. He has no issue with the use of the board and batten; he likes the appearance of the house.

Ms. Kramb stated that she has no concerns with the west, front elevation, although it would be preferable to offset the garage slightly. She cannot detect how the windows are different, so has no issues with those on the west elevation. On the north elevation, she does not believe the pillars will be sufficient; something much more substantial will be needed at the corner to hold the weight. One way of continuing the stone, could be to make that a stone pillar. However, the pillar issue will be resolved during the design stage as they define something more substantial to accommodate the weight. The window configuration on the porch does not need to be the same configuration as on the house, as long as it clearly looks like a porch. A complementary window type is fine.

#### East and south elevations

Ms. Kramb stated that it is difficult to tell how wide the rear porches will be; those issues will be worked out during design. Her preference would not be the stepped stone foundation; she would prefer a consistent line across. She does not believe the cantilever is a problem. The window in that small section seemed large compared to the others on that elevation. However, these minor items can be worked out; she likes the architecture.

Mr. Kownacki stated that he has no issue with the stepped foundation of the south elevation and likes the continuation of the board and batten on the east/rear elevation.

Mr. Cotter stated that while he also prefers a straight line for the stone foundation, overall, he likes the proposed architecture.

Mr. Alexander stated that he also agrees with the consultant in regard to continuing the stone straight across; it would help break up the mass on that side elevation. He also agrees with the suggestion to bring the stone of the chimney down, marrying it into the stone at the base, and thereby breaking up the solid mass at the corner. He would suggest that if grids are used in the windows on the front and sides, they also should be used on the entire house, with the porch being the exception. Applying the grids in one area, alluding to something historic, resembles false historicism, which the Code prohibits.

Mr. Alexander inquired if the applicant had any questions.

Mr. Melaragno stated that he would like to seek clarification regarding some of the Board members' comments. In regard to the board and batten – would it be acceptable to use it on the hyphen and use horizontal siding on the porch, thereby distinguishing the hyphen from the rest of the house?

Mr. Alexander stated that the Board has provided suggestions only. However, Mr. Melaragno's suggestion would address the issue of differentiating the hyphen from the porch itself. Although the Board has provided some suggestions, they are not requirements.

Mr. Melaragno stated that, at this point, the proposed columns were conceptual placemarkers. He would be consulting with a structural engineer, focusing on the size, shape and details of the columns. In regard to the garage setback, the proposed front setback is 10 feet from the right-of-way. Due to the slope, the foundation, cantilevers and garage depth, there is a need to keep the foundation as reasonable as possible; farther back, the slope on the site becomes more steep. The intent was to keep the rear elevation as close as possible to the street and within the reasonable grade. Perhaps the front elevation could be pulled forward slightly and the garage location could remain where it is proposed.

Ms. Krumb responded that she would be supportive of that suggestion; it would be helpful to provide one to two feet of separation.

Mr. Kownacki stated that he has not visited the site, but the grade drop in that area is steep. The applicant can decide if the suggestions that have been offered are feasible. Moving the house forward slightly would provide the illusion of separation; however, he would not vote to disapprove if that is not possible.

Ms. Krumb stated that a waiver will be necessary, regardless, as the garage is not set back 20 feet from the front elevation. She is supportive of a waiver.

Mr. Melaragno stated that the porch windows have been addressed. The original intent was to match what they now have in their sunroom – quadruple-hung, which maximizes the opening space but permits some winterization. They have since determined that the windows will be eliminated, and this will be a screened porch. The columns will be appropriate for the foundation space below. The consultant's report recommended sash or double-hung windows as opposed to casement windows. At the back of the house, they are attempting to maximize the view. Eliminating the grids on those windows was to provide an unobstructed view. Because the rear of house is visible only from the ravine, hopefully, that is acceptable. He inquired the Board consensus on the cantilevers. The cantilevers facilitate their effort to keep the foundation as small as possible.

Mr. Alexander stated that he has no objection to the cantilevers. While he does prefer consistent grids, he does not agree with the consultant's recommendation against the use of casement windows. There are many examples of historic homes with casement windows. In fact, he believes the casement window is a good choice for a smaller window type.

Mr. Cotter and Mr. Kownacki indicated that they have no objection to the cantilevers or casement windows. Mr. Kownacki inquired the reason they suggested grids for the front of the home.

Mr. Melaragno responded that it was to create a more homey, less sterile look. Little details make a house more interesting.

Ms. Krumb stated that she has no objection to their use of casement windows.

Mr. Melaragno thanked the Board for their very helpful input.

## **NEW CASE**

### **2. 53 N. High Street, 21-007MPR, Minor Project Review**