

Property Name

- Sells, Eliud, House
-

Address

- 83 S Riverview St
-

Reference Number

- 79002891
-

City

- Dublin
-

County

- Franklin
-

Image**Other Name**

- Old Stone Tavern
 - Hahm, David, House
-

Resource Type

- BUILDING
-

Applicable Criterion

- Applicable Criterion B. Person
 - Applicable Criterion C. Architecture/Engineering
-

Multiple Property Name

- Washington Township Multiple Resource Area
-

Significant Person

- Sells, Eliud
-

Criterion Consideration

Significant Date

- 1824
-

Period(s) of Significance

- 1825-1849
 - 1800-1824
-

Area of Significance

- Architecture
 - Exploration/Settlement
-

Level of Significance

- LOCAL
-

Other Designation

Cultural Affiliation

Contributing Building

- Contributing Building(s): 1
-

Historic Use

- DOMESTIC: Single Dwelling
-

Current Use

- DOMESTIC: Single Dwelling
 - COMMERCE/TRADE: Restaurant
-

Architectural Style

- Federal
-

Other Architectural Style

Architect

Exterior Materials

- **Foundation(s)**
 - LIMESTONE
 - **Wall(s)**
 - LIMESTONE
 - **Roof**
 - TIN
 - **Other**
 - NONE LISTED
-

Demolished

- FALSE
-

Parcel 273-000256 **Address** 83 S Riverview St **OHI** FRA-2551-1

Year Built: 1824	Map No: 128	Photo No: 2124-2129 (7/12/16)
Theme: Domestic	Historic Use: Single family house	Present Use: Single family house
Style: Federal	Foundation: Stone	Wall Type: Stone
Roof Type: Side gable/standing seam metal	Exterior Wall: Stone	Symmetry: Yes
Stories: 2	Front Bays: 3	Side Bays: 2
Porch: Concrete stoop	Chimney: 4, 2 Interior on opposite sides of house, 1 exterior on rear elevation, 1 on rear ell	Windows: Double-hung replacements

Description: The Federal-style house has an L-plan footprint, with a two-story side-gable core and a one-story rear ell on the southwest corner. The house is of stone masonry construction. The roof is sheathed in standing seam metal. The façade is divided into three fenestration bays. The front door is on the center bay, It is slightly recessed and topped by a transom light. Windows are double-hung replacements. Two ancillary buildings are on the property, including a shed with board and batten siding, and a concrete block garage, both west of the house.

Setting: The property is located on the west side of S Riverview St in the village core of Dublin.

Condition: Good

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

Integrity Notes: The house has good integrity

Historical Significance: The building is within the boundaries of the City of Dublin's local Historic Dublin district and is listed in the Washington Township MRA. The property is recommended to remain contributing to the local district and the Washington Township MRA. It is also recommended as contributing to the recommended Dublin High Street Historic District, boundary increase.

District: Yes Local Historic Dublin district
National Register: Washington Township MRA/
 Recommended Dublin High Street
 Historic District, boundary increase

Contributing Status: Contributing
Property Name: Eulid Sells Residence



83 S Riverview St, looking west



83 S Riverview St, looking east

RECORD OF ACTION

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, June 25, 2025 | 6:30 p.m.

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

2. 83 S. Riverview Street 25-048INF

Informal Review

Proposal:	Request for review and non-binding feedback for a house addition. The .25-acre lot is zoned HD-HR Historic Residential.
Location:	83 S. Riverview Street.
Planning Contact:	Sarah Tresouthick Holt, AICP, ASLA, Senior Planner
Contact Information:	614.410.4662, sholt@dublin.oh.us
Case Information:	www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/25-048

RESULT: This is the oldest stone house in Dublin and is individually listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). The Board considered two addition options and expressed the following: Preference for the larger hyphen space; horizontal windows were not supported; a need for greater simplicity overall; need to be more in keeping with original house style; support for footprint increase and roof pitch waivers; need to minimize coverage of the historic structure; simplification of materials. Next step: Minor Project Review (MPR).

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Lisa Patt-McDaniel	Yes
Sean Cotter	Yes
Martha Cooper	Yes
Mark Stechschulte	Yes
Hilary Damaser	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Signed by:

Sarah Tresouthick Holt

89A2805342A848D...

Sarah Tresouthick Holt, AICP, ASLA
Senior Planner



Community Planning and Development



5200 Emerald Parkway
Dublin, Ohio 43017



614.410.4600
dublinohiousa.gov

Sustainable | Connected | Resilient

Mr. Cotter inquired if the applicant had any objection to the conditions for approval. The applicant indicated he had no objection.

Public Comments

There were no public comments.

Ms. Damaser moved, Ms. Cooper seconded approval of the Minor Project Review with the following amended conditions:

- 1) The applicant shall remove the unapproved HVAC installation on the north elevation and storm doors on the front façade. The applicant must provide appropriate restoration details if penetrations were made into the historic stone façade prior to building permit.
- 2) The applicant shall revise the drawings to show the following prior to building permit:
 - a) Brick-paver pathway;
 - b) Replacement of existing gravel with seeding along N. Blacksmith Lane;
 - c) Architecturally appropriate detailed panels with hardware details to be reviewed by staff (outbuilding panels);
 - d) Umbrella base and pole in black color;
 - e) Light fixture details (restoration, installation height and details, wattage);
 - f) Removal of 6-foot privacy fence on south side of lot.
- 3) The applicant must ensure that all patio furniture is stored during off-season at an off-site location.
- 4) The applicant shall provide a striping and signing plan if on-street parking space can take the place of the current curbcut, as determined by staff, during Site Permit.

Vote: Ms. Damaser, yes; Ms. Patt-McDaniel, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Dr. Stechschulte, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes.

[Motion carried 5-0]

Case #25-048INF - 83 S. Riverview, Informal Review

A request for review and non-binding feedback for a house addition. The .25-acre lot is zoned HD – HR, Historic Residential, and is located at 83 S. Riverview.

Applicant Presentation

Jeffrey Hahm, MD, 83 S. Riverview Street, Dublin, introduced his father, who was present in the audience. His father purchased this house in 1970, when the population of Dublin was 670 people. His father, Dr. David Hahm, a retired Classics professor from Ohio State, was one of the founding members of the Dublin Historical Society and its first president. He was also one of the founders of Dublin's Architectural Review Board (ARB), and for many years, worked with Planning and Zoning and ARB. In the 1970s, his parents worked to get all Dublin's historical homes on the National Register of Historic Places. He indicated he would share the background of their home and their desire to add an addition and make some renovations. The house was built by Elliot Sells in 1820 as a one-story structure. In approximately 1830, Mr. Sells added a second story and built a 1.5-story kitchen wing at the back. Originally, it was a house and a tavern. In the 1920-1930s, a concrete addition was added next to the kitchen wing. In November 2024, they sought ARB permission to demolish that addition and add on to the home, although their intent with that

now has changed. When his father purchased the home in 1970, he conducted many interior renovations in an attempt to bring it back to its historical roots. In doing so, the hand-hewn beams of the kitchen were exposed and hardwood floors were added. A brick fireplace was built in the original location of the kitchen fireplace, which was built to the standards allowing fireplace cooking. In 1970, his mother conducted fireplace cooking demonstrations for historical groups. However, the kitchen is small; that is a constraint, as is the fact that there is only one full bathroom. About 10 years ago, due to the constraints of the house, his parents moved out of the house. Eventually, he took over the house, and his son now is living there. Although he currently lives out of town, he would like to update the house to today's standards and move back to it. Mr. Hahm showed slides of the interior of the home. He noted that if they keep the concrete addition, it has a chronically leaking roof. He would like to increase the roof pitch to 3/12; currently, it is 2/12. Staff is concerned the proposed addition would cover a historic window. It would not; it would be very similar to the alignment at the window now. Their goals are to increase the kitchen space by moving it from the historic kitchen wing and into the adjacent concrete addition and add a covered porch; increase the roof pitch over the concrete addition and improve its exterior appearance; add a new addition. The addition would have a master suite and extra living space. It is important to them to minimize the footprint of the new addition. There are two designs. His first design is 1.5 stories. The second design is a one-story requested by City staff. Both are viable plans. The main downside to the one-story is that it provides less square footage. To keep it from sprawling into the backyard, he reduced the size of the hyphen to 5 or 6 feet. With his first design, the hyphen is over 11 feet long.

Mr. Cotter stated that this is a very important house in the Historic District and the City.

Dr. Hahm stated that they are very aware of that, and their goal is to make the upgrades in the right way.

Board Questions for the Applicant

Ms. Patt-McDaniel inquired if the porch would be open.

Dr. Hahm responded affirmatively.

Ms. Damaser inquired the reason he does not want to remove the 1930s addition.

Dr. Hahm responded that he is physician, but as a sideline, he does building and remodeling. He consulted with building professionals about the design and the historic manner in which the historic house was constructed. The foundation for the original part of the house extends down to the bedrock. Below ground level, it looks just like it does above ground...rubble stone. The 1940s addition is on a concrete slab. If it is torn down, it means significant excavation would be done right next to the foundation of the original structure. That will jeopardize the integrity of the house. Although it might be possible to underpin the foundation, the cost would be exorbitant. He decided to avoid the risk and the cost and use the existing concrete slab, which is in good shape.

Dr. Stechschulte inquired the plans for the chimney on the back of the house.

Dr. Hahm stated that they previously obtained ARB's approval to remove the chimney. In addition, they would restore the roof.

Ms. Patt-McDaniel stated that some earlier additions are now historic, as well. She understands why they are replacing the windows but is glad they are preserving the structure.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Bitar stated that this house is located just north of Pinney Hill Lane between S. Blacksmith and S. Riverview streets. It is zoned HR-Historic Residential. The site contains a Landmark Federal-style house, built in 1824 by Eliud Sells, making it the oldest stone house in the district. The front of the building reflects a simple, Federal style of architecture. The rough-hewn beams were part of the construction of the second floor in the 1800s. The building was used as a tavern as well as a residence, and it has evolved over time. A single-story kitchen ell was also added early in the house's history. A ca. 1930 CMU addition and chimney were added between the core and kitchen ell. His understanding, in looking at the National Register nomination is that the 1930s addition was originally an open porch that later was enclosed with concrete block. There are some interesting details from the original porch construction that staff suggests be taken advantage of in informing the elements of the proposed addition. Over time, the windows have changed. The original windows probably were 6/6. Currently, they are 1/1 in the front and 2/2 in the back in a variety of configurations. Mr. Bitar reviewed details of the two options under consideration. Option 1 was the applicant's first design. Option 2 requires a little more lot coverage than Option 1; however, both options would exceed the 25% lot coverage limitation, so a Code waiver would be required. The waiver is reasonable, given previous approvals in the surrounding area.

Option 1

The proposal is for a first-floor primary suite and second-floor storage area addition on the western side of the home, along with various interior and exterior renovations. The 1930s CMU addition is kept, renovated and reclad with new siding materials. A porch is proposed on the north edge of the 1930s addition, with another porch at the rear of the new addition. A hyphen connects the existing home with the proposed new addition to the rear. The staff report included comments about the pitch of the proposed roof, which is steeper than what is on the existing house. Staff recommends that the pitches match, if Option 1 is pursued. Staff is also concerned that the shed dormers are not consistent in character with the rest of the house. They extend all the way to the same surface as the outer walls. Traditionally, shed dormers are set back from the main façade of the house. In addition to the pitch, the roof forms over the existing addition, new porch and hyphen need to be simplified. The Federal style of architecture traditionally has more delicate proportions for the columns and beam above than is reflected in this option. The 3/12 roof pitches will require a waiver. The proposed height of the addition is taller than the kitchen ell but shorter than the original portion of the building. On the rear elevation, the window orientation should be more vertical. Staff is concerned with the proportions and organization of the dormers and windows.

Option 2

This single-story option lowers the building height, and the roof line is more in line with the existing kitchen ell. The hyphen is much narrower. Whether that provides adequate separation from the original components of the house is a matter of discussion. The roof pitches would require a waiver.

Staff believes that there are architectural details/cues in the original open porch architecture that could be integrated into the design of the addition, regardless which option is selected. There may be opportunities with the materials and the openings, especially within the hyphen to give it a more open feel similar to the original open porch.

Staff has provided the following review questions to guide the Board's discussion for this Informal Review:

- 1) Does the Board favor Option 1 or Option 2?
- 2) Relative to the favored option, does the Board support the massing of the addition?
- 3) Per the favored option, would the Board support maximum footprint and roof pitch Waivers?
- 4) Per the favored option, is the hyphen adequately expressed?
- 5) Does the Board support the porch forms and/or horizontal windows?
- 6) Does the Board agree with the materials as suggested?
- 7) Other discussion by the Board.

Mr. Bitar stated that staff would like the Board's input concerning the proposed materials. Stone is the historic material. Shake and board and batten elements are proposed; however, additions to early structures typically would have been very simple lap siding.

Board Questions

Ms. Patt-McDaniel requested clarification of the reason for staff's preference for Option 2. She assumes Option 1 includes another bedroom upstairs.

Dr. Hahm responded that in Option 1, the master bedroom suite also is on the first floor. The second floor would contain additional living space.

Ms. Patt-McDaniel inquired if the difference is the loss of living space.

Dr. Hahm responded that the one-story addition requires more lot coverage. It also provides a little less living space, although the removal of the stairs recovers some amount of living space. He stated that he would also like to comment on staff's suggestion to step back the dormers. He does not agree with that proposal. In the time period in which the house was constructed, shed dormers were very common; they were never stepped back into the roofline. That was something that was done later in Craftsman style houses in the 1930s and 1940s. Previous to that time, they did not want to build an extra structure to support a step-back dormer, which also would have resulted in loss of living space on the second floor. He owns a historical home in Gatlinburg, as well, and can state that those early houses never stepped back a shed dormer. Staff also indicates the windows are not sufficiently vertical. One of the challenges here is that these are not very big dormers, so there is not much vertical space in which to place windows. If the shed dormer were to be stepped back, there would be an even narrower area. There are some historic structures on High Street with shed dormers and there, square windows are seen. It is difficult to put a vertical window into a shed dormer. In regard to the roof pitch, he took various measures and found that the pitch varied from an 8 to 9 pitch. Because the intent is to maintain the roof pitch between the original structure and the addition, they are constrained not to do more than an 8 or 9 pitch. That is the reason the dormers end up having smaller windows.

Ms. Patt-McDaniel stated that if the existing addition was once an open porch, it would had to have been raised.

Dr. Hahm stated that in his opinion, he is not sure it was ever that open. His belief is that the right side where there are metal windows reflects the original porch design, and that portion is completely framed in wood. He believes on the left side, Eli Pinney replaced the windows with concrete block. There is a dividing wall in the center of that porch addition. Ms. Patt-McDaniel stated that she finds it hard to believe the addition was ever an open porch due to how it looks.

Dr. Hahm concurred. It could have been a sunroom. He asked his father about the passage from the front of the house to the back.

Dr. David Hahm, 3281 Lily Mar Ct., Dublin, stated that it originally was a porch with access only from the kitchen. It was not part of the original structure. Originally, that was where the cellar access via an outside stairway was located. Eli Pinney bought the house in 1938 from the Davis family, who had let the house conditions deteriorate. During the Depression years, they sold the ash flooring in the living room and the beautiful walnut staircase that extended from the front room to the upstairs. Consequently, when the Pinneys purchased the home, they were unable to access the upstairs. His theory was that the metal windows originally surrounded the entire porch area, and Dr. Pinney enclosed it.

Board members reviewed the two options.

Mr. Bitar clarified that he does not believe staff prefers one option over the other. The preference question is posed to the Board with the discussion questions to guide their review.

Dr. Jeffrey Hahm stated that he believes staff's concern was that the height of the roof on the addition would be higher than the roof on the kitchen ell. He pointed out the addition's 1.5-story height is dictated by modern Code, so it will be a little taller. In regard to staff's concern about the complexity of the roof, in the design, there is a notch on the left side of the roof. They were asked to add that to ensure the roof does not touch the historic stone. Cosmetically, he finds that jarring. He would rather have a straight roofline all the way across. Other than that, the porches on both options will be identical. The hyphen on the single-story addition will be shorter. He likes both options. He would not mind if the Board selected Option 2.

Mr. Bitar stated that the feedback might indicate that a combination of both options would be preferred.

Ms. Patt-McDaniel stated that while she likes how the ell is articulated in Option 1, she understands the reason it was reduced in Option 2 was to maximize the backyard, which also is desirable. Her preference would be Option 1.

Ms. Cooper stated that Option 1 looks more subordinate to the original structure. Option 2 looks very crowded. The house is so small and has such a colorful history and reflects historical changes made to the home. She prefers the porch in Option 1.

Mr. Cotter inquired if Board members had any concern with the height of Option 1.

Ms. Cooper and Ms. Patt-McDaniel indicated they did not.

Ms. Cooper indicated that Option 1 reflects the different eras; Option 2 looks blockier. She stated that Option 1 provides more separation; the addition looks more subordinate. It is a better look. She also agrees with Dr. Hahm about the notch in the roofline. She prefers Option 1 with less pitch to the roofline.

Ms. Damaser stated that she prefers the hyphen design in Option 1. She agrees that it adds more separation and subordination to the historical structure. She does not like the horizontal windows in the dormers, although she is aware the Board recently approved square windows in a Riverview case.

Dr. Hahm stated that he would be amenable to any window that would fit in there. It may be possible to use a squarer window in there.

Dr. Stechschulte stated that he agrees that Option 1 is the better option. He realizes the roof pitch and footprint are a concern. This is his first meeting. In the orientation materials, he received the Historic Design Guidelines for the City of Dublin. On p. 51, under outbuildings, it indicates that the shed in the back counts toward the lot coverage, which will take the total amount over 25%. However, that shed is very appealing. He would like to see that incorporated into the design. Dr. Hahm agreed. It actually has a privy in it. They definitely want to keep that outbuilding.

Dr. Stechschulte stated that he prefers Option 1 and would like to see greater emphasis given to the shed. Although it results in greater than 25% lot coverage, he does not have a problem with that.

Mr. Cotter stated that he prefers Option 2. He finds the rooflines of Option 1 overwhelming and distracting. They are overly busy for a simple house. He doesn't mind the height, but the complexity of Option 1 is off-putting. Option 2 is simpler. However, summarizing the Board's input, members believe Option 1 is acceptable due to its more subordinate look with adjustments to the roof pitch and square windows.

Mr. Cooper stated that she would be supportive of a waiver for footprint, particularly in view of the outbuilding on the site.

Ms. Damaser stated that she assumes the roof pitch waivers are for the 1930s porch. She understands staff's concerns about the roof covering the window; however, the applicant's calculations indicate it will not cover the window.

Dr. Hahm confirmed that it would not cover the window.

Board members indicated that they had no objection to a waiver for the footprint.

Board members expressed a preference for the longer Option 1 hyphen.

Dr. Hahm requested Board members' input on the notch in the roof caused by shortening the roof of the porch two feet to avoid covering the stone of the original structure. He believes the appearance is awkward.

[Discussion continued regarding the notch in the roofline.]

Mr. Cotter stated that the intent is to preserve the view of the original stone.

Ms. Patt-McDaniel stated that she believes it becomes a balance between proportion and preserving the view of two feet of stone in an area that actually will not be seen.

Board members indicated that they were unable to take a position on the notch in the roofline until they see the completed design.

Mr. Cotter reiterated that the Board's preference is to abide by the Historic District Code and Guidelines.

Board members indicated a preference for square windows rather than horizontal.

Board members sought clarification of the questions concerning porch forms.

Mr. Bitar stated that it refers to the columns. Staff is asking if the Board is comfortable with the staff and applicant working to refine the porch forms so that the proportions are appropriate.

Board members indicated that they were comfortable with that process.

Mr. Cotter requested clarification of the proposed materials.

Dr. Hahm stated that his proposal was for shingled siding on the outside of the 1930s addition to cover the concrete, transitioning to board and batten on the new addition.

Ms. Patt-McDaniel inquired if Mr. Bitar indicated that early additions to structures traditionally used lap siding.

Mr. Bitar stated that historically, additions to masonry structures would have been frame construction with lap siding. However, there are many examples of board and batten in the district. The thought is that stone has a certain character, and it is desirable not to compete with it. Shingle is a texture that competes with stone. The simplicity of lap siding would be preferred.

Mr. Cotter suggested that the applicant consider a smoother texture material.

Dr. Hahm responded that he does not like lap siding but would have no issue with doing the entire renovation in board and batten. They were trying to distinguish the two structures.

Mr. Cotter emphasized the need for simple lines and simple textures, taking care not to overwhelm the front, historic structure with too much behind it.

Mr. Bitar reiterated that with masonry structures of brick or stone, traditionally, additions were frame with lap siding.

Ms. Cooper and Ms. Damaser inquired when that was the practice and the time period of the addition.

Mr. Bitar responded that the practice was not tied to a single time period, but it was the traditional practice.

Mr. Cotter summarized that Board's preference is for Option 1, softening the roof pitches and simplifying the fenestrations. The Board has no objections to the roof height, or the waivers for roof pitch or footprint. The Board has no objection to the proposed building materials.

Mr. Cotter asked if the applicant sought any additional clarification.

Dr. Hahm indicated that he did not.

Public Comments

There were no public comments on the case.

COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Bitar shared the following:

- Members were reminded of the joint PZC-ARB-BZA training on Tuesday, July 22 at 6:30 p.m. in the Dublin Development Building, 5200 Emerald Parkway. Closer to that date, members will be receiving an agenda and more details.
- Members were provided print copies of the Envision Dublin Community Plan. It is also available online.
- The next regular ARB meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, July 23 at 6:30 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:45 p.m.



Chair, Architectural Review Board



Assistant Clerk of Council

RECORD OF ACTION

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, November 20, 2024 | 6:30 p.m.

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

**2. 83 S. Riverview Street
24-134DEMO**

Demolition

Proposal:	Demolition of an addition to an existing Landmark building in Historic Dublin.
Location:	West side of N. Riverview Street, south of Eberly Hill and north of Pinney Hill Lane.
Request:	Review and approval of a Waiver and Demolition - Background under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.176 and the <i>Historic Design Guidelines</i> .
Applicant:	Geoffrey and Melissa Hahm, Owners
Planning Contact:	Sarah Tresouthick Holt, AICP, ASLA, Senior Planner
Contact Information:	614.410.4662, sholt@dublin.oh.us
Case Information:	www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/24-134

MOTION 1: Ms. Damaser moved, Ms. Patt-McDaniel seconded approval of the following Waiver:
Waiver Per Code Section 153.176(L)(5)(i): Classification of building.
To Reclassify: The 1930s addition and chimney to Background.

VOTE: 5-0

RESULT: The Waiver was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Lisa Patt-McDaniel	Yes
Sean Cotter	Yes
Martha Cooper	Yes
Michael Jewell	Yes
Hilary Damaser	Yes

MOTION 2: Ms. Cooper moved, Ms. Patt-McDaniel seconded approval of the Demolition of the Background Structures with 3 conditions:

- 1) No demolition shall occur until a building permit for the addition is approved, except for the chimney to address safety concerns;
- 2) Demolition shall be conducted using hand tools to ensure the preservation of the original house fabric; and
- 3) Gutter and roofing repair materials shall either match the original materials or be approved during the MPR process.

VOTE: 5-0

RESULT: The Demolition of the Background structures was approved with 3 conditions.

RECORDED VOTES:

Lisa Patt-McDaniel	Yes
Sean Cotter	Yes
Martha Cooper	Yes
Michael Jewell	Yes
Hilary Damaser	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Signed by:

Sarah Tresouthick Holt

89A2805342A848D...

Sarah Tresouthick Holt, AICP, ASLA
Senior Planner



Community Planning and Development



5200 Emerald Parkway
Dublin, Ohio 43017



614.410.4600
dublinohiousa.gov

Sustainable | Connected | Resilient

~~and other high-quality synthetic materials may be approved by the Board if high-quality and climatically appropriate,
To Permit the use of a TimberTech staircase.~~

~~Vote: Ms. Damaser, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Ms. Patt-McDaniel, yes; Mr. Jewell, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes.
[Motion carried 5-0.]~~

~~Ms. Damaser moved, Mr. Jewell seconded approval of a waiver to Code Section: 153.174(C)(3) and 153.174(D)(1): Doors shall have windows and be made of wood, metal clad wood, or vinyl clad wood,
To permit the use of fiberglass doors (at front and rear)~~

~~Vote: Mr. Jewell, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Ms. Damaser, yes; Ms. Patt-McDaniel, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes.
[Motion carried 5-0.]~~

~~Ms. Cooper moved, Ms. Damaser seconded approval of the Minor Project Review (MPR) with one condition:~~

- ~~1) The applicant shall provide basement access door details and utility plans detailing the scope of work to be reviewed, approved, and inspected by Engineering, at building permit.~~

~~Vote: Ms. Patt-McDaniel, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Ms. Damaser, yes; Mr. Jewell, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes.
[Motion carried 5-0.]~~

- **Case #24-134DEMO - 83 S. Riverview Street - Demolition**

A request to approve a waiver to reclassify an enclosed porch as a Background structure and a proposal for demolition of that structure. The 0.25-acre site is zoned HD-HR, Historic Residential District, and is located southwest of the intersection of Eberly Hill Lane and S. Riverview Street.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Holt provided an overview of the request. 83 S. Riverview Street is a 11,108-square-foot lot, zoned HD-HR, Historic Residential District, and located approximately 80 feet northwest of the intersection of Pinney Hill Lane and S. Riverview Street, in the middle of Eberly Hill Lane, S. Blacksmith Lane and Pinney Hill Lane. The site contains a Landmark Federal-style house with an L-footprint, including a two-story side-gable core and a one-story rear ell on the southwest corner. Built in 1824 by Eliud Sells, it is made of stone, with standing seam metal roof. The front façade has three fenestration bays, with the slightly recessed front door in the center. The 2017 Historic and Cultural Assessment noted the building having good integrity and condition. A ca. 1930 concrete block addition and chimney were added between the core and ell, which is the subject of the Waiver and Demolition request. The home has been owned by the same family since 1970. The 2023 Historic District Map, found on page 37 of the *Historic Design Guidelines*, identifies the entirety of this building as Landmark. However, the garage was reclassified in 2023. The subject porch was added in the 1930s. It is built of CMU and steel windows. Per the applicant, the porch has leaks and is functionally obsolete. The owners desire to construct a new addition in that same location to minimize lot coverage impacts. That will require an MPR review and approval by ARB. The applicant wants to hear the Board's determination on this demolition request before they invest in an architect. The waiver request is to reclassify the porch addition and the chimney as a Background structure. Should the Board approve the waiver, the demolition would be of a

Background structure. Of that demolition criteria, one of three needs to be met to earn approval. Staff finds that two criteria are met. Code Section 153.176(J)(3)(g) states that a Background resource needs a timeline for redevelopment and a site restoration plan, both to be approved by staff prior to demolition. The applicant has responded that actual demolition will not occur until the desired future addition is fully approved and ready to commence, so no site restoration will be needed. Staff is supportive of the proposed demolition delay, and to further safeguard the historic resource, recommends a condition to this effect. Further, staff is recommending that resulting roof and gutter repairs either match the existing or the approved MPR materials. Staff recommends approval of the waiver and approval of Demolition of the addition and chimney with conditions.

Board Questions

Mr. Jewell inquired about the chimney access to the addition. The house was built with fireplaces on both ends.

Ms. Holt deferred the question to the applicant.

Applicant Presentation

Jeff Hahm, 83 S. Riverview Street, Dublin stated that the chimney was originally used as a stack for an oil furnace located in the basement. It does not lead to a fireplace; the pipe is currently blocked off. The house has three fireplaces with chimneys on three corners of the original house.

Mr. Cotter stated that the MPR will address preservation of the historic components of the house.

Mr. Hahm stated that he is concerned about the chimney. The top course of brick has come off and dropped to the roof. Because the chimney is leaning and separating from the building, he requests permission to remove part of the chimney, lowering it to be more safe.

Ms. Damaser inquired if staff would have any objection to permitting that.

Ms. Holt responded that staff would not have any objection to permitting that, if it is a safety issue. The condition would be revised accordingly.

Ms. Damaser inquired if there is a passageway from the addition to the original building.

Mr. Hahm responded that the house was built in four stages and originally, there was a door from the kitchen wing of the house. When the addition was built, the doorway was walled over. Now, there is an entranceway from the front of the house to the back addition and the kitchen area.

Mr. Jewell indicated to staff that in the future, it would be helpful to provide the Board with photos.

Public Comments

There were no public comments on the case.

Board Discussion

Board members indicated that they had no questions and no objection to the request.

Ms. Damaser moved, Ms. Patt-McDaniel seconded approval of a waiver to Code Section 153.176(L)(5)(i): Waiver for classification of building to reclassify the 1930s addition and chimney to Background.

Vote: Mr. Jewell, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Ms. Damaser, yes; Ms. Patt-McDaniel, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes.

[Motion carried 5-0.]

Ms. Cooper moved, Ms. Patt-McDaniel seconded approval of the demolition of the Background Structures with 3 conditions:

- 1) No demolition shall occur until a building permit for the addition is approved, except for the chimney to address safety concerns;
- 2) Demolition shall be conducted using hand tools to ensure the preservation of the original house fabric; and
- 3) Gutter and roofing repair materials shall either match the original materials or be approved during the MPR process.

Vote: Mr. Cotter, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Ms. Damaser, yes; Ms. Patt-McDaniel, yes; Mr. Jewell, yes.
[Motion carried 5-0.]

• **Case #24-133FDP - COhatch Riverview Village - Final Development Plan**

~~Request for review and approval of a Final Development Plan for a mixed-use development. The combined ±0.86-acre site is zoned HD-HR, Historic District – Historic Residential and HD-HP, Historic District – Historic Public. It is located on both sides of N. Riverview Street, south of North Street and north of Wing Hill Lane.~~

Applicant Presentation

~~Matt Davis, CEO COhatch, 4620 Hickory Rock Drive, Powell, and Tim Lai, 2576 Summit Street, Columbus presented the applicant's overview of the request, including an aerial view of the subject site. He noted that the street details are still under consideration based on City Council's review on Monday. They may be comprised of asphalt with some crosswalks. Potentially, red brick could be used rather than gray brick. Mr. Davis and Mr. Lai provided an update on the proposed development of the red house at 62 N. Riverview Street. The park plan will be provided in the future.~~

Staff Presentation

~~Mr. Bitar stated that this is the final step of the development review process, except for the caveat that City Council has had the first reading of the rezoning request; the second reading will be on December 9. Therefore, ARB's approval tonight would be contingent on Council's approval of the rezoning. If the Final Development Plan (FDP) is approved, we will begin to see some physical activity on the site, including tree clearing and creation of a construction entrance. That effort will be coordinated with the park design, so that the construction entrance will eventually become one of the paths through the park. It is the same construction entrance as the one used earlier for the bridge, disrupting as few trees as possible. He noted that there will be several encroachments into the public right-of-way with the project, some of which already exist at 37 N. Riverview and 62 N. Riverview. An encroachment agreement will be done separately. The Board is asked to approve a setback waiver for a new shed behind 53 N. Riverview Street. The side yard and front yard setback in the Historic Core zoning is 0 feet; the rear yard setback is 5 feet. The shed is within 4 feet of that setback, so is at the 20% threshold for waivers, which the Board can grant. The shed is needed to support other uses on the site. It replaces a much larger garage, which had a greater encroachment. There is a landscape plan and a tree preservation plan. Very few trees within the project site can be preserved, but on the west side of the street, a few trees may be added on private property to make up for the lack of street trees. On the east side, an ornamental tree will~~



RECORD OF ACTION

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, February 21, 2024 | 6:30 pm

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

2. 83 S. Riverview Street 23-128ARB-MPR

Minor Project Review

Proposal:	Request for review and approval of a proposal for modifications to a garage and driveway at an existing residential home located in Historic Dublin.
Location:	70 feet northwest of the intersection of South Riverview Street and Pinney Hill Lane.
Request:	Review and approval of a Minor Project Review (MPR) under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.176 and the <i>Historic Design Guidelines</i> .
Applicants:	Geoffrey Hahm, Property Owner
Planning Contact:	Jane Peuser, Planning Assistant Rati Singh, Assos. AIA, Planner I
Contact Information:	614.410.4675, jpeuser@dublin.oh.us 614.410.4533, rsingh@dublin.oh.us
Case Information:	www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/23-128

MOTION 1: Mr. Cotter moved, Ms. Damaser seconded approval of the Waiver to Code Sections 153.174 (C)(3) and 153.174 (D)(1) which requires that "Doors shall have windows and be made of wood, metal-clad wood, or vinyl-clad wood," to permit use of a triple-layered, reinforced steel garage door.

VOTE: 3 – 0

RESULT: The garage door Waiver was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

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

MOTION 2: Mr. Cotter moved, Ms. Damaser seconded approval of the Minor Project with no conditions.

VOTE: 3 – 0

RESULT: The Minor Project Review was approved.



RECORDED VOTES:

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

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:

Rati Singh

70CC202EC2BC4C5...

Rati Singh, Assos. AIA, Planner I



Applicant Presentation

~~Nancy Davis, property manager, 1480 Dublin Road, Columbus, stated that she appreciates the opportunity ARB has provided them to conduct additional research. The Poulis' house is an attractive structure, as is evidenced by use of its photograph for marketing purposes. The property owner is not asking to change that historic structure. It is well maintained and occupied by a commercial tenant, who would like to expand her business. To do so, there is a need for additional parking spaces. The property owner is requesting permission to remove the outbuilding, which has deteriorated. The Ohio Historic Inventory (OHI) indicates that the building had been used as a chicken coop or housing for other animals, perhaps a horse. Her research does not indicate that the small ell portion is a wellhouse. There is an earlier survey that shows the well location between 123 and 119 South High Street. She noted that there also is more detail on the financial estimates than was provided at the December 2023 hearing.~~

~~Board members indicated that they appreciated the additional financial detail and had no questions related to that information.~~

Public Comments

~~No public comments were received.~~

Board Discussion

~~Mr. Cotter stated that the report indicates the site has no historic significance; the application meets one of the review criteria and meets Code requirements. Therefore, he has no objections.~~

~~Ms. Damaser noted that it was beneficial to have the detailed renovation costs. Because the structure has no historic significance, the cost would not be justified.~~

~~Mr. Alexander expressed agreement. He inquired if the applicant had any objection to the conditions for approval.~~

~~Ms. Davis indicated that they had no objections.~~

~~Ms. Damaser moved, Mr. Cotter seconded approval of the demolition with the following conditions:~~

- ~~1) That the applicant provide, in conjunction with the demolition permit application, a scaled landscape plan for the previous area of the shed. Required items include, but are not limited to a street tree, a 6-foot tall evergreen hedge, steel edging, and mulch; sight distance triangles shall be maintained; installation of this landscape shall be no later than May 31, 2024 and include complete ailanthus eradication.~~
- ~~2) That any remaining well features be incorporated into the landscape design at grade and any well remnants be properly mitigated for safety purposes. If no features exist, this condition shall not apply.~~

~~Vote: Mr. Cotter, yes; Ms. Damaser, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes.~~

~~[Motion carried 3-0]~~

- **Case 23-128MPR - 83 S. Riverview Street, Minor Project Review**

Request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review proposal for modifications to a garage and driveway at an existing residential home located in Historic Dublin. The 0.26-acre site is zoned HD-HR, Historic Residential District and is located approximately 70 feet northwest of the intersection of South Riverview Street and Pinney Hill Lane.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Peuser stated that this is a request for a Minor Project Review for exterior modifications to a garage on a historic property. The existing home was built in 1824 by Eliud Sells, son of John Sells. It is the oldest stone house in Dublin and is listed in the National Register of Historic Places. The site has frontage on both South Riverview Street and South Blacksmith Lane and is located to the east of the Scioto River. There are two outbuildings located to the rear of the site along S. Blacksmith Lane – a shed and the subject concrete block garage. There is an existing curbcut on S. Blacksmith Lane and a gravel driveway in the southwest corner of the site. This is a request for the rehabilitation of an outbuilding on a landmark property. The proposal includes laying a new concrete foundation inside the garage, installing new siding, replacing the existing garage door and replacing the existing gravel driveway with a 17 ft. x 20 ft. concrete driveway, which will connect to the existing curbcut and apron on S. Blacksmith Lane. The west façade of the garage faces S. Blacksmith Lane. The existing garage has metal window frames, and the east elevation has a painted metal door. The proposed project includes replacing the existing wood siding on the front and rear gables of the garage with RELIABILT Unfinished Pine Tongue and Groove Wall Planks to be painted with Behr Marquis Exterior Latex Satin Paint in Antique White. The applicant has noted that this will match identically the existing siding and color of the garage. The proposed garage door is a Clopay Gallery Collection, 16 ft. x 7 ft., triple-layered, Intellicore Insulated Steel Garage Door with SQ24 Windows in the color Sandtone. A Waiver is required to permit the proposed material. Staff is supportive of the proposed painted steel garage door, as it is consistent with the existing metal rear door and window frames. There are structural concerns, and a heavier wood door would place a strain on the garage door mechanism and the garage itself. Staff has reviewed the application against the Minor Review criteria and found that all criteria are either met, met with the waiver or not applicable. Staff recommends approval of the garage door waiver and the Minor Project Review with no conditions.

Applicant Presentation

Geoffrey Hahm, property owner, 83 S. Riverview Street, Dublin, stated that their goal is to renovate the dilapidated building and make it functional. Only a steel door will work on this building due to the existing support mechanism. The structure does not have trusses; it has only rafters and rafter ties that are spaced every four feet. The door is supported on one rafter tie. Composite garage doors weigh close to twice the weight of a steel door.

Public Comment

There were no public comments.

Board Discussion

Board members indicated that they had no objection to the project as proposed.

Mr. Cotter moved, Ms. Damaser seconded approval of the Waiver to Code Sections 153.174(C)(3) and 153.174(D)(1) which requires that "Doors shall have windows and be made of wood, metal-clad wood, or vinyl-clad wood," to permit use of a triple-layered, reinforced steel garage door.

Vote: Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Ms. Damaser, yes.
[Motion carried 3-0]

Mr. Cotter moved, Ms. Damaser seconded approval of the Minor Project with no conditions.

Vote: Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Ms. Damaser, yes.
[Motion carried 3-0]

Staff indicated that the next two cases would be heard together as they are associated with the same project.

- **~~Case 23-136-DEMO - 16-22 N. High Street, Demolition~~**

~~Request for review and approval of Demolition of two background structures on an existing site in the Historic District. The 0.26-acre site is zoned HD-HC, Historic Core District, and is located approximately 65 feet northeast of the intersection of N. High Street and E. Bridge Street.~~

- **~~Case 23-135ARB-CP - 16-22 N. High Street, Concept Plan~~**

~~Request for review and approval of Concept Plan proposal for a 2-story mixed-use building in the Historic District. The 0.26-acre site is zoned HD-HC, Historic Core District, and is located approximately 65 feet northeast of the intersection of N. High Street and E. Bridge Street.~~

Staff Presentation

~~Ms. Singh stated that this is a request for review of two related applications. The first request is for the demolition of two existing background structures at 16 and 22 N. High Street, and the second request is for review and approval of a Concept Plan for the site. The site contains two structures: 16 N. High Street and 22 N. High Street with a concrete drive between the buildings. A surface parking lot to the rear (east) of the property is accessible from N. Blacksmith Lane. There is an attached existing dirt floor shed at the rear of 22 N. High Street and an unusable, dilapidated outbuilding facing N. Blacksmith Lane. Both 22 N. High Street and 16 N. High Street are listed in the National Register of Historic Places as Dr. Llewellyn McKittrick's office and house, respectively. 22 N. High Street was built circa 1900. The Queen Anne-style building has a rectilinear footprint, a hipped-roof core, and a cross-gable over a bay window on the front façade. The structure has original wood siding and a standing seam metal roof. The structure's historic use was a doctor's office, and the current use is commercial. 16 N. High Street was built in 1843. The stone building has a rectilinear footprint with a two-story core and a one-story frame addition spanning the width of the rear elevation. The vacant building has a side gable roof sheathed in standing seam metal and pierced by two gable wall dormers on the façade.~~

~~Ms. Singh stated that there have been several Minor Review Project applications for improvements on this site. Most recently, the Board provided non-binding feedback for an Informal Review proposal on November 15, 2023. The Board expressed concerns about the massing, siting and the proposed materials. Since then, staff and the applicant have worked together and attempted to address those concerns. A massing study was provided in the meeting packet. Ms. Singh reviewed the existing site conditions. The two buildings, 16 N. High Street and 22 N. High Street, face N. High Street and have a total existing footprint of approximately 2,500 square feet. There is a drop in grade from the west to the east of the site. The rear of the site is wooded, with an 800 square-foot, 4-car garage built into the slope and an approximately 164 square-foot shed attached to the rear of 22 N. High Street.~~