Parcel	273-000118	**Address**	143 S Riverview St	**OHI**	N/A

Year Built:	1949	**Map No:**	128	**Photo No:**	2162-2165 (7/12/16)
Theme:	Domestic	**Historic Use:**	Single family house	**Present Use:**	Single family house
Style:	Minimal Traditional	**Foundation:**	Not visible	**Wall Type:**	Frame
Roof Type:	Hipped/asphalt shingle	**Exterior Wall:**	Aluminum	**Symmetry:**	No
Stories:	1	**Front Bays:**	3	**Side Bays:**	3
Porch:	Concrete stoop	**Chimney:**	1, Interior, on ridge near north side of house	**Windows:**	Double-hung replacements with faux muntins.

Description: The one-story Minimal Traditional-style house has a rectilinear footprint and a hipped roof. The roof is sheathed in asphalt shingles and the exterior walls are clad in aluminum siding. The front door is off-centered on the façade and a second entry is on the north elevation. Windows are double-hung replacements with faux muntins, flanked by fixed shutters on the façade. A detached garage is located northwest of the house.

Setting: The property is located on the west side of S Riverview St. The building sits on an open lawn with minimal landscaping. A dry-laid stone wall extends along the south property boundary.

Condition: Good

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

Integrity Notes: The house has good integrity

Historical Significance: The building is recommended contributing to the City of Dublin's local Historic Dublin district and 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



143 S Riverview St, looking northwest



143 S Riverview St, looking southwest

Docusign Envelope ID: 07ADC27B-EC7B-8BE7-82A9-7BE29B02E631

RECORD OF ACTION

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, August 26, 2026 | 6:30 p.m.

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

1. **143 S. Riverview Street**
   26-042ARB-INF **Informal Review**

Proposal:	Request for review and non-binding feedback for the exterior renovation at 143 S. Riverview Street. The .21-acre site is zoned HD-HR, Historic-District-Historic Residential.
Location:	143 S. Riverview Street
Planning Contact:	Tori Brubaker, Planner I
Contact Information:	614.410.4632, tbrubaker@dublin.oh.us
Case Information:	www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/26-042

RESULT: The Board discussed the Informal request for a small rear addition and exterior renovations at 143 S. Riverview, a Background building. Since the addition is proposed in the rear of the building and does not exceed the existing building height, the Board focused on architectural details/fenestration and materials. The Board directed that the open pediment (front elevation) be adjusted so that it is centered over the entry door, whether by widening the gable, shifting the pediment centerline, or a combination of both approaches, without necessarily relocating the door. The Board also recommended that the overhang of the pediment be projected further forward to create a defined shadow line. Further study of the front fenestration arrangement was encouraged to achieve a more balanced and symmetrical composition. On the rear and south elevations, the Board recommended that the existing L-shaped portion of the structure be reclad in stone to match the primary home, while the new addition would retain a distinct siding material — such as board-and-batten — to clearly differentiate the new construction.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Lisa Patt-McDaniel	Yes
Sean Cotter	Yes
Stasia Suleiman	Yes
Mark. Stechschulte	Absent
Terry Seidel	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Signed by:
Tori Brubaker
B848B8EAE7694FF...

Tori Brubaker
Planner I

MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, August 26, 2026

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Cotter, Chair, called the Architectural Review Board (ARB) meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. in Council Chamber, 5555 Perimeter Drive. He welcomed public participation and stated that the livestream video of the meeting can also be accessed at the City's website. Public comments on the cases are welcome from both in-person meeting attendees and those viewing at the City's website. He explained the meeting procedures, noting that each case would begin with a staff presentation followed by the applicant's presentation, Board questions, public comments, and then Board deliberation. He requested that public comments be limited to three minutes or less.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chair Cotter led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Board members present:	Sean Cotter, Lisa Patt-McDaniel, Terry Seidel, Stasia Suleiman
Board members absent:	Mark Stechschulte
Staff members present:	Sarah Holt, Tori Brubaker

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Cotter moved, Ms. Patt-McDaniel seconded acceptance of the documents into the record and approval of the July 22, 2026 ARB meeting minutes.

Vote: Mr. Cotter, yes; Ms. Patt-McDaniel, yes; Ms. Suleiman, yes; Mr. Seidel, yes.
[Motion carried 4-0]

Mr. Cotter stated that the Architectural Review Board (ARB) is responsible for review of construction, modifications or alterations to any site in the Review District or area subject to ARB under the provision of Zoning Code Section 153.170. The Board has the decision-making responsibility on these cases.

CASE REVIEWS

Case #26-042INF
HD-HR - 143 S. Riverview
Informal Review
Request for review and non-binding feedback for the exterior renovation at 143 S. Riverview Street. The .21-acre site is zoned HD-HR, Historic District - Historic Residential.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Brubaker presented the case, a request for informal, non-binding feedback on a proposed one-story rear addition and exterior renovation at 143 South Riverview Street. The 0.21-acre site is zoned HD-HR, Historic District – Historic Residential and is located on the west side of South Riverview Street.

Ms. Brubaker described the existing conditions of the property, noting that the home is a minimal traditional style structure — a house type built extensively in the post-World War II era, characterized by simplicity, minimal decoration, and small scale. The site features a historic stone wall located approximately six feet from the home and a landmark tree at the front. She noted that in November 2024 the home's classification was changed from a landmark building to a background building, and that a previous informal review request for demolition had been tabled with the Board leaning toward disapproval.

Staff reported that all proposed improvements meet code and setback requirements. The existing detached garage sits within the rear yard setback but is a legal nonconforming structure requiring no further board action. The proposed addition is located at the rear of the home, infilling the existing L-shaped footprint.

Ms. Brubaker reported that staff had worked extensively with the applicant to bring the project into conformance with the Historic District Guidelines. The project was noted to have made substantial progress, particularly in meeting the fundamental elements outlined in the Guidelines for background buildings — including setbacks, massing, height, and preservation of the existing building form. Staff highlighted several positive aspects of the proposal, including the use of stone material on the front and north elevations, a matching stone treatment on the garage, and a gabled roof with projecting eaves resembling an open pediment.

Staff identified several areas of concern and recommendations for refinement:

Regarding the front elevation, staff observed that the proposed fenestration features openings of varying sizes and unequal proportions, which is inconsistent with the Guidelines' recommendation for more proportional openings. Staff also found the proposed open pediment to be more visually complicated than expected, noting that open pediments typically rely on symmetry, and that the current design creates visual confusion because the door is not centered beneath the pediment. Staff recommendations included bringing the overhang forward to create a stronger shadow line, reducing the size of the upper window to avoid interrupting the base of the pediment, creating greater symmetry in the window and door arrangement, and shifting the door to be centered beneath the projecting eave.

Regarding the rear and south elevations, staff found the roof shape to be more complex than necessary and suggested simplification. The applicant proposed board-and-batten siding on the existing L-portion and lap siding on the addition, with a stone water table at the base of both elements. Staff indicated that the existing L-shaped portion should utilize the stone material throughout to match the existing home, while accepting the use of a different material on the new addition to visually distinguish it as a newer element.

Board Questions

Ms. Suleiman asked for clarification regarding the stone wall depicted in the rear elevation rendering, confirming with staff that it was the historic stone wall referenced in the presentation and that the applicant intended to leave it in place.

Mr. Cotter sought clarification regarding the staff recommendation to bring the overhang forward, confirming that the intent was to create a more prominent shadow line to emphasize the entry

door as a focal point. Mr. Cotter also sought clarification on the rear roof offset, and staff confirmed the reference was to the roofline of the addition being slightly lower than the primary structure's ridge due to the infill nature of the design. Mr. Seidel asked whether staff had recommended closing the bottom of the open pediment; staff confirmed that no such recommendation had been made, and that the suggestion was focused on improving symmetry through fenestration alignment.

Applicant Presentation

David Johnson, 8965 Cove Drive, Plain City, presented on behalf of the applicant. He described the overall design intent as taking a 1950s-era, semi-modern home and giving it additional character and material quality commensurate with improvements occurring throughout the neighborhood. He explained that the homeowner's family member had moved into the home and that the goal was to provide a meaningful upgrade without altering the building's modest scale or historical character. He noted that an earlier, more historically elaborate design concept had been set aside in recognition of the property's background building status, with the revised approach focused on simplicity and the integration of Dublin-characteristic stone material.

Mr. Johnson explained that the garage would be veneered with the same stone as the house, with upgraded garage doors to unify the outbuilding with the primary residence. He described the front entry treatment as projecting the front wall slightly forward by approximately one foot to give the entry greater prominence, with cut stone detailing and gas lanterns flanking the door. He confirmed that the existing stone chimney would be veneered, not relocated, and that the rear windows and doors would be retained in their existing size and location. He noted that the rear addition infills the L-shape with a hip roof at a slightly reduced pitch — approximately three-to-one rather than the existing four-to-one — to avoid the addition's ridge intersecting the main roof ridge, and that the roof material would transition from asphalt shingles to dark bronze metal standing seam across the whole structure.

Board Discussion

On the front elevation open pediment and fenestration, Mr. Seidel stated that the most important single correction was to center the open pediment over the door, and that the applicant's suggestion of enlarging the gable triangle to better frame the entry was a reasonable approach. Ms. Suleiman agreed, noting that the architectural detailing descending from the pediment was not in equal alignment on both sides of the door opening, and that either extending the detailing to the left or centering the door and flanking elements beneath the pediment would resolve the visual inconsistency. Mr. Cotter noted that the historic district pattern for homes of this type tends to emphasize the entry door as a clear focal point, and that improving the pediment's relationship to the door would serve that purpose.

The Board also discussed the asymmetrical arrangement of windows on the front facade — three windows clustered to one side and a single window on the other. Mr. Seidel expressed a preference for considering a second window on the single-window side to achieve greater symmetry. However, Mr. Johnson explained that the single window serves a bedroom, and that the homeowner's preference was to retain a smaller window in that location. The board acknowledged the practical and privacy-related rationale.

Ms. Patt-McDaniel noted that the door's offset position relative to the pediment was the primary visual concern, and that the difficulty in assessing the rendering was partly attributable to the

perspective angle of the drawing. She added that the stone material proposal was appealing and expressed general support for the design direction.
The Board concurred with staff's recommendation to simplify the material palette on the rear elevation. Ms. Suleiman noted that three distinct materials on the rear elevation was visually busy and detracted from the architectural character of the design. Ms. Patt-McDaniel supported the approach of applying stone to the existing L-portion to match the primary structure, while using a distinct siding material on the addition to differentiate the new construction. Mr. Johnson agreed that the board-and-batten or a comparable vertical siding material on the addition would be studied further.
Mr. Seidel asked whether it would be feasible to match the addition's roof pitch to the existing four-to-one pitch. Mr. Johnson explained that doing so would cause the addition's ridge to intersect the main ridge, necessitating significant structural changes to the existing trusses. The reduced pitch of the infill hip roof was therefore a deliberate and practical design solution, and the use of metal standing seam at a lower pitch was noted as technically acceptable.
Mr. Seidel also raised the staff recommendation regarding the shadow line at the top of the pediment. Mr. Johnson indicated he would be open to adding a projected rake of six to eight inches, and personally agreed this would improve the appearance.

The Board expressed overall support for the project's direction. Ms. Patt-McDaniel commended the applicant for the thoughtful approach to updating one of the smaller homes on South Riverview Street in a manner consistent with the improving character of the surrounding neighborhood.

The Board provided the following non-binding guidance for the applicant to incorporate before returning for a formal minor project review:
On the front elevation, the Board suggested that the open pediment be adjusted so that it is centered over the entry door, whether by widening the gable, shifting the pediment centerline, or a combination of both approaches, without necessarily relocating the door. The Board also recommended that the overhang of the pediment be projected further forward to create a defined shadow line. Further study of the front fenestration arrangement was encouraged to achieve a more balanced and symmetrical composition.
On the rear and south elevations, the Board recommended that the existing L-shaped portion of the structure be reclad in stone to match the primary home, while the new addition would retain a distinct siding material — such as board-and-batten — to clearly differentiate the new construction.

Public Comment

Senior Planner Holt noted for the record that no public comment was received for this case.

~~Case #26-043INF~~
~~HD-HR – 25 S. Riverview~~
~~Informal Review~~
~~Request for review and non-binding feedback for the construction of a two story addition at 25 S. Riverview Street. The 0.26 -acre site is zoned HD-HR, Historic District – Historic Residential.~~

~~The case was postponed prior to the meeting at the request of the applicant.~~

DocuSign Envelope ID: BF745D79-CF75-4042-A844-7BE4B3A4BDB0

BOARD ORDER

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, April 27, 2022 | 6:30 pm

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

1. 143 S. Riverview Street
22-035ARB **Demolition**

Proposal:	Demolition of a single-story, single-family home located on a 0.21-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic Residential.
Location:	South of the intersection of S. Riverview Street with Pinneyhill Lane.
Request:	Review and approval of a Demolition under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.176(J) and the *Historic Design Guidelines*.
Applicants:	Lindy and Brad Lyon
Planning Contact:	Sarah Tresouthick Holt, AICP, ASLA, Senior Planner
Contact Information:	614.410.4662, sholt@dublin.oh.us
Case Information:	www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/22-035

MOTION: Ms. Damaser moved and Ms. Cooper seconded, to Table the Demolition request for 143 S. Riverview Street at the request of the applicant.

VOTE: 5 – 0

RESULT: The Demolition request was Tabled.

RECORDED VOTES:

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

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:
Sarah T. Holt
89A2805342A848D...

Sarah Tresouthick Holt, AICP, ASLA
Senior Planner

~~**CASE PROCEDURES**~~

~~The Chair stated the Architectural Review Board is responsible for review of construction, modifications or alterations to any site in the area subject to Architectural Board Review under the provision of Zoning Code §153.170. This Board has the final decision-making responsibility on cases under their purview. Anyone who intended to address the Board on any of the cases this evening will be sworn in. The agenda order is typically determined at the beginning of the meeting by the Chair, who also stated the procedures of the meeting. The cases in the minutes follow the order of the published agenda. Anyone who addresses the Board will need to provide their full name and address for the record.~~

~~The Chair swore in anyone planning to address the Board on any of the cases to be reviewed.~~

NEW CASES

1. 143 S. Riverview Street, 22-035ARB, Demolition

The Chair stated this application was a request for Demolition of a single-story, single-family home located on a 0.21-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic Residential. The site is south of the intersection of S. Riverview Street with Pinneyhill Lane.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Holt presented aerial views of the site including the existing house and detached garage. The proposal this evening is a request to demolish the house, only. The house was built in 1949 and is an example of Minimal Traditional architecture, found to be contributing in 5 out of 7 categories: Location, Design, Feeling, Setting, and Association. The City's historical architect consultant, Preservation Designs LTD, found the building to be contributing in all 7 categories that included Materials and Workmanship.

In November of 2021, an Informal Review for demolition and new home construction was reviewed by the ARB for the applicant. The Demolition information was not complete at the time. The Board encouraged the applicants to explore a sympathetic addition. Tonight, all information has been supplied for only the demolition request.
This site plan from the previously-submitted Informal Review showed the proposed front elevation of the new house, which again is not being reviewed this evening. The site plan included the historic stone wall along the south lot line, which may be one of the oldest stone walls in town. The applicant states the wall is 6 feet from the existing house. The location of the Landmark tree #790 was noted. Photographs were provided by the applicant that showed the existing stone wall, which is 158 feet in length per the applicant. Photographs of the Landmark, 28-inch Black Walnut tree, were not submitted with this application. Staff had requested information from the applicant about how the existing stone wall would be protected during demolition. The applicant answered silt fencing would be installed.

The overall demolition criteria for contributing structures were discussed in detail along with Staff's analysis.

§153.176(J)(5)(a) – Demolition criteria for contributing structures:

Applicant shall demonstrate credible evidence of economic hardship

1. Will all economically viable use be deprived without demolition?
2. Will reasonable investment-backed expectations be maintained without demolition?
3. Was economic hardship created by or exacerbated by the owner?
4. Factors

a) Current level of economic return
b) Recent listings of the property
c) Alternative uses
d) Evidence of self-created hardship, including inadequate maintenance
e) Knowledge of landmark designation at time of purchase
f) Economic incentives or funding available

Criteria #1 – Not met because the value of the house has increased since the purchase in 2017. The house is habitable and in good condition per the supplied photos and structural analysis. There was no indication of rot or termites and there were no penetrations for plumbing and/or electrical in the floor joists, which were dry, clean, and straight.

Criteria #2 – The applicant was encouraged to explore the option of an addition similar to 94 Franklin Street that was just approved by the Board. That structure was also an example of Minimal Traditional architecture with a detached garage on a similar sized lot. Two letters were shared from two financial institutions (Huntington Bank and National Equity Fund) that each denied the applicant loans based upon "massive renovations." The information supplied was not presented for appropriateness/comparison with plans that had been presented at the Informal Review in November 2021. Additionally, National Equity Fund is a "leading non-profit, Low-Income Housing Tax Credit syndicator" according to their website.

Criteria #3 - The applicants state they have maintained the property, which is true. Information from Albanese Construction included a cost estimate that included a line item of $125K for foundation work, which is not necessary for a historically-appropriate addition, per Preservation Designs LTD (PDL). This cost estimate would suggest a second story through the structural assessment but the applicant stated they did not pursue that plan. There was no information included in the cost for demolition on this property. Therefore, there is not a complete picture of a true cost comparison.

Looking further into the economic hardship issue as it relates to foundation costs:

1. The owner excavated portions of the foundation; and
2. Comments made in an email from Criterium Liszkay Engineers, stated building on the existing foundation was not advisable (for a two-story addition).

Staff agreed from a preservation-appropriateness standpoint as discussed at the November 2021 hearing because it probably would not meet the intent of the Historic Design Guidelines. Staff disagreed on the end result: the existing foundation was doing its job as intended, for a single-story home. Code does not require reconstruction of the entire foundation, if the original house is not disturbed. This option is open to the applicants. Therefore, this expense/desire may be a self-imposed economic hardship. Photographs from the applicant showed the areas the applicant had excavated the foundation.

Factor (a) Zillow showed a current value (April 4, 2022) at 127% over the purchase price made on May 18, 2017, as confirmed by the Franklin County Auditor.

Factor (b) The property has not been listed for sale or rent since the applicant's purchase in 2017.

Factor (c) Because the property will remain residential per the Zoning Code and Community Plan, there is not feasibility of alternative uses. Again, the applicants were encouraged to pursue an addition but that has not been presented for evaluation and determination.

Factor (d) There was no evidence of hardship due to inadequate maintenance; the house is in good condition.

Factor (e) This property has always been zoned Historic Residential, from the creation of the Historic District and the Franklin County Auditor has historic district designations on their website. The owners state they were not aware of the landmark designation and yet Staff provided proof of the labels in 2020 when the City was updating the Code and Guidelines. Staff stated they also have evidence of labels from 2017, just five months after their purchase of the property.

Factor (f) Staff has not been made aware of economic incentives or funding available for this project.

Based on Staff's analysis and the review by Preservation Designs LTD, disapproval is recommended by Staff for the Demolition Request with the following findings:

1) The structure is an excellent example of Minimal Traditional architecture and is found to be contributing in five out of seven indicators on the HCA and seven out of seven according to PDL.
2) The applicant has not provided evidence that an appropriate alternative to demolition has been explored. Options exist ranging from a sympathetic addition to selling the property.
3) The provided supporting structural information indicates that the foundation is in good condition and appropriate for the current loads. Conflicting information has been provided regarding the need and/or expense of unnecessary foundation work.
4) The provided supporting structural information indicates that the roof framing is in good condition. The accompanying photos of the floor joists appear in good condition.
5) The lot is large enough to accept a building addition at the back of the existing structure, and this was encouraged at the November 2021 Board hearing.
6) The proposed addition, for which the applicant obtained a cost estimate and loan reviews, has not been presented to staff, or the Board, to determine its similarity in size and scope to the November 2021 submittal, so it cannot be evaluated as a direct comparison relative to cost, nor its appropriateness relative to the Code or Guidelines.
7) The cost estimates are incomplete, lacking separate demolition information, new home construction costs, and renovation of the existing home with accompanying plans.
8) The property has been zoned Historic Residential since at least 2014, and the Planning Division has confirmation that the owners were notified of changes in both 2017 and 2020, and the Franklin County Assessor website states the property is within the Dublin Historic District.

Applicant Presentation

Lindy Lyon, 143 S. Riverview Street, was born and raised in Dublin. This house was purchased just a few months before the couple's son was born. It had previously been a rental property and in rough shape. When they purchased the home, they were not told in any form or fashion that the home had been designated contributing in the area. The assessment was completed in 2016, so even the former owner would have been notified; she stated she was never notified. The applicant stated they were never notified of any unique status that would prohibit them in such a way to limit what could be done with their property and if they had known, they probably would not have purchased the property. She remembered well the day Staff informed them that the house was recommended contributing (August 11, 2021). They had set up a meeting with Staff to discuss their completed new-build architecture plans on that day. She stated that Staff said the architecture plans looked good and Staff did not believe the Board would have any issues. Then the contributing property sheet was shared with the applicant. To say the applicants were in absolute shock was an understatement.

Ms. Lyon – This is a one-story, 1,100-square-foot concrete block house built in 1949 with a small addition in the back, ±100 square feet in size that was most likely added in the 1970's when the aluminium siding was also added to the house. The addition had its own heating system they have never used for fear of a fire. Their home should not be historic because it is not associated with any historic event (battle ground) or associated with a historic significant person, and does not represent the work of a master builder. Staff sighted 5 integrity markers, which were highly debateable and subjective and now it all of a sudden has 7 markers. The stone wall is not historically associated with their house but will be preserved. In response to Staff's presentation and recommendation that the Board to not vote in favor of our demolition request, she wanted to cover a couple of points made. The main one being the applicants are not required to submit architectural plans for a renovation addition for a demolition request. It is not required by Code for demolition hearings. From her research, every demo that has been approved, no architectural drawings or renovation additions were submitted. The structural engineer's report was completely inconclusive because he was not able to access the area needed to properly assess the foundation of the house. The access is 17 inches and protected by a Union that states he cannot go over there even though they are $500 per hour. He suggested digging holes under certain areas of the structure to try to get an idea of what the foundation was like. Based on the evidence of the holes, he was able to comfortably state a second story would not be feasible. The homeowners never said anything to him about a second story. Just based off the pictures he could confidently say the foundation was not good enough for a second story. His professional advice was without lifting the home at a cost of $15000 – $20,000. There was no way to truly know what condition the foundation was in; that was his actual report. Ms. Amy Kramb had told her she could pay anyone to get under there.
She discussed the renovation and addition estimate. It was noted that if the applicant was prohibited to add up on the existing structure, then the cost estimate for the foundation modification are deemed unnecessary. Based on the inconclusiveness of the structural engineer's report, they have no idea what they are getting into once the renovation starts. There was no assurance the foundation will not require extensive finances for restoration. To address the lending letters, National Equity Fund is a lending line focused on acquisition and construction lending and Huntington Bank is one of the larger lending institutions around.
The one thing she was struggling with was the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 that was established and passed primarily to protect our Nation's heritage from rampant federal development meaning saving public landmarks, as the original case involved the demolition of Penn Station in New York City. It was not intended to oppress and limit residential property owners the way it is being used now for their specific situation. Over the past few years in America, countless foundational historic statues have been torn down and removed with little consequence but the applicant believes they are being held to a different standard for their tiny, concrete box. They were told there is all this public benefit and public value to their home; the applicant disagreed. There is no financial assistance to fund their financial hardship they may incur due to the recommended contributing structure. The Board has the authority that rules over each unique situation.
She believed she had a right to fight for a decision that will ultimately affect her family's future and nobody else's regarding their own property. The applicant wanted to build a nice home for their growing family and one that fit the character and quality of the incredible area they live in - appropriate in size and scale and working with the Board to ensure that is truly the end result.

Initial Questions for the Applicant

Only Mr. Alexander had a few questions but first wanted to clarify a few things. Every project where the Board has approved demolition recently, designs were provided by the builder. Everything that has come before this Board for demolition has had a design with it.
Ms. Lyon – A design for a future build but not necessarily for renovations and additions. At 110 – 112 S. Riverview that is diagonal to her property, plans never had to be produced.

Mr. Alexander – Plans were not needed for renovations because they had adequate and very different structural evidence than Ms. Lyon has been able to present or her engineers have been able to present that would be visible above the foundation. It is not a requirement to get into the foundation. Ms. Lyon has suggested that the process has not been done correctly. Each one of those projects reviewed by this Board, there was evidence presented that showed there were foundation problems because there were problems found in the rest of the building as a result of the foundation. In this applicant's case, there has been no evidence yet presented to suggest the foundation is not built to current Code and very clear from the photographs but that is the case in many structures. What has been suggested, is the voids in the applicant's foundation was very common. Voids have not led to cracks up above in the structure. There were no cracks presented that resulted in structural deflections. That would be evidence that the other cases were able to show, therefore, demolition was approved. The Board could see the condition of the building. The applicant met the other guidelines and so drawings were not requested for how they would renovate because they met the standards for demolition. At the applicant's last meeting with this Board, the standards for demolition were not met at that time.
Ms. Lyon – They did not know that; the applicant thought it was just an informal meeting.
Mr. Alexander – The applicant can come back as many times as they want. A lot of people come with incomplete information, initially. That is why it was suggested that maybe the applicant look at renovations. The question for all of us… Staff and the Board see this substantial price for renovating the building and the numbers it is based on, but do not know what the design is the cost is based on. Ms. Holt was accurate when she made the assumption that based on what the engineers said for some thought of building upwards. There are a lot of ways to add to this structure that would not result in the price provided by the applicant. The Board needed an example of the proposal to show what led to that price. Usually, a designer would provide options and alternatives for meeting the client's goals. He asked the applicant if she explored other options that would not result in the cost of what was shared with the Board.
Ms. Lyon – They had not. The main reason for not providing plans/proposal for renovation/addition was because they were told in a private meeting that they needed to use an architect of the Staff's selection, not knowing how much it would cost. They had already interviewed many Dublin architects and found one that was in their budget. The fear was the number of times they will have to return to obtain agreement from this Board. It seems there is a process where you have to have an extended amount of money to prove financial hardship, which seemed unfair.
Mr. Alexander – When the applicant came to the Board before, the Board suggested working with a design professional that has worked in Historic Districts. And even said the applicant could look around this community and see projects that have been approved. Those are also people that know the Code.
Ms. Lyon – If the designer is outside of the budget, they cannot be mandated to use them.
Mr. Alexander – The goal is to find a design that is compatible with Dublin's standards and also find a design that meets the applicant's goals. There are design professionals that can do that.
Ms. Lyon – She agreed but felt like all the power and control with no accountability was given to one side and the applicant is at the mercy of possibly a process that does not want them to succeed.
Mr. Alexander – He was sorry she had that impression.
Ms. Holt – In early December, Staff met with the Lyons and recommended as the Board did, to seek a designer/architect that had experience in a Historic District. As public servants, Staff takes very seriously the concept that Staff cannot recommend specific designers, architects, engineers, and contractors of any type.

Public Comment

Mr. Alexander – He was aware of one favorable response for this proposal.
Ms. Holt – There have been three, which she read into the record.
Public comment from the audience - Pete Albanese - 4181 MacDuff Way - He was the builder for the Lyons and also part of the family. He put most of the bid together. He would have to lower the foundation to

meet Code. Anything they hit or fix on the inside, means making an adjustment on the outside. This area is comprised of all rock. Bringing in a hoe and digging down is not an option to redo the foundation, besides a historic wall they need to preserve, 6 feet from the house. The bid included additional problems they may incur, yet to be identified. He had tried to be fair with the bid that was completed at the end of Nov/beginning of December. Prices go up on everything for a builder every 60 days and with the shortage of labor the industry is being crushed. He did not see how this house was deemed historic. There is no way the siding, doors and windows are historic. It is hard to comprehend given the neighboring homes on that street. The builder and the applicant believed if they paid enough money to a structural engineer, he could find something wrong with the home. This project needs to be completed within a budget and a different architect is not affordable. He called for more common sense. He did not see how it was possible for this family to stay in that home.

Board Discussion

The Chair suggested starting with the items under the grounds for demolition starting with the question:

1. Will all economically viable use be deprived without demolition?

Mr. Cotter – Just looking at the pictures, not knowing much more, and how it was presented, there are other uses. The applicant could renovate and add onto the rear of the home. He did not see why nothing can be done without a demolition, economically. He needed to know from the construction side, what made other uses not work.
Ms. Damaser – Agreed. She saw no evidence from the applicants in response to that claim that there were no economically viable alternatives. Plus, there is no evidence to show the property cannot be sold. There is no evidence to show an addition on the rear of the home is not feasible.
Mr. Jewell – The focus on the foundation was not enough; he needed to see more information. He wanted to see if there were other thoughts and ideas that have been successful in other locations in this Historic District. There were no apparent structural issues; it is the unknown of what is underground. He wanted to see conceptual ideas explored. He understood it was a home the applicant wanted for their growing family.
Ms. Cooper – At the last meeting, how the front could be preserved and a subordinate addition be added was discussed. Bringing in informal designs was also discussed to obtain more ideas on how this should be addressed. Everything discussed was recorded from that hearing. She appreciated the applicant's frustration and concerns, but the Board had to follow the Code in place and ensure the requirements were met. For the Board to properly serve the City, they have to follow all of the guidelines and the limit of their abilities.
Mr. Alexander – He concurred with those sentiments. In German Village, there are the same issues with one-and-half story structures that are very old, and have foundation issues along with many other problems. He has seen significant additions to those properties; there is a way to minimize the cost by putting the dollars into the new construction, still retain the original building, and at least retain the character of the streetscape. That was part of the reason for the Board and Staff to encourage the applicant to seek design professionals that can help in Historic Districts. Clearly there are ways the applicant could significantly add to this structure and not sustain the costs presented. He does this work every day and did not find the numbers in the cost estimate the Board was presented with. The benefit is, a foundation on stone is a stable foundation. Even though the foundation is shallow in the existing house, that foundation will not heave. Issues with the frost line are very different when one builds on stone then when built on earth. It does not mean the house cannot be used. There was not enough information to even suggest there could be issues with the foundation. From an architectural point of view, and what was written in the Code, he did not see how this first criteria was met.

2. Will reasonable investment-backed expectations be maintained without demolition?

Mr. Cotter – Today, it is a bit difficult to say, given we do not know what the structure is going to look like and therefore, how to rationalize it.

3. Was economic hardship created by or exacerbated by the owner?

Mr. Alexander – It is clear that if there is economic hardship, it has not been created by the applicant; this does not need to be discussed further. Whether or not the applicant believes this house is a great example of the particular architectural style, is beyond the Board's ability to address formally because of the standards that are being established in the Historic District Criteria. Because that was established for the applicant's structure and many others in the District, the Board follows this procedure.

The Chair – Asked Mr. Shamp, legal counsel, Frost Brown Todd if there was anything the Board had not addressed from his perspective for the three criteria discussed so far or anything he had heard.
Mr. Shamp – Agreed with the applicant that there is not a requirement for submitting any plans. That can be considered under the Subsection in the Code talks about the feasibility of alternative uses. That is a way to show why an alternative use is not feasible. That is the only comment he could make regarding the applicant's comments.

The Chair – The Board could vote on this but his sense was he did not believe the request for demolition was going to be approved. The applicant has the choice to keep this case open and table tonight to return to talk with the Board further at a later date.
Ms. Lyon – Requested clarification for what was being asked of her.
Mr. Albanese – Requested clarification on drawings the Board would like to see.
The Chair – There are a couple of options. If the builder still thinks the demolition is viable, even though this Board has not seen evidence, the applicant could return with a lot more evidence suggesting the demolition is viable. The other option is to vote on this and it is probably not going to pass, the applicant would need to return with design studies for a remodeling plan. It is pretty clear right now, it would be a hard case to make:

1. Because of the standards the Board must follow; and
2. Because there is no evidence of the kind of demolition issues that the Board has seen with other properties.

Mr. Albanese – The applicant did not want the Board to vote this evening, and the applicant will return but he was still not clear on expectations. When they return, did the Board want to see plans or concepts?
Ms. Lyon – Asked if they had to use an architect that had experience with Historic areas.
The Chair – The applicant may select an architect of their choosing. The Board has suggested finding an architect that has experience working in Historic Districts, as it makes the process go a lot easier.
Ms. Lyon – That sounds like she will incur economic hardship because she will have to pay for someone without a guarantee that there will be a smooth process and someone that is more expensive than what she would normally choose for her budget. She was also concerned that she will need to meet with the Board several times to make changes that will cost her too much money.
Mr. Alexander – It is the cost of doing business. The applicant has shown an $800,000 budget. There is a significant amount of documentation that the applicant is proposing for that amount. The architect and the structural engineer are all going to have to prepare and that will be a significant cost out of that budget. The Board has said the applicant is best served selecting someone who has done this kind of work; experience counts.

Ms. Cooper – Clarified that Mr. Alexander was saying the professional with experience in a Historic District will understand the guidelines that are in place. And in this case, the consideration of a subordinate structure, which was discussed at the last meeting, and again today, is still something the Board believes is viable. As a Board, we have not seen enough evidence to support the demolition, as Mr. Alexander has expressed.
Mr. Alexander – As a courtesy, the Board was explaining the applicant has the option to table the case this evening. The applicant proving a demolition is warranted is going to be very difficult.
Mr. Cotter – The Code lays out reasons for a demolition and asks what the risks are if a demolition cannot be approved.
Ms. Lyon – She was concerned if this was an equal process for everyone and would not have to be a "Gazillionaire" to find success in the process. She asked why there is not a designated architect that the Board prefers for the Historic District and pay them to consult, pay them to conduct a tutorial, or have a website that any architect could go to and glean from. She believed she was at a disadvantage for not having unlimited funds.
Ms. Damaser – She told Ms. Lyon that she appreciated her frustration, but applicants and architects alike have access to the Zoning Code and it contains all the information needed. Therefore, any architect could be selected.
Ms. Lyon – There were just seven items in the Code that addressed renovations. Such as the roofline cannot be above the roofline of the original structure. Even though that is in the Code, it may not be true. Three materials are prohibited for additions and one is concrete block. She said that was the significant material used on their original house. At the last meeting, she had asked if the Board would be willing to speak with her architect that was in attendance. Ms. Kramb had stated that is not what the Board does. She stated it was not that they have not tried to find some common ground without having to change their original architect they had selected.
The Chair – There is not much more the Board can say. The applicant has the option to table the case. If the Board votes down the demolition, the applicant can still do an addition or renovation; drawings would be required.
Ms. Lyon – Chose to table and come back another time.

Ms. Damaser moved and Ms. Cooper seconded, to Table the Demolition request for 143 S. Riverview Street at the request of the applicant.

Vote: Mr. Jewell, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; and Ms. Damaser, yes. [Tabling Approved 5-0]

Mr. Cotter – Asked Ms. Holt if there was a process in the Code to appeal whether a structure should be contributing or not.
Ms. Holt – Confirmed that is part of the Code.
Mr. Cotter – Pointed out to the applicant there is a process, if she chose to appeal whether a structure was contributing.

~~*(Cases 2 and 3 were heard together)*~~

~~2. Fox in the Snow at 38 W. Bridge Street, 22-034MPR, Minor Project Review~~

~~The Chair stated this application was a request for exterior modifications to an existing building on a 0.29-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic Core. The site is northwest of the intersection of W. Bridge Street with Darby Street.~~

DocuSign Envelope ID: 05CE65BA-F1DB-4987-9A6E-A93BE6879682

BOARD DISCUSSION
Architectural Review Board
Wednesday, November 17, 2021 | 6:30 pm

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

1. 143 S. Riverview Street
21-157INF **Informal Review**

Proposal:	Demolition of an existing, single-family home and the construction of a new, one-and-a-half story, single-family home. The 0.21-acre site is zoned Historic District, Historic Residential.
Location:	West of S. Riverview Street, ±375 feet south of the intersection with Pinneyhill Lane.
Request:	Informal Review to provide non-binding feedback under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.176 and the *Historic Design Guidelines.*
Applicant:	Lindy and Brad Lyon; and Rob King, Chateaux Designs
Planning Contact:	Sarah T. Holt, AICP, ASLA, Senior Planner
Contact Information:	614.410.4662, sholt@dublin.oh.us
Case Information:	www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/21-157

RESULT: The Board generally did not support the demolition of the existing structure and urged the owner to explore an addition to the rear of the existing structure. The Board stated that the Code's specific demolition criteria will need to be met in order to earn such an approval. Additionally, and relative to the proposed new house, concerns were raised about the front setback, which needs to meet minimum Code requirements and be compatible with surrounding context. Members expressed concern with the setback from the south property line and the potential impact it may have on the existing historic stone wall. The Board suggested coming back for another Informal Review, in more of a sketch format to minimize costs, while allowing additional feedback.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Gary Alexander	Yes
Amy Kramb	Yes
Sean Cotter	Yes
Martha Cooper	Yes
Michael Jewell	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:
Sarah T. Holt
89A2805342A848D...

Sarah Tresouthick Holt, AICP, ASLA
Senior Planner

MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, November 17, 2021

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Alexander, Chair, called the November 17, 2021, meeting of the City of Dublin Architectural Review Board (ARB) to order at 6:32 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Chair led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Board Members present: Mr. Alexander, Ms. Cooper, Mr. Cotter, Ms. Kramb, and Mr. Jewell
Staff present: Ms. Holt, Mr. Ridge, and Ms. Mullinax

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Cooper moved, Ms. Kramb seconded, to accept the documents into the record and to approve the October 20, 2021, meeting minutes.
Vote: Mr. Cotter, yes; Mr. Jewell, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; and Ms. Kramb, yes; and Ms. Cooper, yes. [Motion carried 5-0]

CASE PROCEDURES

The Chair stated the Architectural Review Board is responsible for review of construction, modifications or alterations to any site in the area subject to Architectural Board Review under the provision of Zoning Code §153.170. This Board has the final decision-making responsibility on cases under their purview. Anyone who intends to address the Board on any of the cases this evening will be sworn in. The agenda order is typically determined at the beginning of the meeting by the Chair, who also stated the procedures of the meeting. The case order: 2,3,4,5, and 1. The cases in the minutes follow the order of the published agenda. Anyone that addresses the Board will need to provide their full name and address for the record.

The Chair swore in anyone planning to address the Board on any of the cases to be reviewed.

NEW CASES

1. 143 S. Riverview Street, 21-157INF, Informal Review

The Chair stated this application was a request for demolition of an existing, single-family home and the construction of a new, one-and-a-half story, single-family home. The 0.21-acre site is zoned Historic

District, Historic Residential and is located west of S. Riverview Street, ±375 feet south of the intersection with Pinneyhill Lane.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Holt presented an aerial view of the site with a closer view of the existing detached garage and house, Photographs were shown of the house that the applicant informally requested to be demolished, which is an example of Minimal Traditional architecture, found to be contributing in the elements of location, design, feeling, setting, and association.

The applicant provided 14 photographs of the existing conditions of the structure to discuss in more detail.

Ms. Holt presented the demolition criteria for contributing structures for reference that will be used during the formal request under Zoning Code §153.176(J)(5)(a). The applicant shall demonstrate credible evidence of economic hardship.

1. Will all economically viable use be deprived without demolition?
2. Will reasonable investment-backed expectations be maintained without demolition?
3. Was economic hardship created by/exacerbated by owner?
4. Factors
    a) Current level of economic return
    b) Recent listings of the property
    c) Alternative uses
    d) Evidence of self-created hardship, incl. inadequate maintenance
    e) Knowledge of landmark designation at time of purchase
    f) Economic incentives/funding available

The adjacent structures were identified and mapped as follows:

1. Cottage style, 1 ½ story, directly to the north
2. Modern house of 2 stories (27 feet to the ridge), directly to the south
3. Modern duplex of 1 ½ stories, to the northeast
4. Ranch, single-story directly across from this site
5. Ranch, single-story to the southeast

The house built at 185 S. Riverview Street, two lots down to the south from this site was built at 31 feet, 6 inches measured to the roof.

The proposed site plan was presented for this 0.21-acre site. Demolition of the existing house was requested; the replacement house, including porches creates a 2,880-square-foot footprint, keeping the garage separate. The front setback is 14 feet, 3 inches when 20 feet is required. The south side yard is proposed at 3 feet from the property line but there may be Building Code issues that need to be investigated. The lot coverage is 37% where 45% is the maximum permitted by Code.

Proposed elevations for the east/front and north were presented: board and batten siding, vinyl shake shingles for both gables at the apex, a standing seam metal roof in the front porch area, and asphalt shingles were on the remainder of the structure. The proposed height is 34 feet to the ridge of the roof. Height is measured differently to meet Code and the maximum feet allowed is 24 feet for height in the

district. Proposed elevations for the south and west/rear were presented. The south side is where there may be an issue with Code compliance.

Board Discussion Questions

1. Is the Board supportive of the proposed demolition of the existing house?
2. If the Board is supportive of demolition, is the proposed site layout supported?
3. Is the Board supportive of the massing of the proposed house and the architectural design?
4. Is the Board supportive of the conceptually proposed materials?
5. Are there other considerations by the Board?

Public Comment

There was one letter of concern from a neighbor received.

Applicant Presentation

Brad and Lindy Lyon, property owners of 143 S. Riverview Street, requested to address the earlier photographs presented. Mr. Lyon stated since purchasing the house they have had an inspection and are aware of several issues with deterioration and have considered what it would take to fix these issues. There has been water infiltration causing gapping. The foundation is basically cinderblock wrapped in aluminum siding, which is in rough condition. There is rot underneath the roof where the gutters are located. Renovation has been considered to obtain what the applicant wanted as far as additions, etc. The utilities are captured in the crawl space and the concern was gaining access. The house has been sinking and the utilities in some areas have become partially buried. There is a lot of limestone underneath so it is difficult to consider that is the case. The renovations inside the house required replacing the cast iron plumbing that took making holes in the floor to gain access to that area. There is a lot that needs to be renovated. Inside the house the floor height is only ±seven feet and their desire is for higher ceilings.

Public Comment

Tom Holton, 5957 Roundstone Place, Dublin, Ohio, stated there is a stone wall at the south end between this property at 143 and 179 as one of the most historic stone walls. This area was the site of one of the first three schools built in Dublin. He offered to send the chart of the properties to Ms. Holt. He asked that this stone wall be protected.

Board Discussion

Ms. Kramb – There is not enough information provided to determine if demolition is warranted. There are strict demolition criteria to be met. Much of the problems the applicant showed via photographs, could be repaired. Detailed inspection reports on the foundation, structural problems, roof, a statement on utilities, replacement costs, and quotes on foundation crack repairs are needed. There are plenty of electricians and plumbers that will work in tight crawl spaces.

Mr. Cotter agreed. The Board needs a better understanding of what it would take for the home to be liveable versus completely tearing it down and replacing.

Mr. Jewell – Property line issues have been noted but the utility easement and driveway lines also need to be addressed.

Ms. Cooper – She agreed there is insufficient information provided at this point to judge the demolition request. If the utilities could not be repaired, now that would be significant.

Mr. Alexander – There have been more houses than we would have liked demolished in the Historic District. The Code is specific about what can and cannot be torn down and provides financial limitations. This is considered a contributing structure in the Historic District. Five houses have been demolished since he has been on this Board. Three structures were uninhabitable and had limited value in terms of contributing due to what had been done to the structure(s) by the previous owner(s) of the properties. The house across the street from the applicant on Riverview Street is slated to be demolished. That house has a lot of historical character but the applicant returned with a lot of documentation about the costs of rehabilitating and engineering reports. It is on a hill, which makes it more complicated to resolve foundation issues. The house on Dublin Road that recently came down did not meet the criteria for being a contributing structure to the historic integrity of the district. It was not well-designed or well-built.

Mr. Alexander – The house being considered this evening is contributing and has features that have been judged to be of merit and the overall mass of the house has not been compromised, as far as we can see. For the Board to approve demolition based on the new Code, as well as some approved under the previous Code, there is work yet to be done on the applicant's part.

Ms. Kramb – The 20-foot setback would need to be met in the front. She would not support a Waiver. For site layout, meet the Code. A rear addition was suggested for ease.

Ms. Cooper – She suggested an addition to the structure. The front setback would not be an issue as it is existing. There is an opportunity to maintain and improve a contributing structure in the Historic District.

Mr. Alexander – The house is so close to the southern property line. The applicant's intention to preserve the stone wall, may be an issue of width. A foundation change that close to the wall has the potential to undermine the wall, besides what it would do to that neighbor's property.

Ms. Cooper asked how far the wall extends to the back of the property to which Ms. Kramb answered the wall was on the property line and extends all the way.

Mr. Cotter suggested the proposed structure should be lower in the front but could be higher in the back in context with the neighboring properties. The board and batten proposed to wrap the structure should be broken up with other materials and the windows on the side should be more alike in design.

Mr. Jewell – Height is an issue with the overall massing.

Mr. Alexander – The mass is exaggerated when viewed from the side elevation. The porch on the front helps reduce the massing. Having smaller elements attached to the tallest part is successful at reducing the appearance of mass. A bay window or some sort of projections on the north side was suggested to help reduce the significance to the side elevation. The proposal of the structure today appears enormous compared to the others. He verified the intention is to use vinyl-clad wood windows.

Ms. Lyon requested clarification on the process going forward.
Mr. Alexander – The information requested above needs to be provided and the Board will judge it and address any issues. Submittal does not equate to approval. Staff can assist with deciphering the Code. Public feedback is fine but the Board will evaluate the application based on the merits of the Code and information provided.

Ms. Lyon asked if the Board could provide suggestions on an addition, as this was sought before from contractors and builders who did not agree on additions they had proposed.
Mr. Alexander explained the Board's meeting was not the correct forum to provide that type of information. The idea that Ms. Kramb offered earlier in the meeting was a common practice for homes in the area for additions that are constructed on the back of contributing historic structures and do not exceed the side parameters or overwhelm the original structure. Without seeing a plan proposed, the Board cannot state what will work and what will not and suggested the applicant meet with a design professional.

Ms. Kramb – Staff can be helpful and provide the Historic Guidelines that state what is desirable and acceptable for historic properties and how they have to be subordinate to the original structure. An enclosed hallway connecting two buildings is sometimes an option.

Mr. Alexander – Subordinate does not always mean smaller. A Variance for increasing lot coverage slightly might be achieved to build a house that was sensitive to the original house rather than demolishing the original building and replacing it with a two-story structure. The applicant may return with informal, concept plans to gain the Board's opinion on ideas presented; a full set of plans or renderings is not needed for those types of reviews.

Summarized Comments

- Financial documentation is needed to describe financial hardship.
- The Board would not support a Variance for a front yard setback encroachment.
- Shift the house back at least behind the front setback required.
- Keep the house more to the north, away from the historic stone wall.
- Do not exceed the height limit for massing considerations.
- Do not totally wrap the house in board and batten, as it emphasizes the mass.

~~2. 5707 Dublin Road, 21-163MPR, Minor Project Review~~

~~The Chair stated this application was a request for the installation of a 72-square-foot shed at a historic, single-family home on a 0.75-acre site zoned Planned Unit Development, Llewellyn Farms. The site is ±300 feet north of the intersection of Dublin Road with Hertford Lane.~~

~~Staff Presentation~~

~~Ms. Mullinax presented an aerial view of the site where this historic 'James Davis' home is located, which is outside of the Architectural Review District but is listed on Appendix G, which defers to the Historic District Code. This property appears on the Ohio Historical Inventory and the National Register of Historic Places. A closer view of the property was shown, which once included a spring house and a chicken coop in the rear yard, demolished without City approval by the previous owner. A photograph was taken of the front of the house that was built circa 1840. In May of 2021, the ARB approved a Minor Project for the replacement of windows and a new entry door.~~

~~The proposed 72-square-foot shed will be located in the southwest rear yard behind the asphalt parking area. The shed will have a gravel foundation, which will meet the existing brick walkway and take the place of the previously existing chicken coop location. The shed is set back 24 feet from the southern/side property line, and 80 feet from the western/rear property line, which meet all required setback requirements. The proposed shed is 6 feet wide and 12 feet in length, and 7 feet in height with a gable,~~