

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 8795-1		2.County FRANKLIN		4.Present Name(s) FRANKLIN RANCHES		<input type="checkbox"/> CODED <input type="checkbox"/> CODED	
3.Location of Negatives CITY OF DUBLIN				5.Historic or Other Name(s)			
Roll No. 8		Picture No.(s) 11-12					
6.Specific Address or Location FRANKLIN				16. Thematic Association(s)		28. No. of Stories 1	
6a. Lot, Section or VMD Number				17. Date(s) or Period C. 1950'S		29. Basement? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
7.City or Village If Rural, Township & Vicinity DUBLIN				18. Style or Design <input type="checkbox"/> High Style <input type="checkbox"/> Elements		30. Foundation Material CONC. BLOCK ?	
8. Site Plan with North Arrow W. BRIDGE RANCHES FRANKLIN ON BOTH SIDES S. HIGH ST.				18a. Style of Addition or Elements(s)		31. Wall Construction WOOD FRAME	
9. U.T.M. Reference Quadrangle Name multiple properties Zone Easting Northing				19. Architect or Engineer		32. Roof Type & Material HIP/ASPH. SHINGLE	
10. <input type="checkbox"/> Site <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Building <input type="checkbox"/> Structure <input type="checkbox"/> Object				19a. Design Sources		33. No. of Bays Front 3 Side 2	
11. On National Register? NO				20. Contractor or Builder		34. Exterior Wall Material(s) /STONE/STUCCO	
12. N.R. Potential?				21. Building Type or Plan RANCH		35. Plan Shape IRREG.	
13. Part of Estab. Hist. Dist? Yes				22. Original Use, if apparent RESIDENCE		36. Changes <input type="checkbox"/> Addition <input type="checkbox"/> Altered (Explain In #42) <input type="checkbox"/> Moved	
14. District Potential?				23. Present Use RESIDENCE		37. Window Types <input type="checkbox"/> 6 over 6 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 over 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 over 2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other	
15. Name of Established District (N.R. or Local) DUBLIN HISTORIC DISTRICT				24. Ownership <input type="checkbox"/> Public <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Private		38. Building Dimensions	
				25. Owner's Name & Address, if known		39. Endangered? No By What?	
				26. Property Acreage		40. Chimney Placement CENTER/RIDGE	
				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) Collection of 1950s ranch homes with shallow hipped rooflines, stone, stucco and brick materials, picture windows, corner windows, small porches and both attached and detached garages as typical features.							
43. History and Significance (Continue on reverse if necessary) This street was developed during the post WWII-era and differs dramatically from High Street with its historic 19th century buildings. Yet, the street retains its cohesive visual character because of the repetition of the building type.							
44. Description of Environment and Outbuildings (See #52) The houses are located along a single street with landscaped front yards and driveways.						46. Prepared by NANCY RECCHIE	
45. Sources of Information observation						47. Organization BDR&C	
						48. Date Recorded in Field 5/03	
						49. Revised by	
						50. Date Revised	
						50b. Reviewed by	

FRA - 8795-1

FRANKLIN

FRANKLIN RANCHES

FRANKLIN ST.

Parcel 273-000127 **Address** 86 Franklin St **OHI** FRA-8795-1

Year Built: 1961	Map No: 128	Photo No: 1971-1973 (7/11/16)
Theme: Domestic	Historic Use: Single family house	Present Use: Single family house
Style: Ranch	Foundation: Not visible	Wall Type: Frame
Roof Type: Hipped/asphalt shingle	Exterior Wall: Faux stone/brick	Symmetry: No
Stories: 1	Front Bays: 3	Side Bays: 3
Porch: Recessed corner porch on façade	Chimney: 1, Exterior, off ridge on southwest corner	Windows: Replacement casements and jalousie

Description: The one-and-one-half-story Ranch-style house has a Z-plan footprint. The exterior of the house is clad in faux-stone on the façade, and brick on the side elevations. The roof is sheathed in asphalt shingles. The front door is sheltered by a recessed porch on the façade. Windows on the façade include two configurations with a fixed center-light, flanked by operable sashes. Other windows include metal-framed jalousies.

Setting: The property is located on the east side of Franklin Street. The lawn is shaded by mature trees and floral foundation plantings encircle the house.

Condition: Good

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

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

Historical Significance: The property is within the boundaries of the City of Dublin's local Historic Dublin district. The Franklin Street neighborhood, with this property as a contributing resource, is recommended for inclusion within the recommended Dublin High Street Historic District, boundary increase. Relevant eligibility criteria are Criterion A, for mid-century residential growth in the village of Dublin, and Criterion C, for its architectural character.

District: Yes Local Historic Dublin district **Contributing Status:** Recommended contributing
National Register: Recommended Dublin High Street Historic District, boundary increase **Property Name:** N/A



86 Franklin St, looking east



86 Franklin St, looking southeast

enclosure needs to be attractive. Mr. Woods said the enclosure may be a treated wood fence. Ms. Husak said Staff needs to know what it is proposed and when the permanent structure will be built. She said a condition can be added to speak to the timing of the permanent structure. Mr. Woods said they could also use plant material for temporary screening.

Ms. Husak said foundation plantings have not been provided and they are required. Mr. Woods asked if she was referring to the north side. Ms. Husak said Bridge Park Avenue has not had any but maybe the applicant could get there with the streetscape elements. Mr. Woods indicated they intend for the tenant space to the west will put their statement on it.

Mr. McNally explained why they are requesting a Waiver for floor to floor height.

Ms. Husak noted the signs will be addressed later.

Ms. Husak indicated the Commission was pleased with the open space that was accomplished with the pool being eliminated. She said it is a great amenity and makes the street successful. She inquired about the open space with the benches and trees and how the ART felt about that programming.

Ms. Husak said she will provide a list of needs from the applicant but the timing is tight with the holidays.

Mr. McNally requested feedback from the ART on the general architecture. Mr. Papsidero said it was well designed. Mr. McNally said he wanted to make sure there would be no significant changes needed due to the tight schedule and Ms. Husak indicated she did not anticipate that happening.

Mr. McNally asked for the ART's first impression of the alternate material. Mr. Stanford asked if it would appear different in sheen. Mr. Fagrell asked the applicant if they will use a flat paint. Mr. Meyers said they try to fight the impact of the sun and glare. Mr. Fagrell asked the applicant if they were satisfied with the performance of the material. Mr. Meyers answered it is a new product and they are relying on the testing that has been done. He added it will have a baked on finish and painting on site of the finished product is better than if the product was pre-finished.

Ms. Husak said she was concerned about this tight schedule. She said there are a lot of small details that need to be sifted through and is not sure how realistic the timeline is to be able to turn this around with the holidays in between. She said planning to go to the PZC for review on January 17, 2019, is unrealistic. Mr. Meyers agreed that the timing around the holidays was challenging. He said they are comfortable pushing this back to the February 7, 2019 Commission meeting but wanted to keep the plat for Block F on the January 17, 2019 meeting.

Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any other questions or concerns regarding this proposal. [Hearing none.]

INTRODUCTION

3. BSD HR – 86 Franklin Street 18-075ARB-MPR

Minor Project Review

Nichole Martin said this application is a proposal for exterior modifications and associated site improvements to an existing home located on a 0.36-acre site zoned Bridge Street District, Historic Residential. She said the site is east of Franklin Street, approximately 350 feet north of the intersection with John Wright Lane. She said this is a request for a review and approval of a Demolition and Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066, 153.170, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Ms. Martin presented an aerial view of the site as well as site context to show how the character of the homes in this area varies significantly. She presented photographs of the existing conditions as viewed from Franklin Street (front) and the rear from Mill Lane. She described the residence as a mid-century structure with a faux stone front façade, orange-red brick on the other three sides and windows with white or silver frames on each elevation. She said there are a couple of entrances on different levels of the structure. She noted the stone retaining wall along the driveway and said the applicant plans to shift it and provide a new asphalt drive at the rear of home.

Ms. Martin presented the proposed site plan and reported a survey has been completed. She explained the applicant is proposing to move the retaining wall to allow for a large deck and additional lawn. She said the shift to the retaining wall will decrease the width of the driveway extending to Mill Lane. She stated due to the site changes a couple of trees will be removed from the site.

Ms. Martin presented a photograph of the existing front façade (Franklin Street) next to the proposed image for a side-by-side comparison. She said the existing front door is a light, yellowish color that was very popular for mid-century architecture but the applicant is proposing a new front door with craftsman character in a dark brown color. She asked the ART to consider if that change would be appropriate. She said the applicant is also proposing to replace the two existing windows on the front with black-framed windows that are the same size. She said the existing stone post at the front door will be refaced with cedar but the other faux stone on the front façade will remain. She said the applicant would like to paint all the brick a white color, which is on three sides of the structure.

Ms. Martin pointed out that there is an exterior stairwell/tower, which the applicant has proposed to decrease its size to make room for the deck. She said originally the applicant proposed the tower to be clad in brown cedar but Staff recommended that if the structure is painted white, the tower should be painted the same so there is less contrast and provided an image for demonstration. She said the other option could be for going back to the original plan of having a cedar tower if the brick was not permitted to be painted and provided that image. She noted in the report from the historic preservation consultant that she recommended not painting the brick.

Jody Wunderlich, Windsor Homes LLC, said the brick on this structure is orange and it is unattractive so that is why they want to paint it. She said all the brick on the house next door is painted. Ms. Martin said the Architectural Review Board is the final reviewing body and they generally come from a preservation standpoint, therefore, the brick should not be painted. She said Staff is trying to prepare the applicant for their review. Ms. Wunderlich said the house next door is painted tan and not white. Brad Fagrill asked if painting was the issue or if a color other than white needed to be proposed. Ms. Martin said painting brick on a historic home is the issue as a practice, not necessarily the color. Ms. Wunderlich asked if the ARB had approved the painted brick for the house next door. Jennifer Rauch said it may or may not have been approved by the ARB.

Ms. Martin said when an exterior change like that is desired, the owner is required to gain approval from the ARB. She said in preparation for the ARB's review, the applicant will need to provide scaled elevations for each façade with all the details included. Ms. Rauch said the ARB will need a more cohesive package and recommended the applicant prepare a comparison between the existing and the proposed plans, which will need to be labeled for clarity. She said it is Staff's and the ART's job to help applicants be successful by gaining approval.

Ms. Wunderlich said she did not select the front door because it was a Craftsman style, they selected it because the vertical windows in it would match the other windows on the front. She said their intention is to modernize it in 2018/almost 2019 and they do not want to keep the light yellowish door. Ms. Martin said

that is a mid-century color. Vince Papsidero said the applicant does not have to use the same exact door, just select one from that period. He said the ARB will appreciate consistency in terms of the window designs but mixing and matching styles is a slippery slope. Ms. Rauch said the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* speak to that as well.

Ms. Martin said it is always a concern when an applicant wants to modernize the outside of a structure in the Historic District whereas there is no issue to modernize the inside. She encouraged the applicant to stay within the mid-century period for the exterior but to use a variety of style and color.

Ms. Martin asked about access to the proposed deck. Ms. Wunderlich said they are replacing some of the rear windows with sliding glass doors to access the deck from the inside. She said they are replacing all the windows with new, framed in black but all the same size.

Ms. Martin said the applicant will need to provide a treatment to finish off the bottom of the deck as it appears unfinished in the renderings.

Ms. Martin noted there were three doors on the exterior of the structure and they were all being proposed different and the applicant should look into using similar styles. Mr. Papsidero said the materials are too arts and crafts style, and the proposed color scheme is colonial. He encouraged the applicant to do some research on styles and to decide on one so they know what style is most appropriate for the home.

Ms. Martin asked why the front column was being changed to cedar. She said normally, there are no more than three exterior materials proposed and suggested the applicant limit the contrast.

Ms. Rauch asked what the ART thought of painting the brick. Mr. Papsidero asked what is happening on the rest of the street. He asked if maybe the ART would be setting a precedent by allowing the brick to be painted.

Mr. Papsidero asked if there were any other questions or concerns regarding this proposal. [Hearing none.]

Ms. Wunderlich said she noted all of the ART's suggestions and recommendations and would consider the changes.

ADJOURNMENT

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any additional administrative issues or other items for discussion. [There were none.] He adjourned the meeting at 4:00 pm.

As approved by the Administrative Review Team on January 17, 2019.