



MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, January 27, 2021

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Alexander, Vice Chair, called the January 27, 2021 virtual meeting of the Architectural Review Board to order at 6:30 p.m., noting that due to the current pandemic, public meetings are being held online and live streamed on YouTube.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. Alexander led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Board Members present: Mr. Alexander, Ms. Kramb, Mr. Cotter, Mr. Kownacki.
Board Members absent: Ms. Bryan [excused]
Staff present: Ms. Rauch, Ms. Martin, Mr. Ridge, Mr. Rayburn

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Kramb moved, Mr. Kownacki seconded to accept the documents into the record and approve the December 16, 2020 meeting minutes.

Vote on the motion: Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Kownacki, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes.
[Motion carried 4-0]

Mr. Alexander stated that the Architectural Review Board is responsible for review of construction, modification or alteration to any site in the Review District or area subject to Architectural Board Review under the provision of Zoning Code Section 153.177. The Board has the decision-making responsibility on these cases. The Chair swore in staff and applicants who planned to address the Board on any of the cases during the meeting.

POSTPONED CASE

1. Ghidotti Residence, 85 S. Riverview Street, 20-187ARB-MPR, Minor Project Review

A request for construction of a new 3,400-square-foot, single-family residence on a 0.41-acre site located west of S. Riverview Street, ±375 feet north of the intersection with Short Street, and zoned Bridge Street District, Historic Residential.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Martin stated that this is a request for a review and approval for construction of a new one-and-a-half story, single-family home on a 0.41-acre site located west of S. Riverview Street, approximately 300 feet north of the intersection with Short Street and zoned BSD-HR: Bridge Street District – Historic Residential District. [Photos of surrounding properties shown for context.] The 0.41-acre parcel has approximately 80 feet of frontage along S. Riverview Street. There is a minimal amount of grade change across the site from west to east. The site is presently vacant, as the previous 1,200-square-foot, single-family home was demolished subsequent to ARB approval.

History

In June 2020, the ARB reviewed and approved demolition of the existing home due to its deteriorated and hazardous condition. There were no conditions of approval associated with the action permitting the property owner to demolish the home prior to approval of a new project. In September 2020, the ARB provided feedback on an informal review for a potential future application to construct a new one-and-a-half story, single-family home with a three-car attached garage on a 0.37-acre site. The Board expressed support for the proposal, particularly the proposed site layout and unique architectural character. The Board encouraged the applicant to provide separation between the home and the two-story attached garage. Some Board members suggested opportunities for improvement, including exterior materials and treatment of roof lines and building height.

Proposal

The updates include a masonry-clad chimney, reduction in the height of the garage, greater separation between the garage and the primary structure, and the preservation of the rear yard through modification of the setbacks. The proposed site plan is substantially similar to the previous site plan. The proposal includes a 3,000 sq. ft. primary residence, an attached three-car garage, an enclosed three-season room, and a large, at-grade patio. The total lot coverage permitted in this District is 50%, which is the amount proposed. The proposed setbacks from S. Riverview Street are substantial. Code identifies required setbacks by street based on the existing context and character. For the west side of S. Riverview Street, the required minimum setbacks are: front yard – 20 feet; side yard – 3 feet, total of 12 feet; and, rear yard – 15 feet. The proposed setbacks are: front yard – 52 feet; south side yard – 3 feet; north side yard – 16.5 feet; and rear yard – 30 feet.

Architecture

The proposal is consistent with the Historic Dublin Design Guidelines recommendation that homes be sited in a manner that is contextually sensitive to the District and surrounding properties. The site layout remains consistent with the September proposal. The home is proposed to be centrally sited on the lot. The front door addresses S. Riverview Street with vehicular access provided by a curvilinear driveway to the north of the home. The primary form of the 1.5 story home is a side-gabled hall, parlor style cottage reminiscent of agricultural forms, with an offset entrance. The chimney is now clad in a veneer. Many of the other details remain the same, but the box bay window on the front façade has been eliminated. The exterior cladding material will be a cultured limestone with buttered joints, tongue and groove vertical siding, composite slate roof, and a 16-inch standing seam roof. Details have not yet been provided regarding doors and light fixtures, although gas light fixtures are anticipated. [Description of each façade provided.] The garage will be separated from the primary structure via a connector stoop. The primary home is proposed to be stained a semi-transparent light beige, and the garage is proposed to be stained a semi-transparent gray-brown. At the past meeting, the Board requested delineation of the convergence of rooflines, and the applicant has provided information regarding the hidden elevation per the Board's request. Casement windows in a bronze finish are proposed, and staff has conditioned that the applicant should ensure all windows are full, simulated divided lights with spacer bar and muntins. Staff has reviewed the application against the applicable criteria and recommends approval with two conditions.

Applicant Presentation

Richard Taylor, Architect, 48 S. High Street, Dublin, OH, stated that this is the third time the Board has reviewed their proposal, and it has been very helpful to gain the Board's feedback as the design has progressed. The application is essentially the same as was reviewed in September, but with changes that are responsive to the Board's comments at that meeting. An open porch has been added, and the roof has been stepped down on the north side between the house and the garage to enhance the visual separation of the masses. The height of the garage roof also has been reduced, and is now approximately 32 inches lower than the roof of the primary structure. The roofing materials were reduced from three to two, the chimney materials have been changed from siding to stone, and the house has been pulled forward on the site to be better aligned with the adjacent homes and preserve more of the backyard. The previously hidden elevation of the garage is also shown in the meeting materials, and the shed dormer on the back can be seen. The 50% lot coverage is somewhat

misleading, as included in the calculation is almost 3,000 square feet of driveway; the driveway is 190 feet in length. That driveway length is necessary to permit location of the garage at the back of the lot.

Public Comments

Denise Franz King, 170 S. Riverview Street, Dublin, OH 43017:

"The Historic Dublin community, the ARB and staff have worked hard over years to establish the new Historic Dublin Guidelines. These instructions for development in the Historic District provide instruction on the mass, scale, lot coverage, height and setback of new structures in the HD. I am glad to see that the new home proposed at 185 respects the Guideline's instruction that the setback be the same as adjoining structures in order to maintain the pastoral character, which draws owners and visitors to S. Riverview. Along with setback, mass, scale, lot coverage and height are all critical to the character of the Historic District. Thank you."

Steve Rudy, 129 S. Riverview Street, Dublin, OH 43017:

"Referring to the proposed new home at 185 S. Riverview Street - While the proposed house is in accordance with the new pattern (large, long houses), it does not follow the existing pattern, namely, it leaves no green space. Therefore, the new residents will be able to enjoy green space on neighboring properties, but cuts off sight lines and views of green space for residents of neighboring properties. The proposed layout thus reduces the property values, or at the very least the quality of life enjoyed by neighboring properties. It imposes a win-lose trade-off. More restraint is required in the residual Historic District."

Board Questions/Discussion

Ms. Kramb stated that the front of the structure reflects two sections – the original stone building and a later addition to the south. Originally, the addition would have consisted of one material, but as proposed, the front and part of the side is stone; the rest is siding. Although mentioned by the consultant, she has no objection to the multiple roof lines proposed. The three-dimensional drawings depict the pitch of the roof on the connector as very steep; the ratio should be similar to that of the garage. She preferred the previous garage design over what is proposed tonight, as the building now appears longer. The earlier version did not have an exercise space.

Mr. Cotter stated that he likes this revised plan, although he does see the issue with two materials on the addition. The chimney also appears to be larger.

Mr. Kownacki stated that he agrees with Ms. Kramb in that an addition would not have been constructed of two different materials. He appreciates the setbacks. In regard to the chimney, he believes the chimney cap may be what is now standard.

Mr. Alexander stated that the majority opinion at the September meeting was positive; he was in the minority then and probably will be tonight, as well. However, he states his concerns for the record. He does not believe the proposal meets two of the primary standards of the Historic District Design Guidelines, one of which states, "the building site should be designed to be consistent with the original block street or site patterns of the District in which the building is located." In the pattern of an historic setting, the house is tied to the street with open space behind it, potentially with an outbuilding. The way in which the mass of the proposed structure is distributed across the site is not consistent with that pattern. The second issue is the proposed building coverage, which does meet the zoning requirement. In the District, the first-floor footprint of the average home is 2,200 square feet, or 16.23% of the lot coverage; this is exclusive of the second story. Placing the entire square footage on the ground floor results in a large footprint on the site. It is also the reason the building is long and does not allow for space to pass through the site. The pattern for how houses in historic districts are sited is consistent throughout Columbus, whether in Olde Worthington, Clintonville, South Arlington or Bexley. It is a consistent pattern in historic districts of this time period. The consultant's report provided examples of buildings with length-wise additions, and Dublin does have many of those. There are two exceptions on Pinneyhill Lane,

but those are not original buildings; the buildings have been modified and are atypical in terms of development pattern. The consultant provided a good example of the lengthwise addition, which is the Donato's building. That addition does not extend even to the midpoint of the lot, which continues to have space within the lot. He had hoped that the revision would provide a detached garage, which would have provided that space within the lot. He appreciates that the architect lowered the roof at the entry of the garage in an attempt to address the issue with the connection. However, he does not believe the design meets 5.2 of the Design Guidelines. In addition to Mr. Rudy's comments, others have spoken at ARB meetings, expressing concerns with the long houses that block the space. One does not need to be an architect or urban designer to recognize the difference, and the neighbors are aware of that difference. The surfaces and materials make sense in the District, and he appreciates many of the details provided. However, he wanted his concerns reflected in the record.

Mr. Taylor responded to Ms. Kramb's comment regarding the south gables. The proposed materials were reflected in both of the previous applications and no concerns were expressed at that time. In regard to the roof pitch, all of the roof pitches on the house are identical except for the garage roof, where the pitch has been lowered. The long connector has the same pitch as the rest of the house, although the 3D view may not have made that clear. Ms. Kramb commented that she preferred the previous garage design; however, there are only two differences: some windows were removed, and on the north elevation, the shutters were removed from the upper windows. He inquired if those were the concerns.

Ms. Kramb responded that they are not. Her preference is because the previous design that did not have the exercise room addition on the south side. The revised connection of the home to the garage makes the building appear longer.

Mr. Taylor responded that the intent was to create a difference on the north side of the connector, in response to comments at the previous meeting.

Ms. Kramb responded that this issue is not critical to her. In regard to the siding, previously, the farthest south gable line on the front half portrayed a completely separate addition. However, the rendering provided tonight shows it sharing the same roofline. Therefore, it appears to be part of a construction that occurred all at one time. If that is the case, it would have had the same siding material.

Mr. Taylor responded that he sees her point, but would that be important on an interior façade on an interior lot?

Ms. Kramb responded that it is not critical, as there is no alley, unlike the home on Eberly Lane. As proposed, the back façade will not be seen. The front façade is what is critical, and she is satisfied with what is proposed there.

Mr. Taylor stated that Mr. Cotter commented on the chimney size, and they can reduce the size, if need be. However, he would like to have the latitude to enhance some of the features of the house, without needing to make it like every other house. The direction was to avoid alternate historicism, and constructing a chimney differently than it would have been 150 years ago would seem appropriate. Mr. Alexander's concerns about the consistent pattern in historic districts and the overall size of the home footprint were expressed at the previous meeting, but, as noted, the concerns were not shared by the majority of Board members.

Mr. Alexander responded that, regardless, those points are important.

Mr. Cotter responded that he does understand his point. The Board has discussed the issue with long houses due to attempts to provide more space. This is a valid concern.

Ms. Kramb responded that she agrees some homes have been proposed that were too long, and this house might not work on a different lot. It works here because the site does not border a rear or side alley. The siting of the home on the lot also is consistent with the adjacent homes, which accommodates a concern expressed by Riverview Street residents.

Mr. Cotter responded that for that reason he has no objection. In addition, the substantial setbacks provided help mitigate some of those challenges. The proposal is a good compromise.

Mr. Kownacki responded that the application is consistent with Code, so he has no objections.

Mr. Alexander noted that Mr. Taylor has stated that he has no objection to the proposed conditions.

Mr. Cotter moved, Mr. Kownacki seconded approval of the Minor Project Review with the following conditions:

- 1) The applicant select entry doors, consistent with the proposed elevations, and select light fixtures, subject to staff approval.
- 2) The applicant revise the window selection to a full-simulated divided light window with spacer bar and muntins, subject to staff approval.

Vote: Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Kownacki, yes; Mr. Alexander, no; Mr. Cotter, yes.
[Motion approved 3-1.]

INFORMAL REVIEW CASES

2. 40 N. High Street, 20-196INF, Informal Review

A request for an informal review and feedback to construct a second story addition to an existing, one-story building and a new three-story apartment building on a 0.21-acre site zoned Bridge Street District, Historic Core, located east of N. High Street, ±125 feet south of North Street.

Staff Report

Ms. Martin stated this a request for review and non-binding feedback for a future proposal for 40 N. High Street. The 0.21-acre site is located immediately south of North High Brewing and is adjacent to the Columbus Metropolitan Library – Dublin branch. An existing historic stone wall bisects the site; a portion of the wall is located beyond the bounds of this site and is on the property to the north, identified as Lot 129. This site is presently developed with a gravel parking lot and an existing one-story mid-century dental office building. The portion of the parking lot and drive aisle located south of this site is shared with Lot 129. Presently, the site circulation is one-way in from the south drive and one-way out from the north drive. On the east side of the stone wall that bisects the site, there is informal parking on a gravel lot. The existing building on the site was built in 1956 and is considered “contributing” to the local Historic District. The structure is a concrete block construction with a front gable, low-pitch roof, with overhanging eaves, horizontal casement windows and a recessed entry. There is significant grade change of approximately 17 feet across the site. While the office building and parking lot are located at grade with N. High Street, the additional separate parking is located at grade with N. Blacksmith Lane. The historic stone wall was originally built by the Wing family, who were stone masons and for whom Wing Hill is named. A historic two-story outhouse is located along the southern boundary of the south wall. The outhouse was originally built by Forrest Wing for his mother. The southern boundary of the wall is along a shared property line and primarily located on 36-38 N. High Street. The property owner of 36-38 N. High Street will need to be a joint applicant party to any future application for development. The integrity of the stone wall is presently compromised. This site is zoned Bridge Street District, and is located north of East Bridge Street. This zoning district identifies permitted uses and development standards. Development standards in commercial districts are regulated by building type. Each zoning district permits certain building types based on the location and surrounding development character. Based on the proposal, the applicable Building Type is Historic Mixed Use for the office building, and Single-Family Attached for the apartment building located at the rear of the site. Because the Single-Family Attached building type is not a permitted type in the Historic Core District, a waiver would be required. Due to the conceptual nature of the proposal, it is not possible to determine if all development standards would be met, although the size and scale are consistent with the maximum building height, and there may be opportunities to comply with lot coverage, provided that semi-pervious pavement is included.

Site Layout

The site layout is proposed largely to remain as the existing. The access and building location are proposed to be retained. Parking for the dental office is proposed to continue to be located to the rear of the structure. A new two-unit attached townhome building is proposed to be sited along N. Blacksmith Lane with separate

vehicular access. The existing historic stonewall is proposed to be modified to accommodate the proposed townhomes and the existing historic outhouse is proposed to be demolished.

Parking

The required vehicle parking is determined by use, and for the Medical Office and General Office building, 2.5 parking spaces/1,000 square feet is required. For townhouse dwellings, two parking spaces per dwelling unit are required. Presently, the site does not contain any formal parking spaces, as it is not paved, but with paving of the parking area, five spaces including an ADA accessible space will be provided for the office building, in addition to the one on-street parking space in front of the property. An additional four parking spaces (two per dwelling unit) will be provided for the townhomes. Because 10 parking spaces are proposed where 18 spaces typically would be required, approval of a Parking Plan will be necessary.

Architecture

The applicant has proposed building massing and inspirational architectural character for the Board's consideration. The proposed concept builds on the existing structure by creating a two-story, stair tower entrance providing access to a new second story addition. The second story extends over the improved parking area, creating a cantilevered appearance supported by structural beams. The second story will accommodate additional general office uses. Two attached, three-story townhomes are proposed to be constructed along N. Blacksmith Lane, with parking located on the first floor. The proposed architectural character would take cues from the Mid Century lines of the existing structure in an attempt to not apply a false history to the building or site. While no elevations, materials, or details are provided, the applicant has indicated a desire to apply a Usonian aesthetic, which most often emphasizes horizontal geometric forms and warm, natural exterior materials to blur the line between indoors and outdoors. Together, the inspiration images identify elements that a future design could incorporate, but are not intended to stand alone.

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

- 1) Does the Board support demolition of the outhouse and partial demolition of the stonewall?
- 2) Does the Board support a Waiver to permit the Single-Family Attached building type?
- 3) Does the Board support a Parking Plan to permit 10 parking spaces where 18 are required?
- 4) Does the Board support the proposed site layout?
- 5) Is the Board supportive of the mass and scale of the building addition and new townhomes?
- 6) Is the Board supportive of the conceptual architectural character?

Board Questions/Discussion

Mr. Cotter inquired if the development occurring to the north of this site will be Residential.

Ms. Martin responded that it would not be Residential. The development to the north is the approved Co-Hatch project, which is a co-working space with opportunities for work-oriented gatherings.

Mr. Cotter stated that certainly, a permitted use in the District is live-work and multi-family, but determination of the permitted Building Type is unclear.

Ms. Martin responded that for multi-family, the Historic Mixed-Use Building Type would be appropriate, as is proposed here.

Ms. Kramb inquired the anticipated height of the building to the north.

Ms. Martin responded that she believes it is slightly less than 45 feet in height.

Ms. Kramb inquired if that structure is 3 stories.

Mr. Alexander responded that it is 2.5 stories.

Ms. Kramb stated that with the new Code revision and area rezoning, this site is being rezoned as Historic Core.

Ms. Martin confirmed that it would be rezoned from Bridge Street District-Historic Core to Historic District-Historic Core.

Applicant Presentation

Dan Morgan, AIA, Behal Sampson Dietz, 990 W 3rd Ave, Columbus, OH 43212, requested that the Board clarify its position in regard to considering the Blacksmith Alley building as Single Family Attached, which is not a Permitted Use, versus an apartment building, which is a Permitted Use. Originally, this was a simple, block office building with a flat roof, which later received a pitched roof. The permitted lot coverage in the District is 85%. This plan will provide impermeable, partially covered parking spaces. They are attempting to maximize the greenspace and provide pocket terraces for the apartment building. At this preliminary point, the design is conceptual only. To minimize the scale of the apartment building, the garages are pulled forward toward the street, so that the taller mass of the apartment building sets back from the street. As designed, the site plan will provide views of the tuck-pointed, restructured retaining wall, which is presently in a compromised condition. Dr. Lapiere has invested money in preventing the parking lot from sinking, but that is a losing battle when the foundation of the retaining wall is in this type of disrepair. The wall extends past this site and to the adjacent neighbor's property before making an 85-degree turn toward High Street to support the existing two-story outhouse. That portion of the wall is in the most disrepair, so they would be coordinating efforts to remedy with the neighbors to the south.

Ms. Martin stated that, in response to an earlier question from Ms. Krumb regarding permitted lot coverage in the proposed rezoning, the lot coverage would be reduced to 85% flat. Currently, it is 85% plus a semi-pervious allowance, for a total of 90%.

Board Questions/Discussion

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

1) Does the Board support demolition of the outhouse and partial demolition of the stonewall?

Ms. Krumb stated that she does not support partial demolition of the stonewall, unless they can provide proof of total disrepair and structural and cost analysis, justifying its demolition. She would much prefer to keep the stonewall.

Mr. Cotter stated that his position is essentially the same, although the building is on a hill and the upper parking area must be prevented from coming down.

Mr. Kownacki expressed agreement. The site has only one historic element, and it is the stonewall built by the Wing family, for which a street is named. Obviously, saving the wall is a priority.

Mr. Alexander expressed agreement. With some projects, a historic wall can be incorporated into the architecture. However, integrating the wall with the new construction here could be difficult. It may be necessary to dismantle and rebuild the wall to retain the parking area in a more stable manner. He requested the architect to respond.

Mr. Morgan responded that is the issue. They would have to take the wall down and then rebuild it. The stonewall is a significant feature of this site, and they are attempting to protect it as much as possible. If they were to dismantle the wall and restructure it into the design proposal, making it an interior wall or an element of the apartment building, would that be acceptable with the Board? They will be conducting a full structural investigation of the wall and also of the existing office building to ensure it is feasible to build another story above it.

Ms. Krumb stated that if their structural analysis meets the threshold for proving that a historic element in the Historic District must be demolished, then she will support the demolition. She is less concerned with whether it is incorporated into the future design. Her preference is that the wall remain a feature on the site as is.

James Lapiere, DDS, 40 N. High Street, Dublin, Ohio, stated that as the photos show, his sewer line extends through that area, and that part of the wall is 6-12 inches from the existing structure. The stones in the wall

are separating, some of which have loosened and fallen into the parking lot below. There is concern if the wall were to come apart to a greater extent, a vehicle in the top parking area could fall into the area below. The wall would need to be taken down and rebuilt just to retain the existing parking lot for his dental office, regardless of any addition.

Mr. Alexander stated that there is a process for demolition approval for cases in which the structure is in poor shape and cannot be retained or the cost of retaining it would be substantially overwhelming. If the desire is to replace it with something new, there is a process for receiving demolition approval. Such a process may be applicable in this case.

2) Does the Board support a Waiver to permit the Single-Family Attached building type?

Board consensus was support for a Waiver to permit the Single-Family Attached building type.

3) Does the Board support a Parking Plan to permit 10 parking spaces where 18 are required?

Board consensus was support for a Parking Plan to permit 10 parking spaces, if determined appropriate with the Concept Plan review.

4) Does the Board support the proposed site layout?

Board consensus was support for the proposed site layout, exclusive of the stonewall remedy, which is yet undetermined. Members noted that if the stonewall were to be removed, another retaining method would be necessary. The grade change warrants the building and use changes. The different streets support different uses and types of building.

Ms. Krumb noted that there is a large tree on the site next to the wall. The applicant should provide information on its size and condition. It is preferable to save the older trees in the Historic District, but in this case, it may not be practical to save it.

5) Is the Board supportive of the mass and scale of the building addition and new townhomes?

Board members expressed support for the mass and scale at this preliminary point.

Ms. Krumb stated that with the Concept Plan, the applicant should provide information on the height of the building, both from the front and from the alley, in relation to the adjacent buildings.

Mr. Alexander noted that the mass may change if the roof were to change.

6) Is the Board supportive of the conceptual architectural character?

Mr. Cotter stated that he believes that for the office addition, the architectural character is too utilitarian and stark; it appears out of place with the other structures. He has no objection to the proposed architectural character of the townhouses.

Mr. Kownacki indicated that he had no objections to the proposed architectural character of the structures.

Ms. Krumb stated that she likes the Mid Century Modern architecture, which is what currently exists on the office building, although the concrete structure could be enhanced with stone. She does not like the townhouse architectural views, particularly the middle image.

Mr. Alexander stated that the classification of an architectural style for the current office building is tenuous at best, but if the roof is removed, he believes the office building also becomes new construction. The Guidelines state that the operative principle should be "similar to existing contributing buildings in the District in which it is located." To him, this is more like the Library, which is not a contributing building. It also states that, "roof pitch and form should be similar to surrounding buildings." With the townhomes, he prefers the middle image, because it is a clear residential form; it is a simple gable in the center of windows. The modulation of the elevations is responsive to the scale of the small buildings across the street. There would be a nice transition from those

buildings to these and to the Co-Hatch building to the north. He likes the townhome images, but the concern is whether they are appropriate per the standards of this District. With a previous Concept Plan proposal within this same block, when questioned about the relationship of their proposal with contributing structures in the District, the applicant responded that the Historic District was gone. He is concerned about the message that might be communicated with this elevation in this setting.

Mr. Morgan stated that, per the Consultant's report, this building, which reflects a simple vernacular Mid Century construction and materials, is the contributing architecture, which they were attempting to continue. Their intent was to incorporate the same lines with a few more contemporary elements into the Blacksmith Alley structure. He hesitates to think of the dental office as new construction and would prefer not to attempt to make it look like something it is not.

Mr. Alexander responded that he understands his point. He noted that if a waiver were to be requested for coverage, the applicant would need to provide a strong case for the hardship justifying a variance. It is difficult to support a variance for coverage just to enable more square footage to be constructed.

Mr. Morgan responded that at this point, they are meeting the 85% maximum coverage. He would attempt to avoid a variance request, if possible.

Mr. Alexander inquired if the applicant would need any further direction.

Mr. Morgan indicated that they had sufficient direction.

3. Winan's Addition at 48-52 S. High Street, 20-217INF, Informal Review

A request for informal review and feedback regarding the construction of a one-story, 400-square-foot addition to a structure on a 0.25-acre site zoned Bridge Street District, Historic South, and located southeast of the intersection of South High Street with Spring Hill Lane.

Staff Presentation

Background

Mr. Rayburn stated that this a request for informal review and feedback on a proposed 400-square foot addition and exterior modifications to an existing building on a site located southeast of the intersection of South High Street and Spring Hill Lane, and zoned BSD-HS: Historic South District. The site is developed with a two-story commercial building constructed circa 1850. The 2,761-square-foot building has an irregular footprint, formed by a two-story, side-gable core and expanded by multiple additions on the east (rear) elevation. The original building has a stone foundation, a standing-seam metal roof, and is divided into two distinct parts by address. The north section of the building is 48 S. High Street, occupied by law offices and providing access to upper story tenants, and the south building section is 52 S. High Street occupied by Winan's Coffee. The site is located on a 10,890-square foot lot, which contains mature trees, landscaping and a decorative stone wall along the northern edge of the parking lot to the rear of the site. The surface parking lot has recently been resurfaced and is not currently striped. Should a formal application be pursued, the applicant will need to include a parking plan informed by the building uses. In 2017, the City of Dublin City Council adopted a Historic and Cultural Assessment, which documents a variety of community assets including homes, cemeteries, and stone walls. As part of the assessment, the structure on this site was listed as a contributing building to the High Street Historic District.

Proposal

The applicant is proposing to expand the existing tenant space for Winan's Coffee with an approximately 400-square-foot (20'-3" x 20'-6"), single-story addition to the east elevation of the building. The color and architectural style of the addition will match the existing drop siding. A metal standing-seam shed roof on the addition will be visible, and is proposed in a Slate Gray color to match the existing standing seam on the building. The addition extends the south building wall to the east, maintaining the existing side yard setback. It will allow the applicants to relocate bathrooms and service areas in order to free up more space for seating. It is important to note that the Code permits a maximum of 65% lot coverage with an additional 10% permitted for semi-pervious surfaces. The applicant has indicated that the existing site exceeds this limit with a total of 72%

impervious lot coverage. With the proposed addition, the lot coverage would increase to approximately 76%; therefore, a waiver for lot coverage would be necessary with a future application for formal review. There are no new windows proposed on the addition. A new doorway is proposed on the north elevation of the addition for ingress/egress. Because the height of the addition is not provided, the applicant should provide the height of the addition, as measured per Code, should they move forward with a formal application. The addition is located to the rear of the existing structure and is subordinate to the existing structure. The proposed addition also requires the relocation of three existing HVAC compressor units. The applicant is proposing to relocate this equipment to the east elevation of the new addition, and install a living screening wall in between the east elevation of the proposed addition and the rear surface parking lot. The conceptual drawings indicate Euonymus as the preferred selection of plant for the living screening wall. Euonymus species range from evergreen shrubs such as Euonymus japonicus to evergreen vines such as Euonymus fortunei. Should a formal application be pursued, the species of Euonymus may be a condition of approval for a minor project review. Additionally, the applicant will be required to provide screening on all sides of the compressor units with a future application. Upon review and feedback of the Informal Review by the Architectural Review Board (ARB), the applicant may file a formal application for review and approval of a Minor Project Review by the ARB.

The following questions are provided to facilitate the Board's review of the proposal:

- 1) Does the Board support the location of the proposed addition?
- 2) Does the Board support the proposed mass, scale and materials of the addition, including the living screening wall?
- 3) Does the Board support the proposed lot coverage?

Applicant Presentation

Peter Lenz, Lenz Architecture, 515 Hartford Street, Worthington, OH stated that Mr. Rayburn's presentation was thorough. He would like to point out that the mechanical equipment must be serviced annually, and since most of the service is done to the side of the units, it would be difficult to screen them completely. The applicant would prefer to use a species of Euonymus that Oakland Nurseries recommends.

Ms. Martin responded that in terms of mechanical screening, there has been a long history of applicants screening the mechanicals on all sides, particularly the sides that are visible from public rights-of-way, and this site has two. Staff would work with the applicant, and potentially, access could be provided from the southern property line.

Mr. Lenz stated that once the walls are set in place, they cannot be moved, which makes it difficult to deal with planting materials.

Ms. Martin responded that a gate would be a compliant solution. Where access is needed, a solid gate could be provided; in the other areas, plantings could be provided.

Mr. Lenz pointed out that the Euonymus would grow to at least two feet above the fence. A wall of 6 to possibly 12 feet will be needed to cover the mechanicals, and ability provided to service the mechanicals on the sides.

Ms. Kramb stated that the photos of the existing mechanicals show units that are approximately 3 feet in height.

Mr. Lenz responded that per the new Energy Code, larger units are required; the new units will be 4.5 – 5.0 feet in height.

Mr. Alexander inquired if the units would be supported on a platform.

Mr. Lenz responded that they do not know precisely where the wall will lie in terms of the addition. It could be necessary to place the units on platforms.

Mr. Alexander responded that in that case, he would understand the reason the screening would need to be tall. If the starting point of the screening wall is two feet below, due to the grade change, potentially, the height of the walls could be six feet.

Mr. Lenz noted that two additional feet should be considered for the stonewall.

Board Questions/Discussion

Ms. Kramb stated that there is an existing limestone wall between the parking and the yard. Is that part of the historic wall that runs east-west along the alley?

Mr. Rayburn responded that the wall runs along the northern edge of the lot. This tenant space is on the southern section of the building, so it would not be near that wall.

Ms. Kramb stated that there is also a limestone wall that runs north-south between the grassy area and the parking lot. Would that wall be impacted by this project?

Mr. Lenz responded that it would not; their intent is to protect the wall.

Mr. Alexander stated that in the photo provided, there is a projection to the right with a different kind of siding. Is that an earlier addition?

Mr. Lenz responded that it was an earlier addition. A number of additions have been made to the original building.

Robert Deuberry, 48-52 S. High Street, Dublin, OH, stated that one addition has painted shingles, while most of the remaining building has painted hardiplank. On the front façade, the left section of the building has shingles, which transitions to clapboard on the right side. The building was renovated in the early 1980s, when the addition at the back was added, which is covered in hardiplank.

Mr. Alexander inquired if the proposed addition would abut any original siding.

Mr. Deuberry responded that it would abut only the addition made in the 1980s.

1) Does the Board support the location of the proposed addition?

Board consensus was support for the location.

2) Does the Board support the proposed mass, scale and materials of the addition, including the living screening wall?

Board consensus was support for the location.

3) Does the Board support the proposed lot coverage?

Mr. Alexander inquired if any change in permitted lot coverage was included in the proposed Code revision.

Ms. Martin responded that no changes were proposed. The lot coverage permitted in a rezoning is 65%.

Mr. Cotter stated that although, typically, a waiver for lot coverage is not viewed favorably; however, in this case, he would have no objection, as it would be difficult to do anything with the lot otherwise.

Ms. Kramb stated that she would prefer first to ensure the site was not over parked. If it is, they could remove a parking space or two and, thereby, meet Code.

Mr. Alexander stated that he would agree with that suggestion. It is important to look at the parking requirements in relation to the lot coverage.

Mr. Alexander inquired if the applicant required additional feedback.

Mr. Deuberry stated that the lot coverage and the parking would be the primary issue. He inquired if the Board's request is that the required parking for the existing building and for the addition be compared against the existing parking spaces.

Ms. Kramb responded that it would be preferable to see if a couple of parking spaces could be removed versus providing a waiver.

Mr. Lenz stated that 400 square feet would be approximately two cars. He noted that there is a City access drive across the lot, which impacts the lot coverage.

Ms. Kramb stated that with their formal application, they would need to indicate the amount of parking required for the building and how much parking they currently have to accurately evaluate the lot coverage.

Mr. Alexander stated that if additional lot coverage is needed to provide access for an adjacent lot, that is clearly a mitigating factor. They should not be penalized for service they are providing an adjacent lot. The Board is supportive of the proposed project, but would like details concerning the parking.

4. 87 S. High Street, 20-218INF, Informal Review

A request for informal review and feedback to demolish a detached structure, modify an existing building, and construct a two-story, 2,000 square-foot addition on a 0.11-acre site zoned Bridge Street District, Historic South. The site is located west of S. High Street, ±75 feet north of the intersection with Pinneyhill Lane.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Ridge stated that this is a request for informal review and feedback to demolish a detached structure, modify an existing building, and construct a two-story, 2,000-square-foot addition on a 0.11-acre site located northwest of the intersection of S. High Street and Pinneyhill Lane, and zoned BSD-HS: Bridge Street District – Historic South District. Today, the site contains an existing structure and detached shed on the eastern third of the site. A joined parking lot, which accesses the sites immediately to the north and south, encompasses the middle third of the site. The western third of the site contains a small grass lawn and landscaping. The 0.11-acre site has 30 feet of frontage along S. High Street and on Mill Lane. [Photographs of adjacent buildings shown for site context.] Presently, the site contains a rectilinear one-and-one-half-story Greek revival building constructed Ca. 1840. The structure has a simple front gable roof with a standing seam metal material. The structure is supported by a stone foundation. In 2017, the City of Dublin City Council adopted a Historic and Cultural Assessment, which documents a variety of community assets including homes, cemeteries, and stone walls. As part of the assessment, the existing structure on this site was found to be listed on the Ohio Historical Inventory (OHI), and determined to be recommended contributing. The existing structure is listed in good condition, and received positive integrity notes for location, setting, design, materials, workmanship, feeling and association.

Proposal

The proposal is for a large, multi-part addition to an existing, approximately 936-square-foot, 1.5-story historic building. The addition consists of three parts: 1) a 327-square-foot addition to the rear of the existing historic structure; 2) a 143-square-foot connector providing access between the east and west additions; and, 3) an approximately 2,000-square-foot, two-story addition at the rear of the property. The existing structure is approximately 26 feet wide. The applicant is proposing that the addition be 24 feet in width to create a visual break in the historic portion of the home and the addition, as well as to give the perception that the addition is subordinate to the historic structure. The height of the existing historic structure is approximately 20 feet from established grade to the peak of the roof. Both the addition to the historic structure and the connector are shorter than the historic building, although by how much is unclear. The proposed height of the two-story rear addition is approximately 22 feet, 8 inches, measured in the same manner. Per Code, these heights are measured incorrectly and should be corrected should this return to the ARB. A maximum of 65% impervious lot coverage is permitted, with an additional 10-percent permitted for semi-pervious coverage. The applicant has provided initial estimates for lot coverage and appears to meet the requirements; however, further analysis will be required to determine whether a waiver will be required with a future formal application. [Described the details of each façade.]

The following questions are provided for the Board's discussion:

- 1) Does the Board support demolition of the detached shed, and demolition of an addition to the historic structure?
- 2) Does the Board support the proposed height, scale and massing of the addition?
- 3) Is the Board supportive of a potential Waiver to lot coverage requirements?
- 4) Does the Board support the conceptual architecture, exterior materials and material transitions?

Applicant Presentation

John Staudt, Staudt Design & Architecture Group, 1489 Ardwick Road, Upper Arlington, OH, stated that a survey is being completed and they will be able to provide more accurate measurements regarding distance from the building to ensure access for the adjacent tenant. The objective of this project was to maximize the smaller lot with a live-work dwelling, taking advantage of the walkable amenities of downtown Dublin. They are pressing the limits of the lot coverage with the intent of creating the most high-end live-work dwelling possible on this narrow site.

Board Questions/Discussion

Mr. Alexander stated that floorplans for the interior of the existing building depict a clean slate. How will that building be used?

Mr. Staudt responded that there is currently an office and restroom in the front section. A small office will remain in the front section, and the kitchen-dining area will be expanded toward the back of the space. He has no additional details at this point.

Mr. Alexander inquired if the division is down the center.

Mr. Staudt responded affirmatively.

Mr. Alexander requested the Board members to respond to the following discussion questions

- 1) Does the Board support demolition of the detached shed, and demolition of an addition to the historic structure?*

Mr. Cotter inquired the reason for the demolition. Is the shed in poor shape, or is the reason that it is in the way of the proposed project?

Mr. Staudt responded that it is located in the way of the proposed project. A functional kitchen for today's family will not fit in the current building, so the structure must be expanded. They found no record of the shed being significant in any manner, so have proposed demolition.

Ms. Kramb stated that unless they can meet the criteria for demolition, she disagrees with demolition of the shed or the addition. Both are historic components of the existing building, which is an extremely historic building in this District. Most of the existing buildings have no architectural style or details and are very limited. However, this building has those attributes; it is a unique gem.

Mr. Kownacki stated that reasons provided for the demolition do not align with the criteria for permitting it in the Historic District. In the photo, the shed to the right appears to be original to the building – perhaps the original kitchen. There are few structures of that age in the District.

Mr. Alexander stated that the small shed to the right has drop siding, a stone foundation, and concrete poured over that foundation. There is age associated with that small structure. The Board has approved the demolition of some detached, rear structures, but typically, they have been block garages constructed in the 1940s or 1950s, without the integrity of this structure. He would prefer that they incorporate the structure into their design; perhaps it could be made a pantry for the kitchen, or the courtyard could be configured in a way to utilize the structure as an object of the courtyard. He would not like to see that structure demolished.

Mr. Kownacki stated that the shed roof addition and the small shed to the right are probably at least 100 years old. They are part of the history of the existing building.

- 2) Does the Board support the proposed height, scale and massing of the addition?*

Mr. Cotter stated that the proposed height, scale and massing exceed what is appropriate for this site. It will place a large barrier in that particular area.

Mr. Alexander stated that he likes the concept. It makes sense in a historic setting in which the historic structure is separated from a new construction, and the two structures are joined with a common exterior space. He

appreciates that they took advantage of the grade change to achieve the needed height without having a ridge height taller than the existing building. It was a thoughtful use of site features to avoid overwhelming the existing building. It is logical to build on the alleys. It is a logical infill approach, although it is larger than the other structures on the alley. However, they are limited by the square footage of the existing building, and if it is more difficult to add on to the existing building, there may be no other choice than to have something slightly larger at the rear. Changing the material helps to reduce the mass of the one elevation, but perhaps it needs to be completely transparent, a glass link. He is supportive the concept if it could be more sensitive to the back of the original building.

Ms. Krumb stated that the Guidelines state that any addition must be subordinate to the main building. Everything they are proposing is an addition – it is all attached to the primary building. Everything they want to build is over twice the size of the main building. It is not an appropriate addition; nor, does she agree with the proposed demolition. However, a second structure could be placed at the rear of the lot, next to the alley, and separate from the building at the front. She would be supportive of a detached structure on this lot, but she does not support an addition that is twice the size of the original building.

Mr. Kownacki stated that he agrees with Mr. Alexander's comment. In regard to Ms. Krumb's comments about the need for an addition to be a subordinate structure, it would be helpful to limit its height so that the rear addition cannot be seen from High Street.

Mr. Cotter stated that he also likes the suggestion of using different materials or reduced height for the connector to restrain the mass.

Mr. Alexander stated that in the past the Board has discussed the premise that subordinate does not always mean smaller. He could envision the possibility for a rear addition with a larger footprint than the original, if it were more subordinate than what is proposed. What do fellow Board members believe?

Ms. Krumb responded that the applicant proposes to enlarge the existing building, then make a physical connection to a second building. As presented, she seems no opportunity for that to succeed, because the main building is so small. Perhaps, if the connection is transparent, it could work. The simplest solution would be to clearly detach the second structure.

Mr. Alexander stated that perhaps if it were possible to shift more of the mass to the new structure at the rear, it could break up the mass sufficiently.

Ms. Krumb responded that her concern is not the size of the rear addition; it is the connection, which presently has a solid wall. Perhaps if it were in essence an open courtyard, and was subordinate to the small original building, it could work.

Mr. Staudt stated that from S. High Street, there would be no visibility of the addition or a new structure. They could only be seen from the back alley or the parking lot.

Ms. Krumb responded that this a very busy alley, so the back and sides of this building will be viewed. With this proposal, they would completely lose the rear of the original building; it will no longer be visible.

Mr. Kownacki inquired the definition of subordinate; does it mean size.

Mr. Staudt responded that to the contrary; there is language that clarifies that it isn't necessarily size. It could be subordinate due to other factors.

Mr. Kownacki stated that "subordinate" can be open to interpretation.

Ms. Krumb stated that subordinate also means secondary. When you look at the building, you need to recognize that the older building is the main building, and that is what we want to preserve.

Mr. Alexander stated that it is common with architectural review boards to not consider subordinate as size necessarily.

Ms. Martin stated that the proposed Code revision includes definitions, and the proposed definition for subordinate, which states: "A building or structure that is secondary or incidental to the primary structure building or use on a lot." The definitions in the Code apply to every zoning district within the City of Dublin, even outside the Architectural Review District. The important word is "incidental" and "secondary" to the primary structure building or use.

Mr. Alexander noted that the small office building built behind the primary structure on a lot to the south of this property was considered subordinate to the existing structure. That office building had a larger footprint than the primary structure, but it also had different details.

Ms. Kramb stated that if this rear structure was detached and sited at the rear of the lot, she would not object to that concept. Being connected as an addition, is the issue.

Shannon Hospel, 87 S. High Street, Dublin, OH inquired if the Board would be supportive of a glass connector between the two buildings.

Ms. Kramb responded that it would depend on its overall size and how the back of the existing building was addressed. Although it may be possible, she remains skeptical.

Mr. Cotter stated that visually, glass walls would be more subdued than solid walls.

3) Does the Board support the conceptual architecture, exterior materials and material transitions?

Other than the concerns raised regarding the connector and need for an addition to be subordinate of the primary structure, Board members had no significant objections to the architecture and materials.

Mr. Alexander stated that, due to Code requirements, typically, the Board does not approve door replacements on an original building; therefore, the proposal to change the front door to a full glass door would be an issue. He noted that reverting the block glass window to what was original would be beneficial, and he would advise against modifying window openings on the sides of the existing structure, regardless of functional changes occurring inside. There are ways to accommodate functions where a window is not wanted, yet is retained externally. The scale of new materials touching existing structure also could be problematic. However, he likes the material palette that was selected.

Mr. Alexander indicated that the applicant could return to the Board as many times as they would like for Conceptual Reviews. He inquired if the applicant needed further direction at this time.

Mr. Staudt inquired about the remaining question concerning a waiver.

4) Is the Board supportive of a potential Waiver to lot coverage requirements?

Board members stated that typically, they are not supportive of granting waivers for lot coverage, except in unique circumstances, where doing so improves the efficiency of the lot. In this case, it would be difficult to make that case; therefore, a waiver is unlikely.

Ms. Hospel stated that their request to remove the shed was not based solely on opportunity. The shed is completely dilapidated, and it would need to be taken down and rebuilt to be used. There also is an electrical conduit between the buildings that does not meet Code.

Ms. Kramb stated that Planning staff could provide the applicants with information related to the demolition criteria and process. Generally speaking, they would need a structural analysis and an engineering report to assess the condition of the structure. The financial component is considered, as well.

Mr. Ridge indicated that he would provide the demolition criteria and information to the applicant.

COMMUNICATIONS

- The Code Revision and accompanying Area Rezoning are scheduled for Council consideration at their two February meetings.
- Staff is completing the final draft of the Historic Dublin Design Guidelines, which is anticipated to be ready for Council's consideration at the same time as the effective date of the approved Code revision.
- The 2020 ARB Annual Report will be provided for review/approval in first quarter 2021.
- The next regular meeting of the ARB is scheduled for February 24, 2021.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:04 p.m.

Gary Alexander

Vice Chair, Architectural Review Board

Judith K. Beal

Assistant Clerk of Council