

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

MEETING MINUTES

MAY 23, 2012

AGENDA

- 1. Bridge Street Corridor Code
(Presentation and Discussion Only)**
- 2. Historic Dublin Design Guidelines Update Work Plan
(Presentation and Discussion Only)**

William Souders called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Board members present were Robert Schisler, Bob Dyas, and Tom Currie. Tasha Bailey was absent. City representatives present were Council member Marilee Chinnici-Zuercher, Eugenia Martin, Jennifer Rauch, and Libby Farley.

Administrative Business

Council member Marilee Chinnici-Zuercher administered Oaths of Office to newly appointed Board member Bob Dyas and reappointed Board member Robert Schisler. She then made a few remarks regarding the importance of the Architectural Review Board and the responsibilities of the Board position.

Motion and Vote

William Souders made the motion, seconded by Robert Schisler, to adjourn into Executive Session to discuss election of Chair and Vice Chair. The vote was as follows: Mr. Dyas, yes; Mr. Currie, yes; Mr. Schisler, yes; and Mr. Souders, yes. (Approved 4 – 0.)

[The meeting was reconvened.]

Motion and Vote

Tom Currie nominated and made the motion, seconded by William Souders, to elect Robert Schisler as the 2012-2013 Chair of the Architectural Review Board. The vote was as follows: Mr. Dyas, yes; Mr. Schisler, yes; Mr. Souders, yes; and Mr. Currie, yes. (Approved 4 – 0.)

Motion and Vote

Robert Schisler nominated and made the motion, seconded by William Souders, to elect Bob Dyas as the 2012-2013 Vice Chair of the Architectural Review Board. The vote was as follows: Mr. Dyas, yes; Mr. Schisler, yes; Mr. Souders, yes; and Mr. Currie, yes. (Approved 4 – 0.)

[Mr. Schisler assumed the role of Chair as the meeting continued.]

Motion and Vote

William Souders made the motion, seconded by Bob Dyas, to accept the documents into the record. The vote was as follows: Mr. Schisler, yes; Mr. Currie, yes; Mr. Dyas, yes; and Mr. Souders, yes. (Approved 4 – 0.)

Motion and Vote

William Souders made the motion, seconded by Bob Dyas, to approve the March 28, 2012, meeting minutes as presented. The vote was as follows: Mr. Schisler, yes; Mr. Currie, yes; Mr. Dyas, yes; and Mr. Souders, yes. (Approved 4 – 0.)

Communications

Eugenia Martin reported the Dublin City Council adopted the Bridge Street Corridor Zoning Code Amendment on March 26, 2012 and approved the area rezonings to Bridge Street Corridor zoning districts on April 9, 2012, which became effective on May 9, 2012. She said the area is now officially referred to as the Bridge Street District, instead of Corridor. She pointed out the final draft of the Code was included with the Newsletter and should be inserted between pages 204 and 205 in the Board's Zoning Code binders.

Jennifer Rauch suggested the Definition section be inserted after Page 112(B). She said when codified, new pages will be distributed to replace the green pages.

Ms. Martin announced Senior Planner Carson Combs had resigned on May 4, 2012 after 14 years with the City to devote more time to his family and Mockingbird Meadows farm business.

Tom Currie referred to outstanding maintenance issues within the District and said there seemed no real buy-in to what the Board and the City is attempting to do as far as making it a historic district with character and pride. He suggested a booth on Thursday nights. He asked what could be done to explain what the City and the ARB is trying to accomplish.

Ms. Martin said dumpster doors left open are Code Enforcement issues that Planning needs to be made aware of so that a Code inspector can contact the owners. She said in regards to the goals and objectives of the City for the Historic District and the entire Bridge Street District, and how the message is carried forward, she thought there were opportunities over the next months as they begin with the implementation of the Bridge Street Code, the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* update, and other projects moving forward. She said a newsletter is being compiled by Planning to update business owners on things the City is doing, initiatives and things to look out for in conjunction with communications with the Historic Dublin Business Association. Ms. Martin offered to take back and discuss any suggestions about what might be able to be done.

Ms. Rauch explained that a District 'sweep' is being conducted in the District by the Deputy City Manager, the Planning Director, and the Chief Building Officer on a regular basis to make sure that everything is taken care of and to identify solutions of how to fix things.

1. Bridge Street Corridor Code

Eugenia Martin presented a review of the approved Bridge Street Code and the Architectural Review Board (ARB) process. She said the Board process remains the same as it exists with a more expedited timeline. She said it was not mandatory for any projects within the Historic Core, Historic Residential, or Historic Transition Districts to go through the Administrative Review Team (ART) pre-application review. She said that Planning asks potential applicants for a preliminary discussion on what they are considering in order to provide guidance on what they will need to do in order to move forward.

Ms. Martin explained the ART was an internal review team consisting of the directors from all the departments. She said they meet every Thursday to review new projects coming in or to get a preliminary introduction to the project so that they know what to expect. Jennifer Rauch explained that anyone could attend the ART meeting, but it was not advertised publically.

Mr. Currie asked if it would be beneficial for the Board members to attend an Architectural Review Team meeting. Ms. Rauch said the ART meeting was an evolving process at this time. She suggested waiting to see how it works and to maybe revisit the topic. She said the Board will be provided a recommendation from the ART with comments about what is met or not met, and what their recommendation is when the application comes before the Board.

Mr. Currie said it looked like the ARB might become just a rubber stamp. Ms. Martin said not necessarily. She said effectively, it is what they have been doing for a long time, but this formalizes the process. She explained there are many things that happen on the front end before the Board sees an application, and the recommendations made in the Planning Reports are based upon those internal meetings and conversations. She reiterated that it was just a more formalized process. She said the decisions and recommendations are not made in a vacuum. She explained that when a project comes through for building permits, they all have to be on the same page and know what is going on because if they are not, it could go the wrong direction.

Ms. Martin said if a pre-application meeting is chosen or not, the next step would be a pre-application review, which means that when an application is submitted, the ART has 14 days to complete their review and give back comments and recommendations. Ms. Rauch said the basic plan is very similar to the concept plan or an informal, where Planning and the ART would provide information about whether they were meeting the big picture items of the Bridge Street Code, and then if they move forward, these are the things that should be addressed.

Ms. Martin said the recommendations from the ART to the Board could be approved as submitted, approved with conditions, or denied. She explained that if denied, at that point, the applicant has to do a resubmittal. She said after the Basic Plan Review, if it has been approved or approved with conditions, the applicants will come back and submit a development plan, a site plan, or both. She said at that point, it comes back for an ART review within 28-days, and then recommendations are forwarded to the ARB, similar to what is done now. Ms. Martin said after an approval is received, the application can move forward for Building Permits.

Robert Schisler said when he first read this, it seemed like the ARB had no responsibility, but as it was explained, he understood they had a lot of responsibility. Ms. Martin said the ARB still had basic governing review of anything within the Historic Core, Historic Residential, or Historic Transition and conditional uses and rezoning, just as they always have been.

Ms. Martin explained the intent of the Development Plan Review was to make sure proposals meet the basic Street Network as well as the Lots and Blocks requirements identified in the Bridge Street Code. She said the Board would not look at any of the details of the proposal until the Site Plan, just the basic framework of the proposal. She said also during the Development Plan any potential waivers that might be requested may be identified. She said they could be unique site conditions which require deviations while still meeting the intent and spirit of the Code. Ms. Martin said the Board can approve or make recommendations for approval for waivers to a Development Plan. She said previously, the applicant would have to go before the Board of Zoning Appeals and receive a variance from whatever the requirement was, and now the Board has the ability to make the decision if they feel that it is within the intent of meeting the Bridge Street Code.

Mr. Currie asked what the Vision Plan was. Ms. Rauch said the Vision Plan, adopted by City Council in October 2010, was what kicked off the entire Bridge Street Code. Ms. Martin asked the Board members to let her know if they do not have their copy of the Vision Plan. Mr. Souders asked about the two new bridges shown. Ms. Rauch said the details and timing for any bridges at this point was unknown.

Ms. Martin said the Board will review Site Plans and Waivers. She said that as a proposal comes forward with recommendations from the ART, the report will talk about uses, whether it meets the proposed use that is approved for the district it is in and if it is an existing use, whether it has expanded beyond 50 percent, at which point, it must come into compliance.

Ms. Martin said they also will begin to get more in depth with Lots and Blocks, looking into internal circulation for pedestrians, and connectivity with connector streets and alleys, and the design of the roadways, including existing roadways and how they might have accommodated any sidewalks internally to the site. She said it was going to be adherence to the street network, so when it moves forward as a

development plan, then they are making sure the more in-depth plan is meeting the approved site plan. She said it makes sure whatever was presented earlier still met the intents of those plans.

Ms. Martin said there are four building types applicable for Board review which are the Historic Mixed Use, Historic Cottage Commercial, Civic Building, and Parking Structure. She said the Board will review anything in the Historic Residential, Historic Core, or Historic Transition Districts. She said materials, roofs, fenestration on the building, articulation of the façade, and so forth will be looked at in depth. Ms. Martin said that within the Code, there is information on the building type and where it might be approved for which district and for what use. She said it would also talk about the different requirements in the Required Building Zone (RBZ), where stoops might be able to encroach, occupancy along the façade of the frontage, transparency, and so forth.

Ms. Martin said it also talks about existing uses and existing structures. She said existing structures are allowed to expand up to 50 percent of the current approved footprint. She said if the structure expands beyond 50 percent, it is required to come into compliance with the Bridge Street Code. She said if it was under 50 percent, it will be reviewed against the guidelines that are part of the ARB Code that has been used to date as far as reviewing proposals that come forward.

Ms. Martin said they also will be looking at neighborhood standards as far as some of the place making elements. She said there are standards there that they want to maintain, such as gateways, greenways, connections, open spaces, and so forth. She said there are various types of open spaces that are included, and there are recommendations that will be brought forward from the ART as far as the appropriateness of the open space and locations, making sure that they meet the intent of the Vision Plan.

Ms. Martin explained that Site Plan Waivers will be up to the Board to make a determination of approval if they feel they are within the intent and appropriate as part of the overall approval of any proposals within those areas.

Ms. Martin said they will begin talking about Site Development Standards and Parking. She said changes within the Code can be reviewed, talking about shared parking incentives, bicycle parking, urban-style landscaping, and signs. She said the ARB will always review any signs coming forward that are within the District. She said if they meet all the intents of the Code (Pages 99 through 105), something else that could happen would be a Master Sign Plan which might deviate from what is approved within the Code. She said it could be for example, because all the PUDs in the District have gone away with the area rezoning, there was a Town Center I Sign and Graphics Plan all those signs are wood, green back, with gold trim, and could be either a wall or a projecting sign. She said under the new Code, they would be permitted to have a wall sign and a projecting sign, and would not be limited to those colors or shapes. Ms. Martin explained that the whole building could come to ARB with a Master Sign Plan on where they might want signs located, shapes, and so forth. Mr. Schisler asked if an individual business in the Town Center I building could come for a new sign approval. Ms. Martin said one tenant in the building could request a new sign that met the Code, but they were not required to do a Master Sign Plan.

Ms. Rauch assured the Board that Planning would be very clear in the formatting of the Report in what the Board is to be reviewing so that they can understand it. She asked if the Report was not clear, to let Planning know so that they can make sure that it is made as easy and painless as possible for the Board.

Mr. Souders asked if there is any major difference as far as the Historic District was concerned. Ms. Rauch said there will be an easier transition in the Historic District than for other areas because there are more specific requirements in the Bridge Street Code for those properties that would have to meet the Code than there are currently.

Mr. Souders asked how that would change under the new Code. Ms. Rauch said depending on the building type, there are specific requirements in the Bridge Street Code that have to be met like including particular fenestration or windows. She said they could chose how they want to handle that, but the Code is fairly clear about what has to be provided.

Mr. Souders asked if the Code was specific to the Historic District. Ms. Rauch said it was like that for all the districts. Mr. Souders asked if people are being asked to do something to buildings in the Historic District that is not historic. Ms. Martin explained new construction or an expansion greater than 50 percent, must come into compliance. She said there is a caveat that if it is a historic structure, and they are expanding it beyond 50 percent, at that point, that is where there is going to be a discussion from the Board. She said that potentially it could be a waiver from the historic structure itself maintaining its character and the rest of it coming into compliance with the Bridge Street Code.

Ms. Rauch explained that it could also be vice versa if the Board found that what was being proposed was not historic and did not meet that. She said she did not know exactly how that would be handled, but she assumed there was a way to make sure the Board felt it preserves the historic intent and historic design. She said that was the goal.

Mr. Souders noted that the Historic District tends to have many more simple details, whereas the things that imitate historic tend to have a lot more gingerbread details added. Ms. Rauch said that it tells you that you have to have windows or some transparency, but it does not tell you that you have to have gingerbread on every house. She said it just lays the groundwork that you will have to have a window or an opening for every 'X' linear feet of building frontage. She said how handle that with their building, they are at liberty to do. She said if the applicant does not feel it would meet that, then a waiver would be a way they could request it because they think that it meets historic intent without providing whatever the requirement would be.

Ms. Martin said the building types identified in the Code are in keeping with the character of what exists in the historic area. She said the only place Historic Cottage and Historic Mixed Use can be located is within the Historic Core. She added that also, the Historic Mixed Use can also be permitted in Historic Transition to mimic and compliment what is already there as far as transparency requirements. Ms. Martin said when looking at the building type requirements, it tells what is needed; a pitched or flat roof; building materials, standing metal seam, shingles, so forth; or if it is going to be a window, what does it look like as far as what material it is. She said it was not different from what is currently identified in the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Mr. Souders said on the surface, it almost sounded like the Bridge Street Code is trumping the Historic District. Ms. Rauch said that was not the intent, and she did not think they would find that was the case. She said it was just encouraging applicants to do more of the details that would already be found there, and making them required. Mr. Sounders suggested examples could highlight what they were discussing. He asked if examples would be coming this summer.

Ms. Martin said there had been four or five Bridge Street calls received by Planning within the Historic Core or Historic Residential and one for a site on Sawmill Road. She pointed out that the Bridge Street Historic Residential has effectively remained the same as the previous zoning of Historic Residential. She said however, there were three or four types of zoning in business/commercial area along South High Street and West Bridge Street. She said all of them are now Historic Core so everyone will be on the same playing field. She said before, they were dealing with different types of setbacks, parking requirements, and so forth.

Ms. Rauch clarified that up to the 50 percent threshold, the site can be built out if the previous zoning requirements or the Bridge Street Code is met. She explained that there could be some non-conforming status with that 50 percent. Ms. Rauch said that you do not have to meet the Bridge Street Code up to the 50 percent.

Mr. Schisler asked if the Board will have to decide which they are supposed to follow. Ms. Rauch said that everything that the Board sees will be reviewed and a recommendation will be made by the ART. She said it should be very straightforward what the Board is reviewing and what the Board's goal is, and if it is not, they should let Planning know so that they can make sure that it is clear.

Mr. Souders asked for a general review regarding signs. Ms. Martin said that anyone with frontage on High Street or West Bridge Street shall be permitted to have two signs on the front façade, and if they have access to rear parking, similar to what they have now, then they can have a sign on the rear as well. She explained the front façade could be a wall sign and a projecting sign, or an awning sign and a projecting sign, or a window sign. She said projecting and wall sign size went from six to eight square feet in area. Ms. Martin said three colors were still permitted, however if there is a recognized logo with multiple colors, the logo itself becomes one of those three colors, no matter how many colors are in the logo. She said different sign shapes are now permitted.

Mr. Souders asked if the logo itself would be limited in size so that it would not be the whole sign. Ms. Rauch said it is written as 20 percent of the total permitted square footage. She said if they were permitted ten square feet and chose to use for example the Starbucks logo, it could only be two-square-feet of a ten-foot-square sign. She emphasized the logo could not be the whole sign. Mr. Souders said if someone in the Historic District came in with a crazy multiple-colored logo, only 20 percent of their sign could be the logo. Ms. Rauch clarified that the logo was limited to 20 percent.

Ms. Martin pointed out that also added was guidance on sandwich boards; that they had to be either a white board or chalkboard, limited in size to six square feet, three feet high, taken in every night, and located within six feet of the entrance. Mr. Souders asked if plywood painted white would be permitted. Ms. Rauch said the Code said sandwich board signs may include chalkboard and white board. She said the point was to encourage those things, but it could be other materials. Mr. Dyas asked if the Brazenhead sandwich sign was permitted to be displayed at 10 p.m. Ms. Martin said it was permitted only when they were open.

Ms. Martin said awning signs and directory signs are addressed in the new Code, and additional display definitions have been added. Mr. Souders asked if anything had been done about the conglomerates like MasterCard in terms of being able to put all that onto on a menu sign, as opposed to oddly putting that on a glass door or in the window all the special 'For Sale,' 'MasterCard,' 'Visa,' and 'Yes, We Are Open/Closed' signs. Ms. Rauch said it was not as clean and tidy as was originally recommended by the Board. She said that directory and display signs were addressed, but the Code does not specify what can and cannot be on them. Mr. Souders asked if in the Historic District, they would continue to see credit cards signs of all sizes in addition to approved signs in all different types of locations. Ms. Rauch said unfortunately, they would still see those signs. Ms. Rauch said the time to regulate that and trying to ensure how that happened and how you write it and enforce it was fairly difficult and that was why it was not included. She said that the hardest part would be how to get people to comply.

Ms. Rauch concluded the presentation, and asked the Board contact either her, Ms. Martin, or Mr. Langworthy with any suggestions to make it easier for the Board to do their job or if something included in a packet that did not make sense.

2. Historic Dublin Design Guidelines Update Work Plan

Eugenia Martin reviewed and discussed the Work Plan for updating the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*. She said the Board began discussing updating the *Guidelines* last year. She said they were originally written in 1999 and were updated in 2005. She said through the years, it has been identified there are different needs for different users as there are businesses as well as the residents who use the *Guidelines*. Ms. Martin said additionally, with the adoption of the Bridge Street Code and the Vision Plan, a Bridge Street Users' Guide will be created to provide preliminary guidance. She said a historic

preservation consultant will be hired to assist the Board and staff project team to update the *Guidelines*. She explained the expected outcomes include updating the *Guidelines* to reflect different user needs, provide clear criteria on appropriate elements and architectural styles, provide a clearer definition of the Bridge Street Code as it pertains to the District, and incorporate it into the Applicant Guide.

Mr. Souders asked if they would remain as guidelines, or will they be codified. Ms. Martin said because a lot of what they were wanting either was put into the Zoning Code or the Bridge Street Code, it is going to be more of a guide on how to meet those code requirements.

Mr. Souders asked if the *Guidelines*, as a separate entity still will exist and will they be modified to pull out the things that are now codified within the *Guidelines*. Ms. Martin said that was the intent. She said they had discussed that it was very confusing to have some things codified and others not and that it needed to be simplified.

Mr. Currie asked how the Users' Guide and the *Guidelines* would differ. Ms. Martin explained that the *Guidelines* will be specific to the Historic District, so it will be something for the Historic Core and Historic Residential, but it also needs to be applicable for any properties located outside of the Bridge Street District. Ms. Rauch clarified that the Applicant Guide is meant to guide people into using the Code and what information that they would find helpful when submitting an application, and how to interpret certain requirements. She said the purpose of the *Guidelines* are just to make it easier for someone owning a business or residence to know what they needed to do and what elements make the property historic and how to preserve it that way.

Ms. Martin said regarding the Work Plan, there will be a more in depth inventory analysis over the next several months when the meeting agendas are not full. She said the Board will be involved with this part as well. She said for Phase II – Preliminary, a historic preservation consultant will be secured to evaluate the preliminary analysis and be a part of the *Guidelines* development working in conjunction with the Board and staff team as they move forward. She said the Board and the team will be writing it, not the consultant. Ms. Martin said the final phase would be the Board recommending approval by motion to City Council for the adoption and implementation of the *Guidelines*. She said the entire process would take at least 18 months to two years.

Mr. Souders asked if there would be an inventory of all the buildings. Ms. Martin said the inventory analysis phase would evaluate what buildings are identified in the *Guidelines* to see if it made sense to be included or it should be somewhere else. She said it was like the preliminary identification of it. She said by the time the consultant is hired, a lot of that work will be done and the consultant can help the team and the Board to make sure that it has identified all the properties or help identify things missed. She said it would not be a physical inventory, because that information was in Dublin's GIS currently, so it will not be necessary to do as far as the inventory goes.

Ms. Martin said she did not think that Appendix G had been done, but it would be updated and incorporated into the Community Plan which will be updated because of the Bridge Street District. She said there were recommendations and things they wanted to be updated that would end up occurring either through the Community Plan update or through the *Guidelines* update. She said there are some shown in the 2007 Plan which are no longer there.

Mr. Souders asked if it would be as simple as a one-page handout or online so that if someone in the District wanted just to modify or add a sign, they could look up something regarding signs that referenced Code Sections and they would see one-page outline of the necessary process. Ms. Martin said it would probably be more like the Applicant Guide. She said it was something the Board could discuss.

Mr. Souders said that it sounded like 50 percent of what the Board sees is signs and the other 50 percent is sign modifications, and then there are a few that would be infill. He said if the majority of people are looking to modify a sign, it seemed like they would want the 50 to 90 percent to get a quick snapshot.

He said if eight-square-feet was the limit of the sign, that was a basic starting point, and whatever is important should fit on one page, going through the Code, highlighting a couple of critical things. Ms. Martin said how the Board and team wanted this to function and operate could be discussed.

Mr. Schisler invited additional questions from the Board members. [There were none.] He adjourned the meeting at 7:46 p.m.

As approved/amended by the Architectural Review Board on July 25, 2012.