



Planning

5800 Shier Rings Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236

phone 614.410.4600

fax 614.410.4747

www.dublinohiousa.gov

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

MEETING MINUTES

MAY 25, 2016

AGENDA

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. BSD HC – S. High Street Mixed-Use Development
16-032INF | 76-82 S. High Street
Informal Review |
| 2. BSD HTN – Bridge Park West
16-033ARB-MPR/WR | 94-100 N. High Street
Minor Project Review (Approved 5 – 0)
Waiver Review (Approved 5 – 0) |

The Chair, David Rinaldi, called the meeting to order at 6:31 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Board members present were: Jane Fox, Thomas Munhall, Everett Musser, and Shannon Stenberg. City representatives were: Jennifer Rauch, JM Rayburn, Donna Goss, Alan Perkins, and Laurie Wright.

Administrative Business

Motion and Vote

Mr. Munhall moved, Ms. Stenberg seconded, to accept the documents into the record. The vote was as follows: Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Musser, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; and Mr. Munhall, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Munhall moved, Mr. Musser seconded, to accept the April 27th meeting minutes as presented. The vote was as follows: Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; Mr. Musser, yes; and Mr. Munhall, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

The Chair briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Architectural Review Board [the minutes reflect the order of the published agenda.] He swore in anyone planning to address the Board during this meeting.

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. BSD HC – S. High Street Mixed-Use Development
16-032INF | 76-82 S. High Street
Informal Review |
|---|---|

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following application is a request for an Informal Review for a mixed-use development for a site with existing historic commercial buildings and construction of a proposed structure on the east side of South High Street, south of the intersection with Eberly Hill Lane. He said this is a request for review and non-binding feedback for a future application under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066.

JM Rayburn presented the Bridge Street Historic District Review Timeline for a typical application and an aerial view of the site. He said the site is zoned BSD Historic Core, which permits a mix of uses including multiple-family, office, retail, and restaurant. While residential is a permitted use, he noted it is limited to upper floors and not permitted on the ground story. He added the zoning and uses surrounding the site

include Historic Core, which is largely commercial uses to the north, south, and west; Historic Residential is located to the rear of the property and contains single-family use.

Mr. Rayburn presented the existing Site Plan that shows three existing historic structures located along S. High Street and two accessory structures to the rear of the property, adjacent to the gravel parking area. He said vehicular access to the site is provided from Blacksmith Lane and Eberly Hill Lane. He pointed out the significant grade change from west to east of approximately 16 feet in photos of the site.

Mr. Rayburn presented a conceptual drawing of the proposal, which retains the existing historic structures along S. High Street, the demolition of the accessory structures to the rear of the property, and the proposed development of a 2.5-story mixed-use building. He said the proposed mixed-use building includes ground floor parking, first story office, and second story residential, taking advantage of the 16-foot grade change between S. High Street and Blacksmith Lane. He noted the proposed plaza area shown between the existing historic buildings and the proposed development.

Mr. Rayburn indicated the ART encouraged the applicant to ensure the proposal fits appropriately with the existing neighborhoods. He presented the proposed development in context with the existing historic neighborhood along High Street that shows the proposed 2.5 story to the rear, which does not exceed the height of the existing building along High Street.

Mr. Rayburn presented a list of questions for the Board to consider as part of this review. He said Planning recommends the Board consider this proposal with respect to compatibility with surrounding context, the site layout, scale, architectural concept, and site details.

The Chair called for public comment.

Richard Taylor, 48 S. High Street, Dublin, Ohio, said he is okay with the concept of this project, the uses of the building, and the location. He said when he was on the ARB, this is the type and scale of building he was expecting to see for this area. He indicated he liked that the historic buildings on this site would be preserved and the new building sits back from High Street. He said he likes the plaza that would separate the old from the new. He stated he had issues with the massing of the building that should instead be made to look like a grouping of smaller buildings. He indicated the entrance to the garage should be moved to the side due to the concerns of the residents behind there and the east side should be made more sensitive to the neighbors in that area. He said he was confused by the character of the three-dimensional sketch as it does not look anything like Historic Dublin. He questioned the review process and indicated he did not think there was enough reviews for the ARB and the public before it gets to the point it is pretty well developed.

Jane Fox said she had several concerns but one was how the original structure on High Street will be utilized as that is the structure that should get the most attention. She inquired about the Code requirements for uses on the floors for the mixed-use building.

Ms. Rauch said the Code states for a Historic Mixed-use building type in the Historic Core, residential is not permitted on the ground floor, which has to do with activating a streetscape. She said limiting residential to the upper story would then ensure that more commercial or active uses would be at the street level.

Ms. Fox stated the proposal is not appropriate for the site given the surrounding development. She said this is a 25,300-square-foot building and the surrounding properties are much smaller:

- 63 S. High Street = 11,000-square-foot home across the street
- 55 S. High Street = 13,400-square-foot two-story building
- 66 S. High Street = 2,000 square feet

Therefore, she said the massing of the proposed building does not fit into the surrounding small rhythmic structures. She stated the ARB is tasked with making sure any new structure fits within the scale, the massing, and the pedestrian feel of what is already in the Historic District. She said the proposed building is 2.5 stories with a parking garage underneath and there is nothing quite like it. She referred to photos she had taken of the area and placed in the drop box. She said the physical character of the area is both commercial and residential and includes large open areas that contribute to the overall rhythm and history of this neighborhood. She indicated that if this large building is put on this corner, the little sheds, the outhouse, tree canopies, and soft edges of grass and shrubs would all disappear from view. She said whatever development happens on that corner, needs to mimic what is already there as far as physical attributes and the way it is utilized.

Ms. Fox said this is the heart or core of the Historic District here. She said one of the reasons it has existed for as long as it has is because there is only one access in and out of this neighborhood, which is a two lane street and the rest is alleyways and they were never meant to carry traffic. She suggested the City resurface the alleys to look more like cobblestone and grass so it deters traffic where there is already an issue and to invite pedestrian traffic instead.

Ms. Fox concluded the scale of the proposed building is too large. She said for development in areas where the Historic District borders residences, one has to be sensitive to ensure the transitions from the historic residential neighborhood to historic commercial are soft transitions so neighbors do not lose sunlight to their backyard, the tree canopy, the pedestrian scale, and the essence of the Historic District character. She encouraged the applicant to reduce the mass of the building and mimic the surrounding area and if it is done correctly, the area will be highly sought after. She indicated people are knocking down doors to live in quaint cottages. She said this area should feel natural and indigenous to the area and the existing residents should not be made to feel like a large building has intruded into their Historic Core.

Mr. Rinaldi asked Ms. Rauch if deviations from the Code have been identified by staff. Ms. Rauch answered not enough information has been provided at this point given this is just an Informal Review. She indicated she anticipates any new development will have Waivers or Administrative Departures associated with the proposals because the Code cannot account for every single scenario. She said there are concerns identified thus far about building materials, parking, and maneuverability.

Ms. Fox said she could not imagine getting a fire truck down there because it is an alley and not a street. Ms. Rauch said the Fire Department is represented on the ART and they have reviewed the proposal preliminarily.

Mr. Rinaldi said he echoes a lot of what Mr. Taylor said. He said on a conceptual basis, he is not opposed to this and likes that it is separated from the existing historic structures. He said massing is his main concern as it appears as one big building and does not fit the character of the surrounding historic structures. He said he agreed with Ms. Fox in that the mixed-use building cannot look like the yellow structure to the south. He said the details are far from where they need to be and invited the applicant to speak to the concerns.

Pete Coratola, CVS Garvey, LLC, said he is the managing partner at 37 W. Bridge Street, Dublin, Ohio. He introduced Frank Albanese as their construction consultant. He said the building is 13,000 square feet including 6,500 square feet of both residential and office, not including the parking garage. He reported he has met with the neighbors and there is concern about the alley. He said the entryway was proposed to come from the alley but they would consider changes.

Mr. Coratola said the former Biddies Coach House was always a concern. He indicated they would maintain the heritage of Historic Dublin and invest money in the structure.

Mr. Rinaldi asked if the second floor would be removed. Mr. Coratola answered the second floor is not very safe. He said they had a historian inspect the building, which has nice wood beams made from the trees in the early 1800s and hopefully their intended renovations are headed in the right direction.

Shannon Stenberg asked how the applicant is going to address getting pedestrians to that secondary building if it is supposed to be office space and mixed-use. Mr. Coratola said there is a five-foot breezeway to the north of 82 S. High Street (yellow building) they intend to keep.

Ms. Fox asked the applicant if they would be willing to meet with the Historical Society, the neighbors, and Historic Dublin Foundation to brainstorm to create a design feel that would work for everyone. Mr. Coratola answered yes. He said the rendering is a general concept and they have already decreased the size and use from the original plans. He said they want to be good neighbors. He said their offices are the old Dublin Firehouse so they have a stake in the area.

Mr. Rinaldi inquired about the renovations intended for the historic structures. Mr. Coratola answered cosmetic changes would be made mostly but the structures have dirt basements, which will have to be reinforced. He said the second floor of Biddies is caving in and they plan to add windows. For the yellow building, he said they plan to paint and add a new roof.

Ms. Fox asked if there were anticipated uses for the former Biddies Coach House. Mr. Coratola said Biddies had a liquor license but it is not their intention at this point to make it into a liquor establishment; they are considering an office use. He explained they want to maintain that courtyard and a restaurant, bar, or deli may generate too much noise and trash; he indicated there is a lot of interest in the project for both residences and offices.

Ms. Fox said the proposed rendering is not an unattractive design; it is the scale and feel in the heart of that neighborhood that really is the challenge. She encouraged the applicant to find a way to create a cottage grouping that provides a wonderful pedestrian feel; that would be a home run. She restated the need for a soft transition to the neighbors like European villages and limiting the traffic.

Mr. Coratola said the benefit of this project being half office use is that people will arrive at 8 am and leave at 5 pm and there will only be 6,500 square feet of residences consisting of three or four units.

Everett Musser suggested the applicant first engage an architect that could create a design concept that fits the Historic District.

Mr. Coratola said they are requesting the ARB's feedback on the concept of 13,000 square feet of both office and residential with the parking garage underneath. He said the look and the building materials etc. can be worked out.

Mr. Rinaldi stated he is fine with the mixed-use proposal. He said there are challenges such as parking, trash storage and collection. From an aesthetic standpoint, he said he likes that it comes off the alley but from the practical and functional standpoint that might not be the best solution.

Steve Rudy, 129 S. Riverview Street, said he would run through an abbreviated version of what was presented to City Council two days ago. He said residents on the south end of the Historic District have coexisted with a mix of businesses for decades and the short answer to this project is it is not a good neighbor. He said he totally agrees with Ms. Fox's comments in terms of this blocking out the light and destroying the character and rhythm of the district. He encouraged everyone to walk the street as the sun goes down to witness the light streaming through the district illuminating the historic structures.

Mr. Rudy said they had pointed out to Council that this would go through the ART without any serious concern whereas he personally went through the ART for his proposal for a half addition for his National

Register listed property and the ART ripped him to shreds and said not to build it. He said he does not believe the ART has the guidance and parameters that the ARB has. He said there is no question that this project would change the scale and the character of the District and hopes Council gets involved. He summarized he wants to see transitional use and not a lot of tall buildings and emphasized traffic issues that prohibit kids from riding their bikes during lunchtime and rush hours. He said the Fire Department did a run and it did not work. He said the development being built across the river and the historic character does not need to be crushed here in order for that vision to work over there.

Frank Albanese, ISL Communities, 37 W. Bridge St., said there is a misnomer about the scale. He said the applicant did an aerial perspective of this building and have spent five months with civil engineers to come up with a plan that would make them a good neighbor for the community. He agreed the rendering made the building look out of scale. He pointed out that there are gables and hip roofs in the district so by an architectural perspective this proposal could fit. He said the applicant is in the process of obtaining the right architect for this project in Dublin. He said it is a two-story but there is light that comes down behind the yellow house into that parking area. He said he understands the issues with parking and that is why they proposed underground parking. He said this plan cleans up the streetscape of Historic Dublin. He concluded that the applicant wants to work with the City of Dublin.

Mr. Carroll inquired about the height of the roof. Mr. Albanese said the building is lower than Biddies.

Ms. Rauch confirmed historic residential structures are permitted a height of 35 feet.

Kurt Schmitt, 97 S. Riverview Street, said he was encouraged by the Board's comments. Mr. Schmitt recalled the height of 27 feet that he had requested for his home's proposed renovation that was not acceptable. He said his main concern is the scale of the proposed building and that if this is permitted, many others would follow requesting increased size and height. He said there is bedrock in the area and the applicant will not be able to blast to get an underground garage in the limestone. He said he knows first-hand because he tried to get a wine cellar built and it took three weeks of pounding to get it in and the size was very small in comparison to this project. He indicated the applicant could get approved for this garage and then when they could not build it due to the stone, they would be permitted to raise the building.

Mr. Schmitt said the Fire Department brought in the smallest piece of equipment and Blacksmith Lane is the concern. He said the Planning Report states the building would not be taller than the structure on High Street but he and his neighbors are concerned about the view from Blacksmith Lane and Riverview going the other way. He said it will look good from High Street but it would look terrible from their side.

Mr. Schmitt indicated that if the applicant created a building that looked like it had been created over time, there would not be the objections because there would not be one large mass.

David Hahm, 83 S. Riverview Street, said he has resided there since 1970. He said he understands this is an early concept. He said the alley is 13.5 feet from the curb to one of the light posts. He said an electric light post can be moved to the property line. He said it is 14.5 feet to an existing curb and he resides right behind it. He referenced the historic garage that was originally a horse barn and then later turned into a garden shed because cars increased in size. He said the alley is 1.5 lanes wide and cars are 7 feet wide so one cannot get by anywhere without using private property for a passing lane. He pointed out the big hole in his building that was from a garbage truck incident and this was the third time since they have been living there. He concluded that nobody should be permitted to build up to the property line.

Mr. Rinaldi restated the Board recognizes the traffic concerns.

Elizabeth Larson, 76 S. Riverview Street, inquired about the terminology used in the Planning Report and other materials supplied for the meeting. She asked about the size of the terrace/plaza/walkway. Mr. Albanese answered it is 15 feet wide.

Ms. Larson said she had concerns about the property values going down and the amount of traffic that would be generated if this project was approved as proposed.

Tom Holton, 5957 Roundstone Place, said he represents the Dublin Historical Society. He said he thought the ARB should be asking questions about the excavation that would need to happen to build that underground parking garage because in years past there was a significant amount of damage done to foundations to some of the buildings when the City did excavation for water and sewer lines. He indicated he anticipates a lot of rock to be found in that hill and the former Biddies building's foundation could be affected.

Anne Gleine, 75 S. High Street, said Ha'penny Bridge Ports of Ireland is right across the street from the former Biddies structure. She said Biddies was a gem and hopes that a similar business goes in there, possibly expanding the building.

Michael Carroll, 190 S. High Street, Dublin, Ohio, asked if traffic can finally be resolved before the development is determined.

Mr. Rinaldi asked staff if a traffic study is required. Ms. Rauch answered a traffic study it is not required as part of this proposal. She said she hears the concerns about traffic from the residents and will have a conversation with Engineering, Fire, and Police.

Ms. Fox said development in the Bridge Street District has brought a lot of changes and has changed the Code in the City. She reiterated the ARB is bound to protect the Historic District including the look and feel of it, the rhythm, history, character, tree canopies, physical landscape, river valleys, and vistas, etc. She indicated that as development comes in it is starting to push up against these guidelines. She said this is where a conversation with City Council must happen. She said they can be told about the traffic issues and the development that is being proposed that is too large as infill in a neighborhood that has small structures with historical elements.

Ms. Rauch said concerns were raised at City Council and as a result, Staff was asked to review the Code related to the Historic District as a priority. She said Staff is in the process of outlining the scope and working with the consultant with public participation anticipated. She emphasized there is forward movement on this topic. She said traffic and maneuverability will be part of the ART's discussion during upcoming reviews should this proposal move forward.

Mr. Munhall asked to get back to the topic of the applicant's request for an Informal Review.

Ms. Fox told the applicant that she feels bad for him because the Historic District is going through some major changes that are not necessarily working with this plan. She said we are in the midst of development but we have the Historic District to protect.

Ms. Larson said she wanted it on record that laws are being broken due to traffic circulation.

Mr. Rudy said he attended the new Historic Dublin Leadership meeting that will meet monthly. At that meeting, he said Amy Salay confirmed that the Historic District would get a light touch per City Council.

Mr. Taylor asked for clarification of the Code §153.066(D)(1)(b)(3) regarding the review process. Ms. Rauch said understanding the sensitivity of this project, the project will proceed through the ARB. She

said the applicant requested an Informal Review tonight and they did not have to take this step but they wanted to get input and feedback before they move forward with a formal submission.

Christina Wentz, 54 S. High Street, asked if 30 parking spaces is enough for the proposed development. Ms. Rauch said the final parking numbers would be reviewed with a formal submission.

Mr. Rinaldi confirmed the applicant will need to meet the parking requirements of the Zoning Code for this property or gain approval of a parking plan.

Shannon Stenberg encouraged the applicant to consider green space and transition space between the residential neighborhood and the proposed commercial buildings.

Ms. Rauch stated the next steps would be submission of a formal application.

**2. BSD HTN – Bridge Park West
16-033ARB-MPR/WR**

**94-100 N. High Street
Minor Project Review and Waiver Review**

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following application is a request for modifications to the landscape planters along North High Street, a tenant space within the Historic Mixed-Use building, and the Apartment building elevations to permit mechanical louvers along street facing facades within the Bridge Park West development on the east side of North High Street, north of the intersection with North Street. He said this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review and a Waiver Review under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Jennifer Rauch presented an aerial view of the site and the mixed-use elevations. She noted the existing entry door for the southernmost tenant space of the mixed-use building and the proposed modification that relocates the door for improved internal operations and changes the front curtain wall. She explained by moving the door, the applicant is requesting a change to the landscaping that was previously approved and presented the additional proposed plant materials. She said the width of the columns and the tower has changed from the approved proposal based on the needs of the tenant.

Ms. Rauch presented the east elevation of the apartment building and noted the mechanical louvers, which the Code requires to be on non-street facing facades. She referred to another application where vents were approved due to similar issues with the internal space layout. She said the vents are located in an organized fashion and aligned with each other and match the building. She said the second Waiver request addresses the number of doors. She presented the mixed-use building on High Street with 7 entrance doors but 9 doors are required by the Code and 7 were approved in April 2015. She emphasized the number of doors was retained and just the spacing was different. She reported the ART recommended approval of the two Waivers as well as the Minor Project Review with no conditions.

Tom Munhall inquired about the rooflines. Ms. Rauch confirmed changes were approved administratively due to the drainage issues relating to the rooflines.

Michael Carroll, 190 S. High Street, Dublin, Ohio, inquired about the previous location of the vents. Ms. Rauch said the details of how the vents would be installed was not included in the original plans. She said as the internal plans of the floor plans were determined, this was identified to meet the Building Code.

Mr. Carroll asked what the vents are used for.

Mike Burmeister, OHM Advisors, 580 N. 4th Street, said the vents provide fresh air intake and exhaust for equipment in the units including bathroom exhaust, furnace exhaust, and washer/dryers. He said the vents are metal caps that will be painted to match the façade like what is found on the outside of a residential home.

Mr. Carroll asked if pedestrians will be able to notice if someone is doing laundry. Mr. Burmeister said dryer fluff will not be blown out of these vents and that most of them are for air intake and exhaust.

David Rinaldi asked if this was the only mechanical solution or if there was an opportunity to do it through the roof. Mr. Burmeister explained the floor plates do not stack vertically so a continuous chase could not be run seven stories so they selected the closest path out, which was the front of the building.

Mr. Munhall said he did not have an issue with the design.

Jane Fox asked if there were not options for the top four levels to go to the roof. Mr. Burmeister replied the applicant wanted consistency from floor to floor and there are additional pieces of equipment on the roof that would interfere.

Ms. Fox asked Mr. Burmeister if he anticipates them to be noisy. Mr. Burmeister said he did not.

Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, 555 Metro Place, added the tenant space they are changing is for the Cameron Mitchell restaurant, The Avenue. He said they are in the process of customizing their space to meet their brand so they may need additional landscape features, or canopies, etc. that will come later.

Kurt Schmitt, 97 S. Riverview Street, said he is concerned about the warm moist air that will come out of the building in the winter and could be resolved by using a shaft. Mr. Burmeister restated that due to the layout of the spaces, not all spaces are stacked floor to floor so a shaft could not be used.

Mr. Hunter said they do not have a back of a building because it is the parking garage. He said there are vents and filters on the vents so this is the best mechanical solution.

Ms. Rauch said the ART agreed this was the best solution given the constraints with this building.

Mr. Munhall asked if this building design has been used for other buildings. Mr. Hunter said there are several properties in their portfolio with this design and the buildings do not steam and look like they are on fire.

Mr. Rinaldi said he questioned it to make sure this was not done as a cost savings measure and this was the best engineering solution.

The Chair called for any other comments. [Hearing none.]

Motion and Vote

Mr. Musser moved, Mr. Rinaldi seconded, to approve a request for two Waivers:

Apartment Building – Mechanical Louvers

1. §153.062(N)(4)5 - Façade Requirements – Vents (mechanical systems) shall not be part of street-facing facades. Request is to allow mechanical louvers on street-facing façades for the apartment building elevation along the (future) North Riverview Street extension.

Historic Mixed-Use Buildings – Principal Entrances

2. §153.065(O)(9)(d)3 – Façade Requirements – Building Entrance - one principal entrance for every 40 feet of façade along a principal frontage street – 9 entrances (required). Request to increase the distance between the required principal entrances along North High Street – 7 entrances (requested).

The vote was as follows: Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; Mr. Munhall, yes; Mr. Musser, yes; and Mr. Rinaldi, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Ms. Fox moved, Ms. Stenberg seconded, to approve a Minor Project Review with no conditions. The vote was as follows: Mr. Musser, yes; Mr. Munhall, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; and Ms. Fox, yes. (Approved 5 – 0)

Communications

Jennifer Rauch said the Historical and Cultural Assessment project will be introduced this evening.

Charissa Durst said she is a historic architect and the lead firm for the cultural and historical assessment. She said she is looking at the preservation strategies, possibly expanding the list of buildings that fall under the ARB purview, possibly refining the preservation guidelines, and finding ways to make preserving buildings more profitable or attractive to developers via grants or other methods that other communities have successfully used rather than demolition and building new. She said they are working with the Commonwealth Heritage Group who will run the actual inventory and assessment of the plus or minus 900 buildings in the City's planning area.

Anne Lee said she is an archeologist that works with the Commonwealth Heritage Group. She said they are doing the survey portion and part of that is looking at contributing structure analysis. She said there are two main parts of this project - one is the inventory and assessment part and the other is the preservation strategies. She explained the cultural and historical assessment reviews that are already in the district and what could be added to the list and what the key elements are of these resources that contribute to Dublin's historic character. She said first they are doing a context development, which includes compiling the history and data for what is already known and the themes of what is important. Starting on June 6, she said they will be conducting a comprehensive survey to look at all the above ground or built structures within the Historic District and the entire planning area. She said they are not just looking at the 19th and 20th century components that make Dublin historic but extending that into mid-century modern, part of Dublin's history of urbanization, which might become a new historic district in a few years. She said they are reviewing landscape elements like the stone walls and historic fire plugs and that no cemeteries have been missed. She said the City has compiled a lot of the information on this but there might be some family cemeteries not listed. In addition, she said they will also be looking for ruins and archeological sites. She said they will determine which structures contribute to the Historic District and why to provide a better guideline for the ARB.

Ms. Lee said two workshops will be planned to present their drafted report back to the ARB and obtain feedback from the ARB.

Ms. Lee explained that Ms. Durst's approach is doing research, stakeholder meetings, public engagement through presentations, and devising a preservation strategy handbook. Ms. Lee said that during their field work through June, they will provide weekly updates to the Planning Department so the residents will know where they plan to be and use it to spur some ideas that may not have been identified yet.

Jane Fox asked what resources this team is going to be utilizing to begin the discovery. Ms. Lee said they are looking at existing resources such as what has been recorded with the state Historic Preservation Office, GIS data, county historical plat maps and atlases, aerial photographs of historic areas, and they have talked with the Dublin Historic Society.

Ms. Fox said the focus for the ARB has always been the main Historic District and it is such a small area. She indicated the consultants will find people are very willing to tell all about their properties. She said the concern is if the City has concentrated too heavily on this small little core and we are losing some precious historic elements that are outside the district that are going into disrepair because either they

are not on Appendix G or nobody wants to deal with it. She said she loves that physical landscapes will be taken into account because the river valley is integral to how Dublin was created including Riverside Drive, Old Dublin Road, stone walls, mills, stone quarries, and Indian Run. She said they are the vertebrae of the Historic District and if the skeleton is gone, there is really nothing left to preserve. She encouraged the consultants to look at this holistically.

Steve Rudy, 129 S. Riverview Street, said he is not operating a business in the Historic District but has complete empathy that there is very favorable tax disposition for the brand new businesses that has no respect for preservation of historic scale and character. He indicated there should be a level playing field in the commercial district. He said preserving historic structures is a labor of love.

Kurt Schmitt, 97 S. Riverview Street, indicated if the tax burden is calculated on these historic buildings in dollars per square foot, as much as \$9 a square foot could be added to the rent against a property across the street that is tax abated. He said tenants are seeing these numbers and saying their rent is X and they are responsible for maintenance, taxes, and insurance, and the guy across the street are not paying that for 15 years or whatever the agreement is. He said there is a struggle with it.

Ms. Fox said she appreciated that point being made. She said the ARB realizes the City is penalizing owners of historic properties because we are burdening them with restrictions but we are not incentivizing them to do anything and we need to flip that around. She said she anticipates that people with historic properties will sell them out for new development because it is the only feasible way to make it work.

Michael Carroll, 190 S. High Street, said he is interested to know what the City of Dublin has paid for new development in the past 3 – 5 years and how much they have spent on historic development. He said he would guess it would be like \$20 million for new development and zero for historic. He said he also thought there was a group of people working for the City on new development and zero on historic. He indicated California has solved that problem by eliminating the office of development.

Mr. Rinaldi said he thought the comments need to be geared towards Council as they decide how to spend the City's finances and this is not the ARB's responsibility. Mr. Carroll said he appreciated the ARB taking the time to listen to the residents and it gave them hope.

Ms. Fox asked that the consultants keep both the ARB and the ART in the loop as to what they are doing weekly as she does not want to wait a month to hear about it. She said she wants to be involved all along the way as an ARB member on categorizing and updating.

Ms. Rauch said a team made up of herself, JM Rayburn, and Joanne Shelly will receive the information from the consultants and they can pass it along to the ARB. She offered to work with Community Relations to make this as transparent as possible.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 8:47 pm.

As approved by the Architectural Review Board on July 27, 2016.