

PLANNING REPORT

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, July 23, 2025

109 S. High Street – Roof Material Change 25-062ARB-MPR

www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/25-062/

Case Summary

Address	109 S. High Street, Dublin, Ohio, 43017
Proposal	Change in roofing material on Landmark building known as Black Horse Tavern.
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 Minor Project Review</u>
Next Steps	Upon approval of the Minor Project Review (MPR) from the Architectural Review Board (ARB), the applicant may proceed with the work.
Applicant	Richard S. Gerber
Case Manager	Donavan Trimble, Planning Assistant (614) 410-4675 dtrimble@dublin.oh.us Sarah Tresouthick Holt, AICP, ASLA, Senior Planner (614) 410-4662 sholt@dublin.oh.us



Community Planning and Development



5200 Emerald Parkway
Dublin, Ohio 43017



614.410.4600
dublinohiousa.gov

Sustainable | Connected | Resilient

Site Location Map

25-062ARB-MPR - 109 S High St



1. Request and Process

Request

The applicant is seeking approval of a MPR to replace the existing cedar shake shingles with GAF Camelot® II Shingles in "Royal Slate."

Process

This project comes to the Board because changes to Landmark buildings require approval of an MPR. The Historic District Code § 153.174(B), and *Historic Design Guidelines* (Chapter 4) apply.

2. Background

Site Summary

The 0.23-acre site is zoned HD–HS, Historic South District, and is located at the intersection of S. High Street and Pinney Hill Lane. The property includes an existing two-story structure, along with a rear one-story frame garage, each currently roofed with cedar shake shingles.

Historic and Cultural Facilities

The Landmark original structure, known as the Black Horse Tavern, was constructed in 1842 by John and Eliud Sells. The main building features a T-plan footprint with a two-story, side-gable core. It operated as a tavern for many years and remains a significant example of early 19th-century commercial architecture in Dublin.

The front façade features a National Register of Historic Places plaque, recognizing the structure's historic and architectural significance. According to the 2017 Historic and Cultural Assessment (HCA), the building is in good condition.

History

Various signs and Variances have been approved since 1990, none of which have bearing on this request.

January 2005, Case 05-009ARB

- Review and approval of a roofing material substitution from standing seam metal to wood shingle on a 1,056-square-foot barn (the accessory garage).

July 2003, Case 03-076ARB

- Suspension of the ARB Rules of Procedure to permit the emergency review and approval of a wood shingle and/or standing seam metal replacement roof.

3. Zoning Code and *Historic Design Guidelines*

Zoning Code

Per the Historic District Code, the intent of the Historic South is to ensure sensitive infill development and redevelopment and provide an improved environment for walking while accommodating vehicles. The Code identifies development standards regarding roof design standards in § 153.174(B).

Historic Design Guidelines

The Code is supplemented by the *Historic Design Guidelines*, which provide the Board with additional direction regarding Rehabilitation (Chapter 4).

4. Project

Summary

The applicant proposes GAF Camelot® II Shingles in “Royal Slate.” The selected roofing material has been chosen for its compatibility with the historic character of the property and its ability to replicate the appearance of the current roof, while also offering improved structural accommodation for the roof’s current condition. It has been used elsewhere in the District.

Section 4.1B of the Guidelines states that repair or replacement of historic materials should be based on accurate replication of the original materials, according to pictorial evidence. There are conflicting accounts regarding the building’s original roofing material. The Ohio Historic Inventory (OHI) identifies the original roof as standing seam, while the HCA cites wood shingles as the initial material. Additional research has uncovered two historic photographs - Exhibit A and Exhibit B - each showing the Black Horse Tavern, but one with a standing seam roof and the other a wood shingle roof. Either material could have been the original. The applicant states that standing seam is not a viable option, based on the curvature of the building’s ridge pole and joists: the metal is not flexible enough to accommodate this condition. The contractor recommends using asphalt shingles, and the applicant has chosen a cedar shake-appearing product.

Section 4.1C of the Guidelines states that if not practical to retain the original materials, then quality contemporary materials may be substituted. The applicant also states that presently available cedar shakes are of inferior quality because they are no longer old-growth wood. Staff have confirmed this information on other projects. The selected roofing material has similar “quality and character as the historic material” in staff’s opinion.

Material example



5. Plan Review

Minor Project Review

Criteria	Review
a) The MPR is consistent with the Community Plan, the applicable Zoning Code requirements, <i>Historic Design Guidelines</i> , and adopted plans, policies, and regulations.	Criterion Met: The proposal is consistent with the Community Plan, <i>Historic Design Guidelines</i> , and all City adopted plans, policies, and regulations, especially given that original roofing cannot be determined and based on structural limitations.
b) 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 are no associated PDPs or FDPs.
c) The MPR shall be consistent with the record established by the required reviewing body, the associated Staff Report, and the Director's recommendation.	Criterion Met: The application is consistent with the record established by the Board.
d) The proposed land uses meet all applicable requirements and use specific standards of §153.172, Uses.	Not Applicable: The land use will not change with this request.
e) The proposed development is consistent with the <i>Historic Design Guidelines</i> .	Criterion Met: The proposal responds to the <i>Historic Design Guidelines</i> and is a reasonable response to historical accuracy.
f) The proposed MPR is consistent with surrounding historic context, character, and scale of the immediately surrounding area and the district as a whole.	Criterion Met: The proposal responds appropriately to the surrounding context and is sensitive to the historic structure's original character. The proposed roof design and color looks similar to the current cedar shake.
g) The proposed buildings are appropriately sited and conform to the requirements of §153.173, Site Development Standards, and the <i>Historic Design Guidelines</i> .	Not Applicable: There will be no new buildings on the site.
h) 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> .	Not Applicable: There will be no changes to landscaping, screening, signs, or buffering.

6. Recommendation

Staff Recommends **Approval.**