

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

MEETING MINUTES

JANUARY 28, 2015

AGENDA

- 1. BSC Public District – Dublin Spring Park – Shelter & Path Improvements**
14-112ARB-MPR **56 South Riverview Street**
Minor Project Review
- 2. Historic Dublin Design Guidelines Update**

Robert Schisler called the meeting to order at 6:31 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Board members present were David Rinaldi, Bob Dyas, Neil Mathias, and Thomas Munhall. City representatives were Steve Langworthy, Jennifer Rauch, Marie Downie, Katie Ashbaugh, and Laurie Wright.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Rinaldi moved, Mr. Mathias seconded, to accept the documents into the record. The vote was as follows: Mr. Schisler, yes; Mr. Dyas, yes; Mr. Mathias, yes; and Mr. Rinaldi, yes. (Approved 4 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Schisler moved, Mr. Dyas seconded, to accept the December 10, 2014, meeting minutes as presented. The vote was as follows: Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Mathias, yes; Mr. Dyas, yes; and Mr. Schisler yes. (Approved 4 – 0)

Mr. Schisler briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Architectural Review Board [the minutes reflect the order of the published agenda.]

- 1. BSC Public District – Dublin Spring Park – Shelter & Path Improvements**
14-112ARB-MPR **56 South Riverview Street**
Minor Project Review

Marie Downie said this application is for improvements to the Dublin Spring Park on the west side of the Scioto River, south of Bridge Street, including new concrete paths to replace existing asphalt paths, and a new park shelter to be constructed over an existing historic foundation. She said this is a request for review and approval for a Minor Project Review in accordance with Zoning Code Sections 153.066(G) and 153.170 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Ms. Downie presented a rendering of the site plan showing where the new concrete paths will replace as the existing asphalt path. She pointed out the location of the existing pergola where the base of the structure is deteriorating. She said the foundation portion of the structure has historic significance so the proposal includes restoring that foundation. She presented the drawings for the proposal that includes a new structure on top of the foundation with a red cedar shake roof and a three and a half inch cedar rail surrounding it. She said this application meets all of the Minor Project Review Criteria as well as the Architectural Review Board standards. She reported this application was recommended for approval by the Administrative Review Team December 4, 2014, with no conditions.

Neil Mathias asked if the structure was meant to be symmetrical or asymmetrical as it was hard to discern from the side view of the building elevation provided. Laura Ball confirmed the roof pitch will be centered.

Mr. Mathias asked if there was a plaque stating the historical significance of the foundation and if not, it would be nice to have one incorporated. Ms. Ball answered there was no existing plaque in place and agreed to provide one.

Robert Schisler said he thought it would be a good idea to incorporate a plaque at the spring.

Ms. Ball explained the site historically was where the fire trucks used to draw water out of the river.

Bob Dyas inquired about lighting. Ms. Ball said there is no lighting on the pump or the shelter but there is lighting provided on the steps. Mr. Dyas commented that he is on the steps frequently and many of the lights are not functioning approximately 80 percent of the time. He thanked the City of Dublin for these proposed improvements because he is a frequent visitor of the site.

Mr. Schisler inquired about the previous proposal for the site that included improvements under the bridge. Ms. Ball said it had been considered but the Board provided feedback that the park should remain the same. She said the upgrades to the paths are due their poor condition and the non-uniformity of the widths. Mr. Schisler said the previous comments were largely related to the labyrinth and encouraged Ms. Ball to pursue the other improvements. Ms. Ball agreed to consider this.

[Thomas Munhall arrived to join the meeting.]

David Rinaldi asked whether the park was ADA accessible. Ms. Ball explained the park is not accessible as parking is not permitted down there. Mr. Schisler added the hills are steep. Ms. Ball reported there were deed restrictions on the site as well.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Rinaldi moved, Mr. Mathias seconded, to approve the request for a Minor Project with no conditions. The vote was as follows: Mr. Dyas, yes; Mr. Munhall, yes; Mr. Schisler, yes; Mr. Matias, yes; and Mr. Rinaldi, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

2. Historic Dublin Design Guidelines Update

Katie Ashbaugh presented the proposed updates and revisions to the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*. She said she would outline the City's policy framework and the *Guidelines* history and requested that the Board provide feedback on how the *Guidelines* are used.

Ms. Ashbaugh explained the differences between the Community Plan and the Zoning Code and how the Bridge Street District and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* fit into these foundations. She stated the Bridge Street District was adopted and as such there are some parts of the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* that conflict with that part of the Code. She said that is one of the reasons for proposing an update to the *Guidelines*.

Ms. Ashbaugh reported the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* were adopted by the ARB in 1999 and a few years later, staff determined the Plant and Sign Section in the *Guidelines* needed to be revised. She said City Council formally adopt the *Guidelines* to provide greater standing of the document. She reported the *Old Dublin Design Guidelines* name was changed to *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* between 2004 and 2007.

Ms. Ashbaugh said the current document is in a narrative format, which makes it challenging to find specific information quickly. She said there seems the purpose or objective of the *Guidelines* needs to be made clearer. She reiterated that some elements no longer comply with Code. She said the maps provide historic context for the original Village of Dublin, but not the existing conditions. She shared some opportunities of how the *Guidelines* can be improved.

Ms. Ashbaugh presented a page from the Architectural Section on housing types. She pointed out the black and white photo that could be in color and how the paragraph above the photo could be used better to explain the different housing types.

Ms. Ashbaugh presented the Worthington Guidelines that provide an example of how architectural styles can be explained. She pointed out a graphic showing how the numbered architectural features on the house corresponded with a chart that illustrated the description of the house and what made it a particular housing style.

Ms. Ashbaugh presented a map in the current *Guidelines* dated 1857 showing the Village of Dublin at that time including building footprints. She compared this map with a map of Historic Dublin as it exists today to show the growth. She suggested that a map showing the transformation through time could be included in the *Guidelines* in addition to outlining the jurisdiction and function of the ARB.

Ms. Ashbaugh presented a map from the Bexley Guidelines, which showed properties that meet their standards and guidelines; those that are neutral or barely make the standards; and properties that do not meet the standards of the guidelines. She suggested something like that would be useful in the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* to show the status of the Historic District and what areas are doing well along with areas that could improve.

Ms. Ashbaugh said she documented the construction date of each property that lies within the Historic Core, Historic Transition, and Historic Residential Districts of the Bridge Street District. She presented the map of color codes, which designated the time periods in 30-year increments. She said her intent was to find any clustering of development during different periods of time. She pointed out the oldest structures in Historic Dublin that are rooted along High Street. She noted that expanding outwards are the properties that were built in the early to late 20th century.

Ms. Ashbaugh said the goal was to provide clearer and more defined objectives for the new document that also correspond with the Community Plan and the Bridge Street Vision Report. She stated she would also like to modify the *Guidelines* content to ensure it meets the objectives, does not reference any specific sections of the Code, and reflects the character that the *Guidelines* are attempting to create. She proposed a more attractive, readable format as the *Guidelines* are difficult to navigate currently. She said the intent is for ease of use for applicants for submission preparation; the goal being the best projects for Historic Dublin.

Ms. Ashbaugh said Phase 1 of the project began January 30 with an introduction to a group of internal staff. She reported this group will meet again in the middle of February to conclude Phase 1 and determine the next steps. She said specific review will be conducted on certain sections of the *Guidelines* and an external consultant may be hired to assist with specific areas.

Ms. Ashbaugh said Phase 2 will run March through May and will be simultaneous with Phase 3. She said the plan is also to create a website in addition to a hard copy of the *Guidelines*. Ms. Ashbaugh said the first draft of the updated *Guidelines* will be presented during Phase 4 for review and comment. Ms. Ashbaugh said Phase 5 could include the adoption process.

Ms. Ashbaugh noted the discussion questions for the Board to consider tonight, which were included in the memo:

- 1) How do you use the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*?
- 2) What are the issues or concerns you have identified with the *Guidelines*? How could these be improved with an update?
- 3) What additional topics or information should be included?
- 4) How should sustainability and technology be incorporated?

Robert Schisler said he has not been using the *Guidelines* since he got involved with the Bridge Street District other than for houses or signs with minor additions in Historic Dublin. He recalled when first being on the Board, approximately six years ago, there were a lot more renovations and remodeling projects where styles were discussed. He indicated updated *Guidelines* would be useful to clear up confusion. He stated he has a degree in Architecture and took historic preservation classes so he has a fairly decent library at home on historic architecture, which he references for case reviews.

Bob Dyas said he joined the Board about three years ago, and almost every project was tracked back to the specific paragraph in the *Guidelines*. He recalled at the time, it was mostly recommendation.

David Rinaldi suggested the *Guidelines* be more applicable to the Historic Core and did not believe it would apply too much to the Historic Transition District based on what the Board has been presented with recently. He indicated he liked the map of Bexley and would like a table readily available that showed a historic inventory including an explanation of timeframe of construction. He said if nothing else, for residents that may pick up the *Guidelines* to peruse.

Thomas Munhall questioned the use. He said if the *Guidelines* were updated with all these proposed changes, he would like it better. He tried to envision a City staff person referring a resident to this document when in reality the resident would need to hire an architect, especially if he/she were undertaking a major project. He questioned the time and resources needed for these updates vs the actual amount of use this document would provide. He indicated that if the City determines this would be useful, changes would be good and it is a natural development.

Neil Mathias said he has not been on the Board as long and not being an architect, the *Guidelines* have been helpful to him. He admitted he probably referred to the *Guidelines* more so early on and has since become familiar with it. He indicated he liked the Worthington Guideline example because of the detail delineating of the different architectural styles. He said at the very least that change would be helpful not knowing what our makeup is going to be 3, 10, 15, or 30 years from now. He liked pictures of the Historic Area. He said it is important to keep a history of Dublin and show the progression whether it is recorded in a book or the website, and even if it is not referring to a specific Code for approval of an application. He said just like the application we just approved this evening, it has a historical foundation and that story should be kept. He said the more the area develops and things turnover, the more likely it is we will lose that historical content. He stated that one of the tasks of this Board is to not just keep things looking good and like Dublin but looking like the Historic Core and where we came from. He indicated it is important to have that incorporated to some degree in what these *Guidelines* are to show where we have been and what we want to keep. Even though it is not a specific code he said, it defines what our objectives and goals are for this area.

Mr. Schisler said one of the things to be incorporated in the *Guidelines* should be relative age as that is very helpful. He said for people that are not as in tuned to different periods and styles this would be helpful. He suggested noting structures that are actually on the Register with a dot or a star to ensure the character of that structure is maintained. He said there has been some discussion lately about the age of the wall and asked if that could be part of the records.

Ms. Rauch said there is the Ohio Historic Inventory, which has been conducted for properties within the District. She explained the wall would be part of the inventory. She said the current city website has the option to click on a property and read this information.

Mr. Schisler said the *Guidelines* website would be better for a quick link rather than referring to a book. Ms. Rauch said the *Guidelines* website will offer additional resources and supplemental pieces.

Mr. Munhall asked how many times these projects happen or are at least initiated and get somewhat down the road without having City interaction. He indicated it sounds like this information would help a person get to the '30-yard line' before having to contact the City.

Ms. Rauch said because of the BSD and the complexity of the Code, staff encourages people to meet with staff prior to the submission of an application. She explained staff is undertaking this project to have the *Guidelines* better align with the BSD vision and there is a lot of content that is very useful. She cited a case reviewed within the last six months where the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* were studied to find the appropriate paint colors and style for that particular era. She said the Code must be abided by and the Guidelines are more about character. She said the goal is find a way to make the *Guidelines* useful and not be in conflict with the Code.

Mr. Rinaldi said for the lay person, BSD Code can be quite intimidating and the *Guidelines* would be easier for the lay person to use and understand.

Mr. Munhall suggested a very short explanation as to the order of the rules one must follow. He said the Code would be first but the annotations or *Guidelines* should be referenced there for an example. He said this could easily be accomplished with a link on the website.

Mr. Schisler addressed the sustainability issue. He said there are a lot of new items out there and products have decreased in price in the last five years. He said you can get new materials that emulate the character of more traditional materials. He suggested encouraging sustainability without actually listing out products.

Mr. Rinaldi asked if there were specific areas of technology or specific sustainability issues that Staff was considering. Ms. Ashbaugh said staff discussed general how sustainable principles would fit into the character of Historic Dublin.

Ms. Rauch questioned using modern materials that looked like traditional materials.

Mr. Rinaldi said there are some fantastic rubber shakes that look very much like cedar shakes. He said if the structure is on the Historic Register, rubber shakes are not going to be acceptable. He said as a Board, we will have to decide if something like that was appropriate as long as the structure was not on the Historic Register. He said if a product provides a historic look that is a highly recyclable and very sustainable then why not consider it. Ms. Rauch said if Staff were to incorporate that we might want to distinguish the types of uses and where it can be used.

Mr. Schisler said we do not have to list of what is or is not appropriate but more of a discussion throughout the *Guidelines* about the use of sustainable products appropriately. Mr. Rinaldi suggested we could say we encourage sustainability within the context or Historic District.

Ms. Rauch said Jeff Tyler, the CBO, is part of the staff group working on this project and will work with him regarding this topic as it moves forward.

Mr. Schisler asked Staff if they work with the Dublin Historical Society. Mr. Dyas said the Historical Society could be consulted, if needed. Ms. Rauch agreed.

Mr. Mathias said updating the pictures from black and white is a good idea but also suggested incorporating some video for the website. He said there is virtual software that is easy to incorporate.

Ms. Rauch asked if there was anything further the Board wished to express about the *Guidelines*. [There were none.] She explained Staff would be working from the proposed outline to capture everything discussed.

Mr. Mathias thanked the City for improvements on SR161 with the school zone sign and the new speed limit sign upon entering the Historic District. He inquired about a future discussion item regarding the pedestrian bridge landing and how that fits into the planning efforts. He suggested reviewing those areas by the way they tie in from a safety aspect. He said there used to be limited turns going north from the library parking lot that had been removed. He said one resident approached him about that one intersection in particular.

Mr. Rauch said that projected traffic information could be provided once more information is available.

Mr. Munhall asked for an update and timeframe on the John Shield's Parkway on the west side of the river. He said his issue with downtown traffic is if people could go around downtown they would.

Steve Langworthy said late last year, we commissioned a study to discuss the road network on the west side of the river but that got delayed for higher priority projects on the east side of the river. He said the timing for that roadway to be built depends on the construction of the bridge. Mr. Langworthy emphasized that regardless of the amount of road construction, we are not going to ease of congestion so traffic flows 35 mph on every road through every intersection. He said there has to be a different expectation in this more urban setting where traffic is expected to be slower.

Communications

Ms. Rauch discussed some upcoming training opportunities and addressed the email invitations. She also discussed the previously approved meeting that was scheduled for November 18, 2015, which needs to be changed to November 17, 2015, because of a City Council meeting conflict. The Board agreed to the new date.

Mr. Munhall asked if there was an official update to why we are not seeing something on the Bridge Park West project. Ms. Rauch assured the Board the project is still moving forward.

Mr. Schisler adjourned the meeting at 7:40 p.m.

As approved by the Architectural Review Board on February 25, 2015.