

Parcel 273-000118 **Address** 143 S Riverview St **OHI** N/A

Year Built: 1949	Map No: 128	Photo No: 2162-2165 (7/12/16)
Theme: Domestic	Historic Use: Single family house	Present Use: Single family house
Style: Minimal Traditional	Foundation: Not visible	Wall Type: Frame
Roof Type: Hipped/asphalt shingle	Exterior Wall: Aluminum	Symmetry: No
Stories: 1	Front Bays: 3	Side Bays: 3
Porch: Concrete stoop	Chimney: 1, Interior, on ridge near north side of house	Windows: Double-hung replacements with faux muntins.

Description: The one-story Minimal Traditional-style house has a rectilinear footprint and a hipped roof. The roof is sheathed in asphalt shingles and the exterior walls are clad in aluminum siding. The front door is off-centered on the façade and a second entry is on the north elevation. Windows are double-hung replacements with faux muntins, flanked by fixed shutters on the façade. A detached garage is located northwest of the house.

Setting: The property is located on the west side of S Riverview St. The building sits on an open lawn with minimal landscaping. A dry-laid stone wall extends along the south property boundary.

Condition: Good

Integrity: Location: Y Design: Y Setting: Y Materials: N
 Workmanship: N Feeling: Y Association: Y

Integrity Notes: The house has good integrity

Historical Significance: The building is recommended contributing to the City of Dublin’s local Historic Dublin district and recommended contributing to the recommended Dublin High Street Historic District, boundary increase, which is more inclusive of historic resources in the original village.

District: Yes Local Historic Dublin district **Contributing Status:** Recommended contributing
National Register: Recommended Dublin High Street Historic District, boundary increase **Property Name:** N/A



143 S Riverview St, looking northwest



143 S Riverview St, looking southwest



BOARD ORDER

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, April 27, 2022 | 6:30 pm

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

**1. 143 S. Riverview Street
22-035ARB**

Demolition

Proposal: Demolition of a single-story, single-family home located on a 0.21-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic Residential.

Location: South of the intersection of S. Riverview Street with Pinneyhill Lane.

Request: Review and approval of a Demolition under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.176(J) and the *Historic Design Guidelines*.

Applicants: Lindy and Brad Lyon

Planning Contact: Sarah Tresouthick Holt, AICP, ASLA, Senior Planner

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

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/22-035

MOTION: Ms. Damaser moved and Ms. Cooper seconded, to Table the Demolition request for 143 S. Riverview Street at the request of the applicant.


VOTE: 5 – 0

RESULT: The Demolition request was Tabled.

RECORDED VOTES:

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

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:

 Sarah Tresouthick Holt, AICP, ASLA
 Senior Planner



CASE PROCEDURES

The Chair stated the Architectural Review Board is responsible for review of construction, modifications or alterations to any site in the area subject to Architectural Board Review under the provision of Zoning Code §153.170. This Board has the final decision-making responsibility on cases under their purview. Anyone who intended to address the Board on any of the cases this evening will be sworn in. The agenda order is typically determined at the beginning of the meeting by the Chair, who also stated the procedures of the meeting. The cases in the minutes follow the order of the published agenda. Anyone who addresses the Board will need to provide their full name and address for the record.

The Chair swore in anyone planning to address the Board on any of the cases to be reviewed.

NEW CASES

1. 143 S. Riverview Street, 22-035ARB, Demolition

The Chair stated this application was a request for Demolition of a single-story, single-family home located on a 0.21-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic Residential. The site is south of the intersection of S. Riverview Street with Pinneyhill Lane.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Holt presented aerial views of the site including the existing house and detached garage. The proposal this evening is a request to demolish the house, only. The house was built in 1949 and is an example of Minimal Traditional architecture, found to be contributing in 5 out of 7 categories: Location, Design, Feeling, Setting, and Association. The City's historical architect consultant, Preservation Designs LTD, found the building to be contributing in all 7 categories that included Materials and Workmanship.

In November of 2021, an Informal Review for demolition and new home construction was reviewed by the ARB for the applicant. The Demolition information was not complete at the time. The Board encouraged the applicants to explore a sympathetic addition. Tonight, all information has been supplied for only the demolition request.

This site plan from the previously-submitted Informal Review showed the proposed front elevation of the new house, which again is not being reviewed this evening. The site plan included the historic stone wall along the south lot line, which may be one of the oldest stone walls in town. The applicant states the wall is 6 feet from the existing house. The location of the Landmark tree #790 was noted. Photographs were provided by the applicant that showed the existing stone wall, which is 158 feet in length per the applicant. Photographs of the Landmark, 28-inch Black Walnut tree, were not submitted with this application. Staff had requested information from the applicant about how the existing stone wall would be protected during demolition. The applicant answered silt fencing would be installed.

The overall demolition criteria for contributing structures were discussed in detail along with Staff's analysis.

§153.176(J)(5)(a) – Demolition criteria for contributing structures:

Applicant shall demonstrate credible evidence of economic hardship

1. Will all economically viable use be deprived without demolition?
2. Will reasonable investment-backed expectations be maintained without demolition?
3. Was economic hardship created by or exacerbated by the owner?
4. Factors

- a) Current level of economic return
- b) Recent listings of the property
- c) Alternative uses
- d) Evidence of self-created hardship, including inadequate maintenance
- e) Knowledge of landmark designation at time of purchase
- f) Economic incentives or funding available

Criteria #1 – Not met because the value of the house has increased since the purchase in 2017. The house is habitable and in good condition per the supplied photos and structural analysis. There was no indication of rot or termites and there were no penetrations for plumbing and/or electrical in the floor joists, which were dry, clean, and straight.

Criteria #2 – The applicant was encouraged to explore the option of an addition similar to 94 Franklin Street that was just approved by the Board. That structure was also an example of Minimal Traditional architecture with a detached garage on a similar sized lot. Two letters were shared from two financial institutions (Huntington Bank and National Equity Fund) that each denied the applicant loans based upon “massive renovations.” The information supplied was not presented for appropriateness/comparison with plans that had been presented at the Informal Review in November 2021. Additionally, National Equity Fund is a “leading non-profit, Low-Income Housing Tax Credit syndicator” according to their website.

Criteria #3 - The applicants state they have maintained the property, which is true. Information from Albanese Construction included a cost estimate that included a line item of \$125K for foundation work, which is not necessary for a historically-appropriate addition, per Preservation Designs LTD (PDL). This cost estimate would suggest a second story through the structural assessment but the applicant stated they did not pursue that plan. There was no information included in the cost for demolition on this property. Therefore, there is not a complete picture of a true cost comparison.

Looking further into the economic hardship issue as it relates to foundation costs:

1. The owner excavated portions of the foundation; and
2. Comments made in an email from Criterium Liskay Engineers, stated building on the existing foundation was not advisable (for a two-story addition).

Staff agreed from a preservation-appropriateness standpoint as discussed at the November 2021 hearing because it probably would not meet the intent of the Historic Design Guidelines. Staff disagreed on the end result: the existing foundation was doing its job as intended, for a single-story home. Code does not require reconstruction of the entire foundation, if the original house is not disturbed. This option is open to the applicants. Therefore, this expense/desire may be a self-imposed economic hardship. Photographs from the applicant showed the areas the applicant had excavated the foundation.

Factor (a) Zillow showed a current value (April 4, 2022) at 127% over the purchase price made on May 18, 2017, as confirmed by the Franklin County Auditor.

Factor (b) The property has not been listed for sale or rent since the applicant's purchase in 2017.

Factor (c) Because the property will remain residential per the Zoning Code and Community Plan, there is not feasibility of alternative uses. Again, the applicants were encouraged to pursue an addition but that has not been presented for evaluation and determination.

Factor (d) There was no evidence of hardship due to inadequate maintenance; the house is in good condition.

Factor (e) This property has always been zoned Historic Residential, from the creation of the Historic District and the Franklin County Auditor has historic district designations on their website. The owners state they were not aware of the landmark designation and yet Staff provided proof of the labels in 2020 when the City was updating the Code and Guidelines. Staff stated they also have evidence of labels from 2017, just five months after their purchase of the property.

Factor (f) Staff has not been made aware of economic incentives or funding available for this project.

Based on Staff's analysis and the review by Preservation Designs LTD, disapproval is recommended by Staff for the Demolition Request with the following findings:

- 1) The structure is an excellent example of Minimal Traditional architecture and is found to be contributing in five out of seven indicators on the HCA and seven out of seven according to PDL.
- 2) The applicant has not provided evidence that an appropriate alternative to demolition has been explored. Options exist ranging from a sympathetic addition to selling the property.
- 3) The provided supporting structural information indicates that the foundation is in good condition and appropriate for the current loads. Conflicting information has been provided regarding the need and/or expense of unnecessary foundation work.
- 4) The provided supporting structural information indicates that the roof framing is in good condition. The accompanying photos of the floor joists appear in good condition.
- 5) The lot is large enough to accept a building addition at the back of the existing structure, and this was encouraged at the November 2021 Board hearing.
- 6) The proposed addition, for which the applicant obtained a cost estimate and loan reviews, has not been presented to staff, or the Board, to determine its similarity in size and scope to the November 2021 submittal, so it cannot be evaluated as a direct comparison relative to cost, nor its appropriateness relative to the Code or Guidelines.
- 7) The cost estimates are incomplete, lacking separate demolition information, new home construction costs, and renovation of the existing home with accompanying plans.
- 8) The property has been zoned Historic Residential since at least 2014, and the Planning Division has confirmation that the owners were notified of changes in both 2017 and 2020, and the Franklin County Assessor website states the property is within the Dublin Historic District.

Applicant Presentation

Lindy Lyon, 143 S. Riverview Street, was born and raised in Dublin. This house was purchased just a few months before the couple's son was born. It had previously been a rental property and in rough shape. When they purchased the home, they were not told in any form or fashion that the home had been designated contributing in the area. The assessment was completed in 2016, so even the former owner would have been notified; she stated she was never notified. The applicant stated they were never notified of any unique status that would prohibit them in such a way to limit what could be done with their property and if they had known, they probably would not have purchased the property. She remembered well the day Staff informed them that the house was recommended contributing (August 11, 2021). They had set up a meeting with Staff to discuss their completed new-build architecture plans on that day. She stated that Staff said the architecture plans looked good and Staff did not believe the Board would have any issues. Then the contributing property sheet was shared with the applicant. To say the applicants were in absolute shock was an understatement.

Ms. Lyon – This is a one-story, 1,100-square-foot concrete block house built in 1949 with a small addition in the back, ±100 square feet in size that was most likely added in the 1970's when the aluminium siding was also added to the house. The addition had its own heating system they have never used for fear of a fire. Their home should not be historic because it is not associated with any historic event (battle ground) or associated with a historic significant person, and does not represent the work of a master builder. Staff sighted 5 integrity markers, which were highly debateable and subjective and now it all of a sudden has 7 markers. The stone wall is not historically associated with their house but will be preserved. In response to Staff's presentation and recommendation that the Board to not vote in favor of our demolition request, she wanted to cover a couple of points made. The main one being the applicants are not required to submit architectural plans for a renovation addition for a demolition request. It is not required by Code for demolition hearings. From her research, every demo that has been approved, no architectural drawings or renovation additions were submitted. The structural engineer's report was completely inconclusive because he was not able to access the area needed to properly assess the foundation of the house. The access is 17 inches and protected by a Union that states he cannot go over there even though they are \$500 per hour. He suggested digging holes under certain areas of the structure to try to get an idea of what the foundation was like. Based on the evidence of the holes, he was able to comfortably state a second story would not be feasible. The homeowners never said anything to him about a second story. Just based off the pictures he could confidently say the foundation was not good enough for a second story. His professional advice was without lifting the home at a cost of \$15000 – \$20,000. There was no way to truly know what condition the foundation was in; that was his actual report. Ms. Amy Kramb had told her she could pay anyone to get under there.

She discussed the renovation and addition estimate. It was noted that if the applicant was prohibited to add up on the existing structure, then the cost estimate for the foundation modification are deemed unnecessary. Based on the inconclusiveness of the structural engineer's report, they have no idea what they are getting into once the renovation starts. There was no assurance the foundation will not require extensive finances for restoration. To address the lending letters, National Equity Fund is a lending line focused on acquisition and construction lending and Huntington Bank is one of the larger lending institutions around.

The one thing she was struggling with was the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 that was established and passed primarily to protect our Nation's heritage from rampant federal development meaning saving public landmarks, as the original case involved the demolition of Penn Station in New York City. It was not intended to oppress and limit residential property owners the way it is being used now for their specific situation. Over the past few years in America, countless foundational historic statues have been torn down and removed with little consequence but the applicant believes they are being held to a different standard for their tiny, concrete box. They were told there is all this public benefit and public value to their home; the applicant disagreed. There is no financial assistance to fund their financial hardship they may incur due to the recommended contributing structure. The Board has the authority that rules over each unique situation.

She believed she had a right to fight for a decision that will ultimately affect her family's future and nobody else's regarding their own property. The applicant wanted to build a nice home for their growing family and one that fit the character and quality of the incredible area they live in - appropriate in size and scale and working with the Board to ensure that is truly the end result.

Initial Questions for the Applicant

Only Mr. Alexander had a few questions but first wanted to clarify a few things. Every project where the Board has approved demolition recently, designs were provided by the builder. Everything that has come before this Board for demolition has had a design with it.

Ms. Lyon – A design for a future build but not necessarily for renovations and additions. At 110 – 112 S. Riverview that is diagonal to her property, plans never had to be produced.

Mr. Alexander – Plans were not needed for renovations because they had adequate and very different structural evidence than Ms. Lyon has been able to present or her engineers have been able to present that would be visible above the foundation. It is not a requirement to get into the foundation. Ms. Lyon has suggested that the process has not been done correctly. Each one of those projects reviewed by this Board, there was evidence presented that showed there were foundation problems because there were problems found in the rest of the building as a result of the foundation. In this applicant's case, there has been no evidence yet presented to suggest the foundation is not built to current Code and very clear from the photographs but that is the case in many structures. What has been suggested, is the voids in the applicant's foundation was very common. Voids have not led to cracks up above in the structure. There were no cracks presented that resulted in structural deflections. That would be evidence that the other cases were able to show, therefore, demolition was approved. The Board could see the condition of the building. The applicant met the other guidelines and so drawings were not requested for how they would renovate because they met the standards for demolition. At the applicant's last meeting with this Board, the standards for demolition were not met at that time.

Ms. Lyon – They did not know that; the applicant thought it was just an informal meeting.

Mr. Alexander – The applicant can come back as many times as they want. A lot of people come with incomplete information, initially. That is why it was suggested that maybe the applicant look at renovations. The question for all of us... Staff and the Board see this substantial price for renovating the building and the numbers it is based on, but do not know what the design is the cost is based on. Ms. Holt was accurate when she made the assumption that based on what the engineers said for some thought of building upwards. There are a lot of ways to add to this structure that would not result in the price provided by the applicant. The Board needed an example of the proposal to show what led to that price. Usually, a designer would provide options and alternatives for meeting the client's goals. He asked the applicant if she explored other options that would not result in the cost of what was shared with the Board.

Ms. Lyon – They had not. The main reason for not providing plans/proposal for renovation/addition was because they were told in a private meeting that they needed to use an architect of the Staff's selection, not knowing how much it would cost. They had already interviewed many Dublin architects and found one that was in their budget. The fear was the number of times they will have to return to obtain agreement from this Board. It seems there is a process where you have to have an extended amount of money to prove financial hardship, which seemed unfair.

Mr. Alexander – When the applicant came to the Board before, the Board suggested working with a design professional that has worked in Historic Districts. And even said the applicant could look around this community and see projects that have been approved. Those are also people that know the Code.

Ms. Lyon – If the designer is outside of the budget, they cannot be mandated to use them.

Mr. Alexander – The goal is to find a design that is compatible with Dublin's standards and also find a design that meets the applicant's goals. There are design professionals that can do that.

Ms. Lyon – She agreed but felt like all the power and control with no accountability was given to one side and the applicant is at the mercy of possibly a process that does not want them to succeed.

Mr. Alexander – He was sorry she had that impression.

Ms. Holt – In early December, Staff met with the Lyons and recommended as the Board did, to seek a designer/architect that had experience in a Historic District. As public servants, Staff takes very seriously the concept that Staff cannot recommend specific designers, architects, engineers, and contractors of any type.

Public Comment

Mr. Alexander – He was aware of one favorable response for this proposal.

Ms. Holt – There have been three, which she read into the record.

Public comment from the audience - [Pete Albanese - 4181 MacDuff Way](#) - He was the builder for the Lyons and also part of the family. He put most of the bid together. He would have to lower the foundation to

meet Code. Anything they hit or fix on the inside, means making an adjustment on the outside. This area is comprised of all rock. Bringing in a hoe and digging down is not an option to redo the foundation, besides a historic wall they need to preserve, 6 feet from the house. The bid included additional problems they may incur, yet to be identified. He had tried to be fair with the bid that was completed at the end of Nov/beginning of December. Prices go up on everything for a builder every 60 days and with the shortage of labor the industry is being crushed. He did not see how this house was deemed historic. There is no way the siding, doors and windows are historic. It is hard to comprehend given the neighboring homes on that street. The builder and the applicant believed if they paid enough money to a structural engineer, he could find something wrong with the home. This project needs to be completed within a budget and a different architect is not affordable. He called for more common sense. He did not see how it was possible for this family to stay in that home.

Board Discussion

The Chair suggested starting with the items under the grounds for demolition starting with the question:

1. Will all economically viable use be deprived without demolition?

Mr. Cotter – Just looking at the pictures, not knowing much more, and how it was presented, there are other uses. The applicant could renovate and add onto the rear of the home. He did not see why nothing can be done without a demolition, economically. He needed to know from the construction side, what made other uses not work.

Ms. Damaser – Agreed. She saw no evidence from the applicants in response to that claim that there were no economically viable alternatives. Plus, there is no evidence to show the property cannot be sold. There is no evidence to show an addition on the rear of the home is not feasible.

Mr. Jewell – The focus on the foundation was not enough; he needed to see more information. He wanted to see if there were other thoughts and ideas that have been successful in other locations in this Historic District. There were no apparent structural issues; it is the unknown of what is underground. He wanted to see conceptual ideas explored. He understood it was a home the applicant wanted for their growing family.

Ms. Cooper – At the last meeting, how the front could be preserved and a subordinate addition be added was discussed. Bringing in informal designs was also discussed to obtain more ideas on how this should be addressed. Everything discussed was recorded from that hearing. She appreciated the applicant's frustration and concerns, but the Board had to follow the Code in place and ensure the requirements were met. For the Board to properly serve the City, they have to follow all of the guidelines and the limit of their abilities.

Mr. Alexander – He concurred with those sentiments. In German Village, there are the same issues with one-and-half story structures that are very old, and have foundation issues along with many other problems. He has seen significant additions to those properties; there is a way to minimize the cost by putting the dollars into the new construction, still retain the original building, and at least retain the character of the streetscape. That was part of the reason for the Board and Staff to encourage the applicant to seek design professionals that can help in Historic Districts. Clearly there are ways the applicant could significantly add to this structure and not sustain the costs presented. He does this work every day and did not find the numbers in the cost estimate the Board was presented with. The benefit is, a foundation on stone is a stable foundation. Even though the foundation is shallow in the existing house, that foundation will not heave. Issues with the frost line are very different when one builds on stone then when built on earth. It does not mean the house cannot be used. There was not enough information to even suggest there could be issues with the foundation. From an architectural point of view, and what was written in the Code, he did not see how this first criteria was met.

2. Will reasonable investment-backed expectations be maintained without demolition?

Mr. Cotter – Today, it is a bit difficult to say, given we do not know what the structure is going to look like and therefore, how to rationalize it.

3. Was economic hardship created by or exacerbated by the owner?

Mr. Alexander – It is clear that if there is economic hardship, it has not been created by the applicant; this does not need to be discussed further. Whether or not the applicant believes this house is a great example of the particular architectural style, is beyond the Board's ability to address formally because of the standards that are being established in the Historic District Criteria. Because that was established for the applicant's structure and many others in the District, the Board follows this procedure.

The Chair – Asked Mr. Shamp, legal counsel, Frost Brown Todd if there was anything the Board had not addressed from his perspective for the three criteria discussed so far or anything he had heard.

Mr. Shamp – Agreed with the applicant that there is not a requirement for submitting any plans. That can be considered under the Subsection in the Code talks about the feasibility of alternative uses. That is a way to show why an alternative use is not feasible. That is the only comment he could make regarding the applicant's comments.

The Chair – The Board could vote on this but his sense was he did not believe the request for demolition was going to be approved. The applicant has the choice to keep this case open and table tonight to return to talk with the Board further at a later date.

Ms. Lyon – Requested clarification for what was being asked of her.

Mr. Albanese – Requested clarification on drawings the Board would like to see.

The Chair – There are a couple of options. If the builder still thinks the demolition is viable, even though this Board has not seen evidence, the applicant could return with a lot more evidence suggesting the demolition is viable. The other option is to vote on this and it is probably not going to pass, the applicant would need to return with design studies for a remodeling plan. It is pretty clear right now, it would be a hard case to make:

1. Because of the standards the Board must follow; and
2. Because there is no evidence of the kind of demolition issues that the Board has seen with other properties.

Mr. Albanese – The applicant did not want the Board to vote this evening, and the applicant will return but he was still not clear on expectations. When they return, did the Board want to see plans or concepts?

Ms. Lyon – Asked if they had to use an architect that had experience with Historic areas.

The Chair – The applicant may select an architect of their choosing. The Board has suggested finding an architect that has experience working in Historic Districts, as it makes the process go a lot easier.

Ms. Lyon – That sounds like she will incur economic hardship because she will have to pay for someone without a guarantee that there will be a smooth process and someone that is more expensive than what she would normally choose for her budget. She was also concerned that she will need to meet with the Board several times to make changes that will cost her too much money.

Mr. Alexander – It is the cost of doing business. The applicant has shown an \$800,000 budget. There is a significant amount of documentation that the applicant is proposing for that amount. The architect and the structural engineer are all going to have to prepare and that will be a significant cost out of that budget. The Board has said the applicant is best served selecting someone who has done this kind of work; experience counts.

Ms. Cooper – Clarified that Mr. Alexander was saying the professional with experience in a Historic District will understand the guidelines that are in place. And in this case, the consideration of a subordinate structure, which was discussed at the last meeting, and again today, is still something the Board believes is viable. As a Board, we have not seen enough evidence to support the demolition, as Mr. Alexander has expressed.

Mr. Alexander – As a courtesy, the Board was explaining the applicant has the option to table the case this evening. The applicant proving a demolition is warranted is going to be very difficult.

Mr. Cotter – The Code lays out reasons for a demolition and asks what the risks are if a demolition cannot be approved.

Ms. Lyon – She was concerned if this was an equal process for everyone and would not have to be a “Gazillionaire” to find success in the process. She asked why there is not a designated architect that the Board prefers for the Historic District and pay them to consult, pay them to conduct a tutorial, or have a website that any architect could go to and glean from. She believed she was at a disadvantage for not having unlimited funds.

Ms. Damaser – She told Ms. Lyon that she appreciated her frustration, but applicants and architects alike have access to the Zoning Code and it contains all the information needed. Therefore, any architect could be selected.

Ms. Lyon – There were just seven items in the Code that addressed renovations. Such as the roofline cannot be above the roofline of the original structure. Even though that is in the Code, it may not be true. Three materials are prohibited for additions and one is concrete block. She said that was the significant material used on their original house. At the last meeting, she had asked if the Board would be willing to speak with her architect that was in attendance. Ms. Kramb had stated that is not what the Board does. She stated it was not that they have not tried to find some common ground without having to change their original architect they had selected.

The Chair – There is not much more the Board can say. The applicant has the option to table the case. If the Board votes down the demolition, the applicant can still do an addition or renovation; drawings would be required.

Ms. Lyon – Chose to table and come back another time.

Ms. Damaser moved and Ms. Cooper seconded, to Table the Demolition request for 143 S. Riverview Street at the request of the applicant.

Vote: Mr. Jewell, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; and Ms. Damaser, yes.
[Tabling Approved 5-0]

Mr. Cotter – Asked Ms. Holt if there was a process in the Code to appeal whether a structure should be contributing or not.

Ms. Holt – Confirmed that is part of the Code.

Mr. Cotter – Pointed out to the applicant there is a process, if she chose to appeal whether a structure was contributing.

(Cases 2 and 3 were heard together)

2. Fox in the Snow at 38 W. Bridge Street, 22-034MPR, Minor Project Review

The Chair stated this application was a request for exterior modifications to an existing building on a 0.29-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic Core. The site is northwest of the intersection of W. Bridge Street with Darby Street.



MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, April 27, 2022

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Alexander, Chair, called the April 27, 2022, meeting of the City of Dublin Architectural Review Board (ARB) to order at 6:31 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Chair led the Pledge of Allegiance.

OATH OF OFFICE

Council Member, Andrew Keeler, administered the Oath of Office to an Architectural Review Board Re-appointed Member, Michael Jewell and to a new Board Appointee, Hilary Damaser.

ROLL CALL

Board Members present: Mr. Alexander, Mr. Cotter, Mr. Jewell, Ms. Cooper, and Ms. Damaser
Staff present: Ms. Holt, Ms. Mullinax, and Mr. Jesse Shamp, Legal Counsel

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Mr. Jewell moved, Ms. Cooper seconded, to re-elect Sean Cotter for the role of ARB Vice Chair during the term of April 2022 through March 2023.

Vote: Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Ms. Damaser, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; and Mr. Jewell, yes.
[Motion carried 5-0]

Ms. Cooper moved, Mr. Jewell seconded, to re-elect Gary Alexander for the role of ARB Chair during the term of April 2022 through March 2023.

Vote: Mr. Cotter, yes; Ms. Damaser, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Jewell, yes; and Ms. Cooper, yes.
[Motion carried 5-0]

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Jewell moved, Mr. Cotter seconded, to accept the documents into the record and to approve the March 23, 2022, meeting minutes.

Vote: Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Ms. Damaser, abstain; Mr. Cotter, yes; and Mr. Jewell, yes.
[Motion carried 4-0-1]

3. Fox in the Snow at 38 W. Bridge Street, 22-042MSP, Master Sign Plan

The Chair stated this application was a request for the installation of a ±19-square-foot wall sign for an existing building zoned Historic District-Historic Core. The 0.29-acre site is northwest of the intersection of W. Bridge Street with Darby Street.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Mullinax stated a review and approval was being requested for a Minor Project Review for exterior modifications and a Master Sign Plan for a wall sign, both at 38 W. Bridge Street. She presented an aerial view of the site that included 63 feet of frontage along W. Bridge Street and surrounded by commercial uses. The existing International Style building was built in 1965 and originally served as a U.S. Post Office until 1982. The masonry building features a stone accent wall and a covered entryway on its front façade [current photograph shown]. The building was recommended contributing (HCA 2017). The same entity owns this property as well as the one next door at 50 W. Bridge Street where the J-Liu restaurant is located. The applicant has proposed a coffee shop for the 2,958-square-foot building, along with a unique sign concept, which is the Fox in the Snow's brand. The front of the building faced W. Bridge Street and the rear faced Wing Hill Lane [photographs shown]. Additional existing conditions for the site [photographs] included the east elevation, which faced the Dublin Veterinary Clinic, and the west elevation that faced the J-Liu restaurant.

Minor Project Review

Proposed modifications on the Site Plan included adding landscaped islands throughout the site and replacing dying plants in the existing planted islands. Restriping and reconfiguring the existing parking will include the parking spaces where the ADA parking is located while repairing the ADA ramp. The flag pole and bollards near the front entry will be removed.

Parking required for this site to contain an eating and drinking establishment is 30 parking spaces; 18 spaces are proposed on the site with an additional 12 spaces obtained through a shared parking agreement with 50 W. Bridge Street, J-Liu restaurant. Both sites are owned by the same person so all patrons will have access to the combined spaces between both properties. Staff is in favor of the Parking Plan as presented.

On the south elevation, the applicant proposed to add:

- New steel frame windows and a front entry door (requiring a Waiver);
- Muntins to the storefront windows;
- Cedar planks to the ceiling of the covered entry to address water damage; and
- A trellis system on the existing stone façade to help create the applicant's signature sign concept.

The applicant also proposed to paint the gas meter to match the stone façade to conceal this utility.

Staff supported a Waiver for the steel material. Staff and the City's preservation architect who consulted on the project, did not recommend adding muntins to the storefront windows. The reason cited was "Adding muntins would take away from the simple material aesthetic of the glass, and changing the window proportions alters the overall material composition."

On the east elevation, the applicant proposed to:

- Enlarge the existing opening of the horizontal ribbon window and add muntins;

- Add a new window to the left of the existing window opening

Staff was supportive of using two horizontal rows of windows that match the existing, where the stone sill is retained/repeated, to best honor the architecture.

Staff was not supportive of the muntins as proposed; rather, Staff recommended the muntins be diminished so that they are less visible.

Staff did not support the window opening as its form is not architecturally appropriate for the International Style of architecture.

On the north elevation, the applicant proposed to:

- Clean, repair, or replace the existing blue awning. If replacement is needed, this item will be administratively approved by Staff; and
- Remove the existing non-compliant flood light.

The applicant proposed the following materials and colors:

- RTU screening made by Industrial Louvers, Inc. is an extruded aluminum product, in an anodized clear color to match the era of the building;
- Cedar for the front entry ceiling;
- A&S Steel frame windows and door;
- Jakob GreenGuide Trellis;
- Hubbell Sling Series of lighting for the east elevation;
- 'Repose Gray' paint for the gas meter and piping, which matches the stone;
- 'Rockwood Terra Cotta' paint for the electric meter box and downspout that matches the brick;

Staff supported the Waiver for the Industrial Louvers for RTU screening and the window and door materials proposed.

An approval was recommended for two Waivers:

1. §153.173(I)(10) Alternative Screening Requirement: In lieu of compliance with the requirements of §153.173(I), an alternative approach to accommodate unique site conditions may be approved if the required reviewing body determines that the proposed alternative achieves the aesthetic, environmental, and screening results as well or better than compliance with the standards of §153.06(I).
Request: To permit the use of extruded aluminum material for roof mechanical equipment screening.
2. §153.174(D)(1) Windows Requirement: Windows shall be wood, metal-clad wood, or vinyl-clad wood. The ARB may approve other high quality synthetic materials with examples of successful, high quality installations in comparable climates.
Request: To permit the use of steel framed windows.

An approval was recommended for the Parking Plan as follows:

A total of 30 spaces is required for this site. 18 spaces are on site including 1 ADA space with the additional 12 spaces obtained through a Shared Parking Agreement with 50 W. Bridge Street, J-Liu restaurant. Both businesses are owned by the same person so patrons to each establishment will have access to all spaces combined.

An approval was recommended for the Minor Project with five conditions:

- 1) The site circulation will change with the impacts of the Franklin Street improvements. Within two years, the owner of the properties at 38 and 50 W. Bridge Street, this tenant, and the City, shall make a joint application for a Minor Project to address parking layout, parking space sizes, and circulation; pedestrian circulation; bike parking; landscaping and screening; and dumpster location(s) and required screening at the time of the Franklin Street extension project on both properties;
- 2) If the Franklin Street site circulation project (condition 1) is not completed within 2 years, the dumpster enclosure must be fully screened;
- 3) The square window on the east elevation shall not be approved and muntins on the south façade shall not be approved. The applicant shall work with staff on the arrangement of the horizontal ribbon window on the east elevation, including muntin design, to better respond to the architectural style of the building;
- 4) All items which require maintenance, repair, or replacement, which include but are not limited to, the rear awning, gutters and downspouts, and chipping paint will be fully addressed to the City's satisfaction, within one year; and
- 5) That the applicant work with Staff to administratively approve any color changes to the awning on the north elevation.

Master Sign Proposal

The applicant proposed a 10-square-foot, dimensional wall sign for the front elevation that faced W. Bridge Street located at a height of 6 feet, 4 inches from grade to the top of the sign, and would be mounted to the existing stone wall with 4-inch stainless steel stand-offs attached at the mortar joints. The custom aluminum, powder-coated green sign features a fox painted with white highlights to accentuate the features of the fox, appearing to be diving into the snow for food. There is no dimensional lettering of text, which is the brand image. The fox will be halo-lit from behind, encircled with Boston Ivy, which was part of the tenants brand image. This wall sign would provide visual interest and vibrancy to the streetscape as shown at the other locations. The proposed wall sign deviated from the Code due to its size, custom aluminum sign material, and the fox as the brand image in lieu of dimensional lettering.

An approval was recommended for the Master Sign Plan with the following condition:

- 1) That the applicant apply for permanent sign permits through Building Standards, prior to installing the wall sign.

The future City project - Franklin Street Extension was relative to tonight's discussion but not part of this application. Franklin Street is due to be extended west of 50 W. Bridge Street, starting construction in the spring of 2023. Staff is working with the property owner (Jason Liu) and the City regarding the site changes including parking and circulation of both sites. The changes will NOT affect the shared parking agreement between the two sites. The owner, future tenant, and the City of Dublin will submit a joint ARB application for future site modifications for both sites at the appropriate time.

Questions for Staff

Mr. Alexander – Inquired about the Staff’s request for the muntins to be less visible. He asked if that meant Staff wanted less muntins used or thinner muntins?

Ms. Taylor – Staff deferred to the architect.

Mr. Alexander – Requested further clarification on the windows.

Ms. Taylor – Staff supported the steel to be used instead of the existing aluminum but would like the overall storefront form to remain.

Applicant Presentation

Mr. Rosenthal – Introduced himself as the architect for the applicant. Staff comments make this sound easier than it is. As architects, we are very aware of the International Style of architecture. The first design shared with the client and Staff was definitely reflecting of the International Style and would have been easy to approve. The client did not support that design for their type of business. The design provided in the packet to the Board is what the client ideally wants to have, which is clearly not the International Style of architecture. Lots of people want the steel windows as they are very substantial and nice but there are not many that want to pay the higher price for it. He has looked over this property with many clients over the past four or five years. Their proposal is probably the closest fit from what they have seen, however not a perfect fit. The client would like to replicate the Fourth Street location. His client understood what Staff was proposing was more relevant or accurate to the International Style but what the client proposed was very high quality and could be reversed to the original post office if desired in the future. Something has to be done. The existing door was not original, just insulated glass but all the other glazing was original single pane and anyone would have to replace it with something. From an energy perspective, whoever takes this building over will need to replace the windows. The east façade makes sense for a post office needing a blank wall but probably would not be desired by any other use on Bridge Street. This is where architecture meets commerce. The question is how much the Board will allow deviation from the original structure to accommodate this user or push it down the road and hope to find someone who is willing to use the building closer to what it was originally.

Questions for the Applicant

Mr. Cotter – Windows were on the east façade to aesthetically bring light into the building.

Mr. Rosenthal – He was not clear on what Staff was recommending.

The Board was also unsure of the expectations.

Mr. Jewell – The east façade would be important to a business that would need light in the morning. He understood adding more windows period, due to the type of business it was proposed to be.

Mr. Alexander – Inquired about the purpose of the proposed square window Staff had said should not be approved on the east elevation.

Mr. Rosenthal – To get more light into the intended dining room space and leave the existing header intact. That was the remaining piece that had some flexibility to it from the client’s perspective. There was a fundamental question on the table, which was what the Board could or could not live with more of an industrial sash than what would have been typical on this structure in the 60s. Staff has been great to work with and very helpful but he did not have much confidence that there was a solution that both the client and Staff could live with or what the consultants would agree to.

Mr. Alexander – Suggested a design with less grids. He had visited the Fox in the Snow on North 4th Street. He asked if there was a middle ground because this architect is good.

Mr. Rosenthal – They have drawn many iterations. His client has said if this does not work for Dublin, they will find a different location to do what they wanted to do.

Questions for Staff

Mr. Alexander – Inquired about the Staff’s request for the muntins to be less visible. He asked if that meant Staff wanted less muntins used or thinner muntins?

Ms. Taylor – Staff deferred to the architect.

Mr. Alexander – Requested further clarification on the windows.

Ms. Taylor – Staff supported the steel to be used instead of the existing aluminum but would like the overall storefront form to remain.

Applicant Presentation

Mr. Rosenthal – Introduced himself as the architect for the applicant. Staff comments make this sound easier than it is. As architects, we are very aware of the International Style of architecture. The first design shared with the client and Staff was definitely reflecting of the International Style and would have been easy to approve. The client did not support that design for their type of business. The design provided in the packet to the Board is what the client ideally wants to have, which is clearly not the International Style of architecture. Lots of people want the steel windows as they are very substantial and nice but there are not many that want to pay the higher price for it. He has looked over this property with many clients over the past four or five years. Their proposal is probably the closest fit from what they have seen, however not a perfect fit. The client would like to replicate the Fourth Street location. His client understood what Staff was proposing was more relevant or accurate to the International Style but what the client proposed was very high quality and could be reversed to the original post office if desired in the future. Something has to be done. The existing door was not original, just insulated glass but all the other glazing was original single pane and anyone would have to replace it with something. From an energy perspective, whoever takes this building over will need to replace the windows. The east façade makes sense for a post office needing a blank wall but probably would not be desired by any other use on Bridge Street. This is where architecture meets commerce. The question is how much the Board will allow deviation from the original structure to accommodate this user or push it down the road and hope to find someone who is willing to use the building closer to what it was originally.

Questions for the Applicant

Mr. Cotter – Windows were on the east façade to aesthetically bring light into the building.

Mr. Rosenthal – He was not clear on what Staff was recommending.

The Board was also unsure of the expectations.

Mr. Jewell – The east façade would be important to a business that would need light in the morning. He understood adding more windows period, due to the type of business it was proposed to be.

Mr. Alexander – Inquired about the purpose of the proposed square window Staff had said should not be approved on the east elevation.

Mr. Rosenthal – To get more light into the intended dining room space and leave the existing header intact. That was the remaining piece that had some flexibility to it from the client’s perspective. There was a fundamental question on the table, which was what the Board could or could not live with more of an industrial sash than what would have been typical on this structure in the 60s. Staff has been great to work with and very helpful but he did not have much confidence that there was a solution that both the client and Staff could live with or what the consultants would agree to.

Mr. Alexander – Suggested a design with less grids. He had visited the Fox in the Snow on North 4th Street. He asked if there was a middle ground because this architect is good.

Mr. Rosenthal – They have drawn many iterations. His client has said if this does not work for Dublin, they will find a different location to do what they wanted to do.

Mr. Alexander – He was concerned with the proposal with suspending a line of brick for this long strip and having a window up high and one down below. Constructability of that would be a major challenge and would look peculiar as an architect/designer.

Public Comment

There were no comments submitted by the public but Mr. Holton wished to address the Board.

Tom Holton, 5957 Roundstone Place, said he was happy to see something happening with the old post office as it had been vacant for 10 years. He requested clarification on the proposal. He asked if a trellis was planned for the whole stone façade to which Ms. Mullinax answered affirmatively. He suggested not doing that as this was a historic building as the first permanent post office in Dublin. It is a treasure, even though people may not see it that way. Before 1965, Dublin did not have a post office, the services moved from building to building, which is pointed out on tours, etc. that this is an important building in Dublin's history. If the trellis is as important as he understood it from the presentation, and part of the identity for the brand, as the ivy is incorporated into the logo. He asked that the trellis only be incorporated behind the logo and not over all the stone. He clarified the logo is proposed at 10 square feet in size, which is larger than what the Code permits.

The Chair – Answered he understood why Staff was okay with the size given other things that have been approved at this size and larger.

Mr. Holton – Requested the size be reduced.

Board Discussion

The Chair – Suggested going through each motion and conducting the discussion for each item. The first motion are the two Waivers for mechanical equipment and steel windows. The Waiver is just for the material of the windows, not the design.

Mr. Jewell moved and Mr. Cotter seconded, to approve the first Waiver as part of the Minor Project:

1. §153.173(I)(10) Alternative Screening Requirement: In lieu of compliance with the requirements of §153.173(I), an alternative approach to accommodate unique site conditions may be approved if the required reviewing body determines that the proposed alternative achieves the aesthetic, environmental, and screening results as well or better than compliance with the standards of §153.06(I).

Request: To permit the use of extruded aluminum material for roof mechanical equipment screening.

Vote: Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Damaser, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Mr. Jewell, yes; and Mr. Cotter, yes.
[Approved 5-0]

Mr. Jewell moved and Ms. Damaser seconded, to approve the second Waiver related to the Minor Project:

2. §153.174(D)(1) Windows Requirement: Windows shall be wood, metal-clad wood, or vinyl-clad wood. The ARB may approve other high quality synthetic materials with examples of successful, high quality installations in comparable climates.

Request: To permit the use of steel framed windows.

Vote: Ms. Damaser, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; and Mr. Jewell, yes.
[Approved 5-0]

Ms. Damaser moved and Mr. Cotter seconded, to approve the Parking Plan for the Minor Project as follows:

A total of 30 spaces is required for this site. 18 spaces are on site including 1 ADA space with the additional 12 spaces obtained through a Shared Parking Agreement with 50 W. Bridge Street, J-Liu restaurant. Both businesses are owned by the same person so patrons to each establishment will have access to all spaces combined.

Vote: Ms. Cooper, yes; Mr. Jewell, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; and Ms. Damaser, yes.
[Approved 5-0]

The Chair – Asked if the last condition could be approved without the owner present. He was not comfortable that the owner was not present to speak to any of the conditions. He asked Mr. Rosenthal if he and the owner have had any discussions about this specifically.

Mr. Rosenthal – He was only aware that Staff had definitely communicated with the owner and there is general consensus around of what the possibilities are because the City's plans are somewhat in flux.

Ms. Holt – The last condition can be stricken for now but the owner has met with Planning, Engineering, Transportation and Mobility early last week and they discussed this as a concept for the overall site improvements. We all have a good understanding of what needs to happen and that can be worked out separately as part of the Franklin Street Extension.

Mr. Cotter moved and Mr. Jewell seconded, to approve the Minor Project with five amended conditions:

- 1) That the dumpster enclosure be fully screened within two years;
- 2) That the applicant shall work with Staff on the window muntins on the east elevation to better respond to the architectural style of the building. The window divisions on the east and south elevations do not need to match;
- 3) That the applicant continues to work with Staff to provide south elevation windows that could incorporate muntins in a way that is consistent with the existing character of the building;
- 4) That all items, which require maintenance, repair, or replacement, include but are not limited to, the rear awning, gutters and downspouts; and chipping paint will be fully addressed to the City's satisfaction, within one year; and
- 5) That the applicant works with Staff to administratively approve any color changes to the awning on the north elevation.

Vote: Mr. Jewell, yes; Ms. Damaser, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; and Mr. Cotter, yes.
[Approved 5-0]

Ms. Mullinax – The Master Sign Plan needed a motion and vote.

The Chair – Asked if the sign needed discussion since the public requested some changes. He asked if the trellis was part of the sign.

Ms. Mullinax – The trellis was not included in the calculation but it was part of their brand and identity for the Fox in the Snow.

Mr. Cotter – The sign concept covers the historic stone wall but it is reversible; he had no major opposition to the sign proposal.

Ms. Cooper – The trellis adheres to the stone on the front.

Mr. Rosenthal – That was not historically accurate and was discussed with Staff. Boston Ivy was not super invasive as far as ivies go. Typically, the client would let the ivy grow up the wall and trim it around the sign from time to time.

Mr. Alexander – Using a trellis attached to the mortar joints preserves and protects the building.

Ms. Damaser – With this wire trellis, the stones will still be visible and see the frontage that is important.

Mr. Jewell – The halo lighting will also help reveal the stone.

Mr. Alexander – In terms of the size of this, the mural has been approved for the fairy garden compared to this is enormous. The intent that is part of the zoning is to have more creative, decorative, and better signs.

Ms. Damaser moved and Mr. Cotter seconded, to approve the Master Sign Plan with the following condition:

- 1) That the applicant apply for permanent sign permits through Building Standards, prior to installing the wall sign.

Vote: Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Mr. Jewell, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; and Ms. Damaser, yes.
[Approved 5-0]

There was a quick break.

Ms. Holt read into the record another public comment for 143 S. Riverview Drive. Since the determination has been made, on the advice of the attorney, it is acceptable to read it into the record, now. The bottom line was this resident was in support of the demolition.

4. Dublin Arts Council at 7125 Riverside Drive, 22-036MPR, Minor Project Review

The Chair stated this application was a request for the reconstruction of a historic log cabin relocated to this site with associated site improvements on a ±5-acre site zoned Restricted Suburban Residential. The new site is northwest of the intersection of Riverside Drive with Emerald Parkway.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Holt presented an aerial view of the site which is outside the Historic District but listed on Appendix G as a historic property. A closer aerial view showed both properties, which the City owned since 1999. It became the site for the Dublin Arts Council in 2002. The historic site is the Krumm Home built in 1941 and is individually listed on the National Register of Historic Places [photograph]. The cabin we are speaking of was originally found during an extensive renovation project on Riverside Drive in 2017. It was cited as part of Thaddeus Kosciuszko land grant and dates from 1820-40. When the cabin was found during this demolition/renovation project, it was seen as something very unique and therefore it was disassembled, all the logs were numbered, and has been in storage ever since.

In August 2021, City Council unanimously agreed to relocate the cabin to property of the Dublin Arts Council. The cabin was specifically meant to be a small event venue and provide an educational opportunity for visitors to the site. The proposed site location for the cabin is just southwest of the main building [photograph]. The cabin originally sat on a sloped site to accommodate a root cellar or basement. The proposed siting here specifically replicates the unique, original placement. This project is just the first phase of a three-phase project to include more outdoor spaces and river access. The site plan showed what is coming. Tonight, we are just looking at the cabin relocation, parking upgrades to add ADA spaces, and a pathway to the cabin and historic root cellar.

The proposed graphic of the east elevation/front of the cabin was shown. The logs were conserved, and numbered and will be reassembled from storage. The front porch is to be added as it is thought that very likely, that it had a front porch, originally. The chinking will be restored or reinserted per the NPS Preservation Brief 26 re: repair/preservation of historic log buildings. The windows will be Marvin Ultimate in 6-over-6 operable windows on the first floor and 6-pane fixed on the second floor. The door is custom made out of salvaged wood and hardware. The required Code lighting will be hidden within the porch rafters. The proposed north elevation [graphic] shows a 12:12 roof pitch for the main part of the building and a 2:12 pitch for the porch, which was very typical for porches. The chimney will be constructed with Ohio limestone with the chimney cap hidden within the stone for the most authentic look. Public access is limited to the main level. Only Staff will have access to the upper level and cellar. The south elevation [graphic] represents the same materials, roof pitches, and elements just discussed. The west elevation [graphic] is the rear of the building on the downslope side of the property showing the same custom door and hardware as the front. The proposed stone type and pattern were shown in a photograph of a similar cabin. A typical front porch, similar to that being added in this case was included. Red cedar shakes cut by hand were proposed for the roof. Half-round, five-inch galvanized gutters are proposed, and the downspouts will be four-inch round, galvanized and corrugated. Windows are proposed to be Marvin Ultimate, which the Board has approved before in the Historic District. The main floor will be 6-over-6 double hung (operable), the upper floor will be 6-pane (inoperable), and all the windows will be finished in gunmetal to mimic weathered wood as well as the metal door frame. The doors will be rough-cut out of salvaged wood with salvaged antique hardware. Front porch lighting will be a six-inch floodlight, hidden within the porch rafters which are 8-inches deep to meet modern day safety requirements. A wall light will be mounted on the inside of the retaining wall for the safety of employees only at the rear entry. This minimal lighting was found to be the least-obtrusive option.

This application was reviewed against the Minor Project Review Criteria and approval was recommended with the following condition:

- 1) Bike parking shall be provided with Phase II approval and construction, or within two years, whichever is soonest.

Applicant Presentation

Shawn Krawetzki, Landscape Architect Manager, City of Dublin - He did not have anything to add but was present to answer any questions as were the other architects, builder, and landscape architects.

Ms. Damaser – Thought this was impressive.

David Keyser, DKDR – They had been working with Tom Holton through the entire process to get to a design that was acceptable. Mr. Holton had provided an idea for the columns on the front porch, to which he agreed. The suggestion was to replace the square columns that are shown in the drawings and renderings with round columns, more like logs, and remove the diagonal bracing.

Mr Alexander – He had submitted a question to Staff and the Board, prior to the meeting. He was concerned with rafter tails exposed and a soffit added to the cabin, which would not have been historically accurate. The underside of the roof sheeting is visible between the rafter tails. He asked if the goal was to reuse the logs and assemble them the way they were found because there are a lot of details we could talk about. The City's consultant was not hired to do an analysis like both projects we reviewed earlier this evening. He asked what the intent was when more was added to the cabin.

Mr. Keyser – There was a balancing act between addressing some modern building code issues with historic authenticity. One being the placement of egress lighting for the rear, lower-level door. They worked with Staff to find a balance for a good window related to maintenance with historically accurate detailing for the windows. The porch details, original logs, and casings around the windows were used to be historically

accurate. Obviously, gutters would not be found on a building like this but gutters were a good idea for a City-owned structure.

The Chair – We are all your clients because we are residents here, unlike the earlier applications reviewed.

Public Comment

One comment was received – Paul Gelpi lives directly adjacent to the Dublin Arts Council and had phoned Ms. Holt directly prior to the meeting. His concern was the stone wall at the entry off of Riverside Drive that has never been completed. People drive onto the property during weekends and party directly next to his property.

Ms. Holt – That wall is not part of this project.

The Chair – Asked if anyone in the City had been contacted to address this resident's concerns. This does not need to be discussed here as it is out of the ARB's purview.

Ms. Holt – Confirmed this concern has been relayed to the appropriate parties.

Board Discussion

Mr. Alexander – He noticed the way the floors were made and the roof was framed, and asked if the applicant was using conventional, dimensional lumber.

Mr. Keyser – The applicant had to have an agreement with the Building Department to have a 100 lbs per square foot live load for the first floor. That is a requirement for an assembly building. It is way beyond what would have ever been built originally. The foundations are much heavier. The stairway was another issue. The first floor will be framed in all LDLs, all of this creating a hidden modernization to be publically accessible.

Mr. Alexander – He figured the builder will use heavier timber for the ceiling and spaced farther apart and then have a planking to which Mr. Keyser confirmed. There will be false floor joists. There was definitely some give and take for planning reassembly.

Mr. Krawetzki – The applicant is trying to make it as authentic as we can within current Code. The goal is an assembly space for the public. Furniture will be added later to demonstrate how this cabin would have been inhabited. Old replacement logs had to be sought to fill in some of the holes. The old cabin where it had been found had additional doors cut through the walls, etc. to fit the later use.

The Chair asked if the submission had to be modified in order to incorporate the change for the columns that was suggested by Mr. Holton.

Ms. Holt – A second condition can be added to memorialize that.

The Chair – That would give the applicant the flexibility to incorporate that column. The Board can approve what was submitted and then if there is some issue that makes it difficult to incorporate that, they have flexibility.

Mr. Jewell moved and Ms. Cooper seconded, to approve the Minor Project with two conditions:

- 1) That bike parking shall be provided with Phase II approval and construction, or within two years, whichever is soonest; and
- 2) That round columns may be used for the front porch along with removing the angled braces, if feasible.

Vote: Ms. Damaser, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; and Mr. Jewell, yes.
[Approved 5-0]

accurate. Obviously, gutters would not be found on a building like this but gutters were a good idea for a City-owned structure.

The Chair – We are all your clients because we are residents here, unlike the earlier applications reviewed.

Public Comment

One comment was received – Paul Gelpi lives directly adjacent to the Dublin Arts Council and had phoned Ms. Holt directly prior to the meeting. His concern was the stone wall at the entry off of Riverside Drive that has never been completed. People drive onto the property during weekends and party directly next to his property.

Ms. Holt – That wall is not part of this project.

The Chair – Asked if anyone in the City had been contacted to address this resident's concerns. This does not need to be discussed here as it is out of the ARB's purview.

Ms. Holt – Confirmed this concern has been relayed to the appropriate parties.

Board Discussion

Mr. Alexander – He noticed the way the floors were made and the roof was framed, and asked if the applicant was using conventional, dimensional lumber.

Mr. Keyser – The applicant had to have an agreement with the Building Department to have a 100 lbs per square foot live load for the first floor. That is a requirement for an assembly building. It is way beyond what would have ever been built originally. The foundations are much heavier. The stairway was another issue. The first floor will be framed in all LDLs, all of this creating a hidden modernization to be publically accessible.

Mr. Alexander – He figured the builder will use heavier timber for the ceiling and spaced farther apart and then have a planking to which Mr. Keyser confirmed. There will be false floor joists. There was definitely some give and take for planning reassembly.

Mr. Krawetzki – The applicant is trying to make it as authentic as we can within current Code. The goal is an assembly space for the public. Furniture will be added later to demonstrate how this cabin would have been inhabited. Old replacement logs had to be sought to fill in some of the holes. The old cabin where it had been found had additional doors cut through the walls, etc. to fit the later use.

The Chair asked if the submission had to be modified in order to incorporate the change for the columns that was suggested by Mr. Holton.

Ms. Holt – A second condition can be added to memorialize that.

The Chair – That would give the applicant the flexibility to incorporate that column. The Board can approve what was submitted and then if there is some issue that makes it difficult to incorporate that, they have flexibility.

Mr. Jewell moved and Ms. Cooper seconded, to approve the Minor Project with two conditions:

- 1) That bike parking shall be provided with Phase II approval and construction, or within two years, whichever is soonest; and
- 2) That round columns may be used for the front porch along with removing the angled braces, if feasible.

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

[Approved 5-0]

Communications


Ms. Holt stated the following:

- The Penalty Code Update will again be reviewed by City Council on May 23, 2022.
- New ARB submittal checklists have been posted on the City's website for greater clarity and include the full range of all projects and match the new Zoning Code.
- The ARB Rules and Regulations were updated and reviewed by the ARB in February of this year and adopted by City Council on Monday, April 25, 2022. These have been added to OneDrive for your convenience.
- The Remembrance Project is to honor Dublin's Veterans. Using today's technology (GR Codes), the public can locate and read about the veterans interred in the Dublin Cemetery when they visit, as told by the families and friends.
- The City is applying for two Ohio SHPO Awards. The first to being recognized is the Zoning Code and Guidelines as part of our suite of tools and the other for our Outreach documents implemented in January 2022 that include the Annual Mailer and the Welcome Flyer for properties in the Historic District as well as Appendix G.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 9:38 p.m.



Chair, Architectural Review Board



Administrative Assistant II, Recorder



BOARD DISCUSSION

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, November 17, 2021 | 6:30 pm

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

**1. 143 S. Riverview Street
21-157INF**

Informal Review

Proposal: Demolition of an existing, single-family home and the construction of a new, one-and-a-half story, single-family home. The 0.21-acre site is zoned Historic District, Historic Residential.

Location: West of S. Riverview Street, ±375 feet south of the intersection with Pinneyhill Lane.

Request: Informal Review to provide non-binding feedback under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.176 and the *Historic Design Guidelines*.

Applicant: Lindy and Brad Lyon; and Rob King, Chateaux Designs

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

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


Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/21-157

RESULT: The Board generally did not support the demolition of the existing structure and urged the owner to explore an addition to the rear of the existing structure. The Board stated that the Code’s specific demolition criteria will need to be met in order to earn such an approval. Additionally, and relative to the proposed new house, concerns were raised about the front setback, which needs to meet minimum Code requirements and be compatible with surrounding context. Members expressed concern with the setback from the south property line and the potential impact it may have on the existing historic stone wall. The Board suggested coming back for another Informal Review, in more of a sketch format to minimize costs, while allowing additional feedback.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Gary Alexander Yes
Amy Kramb Yes
Sean Cotter Yes
Martha Cooper Yes
Michael Jewell Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:

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





MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, November 17, 2021

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Alexander, Chair, called the November 17, 2021, meeting of the City of Dublin Architectural Review Board (ARB) to order at 6:32 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Chair led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Board Members present: Mr. Alexander, Ms. Cooper, Mr. Cotter, Ms. Kramb, and Mr. Jewell

Staff present: Ms. Holt, Mr. Ridge, and Ms. Mullinax

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Cooper moved, Ms. Kramb seconded, to accept the documents into the record and to approve the October 20, 2021, meeting minutes.

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

CASE PROCEDURES

The Chair stated the Architectural Review Board is responsible for review of construction, modifications or alterations to any site in the area subject to Architectural Board Review under the provision of Zoning Code §153.170. This Board has the final decision-making responsibility on cases under their purview. Anyone who intends to address the Board on any of the cases this evening will be sworn in. The agenda order is typically determined at the beginning of the meeting by the Chair, who also stated the procedures of the meeting. The case order: 2,3,4,5, and 1. The cases in the minutes follow the order of the published agenda. Anyone that addresses the Board will need to provide their full name and address for the record.

The Chair swore in anyone planning to address the Board on any of the cases to be reviewed.

NEW CASES

1. 143 S. Riverview Street, 21-157INF, Informal Review

The Chair stated this application was a request for demolition of an existing, single-family home and the construction of a new, one-and-a-half story, single-family home. The 0.21-acre site is zoned Historic

District, Historic Residential and is located west of S. Riverview Street, ±375 feet south of the intersection with Pinneyhill Lane.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Holt presented an aerial view of the site with a closer view of the existing detached garage and house, Photographs were shown of the house that the applicant informally requested to be demolished, which is an example of Minimal Traditional architecture, found to be contributing in the elements of location, design, feeling, setting, and association.

The applicant provided 14 photographs of the existing conditions of the structure to discuss in more detail.

Ms. Holt presented the demolition criteria for contributing structures for reference that will be used during the formal request under Zoning Code §153.176(J)(5)(a). The applicant shall demonstrate credible evidence of economic hardship.

1. Will all economically viable use be deprived without demolition?
2. Will reasonable investment-backed expectations be maintained without demolition?
3. Was economic hardship created by/exacerbated by owner?
4. Factors
 - a) Current level of economic return
 - b) Recent listings of the property
 - c) Alternative uses
 - d) Evidence of self-created hardship, incl. inadequate maintenance
 - e) Knowledge of landmark designation at time of purchase
 - f) Economic incentives/funding available

The adjacent structures were identified and mapped as follows:

1. Cottage style, 1 ½ story, directly to the north
2. Modern house of 2 stories (27 feet to the ridge), directly to the south
3. Modern duplex of 1 ½ stories, to the northeast
4. Ranch, single-story directly across from this site
5. Ranch, single-story to the southeast

The house built at 185 S. Riverview Street, two lots down to the south from this site was built at 31 feet, 6 inches measured to the roof.

The proposed site plan was presented for this 0.21-acre site. Demolition of the existing house was requested; the replacement house, including porches creates a 2,880-square-foot footprint, keeping the garage separate. The front setback is 14 feet, 3 inches when 20 feet is required. The south side yard is proposed at 3 feet from the property line but there may be Building Code issues that need to be investigated. The lot coverage is 37% where 45% is the maximum permitted by Code.

Proposed elevations for the east/front and north were presented: board and batten siding, vinyl shake shingles for both gables at the apex, a standing seam metal roof in the front porch area, and asphalt shingles were on the remainder of the structure. The proposed height is 34 feet to the ridge of the roof. Height is measured differently to meet Code and the maximum feet allowed is 24 feet for height in the

district. Proposed elevations for the south and west/rear were presented. The south side is where there may be an issue with Code compliance.

Board Discussion Questions

1. Is the Board supportive of the proposed demolition of the existing house?
2. If the Board is supportive of demolition, is the proposed site layout supported?
3. Is the Board supportive of the massing of the proposed house and the architectural design?
4. Is the Board supportive of the conceptually proposed materials?
5. Are there other considerations by the Board?

Public Comment

There was one letter of concern from a neighbor received.

Applicant Presentation

Brad and Lindy Lyon, property owners of 143 S. Riverview Street, requested to address the earlier photographs presented. Mr. Lyon stated since purchasing the house they have had an inspection and are aware of several issues with deterioration and have considered what it would take to fix these issues. There has been water infiltration causing gapping. The foundation is basically cinderblock wrapped in aluminum siding, which is in rough condition. There is rot underneath the roof where the gutters are located. Renovation has been considered to obtain what the applicant wanted as far as additions, etc. The utilities are captured in the crawl space and the concern was gaining access. The house has been sinking and the utilities in some areas have become partially buried. There is a lot of limestone underneath so it is difficult to consider that is the case. The renovations inside the house required replacing the cast iron plumbing that took making holes in the floor to gain access to that area. There is a lot that needs to be renovated. Inside the house the floor height is only ±seven feet and their desire is for higher ceilings.

Public Comment

Tom Holton, 5957 Roundstone Place, Dublin, Ohio, stated there is a stone wall at the south end between this property at 143 and 179 as one of the most historic stone walls. This area was the site of one of the first three schools built in Dublin. He offered to send the chart of the properties to Ms. Holt. He asked that this stone wall be protected.

Board Discussion

Ms. Kramb – There is not enough information provided to determine if demolition is warranted. There are strict demolition criteria to be met. Much of the problems the applicant showed via photographs, could be repaired. Detailed inspection reports on the foundation, structural problems, roof, a statement on utilities, replacement costs, and quotes on foundation crack repairs are needed. There are plenty of electricians and plumbers that will work in tight crawl spaces.

Mr. Cotter agreed. The Board needs a better understanding of what it would take for the home to be liveable versus completely tearing it down and replacing.

Mr. Jewell – Property line issues have been noted but the utility easement and driveway lines also need to be addressed.

Ms. Cooper – She agreed there is insufficient information provided at this point to judge the demolition request. If the utilities could not be repaired, now that would be significant.

Mr. Alexander – There have been more houses than we would have liked demolished in the Historic District. The Code is specific about what can and cannot be torn down and provides financial limitations. This is considered a contributing structure in the Historic District. Five houses have been demolished since he has been on this Board. Three structures were uninhabitable and had limited value in terms of contributing due to what had been done to the structure(s) by the previous owner(s) of the properties. The house across the street from the applicant on Riverview Street is slated to be demolished. That house has a lot of historical character but the applicant returned with a lot of documentation about the costs of rehabilitating and engineering reports. It is on a hill, which makes it more complicated to resolve foundation issues. The house on Dublin Road that recently came down did not meet the criteria for being a contributing structure to the historic integrity of the district. It was not well-designed or well-built.

Mr. Alexander – The house being considered this evening is contributing and has features that have been judged to be of merit and the overall mass of the house has not been compromised, as far as we can see. For the Board to approve demolition based on the new Code, as well as some approved under the previous Code, there is work yet to be done on the applicant's part.

Ms. Kramb – The 20-foot setback would need to be met in the front. She would not support a Waiver. For site layout, meet the Code. A rear addition was suggested for ease.

Ms. Cooper – She suggested an addition to the structure. The front setback would not be an issue as it is existing. There is an opportunity to maintain and improve a contributing structure in the Historic District.

Mr. Alexander – The house is so close to the southern property line. The applicant's intention to preserve the stone wall, may be an issue of width. A foundation change that close to the wall has the potential to undermine the wall, besides what it would do to that neighbor's property.

Ms. Cooper asked how far the wall extends to the back of the property to which Ms. Kramb answered the wall was on the property line and extends all the way.

Mr. Cotter suggested the proposed structure should be lower in the front but could be higher in the back in context with the neighboring properties. The board and batten proposed to wrap the structure should be broken up with other materials and the windows on the side should be more alike in design.

Mr. Jewell – Height is an issue with the overall massing.

Mr. Alexander – The mass is exaggerated when viewed from the side elevation. The porch on the front helps reduce the massing. Having smaller elements attached to the tallest part is successful at reducing the appearance of mass. A bay window or some sort of projections on the north side was suggested to help reduce the significance to the side elevation. The proposal of the structure today appears enormous compared to the others. He verified the intention is to use vinyl-clad wood windows.

Ms. Lyon requested clarification on the process going forward.

Mr. Alexander – The information requested above needs to be provided and the Board will judge it and address any issues. Submittal does not equate to approval. Staff can assist with deciphering the Code. Public feedback is fine but the Board will evaluate the application based on the merits of the Code and information provided.

Ms. Lyon asked if the Board could provide suggestions on an addition, as this was sought before from contractors and builders who did not agree on additions they had proposed.

Mr. Alexander explained the Board's meeting was not the correct forum to provide that type of information. The idea that Ms. Kramb offered earlier in the meeting was a common practice for homes in the area for additions that are constructed on the back of contributing historic structures and do not exceed the side parameters or overwhelm the original structure. Without seeing a plan proposed, the Board cannot state what will work and what will not and suggested the applicant meet with a design professional.

Ms. Kramb – Staff can be helpful and provide the Historic Guidelines that state what is desirable and acceptable for historic properties and how they have to be subordinate to the original structure. An enclosed hallway connecting two buildings is sometimes an option.

Mr. Alexander – Subordinate does not always mean smaller. A Variance for increasing lot coverage slightly might be achieved to build a house that was sensitive to the original house rather than demolishing the original building and replacing it with a two-story structure. The applicant may return with informal, concept plans to gain the Board's opinion on ideas presented; a full set of plans or renderings is not needed for those types of reviews.

Summarized Comments

- Financial documentation is needed to describe financial hardship.
- The Board would not support a Variance for a front yard setback encroachment.
- Shift the house back at least behind the front setback required.
- Keep the house more to the north, away from the historic stone wall.
- Do not exceed the height limit for massing considerations.
- Do not totally wrap the house in board and batten, as it emphasizes the mass.

2. 5707 Dublin Road, 21-163MPR, Minor Project Review

~~The Chair stated this application was a request for the installation of a 72-square-foot shed at a historic, single-family home on a 0.75-acre site zoned Planned Unit Development, Llewellyn Farms. The site is ±300 feet north of the intersection of Dublin Road with Hertford Lane.~~

Staff Presentation

~~Ms. Mullinax presented an aerial view of the site where this historic 'James Davis' home is located, which is outside of the Architectural Review District but is listed on Appendix G, which defers to the Historic District Code. This property appears on the Ohio Historical Inventory and the National Register of Historic Places. A closer view of the property was shown, which once included a spring house and a chicken coop in the rear yard, demolished without City approval by the previous owner. A photograph was taken of the front of the house that was built circa 1840. In May of 2021, the ARB approved a Minor Project for the replacement of windows and a new entry door.~~

~~The proposed 72-square-foot shed will be located in the southwest rear yard behind the asphalt parking area. The shed will have a gravel foundation, which will meet the existing brick walkway and take the place of the previously existing chicken coop location. The shed is set back 24 feet from the southern/side property line, and 80 feet from the western/rear property line, which meet all required setback requirements. The proposed shed is 6 feet wide and 12 feet in length, and 7 feet in height with a gable,~~