



RECORD OF ACTION

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, September 25, 2024 | 6:30 pm

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

4. COhatch Riverview Village 24-110Z

Rezoning

Proposal: Request for review and recommendation of approval of a rezoning from HD-HR, Historic District – Historic Residential and HD-HP, Historic District – Historic Public to HD-HC, Historic District – Historic Core. The combined ±0.86-acre site is located on both sides of N. Riverview Street, south of North Street and north of Wing Hill Lane.

Request: Review and recommendation of approval for a rezoning under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.234.

Applicant: Megan O’Callaghan, Dublin City Manager

Planning Contact: Bassem Bitar, AICP, Deputy Director of Planning

Contact Information: 614.410.4635, bbitar@dublin.oh.us

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/24-110

MOTION: Ms. Cooper moved, Ms. Damaser seconded to recommend a Planning and Zoning Commission recommendation of approval with no conditions to City Council.

VOTE: 5-0

RESULT: The rezoning was recommended for approval and forwarded to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

RECORDED VOTES:

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

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Bassem Bitar, AICP, Deputy Director of Planning





RECORD OF ACTION

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, September 25, 2024 | 6:30 pm

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

3. COhatch Riverview Village 24-109PDP

Preliminary Development Plan

Proposal: A Preliminary Development Plan for a mixed-use development. The combined 0.86-acre site is located on both sides of N. Riverview Street, south of North Street and north of Wing Hill Lane.

Request: Review and approval of a Preliminary Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.176 and the *Historic Design Guidelines*.

Applicants: Matt Davis, COhatch
Megan O'Callaghan, Dublin City Manager

Planning Contact: Bassem Bitar, AICP, Deputy Director of Planning

Contact Information: 614.410.4635, bbitar@dublin.oh.us

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/24-109

MOTION 1: Ms. Damaser moved, Ms. Patt-McDaniel seconded approval of a Parking Plan with no conditions.

VOTE: 5-0

RESULT: The Parking Plan was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

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

MOTION 2: Ms. Cooper moved, Ms. Damaser seconded to approve the following Waiver:

Waiver to Code Section 153.174(j)(1): Permitted materials are stone, manufactured stone, full depth brick, brick veneer... Other high-quality synthetic materials may be approved by the Board with examples of successful high-quality installations in comparable climates.

To Permit: The use of TimberTech for decks and staircases (62 N. Riverview Street and the New Building).

VOTE: 5-0

RESULT: The Waiver was approved.



RECORDED VOTES:

Lisa Patt-McDaniel Yes
Sean Cotter Yes
Martha Cooper Yes
Michael Jewell Yes
Hilary Damaser Yes

MOTION 3: Ms. Cooper moved, Ms. Damaser seconded approval of the following Waiver:

Waiver to Code Section 153.174(D): Windows shall be wood, metal-clad wood, or vinyl-clad wood. ARB may approve high quality synthetic materials with examples of successful, high quality installations in comparable climates; windows shall have architecturally appropriate lintels and projecting window sills.

To Permit: To use Aluminum Windows with no lintels and projecting sills (62 N. Riverview Street – North Addition, and New Building).

VOTE: 5-0

RESULT: The Waiver was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Lisa Patt-McDaniel Yes
Sean Cotter Yes
Martha Cooper Yes
Michael Jewell Yes
Hilary Damaser Yes

MOTION 4: Mr. Jewell moved, Ms. Damaser seconded approval of the following Waiver:

Waiver to Code Section 153.174(B)(4)(c): Principals roofs shall not be sloped less than 6:12; minor roofs shall have a pitch greater than 3:12... unless determined to be architecturally appropriate by ARB.

To Permit: Shallower roof pitches at porches, canopy and altered/rebuilt additions at 37, 45, 53, and 62 N. Riverview Street

VOTE: 5-0

RESULT: The Waiver was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Lisa Patt-McDaniel Yes
Sean Cotter Yes
Martha Cooper Yes
Michael Jewell Yes
Hilary Damaser Yes

MOTION 5: Ms. Damaser moved, Mr. Jewell seconded approval of the Preliminary Development Plan with the following conditions:



- 1) That the individual parts of the three parcels to be conveyed to the applicant on the east side of N. Riverview Street be combined into one parcel in order to meet the minimum lot size requirements.
- 2) That the bicycle parking requirements be met with details to be provided at Final Development Plan (FDP).
- 3) That Tree preservation and landscape plans be finalized at FDP, including any alternatives to the street tree requirements.
- 4) That reconstruction of the historic stone wall on the east side of N. Riverview Street be maximized to the extent possible, with details provided at FDP.
- 5) That the surface below the new building's southern gable on the west elevation be further articulated at FDP to better correspond to its surroundings and address applicable Code standards.
- 6) That the roof details of the north addition at 62 N. Riverview Street be refined to better relate to existing structure and the the mass of the patio roof on the east side be reduced at FDP.
- 7) That the applicant continue to work with staff on reining the design and material details, as noted in the Planning Report, for the structures at 37, 45, 53, and 62 N. Riverview Street to be provided at FDP.
- 8) That additional information about the proposed composite slate roof for the new building be provided at FDP to help determine whether a Waiver allowing its use is warranted.
- 9) That the design details of the proposed plaza and kiosk be provided at FDP.
- 10) That the design details of the patios at the rear of 37, 45 and 53 N. Riverview Street be provided at FDP, including any associated structures, fences, pergolas or other features.
- 11) That the location of the proposed shed at the rear of 53 N. Riverview Street be adjusted at FDP to meet the setback/Waiver requirements, or that the shed be excluded from FDP approval.

VOTE: 5-0

RESULT: The Preliminary Development Plan was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Lisa Patt-McDaniel	Yes
Sean Cotter	Yes
Martha Cooper	Yes
Michael Jewell	Yes
Hilary Damaser	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Bassem Bitar, AICP, Deputy Director of Planning





RECORD OF ACTION

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, March 27, 2024 | 6:30 pm

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

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

Proposal: Mixed-use development on five parcels totaling 2.16 acres. The site is currently zoned HD-HR, Historic District-Historic Residential and HD-P, Historic District-Public.

Location: Both sides of N. Riverview Street, south of North Street and north of Wing Hill Lane.

Request: Review and recommendation of approval of the Concept Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.176 and the *Historic Design Guidelines*.

Applicants: Matt Davis, COhatch and Megan O’Callaghan, Dublin City Manager

Planning Contact: Bassem Bitar, AICP, Deputy Director of Planning

Contact Information: 614.410.4635, bbitar@dublin.oh.us

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/23-131

MOTION: Mr. Jewell moved, Ms. Damaser seconded, to recommend to City Council approval of the Concept Plan with five 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: 4 – 0

RESULT: The Concept Plan was recommended for approval and forwarded to City Council.

RECORDED VOTES:

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

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Bassem Bitar

Bassem Bitar, AICP, Deputy Director of Planning





RECORD OF ACTION

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, March 27, 2024 | 6:30 pm

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

**2. Riverview Village at 37, 45, and 53 N. Riverview Street
23-132-ARB-DEMO Demolition/Background**

Proposal: Demolition of three Background structures. The 0.11, 0.12, and 0.16-acre sites are zoned HD-HR, Historic District-Historic Residential.

Location: Southeast of the intersection of North Street and N. Blacksmith Lane.

Request: Request for review and approval of the Demolition/Background application under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.176 and the *Historic Design Guidelines*.

Applicant: Matt Davis, COhatch and Megan O'Callaghan, Dublin City Manager

Planning Contact: Bassem Bitar, AICP, Deputy Director of Planning

Contact Information: 614.410.4635, bbitar@dublin.oh.us

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/23-132

MOTION: Mr. Jewell moved, Ms. Damaser seconded, to approve the Demolition/Background with one condition:

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

VOTE: 4-0

RESULT: The Demolition/Background was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

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

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:

Bassem Bitar

Bassem Bitar, AICP, Deputy Director of Planning





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]~~

~~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~~



BOARD ORDER

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, February 22, 2023 | 6:30 pm

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

3. Riverview Village at 40 E. Bridge Street, 17, 27, 37, 45, 53, and 62 N. Riverview Street, and PID 273-005564 23-014INF Informal Review

Proposal: A walkable, commercial village of mixed-use development in the north section of the Historic District on a 2.85-acre, multi-parcel site currently zoned Historic District, Historic Residential and Historic District, Historic Public.

Location: Northeast of the intersection of N. Blacksmith Lane with E. Bridge Street.

Request: Informal review and non-binding feedback for a possible future Development under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.176 and the *Historic Design Guidelines*.

Applicants: Matt Davis, COhatch; and Megan O’Callaghan, City Manager, City of Dublin

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

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

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/23-014

RESULT: The Board provided informal feedback on an idea for Riverview Village, a walkable community of makers’ spaces, office buildings, and eating/drinking establishments. Generally, the Board was supportive of rezoning the entire project area to Historic Core. The Board was supportive of a new 10,400 SF office building, depending on design. Although there was room for some flexibility on design. The Board offered greater support for the “minimum density” option relative to the number and size of buildings. There was general support for the demolition of two outbuildings along N. Blacksmith Lane in order to accommodate greater use of that street, pending recommendation of Engineering. Finally, the Board supported the idea of the branding for Riverside Village to extend up Wind Hill Lane.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:

Sarah T. Holt

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



3. Riverview Village, 40 E. Bridge Street, 17, 27, 37, 45, 53, and 62 N. Riverview Street, and PID 273-005564, 23-14INF, Informal Review

Informal review and feedback for a walkable commercial village in the north section of the Historic District. The 2.85-acre site is zoned HD-HR and HP, Historic District - Historic Residential and Historic Public. This site is located northeast of the intersection of N. Blacksmith Lane and E. Bridge Street.

Case Presentation

Ms. Holt stated that the 2.85-acre, multi-parcel site is located on both sides of N. Riverview Street, north of E. Bridge Street. Currently, the site contains seven contributing single-family residences on eight individual lots. The City purchased these properties in early 2021 with the goal of redevelopment. Approval of a future rezoning and Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) would be necessary for the project to proceed. At this point, all existing buildings are legal with their setbacks and lot coverage, based on their pre-existing conditions prior to adoption of the current Code. The uses envisioned for this project would fit within the Historic District – Historic Core zone, rather than the existing Historic Residential and Historic Public zones. New buildings and additions will have to conform to Code requirements. With the PDP, each lot would need to be surveyed to determine exact locations, setbacks, and lot coverages. The existing lots range in size; potential lot coverage if rezoned to Historic Core would be 85 percent. [Description of existing site conditions and structures was given.] The proposal is for the creation of Riverview Village, a mixed-use development for all properties within the project area. Envisioned is a walkable district that has a mix of makers and artists, restaurants, educators, start-up businesses, and growing small businesses.

There are two development options: one is a minimum density and one is a maximum density. The minimum density proposal includes: parking on Blacksmith Lane; pedestrian access on Wing Hill Lane; a new 10,400 SF office building on the currently vacant lot south of 62 N. Riverview; potential removal of the three south properties from the project; addition of decks/eating areas to 62 N. Riverview for a restaurant or outdoor venue; potential to remove 53 N. Riverview Street; addition of new outbuildings. The maximum density proposal includes the same features, plus additions to 40 E. Bridge Street, 17 N. Riverview and 37 N. Riverview Street, and a new structure located between 45 and 53 N. Riverview Street. If the site is rezoned to Historic Core, the minimum lot sizes would be 21,000 SF. The proposed COhatch office building located south of 62 N. Riverview is conceptually shown as a series of three interlocking boxes with off-set gables, located along the uppermost lot edge adjacent to N. Riverview Street. Conceptual materials include vertical board and batten siding and possibly a standing seam metal roof. It is anticipated that the architecture would be similar to the existing COhatch building on North Street, which could be appropriate given the campus-like nature of the project, proximity to the river and the Link Bridge, and screening with natural vegetation.

Staff has provided the following discussion questions:

- 1) Does the Board support the proposed design concept for the N. Riverview Street area?
- 2) Does the Board support the rezoning from Historic Residential and Public to Historic Core? Would the Board support 17 and 19 N. Riverview Street and 40 E. Bridge Street being kept as Historic Residential as an option?
- 3) Does the Board support the addition of a 10,400 SF office building south of 62 N. Riverview, and what is the Board's reaction to potential scale and massing?

- 4) Does the Board support the proposed inspiration material palette? Would the Board support the new office building to appear similar to the existing COhatch building?
- 5) Does the Board support the proposed infill building options for location, scale, massing, and number?
- 6) Does the Board support the potential demolition of the historic outbuildings along N. Blacksmith Lane to allow for vehicular traffic and parking?
- 7) Would the Board support the potential demolition of the house at 53 N. Riverview?

Applicant Presentation

Matt Davis, 4620 Hickory Rock Drive, Powell, OH and Tim Li, 401 W. Town Street, Columbus, OH were present.

Mr. Davis stated that they submitted this project last July in response to a City RFP for a walkable district, highly community engaging and interfacing with the park. Their project is conceptual only at this point, so they are seeking the Board's input. To date, they have had several meetings with City staff. 70-80% of their proposed plan is very flexible, but some elements are necessary for the plan to move forward. The most important element to make this project work is the view from The Link Bridge. Additionally, the view of the red house at 62 N. Riverview from the bridge would be an attractive entrance into this district. There must be sufficient critical mass and desirability for people to be attracted to this area, as there will be limited parking. The new office building on the cliff overlooking the river would also be essential to make the project feasible. He believes the 53 N. Riverview structure is essentially unusable. Due to its small footprint and low ceiling, it is the least useful building on the site. He is interested on having the Board's feedback on the proposed massing and the options concerning 53 N. Riverview Street.

Board Questions for Applicant

Mr. Cotter requested clarification of the critical pieces of the development to the applicant.

Mr. Davis responded that the critical pieces are the office building, the view from The Link Bridge and the red house at 62. N. Riverview. He suggested possible uses for the other homes within the project area.

Public Comment

Scott Haring, 3280 Lily Mar Ct. Dublin, OH stated that he was unaware that a future rezoning of this area was being considered. He is concerned about the proposed density. A proposed 85% lot coverage would spoil the character of this street, which has contained individual houses for many decades. The potential rezoning is the greater question here.

Mr. Alexander stated that the position the City is in is that there is no market for these structures as single-family homes, so another option for this area must be considered.

Board Discussion

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

- 1) Does the Board support the proposed design concept for the N. Riverview Street area?
The Board indicated support for the proposed design concept.

- 2) Does the Board support the rezoning from Historic Residential and Public to Historic Core? Would the Board support 17 and 19 N. Riverview Street and 40 E. Bridge Street being kept as Historic Residential as an option?

The Board was supportive of rezoning the entire area as opposed to keeping three structures as Historic Residential. Rezoning the entire area would present more coverage opportunities.

- 3) Does the Board support the addition of a 10,400 SF office building south of 62 N. Riverview Street, and what is the Board's reaction to the potential scale and massing?

Mr. Alexander inquired if in this case, the square footage does not apply to the building footprint, but to the total building area of multiple floors.

Mr. Davis responded affirmatively.

The Board indicated support for the addition of the 10,400 SF office building south of 62 N. Riverview, depending on its proposed design.

- 4) Does the Board support the proposed inspiration material palette? Would the Board support the new office building to appear similar to the existing COhatch building?

Mr. Li clarified that they would not be proposing a structure similar to the existing COhatch building. There were specific reasons for the design of their existing building. This site does not have the same site constraints. They would be suggesting a material palette that would fit into the neighborhood.

The Board indicated that they were tentatively supportive of a more flexible design.

- 5) Does the Board support the proposed infill building options for location, scale, massing, and number?

The Board indicated greater support for the minimum density proposal, although they could support a hybrid of the minimum and maximum density options.

- 6) Does the Board support the potential demolition of the historic outbuildings along N. Blacksmith Lane to allow for vehicular traffic and parking?

Ms. Holt indicated that one of the outbuildings is a duplex privy.

The Board indicated support for demolition for two of the outbuildings; discussion of the historical significance related to the duplex privy would occur with any proposal for demolition. The Board indicated they had no objection to the proposed use of N. Blacksmith Lane, if that is the recommendation of Engineering staff.

- 7) Would the Board support the potential demolition of the house at 53 N. Riverview?

Board members indicated varying support for the potential demolition, noting that there is demolition criteria that must be met for approval.

Mr. Davis inquired if the Board had any objections to extending the brand of Riverview Village up Wing Hill Lane establishing a connection point, using similar light posts, sidewalks and signage.

The Board indicated that they were supportive; it would have the potential of helping the businesses on High Street. The proposed connections in the concept seem appropriate.

COMMUNICATIONS

~~Ms. Holt shared the following:~~



BOARD ORDER

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, January 25, 2023 | 6:30 pm

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

3. Mothballing Historic Roofs at 40 E. Bridge Street, 27, 37, 53, and 62 N. Riverview Street 23-003MPR Minor Project Review

Proposal: Mothballing of historic property roofs in association with the North Riverview Street Project in the area zoned Historic District, Historic Residential.

Location: North of E. Bridge Street and between N. Blacksmith Lane and N. Riverview Street.

Request: Review and approval of a Minor Project under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.176 and the *Historic Design Guidelines*.

Applicants: Brian Ashford, Director of Facilities and Fleet Management; and Tim Elmer, Operations Administrator, City of Dublin

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

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

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/23-003

MOTION: Mr. Jewell moved and Mr. Cotter seconded, to approve the Minor Project with one condition:

- 1) This temporary solution may be required for longer than six months, the projected lifespan of the proposed materials. At that time, the condition of roof felt shall be examined, and replacement may be necessary based on condition and the timeline of the N. Riverview Properties project.

VOTE: 5 – 0

RESULT: The Minor Project was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

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

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:

Sarah T. Holt

89A2805342A848D
 Sarah Tresouthick Holt, AICP, ASLA
 Senior Planner



~~Mr. Jewell moved and Ms. Damaser seconded, to approve the Minor Project.~~

~~Vote: Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Mr. Jewell, yes; and Ms. Damaser, yes.
[Motion Carried 5 – 0]~~

~~The Chair affirmed the Minor Project was approved.~~

~~The Chair indicated Cases three and four will be presented together.~~

3. Mothballing Historic Roofs at 40 E. Bridge Street, 27, 37, 53, and 62 N. Riverview Street, 23-003MPR, Minor Project Review

The Chair stated this application was a request for mothballing of historic property roofs in association with the North Riverview Street Project from the City of Dublin Facilities Division. The sites are zoned Historic District, Historic Residential and located north of E. Bridge Street and between N. Blacksmith Lane and N. Riverview Street.

4. Carport Demolition at 40 E. Bridge Street, 23-004ARB, Architectural Review

The Chair stated this application was a request for Demolition of a non-contributing structure/carport at an existing home on a 0.319-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic Residential. The site is located northeast of the intersection of N. Blacksmith Lane with E. Bridge Street.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Holt stated these two cases are part of the larger, N. Riverview Project and presented the sites involved [aerial view]. West of N. Riverview Street is zoned Historic Residential, east of N. Riverview is zoned Historic Public, and to the west of the project it is zoned Historic Core. The address of 40 E. Bridge Street is part of both applications. The structure's roof will be repaired and carport demolished. Not included properties involve like-for-like maintenance related to standing-seam, metal roofs.

In January 2021, the City purchased all these properties for redevelopment opportunities. In April 2021, Council appointed an Advisory Committee who indicated support to create a Request for Proposal (RFP) for the project. In June 2022, the RFP was advertised. In September 2022, the Advisory Committee recommended a proposal to City Council, which was accepted. The City is currently working with the chosen developer.

Photographs were shown of the five properties with the deteriorating structures all in fair to poor condition as reported by CTL Engineering in 2020. The structure at 40 E. Bridge Street is suffering interior damage due to leaks. The non-compliant and non-contributing carport was shown for the demolition request for 40 E. Bridge Street.

The application was reviewed against the Minor Project Review Criteria. Staff recommended approval with the following condition:

- 1) This temporary solution may be required for longer than six months, the projected lifespan of the proposed materials. At that time, the condition of roof felt shall be examined, and replacement may be necessary based on condition and the timeline of the N. Riverview Properties project.

The application was reviewed against the Demolition Review Criteria. Due to the age of the structure and the detractor from the historic character, Staff recommended approval. Two separate motions are being requested.

Questions for Staff

Mr. Cotter – He confirmed the material will keep the structures safe until the proposal is completed as part of this larger project.

Applicant Presentation

Brian Ashford, Director of Facilities stated he did not have a presentation.

Public Comment

There were no public comments received.

Board Discussion

As there was no further comments, the Chair called for the motions.

Ms. Cooper moved and Mr. Jewell seconded to approve the Demolition of the carport at 40 E. Bridge Street.
Vote: Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Mr. Jewell, yes; and Ms. Damaser, yes.
[Motion carried 5 – 0]

Mr. Jewell moved and Mr. Cotter seconded, to approve the Minor Project with one condition.
Vote: Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Mr. Jewell, yes; and Ms. Damaser, yes.
[Motion carried 5 – 0]

The Chair affirmed the Minor Project was approved.

Communications

- ~~Ms. Holt thanked Emily Goliver for sitting in for Laurie Wright to record the meeting's proceedings. She introduced Ms. Rati Singh as the new Planner I for the division. She is an architect with a lot of project management experience.~~
- ~~Ms. Holt noted the year-end report.~~
- ~~Ms. Cooper will not be able to attend the February meeting.~~
- ~~Mr. Jewell will not be able to attend the February and March meetings.~~

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 8:03 p.m.

Gary Alexander
Chair, Architectural Review Board

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Held

September 26, 2022

Page 7 of 14

OTHER BUSINESS

- **Proposed 2023 Council Meeting Schedule**

~~Vice Mayor De Rosa stated that the retreat for 2023 will be two full days instead of an evening and one full day and the retreat will be held April 13 and 14.~~

~~Mayor Fox moved to adopt the 2023 Council meeting schedule.~~

~~Ms. Alutto seconded.~~

~~Vote on the motion: Mayor Fox, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Vice Mayor De Rosa, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes.~~

- **Request for DORA Extension – Founder’s Day**

~~Ms. LeRoy stated that this request is asking for an extra hour for the Founder’s Day event. This would allow the venue to start selling alcohol at noon instead of 1:00 p.m.~~

~~Mayor Fox moved to approve the request for the DORA extension.~~

~~Ms. Alutto seconded.~~

~~Vote on the motion: Mr. Reiner, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Vice Mayor De Rosa, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Mayor Fox, yes.~~

- **N. Riverview Advisory Committee Recommendation**

Ms. Blake provided a brief overview of the properties and the Advisory Committee Members. She stated that the following were goals of the Request for Proposals (RFP):

- Preserve historic nature and mass of North Riverview Street;
- Rehabilitate/renovate/redevelop the Properties, which have fallen into disrepair, so they can contribute to the beauty of Historic Dublin;
- Enhance the neighborhood while respecting the historic character of early Dublin and the Properties themselves;
- Encourage uses that create visitor interest, experiential vibrancy and pedestrian engagement;
- Demolition would require Architectural Review Board (ARB) approval;
- Provide the vision, experience and financial commitment to renovate the Properties in a timely manner;
- Preserve Dublin’s signature historic stone walls on each applicable property; and
- Document historic details and cultural resources prior to any demolition or removal.

There were two proposals received. One RFP was received from Corinthian Fine Homes and one from Community Space Development, LLC dba COhatch (“CSD”).

- Corinthian Fine Homes’ proposal shows nine new single-family homes. They would also renovate and donate 62 N. Riverview Street property back to the City as a park structure or museum. North Riverview Street would be for pedestrian use only.
- Community Space Development LLC COhatch proposal creates “Riverview Village” as a walkable arts and commerce district with renovation of the existing buildings, plus addition of seven new buildings and parking areas. This concept focused on restoring each historic building, adding additional structures along N. Blacksmith Lane and N. Riverview Street, and creating a pedestrian path along N. Riverview Street. This would be a vibrant, walkable, one-of-a-kind destination that would be pedestrian only.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Dublin City Council

Meeting

BARRETT BROTHERS - DAYTON, OHIO

Form 6101

Held

September 26, 2022

Page 8 of 14

Ms. Blake provided a rendering depicting three buildings that would be used for office/commercial in CSD's proposal on property designated as parkland in the Parks and Recreation Master Plan.

The Committee met and reviewed the proposals against the selection criteria. The Committee recommended to Council to select Community Space Development, LLC's proposal for further consideration and to direct staff to further evaluate and negotiate the proposal through the development process. Staff will update Council on the progress of any negotiations in furtherance of a potential Economic Development Agreement as needed. The Committee sought Council's feedback on the inclusion of a portion of designated parkland for office/commercial uses, potential subsidy of maker spaces for financial viability and the vision for the three southernmost properties.

There were no public comments.

Mr. Reiner asked about the return on investment regarding these proposals. Ms. Blake stated that the public improvements needed are not fully known at this point, so calculating the return on investment would be difficult. Mr. Keeler pointed out that the deal breaker is the office building on the parkland. If that is not allowed, the developer cannot make this proposal work. Mr. Keeler reiterated that this would be a destination for residents and visitors.

Mr. Reiner stated that the RFP goals could be accomplished by private people who buy and restore the homes. He stated this would return some money to the City. He suggested auctioning off the homes and still adhering to the RFP goals.

Vice Mayor De Rosa stated that there was a return on investment in the documents. She asked if someone could speak to that. Mr. Stiffler stated that he was not involved in the calculation.

Matt Davis, COhatch was present to speak about the project proposal. He stated that he was trying very hard to not tear down the historic structures. The office building would be COhatch's building expansion. He stated that he was trying to build a vibrant eco-system that would be walkable. The houses that were left could be restored. He stated the overall return on investment would be income tax not property tax.

Ms. Alutto asked about the revenue from leases. Mr. Davis responded affirmatively and then continued his explanation about how just restoring the homes would not bring vibrancy.

Ms. Alutto was in favor of continuing the discussion and considering the parkland use.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that it is important to have the conversation. She stated that steps have been taken to try to spur development, but it has not occurred. Are we going to just keep going with public/private partnerships or will we reach a point where these are self-sustaining?

Vice Mayor De Rosa stated that the village concept is very intriguing. She was asking about density and maintaining the village feel. Ms. Kramb stated that this is too preliminary. It has not even been vetted through ARB with massing and design standards.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated she would be willing to entertain development on the east side.

Mayor Fox stated that this concept could be a central focus of a historic niche with maker spaces and restaurants. She is okay with continuing the discussion about using the parkland. It must be done thoughtfully.

Mayor Fox moved to approve the recommendations of the Advisory Committee and select Community Space Development LLC's proposal for further consideration and to direct staff to further evaluate and negotiate the proposal through the development process.

Ms. Alutto seconded.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Dublin City Council

Meeting

BARRETT BROTHERS - DAYTON, OHIO

Form 6101

Held

September 26, 2022

Page 9 of 14

Vote on the motion: Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Vice Mayor De Rosa, yes; Mayor Fox, yes.

- **Tucci's Tent Request**

Ms. Rauch stated that this is a request for the re-installation of the temporary tent. She gave an overview of the history of the executive orders during the COVID-19 pandemic. During the timeframe of the three extensions that were granted by Council, property owners were notified that a more permanent structure application would need to be filed to go through the ARB process. The final deadline for temporary structures was June 13, 2022. The owner of Tucci's came before Council to request another extension, but Council did not grant a further extension and the June deadline was upheld. In November 2021, the concept plan was approved through ARB with conditions to modify the temporary structure to make it fit more seamlessly into the historic district. Tucci's then came back to ARB in January 2022 with two options for a permanent structure. In July 2022, a preliminary development plan was approved with additional project scope with the addition of a kitchen and a wine room. The applicant is on track for a final development plan review in November 2022. This request is for the reinstallation of the temporary tent for a wine festival. There is an administrative process to apply for an event tent if the applicant so chooses, but it would be a smaller scale tent. Staff recommended Council not consider the temporary tent.

Michael Lusk, 6170 Riverside Drive, spoke as the architect hired by Tucci's for the permanent structure project. He stated that this is the most challenging approval process that he has ever been through. He was complimentary of staff and their support. He was given the deadline of the Memorial Tournament for 2023 and he does not see that as a possibility because of the long approval process. This temporary structure would help to keep the business going as they continue to work through the process.

Mayor Fox stated that staff's recommendation is to not consider the request as the final development plan is pending before ARB.

Mr. Barnum stated that the last few months have been challenging. He is excited about the finished project, but this process has been frustrating. He is asking to bridge the gap to help with the hardship they are going through.

Mayor Fox stated that Council appreciates his investment in the historic district. She noted that she is appreciative of the planning for the permanent structure. She thanked them for coming to the meeting.

- **Art in Public Places (AiPP) Funding**

Mr. Reiner and Ms. Alutto both abstained from the discussion.

Mr. Ranc stated that on May 31, 2022, the City was notified that the State Capital Budget included \$175,000 for a public arts project on Muirfield Drive. The City did not apply for the project funds and was not aware of the request for funds for the Muirfield Drive public arts project. Since May, City staff has worked with the Dublin Arts Council and the Ohio Facilities Construction Commission to understand the scope of the project, the grant requirements, and the best way to approach the project moving forward. Representatives of the Muirfield Association expressed awareness of the grant and interest in it being placed in Muirfield on Muirfield Association land. The grant is administered by the Ohio Facilities Construction Commission (OFCC). Grantee must be a governmental entity or an Ohio non-profit organization with long-term property interest. Fifty percent matching funds are required for the project (\$87,500). The deadline for project completion is June 30, 2024. Staff is approaching this as an opportunity to use this funding as the next Art in