

Parcel 273-000007 **Address** 83 S High St **OHI** FRA-2591-1

Year Built: Ca.1830	Map No: 128	Photo No: 2081-2083, 2093 (7/12/16)
Theme: Domestic	Historic Use: Single family house	Present Use: Single family house
Style: Federal (elements)	Foundation: Stone	Wall Type: Frame
Roof Type: Saltbox/standing seam metal	Exterior Wall: Clapboard	Symmetry: No
Stories: 2	Front Bays: 4	Side Bays: 2
Porch: Open concrete deck encircled by wrought iron	Chimney: 1, Interior, on ridge, near north side of house	Windows: 1-over-1 Replacements

Description: The two-story house has a rectilinear footprint, resting on a stone foundation. The saltbox roof is sheathed in standing seam metal and the exterior walls are clad in clapboard siding. The front door is off-centered on the façade. The door features a modest surround and is accessed by a concrete deck. Windows present are one-over-one replacements. A one-and-one-half-story ancillary building is west of the house.

Setting: The property is located on the west side of S High St. A paved parking lot is west of the house.

Condition: Good

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

Integrity Notes: The building has fair integrity.

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

District: Yes Local Historic Dublin district **Contributing Status:** Contributing
National Register: Recommended Dublin High Street Historic District, boundary increase **Property Name:** Giles Weaver Residence



83 S High St, looking northwest



83 S High St, ancillary building, looking northeast



BOARD ACTION

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, September 21, 2022 | 6:30 pm

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

1. **Renovation at 83 S. High Street 22-124INF**

Informal Review

Proposal: An addition and remodel of an existing, two-story residence on a 0.15-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic South.
Location: Southwest of the intersection of Eberly Hill Lane with S. High Street.
Request: Informal review and non-binding feedback for a future Minor Project under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.176 and the *Historic Design Guidelines*.
Applicants: Richard Taylor, RTA Architects
Contact: Sarah Holt, AICP, ASLA, Senior Planner
Contact Information: 614.410.4662, sholt@dublin.oh.us
Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/22-124

RESULT: The Board provided non-binding feedback on a residential addition for the historic structure at this site. Comments from the Board included: concern about the size of the addition, especially relative to the maximum building size permitted in the district; a proposed 20% building size increase provision of a Waiver; the proposed garage addition on the back of the residential structure; and the potential for two accessory structures on one lot.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Sarah Tresouthick Holt, AICP, ASLA
Senior Planner



- ~~1) That the applicant apply for and obtain a Certificate of Zoning Plan Approval (CZPA), prior to construction for all hardscape improvements not previously approved. The CZPA should also reflect as-built conditions for elements previously constructed and part of this application; and~~
- ~~2) That the applicant receive Architectural Review Board (ARB) approval for the stone wall and columns along S. High Street, prior to construction, should the applicant pursue those improvements at a later date.~~

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

INFORMAL CASE

1. Renovation at 83 S. High Street, 22-124INF, Informal Review

The Chair stated this application was a request for an addition and remodel of an existing, two-story residence on a 0.15-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic South and deemed contributing. The site is located southwest of the intersection of Eberly Hill Lane with S. High Street.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Holt presented an aerial view of the site that contains an existing, historic, Federal Style home built around 1830; a detached accessory structure/garage/Carriage House built in 1940 - previously used for commercial purposes, and a shared parking lot between the house and the accessory structure that extends to Pinneyhill Lane. The owners wish to convert the Carriage House at 444-square-feet in size to be part of their private residence as a home office. This structure is accessed from Mill Lane. The applicant proposed to remove the less-historic porch on the back of the house to make room for an addition of living space inset with roof lines below the original historic home, increasing the square footage of the house to 2,373, where this district allows up to 1,800 square feet per building and would include an attached one-car garage. A maximum of 3,000 square feet is permitted for all the buildings on the site and this request would total 2,817 square feet. Lot coverage under this scenario would be ±57%, whereas 65% is the maximum.

The applicant requested feedback on a second option that would detach the single car garage from the house and result in three individual buildings so the square footage of the main house could be less but would still be over the maximum square footage of 1,800 for size. The applicant is aware that any pavement or gravel added for an outdoor living area would also count toward the maximum lot coverage.

Discussion Questions

- 1) Is the Board supportive of the proposed massing and form and their response to the Guidelines and the original structure?
- 2) If so, is the Board supportive of additional square footage, above that permitted by the Code?
- 3) If not, is the Board supportive of the new garage being separated from the main house, noting that the house's square footage will still exceed that permitted by Code?
- 4) If the Board is supportive of the proposed addition, does the Board support the removal of the porch at the rear of the building?

Questions for Staff

Mr. Alexander – He asked if there was a limit to size because the existing detached garage, is considered an accessory structure.

Ms. Holt – Yes, there is a limit for the size of accessory structures; they can be 25% of size/square footage of main/primary structure, falling under the general Zoning Code.

Mr. Cotter – He asked if two detached structures were permitted – a Carriage House at 444 square feet and a one-car garage at 385 square feet. He asked if the total is too large.

Ms. Holt – The general Code does not anticipate more than one accessory structure. She offered to research the subject.

Ms. Damaser – If the main house is detached, it is 1,950 square feet in size.

Mr. Cotter – The allowable size is 1,800.

Ms. Damaser – She asked if the 25% of the primary structure square footage was for the actual square footage or the allowable amount of square footage.

Ms. Holt – Another question to research. The Waiver, if approved would allow 20% increase in size of primary structure or accessory structure. There is precedent with this with another project on N. High Street. The question is whether a second accessory structure is permitted.

Ms. Cooper – If the single car garage is separated from the main structure, there will be two problems.

Applicant Presentation

Richard Taylor, RTA Architects, 48 S. High Street, Dublin, stated the primary house was a commercial property quite some time ago. It was lived in by the owner before being used as a rental property and now the owners want to use it as their primary residence; it is not currently a commercial building. The Carriage House was probably technically built as a garage but has been used as living space for some time now; it is finished on the inside, being used as a home office space.

In his 35 years of practicing in this profession, the size has been an issue when building an accessory structure while having an existing building. Having an existing accessory structure and modifying the size of the primary building/house is a unique situation.

The owners want to move back into this house. The house has been renovated quite a bit over the past few years to return it to its historical integrity. The inside is authentic in many areas of the house. If you have the opportunity to see the inside, you would understand how important it is to them to maintain the existing house in a historic character. That is why they are not doing anything to the three sides of the house that include the front and public sight in general. The date the open porch at the back was built is unknown. Because it has a poured concrete floor and modern 2-inch by 4-inch construction, with the posts holding it up, it is much more modern than 1840 when the house was built; it is considered a modern addition and not as contributing like the main house.

He appreciated the informal review because it allowed for identifying everyone's concerns and ensures the community has a role in shaping this project as it goes along. The project is in the earliest design stage to identify what the owner's want to get out of this but also an opportunity to have a conversation with the Board early on about the project. The applicant is meeting some of the zoning requirements being under the 65% maximum lot coverage and do not anticipate any walkways beyond what is currently being shown on the drawings that include a garden without hardscape. The applicant meets the 3,000-square-foot limit for all the buildings on the site, but are over the 1,800-square-foot limit for the primary structure. Per the quick massing studies, the applicant is meeting the spirit of that requirement, which is to not have one, overwhelming massive building on the site so it has been proposed as separate buildings. The issue of separating the garages is not their preference because of the climate in Central Ohio. If the one-car garage

was pulled away a few feet from the house, it still may not appear to the casual observer any less attached to the house as that would be the smallest amount of space they could get away with, between the two buildings.

Public Comment

There has not been any public comment received.

Questions for the Applicant

Mr. Cotter – He inquired about what would be removed as part of the porch.

Mr. Taylor – There are two shed roofs off the back and the long, lower roof will be removed.

Mr. Taylor – All the exterior materials are going to match what is existing.

Mr. Alexander – He asked what determines the height of the detached garage.

Mr. Taylor – The owners would like to include some storage space since there is just a stone basement with a dirt floor and low ceiling, accessed through a hatch, making it unusable for storage. Because this is so early in the process, he has spent no time on the garage design. The stairway to get up to the storage will be located where that shed is currently but the plan will require more work.

Mr. Jewell – He had the same concern as Mr. Alexander. The view looking west to east looks awkward with that height of the proposed garage at almost 18 feet.

Mr. Alexander – He inquired about windows on the Carriage House, if there was an upper level, and if that upper level could be used for storage.

The owner – Confirmed there was usable space on the second floor.

Ms. Cooper – She asked if the Carriage House had been rented out as a one-bedroom living space.

Owner not recorded.

Mr. Jewell – He inquired about the impact for the tree on the back.

Mr. Taylor – That tree would be removed to make room for the addition.

Mr. Cotter – The height of the back building could look overwhelming and was concerned about how the buildings would be connected from a historic perspective.

Board Discussion

The Chair – He began the discussion with the questions from the Planning Report but in a different order.

(Q4) He asked if anyone on the Board had an issue with the removal of the rear porch.

Everyone was comfortable with that part of the proposal.

(Q2) He asked the Board how they felt about additional square footage for the footprint of the main house, regardless of the massing.

Mr. Cotter – The Board has spent a lot of time considering massing in the Historic District, keeping it into a reasonable area. His first reaction to the proposal was to not allow it to be over what is stated in the Code but there is the plus or minus factor of 20% that could be considered. The first number of 2,373 square feet is too large as we try to scale some of the projects down in size.

Ms. Damaser – Agreed with that statement. It would be a variance to the Code we do not allow for others. She wanted to see the proposed additions smaller.

Mr. Taylor – One of the reasons the applicant is over the requirement is there is a proposed one-car garage rather than two, which is a large sacrifice. A couple of the rooms in the house are pristinely historic, especially the front room they are proposing to use as the dining room but it is too large for a dining room, even with the appearance of a large dining table included in the drawing. It has all exposed logs, the original brick fireplace, foyer, and floors like the rest of the house. The applicant would like to avoid changing those rooms or the second floor; it is mostly historic. That takes a significant amount of space out of the calculations to add onto the house. They are trying to get as much as they can into the existing house and only add what they need to that includes a very tiny mud room, a master bedroom that is not very large, and the bathroom would be wedged in there. The only living space on the first floor is the family room. This gives the owners the basics for a habitable, single-family home using the least amount of space possible, given the existing space cannot be decreased without destroying the historical character.

Ms. Cooper - She was concerned about exceeding the Code's limits. She noted the linear space on the floor plan for the garage and the family room. She asked to consider reducing the size there in order to meet the Code, which meant reducing the size about 200 square feet.

Mr. Jewell – He did not feel comfortable going outside the Board's ability to accept a Waiver for that increased square footage.

Mr. Alexander – He was worried the size of this proposal and the size of the adjacent house. The cost to remodel these houses is substantial. A little more latitude, but not where it is now, is warranted. He would be fine with the 20% increase to make these structures work. The cost of the construction needs to be distributed over more square footage as the reality for the cost to do these projects. He was not certain yet about an increase beyond that if a Variance is needed additionally through the Board of Zoning Appeals. Some latitude on the 1,800 maximum square footage is important.

Ms. Damaser – She asked if the neighboring house was beyond the 1800 limit for square footage size.

Ms. Holt – She did not have that information. The house directly to the south is for sale.

Mr. Alexander – He had referenced the neighboring house as it had been reviewed by the ARB and they had to make their way to make the requests for additional square footage work, also.

Mr. Taylor – He had presented a hand-sketch at this very early stage and square footages are not highly accurate - just close. Typically, when they throw this site plan on a computer, the square footage will come down somewhat but not 200 square feet and not by 20%. If the square footage of the existing footprint was in the calculation, and only what is above that was added, the actual square footage would be less because they are taking the porch off and adding space back on for the addition.

Mr. Alexander – The size of the porch being taken away is exterior space.

Mr. Taylor – There is not as much space being added at first glance. He agreed, these projects are expensive and his clients in Historic Dublin want to come here (from New Albany), live in this area as the City has done a great job at making this area attractive to be in. There are certain components needed in a single-family home to make it liveable these days. For these clients and others that are his same age, a first floor master bedroom and bathroom is essential. He said this has been the same situation for his other three clients; they match his advanced age and want to live on the first floor of their house. He reiterated he thought the spirit was still being met by not having one massive house and have it broken up, visually.

The Chair – All the Board members agree the square footage needs to be reduced in the proposal.

(Q3) The Chair – He asked the applicant if an addition could be considered for the new garage and noted it would be a longer walk. This is not the Bergwell lot and there are limitations to it. He asked the members if they would allow a second accessory structure on the property.

Mr. Jewell – He questioned the pergola off the back of the Carriage House that appeared to be pretty good size, covering quite a bit of space. He read that was due to be removed as part of the construction. Maybe

an addition could be hitchhiked to that. He agreed, everything needs to be on the first floor to get around as we age.

Mr. Taylor – If the proposed one-car garage is detached from the house and square footage is added to the Carriage House, the number of square footage is just being moved from one side of the site to the other to meet a math table.

Mr. Alexander – There is a big difference, spatially. It would spatially match a pattern expected in the Historic District. Whether that garage is detached further back than a few feet or the garage is detached as a second structure, there are buildings in the Historic District that have a privy and then a storage structure behind so there can be multiple structures behind a main house. Or whether it is attached to the Carriage House. A lot of these houses have a space behind the house and then accessory structures in the back on the alley. It would be a little bit more than a numbers game. We would get the spatial character you would expect in the Historic District while helping the massing because many of us are asking about that garage and the addition. Right now the applicant's drawing is rough but it may help with the massing, too.

Mr. Taylor – If he were to rank by preference, first would be the garage attached as presented, second would be the garage detached from the house at some distance and a distant third choice would be to attach the garage to the Carriage House.

Ms. Cooper – The new single-car garage as proposed appears 24 feet by 11 feet, which would be very long.

Mr. Taylor – The stair takes up some space at the front and there is room for a lawn mower, lawn tools, and trash cans, etc. Standard size is 24 feet deep for a full-size car and the client is planning on a medium-size car and room for some 'stuff' as mentioned.

Mr. Cotter - Moving the garage west is one way to break up the massing with the two out-buildings. How the gable fits into the back helps with the mass. The Board has reviewed projects lately where the buildings are solid and then the applicant finds ways to break up the profile to appear more historic.

Mr. Alexander – He agreed that recent applicants have taken into account the feedback and have been approved.

Mr. Taylor – He requested some feedback to know how to proceed with the next iteration. He asked what was more important: the square footage number; the massing; or if the answer was 'yes' to both.

Mr. Cotter – The answer is yes. The Code is for consistency but we all understand there has to be a way to pay for the space so the project is viable and meets the needs of the client but for a Historic District, feedback from the community has been that the project cannot be too large so it still fits in with the historic character of the community.

(Q1) The Chair – He asked the Board members for any further feedback on the massing and the shape. A few members have commented on the massing of the proposed garage.

Mr. Alexander – The applicant did a nice job at keeping the project low and subordinate to the primary structure.

Mr. Taylor – The project still needs work.

Mr. Jewell – The Board has a little leeway to help but it is too far outside of the Code at this point.

Ms. Cooper – Historically, she asked how many of these properties have been permitted adding more than one outbuilding.

The Chair – The Board has not approved adding more than one accessory building since he has been on the Board; this would be a new precedent. There have been properties with multiple accessory structures that the Board has allowed to be removed such as non-historic block garages. If the house next door were to be developed, the accessory structure on that property would probably have to be relocated and that

would not be the first time. Mr. Taylor is being sensitive to the argument of a long building and trying to break it up. The clients want an attached garage but we have a community that is telling us these houses are getting too large on these smaller lots. This is probably one of the smaller lots in the community Mr. Taylor has worked on.

Ms. Cooper – She suggested leaving the garage attached but reducing the size so the overall mass of the structure is less and to add storage to the Carriage House or a separate outbuilding for storage.

Mr. Taylor – He was now considering other options. There is a chance this could be approved if they do some more work with the project. First, to tighten up the square footage of the main house as much as possible. He may return with a couple of different options.

Ms. Cooper – She was sympathetic to wanting to keep the proposed garage attached to the house as that would be her preference for herself, personally. Adversely, it would be an opportunity to make the whole mass smaller.

Mr. Taylor – He has lived with both attached and detached garages and prefers the attached.

The Chair – He asked if enough feedback had been provided to which Mr. Taylor responded there had. The Chair summarized the Board's comments:

- Decrease the overall massing of the structure by shortening the length and bringing down the height of the garage.
- There is some support on the Board for going beyond the 1,800-square-foot limit for the main structure/house.
- A new garage is okay if there can be some breaks and keeping it attached if possible but not cluttering the small lot with too many buildings.
- The Board is fine with the removal of the back porch.
- Zoning questions need to be researched.

The property owner asked to address the Board and had to be sworn in, first.

Phillip S. Renaud, 7534 King George Drive, New Albany, Ohio, owner of the property along with this wife, Julie. He thanked the Board for allowing them to be considered to bring this historic property back to the state it needs to be; it is a beautiful property. They want to move back to Dublin from New Albany as they love the property and the area. It is a small home and in order to reside there, they need a footprint that allows them not to have to run upstairs for a master bedroom. The proposed bedroom on the first floor is not huge. It is really important to the homeowners that the home meets the historical standards. He grew up just outside Newport, Rhode Island where there were homes that were built in the early 1700's. If they start messing with the Carriage House, the integrity and visual look of the property could be ruined or lost from its historic nature. The goal is that the property meets the historic standards and looks its very best for the citizens of Dublin. The homeowner wants to take pride in what they are accomplish. He thanked the Board for their guidance and direction. The finished product will be something everyone can be proud of.

Communications

- ~~Ms. Holt introduced new Staff members, Jane Peuser as the new Planning Assistant and Chris Will as a Planner II, who has been with the City for just over one year.~~
- ~~The Board Members followed up with a few general clarifying questions and discussed possible changes in the process for handling cases that could be eligible for a Consent Agenda.~~