



PLANNING REPORT

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, November 16, 2022

114 S. HIGH STREET 22-156ARB-MPR

www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/22-156

Case Summary

Address	114 S. High Street, Dublin, OH 43017
Proposal	Exterior modifications including deck revisions and window replacements to an existing commercial building located within the Historic District.
Request	Review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.176 and the <i>Historic Design Guidelines</i> .
Zoning	HD-HS, Historic South District
Planning Recommendation	<u>Approval of the Minor Project Review with Conditions.</u>
Next Steps	Upon review and approval of the Minor Project by the Architectural Review Board (ARB), the applicant shall revise an open building permit and apply for a sign permit through Building Standards.
Applicant	Jeff Baur, JBM Development Brandon Dubinsky, JBM Development Moises Gutierrez, JBM Development Steven Gagliardi, Berardi + Partners, Inc.
Case Manager	Taylor Mullinax, Planner I 614.410.4632 tmullinax@dublin.oh.us

Site Location Map



22-156MPR | 114 S. High St

- Site Features**
- 1 Existing building
 - 2 Approved deck location



1. Background

Site Summary

The 0.20-acre site features an existing ±1,605-square-foot one-and-one-half-story building that was built in 1948 and is historically known as the Dr. Harry Karrer office. The building was built in the Colonial Revival style, and contains a stone foundation, and its exterior walls are clad with stone and clapboard wood siding. According to the 2017 Historic and Cultural Assessment (HCA), the building is in good condition, has excellent integrity, and is recommended contributing to the district.

The site is located ±85 feet southeast of the intersection of Pinneyhill Lane and S. High Street and is zoned HD-HS: Historic District- South. It is surrounded by businesses to the north, south, and west and single-family homes to the east. Existing sidewalks lead to the front entry off S. High Street and the side entry on the north elevation. An existing parking lot is along the rear elevation. The site contains various existing planting beds along the front elevation and a mature tree line separating the site from the residential properties to the east.

Development History

October 2022: ARB approved a minor project for exterior modifications with nine conditions which included a condition that the applicant provide additional window documentation with their next MPR application within three months.

May 2022: Administrative Approval for the excavation of the basement and full restoration of the rear elevation. This building permit is still open.

April 2019: The ARB approved a Master Sign Plan (MSP) for future tenant panels on a ground sign with one condition.

April 2018: The Administrative Review Team (ART) made a recommendation of approval to the ARB for a MSP with one condition.

February 2016: The ARB approved a MSP for a new ground sign without conditions.

Process

The purpose of the Minor Project Review (MPR) is to provide an efficient review process for qualified minor projects located within the Historic District, ensuring that applications meet the requirements of Code Chapter 153. Typically, a Certificate of Zoning Plan Approval would be required for applicable commercial building modifications; however, since an open building permit exists for the Administrative Approval, the applicant shall submit revisions to their existing building permit after ARB approval.

2. Zoning Code

HD-HS: Historic South District

The intent of the Historic South District, as outlined in the Code, is ensuring "sensitive infill development and redevelopment and providing an improved environment for walking while accommodating vehicles." The Code identifies applicable development standards which include lot coverage and setbacks. All historic structures that are within Historic Dublin require the review and approval of the ARB to make modifications.

Historic Design Guidelines

The development standards are supplemented by the *Historic Design Guidelines*, which provide the Board additional direction on preservation, sensitive design, and complementary materials. The Guidelines provide best practices for rehabilitation, new construction, and site design. Specifically, Chapter 4 of the Guidelines speaks to rehabilitation; Chapter 5, new construction; and Chapter 6, refers to site design.

3. Project

Details

This is a request for exterior modifications to an existing commercial building which include the following:

- Replacing all ground level windows, excluding the half story and east elevation basement level windows; and
- Modifying an approved ±468-square-foot deck to ±490 square feet, and revising the ramp design to provide ADA access to the building along the north elevation.

Lot Coverage & Setbacks

In the Historic South District, a maximum lot coverage of 65 percent is permitted. The existing lot coverage totals 52.8 percent, and with the revised attached deck, the modified lot coverage totals 58.4 percent and meets the Code requirement. The applicant continues to meet all setback requirements which are listed as follows.

- Front yard: 0 feet
- Side yard: 3 feet
- Rear yard (building): 25 feet

Exterior Modifications

Attached Deck

The applicant is proposing modifications to the deck which was recently approved by ARB in October. As part of that review, the applicant was required to revise the deck to create an 18-inch offset from the rear building elevation to distinguish between the deck addition and historic structure. The applicant is proposing a modified deck at 490 square feet due to the 18-inch offset and ramp modifications to accommodate an improved design for ADA access. All materials and colors for the deck were approved with the previous MPR application. The proposed modifications meet Code and the Guidelines. Lastly, the applicant is required to provide underside deck screening/landscaping as part of a future MPR application, in accordance with the previous ARB approval in October.

Windows

Code Section 153.174 (D)(1) requires windows to be made of wood, metal-clad wood, or vinyl-clad wood. Sills should be projecting, and both sills and lintels should be architecturally appropriate for the building. The *Historic Design Guidelines*, Section 4.8, state that any windows which are repairable should avoid being removed, and only extensively deteriorated windows should be completely replaced. Any replacement windows should match the appearance of the historic originals.

The applicant is proposing the replacement of the 11 ground level windows due to existing window degradation. The applicant is proposing Jeld Wen Sitrine, double hung and double pane, Auralast Pine windows. The windows will be painted SW 2829 Classical White to match

the building trim which was previously approved by ARB in October. On the west elevation ground level, a fixed center light is flanked by two two-over-two wood sash windows, and an eight-over-eight window (1 and 2). On the north elevation ground level, a fixed center light is flanked by two two-over-two wood sash windows (11). On the east elevation ground level, there are three six-over-six windows and one four-over-four window (7, 8, 9, and 10). Lastly, on the south elevation ground level, there are four six-over-six windows and one four-over-four window (3, 4, 5 (set of two), and 6).

The proposal indicates all replacement windows will maintain the size of the existing window openings and number of muntin divisions. At the October ARB meeting, the ARB requested that the applicant considers the use of interior or exterior storm windows, or presents window repairs. The proposal indicates that repairs or use of storm windows will further deteriorate the window conditions and indicates replacement is required. Staff is supportive of the proposed window replacements with the exception of windows 1, 2, and 11. A discrepancy with the dimensions for windows 1 and 2 has been identified and does not match the existing framing size. Additionally, staff is concerned that replacing these three windows will negatively affect the character of the building by changing window ratios, muntin widths and the arrangement. Window 1 is the signature picture window on the front (west) elevation with the copper roof cap, window 11 is a similar picture window on the north side, and window 2 is the existing eight-over-eight front façade window. All are very visible from S. High Street and are integral to the character of the building.

Staff recommends the applicant provide additional dimensions of the existing muntin divisions for windows 1, 2, and 11 to indicate that the proposed window replacements will be like-for-like. The applicant should continue to work with Staff on two discrepancy items noted on the plans: 1) on window 2, a six-over-six window is shown and should be revised to an eight-over-eight window as proposed in the window quote; and 2) for windows 1 and 2, that the existing and proposed window frame dimensions match exactly and are revised, or if this manufacturer cannot supply an exact size window, another manufacturer or custom window shall be used.

4. Plan Review

Minor Project Review Criteria	
Criteria	Review
1. The MPR shall be consistent with the Community Plan, applicable Zoning Code requirements, <i>Historic Design Guidelines</i> , and adopted plans, policies, and regulations.	Criteria Met with Conditions. Once conditions are met, the proposal will be consistent with the Community Plan, and all adopted plans, policies and regulations. A future MPR application for landscaping and screening is required to allow planting at the best time of year.
2. In cases where a MPR is proposed within or as part of an approved PDP or FDP, the MPR shall be consistent with such approved PDP or FDP.	Not Applicable: There is no PDP or FDP for this site.

- | | |
|--|--|
| 3. The MPR shall be consistent with the record established by the required reviewing body, the associated staff report, and the Director's recommendation. | Criteria Met with Conditions. The MPR is consistent with the established record, and generally meets the Code and Guidelines. Minor revisions to the plans and additional dimensions are needed. |
| 4. The proposed land uses meet all applicable requirements and use specific standards of Section 153.172 Uses. | Not Applicable. The land uses will not change with this request. |
| 5. The proposed development is consistent with the <i>Historic Design Guidelines</i> . | Criteria Met with Conditions. The proposed exterior modifications to the deck meet the Code and Guidelines. The applicant is required to revise the window plans to address any discrepancies and provide additional dimensions as requested. |
| 6. The proposed MPR is consistent with surrounding historic context, character, and scale of immediately surrounding area and the district as a whole. | Criteria Met. The proposed exterior modifications are appropriate with surrounding building context, character, and scale. The underside screening of the deck is an outstanding issue, addressed by a condition of approval from the October 2022 MPR application. |
| 7. The proposed buildings are appropriately sited and conform to the requirements of Section 153.173 Site Development Standards and the <i>Historic Design Guidelines</i> . | Criteria Met. The site development standards and Guidelines are met which include setbacks and lot coverage. A minor change to the lot coverage is indicated due to the revisions of the approved deck to accommodate an improved ramp design and the previously-required 18-inch offset from the rear elevation of the building. |
| 8. The proposed site improvements, landscaping, screening, signs, and buffering shall meet all applicable requirements of the Code and respond to the standards of the <i>Historic Design Guidelines</i> . | Criteria Met. The proposed modifications to the deck design are appropriate and accommodate a better ramp design for ADA access. The applicant shall submit a future MPR application to address landscaping and HVAC and deck screening. |

Recommendation

Planning Recommendation: Approval of the Minor Project Review with conditions:

- 1) That the applicant revise window 2 from a six-over-six window to an eight-over-eight window and provide a window elevation from Jeld-Wen, subject to Staff review and approval prior to the revision of the existing building permit; and
- 2) That the applicant ensure that window dimensions (overall, muntins, and glass area) for windows 1, 2, and 11 match the existing windows, subject to Staff review and approval prior to revising the existing building permit. If the window manufacturer cannot provide

matching window frame dimensions, then the applicant is required to seek a new manufacturer or custom fabrication that can provide exact replacements or use interior storm windows.