



City of Dublin

**LAND USE & LONG
RANGE PLANNING**

November 1, 2012

ARB Board Order for Demolition

12-063ARB – BSC Historic Core District

North Riverview Redevelopment Demolition Request—17, 27, 37, 45, 53 N. Riverview Street; 40 N. Blacksmith Lane

This is a request for a recommendation from the Administrative Review Team to the Architectural Review Board for a request for a Board Order to permit the demolition of six single-family residential structures in Historic Dublin. The proposed demolition would facilitate the future redevelopment of the properties as a comprehensive mixed-use development. This proposal is to be reviewed under the provisions of the Dublin Zoning Code related to the Architectural Review Board, §153.173 and §153.176-177.

Date of Application Acceptance

Tuesday, September 11, 2012

Date of ART Recommendation

Thursday, November 1, 2012

Date of Architectural Review Board Determination

Thursday, November 15, 2012

Case Manager

Dan Phillabaum, AICP, ASLA, Senior Planner | (614) 410-4662 |
dphillabaum@dublin.oh.us

PART I: Application Overview

<i>Zoning District</i>	BSC Historic Core District
<i>Use</i>	Dwellings, Single-Family
<i>Building Type</i>	N/A
<i>Review Type</i>	Demolition
<i>Development Proposal</i>	Future redevelopment of the subject properties as a comprehensive mixed-use development.
<i>Administrative Departures</i>	N/A
<i>Waivers</i>	N/A
<i>Property Address</i>	17, 27, 37, 45, 53 North Riverview Street, 40 North Blacksmith Lane
<i>Property Owners</i>	BET Investments LLC—17, 37, 45 N. Riverview St.; 40 N. Blacksmith Ln. Coffman Company Limited—27, 53 N. Riverview St.
<i>Applicants</i>	Jack Eggspuehler
<i>Representative</i>	Gerry N. Bird, AIA, MBA , Bird Houk, A Division of OHM
<i>Case Manager</i>	Dan Phillabaum, AICP, ASLA, Senior Planner (614) 410-4662 dphillabaum@dublin.oh.us

Part II: Application Review Procedure: Board Order for Demolition

No building permit or Certificate of Zoning Plan Approval may be issued by the Chief Building Official or Director and/or their designees for any proposal which is subject to ARB review unless a Board Order has been issued in accordance with the requirements of Chapter 153: Zoning Regulations. Board Orders are required for requests for demolition of a structure in accordance with the requirements of Section §153.176.

§153.176 – Demolition

In cases where an applicant applies for a Board Order to demolish a structure within the Architectural Review District, the application may be approved when the applicant is able to demonstrate economic hardship or unusual and compelling circumstances, or at least two of the following conditions prevail:

- (1) The structure contains no features of architectural and historic significance to the character of the area in which it is located.*
- (2) There is no reasonable economic use for the structure as it exists or as it might be restored, and that there exists no feasible and prudent alternative to demolition.*
- (3) Deterioration has progressed to the point where it is not economically feasible to restore the structure and such neglect has not been willful.*
- (4) The location of the structure impedes the orderly development, substantially interferes with the Purposes of the District, or detracts from the historical character of its immediate vicinity; or, the*

proposed construction to replace the demolition significantly improves the overall quality of the Architectural Review District without diminishing the historic value of the vicinity or the District.

PART III: Description of the Properties

Ohio Historic Inventory

All of the properties listed on the application are listed on the Ohio Historic Inventory through a City-sponsored initiative in March 2003. The inventory provides a brief description of the location, background, and architecture of a building, site, structure, or object of architectural or historical significance. Inclusion on the OHI is not a form of protection for a historic resource, nor does it provide owners with a list of restrictions.

The Inventory noted that the existing structures were all constructed as single family residences between 1890 and 1932 and are modest wood frame homes in vernacular styles. The structures were noted as contributing to the village scale and character of North Riverview and typical of the vernacular housing found in Dublin and Washington Township from this period. The complete OHI forms for each of the subject properties are included as an attachment to this report.

PART IV: Analysis of Applicable Review Standards

The Review Standards for Demolition of Section §153.176 provide two options for an applicant to request a Board Order for Demolition from the ARB. An applicant may either demonstrate an economic hardship or unusual and compelling circumstances to support the demolition OR the applicant may demonstrate compliance with at least two of four Conditions for Demolition in that section. The information provided by the applicant as part of the Application for Demolition and the Application Addendum are intended to describe an economic hardship and the Conditions for Demolition. The following is an analysis by Planning based on those Review Standards and the information provided by the applicant.

A. Economic hardship exists which support the demolition of the structures.

The Economic Hardship Statement from the applicant asserts that these structures, that are rental properties, have a negative cash flow, the properties were acquired for values greater than their present marketable value, and the combined property has greater land value as redeveloped than the existing value of the individual houses. (Refer to the justification for Demolition Condition (2)—Economic Use in the Application and the Addendum.)

Section §153.177 outlines the information that Architectural Review Board may require to demonstrate that an application for demolition is related to economic hardship or unusual and compelling circumstances. The level of documentation required for documentation of economic hardship is extensive, commensurate with the number of structures requesting be demolished. Section §153.177(E) identifies the following criteria to determine if there is a substantial economic hardship. The Code does not specify whether all criteria must be met, or only one.

- (1) Denial of a certificate will result in a substantial reduction in the economic value of the property;
- (2) Denial of a certificate will result in a substantial economic burden on the applicant because the applicant cannot reasonably maintain the property in its current form;

- (3) No reasonable alternative exists consistent with the architectural standards and guidelines for the property; and
- (4) The owner has been unable to sell the property.

Criteria not met. The information provided does not adequately demonstrate that the criteria for economic hardship are met. While it may be possible to demonstrate compliance with one or more of the individual homes, taken as a group the information does not rise to the level of demonstrating a true economic hardship. These criteria in the past have been used for homeowners that may have insufficient income to make improvements that meet the standards required by the Zoning Code. However, the documentation provided by this applicant is appropriate to demonstrate Demolition Condition (2)—Reasonable economic use.

B. At least two of the following Conditions for Demolition prevail:

(1) The structure contains no features of architectural and historic significance to the character of the area in which it is located.

Condition not met. The applicant enlisted the services of ASC Group, an Architectural History consultant, to analyze the architectural and historic significance of the existing structures. The summary opinion of the consultant is that the houses were not identified as significant in a survey of Washington Township Historic Resources in 1979; the six houses do not create a critical mass to form a National Register of Historic Places-eligible district in their own right; the six houses are isolated by terrain and non-historic buildings; none of the six houses has sufficient architectural significance to be individually eligible for the NHRP; in contrast to the residential structures on South Riverview, none of the houses displays the use of brick or stone construction or pre-1860 design features.

The degree of emphasis placed by the consultant on the lack of inclusion--or eligibility for inclusion--on the National Register of Historic Places should not necessarily be the principal determinant of architectural or historic significance of these structures. This quadrant of Historic Dublin is small and possesses limited tangible reminders of the early architecture of the village. While these particular structures are isolated from the concentration of historic properties of South Riverview, the relative scarcity of homes like these creates an increased level of importance on the remaining pre-World War II structures, and how they maintain part of the cultural history of the village. As a group, they create a consistent streetscape along North Riverview that is reflective of the historic village character.

The Ohio Historic Inventories for the structures does not denote any of the residences as being individually noteworthy examples of period architectural styles or possessing significant architectural elements, but rather as evidence of the modest, vernacular residences that were constructed at the turn of the century.

(2) There is no reasonable economic use for the structure as it exists or as it might be restored, and that there exists no feasible and prudent alternative to demolition.

Condition Met. The applicant enlisted the services of Brian W. Barnes & Co., Inc, Real Estate Appraisers and Consultants, to analyze the properties to determine the financial feasibility as a real estate investment in both "as is" and "as if renovated" conditions. The consultant cites the *Dictionary*

of Real Estate Appraisal definition of Financial Feasibility as “(T)he ability of a property to generate sufficient income to support the use for which it was designed.”

The Financial Analysis for feasibility of the properties “as is” results in a negative cash flow for the property owners with no return on equity. Further, the consultant does not consider there to be any reason for an appreciation in the value of the assets in their “as is” condition.

The consultant next analyzed the cost to renovate the properties to a level comparable to average quality single family dwellings/Class A apartments in this market to determine if the cost of renovation results in a financially feasible investment. Renovations included in the analysis were those in categories known to be deficient in the existing structures relative to the comparison dwelling types in this market.

The Financial Analysis for feasibility of the properties “as if renovated” concludes that the required increase in rent required to attract investment capital would far exceed market rates and have a very low chance of being achieved. The consultant also evaluated the ability to sell the renovated units to individual owners and determined that the cost basis of the renovated units is about twice the sale price of competing housing stock. In conclusion, it is the consultant’s opinion that renovating the six units for rental or for sale would not be a viable investment.

The economic feasibility analysis provided appears to be accurate based on the existing income and expense information provided by the applicant, and based on the analysis of financial feasibility under the scenarios developed by the real estate consultant for the properties both “as is” and “as if renovated.” This review standard would also consider the difficulty in attempting to find six separate buyers for these properties that would be willing to put a significant investment into these modest homes.

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

Condition Not Met. The statements provided by the applicant addressing this Condition are not evidence of deterioration of the structures, but do provide additional justification for economic feasibility (Condition 2).

A cursory analysis of the condition of the exterior of the structures shows that the degree of deterioration does not appear to have progressed beyond economic feasibility for restoration. This is reinforced by the owner’s ability to maintain renters in these residences to demonstrate that they are at least in habitable condition.

(4) The location of the structure impedes the orderly development, substantially interferes with the Purposes of the District, or detracts from the historical character of its immediate vicinity;

OR [emphasis added], the proposed construction to replace the demolition significantly improves the overall quality of the Architectural Review District without diminishing the historic value of the vicinity or the District.

Met by Condition. This standard may be satisfied by demonstrating either of these components. The applicant specifically addressed only the second component of this standard.

With respect to the first component, the structures are located on a single-loaded street facing the Scioto River, and at the edge of the Architectural Review District, they do not necessarily interfere with the orderly development of the area unless viewed with respect to potential redevelopment. These structures are generally surrounded by non-historic structures, so these six structures largely constitute the only historical character of the area.

The Purposes of the District are outlined in several adopted plans, including the Bridge Street Vision Report and the 2007 Community Plan, and are described under the second component of this standard. The applicant has provided conceptual drawings of the proposed construction to replace the demolition. The proposed mixed-use development has two multi-story structures with parking at the lower level. The building south of Wing Hill contains a mix of retail, restaurant, office, and residential units, and the building north of Wing Hill is comprised entirely of residential units. The three floors of residential units are oriented with views toward the Scioto River, and the two floors of commercial space are oriented toward Bridge Street.

This area of the city has been the focus of considerable attention in past studies and adopted plans, and has consistently depicted the redevelopment of this area to achieve several objectives identified in these plans. The foremost among these are the *2007 Community Plan*, and more recently the *Bridge Street Vision Report*, adopted on October 25, 2010.

2007 Community Plan: The Future Land Use Map in the Community Plan designates this area, and the core of the Historic District as a Mixed Use Village Center. This is generally described as an integrated mix of land uses within a pedestrian oriented environment. The proposed mix of uses is generally consistent with the Future Land Use designation of Mixed Use Village Center as identified in the Community Plan.

For Historic Dublin, the Community Plan identifies a goal “To enhance and revitalize Historic Dublin as an activity center within the city that is vibrant, pedestrian-oriented and user friendly with an integrated mix of uses that supports economic, civic, recreational and housing opportunities for all segments of Dublin’s population.”

Historic Dublin Area Plan: The Area Plan for this portion of the Historic District includes the integration of multi-story residential units overlooking the Scioto River, a parking terrace to serve mixed-uses along the River, and at the terminus of North Street, a small pocket park and the commercial reuse of the existing residential structure. A future pedestrian bridge over the Scioto River is also recommended in this area of the Plan, along with public access to a riverfront boardwalk and trail system.

Bridge Street Corridor Study Vision Report: This proposal is addressed as part of the *Bridge Street Corridor Vision Report* which defines the optimal role for the corridor for the future by describing the corridor in a Vision Statement supported by five Vision Principles.

Vision Principles:

The Vision Principles are action-oriented concepts that lead to the fulfillment of the Vision. The Principles provide a framework for decision-making, communicate the intent of the Vision Plan recommendations, and provide a context for addressing critical issues or future decisions not anticipated at this time. Elements of these Principles are met through the proposed redevelopment. The Principles are:

1. Enhance economic vitality: Create vibrant and walkable mixed-use districts that build on the community's quality and character to make a highly competitive place to live, work, and invest.
2. Integrate the new center in the community life: Connect the Bridge Street Corridor to the surrounding community through enhanced bike, pedestrian, auto and transit connections, lively public spaces and a mix of retail and other uses that invite the larger community, and with civic, educational, and other uses to engage the full spectrum of community life.
3. Embrace Dublin's natural setting and celebrate a commitment to environmental sustainability: Celebrate the Scioto River, North/South Indian Run, and other natural features as symbols of Dublin's commitment to environmental preservation and sustainability.
4. Expand the range of choices available to Dublin and the region. Offer housing, jobs, shopping, recreation, transportation and other choices increasingly supported by changing demographics and lifestyles to complement and strengthen Dublin's existing community fabric.
5. Create places that embody Dublin's commitment to community: Design a 21st-century center for community inspired by Historic Dublin and marked by walkability, variety, and vitality.

Historic Dublin District Vision

The site is located within the Historic Dublin District of the *Bridge Street Corridor Vision Report*. Many of the specific design recommendations in the Historic Dublin District Vision Framework for this area build on those identified in the Historic Dublin Area Plan within the *2007 Community Plan* and are incorporated into the proposed redevelopment of this site.

1. Near-term pedestrian and parking improvements as a key element of successful new development to enhance existing conditions.
2. Sensitive mixed-use redevelopment of infill sites with an emphasis on housing as a complement to existing uses.
3. Long-term potential to redevelop the school site as a mixed-use development to complement Historic Dublin's existing core. (Not applicable)

The Historic District Vision also recommends that natural areas and neighborhoods surrounding the district be treated sensitively in all cases and that new development must avoid creating negative impacts in these areas. This statement was added by the City to recognize the existing South Riverview neighborhood.

The proposed redevelopment could contribute greatly to the advancement of all of the Community Plan, and the Bridge Street Vision Principles. The creation of a mixed-use development located

centrally in the Bridge Street District and in the heart of Historic Dublin would enhance the economic vitality of Dublin, expand the range of choices and quality of life for residents, and present opportunities to better engage the Scioto River. This project will ultimately improve the overall quality of the Architectural Review District without diminishing the historic value of the vicinity or the District.

PART V:ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM RECOMMENDATION

Approval of the request for Board Order for Demolition is recommended with conditions, having effectively demonstrated two of the four standards for Demolition as required by Code, with conditions. The applicant has included in the introduction portion of the application self-imposed conditions regarding the timing of the demolition, if approved. These have been incorporated into the ART Recommended Conditions, as noted below.

1. That demolition will not occur until:
 - (a) City approval of a proposed design;
 - (b) Resolution with the City of Dublin on two sites along the river, agreement for improvements to Blacksmith Lane and agreement on several land related issues, i.e. right-of-way revisions, power lines and other normal development issues; and
 - (c) Building Permits issued.

OHIO HISTORIC INVENTORY

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



OHIO
HISTORICAL
SOCIETY
SINCE 1885

THIS IS A FACSIMILE OF THE FORM PRODUCED BY:

1.No. FRA-8843-1		2.County Franklin		4.Present Name(s)		<input type="checkbox"/> CODED <input type="checkbox"/> CODED	
3.Location of Negatives City of Dublin				5.Historic or Other Name(s)			
Roll No. 2		Picture No.(s) 33					
6.Specific Address or Location 7 N. Riverview				16. Thematic Association(s)		28. No. of Stories 1.5	
6a. Lot, Section or VMD Number				17. Date(s) or Period mid-19c		17b. Alteration Date(s)	
7.City or Village If Rural, Township & Vicinity Dublin				18. Style or Design vernacular		<input type="checkbox"/> High Style <input type="checkbox"/> Elements	
8. Site Plan with North Arrow				18a. Style of Addition or Elements(s)		29. Basement? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
				19. Architect or Engineer		30. Foundation Material ashlar stone	
				19a. Design Sources		31. Wall Construction frame	
				20. Contractor or Builder		32. Roof Type & Material gable/asph.shingle	
9. U.T.M. Reference				21. Building Type or Plan		33. No. of Bays Front 3 Side 2	
Quadrangle Name NW Columbus 17 319900 4440770 Zone Easting Northing				22. Original Use, if apparent residence		34. Exterior Wall Material(s) various wood shing.	
10.				23. Present Use residence		35. Plan Shape L	
<input type="checkbox"/> Site <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Building <input type="checkbox"/> Structure <input type="checkbox"/> Object				24. Ownership <input type="checkbox"/> Public <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Private		36. Changes <input type="checkbox"/> Addition <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Altered (Explain in #42) <input type="checkbox"/> Moved	
11. On National Register? No		12. N.R. Potential?		25. Owner's Name & Address, if known		37. Window Types <input type="checkbox"/> 6 over 6 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 over 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 over 2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other	
13. Part of Estab. Hist. Dist? Yes		14. District Potential?		26. Property Acreage		38. Building Dimensions	
15. Name of Established District (N.R. or Local) Dublin H.D. (local)				27. Other Surveys in Which Included		39. Endangered? No By What?	
42. Further Description of Important Interior and Exterior Features(Continue on reverse if necessary) Simple residence with intersecting gable roof, one-over-one windows, enclosed front porch, large rear porch and deck and a one story addition on the south side.						40. Chimney Placement center/n.ridge	
43. History and Significance (Continue on reverse if necessary) Although altered, this building contributes to the scale and residential character of N. Riverview.						41. Distance from and Frontage on Road	
44. Description of Environment and Outbuildings (See #52) Located on a landscaped lot with a frame outbuilding at the rear.						 PHOTO	
45. Sources of Information observation						46. Prepared by N. Recchie	
						47. Organization BDR&C	
						48. Date Recorded in Field 3/03	
						49. Revised by	
						50. Date Revised	
						50b. Reviewed by	

FRA-8843-1

FRANKLIN

7 N. RIVERVIEW

OHIO HISTORIC INVENTORY

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



OHIO
HISTORICAL
SOCIETY
SINCE 1885

THIS IS A FACSIMILE OF THE FORM PRODUCED BY:

1.No. FRA-8833-1		2.County FRANKLIN		4.Present Name(s)		<input type="checkbox"/> CODED <input type="checkbox"/> CODED		FRA- 8833-1
3.Location of Negatives CITY OF DUBLIN				5.Historic or Other Name(s)				
Roll No. 2		Picture No.(s) 32						
6.Specific Address or Location 17 N. RIVERVIEW				16. Thematic Association(s)		28. No. of Stories 1.5		FRANKLIN
6a. Lot, Section or VMD Number				17. Date(s) or Period C. 1910		29. Basement? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		
7.City or Village If Rural, Township & Vicinity DUBLIN				18. Style or Design <input type="checkbox"/> High Style <input type="checkbox"/> Elements		30. Foundation Material ROCK FACED BLOCK		
8. Site Plan with North Arrow 				18a. Style of Addition or Elements(s)		31. Wall Construction FRAME		
				19. Architect or Engineer		32. Roof Type & Material GABLE/ST. SEAM METL		
				19a. Design Sources		33. No. of Bays Front 3 Side 2		
				20. Contractor or Builder		34. Exterior Wall Material(s) PAINTED WOOD SH.		
				21. Building Type or Plan BUNGALOW		35. Plan Shape RECT.		
				22. Original Use, if apparent RESIDENCE		36. Changes <input type="checkbox"/> Addition <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Altered (Explain in #42) <input type="checkbox"/> Moved		
9. U.T.M. Reference Quadrangle Name NW COLUMBUS 17 319900 4440830 Zone Easting Northing				23. Present Use RESIDENCE		37. Window Types <input type="checkbox"/> 6 over 6 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 over 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 over 2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other		
10. <input type="checkbox"/> Site <input type="checkbox"/> Building <input type="checkbox"/> Structure <input type="checkbox"/> Object				24. Ownership <input type="checkbox"/> Public <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Private		38. Building Dimensions 45 X 30		
11. On National Register? No		12. N.R. Potential?		25. Owner's Name & Address, if known		39. Endangered? No By What?		
13. Part of Estab. Hist. Dist? Yes		14. District Potential?		26. Property Acreage		40. Chimney Placement CENTER/ON RIDGE		
15. Name of Established District (N.R. or Local) DUBLIN H.D. (local)				27. Other Surveys in Which Included		41. Distance from and Frontage on Road 35/65		
42. Further Description of Important Interior and Exterior Features(Continue on reverse if necessary) This early 20th century bungalow features a wood shingle exterior, three-over-one and one-over-one windows, a central entrance and large integrated front porch.						 PHOTO		17 N. RIVERVIEW
43. History and Significance (Continue on reverse if necessary) This is a very well-preserved early 20th century residence in the historic area of old Dublin.								
44. Description of Environment and Outbuildings (See #52) Located on a landscaped lot with a garage with vertical siding at the rear.						46. Prepared by NANCY RECCHIE		
45. Sources of Information observation						47. Organization BDR&C		
						48. Date Recorded in Field 5/03		
				49. Revised by		50. Date Revised		
						50b. Reviewed by		

OHIO HISTORIC INVENTORY

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



OHIO
HISTORICAL
SOCIETY

SINCE 1885

THIS IS A FACSIMILE OF THE FORM PRODUCED BY:

1.No. FRA-8834-1		2.County FRANKLIN		4.Present Name(s)		<input type="checkbox"/> CODED <input type="checkbox"/> CODED	
3.Location of Negatives CITY OF DUBLIN				5.Historic or Other Name(s)			
Roll No. 2		Picture No.(s) 30-31					
6.Specific Address or Location 27 N. RIVERVIEW				16. Thematic Association(s)		28. No. of Stories 2	
6a. Lot, Section or VMD Number				17. Date(s) or Period C. 1880-1900		17b. Alteration Date(s)	
7.City or Village If Rural, Township & Vicinity DUBLIN				18. Style or Design vernacular		<input type="checkbox"/> High Style <input type="checkbox"/> Elements	
8. Site Plan with North Arrow 				18a. Style of Addition or Elements(s)		29. Basement? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
9. U.T.M. Reference Quadrangle Name NW COLUMBUS 17 319900 4440860 Zone Easting Northing				19. Architect or Engineer		30. Foundation Material COURSED RUBBLE	
10. <input type="checkbox"/> Site <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Building <input type="checkbox"/> Structure <input type="checkbox"/> Object				19a. Design Sources		31. Wall Construction FRAME	
11. On National Register? No				20. Contractor or Builder		32. Roof Type & Material GABLE/ASPHALT SHNGL	
12. N.R. Potential?				21. Building Type or Plan GABLED ELL		33. No. of Bays Front 2 Side 2	
13. Part of Estab. Hist. Dist? Yes				22. Original Use, if apparent RESIDENCE		34. Exterior Wall Material(s) NARROW SHIPLAP	
14. District Potential?				23. Present Use RESIDENCE		35. Plan Shape IRREG.	
15. Name of Established District (N.R. or Local) DUBLIN H.D. (local)				24. Ownership <input type="checkbox"/> Public <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Private		36. Changes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Addition <input type="checkbox"/> Altered <input type="checkbox"/> Moved (Explain in #42)	
16. Property Acreage				25. Owner's Name & Address, if known		37. Window Types <input type="checkbox"/> 6 over 6 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 over 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 over 2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other	
17. Other Surveys in Which Included				26. Property Acreage		38. Building Dimensions 35 X 40	
18. Other Surveys in Which Included				27. Other Surveys in Which Included		39. Endangered? By What? No	
42. Further Description of Important Interior and Exterior Features (Continue on reverse if necessary) Gabled ell residence with original shiplap siding, one-over-one windows, and intersecting gable roofline and several additions including a screened porch and a wing at the rear.				40. Chimney Placement EXT. /SIDE WALL		41. Distance from and Frontage on Road 35/40	
43. History and Significance (Continue on reverse if necessary) This building is typical of the vernacular housing found in Dublin and Washington Twp. from the late 19th century. It is an element in the streetscape along N. Riverview.				46. Prepared by NANCY RECCHIE		47. Organization BDR&C	
44. Description of Environment and Outbuildings (See #52) Located on a landscaped lot with a large barn with horizontal siding at the rear. This is a short street that parallels the Scioto River and High Street.				48. Date Recorded in Field 3/03		49. Revised by	
45. Sources of Information observation				50. Date Revised		50b. Reviewed by	

FRA-8834-1
FRANKLIN

27 N. RIVERVIEW



OHIO HISTORIC INVENTORY

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



OHIO
HISTORICAL
SOCIETY

SINCE 1885

THIS IS A FACSIMILE OF THE FORM PRODUCED BY:

1.No. FRA-8835-1		2.County FRANKLIN		4.Present Name(s)		<input type="checkbox"/> CODED <input type="checkbox"/> CODED		FRA- 8835-1
3.Location of Negatives CITY OF DUBLIN				5.Historic or Other Name(s)				
Roll No. 2		Picture No.(s) 29						
6.Specific Address or Location 37 N. RIVERVIEW				16. Thematic Association(s)		28. No. of Stories 1.5		FRANKLIN
6a. Lot, Section or VMD Number				17. Date(s) or Period C. 1920		17b. Alteration Date(s)		
7.City or Village If Rural, Township & Vicinity DUBLIN				18. Style or Design <input type="checkbox"/> High Style <input type="checkbox"/> Elements		29. Basement? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		
8. Site Plan with North Arrow				18a. Style of Addition or Elements(s)		30. Foundation Material RUBBLED STONE		
				19. Architect or Engineer		31. Wall Construction FRAME		
				19a. Design Sources		32. Roof Type & Material GABLE/ASPH. SHINGLE		
9. U.T.M. Reference Quadrangle Name NW COLUMBUS 17 319900 4440860 Zone Easting Northing				20. Contractor or Builder		33. No. of Bays Front 3 Side 3		
10. <input type="checkbox"/> Site <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Building <input type="checkbox"/> Structure <input type="checkbox"/> Object				21. Building Type or Plan		34. Exterior Wall Material(s) WIDE BEVELED SIDING		
11. On National Register? No				22. Original Use, if apparent RESIDENCE		35. Plan Shape RECT		
12. N.R. Potential?				23. Present Use RESIDENCE		36. Changes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Addition <input type="checkbox"/> Altered <input type="checkbox"/> Moved (Explain in #42)		
13. Part of Estab. Hist. Dist? Yes				24. Ownership <input type="checkbox"/> Public <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Private		37. Window Types <input type="checkbox"/> 6 over 6 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 over 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 over 2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other		
14. District Potential?				25. Owner's Name & Address, if known		38. Building Dimensions 35 X 30		
15. Name of Established District (N.R. or Local) DUBLIN H.D. (local)				26. Property Acreage		39. Endangered? No By What?		
15. Name of Established District (N.R. or Local) DUBLIN H.D. (local)				27. Other Surveys in Which Included		40. Chimney Placement INTERIOR/END WALL		
42. Further Description of Important Interior and Exterior Features (Continue on reverse if necessary) Simple early 20th century building with gable end facing the street, six-over-one windows, front porch, screened porch at rear and rear lean-to wing that appears to be original.						41. Distance from and Frontage on Road 35/50		
43. History and Significance (Continue on reverse if necessary) This building maintains the scale and residential character of N. Riverview.						PHOTO		
44. Description of Environment and Outbuildings (See #52) Located on a landscaped lot with a small wood shed in the rear yard.								
45. Sources of Information observation				46. Prepared by NANCY RECCHIE		37 N. RIVERVIEW		
				47. Organization BDR&C				
				48. Date Recorded in Field 3/03				
				49. Revised by		50. Date Revised		
				50b. Reviewed by				

OHIO HISTORIC INVENTORY

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



OHIO
HISTORICAL
SOCIETY
SINCE 1885

THIS IS A FACSIMILE OF THE FORM PRODUCED BY:

1.No. FRA-8836-1		2.County FRANKLIN		4.Present Name(s)		<input type="checkbox"/> CODED <input type="checkbox"/> CODED		FRA-8836-1
3.Location of Negatives CITY OF DUBLIN				5.Historic or Other Name(s)				
Roll No. 2		Picture No.(s) 28						
6.Specific Address or Location 45 N. RIVERVIEW				16. Thematic Association(s)		28. No. of Stories 1.5		FRANKLIN
6a. Lot, Section or VMD Number				17. Date(s) or Period C. 1880		17b. Alteration Date(s)		
7.City or Village If Rural, Township & Vicinity DUBLIN				18. Style or Design vernacular		<input type="checkbox"/> High Style <input type="checkbox"/> Elements		
8. Site Plan with North Arrow				18a. Style of Addition or Elements(s)		30. Foundation Material COURSED RUBBLE		
				19. Architect or Engineer		31. Wall Construction FRAME		
				19a. Design Sources		32. Roof Type & Material Gable/St. Seam METAL		
				20. Contractor or Builder		33. No. of Bays Front 2 Side 2		
9. U.T.M. Reference Quadrangle Name NW Columbus 17 319900 4440870 Zone Easting Northing				21. Building Type or Plan		34. Exterior Wall Material(s) ALUMINUM SIDING		
10. <input type="checkbox"/> Site <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Building <input type="checkbox"/> Structure <input type="checkbox"/> Object				22. Original Use, if apparent RESIDENCE		35. Plan Shape IRREG.		
11. On National Register? No				23. Present Use RESIDENCE		36. Changes <input type="checkbox"/> Addition <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Altered (Explain in #42) <input type="checkbox"/> Moved		
12. N.R. Potential?				24. Ownership <input type="checkbox"/> Public <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Private		37. Window Types <input type="checkbox"/> 6 over 6 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 over 4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2 over 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Other		
13. Part of Estab. Hist. Dist? Yes				25. Owner's Name & Address, if known		38. Building Dimensions 35 X 35		
14. District Potential?				26. Property Acreage		39. Endangered? No By What?		
15. Name of Established District (N.R. or Local) DUBLIN HISTORIC DISTRICT				27. Other Surveys in Which Included		40. Chimney Placement OFF CENTER/RIDGE		
41. Distance from and Frontage on Road 30/50								
42. Further Description of Important Interior and Exterior Features (Continue on reverse if necessary) This is a very modest late 19th century building with a gable roof, two-over-two windows and a later front porch and a room added in the ell.								45 N. RIVERVIEW
43. History and Significance (Continue on reverse if necessary) This building contributes to the scale and village character of N. Riverview.						PHOTO		
44. Description of Environment and Outbuildings (See #52) The building is located on a landscaped lot with a frame garage with wood siding.						46. Prepared by NANCY RECCHIE		
45. Sources of Information observation						47. Organization BDR&C		
						48. Date Recorded in Field 3/03		
						49. Revised by		
						50. Date Revised		
						50b. Reviewed by		

OHIO HISTORIC INVENTORY

THIS IS A FACSIMILE OF THE FORM PRODUCED BY:

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



OHIO
HISTORICAL
SOCIETY
SINCE 1885

1.No. FRA-8837-1		2.County FRANKLIN		4.Present Name(s)		<input type="checkbox"/> CODED <input type="checkbox"/> CODED		FRA- 8837-1
3.Location of Negatives CITY OF DUBLIN				5.Historic or Other Name(s)				
Roll No. 2		Picture No.(s) 27						
6.Specific Address or Location 53 N. RIVERVIEW				16. Thematic Association(s)		28. No. of Stories 1		FRANKLIN
6a. Lot, Section or VMD Number				17. Date(s) or Period C. 1920		29. Basement? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		
7.City or Village If Rural, Township & Vicinity DUBLIN				18. Style or Design <input type="checkbox"/> High Style <input type="checkbox"/> Elements		30. Foundation Material CONCRETE BLOCK		
8. Site Plan with North Arrow 				18a. Style of Addition or Elements(s)		31. Wall Construction FRAME		
				19. Architect or Engineer		32. Roof Type & Material GABLE/ASPH. SHINGLE		
9. U.T.M. Reference Quadrangle Name NW COLUMBUS 17 319900 4440900 Zone Easting Northing				19a. Design Sources		33. No. of Bays Front 3 Side 2		
10. <input type="checkbox"/> Site <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Building <input type="checkbox"/> Structure <input type="checkbox"/> Object				20. Contractor or Builder		34. Exterior Wall Material(s) STAG. BUTT WOOD SHG		
11. On National Register? No				21. Building Type or Plan		35. Plan Shape		
12. N.R. Potential?				22. Original Use, if apparent RESIDENCE		36. Changes <input type="checkbox"/> Addition <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Altered (Explain in #42) <input type="checkbox"/> Moved		
13. Part of Estab. Hist. Dist? Yes				23. Present Use RESIDENCE		37. Window Types <input type="checkbox"/> 6 over 6 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 over 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 over 2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other		
14. District Potential?				24. Ownership <input type="checkbox"/> Public <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Private		38. Building Dimensions 40 X 30		
15. Name of Established District (N.R. or Local) DUBLIN H.D. (local)				25. Owner's Name & Address, if known		39. Endangered? No By What?		
				26. Property Acreage		40. Chimney Placement EXTERIOR/END WALL		
				27. Other Surveys in Which Included		41. Distance from and Frontage on Road 25/70		
42. Further Description of Important Interior and Exterior Features (Continue on reverse if necessary) Small early 20th century building with a gable roof, one-over-one windows and wood shingle siding. The shed-roofed rear wing appears to be original, as is the porch.						 PHOTO		53 N. RIVERVIEW
43. History and Significance (Continue on reverse if necessary) This small-scale residence contributes to the scale and character of N. Riverview. It appears to be little altered.								
44. Description of Environment and Outbuildings (See #52) Located on a corner lot at the north end of N. Riverview. A garage with vertical wood siding is located at the rear.						45. Prepared by NANCY RECCHIE		
45. Sources of Information observation						47. Organization BDR&C		
						48. Date Recorded in Field 3/03		
						49. Revised by		
						50. Date Revised		
						50b. Reviewed by		