



**PRESERVATION DESIGNS, LTD.**  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION - PLANNING - DESIGN  
2624 COLTSBRIDGE DRIVE  
LEWIS CENTER, OHIO 43035  
678-557-8571

# MEMO

To: Sarah T. Holt, AICP, ASLA  
Senior Planner, Planning Dept., City of Dublin

From: Christine Trebellas, AICP, AIA, LEED Green Associate  
Vivian C. Majtenyi, AIA, NCARB  
Historic Preservation Consultants

Date: November 1, 2022 , revised

Re: 83 S High Street; Informal Review of October Submittal, Preservation  
POV

## INTRODUCTION

The City of Dublin Planning Department contacted Preservation Designs LTD to address the suitability of the proposed new addition for 83 South High Street, also known as the Giles Weaver House. The building lies within the Historic District Appendix F, and it is important to address the compatibility of the proposed design within the district as well as the preservation of the character defining features of the building. As always, this review is based upon this reviewer's understanding of the City of Dublin Historic District Zoning District, the City of Dublin's Historic District Code Amendment (2/22/21), and the Preservation, Rehabilitation, and New Construction Guidelines of the City of Dublin's Historic Design Guidelines (HDG). These comments are based on the reviewer's professional experience and judgment regarding historic architecture and preservation projects. However, these comments do not (and cannot) identify every issue that may be of concern to the City of Dublin and its various review boards. As always, the final determination of these issues lies with the City of Dublin.

## BACKGROUND AND DESCRIPTION

Built in the 1830s, the original two-story residence appears to have been a four-bay I-House. The one-story lean-to at the rear is a later addition and created the salt-box appearance of the building. The addition was probably added in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century along, and we theorize a Victorian-style front porch was built as well, as an undated historic photo (see Photo 1). This photo also appears to show one-over-one windows on the I-House portion of the building. These may be the original windows, but it is also possible the windows might have been replaced when the lean-to was built; so, there is no conclusive information at this point indicating what the original I-House windows were. Further archival research shows Federal style, nine-over-nine windows on the I-House with the October 1976 Ohio Historic Inventory form. This, along with other limited historic research, indicates this Victorian-style porch was removed sometime before 1976, along with the

windows and the door surround; and non-operable shutters, nine-over-nine double hung windows and a federal-style door entry surround were added. The current owner referenced a historic photograph dating to the late 19<sup>th</sup> to early 20<sup>th</sup> century and removed these “fake” Federal-style elements sometime between 2012 and 2013. This also returned the building to its vernacular appearance, although with a wider clapboard than was shown in the historical photograph. The wooden recreation of the front porch was added to a pre-existing concrete slab around 2015-2016, based on Google Maps’ Street View Timeline (see “83 South High Street, Dublin OH: Street View Timeline...”, attached) and the Franklin County Auditor’s photos [<link>](#).

The original I-House and the lean-to addition both have a gray metal-seamed roof, noted as tin in the “Self-Guided Walking Tour of the Dublin Historic District”. The I-House portion has a slightly more ornamentation with a plain board boxed cornice under the eaves and along its side-gabled roof, as well as its restored porch with turned columns and spindle-work. The rear historic lean-to addition has a high sloped roofline that extends to just below the I-House’s roof to create the salt-box appearance. A rectangular porch, with less ornamentation, takes up approximately three-quarters of the rear addition’s west elevation. There is also a small bump out on the addition’s north elevation; this mini-structure has a low-sloped roof, appearing to be almost level.

#### THOUGHTS on the PROPOSED DESIGN

Richard Taylor, Architects, created this proposed new addition in mid-October based on the results of an earlier, informal submittal in August. The October submittal included a land survey with maps and the location of the site, existing floor plans and elevations, a new site plan, a building section through the two-story garage comparing it to the previous garage design, four rendered perspective views showing the proposed new addition in relation to the historic structure, and a rendered roof view. This review is limited to only this set of drawings and does not address the earlier submittal.

The proposed new addition consists of multiple pieces connected to the immediate west of the historic lean-to addition, satisfying the requirement that any additions are located to the rear. This results in the removal of the lean-to addition’s covered porch; but as this is the best placement for any addition on this narrow site, it is acceptable. A small one-story “cottage” portion with the new family room and master bedroom runs north-south with its gable roof parallel to that of the original house. Two small recesses in plan, or hyphens, are meant to visually break the addition from the original lean-to addition. However, these hyphens are only approximately 12” deep by 24” wide in plan and should be more substantial (perhaps double in size). Moreover, more attention needs to be paid to the rooflines of the existing structure and proposed new addition. A large cross-gabled roof cricket bridges the eastern half of the “cottage” roof with the lean-to addition’s roof. While not dating to the I-House’s original construction, the lean-to is over a hundred years old and dates to the period of significance of the historic district. As such, it is a contributing element of the property to the historic district and gives the structure its salt-box appearance. This portion of the historic house should not be impacted, but due to the narrow site, a gabled cricket of some sort is needed to adequately channel rainwater. It is highly recommended that this gabled cricket’s apex be lowered a couple of feet to lessen the visual impact on the lean-to addition. It is also important that eaves of the proposed new construction be lower than the existing building to not over-power the historic structure.

The one-and-a-half-story, one-car garage sits west of the “cottage” addition and is connected to the “cottage” by the laundry room. The architect notes that this new, slightly wider garage is the same height as the previously proposed garage, allowing 73” of standing room, presumably for storage. The laundry room

has a low gable roof between the higher gable of the garage and the cross gable of the “cottage” portion of the proposed addition. gable roof. Overall, this area needs more attention; the laundry room bump-out feels awkward, especially on the north elevation. And the roof intersections feel forced—especially the laundry room and the cottage portion of the proposed addition. In addition, the area north of the garage and west of the “cottage” portion of the addition needs definition. It is unclear how this area will be treated (as well as how shared access to the neighboring properties will continue). Are there large windows or doors from the “cottage” portion leading to this area? Hopefully this will be resolved in a future submittal.

Moreover, some of the addition elements have a complexity that could benefit from being simplified. For example, the laundry room could be reduced in size and the bump out could be smoothed out. As mentioned above, the roof plan needs some work. The “cottage” portion’s north/south gable seems to be too close, too parallel to the lean-to’s roof. Instead, try increasing the space between the “cottage” portion of the new construction and the existing lean-to addition. Or consider using a taller element to run East/West on the southern portion of the addition, between the Master Bath and the Laundry Room; provided it can be subordinate to both the I-House and the lean-to historic addition.

It is important that any proposed new addition to be “clearly distinguishable from the original structure,” per the HDG. This first means any addition’s form or placement must not overpower or overcome the original building. In this case, both the original I-House and the late 19th Century lean-to addition are important, as both represent the evolving history of this site. Their forms can help guide the addition’s forms, such as determining the roof slope and matching this slope to the “cottage’s” roof. The architect has made several good design choices, including choosing one story structures with gable roof. However, the materials appear to be a continuation of what the original building’s cladding currently is, even down to its color and cladding dimensions. Choosing a slightly different siding material or one with a different reveal or exposure is one way to make an addition slightly different. For example, the historic structure currently has standard beveled siding; a beveled siding with a different dimension, such as a narrower or wider reveal, would provide a subtle clue that the addition is a separate entity. The same could be said for the roof of the proposed new addition. Having a metal standing seam that is close in tone but has a slightly different spacing of seams would also add a slight visual, textural clue. Another way to differentiate would be to have a different siding material on the garage, perhaps flush horizontal siding or vertical siding. The garage would have historically been considered an outbuilding, and this cladding type is typical of what was used in Dublin historically.

### SUMMARY

Overall, the architect’s design is suitable for an addition to the historic district. However, some elements need to be revised before final approval. From the materials’ presented, it was impossible to determine if the addition’s roof peaks and eaves are lower than the historic lean-to addition, which is recommended to be lowered further. And while the perspective renderings are helpful, they cannot show how different elements align (or not align) with the original building. Without this clarification, it is impossible to approve the drawings as they are currently presented. Based on the suggestions above and with this requirement, we kindly ask that the architect revise and resubmit with this information. And with this later submittal, the architect should include materials, colors, window and door cut-sheets, etc. to determine if these elements are compatible with the historic district.

**PHOTOS**



1. Historic Photo taken of the front of 83 S High, circa 1900 (Photo downloaded from the Movoto website, accessed October 28, 2022 at [https://www.movoto.com/dublin-oh/83-s-high-st-dublin-oh-43017/pid\\_o41bdc5skh/#propertyPop](https://www.movoto.com/dublin-oh/83-s-high-st-dublin-oh-43017/pid_o41bdc5skh/#propertyPop))



2. Construction photo of West Elevation, showing the rear porch, taken some time between 2012 and 2013. (Photo downloaded from Movoto website, accessed October 28, 2022, at [https://www.movoto.com/dublin-oh/83-s-high-st-dublin-oh43017/pid\\_o41bdc5skh/#propertyPop](https://www.movoto.com/dublin-oh/83-s-high-st-dublin-oh43017/pid_o41bdc5skh/#propertyPop))



3. Construction photo taken of the rear of the lean-to, looking northeast, taken between 2012 and 2013 (Photo downloaded from Movoto website, accessed October 28, 2022, at [https://www.movoto.com/dublin-oh/83-s-high-st-dublin-oh43017/pid\\_o41bdc5skh/#propertyPop](https://www.movoto.com/dublin-oh/83-s-high-st-dublin-oh43017/pid_o41bdc5skh/#propertyPop))



4. Construction photo of the front and north elevations, taken between 2012 and 2013, showing the lack of paint where corner boards were placed, as well as the boxed cornice. (Photo downloaded from Movoto website, accessed October 28, 2022 at [https://www.movoto.com/dublin-oh/83-s-high-st-dublin-oh-43017/pid\\_o41bdc5skh/#propertyPop](https://www.movoto.com/dublin-oh/83-s-high-st-dublin-oh-43017/pid_o41bdc5skh/#propertyPop))