

Parcel	273-000079	Address	25 S Riverview St	OHI FRA-8840-1
---------------	------------	----------------	-------------------	-----------------------

Year Built: 1900	Map No: 116	Photo No: 1832-1834 (7/10/16)
Theme: Domestic	Historic Use: Single family house	Present Use: Single family house
Style: Vernacular	Foundation: Stone	Wall Type: Frame
Roof Type: Cross gable/standing seam metal	Exterior Wall: Stone	Symmetry: Yes
Stories: 1.5	Front Bays: 5	Side Bays: 3
Porch: Hipped-roof porch on façade	Chimney: 1, Interior, off ridge near center of house	Windows: 6-over-1 and 3-over-1

Description: The house has a one-and-one-half-story front-gable core with a one-story side-gable ell on its south elevation. The exterior of the building is clad in stone, and the roof is sheathed in standing seam metal. A nearly flat-roof porch spans the width of the façade gable. The porch is supported by stone-faced pillars. A gable roof supported by knee braces is over the entrance on the ell. Windows present are a combination of three-over-one and six-over-one, they are topped by soldier courses. The building is expanded by a rear addition.

Setting: The building is located on the west side of Riverview St. It is one in a row of late-nineteenth/early twentieth century residences. The yard is modestly landscaped by manicured shrubbery.

Condition: Good

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

Integrity Notes: The building has good integrity.

Historical Significance: The building is within the boundaries of 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 Status: Recommended contributing
National Register:	Recommended Dublin High Street Historic District, boundary increase	Property Name: N/A



25 S Riverview St, looking northwest



25 S Riverview St, looking southwest

OHIO HISTORIC INVENTORY

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



OHIO
HISTORICAL
SOCIETY

SINCE 1885

1.No. FRA-8840-1		2.County FRANKLIN		4.Present Name(s)		☐ CODED ☐ CODED		FRA-8840-1
3.Location of Negatives CITY OF DUBLIN				5.Historic or Other Name(s)				
Roll No. 2	Picture No.(s) 12							
6.Specific Address or Location 25 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. 1910		29. Basement? ☒ Yes ☐ No		
7.City or Village If Rural, Township & Vicinity DUBLIN				18. Style or Design ☐ High Style ☒ Elements		30. Foundation Material STONE		
8. Site Plan with North Arrow				18a. Style of Addition or Element(s)		31. Wall Construction STONE		
				19. Architect or Engineer		32. Roof Type & Material GABLE/S S METAL		
				19a. Design Sources		33. No. of Bays Front 3 Side 3		
9. U.T.M. Reference Quadrangle Name NW Columbus 17 319960 4440700 Zone Easting Northing				20. Contractor or Builder		34. Exterior Wall Material(s) STONE		
10. ☐ Site ☒ Building ☐ Structure ☐ Object				21. Building Type or Plan bungalow		35. Plan Shape IRREG.		
11. On National Register? No				22. Original Use, if apparent RESIDENCE		36. Changes ☒ Addition ☐ Altered ☐ Moved (Explain in #42)		
12. N.R. Potential?				23. Present Use RESIDENCE		37. Window Types ☐ 6 over 6 ☐ 4 over 4 ☐ 2 over 2 ☒ Other		
13. Part of Estab. Hist. Dist? Yes				24. Ownership ☐ Public ☒ Private		38. Building Dimensions		
14. District Potential?				25. Owner's Name & Address, if known		39. Endangered? No By What?		
15. Name of Established District (N.R. or Local) DUBLIN H.D. (local)				26. Property Acreage		40. Chimney Placement OFF CENTER/ROOF		25 S. RIVERVIEW
27. Other Surveys in Which Included				41. Distance from and Frontage on Road				
42. Further Description of Important Interior and Exterior Features (Continue on reverse if necessary) This stone residence features a gable roof with the gable end facing the street, a front porch with stone piers, six-over-one windows, a central entrance and a one story wing with matching stone exterior and standing seam metal roof. There is a back porch and a frame addition at the rear that includes a garage.				43. History and Significance (Continue on reverse if necessary) This is a very well-preserved early 20th century building. Its stone exterior makes it unusual for this time period in Dublin.		44. Description of Environment and Outbuildings (See #52) Located on a landscaped lot with a stone wall along the rear property line.		
45. Sources of Information observation				46. Prepared by NANCY RECCHIE		47. Organization BDR&C		
				48. Date Recorded in Field 3/03		49. Revised by		
				50. Date Revised		50b. Reviewed by		



PHOTO



Planning

5800 Shier Rings Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236

phone 614.410.4600
fax 614.410.4747
www.dublinohiousa.gov

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

MEETING MINUTES

JANUARY 27, 2016

AGENDA

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. BSD HR – Castray Residence
15-122ARB-MPR | 25 S. Riverview Street
Minor Project Review (Approved 5 – 0) |
| 2. BSD HC – Gerber & Mitchell, LLC
16-004ARB-MPR | 109 S. High Street
Minor Project Review (Approved 5 – 0) |

The Chair, David Rinaldi, called the meeting to order at 6:32 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Board members present were: Jane Fox, Thomas Munhall, Everett Musser, and Shannon Stenberg. City Mayor, Greg Peterson. City representatives were: Jennifer Rauch, Katie Dodaro, and Laurie Wright.

Administrative Business

The Chair introduced our City Mayor, Greg Peterson, so he could address the Board.

Mayor Peterson thanked the Board for their service performing this incredibly important job. He said City Council also extends their appreciation for the service this Board provides to our community.

Motion and Vote

Ms. Stenberg moved, Mr. Rinaldi seconded, to accept the documents into the record. The vote was as follows: Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Musser, yes; Mr. Munhall, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; and Ms. Stenberg, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Rinaldi moved, Mr. Musser seconded, to accept the December 16, 2015, meeting minutes as presented. The vote was as follows: Mr. Munhall, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; Mr. Musser, yes; and Mr. Rinaldi, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

The Chair briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Architectural Review Board [the minutes reflect the order of the published agenda.] He swore in anyone planning to address the Board on this application.

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. BSD HR – Castray Residence
15-122ARB-MPR | 25 S. Riverview Street
Minor Project Review |
|--|--|

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following application is a request for site modifications to the driveway and walkways of an existing single-family residence on the west side of S. Riverview Street and north of Spring Hill Street. He said this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.170 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Katie Dodaro presented the aerial view of the site and the existing conditions of the two front porches, walkways, driveway, and back porch. She explained the porches connect to the gravel driveway via

walkways made of stone or tiles. She said the proposal includes the resurfacing of three porches, two walkways, and the driveway. She said porches will all be resurfaced with stamped concrete in a five-foot by five-foot Slate Skin pattern and the color will be Putty with a Charcoal release. She said the walkways would also be a stamped concrete finish in the same colors but with a Notched Ashler Slate pattern. She stated the driveway would be solid concrete with no pattern in a Concrete Gray color.

Ms. Dodaro said this application meets all review criteria and approval is recommended with no conditions.

Jane Fox asked for clarification on the description of the concrete color to be added to the porches.

David Rinaldi asked why the applicant chose a four-foot wide walkway with sweeping arcs. He said this design deviates from what was typical for a home of this area; normally the walkways were narrow without radii in the hardscape plan.

Christine Castray, 4859 Shadowlane Drive, Dublin, said the cracking and crumbling of the concrete initiated the project. She said they wanted to remove the plain colored tiles installed in the 80's. She said they decided to do the walkways to accentuate the porches and complement the stone on the house, which is the best design feature.

Mr. Rinaldi said he had no concern over the material choice; he was more concerned with a four-foot wide sidewalk. He said even today, most homes have a three-foot wide sidewalk. He said he was questioning the use of a wide walkway for a historic home.

Tom King, contractor, King Concrete's Design Impression, Inc., 1316 Stimmel Road, Columbus, OH 43223. He said the hardscape design had a nice flow instead of using 90 degree angles. He said a four-foot plan gave it a more appealing look and easier access at the driveway.

Everett Musser asked Mr. King if he had done similar walkways this wide as a contractor. Mr. King answered the number of walkways at this width were probably 80 – 85%.

Ms. Castray said the front porch stairway will allow for a four-foot path and would be more pleasing to the eye, matching the dimensions of the walkway and the width of the porch.

Mr. Rinaldi expressed concerns about the wider walkways as presented.

Mr. Rinaldi invited public comment.

Tom Holton, 5957 Roundstone Place, Dublin, said he is the president of the Historical Society. He noted the proposal included concrete resurfacing applied with a concrete stamp pattern. He said this is a relatively small but very beautiful house, a historic home, built by a stone mason and the craftsmanship shows. He asked the Board and the applicant to consider a flagstone design with a three-foot width, which would be more in keeping with the proportion of the house. He said it was Mr. Rinaldi's comment about the sweeping nature of the walkway plan that prompted him to consider the material being proposed. He said this design would not be consistent with a home of that period; sidewalks would have been closer to the house and not sweeping curves. At the same time, he said he did not want to interfere with the intention of the owners. He added landscaping will make the design much more attractive. He emphasized he would like the parties involved to consider narrowing the width of the walkways by one foot. He agreed the tile should be removed and replaced with something else.

Ms. Fox asked if there were other options for stamp patterns, such as a flagstone design.

Jennifer Rauch said other design options were provided with the submittal including flagstone.

Ms. Castray said she was not opposed to changing the stamp pattern (cobblestone) but the reason they did not select the flagstone style was because they felt it was going to conflict with the existing flagstone design on the house. She indicated the flagstone pattern would look fake next to the flagstone pattern on the house. She said she prefers real stone to stamped concrete but it is more costly.

Ms. Fox confirmed the applicant considered a flagstone pattern. She questioned the flagstone on the back porch. Tom Munhall indicated that was not original to the house. Ms. Castray said that was a quick job they completed on a Saturday.

Sharon Stenberg said she would be supportive of approving everything with a reduction of width to three feet.

Mr. Musser said he would agree with that proposal.

Ms. Fox inquired about the widths of the porches and existing walkways. Mr. King said the width between the two columns on the front porch is four feet and the existing walk is ±three feet. Ms. Fox said she did not mind the width of four feet. She confirmed the terra cotta tiled walkway coming off the front porch was ±three feet. She concluded that a four-foot wide walkway is not going to detract from this because of the wide porches.

Mr. Munhall said he is supportive of the application with no conditions; he said real flagstone is more expensive, it becomes a maintenance issue, and snow removal makes it impossible.

Ms. Fox confirmed the driveway material will just be a plain concrete. She asked if coloring the driveway to match the walkways was considered or if it was cost prohibitive. Mr. King answered the products used for stamped concrete is a different color product that is used for the driveway so there is no way to match it. He said with a driveway that large, there is going to be color variations if color is used because there might be two different days of pouring and would not match.

Ms. Fox asked if the ART discussed the width of the walkways. Ms. Rauch replied the width was not a concern raised by the ART. She said ART found this proposal an improvement to the existing walkways and driveway. She indicated it made sense to her that a flagstone pattern not be used per the reasons stated by the applicant. She agreed for a single-family, resident walkways are usually narrower than four feet but the ART did not discuss the width. She said she would defer to the Board but suggested the walkway could be four feet where it meets the porches and the driveway but tapered down to three feet in between. She restated it is up to the Board's discretion.

Mr. Musser stated three feet is more in scale with the house but he would not argue about the four feet being requested.

Mr. Rinaldi asked the applicant if they would be in agreement if this Board recommended a decision to make the walkways three feet wide.

Ms. Castray said she would not be opposed to three feet; she was relying on Mr. King's expertise. She said they will add landscape to accentuate the new pathways. Mr. Munhall suggested keeping the boxwoods. Ms. Castray said they plan to keep all but the ones on the back porch.

Mr. Rinaldi said he did not want to impede on the process at all, as this was a great improvement. He said the pattern is fine but thought the four-foot walks would dominate the elevations and were not in character with the historic nature of this home.

Ms. Castray said narrower walkways will be less expensive.

Mr. Rinaldi said he was prepared to make a motion to approve the proposal if the walkways were decreased to three feet.

Ms. Fox suggested allowing the paths to widen at the porches to make it more aesthetically pleasing.

Mr. King asked what would be appropriate for the end of the walkways where they meet the driveway. He said he would like to flare that out also to be consistent.

Mr. Munhall said he would be supportive of that as long as the interiors are three feet; he clarified they are not so concerned with the beginning and the ends of the walkways.

Mr. Rinaldi indicated the original plan would need to be modified.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Rinaldi moved, Mr. Musser seconded, to approve a request for a Minor Project Review with the following condition:

- 1) That the applicant reduce the width of the walkways from 4 feet to 3 feet but be allowed to increase the width of the end of the walkways where they meet the driveway and porches.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Munhall, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; Mr. Musser, yes; and Mr. Rinaldi, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

2. BSD HC – Gerber & Mitchell, LLC 16-004ARB-MPR

109 S. High Street Minor Project Review

~~The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following application is a request for the installation of a new projecting sign and a new directory sign for an existing building on the west side of S. High Street at the intersection with Pinney Hill Lane. He said this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.066(G), 153.170 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*."~~

~~Katie Dodaro presented the aerial view of the site and a zoomed-in view of the site itself. She pointed out the main structure on the front, a carriage house on the back of the property, and existing parking. She said there are two existing signs, one at the front of the property on the main structure and one on the back. She said the proposal includes replacing the existing projecting sign with a three-inch thick HDU panel with 1/2-inch raised borders and graphics, installed on the existing wood bracket using existing hardware. She noted the proposed sign's background color will be Amber Slate (dark gray) and the border and graphics will be in the Capital White color. She said the proposed directory sign plaque will be the same color scheme, has three interchangeable panels for tenants, and the text and graphics will be applied with a high performance vinyl. She stated Code permits three signs and this application includes two, which match the size and shape of the existing signs. She said the signs meet the size and color requirements and since the proposed signs are being installed in the same locations as the previous signs, approval is recommended with one condition:~~

- ~~1) That the plans be updated prior to sign permitting to show dimensioned sign location and mounting height meeting Code.~~

~~The Chair asked if there were any questions or concerns with this application. [There were none.]~~

~~Jennifer Rauch explained the agenda was amended to reflect the change of this Minor Project Review. She said originally the applicant requested modifications to building, trim, and door colors and the installation of new shutters and light fixtures for an existing building and outbuilding. She indicated the~~



ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM

RECORD OF DETERMINATION

JANUARY 7, 2016

The Administrative Review Team made the following determination at this meeting:

**1. BSD HR – Castray Residence
15-122ARB-MPR**

**25 S. Riverview Street
Minor Project Review**

Proposal:	Site modifications to the driveway and walkways of an existing single-family residence on the west side of S. Riverview Street and north of Spring Hill Street.
Request:	Review and recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board for a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.170 and the <i>Historic Dublin Design Guidelines</i> .
Applicant:	Tim and Christine Castray.
Representative:	Tom King, Jr., Design Impressions.
Planning Contact:	Jennifer M. Rauch, AICP, Planning Manager; (614) 410-4690, jrauch@dublin.oh.us

REQUEST: Recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board of this request for a Minor Project Review with no conditions.

Determination: The Minor Project Review was forwarded to the Architectural Review Board with a recommendation of approval.

STAFF CERTIFICATION



Vincent A. Papsidero, FAICP
Planning Director



ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM

MEETING MINUTES

JANUARY 7, 2016

ART Members and Designees: Vince Papsidero, Planning Director; Jeff Tyler, Building Standards Director; Matt Earman, Parks and Recreational Department Director; Colleen Gilger, Director of Economic Development; Aaron Stanford, Senior Civil Engineer; Alan Perkins, Fire Marshal; and Laura Ball, Landscape Architect.

Other Staff: Marie Downie, Planner I; Jennifer Rauch, Planning Manager; Claudia Husak, Senior Planner; Katie Dodaro, Planning Assistant; Lia Yakumithis, Planning Assistant; Zachary Sevenish, Planning Assistant; and Laurie Wright, Staff Assistant.

Applicants: Aaron Underhill, Underhill Yaross & Hodge LLC (Case 2); and Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners; Teri Umbarger and Miguel Gonzalez, Moody Nolan (Case 3).

Vince Papsidero called the meeting to order at 2:01 pm. He asked if there were any amendments to the December 22, 2015, meeting minutes. The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

INTRODUCTIONS

**1. BSD HR – Castray Residence
15-122ARB-MPR**

**25 S. Riverview Street
Minor Project Review**

Katie Dodaro said this is a request for site modifications to the driveway and walkways of an existing single-family residence on the west side of S. Riverview Street and north of Spring Hill Street. She said this is a request for review and recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board for a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.170 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Ms. Dodaro presented an aerial view of the site and a sketch of the proposed layout. She said there are three existing porches. She said the brick and stone walkways and steps leading to the main porch will be replaced with a putty colored, slate skin design in concrete. She added a concrete driveway will be poured with a notched ash slate design with charcoal in seams.

Vince Papsidero asked if the proposal meets the guidelines for this area. Jennifer Rauch answered the guidelines are vague pertaining to these types of site modifications but Staff would ensure the proposal meets any listed requirements.

Aaron Stanford asked if the applicant is using the existing driveway. Ms. Dodaro replied the location will remain and the existing unpaved drive will be replaced with the proposed stamped concrete. Ms. Rauch said Staff will ensure the driveway is three feet off of the property line.

Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any further questions or concerns regarding this case. [There were none.] He determined the ART would not need to review this further and confirmed the ART's recommendation of approval to the ARB for the meeting on January 27th.