Parcel	273-000042	Address	37 N Riverview St	C)HI FRA-2545-1
Year Built:	Ca.1850	Map No:	116	Photo No:	1712-1714 (7/9/16)
Theme:	Domestic	Historic Use:	Single family house	Present Use:	Single family house
Style:	Hall and Parlor	Foundation:	Stone	Wall Type:	Frame
Roof Type:	Side gable/asphalt shingle	Exterior Wall:	Clapboard	Symmetry:	No
Stories:	1.5	Front Bays:	3	Side Bays:	3
Porch:	Masonry deck with wrought iron railing on façade, shed roof porch on south elevation	Chimney:	1, Interior, on ridge near north side of house	Windows:	6-over-1 Wood sashes

Description: The one-and-one-half-story house has a rectilinear footprint expanded by a rear addition and shed-roof porch on the south elevation. The building rests on a fieldstone foundation, the walls are clad in clapboard siding, and the side-gable roof in asphalt shingles. The front door is centered on the façade, which opens to a masonry deck with a wrought iron railing. Windows are six-over-one wood sashes.

Setting: The building is located on the west side of Riverview St north of Wing Hill Ln. It is one in a row of latenineteenth/early twentieth century residences. A privy is behind the house.

Condition: Good

Integrity:	Location:	Y	Design:	Ν	Setting:	Y	Materials: Y	,
	Workmanship:	Y	Feeling:	Y	Association:	Υ		

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

Historical Significance: The property is within the boundary and recommended contributing to the City of Dublin's local Historic Dublin district. The property is recommended contributing 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 Sta

 National Register:
 Recommended Dublin High Street Historic District, boundary increase
 Property Name:



37 N Riverview St, looking northwest

37 N Riverview St, looking west

THIS IS A FACSIMILE OF THE FORM PRODUCED BY:

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



SINCE 1885

1.No. 2.County 4.Present N FRA-8835-1 FRANKLIN 3.Location of Negatives 5.Historic of	ame(s) r Other Name(s)			CODED STAT
Roll No. Picture No.(s) 2 29				1
6.Specific Address or Location	16. Thematic Association(s)		28. No. of Stories	1.5
37 N. RIVERVIEW			29. Basement?	
6a. Lot, Section or VMD Number	17. Date(s) or Period C. 1920	17b. Alteration Date(s)	Yes No 30. Foundation Material	- AA
7.City or Village If Rural, Township & Vicinity DUBLIN	18. Style or Design	High Style	RUBBLED STON 31. Wall Construction	E
8. Site Plan with North Arrow	/ 18a. Style of Addition or Eleme	ents(s)	FRAME	5
North 3	19. Architect or Engineer		32. Roof Type & Material GABLE/ASPH. SHI 33. No. of Bays	
	19a. Design Sources		Front 3 Side 34. Exterior Wall Material(s)	3
2 2 2	20. Contractor or Builder		WIDE BEVELED SI	DING
T N	21. Building Type or Plan		35. Plan Shape RECT 36. Changes	
BRIDGE			Addition	
9. U.T.M. Reference	22. Original Use, if apparent RESII	ENCE	Moved (Explain In #4	42)
Quadrangle Name NW COLUMBUS	23. Present Use RESII		37. Window Types	over 2
17 319900 4440860 Zone Easting Northing	24. Ownership		- ⊠Other	
10. Site Building Structure Object	Public Private	if known	38. Building Dimensions 35 X 30	
	25. Owner a Name of Address,		39. Endangered?	No
11. On National 12. N.R.			By What?	
Register? NO Potential?			40. Chimney Placement INTERIOR/END	WALL
13. Part of Estab. Hist. Dist? Yes Potential?	26. Property Acreage		41. Distance from and	
15. Name of Established District (N.R. or Local) DUBLIN H.D. (local)	27. Other Surveys in Which In	cluded	Frontage on Road	35/50
42.Further Description of Important Interior and Exterior Simple early 20th century the street, six-over-one porch at rear and rear le original.	building with ga windows, front po	ble end facir orch, screened	ng d	37 N.
			рното	Riv
43. History and Significance (Continue on reverse if nece This building maintains character of N. Riverview.	the scale and	d residentia	\top \checkmark \checkmark	RIVERUIEU
			46. Prepared by	3
44. Description of Environment and Outbuildings (See #	52)		NANCY RECCHIE	
Located on a landscpaed	lot with a small	wood shed i		
the rear yard.			BDR&C 48. Date Recorded in Field	
			3/03	
45. Sources of Information observation			49. Revised by 50. Date	Revised
			50b. Reviewed by	

CITY OF DUBLIN HISTORICAL AND CULTURAL ASSESSMENT - INDIVIDUAL PROPERTY SHEETS

Parcel	273-000073	Address	45 N Riverview St	C)HI FRA-8836-1
Year Built:	1900	Map No:	116	Photo No:	1705-1711 (7/9/16)
Theme:	Domestic	Historic Use:	Single family house	Present Use:	Single family house
Style:	Gabled-ell	Foundation:	Stone	Wall Type:	Frame
Roof Type:	Cross gable/standing seam metal	Exterior Wall:	Aluminum	Symmetry:	No
Stories:	1	Front Bays:	3	Side Bays:	2
Porch:	Shed roof porch on façade	Chimney:	1, Interior, on ridge of front gable	Windows:	2-over-2 Original wood sashes, and 1- over-1 replacements

Description: The one-story gabled-ell house has an L-plan footprint and a cross-gable roof. The building is expanded by a one-story flat-roof component at the façade juncture of the gable and ell. Stretching across the addition is an open shed-roof porch, with concrete deck and wrought iron posts. The exterior walls are clad in aluminum and the roof is sheathed in asphalt shingles. Most windows are two-over-two wood sashes, except on the addition, which are one-over-one. A gable roofed ancillary building is west of the house near the alley, as is a privy.

Setting: The building is located on the west side of Riverview Street. It is one in a row of nineteenth century residences.

Condition:	Good
------------	------

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

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

Historical Significance: The building is within the boundaries of the City of Dublin's local Historic Dublin district. The property is also recommended contributing 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 Sta

 National Register:
 Recommended Dublin High Street
 Property Name:

 Historic District, boundary increase
 Historic District, boundary increase



45 N Riverview St, looking northwest

45 N Riverview St, ancillary structure, looking northeast

THIS IS A FACSIMILE OF THE FORM PRODUCED BY:

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



SINCE 1885

1.No. FRA-8836-1 2.County 4 FRANKLIN	Present Name	s)			CODED	of I
3.Location of Negatives CITY OF DUBLIN 5	.Historic or Oth	er Name(s)				RH -
Roll No. Picture No.(s)		na) - Contra (Contra (
2 28						
6.Specific Address or Location	7	16. Thematic Association(s)		28. No. of Stories	1.5	*
45 N. RIVERVIEW	V	17 Data (a) as Daried	17b. Alteration Date(s)	29. Basement?		d'
6a. Lot, Section or VMD Number		17. Date(s) or Period C. 1880	T/B. Alteration Date(s)	30. Foundation Mate		TRANKUN
7.City or Village If Rural, Township & Vicinit DUBLIN	lγ	18. Style or Design vernacular	High Style	COURSEL 31. Wall Constructio) RUBBLE	K
8. Site Plan with North Arrow	1 7	18a. Style of Addition or Element	Elements		AME	2
DORTH		Toal orgin of Addition of License		32. Roof Type & Mat	erial	6
5	RIVER	19. Architect or Engineer		Gable/St.	Seam METAL	
	15			33. No. of Bays		
1 2		19a. Design Sources		Front 2	Side 2	
HIGH	6			34. Exterior Wall Ma	terial(s) M SIDING	
T 16 #	SC 1070	20. Contractor or Builder		35. Plan Shape []		
1	VN	21. Building Type or Plan		36. Changes	KKEG.	
BRIDGE				Addition		
9. U.T.M. Reference	1	22. Original Use, if apparent		Altered (Explain In #42)	
Quadrangle Name		RESID	ENCE			
NW Columbus		23. Present Use RESID	ENCE	37. Window Types		
17 319900 4440870			ENCE.			
Zone Easting Northing		24. Ownership		38. Building Dimens	ions	
10. Site Building Structure	Object	25. Owner's Name & Address,	if known		X 35	
				39. Endangered?	No	
11. On National 12. N.R.				By What?		
Register? NO Potential	?			40. Chimney Placen	nent FER/RIDGE	
13. Part of Estab. 14. District				41. Distance from a		
Hist. Dist? Yes Potential		26. Property Acreage 27. Other Surveys in Which Inc	aludad	Frontage on Road		
15. Name of Established District (N.R. or Loca DUBLIN HISTORIC DISTR	ICT	27. Other Surveys in which his	Cluted	. Toninge en trea	- 30/30	
42.Further Description of Important Interior	and Exterior Fea	tures(Continue on reverse if neo	cessary)		ALL DEPENDENCE OF THE	
This is a very modes	t late	19th century bu	ilding with a		AV BALL IN	34
gable roof, two-over	+bo oll	ndows and a lat	er front port		I I Delt	
and a room added in	rue err	•			the second second	5
					maine	
				PH	ото	6
43. History and Significance (Continue on reve	erse if necessar	y)			/	RIVERVIEU
This building contr	ibutes	to the scale	and villag	e	<	2
character of N. River	view.				\sim	5
						18
				46. Prepared by		
44. Description of Environment and Outbuildin	ngs (See #52)			NANCY REC	CHIE	
The building is locat	ted on a	landscaped lo	t with a fram			
garage with wood sidi	ng.			1131152	DR&C	
				48. Date Recorded		
				49. Revised by	50. Date Revised	
45. Sources of Information observation				45. Noviscu by	Ju. Bull Honord	
				50b. Reviewed by		1
				ų.		

CITY OF DUBLIN HISTORICAL AND CULTURAL ASSESSMENT – INDIVIDUAL PROPERTY SHEETS

Parcel	273-000098	Address	53 N Riverview St	C	DHI FRA-8837-1
Year Built:	Ca.1920	Map No:	116	Photo No:	1701-1704 (7/9/16)
Theme:	Domestic	Historic Use:	Single family house	Present Use:	Single family house
Style:	Vernacular	Foundation:	Concrete block	Wall Type:	Frame
Roof Type:	: Side gable/asphalt shingle	Exterior Wall:	Wood shingle	Symmetry:	No
Stories:	1	Front Bays:	3	Side Bays:	2
Porch:	Front gable porch on façade	Chimney:	1, Exterior, off ridge on south elevation	Windows:	1-over-1 Replacements

Description: The one-story house has a rectilinear footprint, resting on a concrete block foundation. The exterior walls are clad in wood shingles and the roof is sheathed in asphalt shingles. An open front-gable porch with wood posts and balustrade is on the south half of the façade. Within the porch is the front door. Windows are one-over-one replacements. A detached garage is west of the house.

Setting: The building is located on the west side of Riverview St at its intersection with North St. It is one in a row of latenineteenth/early twentieth century residences. A stone wall extends along the roadside.

Condition: Good

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

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

Historical Significance: The building is within the boundaries of the City of Dublin's local Historic Dublin district and is recommended as contributing 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 Sta

 National Register:
 Recommended Dublin High Street Historic District, boundary increase
 Property Name:



53 N Riverview St, looking southwest

53 N Riverview St, garage, looking northwest

FRANKLIN

THIS IS A FACSIMILE OF THE FORM PRODUCED BY:

2.County

1.No.

FRA-8837-1 **3 Location of Negatives** CITY OF DUBLIN OHIO HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE 567 East Hudson St. Columbus, Ohio 43211-1030 614/297-2470-fax 614-297-2496



			SINCE 1885	
4.Present Nam	ne(s)			LE837
5.Historic or O	ther Name(s)			7-1
	16. Thematic Association(s)		28. No. of Stories 1	×
v	17. Date(s) or Period17b. AlterC. 1920	ation Date(s)	29. Basement? Yes No 30. Foundation Material	RAN
y (/	18. Style or Design	High Style Elements	CONCRETE BLOCK 31. Wall Construction FRAME	RANKUN
RIVER	19. Architect or Engineer		32. Roof Type & Material GABLE/ASPH. SHINGLE 33. No. of Bays	C
· • · · · · ·	19a. Design Sources		Front 3 Side 2 34. Exterior Wall Material(s) STAG. BUTT WOOD SHG	
SOLOTO RIVE	20. Contractor or Builder 21. Building Type or Plan		35. Plan Shape 36. Changes	
101	22. Original Use, if apparent RESIDENCE		Addition Altered Moved (Explain In #42)	
	23. Present Use RESIDENCE 24. Ownership		37. Window Types 6 over 6 4 over 4 2 over 2 Other	
Dbject	25. Owner's Name & Address, if known		38. Building Dimensions 40 X 30	
?	_		39. Endangered? No By What? 40. Chimney Placement EXTERIOR/END WALL	
?	26. Property Acreage 27. Other Surveys in Which Included		41. Distance from and 25/70 Frontage on Road	
and Exterior Fo tury bu and wo	eatures(Continue on reverse if necessary) nilding with a gable bod shingle siding. T ars to be original, a	he		53 N. RIVE
erse if necessa	ary)		РНОТО	RU

Roll No. Picture No.(s) 2 27					<u> </u>	
6.Specific Address or Location 53 N. RIVER	RVIEW	16. Thematic Association(s)		28. No. of Stories 29. Basement? Yes No	1	1
6a. Lot, Section or VMD Number		17. Date(s) or Period C . 1920	17b. Alteration Date(s)	30. Foundation Mater		AA
7.City or Village If Rural, Township DUBLIN		18. Style or Design	High Style	31. Wall Construction	E BLOCK	RANKUN
8. Site Plan with North Arrow NC	DRTH	18a. Style of Addition or Eleme 19. Architect or Engineer	ents(s)	32. Roof Type & Mate GABLE/ASPI	AME erial H. SHINGLE	à
1	RWERUHEU 070 RIU	19a. Design Sources 20. Contractor or Builder		33. No. of Bays Front 3 34. Exterior Wall Mal STAG. BUT 35. Plan Shape	Side 2 terial(s) T WOOD SHG	
BRIDGE 9. U.T.M. Reference	8	21. Building Type or Plan 22. Original Use, if apparent		36. Changes	Explain In #42)	
Quadrangle Name NW COLUMBUS	0900	23. Present Use RESII		Moved 37. Window Types 6 over 6 4 ov Other		
Zone Easting Northing 10. Site Building Struct	ture Object	24. Ownership Public Private 25. Owner's Name & Address	i, if known	38. Building Dimens	ions X 30 No	
Register? NO	N.R. Potential? District	-		By What? 40. Chimney Placent		
77	Potential?	26. Property Acreage		41. Distance from a	nd 25/70	
15. Name of Established District (N.F DUBLIN H.D. (loca	1)	27. Other Surveys in Which Ir		Frontage on Road		$\overline{(}$
42.Further Description of Important Small early 20th one-over-one win shed-roofed rear porch.	i century buindows and wo	ilding with a g od shingle sidi	gable root, ing. The		TIT	53 N. KIVE
43. History and Significance (Continu This small-scale character of N. altered.	residence d	contributes to		d		WERVIEW
44. Description of Environment and (Located on a corr A garage with ver rear.	ner lot at t				DR&C	
45. Sources of Information observation				49. Revised by 50b. Reviewed by	50. Date Revised	

CITY OF DUBLIN HISTORICAL AND CULTURAL ASSESSMENT - INDIVIDUAL PROPERTY SHEETS

Parcel	273-005565	Address	62 N Riverview St	C	DHI FRA-8839-1
Year Built:	1900	Map No:	116	Photo No:	1696-1700 (7/9/16)
Theme:	Domestic	Historic Use:	Single family house	Present Use:	Single family house
Style:	Vernacular	Foundation:	Stone	Wall Type:	Frame
Roof Type:	Side gable/asphalt shingle	Exterior Wall:	Clapboard	Symmetry:	No
Stories:	1	Front Bays:	3	Side Bays:	1
Porch:	Concrete stoop	Chimney:	1, Exterior, near center of west elevation	Windows:	Multi-light casements/fixed

Description: The one-story house has a rectilinear footprint, resting on a stone foundation. The side-gable roof is sheathed in asphalt shingles and pierced by a broad stone chimney stack on the facade. South of the chimney is the front door, and north is a large arched multi-light fixed window. Remaining windows are casements. The exterior is clad in clapboard.

Setting: The building is located on the east side of Riverview Street, on a tall ridge overlooking the Scioto River. The house is in one of the old residential core neighborhoods of Dublin.

Condition: Good

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

Integrity Notes: The building has good integrity, diminished some by replacement fenestration.

Historical Significance: The building is within the boundaries of the City of Dublin's local Historic Dublin district and is also recommended contributing 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 Sta

 National Register:
 Recommended Dublin High Street Historic District, boundary increase
 Property Name:



62 N Riverview St, looking southeast

62 N Riverview St, looking northeast

THIS IS A FACSIMILE OF THE FORM PRODUCED BY:

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



SINCE 1885

FRA-8839-1 FRANKLIN	4.Present Name	(s)				E833
3.Location of Negatives CITY OF DUBLIN						1 2
Roll No. Picture No.(s)						1
2 26						
6.Specific Address or Location 62 N RIVERVIEW	7	16. Thematic Association(s)		28. No. of Stories 29. Basement?	2	T
50°	V	17. Date(s) or Period	17b. Alteration Date(s)	Yes No		16
6a. Lot, Section or VMD Number		C. 1910		30. Foundation Mat	terial D RUBBLE	RANKLIK
7.City or Village If Rural, Township & Vicin DUBLIN	ity	18. Style or Design vernacular	High Style	31. Wall Construct		KC
8. Site Plan with North Arrow	1 1	18a. Style of Addition or Eleme	nts(s)	- F'I	RAME	1×
NORTH	100 000			32. Roof Type & M		C
2	I UER	19. Architect or Engineer			PH. SHINGLE	
ž	2			33. No. of Bays		
Point Point	R	19a. Design Sources		Front 2	Side 2	
2 2	10			34. Exterior Wall N		
0	0	20. Contractor or Builder			NARROW BEVLD SIDING 35. Plan Shape RECT.	
BRIDGE	E.	04 Duilding Trues of Disp		36. Changes	KEUT.	
	10	21. Building Type or Plan		Addition		
9. U.T.M. Reference		22. Original Use, if apparent		Altered	Altered (Explain In #42)	
9. 0.1.M. Reference Quadrangle Name		RESID	ENCE	Moved		
NW Columbus		23. Present Use		37. Window Types		
17 319950 4440990)	RESID	ENCE		over 4 2 over 2	
Zone Easting Northing		24. Ownership		Other		
10.		Public Private			38. Building Dimensions 30 X 40	
Site Building Structure	Object	25. Owner's Name & Address,	if known			
				39. Endangered?	No	
11. On National 12. N.R.				By What? 40. Chimney Place	ement	
Register? NO Potentia	1?	-		EXTERIOR	FRONT WALL	
13. Part of Estab. 14. District			41. Distance from	and 20/40		
15. Name of Established District (N.R. or Loc		27. Other Surveys in Which Inc	cluded	Frontage on Ro	ad	
DUBLIN H.D. (local)						
42.Further Description of Important Interior This building is cor	and Exterior Fea	on the hillsid	e so that it	K	17.	6
appears to be a sing	ile stor	v from the stre	et but		100	4
actually has several	L levels	It features a	rubble ston	e	1.8m 1111	
foundation, multiple	e window	shapes and siz	es, and a	and the second second	Shine R. South	2
two-story enclosed p	porch th	at is supported	on posts at		- and the	
the rear.					\rightarrow	
				PI	ното	2
43. History and Significance (Continue on re This house may date	from th	y) Na late 19th ce	ntury with	an		8
expansion and modific	cation i	n the early 201	th century.	It	\times	2
forms the end of N. I	Rivervie	W.				
					\sim	1 10
				46. Prepared by		
44 Description of Environment and Outbuildings (See #52) NANCY RECCHIE						
Located very close to the road with a backyard that 47. Organization						
slopes steeply to the bank of the Scioto River. BDR&C						
48. Date Recorded in Field						
					50. Date Revised	-
45. Sources of Information observation	8			49. Revised by	DO. Date Novised	
ODSELVALION				50b. Reviewed b	v	
				1	-	1

Wall Ident	ifier W068				Мар	No . 116
Parcel(s)	27300556	5		Address	Along east side from bridge to N	
Photo No:	A0355-A0365 (9/19/16)	Associated Wa	alls: N/A	Likely period	l of construction:	Pre-1900 + ca. 1900 – ca. 1970
Theme:	Agriculture	Historic Use:	Agriculture	Present Use:	Decorative	
Orientation:	North-South	Wall Length:	454.27 ft / 138.5 m	Style:	Traditional Dry-Lai	id

Description / Location / Setting: Wall W068 was documented during the 2016 survey. The southern extent of this wall is located 30 ft north of the Bridge Street bridge. The traditional dry-laid limestone wall runs along the east side and parallel to North Riverview Street. The wall varies in height from 0.5 ft to approximately 2 feet and is broken in several places due to deterioration, slumping, and/or drainage. There is also a break for the entrance to 62 North Riverview. The wall terminates east of the intersection of North and Riverview Streets.

Condition: Good, Fair, Deteriorated/Poor, Ruinous

Integrity Notes: The wall has fair integrity. The wall appears to retain its original location and design although some materials may be non-original.

Historical Significance: This wall most likely dates to the pre-1900 period based on smaller stone size, location, and condition, and, as such, has historical significance as part of Dublin's agricultural past. However, it is possible that it also dates to the early part of the 1900s as a result of its association with homes of varying ages.

District: Y	Contributing to Dublin High	Street Distinctive Feature:	Yes
	Historic District, Boundary Incr	ease	
National Register:	N/A	Associated OHI:	FRA-8839-1



Overview of wall, looking north

Locator Map

Wall Ident	ifier W069				Мар	No . 116
Parcel(s)	27300009	8, 273000073		Address	45-53 N Rivervie	ew St
Photo No:	A0367-A0369 (9/19/16)	Associated Wa	IIs: N/A	Likely period	l of construction:	Pre-1900 + ca. 1900 – ca. 1970
Theme:	Agriculture	Historic Use:	Agriculture	Present Use:	Decorative	
Orientation:	North-South	Wall Length:	86.46 ft / 26.36 m	Style:	Traditional Dry-Lai	d

Description / Location / Setting: Wall W069 was documented during the 2016 survey. The northern end of this wall begins on the southwest corner of the intersection of North and North Riverview Streets. The 0.5-ft to 2-ft high, traditional dry-laid limestone style wall has concrete block under some portions. The wall is broken for the steps of 53 North Riverview Street and terminates at 45 North Riverview Street, 117 ft north of the intersection of Wing Hill Lane and N Riverview Street.

Condition: Good, Fair, Repaired

Integrity Notes: Wall has fair integrity because it appears to retain integrity of location and design, but has been repaired with some non original materials.

Historical Significance: This wall most likely dates to the pre-1900 period, but has been repaired during the twentieth century, and, as such, may have historical significance as a reflection of Dublin's original settlement and as part of Dublin's 20th century suburban growth.

District: Y	Contributing to Dublin Hi	gh Street Distinctive Feature:	Yes
	Historic District, Boundary In	crease	
National Register:	N/A	Associated OHI:	FRA-8837-1, FRA-8836-1



Overview of wall, looking south

Locator Map

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

nutes of RRETT BROT	Dublin City Council
Held	September 26, 2022 Page 7 of 14
OTHI •	ER BUSINESS Proposed 2023 Council Meeting Schedule Vice Mayor De Rosa stated that the retreat for 2023 will be two full days instead of an evening and one full day and the retreat will be held April 13 and 14. Mayor Fox moved to adopt the 2023 Council meeting schedule.
	Ms. Alutto seconded. <u>Vote on the motion:</u> Mayor Fox, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Vice Mayor De Rosa, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes.
•	Request for DORA Extension – Founder's Day Ms. LeRoy stated that this request is asking for an extra hour for the Founder' Day event. This would allow the venue to start selling alcohol at noon instead of 1:00 p.m.
	Mayor Fox moved to approve the request for the DORA extension. Ms. Alutto seconded.
	<u>Vote on the motion:</u> Mr. Reiner, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Vice Mayor De Rosa, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Mayor Fox, yes.
•	 N. Riverview Advisory Committee Recommendation Ms. Blake provided a brief overview of the properties and the Advisory Committee Members. She stated that the following were goals of the Request for Proposals (RFP): Preserve historic nature and mass of North Riverview Street; Rehabilitate/renovate/redevelop the Properties, which have fallen into disrepair, so they can contribute to the beauty of Historic Dublin; Enhance the neighborhood while respecting the historic character of early Dublin and the Properties themselves; Encourage uses that create visitor interest, experiential vibrancy and pedestrian engagement; Demolition would require Architectural Review Board (ARB) approval; Provide the vision, experience and financial commitment to renovate the properties in a timely manner; Preserve Dublin's signature historic stone walls on each applicable property; and Document historic details and cultural resources prior to any demolitio or removal. There were two proposals received. One RFP was received from Corinthian Fine Homes and one from Community Space Development, LLC dba COhatch ("CSD").
	 Corinthian Fine Homes' proposal shows nine new single-family homes. They would also renovate and donate 62 N. Riverview Street property back to the City as a park structure or museum. North Riverview Street would be for pedestrian use only. Community Space Development LLC COhatch proposal creates "Riverview Village" as a walkable arts and commerce district with renovation of the existing buildings, plus addition of seven new buildings and parking areas. This concept focused on restoring each historic building, adding additional structures along N. Blacksmith Lar and N. Riverview Street, and creating a pedestrian path along N. Riverview Street. This would be a vibrant, walkable, one-of-a-kind

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

 Minutes of
 Dublin City Council
 Meeting

 BARRETT BROTHERS - DAYTON, OHIO
 Form 6101

Held_

September 26, 2022

Page 8 of 14

Ms. Blake provided a rendering depicting three buildings that would be used for office/commercial in CSD's proposal on property designated as parkland in the Parks and Recreation Master Plan.

The Committee met and reviewed the proposals against the selection criteria. The Committee recommended to Council to select Community Space Development, LLC's proposal for further consideration and to direct staff to further evaluate and negotiate the proposal through the development process. Staff will update Council on the progress of any negotiations in furtherance of a potential Economic Development Agreement as needed. The Committee sought Council's feedback on the inclusion of a portion of designated parkland for office/commercial uses, potential subsidy of maker spaces for financial viability and the vision for the three southernmost properties.

There were no public comments.

Mr. Reiner asked about the return on investment regarding these proposals. Ms. Blake stated that the public improvements needed are not fully known at this point, so calculating the return on investment would be difficult. Mr. Keeler pointed out that the deal breaker is the office building on the parkland. If that is not allowed, the developer cannot make this proposal work. Mr. Keeler reiterated that this would be a destination for residents and visitors. Mr. Reiner stated that the RFP goals could be accomplished by private people who buy and restore the homes. He stated this would return some money to the City. He suggested auctioning off the homes and still adhering to the RFP goals.

Vice Mayor De Rosa stated that there was a return on investment in the documents. She asked if someone could speak to that. Mr. Stiffler stated that he was not involved in the calculation.

Matt Davis, COhatch was present to speak about the project proposal. He stated that he was trying very hard to not tear down the historic structures. The office building would be COhatch's building expansion. He stated that he was trying to build a vibrant eco-system that would be walkable. The houses that were left could be restored. He stated the overall return on investment would be income tax not property tax.

Ms. Alutto asked about the revenue from leases. Mr. Davis responded affirmatively and then continued his explanation about how just restoring the homes would not bring vibrancy.

Ms. Alutto was in favor of continuing the discussion and considering the parkland use.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that it is important to have the conversation. She stated that steps have been taken to try to spur development, but it has not occurred. Are we going to just keep going with public/private partnerships or will we reach a point where these are self-sustaining?

Vice Mayor De Rosa stated that the village concept is very intriguing. She was asking about density and maintaining the village feel. Ms. Kramb stated that this is too preliminary. It has not even been vetted through ARB with massing and design standards.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated she would be willing to entertain development on the east side.

Mayor Fox stated that this concept could be a central focus of a historic niche with maker spaces and restaurants. She is okay with continuing the discussion about using the parkland. It must be done thoughtfully.

Mayor Fox moved to approve the recommendations of the Advisory Committee and select Community Space Development LLC's proposal for further consideration and to direct staff to further evaluate and negotiate the proposal through the development process.

Ms. Alutto seconded.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of	Dublin City Council	Meeting
BARRETT BROTHERS - DAYTON, OHIO		Form 6101

Held_

September 26, 2022

Page 9 of 14

<u>Vote on the motion</u>: Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Vice Mayor De Rosa, yes; Mayor Fox, yes.

Tucci's Tent Request

Ms. Rauch stated that this is a request for the re-installation of the temporary tent. She gave an overview of the history of the executive orders during the COVID-19 pandemic. During the timeframe of the three extensions that were granted by Council, property owners were notified that a more permanent structure application would need to be filed to go through the ARB process. The final deadline for temporary structures was June 13, 2022. The owner of Tucci's came before Council to request another extension, but Council did not grant a further extension and the June deadline was upheld. In November 2021, the concept plan was approved through ARB with conditions to modify the temporary structure to make it fit more seamlessly into the historic district. Tucci's then came back to ARB in January 2022 with two options for a permanent structure. In July 2022, a preliminary development plan was approved with additional project scope with the addition of a kitchen and a wine room. The applicant is on track for a final development plan review in November 2022. This request is for the reinstallation of the temporary tent for a wine festival. There is an administrative process to apply for an event tent if the applicant so chooses, but it would be a smaller scale tent. Staff recommended Council not consider the temporary tent.

<u>Michael Lusk, 6170 Riverside Drive, spoke as the architect hired by Tucci's for</u> the permanent structure project. He stated that this is the most challenging approval process that he has ever been through. <u>He was complimentary of</u> staff and their support. He was given the deadline of the Memorial Tournament for 2023 and he does not see that as a possibility because of the long approval process. This temporary structure would help to keep the business going as they continue to work through the process.

Mayor Fox stated that staff's recommendation is to not consider the request as the final development plan is pending before ARB.

Mr. Barnum stated that the last few months have been challenging. He is excited about the finished project, but this process has been frustrating. He is asking to bridge the gap to help with the hardship they are going through.

Mayor Fox stated that Council appreciates his investment in the historic district. She noted that she is appreciative of the planning for the permanent structure. She thanked them for coming to the meeting.

Art in Public Places (AiPP) Funding

Mr. Reiner and Ms. Alutto both abstained from the discussion. Mr. Ranc stated that on May 31, 2022, the City was notified that the State Capital Budget included \$175,000 for a public arts project on Muirfield Drive. The City did not apply for the project funds and was not aware of the request for funds for the Muirfield Drive public arts project. Since May, City staff has worked with the Dublin Arts Council and the Ohio Facilities Construction Commission to understand the scope of the project, the grant requirements, and the best way to approach the project moving forward. Representatives of the Muirfield Association expressed awareness of the grant and interest in it being placed in Muirfield on Muirfield Association land. The grant is administered by the Ohio Facilities Construction Commission (OECC). Grantee must be a governmental entity or an Ohio non-profit organization with longterm property interest. Fifty percent matching funds are required for the project (\$87,500). The deadline for project completion is June 30, 2024. Staff is approaching this as an opportunity to use this funding as the next Art in

3. Riverview Village, 40 E. Bridge Street, 17, 27, 37, 45, 53, and 62 N. Riverview Street, and PID 273-005564, 23-14INF, Informal Review

Informal review and feedback for a walkable commercial village in the north section of the Historic District. The 2.85-acre site is zoned HD-HR and HP, Historic District - Historic Residential and Historic Public. This site is located northeast of the intersection of N. Blacksmith Lane and E. Bridge Street.

Case Presentation

Ms. Holt stated that the 2.85-acre, multi-parcel site is located on both sides of N. Riverview Street, north of E. Bridge Street. Currently, the site contains seven contributing single-family residences on eight individual lots. The City purchased these properties in early 2021 with the goal of redevelopment. Approval of a future rezoning and Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) would be necessary for the project to proceed. At this point, all existing buildings are legal with their setbacks and lot coverage, based on their pre-existing conditions prior to adoption of the current Code. The uses envisioned for this project would fit within the Historic District – Historic Core zone, rather than the existing Historic Residential and Historic Public zones. New buildings and additions will have to conform to Code requirements. With the PDP, each lot would need to be surveyed to determine exact locations, setbacks, and lot coverages. The existing lots range in size; potential lot coverage if rezoned to Historic Core would be 85 percent. [Description of existing site conditions and structures was given.] The proposal is for the creation of Riverview Village, a mixed-use development for all properties within the project area. Envisioned is a walkable district that has a mix of makers and artists, restaurants, educators, start-up businesses, and growing small businesses.

There are two development options: one is a minimum density and one is a maximum density. The minimum density proposal includes: parking on Blacksmith Lane; pedestrian access on Wing Hill Lane; a new 10,400 SF office building on the currently vacant lot south of 62 N. Riverview; potential removal of the three south properties from the project; addition of decks/eating areas to 62 N. Riverview for a restaurant or outdoor venue; potential to remove 53 N. Riverview Street; addition of new outbuildings. The maximum density proposal includes the same features, plus additions to 40 E. Bridge Street, 17 N. Riverview and 37 N. Riverview Street, and a new structure located between 45 and 53 N. Riverview Street. If the site is rezoned to Historic Core, the minimum lot sizes would be 21,000 SF. The proposed COhatch office building located south of 62 N. Riverview is conceptually shown as a series of three interlocking boxes with off-set gables, located along the uppermost lot edge adjacent to N. Riverview Street. Conceptual materials include vertical board and batten siding and possibly a standing seam metal roof. It is anticipated that the architecture would be similar to the existing COhatch building on North Street, which could be appropriate given the campus-like nature of the project, proximity to the river and the Link Bridge, and screening with natural vegetation.

Staff has provided the following discussion questions:

- 1) Does the Board support the proposed design concept for the N. Riverview Street area?
- 2) Does the Board support the rezoning from Historic Residential and Public to Historic Core? Would the Board support 17 and 19 N. Riverview Street and 40 E. Bridge Street being kept as Historic Residential as an option?
- 3) Does the Board support the addition of a 10,400 SF office building south of 62 N. Riverview, and what is the Board's reaction to potential scale and massing?

- 4) Does the Board support the proposed inspiration material palette? Would the Board support the new office building to appear similar to the existing COhatch building?
- 5) Does the Board support the proposed infill building options for location, scale, massing, and number?
- 6) Does the Board support the potential demolition of the historic outbuildings along N. Blacksmith Lane to allow for vehicular traffic and parking?
- 7) Would the Board support the potential demolition of the house at 53 N. Riverview?

Applicant Presentation

Matt Davis, 4620 Hickory Rock Drive, Powell, OH and Tim Li, 401 W. Town Street, Columbus, OH were present.

Mr. Davis stated that they submitted this project last July in response to a City RFP for a walkable district, highly community engaging and interfacing with the park. Their project is conceptual only at this point, so they are seeking the Board's input. To date, they have had several meetings with City staff. 70-80% of their proposed plan is very flexible, but some elements are necessary for the plan to move forward. The most important element to make this project work is the view from The Link Bridge. Additionally, the view of the red house at 62 N. Riverview from the bridge would be an attractive entrance into this district. There must be sufficient critical mass and desirability for people to be attracted to this area, as there will be limited parking. The new office building on the cliff overlooking the river would also be essential to make the project feasible. He believes the 53 N. Riverview structure is essentially unusable. Due to its small footprint and low ceiling, it is the least useful building on the site. He is interested on having the Board's feedback on the proposed massing and the options concerning 53 N. Riverview Street.

Board Questions for Applicant

Mr. Cotter requested clarification of the critical pieces of the development to the applicant. Mr. Davis responded that the critical pieces are the office building, the view from The Link Bridge and the red house at 62. N. Riverview. He suggested possible uses for the other homes within the project area.

Public Comment

<u>Scott Haring, 3280 Lily Mar Ct. Dublin, OH</u> stated that he was unaware that a future rezoning of this area was being considered. He is concerned about the proposed density. A proposed 85% lot coverage would spoil the character of this street, which has contained individual houses for many decades. The potential rezoning is the greater question here.

Mr. Alexander stated that the position the City is in is that there is no market for these structures as single-family homes, so another option for this area must be considered.

Board Discussion

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

1) Does the Board support the proposed design concept for the N. Riverview Street area? The Board indicated support for the proposed design concept.

2) Does the Board support the rezoning from Historic Residential and Public to Historic Core? Would the Board support 17 and 19 N. Riverview Street and 40 E. Bridge Street being kept as Historic Residential as an option?

The Board was supportive of rezoning the entire area as opposed to keeping three structures as Historic Residential. Rezoning the entire area would present more coverage opportunities.

3) Does the Board support the addition of a 10,400 SF office building south of 62 N. Riverview Street, and what is the Board's reaction to the potential scale and massing?

Mr. Alexander inquired if in this case, the square footage does not apply to the building footprint, but to the total building area of multiple floors.

Mr. Davis responded affirmatively.

The Board indicated support for the addition of the 10,400 SF office building south of 62 N. Riverview, depending on its proposed design.

4) Does the Board support the proposed inspiration material palette? Would the Board support the new office building to appear similar to the existing COhatch building?

Mr. Li clarified that they would not be proposing a structure similar to the existing COhatch building. There were specific reasons for the design of their existing building. This site does not have the same site constraints. They would be suggesting a material palette that would fit into the neighborhood.

The Board indicated that they were tentatively supportive of a more flexible design.

5) Does the Board support the proposed infill building options for location, scale, massing, and number?

The Board indicated greater support for the minimum density proposal, although they could support a hybrid of the minimum and maximum density options.

- 6) Does the Board support the potential demolition of the historic outbuildings along N. Blacksmith Lane to allow for vehicular traffic and parking?
- Ms. Holt indicated that one of the outbuildings is a duplex privy.

The Board indicated support for demolition for two of the outbuildings; discussion of the historical significance related to the duplex privy would occur with any proposal for demolition. The Board indicated they had no objection to the proposed use of N. Blacksmith Lane, if that is the recommendation of Engineering staff.

7) Would the Board support the potential demolition of the house at 53 N. Riverview? Board members indicated varying support for the potential demolition, noting that there is demolition criteria that must be met for approval.

Mr. Davis inquired if the Board had any objections to extending the brand of Riverview Village up Wing Hill Lane establishing a connection point, using similar light posts, sidewalks and signage. The Board indicated that they were supportive; it would have the potential of helping the businesses on High Street. The proposed connections in the concept seem appropriate.

COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Holt shared the following:



BOARD ORDER Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, February 22, 2023 | 6:30 pm

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

3. Riverview Village at 40 E. Bridge Street, 17, 27, 37, 45, 53, and 62 N. Riverview Street, and PID 273-005564 23-014INF Informal Review

Proposal:	A walkable, commercial village of mixed-use development in the north section of the Historic District on a 2.85-acre, multi-parcel site currently zoned Historic District, Historic Residential and Historic District, Historic Public.
Location:	Northeast of the intersection of N. Blacksmith Lane with E. Bridge Street.
Request:	Informal review and non-binding feedback for a possible future Development under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.176 and the <i>Historic Design Guidelines</i> .
Applicants:	Matt Davis, COhatch; and Megan O'Callaghan, City Manager, City of Dublin
Planning Contact:	Sarah T. Holt, AICP, ASLA, Senior Planner
Contact Information: Case Information:	614.410.4662, sholt@dublin.oh.us www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/23-014

RESULT: The Board provided informal feedback on an idea for Riverview Village, a walkable community of makers' spaces, office buildings, and eating/drinking establishments. Generally, the Board was supportive of rezoning the entire project area to Historic Core. The Board was supportive of a new 10,400 SF office building, depending on design. Although there was room for some flexibility on design. The Board offered greater support for the "minimum density" option relative to the number and size of buildings. There was general support for the demolition of two outbuildings along N. Blacksmith Lane in order to accommodate greater use of that street, pending recommendation of Engineering. Finally, the Board supported the idea of the branding for Riverside Village to extend up Wind Hill Lane.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

STAFF CERTIFICATION

-DocuSigned by: Sarah T. Holt

Sarah Tresouthick Holt, AICP, ASLA Senior Planner Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes of January 25, 2023 Page 8 of 9

Mr. Jewell moved and Ms. Damaser seconded, to approve the Minor Project. <u>Vote:</u> Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Mr. Jewell, yes; and Ms. Damaser, yes. [Motion Carried 5 – 0]

The Chair affirmed the Minor Project was approved.

The Chair indicated Cases three and four will be presented together.

3. Mothballing Historic Roofs at 40 E. Bridge Street, 27, 37, 53, and 62 N. Riverview Street, 23-003MPR, Minor Project Review

The Chair stated this application was a request for mothballing of historic property roofs in association with the North Riverview Street Project from the City of Dublin Facilities Division. The sites are zoned Historic District, Historic Residential and located north of E. Bridge Street and between N. Blacksmith Lane and N. Riverview Street.

4. Carport Demolition at 40 E. Bridge Street, 23-004ARB, Architectural Review

The Chair stated this application was a request for Demolition of a non-contributing structure/carport at an existing home on a 0.319-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic Residential. The site is located northeast of the intersection of N. Blacksmith Lane with E. Bridge Street.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Holt stated these two cases are part of the larger, N. Riverview Project and presented the sites involved [aerial view]. West of N. Riverview Street is zoned Historic Residential, east of N. Riverview is zoned Historic Public, and to the west of the project it is zoned Historic Core. The address of 40 E. Bridge Street is part of both applications. The structure's roof will be repaired and carport demolished. Not included properties involve like-for-like maintenance related to standing-seam, metal roofs.

In January 2021, the City purchased all these properties for redevelopment opportunities. In April 2021, Council appointed an Advisory Committee who indicated support to create a Request for Proposal (RFP) for the project. In June 2022, the RFP was advertised. In September 2022, the Advisory Committee recommended a proposal to City Council, which was accepted. The City is currently working with the chosen developer.

Photographs were shown of the five properties with the deteriorating structures all in fair to poor condition as reported by CTL Engineering in 2020. The structure at 40 E. Bridge Street is suffering interior damage due to leaks. The non-compliant and non-contributing carport was shown for the demolition request for 40 E. Bridge Street.

The application was reviewed against the Minor Project Review Criteria. Staff recommended approval with the following condition:

1) This temporary solution may be required for longer than six months, the projected lifespan of the proposed materials. At that time, the condition of roof felt shall be examined, and replacement may be necessary based on condition and the timeline of the N. Riverview Properties project.

Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes of January 25, 2023 Page 9 of 9

The application was reviewed against the Demolition Review Criteria. Due to the age of the structure and the detraction from the historic character, Staff recommended approval. Two separate motions are being requested.

Questions for Staff

Mr. Cotter – He confirmed the material will keep the structures safe until the proposal is completed as part of this larger project.

Applicant Presentation

Brian Ashford, Director of Facilities stated he did not have a presentation.

Public Comment

There were no public comments received.

Board Discussion

As there was no further comments, the Chair called for the motions.

Ms. Cooper moved and Mr. Jewell seconded to approve the Demolition of the carport at 40 E. Bridge Street. <u>Vote:</u> Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Mr. Jewell, yes; and Ms. Damaser, yes. [Motion carried 5 - 0]

Mr. Jewell moved and Mr. Cotter seconded, to approve the Minor Project with one condition. <u>Vote:</u> Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Mr. Jewell, yes; and Ms. Damaser, yes. [Motion carried 5 - 0]

The Chair affirmed the Minor Project was approved.

Communications

- Ms. Holt thanked Emily Goliver for sitting in for Laurie Wright to record the meeting's proceedings. She introduced Ms. Rati Singh as the new Planner I for the division. She is an architect with a lot of project management experience.
- Ms. Holt noted the year-end report.
- Ms. Cooper will not be able to attend the February meeting.
- Mr. Jewell will not be able to attend the February and March meetings.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 8:03 p.m.

Gary Alexander

Chair, Architectural Review Board



BOARD ORDER Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, January 25, 2023 | 6:30 pm

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

3. Mothballing Historic Roofs at 40 E. Bridge Street, 27, 37, 53, and 62 N. Riverview Street 23-003MPR Minor Project Review

Proposal:	Mothballing of historic property roofs in association with the North Riverview Street Project in the area zoned Historic District, Historic Residential.
Location:	North of E. Bridge Street and between N. Blacksmith Lane and N. Riverview Street.
Request:	Review and approval of a Minor Project under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.176 and the <i>Historic Design Guidelines</i> .
Applicants:	Brian Ashford, Director of Facilities and Fleet Management; and Tim Elmer, Operations Administrator, City of Dublin
Planning Contact: Contact Information: Case Information:	Sarah T. Holt, AICP, ASLA, Senior Planner 614.410.4662, sholt@dublin.oh.us www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/23-003

MOTION: Mr. Jewell moved and Mr. Cotter seconded, to approve the Minor Project with one condition:

- 1) This temporary solution may be required for longer than six months, the projected lifespan of the proposed materials. At that time, the condition of roof felt shall be examined, and replacement may be necessary based on condition and the timeline of the N. Riverview Properties project.
- **VOTE:** 5 0

RESULT: The Minor Project was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Yes
Yes
Yes
Yes
Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:

Sarah T. Holt

Sarah Tresouthick Holt, AICP, ASLA Senior Planner

intoniousa.gov