

Parcel 273-000045 **Address** 61 S Riverview St **OHI** FRA-8820-1

Year Built: 1894	Map No: 128	Photo No: 2142-2146 (7/12/16)
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: Asbestos	Symmetry: Yes
Stories: 1.5	Front Bays: 3	Side Bays: 2
Porch: Small entry porch with metal roof supported by wrought-iron posts	Chimney: 2, Exterior, 1 on north elevation, 1 on west elevation of rear wing	Windows: 6-over-6 and 4-over-4 Replacements

Description: The one-and-one-half-story house has a rectilinear footprint, expanded by a rear wing. The structure rests on a stone foundation. The exterior walls are clad in asbestos siding, and the side-gable roof is sheathed in asphalt shingles. An open concrete deck encircled by a wrought-iron balustrade stretches across the façade. The façade is divided into three fenestration bays. The front door is on the center bay, sheltered by a metal roof supported by wrought-iron posts. Flanking bays consist of canted oriel windows, comprised of a 6-over-6 window at their center, flanked by four-over-four windows. West of the house is a one-car detached garage with added carport.

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:	N
	Workmanship:	N	Feeling:	Y	Association:	Y		

Integrity Notes: The house has good integrity, diminished slightly by replacement materials.

Historical Significance: The building is recommended contributing to the City of Dublin's local Historic Dublin district and 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 Status: Recommended contributing
National Register:	Recommended Dublin High Street Historic District, boundary increase	Property Name: N/A



61 S Riverview St, looking northwest



61 S Riverview St, looking northeast

OHIO HISTORIC INVENTORY

THIS IS A FACSIMILE OF THE FORM PRODUCED BY:

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



OHIO
HISTORICAL
SOCIETY

SINCE 1885

1.No. FRA-8820-1		2.County FRANKLIN		4.Present Name(s)		☐ CODED ☐ CODED		FRA-8820-1
3.Location of Negatives CITY OF DUBLIN				5.Historic or Other Name(s)				
Roll No. Picture No.(s) 2 9								
6.Specific Address or Location 61 S. RIVERVIEW				16. Thematic Association(s)		28. No. of Stories 1.5		FRANKLIN
6a. Lot, Section or VMD Number		17. Date(s) or Period C. 1850-80'S		17b. Alteration Date(s)		29. Basement? ☐ Yes ☐ No		
7.City or Village If Rural, Township & Vicinity DUBLIN		18. Style or Design vernacular		☐ High Style ☐ Elements		30. Foundation Material NOT VISIBLE		
8. Site Plan with North Arrow				18a. Style of Addition or Elements(s)		31. Wall Construction WOOD/FRAME		
				19. Architect or Engineer		32. Roof Type & Material GABLE/ASPH. SHINGLE		
				19a. Design Sources		33. No. of Bays Front 3 Side 2		
9. U.T.M. Reference Quadrangle Name NW Columbus 17 319960 4440630 Zone Easting Northing				22. Original Use, if apparent RESIDENCE		34. Exterior Wall Material(s) SHINGLE		
10. ☐ Site ☒ Building ☐ Structure ☐ Object				23. Present Use RESIDENCE		35. Plan Shape RECT.		
11. On National Register? No				24. Ownership ☐ Public ☒ Private		36. Changes ☐ Addition ☒ Altered (Explain in #42) ☐ Moved		
13. Part of Estab. Hist. Dist? Yes				25. Owner's Name & Address, if known		37. Window Types ☒ 6 over 6 ☐ 4 over 4 ☐ 2 over 2 ☐ Other		
12. N.R. Potential?				26. Property Acreage		38. Building Dimensions		
14. District Potential?				27. Other Surveys in Which Included		39. Endangered? No By What?		
15. Name of Established District (N.R. or Local) DUBLIN H.D. (local)						40. Chimney Placement END/EXTERIOR		61 S. RIVERVIEW
42. Further Description of Important Interior and Exterior Features (Continue on reverse if necessary) Simple mid-19th century cottage with six-over-six windows, a central entrance, and a newer projecting bay in front. It appears to be a single story from the front but is two stories at the rear with a reverse saltbox form.						41. Distance from and Frontage on Road		
43. History and Significance (Continue on reverse if necessary) This house contributes to the scale and historic character of S. Riverview.						 PHOTO		
44. Description of Environment and Outbuildings (See #52) Located on a landscaped lot with a small frame garage and a carport at the rear of the lot and a small outbuilding with a chimney near the southwest corner of the house.						46. Prepared by NANCY RECCHIE		
45. Sources of Information observation						47. Organization BDR&C		
						48. Date Recorded in Field 4/03		
						49. Revised by		
						50. Date Revised		
						50b. Reviewed by		

~~From Code Section 153.173(M)(4)(c)(1)(a): Permitted materials: HDU, cedar, redwood, and treated lumber.~~

~~To permit: The use of aluminum composite as the sign face material for the proposed wall sign and proposed projecting sign.~~

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

~~[Motion carried 5-0.]~~

~~Ms. Damaser moved, Ms. Patt-McDaniel seconded to approve a Waiver:~~

~~From Code Section 153.173(M)(4)(c)(1)(a): Permitted materials: HDU, cedar, redwood, and treated lumber.~~

~~To permit: Acrylic lettering and logo material for the proposed wall sign and existing projecting sign.~~

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

~~[Motion carried 5-0.]~~

~~Ms. Cooper moved, Ms. Damaser seconded approval of a Waiver:~~

~~From Code Section 153.173(M)(3)(a): All signs shall have dimensional letters, raised or routed with a minimum one-half inch relief.~~

~~To permit: lettering with 1/4" relief for the wall sign.~~

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

~~[Motion carried 5-0]~~

~~Mr. Jewell moved, Ms. Cooper seconded approval of the Minor Project with no conditions.~~

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

~~[Motion carried 5-0.]~~

- **Case #24-104MPR, 87 S. High Street, Minor Project Review**

Proposal for exterior modifications to an existing building in the Historic District. The 0.12-acre site is zoned HD-HS, Historic South District and is located southeast of the intersection of Eberly Hill and South High Street.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Bitar stated that this is a request for approval of a Minor Project Review (MPR) proposal for exterior modifications to the existing building at 87 S. High Street. The 4,950-square-foot lot is zoned HD-HS, Historic South District, and is located approximately 55 feet northwest of the intersection of Pinney Hill Lane and S. High Street. It contains an individually listed building built c. 1840. The building is an excellent example of the Greek Revival style with characteristics of American Vernacular as well. It has front-facing, low-pitched gables and an emphasized cornice line. The decorative dentil frieze board along the front façade is not original to the structure but is a distinctive feature. There is a small well house directly to the rear of the main structure. In 2023,

the owner brought an Informal Request to the Board for a residential addition; no further action was taken.

The request is to approve exterior re-painting of the structure. The owner seeks approval for the use of Iron Ore, SW 7056, as a body color, with the trim remaining Tricorn Black, SW 6258. Unfortunately, painting of the house began in early 2024 prior to the owner seeking approval. Staff made contact with the owner in March 2024, and the applicant submitted an application for ARB approval in July. Currently, the front and rear facades already are painted, and all facades of the well house are painted. As the Board is aware, a document of pre-approved paint colors permitted in the Historic District was approved in 2022. Building owners are permitted to use pre-approved colors, based on building age and style, via an Administrative Approval. Building owners wishing other colors may use the MPR process to obtain Board approval. This house reflects a distinct Greek Revival architectural theme, and reflective of that time period, the previous paint color was light. The application submitted is for a much darker color. Because it is not consistent with the approved colors, the paint cannot be approved administratively; however, the ARB has the authority to consider an alternative color. Two of the applicable criteria are not met; therefore, staff recommends that the Board approve the Minor Project Review with one of the following two conditions:

- A) The applicant choose a body paint color from the Pre-Approved Paint Colors Section 3.0 list and repaint the building and well house body within 30 days of approval. This would require submission of an Administrative Approval application, or
- B) The applicant complete the front-facing upper window trim in Tricorn Black and the north and south elevation bodies in Iron Ore, within 30 days of approval.

Board Questions

Ms. Patt-McDaniel and Ms. Cooper requested clarification of the current paint and the request. Mr. Bitar provided clarification that the house trim color has not changed from its previous color, only the body color.

Applicant Presentation

Shannon Hospell, Owner, 87 S. High Street, Dublin, stated that they are seeking a color variance approval. As owners, their goal is to invest in the house and add to the aesthetic appeal of the neighborhood. They realize that the color they have selected is not on the Historic District's list of approved colors for the Greek Revival time period; however, it is an approved historical color. They believe this color elevates the building's historic charm and balances the District. Next to this house is a white structure and a dark green structure. The red bank building sits across the street. They have received complimentary comments on their selected color from passers-by. They are seeking approval to keep the color.

Public Comments

There were no public comments.

Board Discussion

Mr. Jewell stated that he has seen this color used elsewhere in the District; therefore, he has no concerns with it.

Ms. Damaser stated that she has concerns with the process that was used. The applicant is seeking approval after choosing an in-compliant color.

Ms. Hospell responded that the color was accidentally chosen, and they initially intended to change it. After receiving some compliments, however, they decided to keep the color. Subsequently, they approached the City to seek approval.

Ms. Cooper stated that she prefers the lighter colors for that style architecture, as they showcase the architectural detail. She has no objection to the black trim. The selected color is not an approved color, in which case, the applicant must submit a request for Board approval. She is not comfortable in rewarding an applicant for not following the procedure but seeking approval after the fact. She is reluctant to approve the waiver.

Ms. Patt-McDaniel stated that although not approved, she has no objection to the selected color. She inquired if it is typical with Greek Revival architecture for the wall color to be light and the trim dark.

Mr. Bitar responded that it was typical for the wall color to be light and the trim to be an earth tone.

Ms. Damaser inquired if the contrasting trim color would not be an approved color.

Mr. Bitar responded that for the time period it would have been acceptable, but for the specific architectural style, it would not be an approved color.

Mr. Cotter stated that he would be supportive of requesting the applicant to repaint the structure with a color on the City's Historic District Approved Colors list. From a historic standpoint, the Board's goal is to maintain the District's character. If we permit all those elements to be blended, it becomes impossible to find the reason for the paint colors for specific architecture. He is not opposed to the color, although he believes the contrast is lacking. From the standpoint of the Historic District Guidelines, there is a reason for the designated colors. The Board determined the need for the Historic District Approved Colors document and approved it to prevent the need to deal with a situation such as this. It is not the Board members' personal opinions that matter. From the Historic District process standpoint, we must focus on what the City is trying to preserve. As time has evolved, the City lost some historical elements in the District. It is important to preserve those that remain.

Mr. Cotter requested and Mr. Bitar provided clarification of the two condition options.

Ms. Patt-McDaniel moved, Mr. Jewell seconded approval of the Minor Project with the following condition:

- 1) The applicant shall complete the front-facing upper window trim in Tricorn Black and the north and south elevation bodies in Iron Ore, within 30 days of approval.

Vote: Ms. Cooper, no; Ms. Damaser, no; Mr. Cotter, no; Mr. Jewell, yes; Ms. Patt-McDaniel, yes.
[Motion failed 2-3]

Ms. Damaser moved, Ms. Cooper seconded approval of the Minor Project with the following condition:

- 1) The applicant shall choose a body paint color from the Pre-Approved Paint Colors Section 3.0 list and repaint the building and wellhouse bodies within 30 days of approval.

Vote: Ms. Patt-McDaniel, no; Ms. Damaser, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Mr. Jewell, no.
[Motion passed 3-2]

Ms. Hospell inquired if the motion to approve the color failed.

Mr. Cotter responded affirmatively. The homeowner will need to repaint the structure with an approved color.

Ms. Hospell inquired if she could appeal the decision. The home to the left of theirs is painted white; the home to the right is painted dark green. She is not sure painting their home a light color would enhance the District. She believes a color shouldn't be chosen because it is right for a specific architecture or time period. It also is important to enhance the overall charm of the area. She might select a color that does not look as well next to the existing homes. Is that the intent?

Ms. Patt-McDaniel responded that Ms. Hospell owns an historic home in the Historic District. The home must be maintained in accordance with the Historic District Approved Colors document. The intent does not involve the aesthetics of blending with the neighboring homes. The intent is to preserve the historic character of the home. For that reason, she is asked to select an approved color appropriate for the historic era of the home.

Ms. Hospell inquired if she could appeal the decision based on precedent. Her neighbor has used a dark green color, which also does not exist on the list of Approved Colors.

Mr. Cotter responded that he would surmise that the dark green color was applied before the list of Historic District Approved Colors document was approved. The approved list does contain a range of colors for that time period, some of which are more earth tone. There is no appeal mechanism for this decision.

Ms. Hospell indicated that she understood.

~~Mr. Cotter indicated that the following two cases would be heard together, since they relate to the same site and project.~~

- ~~• **Case #24-109PDP, COhatch Riverview Village, Preliminary Development Plan**~~

~~A request for review and approval of a Preliminary 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.~~

- ~~• **Case #24-110Z, COhatch Riverview Village, Rezoning**~~

~~Request for review and recommendation of approval of a rezoning from HD-HR, Historic District – Historic Residential and HD-HP, Historic District – Historic Public to HD-HC, Historic District – Historic Core. The combined ±0.86-acre site is located on both sides of N. Riverview Street, south of North Street and north of Wing Hill Lane.~~

Applicant Presentation

~~Matt Davis, 4620 Hickory Rock Drive, Powell and Tim Lai, 41 West Town Street, Columbus provided the applicant presentation.~~

~~Mr. Davis stated that they have been working on this project for 2.5 years. The City owns the land and put out an RFP for development of this site. They submitted a proposal for something very unique that reflects COhatch's efforts in historic restorations. They have 42-43 properties on their historic restoration list. They have been meeting with the staff in various City departments over the~~