

## 17-096ARB/MPR – 109 S. RIVERVIEW

### Site Location

Located on the west side of South Riverview Street, southwest of the intersection with Pinneyhill Lane.

### Proposal

The replacement of existing exterior materials to the original brick portion of an existing 2-story single-family dwelling.

### Zoning

Bridge Street District, Historic Residential

### Property Owner

Gregory Schmitt

### Applicant/Representative

Nathan Sampson, BSD Architects

### Applicable Land Use Regulations

Zoning Code Section 153.066

### Staff Recommendation

Approval with one condition.

### Contents

1. Context Map .....	2
2. Overview .....	3
3. Proposal .....	3
4. Criteria Analysis .....	4
5. Recommendation .....	7

### Case Manager

Lori Burchett, AICP, Planner II  
(614) 410-4656  
[lburchett@dublin.oh.us](mailto:lburchett@dublin.oh.us)

### Summary

The applicant is proposing exterior modifications including window and roof replacement, gutter and downspout installations, and general maintenance repair to an existing single family residence at 109 South Riverview Street within the Historic District.

### Zoning Map



### Next Steps

A recommendation for the Minor Project Review from the Administrative Review Team will be considered by the Architectural Review Board for a final determination. Upon approval the applicant will then be eligible to make the approved modifications.

## 1. Context Map

Located on the west side of South Riverview Street, southwest of the intersection with Pinneyhill Lane.



17-096MPR  
ARB Minor Project Review  
Schmitt Residence  
109 South Riverview Street

0 150 300  
Feet



## 2. Overview

### A. Background

The two-story, single-family residence was constructed in approximately 1827 with an addition in 1842, according to Ohio Historic Inventory file.

A garage addition was approved by the Architectural Review Board in April, 2006 and exterior paint colors were approved in August, 2006. The Board of Zoning Appeals approved a front yard setback variance for the property to allow for the garage addition in April, 2006.

### B. Site Characteristics

#### 1) Natural Features

The site is developed and no natural features exist that would impact the proposed project.

#### 2) Historic and Cultural Facilities

The site is located within the Historic District and is listed in the National Historic Register. It is considered a contributing structure. It is identified as an early Dublin building and the original owner was Charles Sells, son of Dublin's founder. It was enlarged by Dr. Eli Pinney, Dublin's second doctor. Pinney reportedly operated a station on the Underground Railroad. It is Greek Revival style with a gable style roof with and steel seam metal roofing material. According to the OHI file, it was originally built as a single story, or possibly a 1 ½ story house. The second story and kitchen wing were added in 1842 when the Greek Revival boxed cornice was added. The building has 6-over-6 windows with flat jack arches and two end/interior chimneys.

#### 3) Surrounding Land Use and Development Character

- North: BSD – HR: Historic Residential (Single Family)
- East: BSD – HR: Historic Residential (Single Family)
- South: BSD – HR: Historic Residential (Single Family)
- West: BSD – HC: Historic Core (Commercial/Office)

### C. Proposal

The applicant is requesting approval of modifications to the exterior of an existing residential building. The applicant is proposing to replace the roofing with a similar metal roof style, windows (Pella architect reserve series in white), front door (two panel nine light glass door), and gutters and downspouts (half-round in gray) in a period appropriate aesthetic. Minor maintenance repairs are proposed to tuck point the brick exterior and repair damage to soffits and gable end trim.

### D. Consultant Review

A third party consultant reviewed the proposal and provided feedback on the proposed changes. Aside from the front door, the consultant was supportive of the selection of the materials and found the modifications are appropriate to the age and style of the historic building. The consultant stated that the "replacement windows will simulate the appearance of divided lights with putty glaze and use a historical profile" and supports this selection. The consultant supports the selection of the gutter and downspout material in that it is an attractive selection and more in keeping with the profile of the original. The consultant



notes that with the roof selection, care must be taken to match period seam details as much as possible. (*Note: While the consultant is requesting that additional information on the roof be provided, the applicant's architect has stated to staff that this product was the widest seam and closest to the width of the original that could be located. Staff is confident that the material width is appropriate.*) In regards to the front door, the consultant states that "while the current door and transom are not original to the house (according to the owner), they are of a style appropriate to that of the historic home. Ideally, a replacement door should not give an entrance an appearance or character that it never had—applied ornamentation, window glazing, different panel styles, etc. can all change the image of a building and diminish its historic character. The proposed replacement door has additional panels and glazing that are not in keeping with the character of the historic portion of the building." Staff recommends a more appropriate door be selected.

### 3. Site Plan

The site is 0.74-acres and is located at the southwest corner of Pinneyhill Lane and South Riverview Street. The two-story, single family residence fronts South Riverview Street and has an addition to the rear extending along Pinneyhill Lane. Access to an attached garage is off Pinneyhill Lane.



## 4. Criteria Analysis

### A. Minor Project Review Analysis

- 1) **The site plan review shall be substantially similar to the approved basic site plan.**  
Criteria Not Applicable. No basic site plan is associated with this project.
- 2) **If a development plan has been approved that includes the property, the application is consistent with the development plan.**  
Criteria Not Applicable. No development plan is associated with this project.
- 3) **The application meets all applicability requirements of 153.059 and 153.062-153.065 except as may be authorized by administrative departure(s) or waiver(s) pursuant to divisions (H) and (I) of this section, respectively.**  
Criteria Met. The project meets the necessary code requirements.
- 4) **The internal circulation system and driveways provide safe and efficient access for residents, occupants, visitors, emergency vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians.**  
Criteria Not Applicable. No alterations to the site are being proposed.
- 5) **The relationship of buildings and structures to each other and to other facilities provides for the coordination and integration of the development within the surrounding area and the larger community and maintains the image of Dublin as a high quality community with a commitment to exemplary planning and design.**  
Criteria met. This proposed materials and colors are consistent with the surrounding character.
- 6) **The application is consistent with the requirements for types, distribution, and suitability of open space in 153.064 and the site design incorporates natural features and site topography to the maximum extent practicable.**  
Criteria Not Applicable. No open space is proposed as part of this project.
- 7) **The scale and design of the proposed development allows the adequate provision of services currently furnished by or that may be required by the city or other public agency including, but not limited to, fire and police protection, public water and sanitary sewage services, recreational activities, traffic control, waste management, and administrative services.**  
Criteria Not Applicable. No new structures or site alterations are proposed.
- 8) **Stormwater management systems and facilities will not cause alterations that could increase flooding or water pollution on or off site, and removal of surface waters will not adversely affect neighboring properties.**  
Criteria Not applicable. No site alterations or impervious surfaces are proposed.

- 9) **If the development is to be implemented in phases, each phase is able to be considered independently, without the need for further phased improvements.**

Criteria Not applicable. No phases are proposed with this project.

- 10) **The application demonstrates consistency with commonly accepted principles of walkable urbanism as described in 153.057 and 153.058, the five Bridge Street District Vision Principles, community plan, and other related policy documents adopted by the city.**

Criteria Met. No site alterations are proposed as part of this project and the material selection is compatible with the context of the surrounding development.

#### **B. General Review Standards**

- 1) **The character and materials are compatible with the context.**

Criteria met with condition. The proposed materials and palette is appropriate for the character of the existing structure.

- 2) **Recognition and respect of historical or acquired significance.**

Criteria met with condition. The proposed materials and palette complement the existing color palette and architectural details of the structure. The repairs will improve the integrity of structure and be in character with the historical context of the residence.

- 3) **Compatible with relevant design characteristics.**

Criteria met with condition. This proposal is compatible and consistent with the existing aesthetic and maintains the historic integrity of the residence.

- 4) **Appropriate massing and building form.**

Criteria no applicable. No new structures are proposed.

- 5) **Appropriate color scheme.**

Criteria met. The proposed colors are appropriate and meet the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* for the age of the structure.

- 6) **Complementary sign design.**

Criteria not applicable. No new signs are proposed.

- 7) **Appropriate landscape design.**

Criteria not applicable. No landscaping is proposed.

- 8) **Preservation of archaeological resources.**

Criteria not applicable. No archaeological resources are associated with this site.

#### **C. Alterations to Buildings, Structure, and Site**

- 1) **Reasonable effort to minimize alteration of buildings and site.**

Criteria met with condition. Minor exterior modifications are proposed and no additions or alterations are proposed that would reduce the historical integrity of the existing residence.

- 2) **Conformance to original distinguishing character.**

Criteria met with condition. The proposed materials and color palette are appropriate for the character and design of the existing structure and are consistent with the period details of Greek Revival building.

**3) Retention of historic building features and materials.**

Criteria met. The applicant is proposing to repair soffits and gable end trims, and the color selection is compatible with the surrounding development and existing historic residence.

**4) Alteration recognizes historic integrity and appropriateness.**

Criteria met with condition. The proposed changes are compatible with the surrounding character of the district and of the existing historic residence.

**5) Recognition and respect of historical or acquired significance.**

Criteria met with condition. The proposed changes are compatible with the surrounding character of the district.

**6) Sensitive treatment of distinctive features.**

Criteria met. The proposed changes are compatible with the surrounding design and character of the district. The materials selection is appropriate to maintain the historic character and repairs are being made to maintain existing architectural features.

**7) Appropriate repair or replacement of significant architectural features.**

Criteria met. Repairs will be made to salvage and repair significant features.

**8) Sensitively maintained historic building materials.**

Criteria met with condition. The materials selection is appropriate to maintain the historic character and repairs are being made to maintain existing architectural features.

## 5. Recommendation

### ART Recommendation

The proposed Minor Project Review is consistent with all of the applicable review criteria.

**Approval** is recommended with one condition:

- 1) That the applicant work with staff to select a more architecturally and period appropriate door.