

Parcel 273-000129 **Address** 94 Franklin St **OHI** N/A

Year Built: 1950	Map No: 128	Photo No: 1967-1970 (7/12/16)
Theme: Domestic	Historic Use: Single family house	Present Use: Single family house
Style: Minimal Traditional	Foundation: Concrete block	Wall Type: Frame
Roof Type: Cross gable/asphalt shingle	Exterior Wall: Vinyl	Symmetry: No
Stories: 1.5	Front Bays: 3	Side Bays: 2
Porch: Front-gable roof over façade entrance supported by decorative brackets	Chimney: 1, Exterior, off ridge on north elevation	Windows: Double-hung replacements with faux muntins

Description: The one-and-one-half-story Minimal Traditional-style house has a rectilinear footprint, resting on a concrete block foundation. The cross-gable roof is sheathed in asphalt shingles and the exterior is clad in vinyl siding. The front door is sheltered by a small gable roof supported by decorative brackets. Windows on the house are double-hung sashes with six-over-six faux muntins. They are flanked by fixed shutters. A multi-light fixed window is adjacent to the door. A detached garage is east of the house.

Setting: The property is located on the east side of Franklin Street. The lawn is shaded by mature trees and floral foundation plantings encircle the house.

Condition: Good

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

Integrity Notes: The house has good integrity, diminished by replacement materials.

Historical Significance: The property is within the boundaries of the City of Dublin's local Historic Dublin district. The Franklin Street neighborhood, with this property as a contributing resource, is recommended for inclusion within the recommended Dublin High Street Historic District, boundary increase. Relevant eligibility criteria are Criterion A, for mid-century residential growth in the village of Dublin, and Criterion C, for its architectural character.

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



94 Franklin St, looking northeast



94 Franklin St, looking southeast



BOARD DISCUSSION

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, October 20, 2021 | 6:30 pm

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

**1. 94 Franklin Street
21-140INF**

Informal Review

Proposal: Construction of a ±1,300-square-foot addition to the rear of a home on a 0.35-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic Residential.

Location: East of Franklin Street, ± 275 feet north of the intersection with John Wright Lane.

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

Applicant: Hylas Stemen, RDS Home Design representative for Shannon Crone, Home Owner

Planning Contact: Zach Hounshell, Planner I

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

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/21-140

RESULT: The Board generally supported the proposal for a new building addition connecting the existing home and garage, and removing the driveway providing access from Franklin Street. The Board indicated that the addition should be subordinate to the existing home in massing and size, and that vinyl materials should not be used on the addition. The Board suggested that the addition should complement the Minimal Traditional design of the home by simplifying the roofline of the addition.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:

Zach Hounshell

B1050D11513A490...

Zach Hounshell, Planner I





MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, October 20, 2021

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Alexander, Chair, called the October 20, 2021, meeting of the City of Dublin Architectural Review Board (ARB) to order at 6:31 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Chair led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Board Members present: Mr. Alexander, Ms. Kramb, Mr. Cotter, Ms. Cooper, and Mr. Jewell
Staff present: Ms. Holt, Mr. Ridge, Mr. Hounshell

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Kramb moved, Mr. Jewell seconded, to accept the documents into the record and to approve the September 29, 2021, meeting minutes.

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

CASE PROCEDURES

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

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

NEW CASES

1. 94 Franklin Street, 21-140INF, Informal Review

The Chair stated this application was a request for the construction of a ±1,300-square-foot addition to the rear of a home on a 0.35-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic Residential. The site is east of Franklin Street, ± 275 feet north of the intersection with John Wright Lane.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Hounshell presented an aerial view of the site with two vehicular access points, both from Mill Lane and Franklin Street. The Mill Lane access point acts as the access to the existing garage, and Franklin Street leads into an asphalt parking area to the rear of the home. Two crab apple trees are to be removed with this proposal; the mature white pine tree to the south of the building could potentially be impacted. Adjacent homes were shown for architecture and massing context.

Photographs were presented of the existing conditions of the west elevation/Franklin Street and the north elevation/side yard. The home was built in 1950 as a Minimal-Traditional home that was popular in the 20th century of 1 to 1.5 stories in height, a simple roofline design, sash windows with shutters, a small covered front porch, vinyl siding, a burgundy thin brick water table, a brick chimney, an aluminium sunroom to the rear of the home, and a detached garage.

The proposed site plan and an existing footprint of the home were highlighted. The proposal included a 1,300 square-foot building addition clad in vinyl siding to connect the existing home and detached garage, 501 square-foot terrace, a 98-square-foot deck, vinyl replacement windows, the removal of two sections of existing split-rail fence, and the removal of the front driveway on Franklin Street, leaving one access point off of the garage to Mill Lane. The west and south elevations were shown that highlighted what was existing and what was proposed. On the south elevation, there were a number of different rooflines with a variety of slopes proposed. The addition would not exceed the height of the original home but expands out from the existing footprint on the sides. One side included an 11-foot bump-out for a new sunroom and match materials on the existing home. The proposed addition wraps around the existing home, eliminating part of the existing walls and window openings of the original. The black awnings would be removed, keeping shutters on the southern-most window. Perspective renderings were presented to show the context of massing from the southwest and northeast views.

Historic Design Guidelines recommended replacement of windows should duplicate the appearance of the originals, as closely as possible, in the number of panes and material.

As a result of the Historic Architectural Assessment completed in 2017, the home was identified as contributing to the Historic District.

The historic architectural consultant recommended the addition not be visible whereby contained within the current footprint, behind the home. Materials should be consistent with those on the original structure by using black asphalt for the roof and to minimize the variety of rooflines to be complementary to the district. The original siding for this home would have been wood, not vinyl, and wood sash windows with simple trim would have been used. Shed dormers with a standing-seam, metal roof that was proposed would not be appropriate for this type of home. A variety of window types and sizes were found across each portion of the home. The consultant recommended the same building style be used for the addition to provide consistency.

Questions were provided to facilitate a discussion with the Board as follows:

1. Is the Board supportive of the proposed massing of the building addition?
2. Is the Board supportive of the variety of rooflines for a minimalist, traditional home?
3. Is the Board supportive of vinyl siding? [*Vinyl siding is not considered for the Historic District*]
4. Is the Board supportive of the removal of two existing windows, and the variety of window styles on the building addition?
5. Is the Board supportive of the removal of mature trees on the site?

The applicant requested clear and concise feedback from the Board in order to move forward in the best manner.

Board Questions for Staff and Applicants

Ms. Kramb asked what was identified as the existing foundation material.
Mr. Hounshell answered a concrete block foundation.

Mr. Alexander requested clarity on the type of windows proposed. Vinyl clad is permitted but vinyl is not. He asked if there have been prior approvals for this site to allow vinyl siding.

Mr. Hounshell answered there were no records found for vinyl for this site. Staff determined the vinyl was probably installed prior to the records kept by the City.

Ms. Kramb asked if Staff knew what material is underneath the vinyl. (clapboard, wood siding, or aluminium?) The Historic Assessment did not identify the material. The Consultant suggested there would be wood siding underneath but Staff has not confirmed the identification of the material, either way.

The Chair invited the applicant to address the Board.

The applicant, Hylas Stemen, Residential Designed Solutions, 7844 Flint Road, Columbus, Ohio 43235, did not offer a presentation beyond Mr. Hounshell's but was available for questions and requested direction from the Board. He confirmed the windows were vinyl, not vinyl-clad wood windows.

Mr. Jewell inquired about mature trees.

Ms. Holt answered there was a substantial white pine identified by Staff during a site visit. Concern was with the possibility of the addition pushing into the tree's root zone.

Mr. Jewell - The trees on the east side were safe.

Ms. Cooper asked if the large pine on the south side of the house would be disturbed to which Mr. Stemen answered it would not as the pine was up near the front corner of the existing home (near the guest room). Only the two crab apple trees between the house and the garage would be disturbed.

Mr. Cotter - One of the guiding principles is for the home to retain its original character.

Mr. Stemen - Tried to protect the front side of the house by pushing as much of the addition as possible to the rear while satisfying the client with the additional square feet requested. He understood the comments regarding overlapping forms.

Ms. Cooper inquired about the foundation and the slope down where the garage was on the south side. On the east side there was an egress and wanted to know if it lead to a basement or a cellar.

Mr. Stemen - The first floor level runs from the front back into the addition. Due to the grade dropping towards the garage, a short set of stairs was proposed to be added.

Ms. Cooper asked if the stairs would be inside the addition to which Mr. Stemen answered affirmatively.

Mr. Stemen - The set of stairs next to the laundry room on the floor plans led from the great room on the first floor level. The bathroom was not part of the existing home; it was a proposed master bathroom.

Board Discussion

The Chair stated Mr. Cotter's question referenced the massing. The consultant had issues with the massing as it appeared to overwhelm the house. A common strategy seen in this district and other historic areas is the desire to add much more square footage but any additions cannot overwhelm the existing structure. By keeping the addition narrower, three sides of visibility are provided so the corners on the original structure help define the original structure as opposed to the addition, which was the goal. The floor plan is somewhat deceptive and the applicant needs to rework the plans. The space for the terrace could be shifted back adjacent to the garage to allow for plenty of room for all the square footage. This would preserve the volume of the original house, reduce the apparent massing from the street view, and would

have less of an impact on the trees. Even though the applicant does not need to seek a variance on setbacks, the one side is still pretty close to the neighbor's residence.

Ms. Kramb agreed with Mr. Cotter, Mr. Alexander, and the Consultant's comments about the massing. She reiterated the addition should only be on the rear of the original structure in this case. The guidance from City Council for the ARB was that the additions have to be subordinate to the house so the original house is visible and pronounced.

Mr. Stemen requested clarification that the complete addition has to fall within the north and south edges of the main house.

Ms. Kramb answered affirmatively and the addition has to be inset on the rear side of the house. She suggested a perpendicular gabled addition on the back.

Mr. Alexander - If the applicant did that, they might have to hip it to gain some height but either way, there would be a flat roof, keeping it below the original house roof ridge line.

Ms. Kramb - The garage can be modified by building upwards.

Mr. Alexander - The Board's task is not to design the house but provide only suggestions. The addition could be bumped out, if it was further back from the front corners of the original structure.

Ms. Kramb - By wrapping the addition in the current proposal, original windows were eliminated.

Mr. Jewell noted the amount of depth on the property.

Mr. Stemen - Wanted to avoid impacting the garage, in any way.

Ms. Kramb did not support vinyl siding and it was likely that the original home had aluminium siding as it was very popular on the Cape Cod style homes in the 40s or it could have been wood. Vinyl siding can remain on the original structure but vinyl cannot be used on the addition.

The Chair - Vinyl siding is never permitted in the Historic District, especially when determined to be a contributing structure per the Code, which evolved from the Secretary of Interior's Standards. The Code allows for some synthetic materials.

Mr. Stemen received confirmation that Hardie-Plank products were permitted.

Ms. Kramb - The windows on the home are probably vinyl replacement windows now and they could remain but vinyl replacement windows are not permitted on the addition, as it is not an acceptable product for the district.

Mr. Cotter remarked on the design variety of the windows proposed.

Ms. Kramb did not have a preference on the windows and just asked the applicant to select one instead of five different types. Any multi-lite window that matched top and bottom would have been very common. The members agreed the one window on the rear of the building could be eliminated to allow for an attached addition.

Ms. Kramb - A metal, standing-seam roof would have pre-dated this house style. Asphalt shingles were used; a metal roof on the addition would make it appear older than the original house.

The members agreed a metal roof could be used to add variety the client requested, if it was facing the rear, close to the garage

Ms. Kramb - The addition should have the same foundation all around so it appears as all being built after the 50s and at the same time but may differ from the original structure.

The Chair requested feedback from the Board regarding trees on the site.

Mr. Stemen - All the trees were overgrown.

Mr. Hounshell - Staff found most of the trees in poor condition during a site visit.

Ms. Holt accompanied the City's landscape inspector and they found many trees not to be in good health. If the large tree on the south side was going to be affected, Staff would have had a concern. Replacement of removed trees is not a requirement on private residential properties.

The members agreed that since the addition was going to be moved further back from the original structure, the large white pine tree would not be impacted.

Summarized Comments

- Reduce the massing of the addition; narrow the width to be within the width of the original structure.
- Simplify the roofline.
- The garage can be extended up and out as it will not impact the appearance of the original house but should not become overwhelming.
- Vinyl siding and vinyl windows on the addition will not be approved.
- A metal roof could be a consideration but it depends on the location.
- Additions must appear to be subordinate to an original structure.

Staff is always available for guidance.

Mr. Stemen clarified next steps in order to return to the ARB in December for the Minor Project Review.

~~2. 36 38 N. High Street, 21 1492NF, Informal Review~~

~~The Chair stated this application was a request for the redevelopment of two existing buildings and a parking lot into a +5,400-square-foot, mixed-use building and a +3,200 square-foot, 2-unit residential building. The 0.25-acre lot is zoned Historic District, Historic Core and is located northeast of the intersection of N. High Street with Wing Hill Lane.~~

Staff Presentation

~~Mr. Ridge stated this is a request for non-binding feedback through an Informal Review. Aerial views of the site included the building built in 1960 with parking to the rear, an existing privy, and an existing stone wall that weaves through the site. Existing conditions showed context of the contributing structure. The applicant had provided a structural analysis and photographs that documented the shifting of the building. A Demolition request will be required shall this proposal of development move forward in a formal capacity. A photograph taken up close of the stone wall and privy in May of 2021. Preservation designs were included in a historical assessment for any historical or cultural value, which it possessed in Historic Dublin without significant modification and met historic integrity markers for location, design, setting, workmanship and material. The Historic District Guidelines state that the wall remains and to not be modified, the degraded wall should be rehabilitated without compromising integrity, character, and replacement of new walls was discouraged. The applicant proposed retaining the stone wall and privy on this site. The applicant will be required to provide credible evidence that they will incur economic hardship, if the request for Demolition is not granted. The applicant has provided some preliminary information for the Board's consideration.~~

~~The proposed site plan showed the construction of a two-story, mixed-use building at 5,400 square feet in size, a separate two-story, two-unit residential building, and 11 parking spaces (9 on site, 2 on street) for this site. Depending on the final mix of uses, 20-38 parking spaces are required. Approval of a Parking Plan will be required. Lot coverage numbers are not provided but will be required with a formal submittal. Multiple renderings provided by the applicant, both structures as viewed from the south/Wing Hill Lane; view from N. High Street highlighted the front porch element and two exterior primary materials (vertical siding and stone); and views from the southwest and northwest corners/N. High Street.~~

Questions were identified to help facilitate a discussion with the Board:

- 1) Does the Board support demolition of the existing structure to facilitate redevelopment?