

# OHIO HISTORIC INVENTORY

THIS IS A FACSIMILE OF THE FORM PRODUCED BY:

OHIO HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE  
567 East Hudson St.  
Columbus, Ohio 43211-1030  
614/297-2470-fax 614-297-2496



OHIO  
HISTORICAL  
SOCIETY

SINCE 1885

1.No. FRA-8847-1		2.County FRANKLIN		4.Present Name(s)		<input type="checkbox"/> CODED <input type="checkbox"/> CODED		FRA-8847-1
3.Location of Negatives CITY OF DUBLIN		5.Historic or Other Name(s)						
Roll No. Picture No(s) 1 30								
6.Specific Address or Location 156-158 S. HIGH				16. Thematic Association(s)		28. No. of Stories 1.5		FRANKLIN
6a. Lot, Section or VMD Number				17. Date(s) or Period C. 1880-1900		29. Basement? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		
7.City or Village If Rural, Township & Vicinity DUBLIN				18. Style or Design <input type="checkbox"/> High Style <input type="checkbox"/> Elements		30. Foundation Material STONE RUBBLE		
8. Site Plan with North Arrow  JOHN WRIGHT LN HIGH RIVERVIEW SCIOTO RIVER				18a. Style of Addition or Elements(s)		31. Wall Construction WOOD FRAME		
9. U.T.M. Reference Quadrangle Name NW Columbus 17 319900 4440300 Zone Easting Northing				19. Architect or Engineer		32. Roof Type & Material GAB/ASPH SHINGLE		
10. <input type="checkbox"/> Site <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Building <input type="checkbox"/> Structure <input type="checkbox"/> Object				19a. Design Sources		33. No. of Bays Front 6 Side 3		
11. On National Register? No				20. Contractor or Builder		34. Exterior Wall Material(s) ALUM./STUCCO/BRICK		
12. N.R. Potential?				21. Building Type or Plan		35. Plan Shape RECT		
13. Part of Estab. Hist. Dist? No				22. Original Use, if apparent RESIDENCE		36. Changes <input type="checkbox"/> Addition <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Altered (Explain in #42) <input type="checkbox"/> Moved		
14. District Potential?				23. Present Use RESIDENCE		37. Window Types <input type="checkbox"/> 6 over 6 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 over 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 over 2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other		
15. Name of Established District (N.R. or Local) DUBLIN H.D. (local)				24. Ownership <input type="checkbox"/> Public <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Private		38. Building Dimensions		156-158 S. HIGH
25. Owner's Name & Address, if known				26. Property Acreage		39. Endangered? No By What?		
27. Other Surveys in Which Included				40. Chimney Placement 1 O/C ROOF, 1 CTR RG		41. Distance from and Frontage on Road		
42.Further Description of Important Interior and Exterior Features(Continue on reverse if necessary) Late 19th century frame cottage with gabled roofline, one-over-one windows and later porch and exterior materials. This is a double house that shares a wall and foundation.				46. Prepared by NANCY RECCHIE		47. Organization BDR&C		
43. History and Significance (Continue on reverse if necessary) This vernacular building contributes to the character and scale of Dublin's historic district. The property was owned by Calvin Eger at one time.				48. Date Recorded in Field 3/03		49. Revised by		
44. Description of Environment and Outbuildings (See #52) Located close to the street with a brick sidewalk across the front.				50. Date Revised		50b. Reviewed by		
45. Sources of Information observation; Dublin Historical Society								



PHOTO

**Parcel** 273-000067/  
273-000078      **Address** 156-158 S High St      **OHI** FRA-8847-1

<b>Year Built:</b> Ca.1880	<b>Map No:</b> 128	<b>Photo No:</b> 2033-2037 (7/11/16)
<b>Theme:</b> Domestic	<b>Historic Use:</b> Multi-family dwelling	<b>Present Use:</b> Multi-family dwelling
<b>Style:</b> Vernacular	<b>Foundation:</b> Parged	<b>Wall Type:</b> Frame
<b>Roof Type:</b> Side gable/asphalt shingle	<b>Exterior Wall:</b> Aluminum/brick/stucco	<b>Symmetry:</b> No
<b>Stories:</b> 1.5	<b>Front Bays:</b> 7	<b>Side Bays:</b> 3
<b>Porch:</b> Wrap-around porch on south half of the façade	<b>Chimney:</b> 1, Interior, on ridge near north side of house	<b>Windows:</b> 1-over-1 Replacements

**Description:** The one-and-one-half-story duplex has an L-plan footprint, resting on a parged foundation. The side-gable roof is sheathed in asphalt shingles. The exterior walls are clad in aluminum, with brick utilized on the façade, and stucco on the south elevation. A half-hipped porch wraps the south half of the façade and south elevation. Entrances to both units are accessed from the porch. Windows are double-hung replacement sashes. They are flanked by fixed shutters on the north unit. A detached garage is southeast of the building.

**Setting:** The property is located on the east side of S High St in the old village core of Dublin. The front lawn is landscaped with manicured shrubs.

**Condition:** Good

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

**Integrity Notes:** The building has poor integrity resulting from additions and replacement materials.

**Historical Significance:** The building is recommended non-contributing the City of Dublin's local Historic Dublin district and the recommended Dublin High Street Historic District, boundary increase.

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



156-158 S High St, looking northeast



156-158 S High St, looking southeast



## BOARD ORDER

# Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, August 28, 2019 | 6:30 pm

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

**6. Property at 158 S. High Street  
19-069ARB-MPR**

**Minor Project Review**

Proposal: Construction of an approximately 2,600-square-foot, one and a half-story house on a 0.45-acre site zoned Bridge Street District Historic Residential.

Request: Review and approval of a Minor Project under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.066 and 153.176, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Applicant: Heidi Bolyard, Simplified Living Architecture and Design

Planning Contacts: Chase J. Ridge, Planner I

Contact Information: 614.410.4656, [cridge@dublin.oh.us](mailto:cridge@dublin.oh.us)

Case Information: [www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/19-069](http://www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/19-069)

**MOTION:** Mrs. Bryan moved, Mr. Keeler seconded, to table the Minor Project.

**VOTE:** 4 – 0

**RESULT:** The Minor Project was tabled.

**RECORDED VOTES:**

Shannon Stenberg	Absent
Gary Alexander	Yes
Andrew Keeler	Yes
Kathleen Bryan	Yes
Robert Bailey	Yes

**STAFF CERTIFICATION**

---

Chase J. Ridge, Planner I



Mr. Alexander stated that when an individual files for a building permit, he believes all those documents are available as public records.

Ms. Bolyard responded that they can be obtained, but they must be formally requested using a form that requires the reason for which they are needed. The plans are not provided to anyone for any reason.

Mr. Boggs stated that there is a distinction. They are potentially public records. Typically, floor plans and architectural plans are not generally provided, as they could be reproduced; there are copyright issues. However, if they were submitted as part of this application process, they would be uploaded to the City's website, where they would be available by demand. Although there are some communities that require the floor plans at this stage, the City of Dublin does not.

Mr. Keeler moved, Mr. Bailey seconded to approve the Minor Project with one condition:

- 1) That the applicant bring the front porch details and all associated trim details for the house to the Board prior to submission for building permits.

Vote: Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Ms. Bryan, yes; Mr. Bailey, yes.  
(Motion approved 4-0)

## **6. 158 S. High Street, 19-069ARB-MPR, Minor Project Review**

Mr. Alexander stated this case relates to the adjacent site at 158 S. High Street. This application is a proposal for the construction of an approximately 2,600-square-foot, one and a half-story house on a 0.45-acre site zoned Bridge Street District Historic Residential.

### **Staff Presentation**

Mr. Ridge stated that this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review for the construction of a new approximately 2,600-square-foot, single-family home in the Historic District. The site is located on the east side of South High Street, south of Pinneyhill Lane, and consists of approximately .48 acres in size. It has approximately 95 feet of frontage and presently contains the other half of the 1.5 story, two-family home, which straddles the property line. The history is similar to that of the previous case.

### Proposal

The applicant is proposing a new, 1.5-story single-family home to replace the existing two-family home that currently straddles the property line with the adjacent lot to the north. The driveway is located north of the home, and provides access to both the single-car garage located within the porte-cochere and a two-car garage at the rear of the home. There is a sidewalk leading to the front door. A front porch is located on the east side of the home and a balcony at the rear of the home. The applicant is proposing to add a small storage place as part of the porte-cochere. The proposed lot coverage for the site is 35%; Code permits 50% coverage. A lot line adjustment will be required between this site and the site to the north, which the applicant has been requested to obtain following ARB approval. The proposed structure is a 1.5 story, 2,600- square-foot home with a large porte-cochere and an overall height at S. High Street of 27.5 feet. The front elevation shows a gable front roof over the occupied portion of the house; a side gable, screened-in porch

on the south of the front façade; and a 1.5-story, side-gable porte-cochere on the north side of the home. Landmark asphalt shingles in a Moire Black color will be used for the majority of the home, as well as a Matte Black metal standing-seam roofing material for the dormers. A vertical HardiePanel siding in an Alabaster color will be used on a majority of the exterior of the home, including portions of all four elevations. A HardieShingle in a Monterey Taupe color will be used for the peaks of the home. The home will have a cultured stone veneer and black window trim and lighting fixtures. There will be a double-door entry, front porch and chimney on the front elevation. Staff is concerned with the significance of the porte-cochere, which represents approximately 34 feet of the 65-ft. wide front façade. It is approximately 22 feet in height, which is one foot taller than the height of the horizontal roofline of the occupied portion of the home. No livable space is proposed above the porte-cochere. The proposed mass and scale appear inappropriate. Staff is concerned by the similarities of material selection and color palettes used with this home and the one proposed for 156 S. High Street. The dormers on the front elevation are not reflected on the north elevation. Staff is concerned with the relatively blank design of this elevation and the significant use of the alabaster siding. The south elevation reflects a heavy use of stone veneer, including on both of the chimneys and the large, screened-in porch. A composite TimberTech balcony in a brown color with black railing is proposed at the rear of the home. The height at the rear entry is approximately 35 feet in height. The rear elevation contains a significant number of windows, including a large wall of windows on the south side of that elevation. A series of columns support the balcony. Two new garage doors are proposed. The proposed doors are stamped-steel carriage-style doors and will be painted an Alabaster color to match the siding on the home. The window trim, doors and railing will be painted black. Staff is concerned that the rear of the home significantly overwhelms its surrounding and appears out of context. Staff has reviewed the application against all applicable criteria and recommends disapproval.

Heidi Bolyard, Simplified Living Architecture and Design, 6065 Frantz Road – Suite 205, Dublin, stated that with their informal review in June, they had shown the Board the front elevation, which is essentially the same as it exists now. Other than removal of the oval windows, they have proceeded with that same design.

Mr. Alexander inquired if the Board viewed the rear elevation at that meeting.

Ms. Bolyard responded that only the front façade was shown for that meeting. She recognizes that this rear elevation is not typical for this District, but the design has been modified and is less modern than what the client originally requested. Although a significant number of windows are included to provide natural light, the windows will have traditional panes.

Ms. Bryan inquired the reason that the same materials will be used on both homes.

Ms. Bolyard responded that the materials are not the same, although the colors are. There is horizontal siding and brick on the neighboring home. This home will have board and batten shingles and stone. The color on this home will be a cream color; on 16 S. High Street, it will be white. These colors are the homeowners' selections.

Mr. Alexander inquired if the height of a structure is measured at the street or at the rear elevation, as well, to determine zoning compliance.

Ms. Rauch responded that height is measured from grade, but all of the height factors in the home are considered. The Code does not specify where the height must be measured.

Mr. Bailey inquired if there is a list of the factors that must be addressed to achieve approval.

Ms. Martin stated that if the case were to be tabled, the applicant would be provided a list of those items as reflected in this review. Staff does not preemptively provide a list of proposed conditions. Because there are so many, a revision to the plan would be necessary.

Mr. Alexander stated that a list of concerns have been identified in the staff report, which include the following:

1. The consultant's report reflected a concern with the size of the porte-cochere, with the amount of the home's footprint that would be comprised of the passage, and the impact thereof on that elevation.

Mr. Bailey noted that at the June meeting, the Board indicated that they had no objection to the porte-cochere.

Mr. Alexander affirmed that was the Board's response.

2. The doors on the front have been changed from a single door with sidelights to a double door. Is the double door an issue?

Mr. Ridge indicated that was not a concern.

Mr. Alexander that the other elevations of the home were not seen at the previous Informal Review. At that meeting, the Board had a site plan and a front elevation to review. Staff's concerns, including the height of the rear elevation, are new.

Ms. Rauch clarified that the Board's feedback at an Informal Review is non-binding. At that time, staff had not conducted a final review of all the details. This design is not necessarily the wrong direction; however, modifications are needed for it to fit better within the context of the District. This is the next level of review.

Mr. Keeler stated that this house appears similar to the type of home seen in Ballantrae or Jerome Village. He understands that the client likes that style of home; however, Historic Dublin may not be the right location for that type of house.

Ms. Bryan stated that the proportion of the porte-cochere seems to dwarf the rest of the house.

Ms. Bolyard responded that the porte-cochere is set back to reduce its prominence. They were also concerned about the porte-cochere, which is the reason they brought it before the Board two months ago. The porte-cochere actually is smaller now than in the plan previously seen by the Board, because a screened porch has been added in the side yard. To make that work for the client, the sides of the porte-cochere had to be moved in.

Mr. Alexander stated that he has some concerns with the rear elevation. Members of the public who were present earlier tonight expressed concerns about the backyard impact. The scale of the rear of this house is enormous. Perhaps floorplans would have provided some explanation of the reason the gable is so tall as it extends to the rear. He requested clarification of staff's concern about the similarity in materials.

Mr. Ridge responded that the concern related primarily to the similarity in color palettes.

Ms. Bolyard stated that there are two different homeowners, and they have been permitted to select their preferred colors.

Ms. Bryan stated that the issue is that it creates an impression of a mini housing development, rather than two individual houses. ARB is responsible for looking at a home in the context of the entire neighborhood. This home does not fit within the context of this neighborhood.

Ms. Bolyard stated that if the porte-cochere were removed, it would look identical to another home on the street.

Ms. Bryan stated that the length of the home to which she is referring infringes significantly on the neighbor's yard. The Board must be conscious of the impact of a proposed home on its neighbors.

Mr. Keeler stated that the Board recognizes that many property owners are interested in replacing existing, unattractive houses. They often inform the Board later that they like the changes that were required. We live in Dublin because it has standards. Although it is difficult to appreciate those standards while undergoing this type of review process, people do appreciate living in Dublin. Several of the Board members live in older homes and have undergone a similar Board review for their homes. This process can be difficult and costly; however, if necessary, he would do it again because he appreciates the fact that Dublin has very high standards. However, the Board will work with the applicant to the extent possible because they do not want the existing property to remain as it is; they want to see improvements.

Ms. Bolyard noted that she previously lived on Franklin Street, and as a homeowner, has experienced this process.

Mr. Bailey inquired if the high gable at the rear elevation meets Code requirements.

Ms. Bolyard responded that it does.

Mr. Bailey requested if the concerns about the rear elevation are related only to the windows.

Mr. Alexander responded that, per Code, the proposed windows are required to look like existing windows within the district. The Code also speaks to the issue of scale, which is a reference to how large something looks, not necessarily how large it measures.

Mr. Bailey inquired how that is defined. For him, the scale of this home is not an issue, but other Board members have a different opinion.

Mr. Alexander responded that the scale of home is inappropriate in this District because it can be defined as grand or massive. The proposed adjacent home has no large gable at the rear; in fact, that design attempts to hide the mass by using hipped roofs. Typically, homes do not have the highest point at the rear. With the typical development pattern, the scale diminishes towards the rear of the home. With this home, the scale becomes more massive.

Mr. Bailey responded that is due to the slope of the site.

Mr. Alexander responded that it is possible to address the scale. For instance, if the gable were not there and the roof were hipped and sloped to the rear, it would make a significant difference.

Ms. Bryan stated that the home must fit within the context of this neighborhood, which is Historic Dublin. In another neighborhood, this home would look great.

Mr. Alexander noted that it does not appear that this application can be approved tonight.

Ms. Bolyard requested the Board's recommendations to enable them to prepare for the next meeting.

Mr. Alexander stated there was one item that was misleading. He believes the consultant applauded the simplicity of the north elevation in her report. Per staff's presentation, staff believed the north elevation was too sterile.

Mr. Ridge stated that staff's primary concern was that the porte-cochere in the front façade was too massive.

Mr. Alexander stated that the simplicity of the north elevation is good. This is a neighborhood with simple, vernacular buildings.

Ms. Bryan read the consultant's statement that, "the north side of the building is simple and cohesive with a series of gabled roofs and front gable extension."

Mr. Alexander stated that because there is some resistance to the porte-cochere, the applicant may want to reconsider it. The majority of the Board members also have an issue with the rear elevation.

Mr. Keeler concurred that, at this point, the plan would not be approved.

Mr. Alexander stated that in some communities, an intermediate work session permits applicants to obtain the Board's feedback without waiting until the regular meeting. This process would expedite the process for the applicant.

Mr. Boggs responded that would be a special meeting of the Board, which would require public notification.

Mr. Dyas stated that they thought that process had occurred with staff before the Board's meeting. Mr. Boggs stated that staff is professionally trained and makes every effort to work with the applicants to prepare a case for Board review. However, the ARB members are individually selected by City Council. They have backgrounds in architecture or other experience of value to the Board's review. Although staff can consider a proposal to be satisfactory, ultimately, the Board can disagree. The Board must review the cases in either a regular or a special meeting, for which public notice must be given. The process must be fair to the applicant and to the public, who, in some cases, may have the right to appeal a decision. Discussion with staff is not equivalent to the Board's review.

Mr. Keeler noted that he assumes the applicant was aware that staff's recommendation was for disapproval of the application.

Mr. Dyas responded that they learned of this only a couple of days ago.

Ms. Rauch stated that staff met with the applicant and discussed their concerns, which are reflected in this report, prior to this case being scheduled on the agenda. Staff shared their feedback with the applicant to provide them the opportunity to make improvements. Staff prefers not to come before the Board with a case on which they will recommend disapproval, but the applicant indicated a desire to remain on the agenda. This meeting packet was published at the City's website on Friday and emailed to the applicant so they could be prepared.



Mr. Dyas stated that although they disagree on some of those points, at this juncture, they need sufficient direction to move forward.

Ms. Bolyard stated that they have proceeded with the porte-cochere design the past two months, as the Board had previously expressed a positive reaction. They are surprised this evening to learn differently. If the porte-cochere were smaller, would that be more acceptable?

Mr. Keeler stated that perhaps a square porte-cochere versus an arch would be more traditional. The arch is a more progressive design.

Mr. Dyas inquired if their application would be tabled or approved with a condition.

Mr. Boggs clarified that if the case is tabled, there is no approval.

Mr. Dyas responded that they need to complete the lot split immediately, but he has been told that ARB needs to approve the project before he can request the lot split. Could ARB indicate that they have no objection to the applicant giving five feet of 158 S. High Street to 156 S. High Street to make that site 60-feet wide in compliance with Code? The 158 S. High Street property would become 90 feet wide versus its current 95 feet, and he would provide the right-of-way to the City at no cost. The engineering has been completed, but he needs final approval of the lot split.

Ms. Rauch stated that the lot split process is based upon Engineering's request. It is standard practice to ensure there is nothing else ARB would require before a lot split is approved to avoid the potential need to repeat the process.

Mr. Dyas inquired if it would be possible to have the lot split approved with the conditional approval of 95 S. High Street and the tabling of 98 S. High Street. It would enable him to continue to work with his clients.

Mr. Boggs responded that he is not familiar with requirements related to the lot split; however, he will look into the possibility of approving it before completion of this ARB review process.

Ms. Bryan stated that if the applicant has the revised materials ready, she would prefer ARB review them at a special meeting to enable the applicant to move forward.

Mr. Boggs stated that the Board may schedule a special meeting to hear a case, if it desires.

Mr. Keeler stated that a special meeting would allow the ARB to review the revisions and either approve it at that time or request additional changes for approval at its next regular meeting.

Ms. Bryan stated that if it were a work session, no approval would be given, only non-binding feedback. It would not be necessary to provide a packet of materials beforehand.

Mr. Keeler stated that if they are available, it would be helpful for the Board to receive the materials beforehand so they could begin their preliminary review.

Ms. Rauch pointed out that staff would not have adequate time to provide their typical review of the materials, ensuring all the criteria has been met.

Mr. Keeler responded that staff's review and determination of criteria met or not met is essential before the Board's review.

Ms. Rauch noted that level of review also does not occur for an Informal Review. With the consultant's and the Board's feedback, there is ability now to be on the same page.

Ms. Martin stated that staff would be willing to meet with the applicant and provide that "work session" discussion on a staff level.

Ms. Bolyard responded that it would be of more value to them to have an architect's review. Mr. Dyas indicated that, due to the time factor, they would attempt to meet with staff as soon as possible.

Mrs. Bryan moved, Mr. Keeler seconded to table the Minor Project Review for 158 S. High Street.

Vote: Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Ms. Bryan, yes; Mr. Bailey, yes.  
(Motion approved 4-0)

## **7. 113-115 S. High Street, 19-073ARB-MSP, Master Sign Plan**

Mr. Alexander stated this is a proposal for the installation of four new signs for one parcel that contains two, existing, multi-tenant buildings on a 0.25 site zoned Bridge Street District Historic South.

### **Staff Presentation**

Ms. Rauch stated this is a proposal for a Master Sign Plan for four signs on two existing multi-tenant buildings located within Historic Dublin. The Board reviewed an earlier version on June 26. This plan will allow some flexibility for signs on a lot on the west side of S. High Street for two buildings located at 113 and 115 S. High Street. At the June 26, 2019 ARB meeting, the Board approved a Master Sign Plan for these two buildings; however, as part of the review, the members expressed concerns about the legibility and constructability of the proposed multi-tenant signs. The applicant has made the recommended modifications.

The applicant is proposing a total of four signs, two along the S. High Street elevation, and one each on the front and rear of the new 115 S. High Street building, which is located behind the historic structure. The first sign, which was for The House of Beauty, 113 S. High Street, was installed following the previous approval. The second sign is a ground sign located in the front lawn to the north of the existing building. Per the revision, the sign will be mounted on a cedar post. The third sign is a projecting sign located on the north corner of the 115 S. High Street building. The fourth sign, located at the rear of the 115 S. High Street building, is a directory sign. The signs will be made of HDU with routed lettering and raised borders. The signs have a black background and raised white lettering. Staff has reviewed the proposed Master Sign Plan against the applicable criteria and recommends approval with one condition, that the depth of the routing be a minimum ½-inch on all sign panels.

Mr. Alexander inquired if the applicant had any objection to the condition for approval. The applicant indicated that he had no objection.



## BOARD ORDER

# Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, June 26, 2019 | 6:30 pm

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

**6. 156 & 158 S. High Street  
19-044ARB**

**Demolition**

Proposal: Demolition of an existing two-family structure and detached garage on a site zoned Bridge Street District Historic Residential.

Location: East of South High Street, approximately 350 feet south of the intersection with Pinneyhill Lane.

Request: Review and approval of a Demolition under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.066 and 153.170, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Applicant: Heidi Bolyard, Simplified Living Architecture and Design representing Bob Dyas, property owner.

Planning Contact: Jennifer M. Rauch, AICP, Planning Manager

Contact Information: 614.410.4690, jrauch@dublin.oh.us

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/19-044

**MOTION:** Ms. Bryan moved, Mr. Bailey seconded, to approve this Demolition with the following condition:

- 1) That the order shall not be issued by the City until a replacement use or building(s) has been approved by the ARB and an associated application for building permits has been submitted to the City for a replacement building(s).

**VOTE:** 5 – 0

**RESULT:** The Demolition was approved.

**RECORDED VOTES:**

Shannon Stenberg	Yes
Gary Alexander	Yes
Andrew Keeler	Yes
Kathleen Bryan	Yes
Robert Bailey	Yes

**STAFF CERTIFICATION**

  
Jennifer M. Rauch, AICP  
Planning Manager





## BOARD ORDER

# Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, June 26, 2019 | 6:30 pm

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

**7. 156 & 158 S. High Street  
19-041INF**

**Informal Review**

Proposal:	Construction of two new single-family homes on a site zoned Bridge Street District Historic Residential.
Location:	East of South High Street, approximately 350 feet south of the intersection with Pinneyhill Lane.
Request:	Informal review and non-binding feedback for a proposal to construct two new single-family homes on two parcels under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.066 and 153.170, and the <i>Historic Dublin Design Guidelines</i> .
Applicant:	Heidi Bolyard, Simplified Living Architecture and Design representing Bob Dyas, property owner.
Planning Contact:	Jennifer M. Rauch, AICP, Planning Manager
Contact Information:	614.410.4690, jrauch@dublin.oh.us
Case Information:	www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/19-041

**RESULT:** The Board informally reviewed the proposal to construct two single-family homes on the two parcels. The Board members expressed support for the proposed site layout, building scale, and massing. The Board recommended the applicant explore a detached garage option to address concerns about the grade change and the proposed driveway design. The Board recommended the applicant simplify the architectural details, such as reducing the number of dormers and simplifying the rooflines.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Shannon Stenberg	Yes
Gary Alexander	Yes
Andrew Keeler	Yes
Kathleen Bryan	Yes
Robert Bailey	Yes

**STAFF CERTIFICATION**

  
Jennifer M. Rauch, AICP  
Planning Manager



Mr. Mayer responded that the small letters will be very difficult to route in HDU, but the House of Beauty design would not be difficult.

Mr. Alexander moved, Mr. Keeler seconded to approve with the following six conditions:

- 1) That the applicant select materials for signs, logos, copy, brackets, and ground sign posts that are identified on the approved materials list that are of high-quality, subject to staff approval;
- 2) That the copy and logos of all signs be dimensionally routed;
- 3) That the applicant reduce the height of the ground sign to six (6) feet;
- 4) That the location of the ground sign meet all required setbacks;
- 5) That the black and white colors identified on all signs match the exact colors that were most recently approved for the repainting of the building located at 113 S. High Street; and
- 6) That the applicant select a bracket for Sign 3 complementary to the building architecture, subject to staff approval.

Vote: Mr. Bailey, yes; Ms. Bryan, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes.  
(Approved 5 – 0)

## **6. 156 & 158 S. High Street, 19-044ARB , Demolition**

Ms. Stenberg stated that this application is a proposal for the demolition of an existing two-family structure and detached garage on a 0.72-acre parcel zoned Bridge Street District Historic Residential.

### **Case Presentation**

Ms. Rauch stated that there are two requests for this property. The first is for demolition, and the second is for an informal review of the proposed development on the site. The site is on the east side of S. High Street, between Pinneyhill Lane and Short Street. Today, the site contains a two-family, 1.5-story structure with an L-shaped footprint, combined from two log cabins built circa 1850. The property owners modified the structure in late 1960s-early 1970s, and the remaining cabin structure is minimal. In 2017, the City of Dublin published the Historical and Cultural Assessment, which documents a variety of community assets including homes, cemeteries, and stone walls. As part of the assessment, this property was found to be listed on the Ohio Historical Inventory (OHI) but determined to be recommended non-contributing based on the additions and alterations that have occurred over time. A driveway provides access to the site at the northernmost point of the property. A detached garage is located in the southern portion of the property.

The Architectural Review Board conducted a previous informal review on February 27, 2019 for a different proposal to demolish a portion of the existing, two-family home and detached garage and construct three, new residential units. A majority of the members expressed concern about

the intensity of development given the limited acreage. They were concerned the proposed layout does not fit with the development pattern in the area with regard to the number of units per lot, as well as the orientation of the units to the street. They were supportive of smaller building footprints, but were unsure how the height and scale of the proposed units would relate to the character of the District. Several members expressed that the desired character should align with the historic single-family homes within the vicinity and indicated that a building height of 1.5 stories would be most appropriate. A majority of the members also expressed concern about the proposed lot coverage, and the limited open space remaining with the proposed development.

Ms. Rauch stated that two of the following four criteria must be met:

**1. Structure contains no architectural and historic features significant to the character of the area.**

Staff finds this criterion for demolition is met. The Historic and Cultural Assessment designates the existing two-family structure and detached garage as non-contributing structures, citing the buildings' lack of historic integrity due to earlier alterations and replacement materials.

**2. No reasonable economic use for the structure as it exists or as it might be restored, and no feasible and prudent alternative to demolition exists.**

Staff finds this criterion for demolition is not met. The home is currently occupied, so there is ability to continue its use as a residential structure. The condition of the home and garage has not reached a level of deterioration where no use of the structure is viable.

**3. Deterioration has progressed where it is not economically feasible to restore the structure and such neglect has not been willful.**

Staff finds this criterion for demolition is not met. The condition of the two-family structure and the garage has not reached a level of deterioration where no alternative option is viable. However, staff does recognize that it is not viable to restore the two-family structure to the original log cabins.

**4. The location of the structure impedes the orderly development, substantially interferes with the Purposes of the District, or detracts from the historical character of its immediate vicinity; or, the proposed construction to replace the demolition significantly improves the overall quality of the Architectural Review District without diminishing the historic value of the vicinity or the District.**

Staff finds the criteria for demolition is met. The existing two-family structure and the garage has no historic architectural significance and in its current condition detracts from the historic value of the neighborhood. The proposed demolition would not remove a significant historic or contributing structure and would not diminish the unique historic character of the surrounding area. Two new single-family structures with the appropriate scale and design could improve the quality and character of the Historic District.



Staff has reviewed the proposed demolition with respect to the Zoning Code as well as the Historic Dublin Design Guidelines and recommends approval of the proposed demolition of the two-family structure and detached garage with one condition:

That the order to allow a demolition shall not be issued by the City until a replacement use or building(s) has been approved by the ARB and an associated application for building permits has been submitted to the City for replacement buildings.

[The next case is related to this property, as well.]

## **7. 156 & 158 S. High Street, 19-041INF, Informal Review**

Ms. Stenberg stated that this application is a proposal for the construction of two new single-family homes on a site zoned Bridge Street District Historic Residential.

### **Case Presentation**

Ms. Rauch stated this is a request for an informal review of two new homes to be constructed on the previously described site. The applicant is proposing to construct one home on each parcel. The proposal for 156 S. High Street includes a new one-story residence, while the proposal for 158 S. High Street includes a new, one and one-half-story residence. Both site layouts include a linear layout of the residence with driveway access leading to the garages in the rear. The proposed site layout for each parcel meets the minimum lot dimensions and setback requirements. Further review of these details will occur should the proposal move forward. The applicant is proposing to modify the property lines. On the previous proposal, there was insufficient frontage. These lots will be made compliant with Code. This plan will retain a large amount of the rear yard space, which is consistent with other properties within the district. The Historic Preservation consultant reviewed these plans, but her comments on 158 S. High Street were based on a previous set of elevations. She has not seen the elevation shown tonight. The proposed elevations are in keeping with the scale and character of development along High Street.

The following discussion questions are proposed:

- 1) Is the Board supportive of construction of two single-family homes in place of the existing two-family unit within the Historic Residential neighborhood in relation to the surrounding development pattern?
- 2) Is the Board supportive of the site layout and design in relation to the surrounding development pattern?
- 3) Is the Board is supportive of the proposed building scale, architectural design, and associated design details?
- 4) Other considerations by the Board.

### **Board Questions**

Mr. Alexander stated that he is confused about the process. ARB is asked to approve the demolition based on a conceptual review of a plan, but the plan that may come back to us could be much different. Why not discuss the demolition as conceptual the same as the design? A final decision could be made on the demolition when there is a final design.

Ms. Rauch stated that the ARB's determination on the demolition would be based on its merit and on the applicant's submitted materials. If what has been provided is insufficient to support the demolition, ARB can request more information. Staff has recommended the condition be added that the applicant cannot obtain a building permit to demolish the structures until ARB has approved the final architecture and layout.

Mr. Keeler stated that it is conceptual, which leaves open the possibility for changes in the application for structure that might be presented later. He believes the site meets the requirements for demolition. Therefore, provided the applicant submits a plan to which ARB conceptually agrees, that would be fine.

### **Applicant Presentation**

Heidi Bolyard, Simplified Living Architecture and Design, 6065 Frantz Road – Suite 205, Dublin, stated that they are present to obtain the ARB's feedback on their conceptual plan and approval for the demolition. They cannot move forward on the design of the two houses if demolition of the existing structures is not approved.

### **Public Comment**

Michael Steele, 138 South High Street, Dublin, Ohio, stated that he owns the commercial building to the north of this site, on the opposite side of the driveway. He has obtained approval for a lot split and will be building a residential unit between his commercial office building and the Eger property. As he understands the plan, the driveway that is contiguous to his property on the north side will be relocated to the south side, which would move the house closer to the property line. On his side of that property are some very large trees with branches that hang over the current driveway. However, a house cannot be built under or next to those branches; the limbs would have to be removed. Whose responsibility and expense would it be to remove the limbs, and is it part of the demolition and construction?

Mr. Alexander responded that in his professional experience, the owner of the neighboring property is permitted to modify the portion of the trees that are overhanging their property with the intent to do as little harm as possible.

Mr. Steele stated that it would seem the responsibility and expense would be the builder's. He has rural property some distance away, and the rules are different there. Only the owner of the property on which the tree grows can determine which overhanging limbs will be removed. He would like to have a legal opinion on that issue.

Ms. Rauch responded that this has occurred with another property within that area. From the City's perspective, that is a civil matter between two private property owners.

Bob Dyas, 180 S. Riverview, Dublin, applicant, stated that he lives near the river but has a view up the hill to the Eger property. He has known the Egers all his life. He has spoken with Mike Eger. Part of his reason for taking on this project is to help control what happens in their neighborhood. He would like to have two attractive houses on that site that will blend with what Dublin and the residents of the Historic District want. They attempted to preserve the historic



nature of the property, but after having the property assessed, they have determined that they will be able only to repurpose a significant amount in the new structures. Two Dublin residents/clients will be assisting in that process. Regarding Mr. Steele's inquiry about the overhanging tree branches, he will take care of trimming the branches.

There was no further public comment.

### **Board Discussion**

Ms. Stenberg indicated that both Case 6 and Case 7 are related to the property. They will be discussed and action taken individually.

#### **[Case 6 - 156 & 158 S. High Street, 19-044ARB, Demolition]**

Ms. Bryan moved, Mr. Bailey seconded to approve the proposal for demolition of an existing two-family structure and detached garage on a site zoned Bridge Street District Historic Residential, with one condition:

- 1) That the order shall not be issued by the City until a replacement use or building(s) has been approved by the ARB and an associated application for building permits has been submitted to the City for a replacement building(s).

Vote: Mr. Keeler, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; Ms. Bryan, yes; Mr. Bailey, yes.  
(Approved 5 – 0)

#### **[Case 7 -156 & 158 S. High Street, 19-041INF, Informal Review]**

Ms. Stenberg requested that the Board respond to each of the review questions.

#### **1. Is the Board supportive of construction of two single-family homes in place of the existing two-family unit within the Historic Residential neighborhood in relation to the surrounding development pattern?**

Board members indicated support for the construction of two single-family homes on the site.

Ms. Stenberg inquired if the lot line adjustment would occur before or with the next review.

Ms. Rauch responded that lot line adjustments are handled by the County, and that should be completed prior to or at the time of the next review.

#### **2. Is the Board supportive of the site layout and design in relation to the surrounding development pattern?**

Ms. Bryan stated that she would like to see a rear view of the site, as several neighbors have voiced concerns about that view [slide view shown].

Mr. Alexander referred to the proposed house at 156 S. High Street. [Proposal for a one-car garage, mudroom/laundry, family room, dining room, kitchen, ½ bath, sunroom, and master suite on the main floor; lower level to include a two-car garage, recreation room, full bath, and two bedrooms.] He is concerned about the side elevation facing the driveway, where the grade

change will be quite steep. The pavement level is established by the front garage location, which is appropriately located back a distance of 24-25 feet. However, the distance between that garage door and the next garage door is relatively short for that slope and will be difficult to negotiate. In view of the way older homes were developed, perhaps it would be appropriate to design the house with a two-car detached garage a greater distance away at the rear. He understands that attached garages are preferred; however, creating a greater distance between the upper pad and a detached garage outbuilding at the rear would allow for a more gradual grade. Addressing the grading issue in this manner would also be more consistent with the typical pattern in a historical community.

Mr. Steele shared that an earlier survey of his property indicated an eight-foot drop from the street to the back of his lot. With the setbacks filling in some of the area, the grade is not as steep as the proposed plan seems to indicate.

Mr. Alexander responded that what is determining the slope is the location of the front garage and that parking pad – the design, not the site conditions.

Mr. Steele noted that the garages would be located to the rear of the structure.

Mr. Alexander responded that is correct, but essentially, level pavement is needed all the way back. From the back of the front parking pad to the lower-level garage door is where all the slope occurs.

Mr. Keeler stated that a previous applicant presented a proposal that generated significant discussion concerning the height. With this proposal, the South High Street elevation appears too short. It would look better if it were higher.

Mr. Alexander noted that the earlier proposal was for a 2.5 story structure.

Mr. Keeler stated that the existing duplex on the site is one-story and is out-of-place, which is one of the reasons there is community support for demolishing the structure. If the applicant wanted to consider a design with a little more height, he would be supportive of that.

Mr. Bailey stated that because the house to the south is much larger, he would agree with that suggestion.

Mr. Keeler stated that house, while larger, appears to be 1.5 stories, so perhaps a 1.5 story structure on this site would be fine.

Mr. Alexander stated that he likes the scale of the proposed houses. Significant square footage occurs at the ground floor of the homes because of the desire to live on one floor. He is supportive of the scale of the homes, and the front porch is a nice gesture to the street. There are many positive features of the design.

Ms. Stenberg expressed concurrence. Having the garages at the rear is not unattractive. The consultant's comments in regard to 156 S. High were very positive and indicated that the size and scale were appropriate. The consultant did not have an opportunity to see elevations for 158 S. High Street. She believes the homes will fit well within the surrounding development. The Board also has responded partially to the next review question:

**3. Is the Board supportive of the proposed building scale, architectural design, and associated design details?**

Ms. Bolyard requested permission to show a revised design for 158 S. High Street. Board members had no objection to viewing the revised drawings.

Mr. Alexander inquired if the Board is commenting on architectural details. Ms. Stenberg responded that it would be appropriate to do so for an Informal Review.

Mr. Alexander shared that the existing Code is written around Vernacular, American buildings, which do not have much complexity. Architecturally, it is a challenge to design an appropriate, yet simple building. He has concerns about the six dormers on the front elevation of 156 S. High Street, which are not simple. He would recommend simplifying the roof and, overall, having a more simple, less dressy design. He prefers the original design of the porte cochere for 158 S. High Street, which focuses on the void, rather than the porte cochere in the revised design, which puts attention on an element to the left. Other than a few such details, the design is on track.

Ms. Bolyard noted that the consultant also indicated there were too many dormers and suggested that the dormers on the side be eliminated. They will revise the plan accordingly.

Ms. Stenberg noted that she is not certain if oval windows are appropriate in the District. She is supportive of the original views for 158 S. High Street or the design with the front fireplace. She is less supportive of the design with the oval windows. She concurs that six dormers is too much for the 156 S. High Street house.

Mr. Alexander suggested that the applicant meet with the neighbor and view their proposed plans. This would enable both property owners to identify any items that would be mutually beneficial and plan accordingly.

There were no further Board comments.

Ms. Bolyard stated that she has not yet discussed possible changes with Mr. Dyas. However, would the Board be supportive of a driveway that extends down the grade and loops around to the back elevation, or would that driveway be too long?

Mr. Alexander indicated that would address the grading issue. He recommends checking the lot coverage.

Ms. Stenberg stated that if it meets the lot coverage requirements, she would have no objection.

**4. Other considerations by the Board.**

There were no other considerations, and the Informal Review was concluded.



## BOARD ORDER

# Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, February 27, 2019 | 6:30 pm

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

**3. Eger Residence  
19-013INF**

**156-158 S. High Street  
Informal Review**

Proposal: Demolish a portion of an existing, two-family home with a detached garage and construct three, new residential units on the parcel zoned Bridge Street District Historic Residential.

Location: East side of S. High Street, 350 feet south of the intersection with Pinneyhill Lane.

Request: Informal review and non-binding feedback for an intended future application under the provisions of Zoning Code §§153.066, 154.170, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Applicant: Pat Grabill, Grabill & Co., representative for Joanna Eger

Planning Contact: Jennifer M. Rauch, AICP, Planning Manager

Contact Information: 614.410.4690, jrauch@dublin.oh.us

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/19-013

**RESULT:** The Board reviewed the informal proposal and a majority of the ARB members expressed concern about the intensity of development given the limited acreage. They were concerned the proposed layout does not fit with development pattern in the area with regard to the number of units per lot, as well as the orientation of the units to the street. They were supportive of smaller building footprints, but were unsure how the height and scale of the proposed units would relate to the character of the District. Several members expressed the desired character should align with the historic single-family homes within the vicinity and indicated that a building height of 1.5 stories would be most appropriate. A majority of the members also expressed concern about the proposed lot coverage, and the limited open space remaining with the proposed development.

### STAFF CERTIFICATION

Jennifer M. Rauch, AICP, Planning Manager



**3. Eger Residence  
19-013INF**

**156-158 S. High Street  
Informal Review**

Mr. Rinaldi stated that this proposal is for informal review and non-binding feedback to demolish a portion of an existing, two-family home with a detached garage and construct three, new residential units on the parcel zoned Bridge Street District Historic Residential.

Case Presentation

Ms. Rauch stated that with an Informal Review, staff and the Applicant present information to obtain the Board's feedback. No decision is made at this point. The Board provides guidance for a future application, should the project be something the Board might support.

Site

Ms. Rauch indicated that the site is located on 156 and 158 South High Street, on the east side of the street south of Pinney Hill. The two parcels comprise a total of .7 acres in area. On the northern portion of the site is the existing residential building, which has two units. The northernmost part of that structure is the historic portion, which was built in the 1880s. The southern portion was added in the 1960-70s although the exact date is unknown. The Applicant will provide more specifics. Access to that portion of the site is located on the north side of the structure. The southern lot contains a detached brick garage building, which has its own driveway access from South High. The lots are fairly deep and have some grade change from South High to the rear of the properties, with some existing mature trees within the area. [showed photos of several nearby residential structures to provide context of the surrounding development character.]

Proposal

The proposed site plan includes the retention of the historic portion of the structure – the northern-most unit with an attached garage. The Applicant is requesting feedback about the potential demolition of the attached portion, identified as Unit #2, with a connection to Unit #3 and Unit #4 – all located in the southern portion of the site. The access is provided at both at the north and south ends of the property, providing access to garages located to the rear and below due to the grade change, as well as additional garage space located behind them. With Historic Residential, it is not necessary to meet the building type requirements, only the neighborhood standards, which regulate the uses, lot area, lot width, setbacks, building height and lot coverage. Given the current proposed lot area and lot width requirements, as well as the setback, there are potential challenges. Given the number of units, they would not meet those requirements without waivers. It will need to be part of the ARB's consideration, as to whether they would be amenable to granting those waivers, should an application be submitted. Additionally, a single family detached is the only permitted residential use, so it would be necessary to determine how to handle Unit #2, which would potentially be re-attached. The Code would not permit that use, so it would be necessary to determine if it would need to be in a separate unit, or an alternative zoning may be required.

Discussion Questions for ARB

1. Would ARB be supportive of the demolition of the southern portion of the residential structure and the detached garage?

2. Is ARB supportive of the construction of three units within this neighborhood in relation to the surrounding development pattern?
3. If the Board is supportive of that, would they support the waivers needed to within the standards of the Code?
4. If supportive, what type of building scale, architectural design would the Board want to see?

#### Applicant Presentation

Pat Grabill, Grabill & Company, 100 S. High Street, Dublin, clarified that between Units #2 and #3, they have attempted to identify a way to connect to the rear of the property, enabling the owners to have a shared elevator within a sun porch or similar space. The units themselves will not be attached. He has made inquiries of the Eger family about these units. In regard to the existing two-unit building, the south addition is likely older than the 1960s and 70s, but the Eger family doesn't have that date. There has been an Eger family member living in that house for approximately 86 years. They bought it from Mr. Gallagher's father, who bought it from the Weber family, who still owns land behind this site. This property has been in the family's possession since early in the village's history. In 2012, a fire destroyed all the historic structure of the second unit, so nothing remains to preserve on the south side. He has renovated a number of historic buildings in the Historic District and has not found a building this old that has not been riddled with powderpost beetles and termites, which impacts the load factor on the floor joists. They will not be able to evaluate Unit 1 until Ms. Eger has vacated the property. Their intent is to restore that unit as a historic property, depending upon the condition of the posts and timber frame.

Mr. Grabill indicated that the intent of this Informal Review is to confirm that his view is consistent with ARB's. With the redevelopment of South High Street, it is important to pay attention to the scale and size of these buildings. The challenge is to try to develop something appropriate for the street, economically feasible and also at scale. He believes the units need to be small. They are hoping to renovate the existing units as four lots with a homeowners' association to maintain the paver driveways. The driveway could also provide access to the adjacent lot to the south, should they want to connect, eliminating the need for another curb cut on South High Street. The driveway width needs to be sufficient to navigate the turns. The units are narrow, which means there is only room in the lower level for a one-car garage. The three garages at the back of the property will look like a carriage house that has been there for some time. Permeable pavers will be used. He is attempting to achieve an architectural character that appears to have always existed here and is compatible with the street. Buyers who are interested and can afford to live in the Historic District also prefer a first-floor master, so there will be a great room and master bedroom with a guest room on the next level. Because these lots sit on a small hill, they are some of the few lots in the District with the ability to put a garage on a lower level. Last week, they met and discussed the proposed project and plans with the neighbors. He doesn't believe it is possible to renovate these units in any other way that wouldn't result in larger structures.

He indicated that it is important to save the Eger property on the north side, although its condition is yet unknown. When they completed 109 South High Street, they were pleasantly surprised by the fact that part of the structure was a log cabin. However, the 182 South High



structure was so compromised that it was necessary to rebuild the structure. There is no reason that the southern unit shouldn't be demolished and replaced with new, architecturally strong units that are compatible with the northern unit that will, hopefully, be preserved. Before committing further financial commitments to the project, it is important to ensure that his plan is compatible with the City's direction.

Mr. Alexander stated that he has indicated that he wants to address the scale, but what is not being appropriately addressed is the pattern of development. What he is proposing would be unusual for existing South High Street. There is no precedent in the community for the proposed lot width. In fact, the two lots that are outlined are the same width as the lots behind. A number of the structures in that part of the District are more horizontal across the front; they are not primarily vertical, which is what is proposed. He believes that there are many other ways in which to develop this parcel that would be more in character with the community. Although economic return may be a reason to do it this way, there are other ways to construct a second building on the properties and have two single-family residences that would appear more consistent with the existing development.

Mr. Grabill responded that it is the Eger family's opinion that if not renovated in the proposed manner, it would be more beneficial to them to demolish the entire structure and sell it as two lots. If that occurs, the result will be two larger houses. In his opinion, that would be a mistake for this street. There are smaller properties on the street, and it is not necessary to have a uniform look; some inconsistencies give the appearance of being built in different periods. This would be very compatible with how the Historic District was developed and what is there; it would be a mistake to allow this site to have two larger structures.

Mr. Alexander stated that it would be helpful to see a rendering.

Mr. Grabill stated that he did not want to spend \$20,000 for a rendering unless he was confident the project could move forward.

Mr. Keeler stated that this resembles a townhome with two or three separate units.

Mr. Grabill stated that it would be three units. The one that will reattach to the Egers' unit will appear to be a horizontal unit, and two additional units of small scale and massing are proposed with a shared driveway. Parking will be provided off the street, hidden behind the structures.

Mr. Keeler stated that it is difficult to envision how that footprint would fit within the neighborhood.

#### Public Comment

Michael Steele, 138 South High Street, Dublin, Ohio, stated that he owns the commercial building to the north of this site, on the opposite side of the driveway. He has plans to split his lot and build a residential unit between his commercial office building and the Eger property. That building will also need to be linear because of the width of the lot. There will be a transition from his commercial property to the residential he will build, then to the Eger property, which is also residential. His understanding of Mr. Grabill's project is that the street-facing facades of these units will be different, not three look-alike units. His structure is 2,000 sq. feet; in comparison, the size of the proposed units is 2,200 sq. ft. In his view, this is an excellent transition from commercial to residential in this area.

Steve Rudy, 129 South Riverview, stated that he lives behind this property. He concurs with both arguments. He wants the streetscape to look good, but the view he enjoys from his home is that of the most open, shared greenspace in the Historic District. He has spoken of this outstanding resource for years. The residences on this block have a different characteristic than the homes north of Pinney Hill. What he appreciates with this project is that the size of the buildings are a real contrast to the size of the buildings that have been approved previously in the District. There are some fairly large houses further to the south. The proposed footprints are consistent with the other homes within this area. He would prefer that it be 1.5 – 2.0 stories instead of 2.5 stories, since he will have a constant view of the back of this property. He is concerned that this project not hinder the protection of the shared greenspace. They have a daily view of that greenspace from their home, and it is very valuable to them. In summary, he likes the proposed building footprints because they show a restraint that has not been consistently required by this Board. He hopes the Board recognizes that this project shows a rare expression of restraint.

#### Board Member Discussion

Mr. Rinaldi stated that the Board would respond to the five staff questions.

1. Would ARB be supportive of the demolition of the southern portion of the residential structure and the detached garage?

Ms. Bryan stated that she supports the demolition.

Mr. Alexander stated that the Franklin County Auditor's website indicates that the building to the north was built in 1850 and the building to the south was built in 1853. If there is no longer anything existing within the shell of the southern building, he would support the demolition. If any portion of the earlier structure remains, he would prefer that it be evaluated first.

Mr. Rinaldi stated he would not object to the demolition of the detached garage. It seems the proposal is remove an existing duplex and replace it with a new duplex. Approval of the new structure would require waivers or conditions. Is it possible to renovate the existing duplex instead?

Mr. Grabill stated that in his opinion, it is not structurally sound; he does not like the look of it. The southern end is comprised of new framing. It will help the north structure to have this south end shored up. Putting a masonry firewall between the two sides would be appropriate, if it is possible. He does not disagree with attempting to retain any of the original remaining structure. However, there is a dispute about earlier renovations, and the Egers do not recall any information.

Mr. Rinaldi summarized that the Board appears to be supportive of the proposed demolition with the caution as noted.

2. Is ARB supportive of the construction of three residential units within this neighborhood in relation to the surrounding development pattern?



Mr. Rinaldi stated that the overall lot width of the proposed footprints is 93-94 feet. The free-standing structures cannot be more than 20-24 feet wide, which is fairly narrow.

Mr. Grabill responded that they are 22-24 feet wide.

Mr. Rinaldi stated that without any visuals to consider, he is envisioning a very vertical appearance. Is it appropriate to have that many structures on this lot?

Ms. Bryan requested clarification – is a duplex and two individual units proposed?

Mr. Grabill responded affirmatively. The prospective buyers would be empty nesters. He would like to find a way to include an enclosed shared elevator between the two units, perhaps in a sun porch. However, that will not be designed until he is certain that there can be four units.

Mr. Alexander stated that his issue is that the footprint is not appropriate "in relation to the surrounding development pattern." The proposed project is very different from the surrounding development pattern. It also sets a dangerous precedent because properties will be valued not for what they are but for what they can become. Based on the ARB Guidelines, he could not support the proposed project. In addition, the lot coverage is immense in terms of pavement and building footprint, so different from the other residences in that neighborhood.

Mr. Rinaldi stated that he agrees that the lot coverage is well over 50 percent, but permeable pavers were listed.

Mr. Grabill requested that they look at this portion of the Historic District as more like German Village than Muirfield Village. With the adjacent 182 South High Street renovation, there were more than 80 variances due to how Dublin's Code is written. This area is not similar to the big lots that exist in a subdivision, a suburban setting. He recalls the Village of Dublin that existed when he grew up here as quite different – it was a small town. Dublin today is a unified whole with different income strata and different size units. Looking at this in any other way will result in large houses on this street. Because that would not be appropriate for this street, he won't build them, nor would he build multiple units. He is interested in creating smaller units that will provide more variety, and a scale and look appropriate for the street. He has completed eleven such units in the District. While that is much more urban than the Code currently dictates, the current Code requirements do not result in the look that is appropriate for this street.

Mr. Rinaldi stated that it is difficult for the Board to discuss scale when they have not been provided any views of the proposed scale. While he is supportive of smaller residences, it is difficult to envision how that would be achieved without a rendering.

Mr. Grabill showed a proposed layout of the site, noting that there are many such units in German Village.

Mr. Alexander stated that this area is different. American small towns that developed on a Main Street have a very different development pattern than German Village. The City of Worthington's Historic District may be a closer example, when comparing this to similar districts, but it is not German Village.

Mr. Alexander inquired if it would be possible to eliminate one of the two drives.

Mr. Grabill responded that two drives are important, as the lot to the south can be provided a connection, eliminating the need for another curbcut. If the current property owners decide to build another house on that southern lot, they would be able to access this cut. These are the difficult choices involved with urban infill. This is the last such project on the street, which he passed up last year because he anticipated this type of difficulty. However, the Egers asked him to reconsider it. He has done so, but doing less than four units would be a mistake.

Mr. Rinaldi stated that he supports smaller residences – Dublin already has many large ones -- but he is very concerned with the scale of the vertical development. The fact that there will be individual units with breaks between is good. It is a different development pattern from what has occurred in this part of the Historic District. Having two-story structures that are this close on this street makes it difficult to defend.

Mr. Grabill stated that if, philosophically, they have opposing views, it makes it difficult for him to proceed with the project. That is unfortunate, however, as what will result here is two large lots with larger homes and garages – all with a visual impact. That won't accomplish the look that is desired for this District.

3. If the Board is supportive of that, would they support the waivers needed to within the standards of the Code?

Mr. Rinaldi stated that it is not known at this point, what waivers would be proposed, although they would address lot coverage, width and depth, potentially setbacks, and a duplex, which is not permitted. Those may not be insurmountable hurdles if the overall architecture is appropriate, but at this point, he is unable to answer the question.

Ms. Bryan inquired if the units would be two stories, not 1.5 stories.

Mr. Grabill stated that his goal is to make them look like 1.5 stories from High Street, but because of the garage underneath, it would be 2.5 stories at the back of the units. In the interest of variety, however, perhaps one of the units should be a full two stories. At this point, it is too early to know; but if, philosophically, ARB prefers two large lots, that ends this effort.

Ms. Bryan stated that she does not want to see large lots here.

Mr. Grabill responded that is the issue that he is trying to resolve. There are some technical challenges for architects to design these units in a manner that people want to live in and yet with a look appropriate for the street. He previously mentioned a first-floor master, keeping the end user in mind and the need for a compatible living area.

Ms. Bryan stated that she does not want the neighborhood she lives in to have any more very large homes next to the little houses that will then look as though they should be eliminated.

Mr. Grabill stated that they have done a number of renovations north of here, and there is already a variety and change. He was hopeful that ARB would view this project as appropriate for the street.

Tim Greenhalgh, 224 South High Street, stated his home is located at the corner of Short and High Streets. His house is not a true 2.0 story, but more a 1.5 story, and is 1,800 square feet. Built immediately next to his home is a home that is over 5,000 square feet -- nearly triple the size of their home. The Carroll house next to the Tackett home is also quite large. The houses

Mr. Grabill is proposing are approximately 2,200 square feet; he does not see the difference between what Mr. Grabill is proposing and his home, and it would lend a little variety. He would suggest that the Board use his home as an example of size. He does not believe the units should be any bigger.

Mr. Rinaldi stated that the issue is not the square footage but the fact that it is achieved vertically.

Mr. Greenhalgh stated that if this project is not built, the alternative will be two big houses that sit deep in the lots.

Mr. Alexander clarified his concern. Mr. Greenhalgh's house graphically looks the same size as the large lot in the proposed project, yet there is only one house. That is the development pattern. On the biggest of the two lots in this project, four units are proposed on a lot that is 1.5 times the size of Mr. Greenhalgh's lot. That is his concern – that the development pattern is so unusual. He has an issue with the amount of structures and the amount of greenspace around them. He has no issue with smaller structures; his issue is with the development pattern. The City has guidelines that are supposed to be followed.

Mr. Steele (continuing his public comments) inquired how many of the ARB members have been to Dublin, Ireland. As with any older city in the world, it reflects an evolution of construction; it is not all one pattern. A Historic District evolves with different structures, sizes and visual perspectives. The City of Dublin, Ireland reflects the transitions that have occurred over 400-500 years. We also have a wide variety of architectural structures here in our Historic Dublin District. His office building was built in 1877. Although it does not look similar, the structure next to his was built in the same time period (the structure that Mr. Grabill proposes to renovate), but that building has been changed/modified over the years. There is an existing driveway on the left side of the property. The driveway to the right is just an extension of the driveway back to the garage; there really are no additional driveways. He does not understand why ARB would not be supportive of a transition from that structure to what Mr. Grabill has proposed. He would suggest that they be flexible and support Mr. Grabill moving to the next step to see how the project would turn out.

Mr. Rinaldi stated that Mr. Grabill has indicated that he wants the Board's support of the project before proceeding further.

Doru Stefanescu, 182 South High Street, stated that he and his wife, Pamela, live in the house south of this particular site, and they own the adjacent lot between. They would like to build a new home on that lot. It would be to their advantage if they could share the driveway Mr. Grabill has proposed. The house in which they now live was built by Mr. Grabill many years ago. It is a beautiful house. Frequently, people stop and ask who built their home. Mr. Grabill was able to take an old house and renovate it internally into a modern home while at the same time preserving the architectural appearance of Old Dublin. They trust him implicitly to provide quality and ability to match the other structures in Dublin. He was born in Europe, and he agrees with the previous comment that diversity in houses is typical and appealing in Europe. Although they must be consistent with certain, common styles, they are different sizes.

Mr. Rinaldi reiterated that his concern is not with smaller homes. It is that the proposed development is very different from the existing development in that area. That is a concern to him, particularly because they aren't able to judge the projected scale.

Mr. Alexander stated that because this is an Informal Review, he will speak frankly. A number of people who live in the area would like something different than what is there today. They tend to agree that demolition would fine, but because something will be built in its place, they don't want to make a hasty decision without seeing drawings of what is proposed. The Board does not want to tell Mr. Grabill to proceed and run the risk of saying later, when drawings are available, that the project cannot proceed. That would be a waste of his money. Mr. Steele spoke about building a second structure on his lot, which would be a total of two single-family homes. Mr. Grabill's project would be four units on one lot, with 4-8 vehicles coming and going. This is Dublin Ohio, not Dublin, Ireland, nor is it German Village. We agree with the desire for some variety, but there is a limited way to achieve that.

Ms. Bryan stated that she lives in this area, and she likes what she sees. She has seen Mr. Grabill's other properties and is confident that he incorporates feedback during the development process very well. She understands the concerns that have been shared; however, her concern was with the impact on neighboring properties whose view would be that of the garages at the rear of these units. Perhaps that can be addressed with landscaping. If a vote were requested, her vote would be that Mr. Grabill take the next step, but she may be in the minority.

Mr. Rinaldi stated that she may not be in the minority. He is supportive of smaller residences, but he is unable to envision the proposed dimensions and assess its ability to fit in with the area. Perhaps that can be accomplished.

There were no other comments offered on the Informal Review.

- **Architectural Review Board Annual Report**

~~Ms. Rauch stated that a draft 2018 Annual Report was provided to ARB for their comments. Mr. Keeler requested a correction/addition:~~

- ~~- On page 5, under Cases and Decisions, it reads "in complexity from minor façade improvements to major residential additions and new, mixed-use development." He suggested that "demolition" be added to that list.~~

~~Mr. Alexander requested one correction/clarification:~~

- ~~- On page 6, Item #10—Was this a reference to "formal recognition and protection of historic stone walls," or historic stone?~~

~~Ms. Rauch stated that it should be clarified as stone walls. Staff will make those corrections, accordingly.~~

~~Ms. Bryan moved to accept the 2018 ARB Annual Report with the corrections as noted.~~

~~Mr. Keeler seconded the motion.~~

Vote: ~~Mr. Keeler, yes; Ms. Bryan, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes.~~