



MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, November 16, 2016

AGENDA

- 1. BSD HTN – Bridge Street, Building Z2
16-088ARB-BPR** **88 North High Street
Basic Plan Review (Discussion only)**
- 2. BSD HC – S. High St. Mixed-Use Development
16-082ARB-BPR** **76 – 82 S. High Street
Basic Plan Review (Approved)**
- 3. R-1 – Kittrell Residence
16-089ARB** **5051 Brand Road
New Construction (Approved)**

The Chair, David Rinaldi, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Board members present were: Jane Fox, Thomas Munhall, and Everett Musser. Shannon Stenberg was absent. City representatives were: Jennifer Rauch, JM Rayburn, and Laurie Wright.

Administrative Business

Motion and Vote

Ms. Fox moved, Mr. Munhall seconded, to accept the documents into the record. The vote was as follows: Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Musser, yes; Mr. Munhall, yes; and Ms. Fox, yes. (Approved 4 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Ms. Fox moved, Mr. Rinaldi seconded, to approve the October 26th meeting minutes. The vote was as follows: Mr. Munhall, yes; Mr. Musser, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; and Ms. Fox, yes. (Approved 4 – 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 HTN – Bridge Street, Building Z2
16-088ARB-BPR** **88 North High Street
Basic Plan Review**

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following application is a request for the construction of a mixed-use building with associated site improvements along the east side of N. High Street, 180 feet north of the intersection with North Street. He said this is a request for an informal review of a Basic Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066 and §153.070 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.



Jennifer Rauch noted the application process and presented an aerial view of the site to provide context and the proposed Site Plan that did not contain any significant changes since the previous review. She pointed out the proposed location of the pedestrian bridge and its landing site at the public plaza.

Ms. Rauch reported that when the Board reviewed this application last month, there were a lot of comments about the scale and architecture of the building as it is located on the edge of the Historic District and the properties directly south are zoned Historic Core District. She said transitioning between the new construction to the north and the existing historic structures that are smaller scaled was discussed. She added the overall mass, scale, and design of the proposed building was discussed. She reported the applicant has made some changes to the design and architecture, which they are requesting feedback before going on to City Council for their review.

Ms. Rauch presented the revised elevations and noted the location of a restaurant proposed for the ground level with residential above, public spaces along the plaza, and service functions and access to the residences on the south side of the building, considered the back. She stated the revisions provided:

- Front elevation along N. High Street continues to be three stories and includes more building divisions to break up the massing along with the removal of the central series of gable dormers;
- Roof is broken up with minor changes to height;
- North elevation design character modified;
- Tower element more dramatic; and
- South elevation has been enhanced to not appear like “back of house”.

Ms. Rauch presented additional renderings of the northeast and northwest perspectives as well as the streetscape elevations to show the proposed building height in relation to Building Z1 to the north and Oscar’s to the south.

Ms. Rauch presented the discussion questions:

1. Does the ARB support the scale and height of the building given the surrounding development?
2. Does the ARB support the revisions to the proposed architectural style and design?
3. Does the proposal fit with the development pattern and character along this section of N. High Street?
4. Are there other considerations by the Board?

Russ Hunter, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, 555 Metro Place, said he wanted additional feedback from the ARB before going to Council to see if they were moving in the right direction, if there are architectural changes needed, and if the three-story proposal is acceptable. He explained the decreased height measurements and compared the proposal to the buildings at BriHi. He concluded that if the ARB believes this revised plan is still not going to work then he will not forward this on to City Council.

The Chair invited public comment.

David Hahm, 83 S. Riverview Street, said the principle of taking the largest building that is in the district and going a little bit higher does not seem to be the best approach.

Steve Rudy, 129 S. Riverview Street, questioned whether there is a requirement in the Code to stay within 2.5 stories in the Historic District. He said he asked because the next case is also proposing a building height greater than 2.5 stories. The Chair answered the Board would get to that discussion.

Tom Munhall inquired about the two shed dormers, specifically about the first one to the north as they stop and do not look natural. Mr. Hunter said there are mechanical units behind the dormers.

Everett Musser said, as an architect, this still looks like two separate buildings and the east end of the building is still too high. He said he agreed with the public comment; it should not be related to the building to the north. He suggested the rooflines could be softened considerably because it is currently very abrupt. He stated he liked the front of the building but is still not sure about the east end of the building.

Jane Fox said the scale is too massive. She indicated it is not what City Council intended when they wrote the Code; the Historic Transition District has to relate to existing architecture in the district and it is directly adjacent to the Historic Core District. She said as a Board member, she has to consider the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* and the BSD Code. She said the BSD limits height to 2.5 stories. She indicated that infill should not relate to the new construction but rather what was already there. She asked staff if Oscar's is considered Historic Commercial Cottage style. Ms. Rauch said the building types are used mainly for new construction but if an established building wanted to make major modifications, the reviewing body would determine the building type.

Ms. Fox indicated when it comes to mixed-use, there are permitted and non-permitted buildings allowed next to each other on the principle frontage street. Comparing to the size of Oscar's, she said the proposed building is just too large.

Ms. Fox said there are two sides to the bridge: one with brand new construction; and one with existing traditional buildings. She suggested that instead of trying to appease the Board by proposing old on the front of the building and new on the back, the applicant should find a uniquely cohesive architectural design that speaks to the character of the Historic District with a sense of newness that shows a freshness and an invitation to this gateway. She said the BSD Code specifically speaks to gateway sites that need to be pedestrian friendly, inviting, and have characteristics that are even more conducive to the pedestrian experience, more than any other place in the district. She concluded this is not the right design or the right scale.

David Rinaldi said he recognized the improvements to the proposal. He said having a three story building when Code permits 2.5 stories at this location at the juncture with the Historic Core District is hard to support and that is a big response to the design. He indicated it still reads as one large block and the Historic Core District is made up of smaller blocks of buildings. He said that was accomplished on Building Z1 where it appears to be smaller buildings even though it is one large building. He said the towers compete with Z1.

Mr. Munhall said overall he likes the proposal and likes the front. He said it is all about scale for him making sure it does not look imposing when one comes across the bridge. He suggested the applicant get more square footage further down the hill.

Ms. Fox reiterated that the story height should be decreased to the size that is permitted in the district, break up the massing into smaller blocks, and extend down the hillside to make it feel like it belongs more to the Historic Core District. As a gateway area, she restated it needs to be pedestrian friendly, especially at the street level to draw people in.

Mr. Hunter said he hears the Board stating that three stories is not appropriate. He said the applicant has a sketch of a two-story option for their consideration, which was not included in their packet. He said they used the exact footprint but modified the massing and brought the height down to two stories with a more traditional roof. He said the front remains largely the same but the back was brought way down in height, still using some of the same architectural characteristics so it feels more like one expression. He said the tower was removed and the south reveals the most dramatic change. He concluded it is a shorter building with much softer transitions as one moves around the corner. He added the ridgeline is roughly where it was before but it is a two story building with a traditional slope roof. He asked the Board

if this is a design they would be more amenable to. The use for the second floor, he said could be office or residential (condominiums or apartments).

Mr. Musser said this newest design addresses some of the Board's concerns. He inquired about the square footage. Mr. Hunter answered around 7,000 – 8,000 square feet and the basement level is significantly smaller.

Mr. Musser said this is much more compatible, looks more historic, and the rooflines are much softer.

Mr. Munhall said he wants people to be able to live, shop, eat, and work here. He said if it is just going to be restaurant and office use, he does not like it as much. He indicated this newest plan is easier to look at and can see it moving through the process easier.

Mr. Rinaldi said even though the overall height is similar, the eave height was brought down dramatically and he appreciates that. He said it still reads as one big building but maybe that could be worked out and may be better received.

Ms. Fox said she struggles with the height being the same and was hoping the massing would be decreased as that height does not occur anywhere in the Historic District. She indicated that if it was three separate buildings and had movement, she would like it better and it would feel like it belonged.

Mr. Hunter asked if different façade treatments to break up the mass is what is preferred or is the physical presence of the building to be considered.

Mr. Rinaldi said the north and south elevations look pretty good broken up but across the High Street elevation it still reads as one.

Mr. Hunter asked if a different shape is preferred by the Board, not necessarily wanting different façade types.

Mr. Rinaldi said he would not necessarily change materials.

Mr. Munhall said he would disagree because material types are important.

Ms. Fox encouraged the applicant to not do different façade types because an artificial look is achieved. She said the large single mass is incongruent and she would rather see separate buildings down the hill. She said she wants a unique, classic, timeless building and not a cookie cutter style.

Mr. Musser encouraged the applicant to provide a visual break between the east and west ends of the building with an architectural feature that makes them appear as two separate buildings.

Ms. Fox suggested an archway that invites people to come and sit down could provide a gathering place.

Mr. Hunter thanked the Board for their comments.

**2. BSD HC – S. High St. Mixed-Use Development
16-082ARB-BPR**

**76 – 82 S. High Street
Basic Plan Review**

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following application is a request for the construction of a mixed-use building with associated parking and site improvements along the east side of South High Street and approximately 35 feet southeast of the intersection with Eberly Hill Lane on a site with existing historic

commercial buildings. He said this is a request for a review and approval of a Basic Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Jennifer Rauch stated there is no Development Agreement associated with this particular project so all reviews stay with the ARB. She said the applicant has revised the proposal since the Informal Review in May 2016 based on the feedback received from the Board as well as the residents that were in attendance. She reported the ART reviewed this application and made a recommendation on November 10, 2016. She explained the Basic Plan is to outline the framework to which the applicant will proceed.

Ms. Rauch presented an aerial view of the site as well as the existing context photos of the surrounding structures. She presented the site plan that reflected the reduction of area, a distance between the existing single-family units, and opened vistas as those were issues at the last meeting. She said there is a single access off Blacksmith Lane, which leads into the majority of off-street parking and there is additional parking underneath the building. She said the first floor is office space with residential on the top floor. She explained this plan is reduced by half compared to what was previously proposed; square footage went from 13,000 square feet to 7,804 square feet. She noted parking meets the total number of spaces required but maneuverability in the off-street lot needs to be examined further.

Ms. Rauch presented the proposed elevations from different views as well as a comparison to existing building height and size as well as the significant grade change. She presented the proposed paint colors and materials.

Ms. Rauch said five Waivers have been preliminarily identified and explained each:

1. Parking Location (2)
2. Front Property Line Coverage
3. Corner Occupancy Requirement
4. Corner Side RBZ
5. Number of Building Stories

Ms. Rauch reported the ART recommended approval of the first four Waivers but disapproval of the fifth Waiver, which dealt with the height that exceeded Code. She provided a graphic to further explain the height differential and another to highlight the massing in context behind the existing buildings.

Tom Munhall asked for the measurement from the back level up to the top of the roof and if that is how all buildings are measured. Ms. Rauch explained it is not the maximum height that is the issue but the number of stories.

Ms. Rauch presented the three-story building directly south of the cottages from the alley, which is adjacent to the proposed building. Jane Fox emphasized what a three-story, large mass structure looks like next to small structures, which is a mistake.

Ms. Rauch explained the previous Code addressed overall height of 35 feet, prior to the BSD Code. She clarified how stories are counted and a minimum/maximum height for each story is considered.

Peter Coratola, 37 W. Bridge Street, said the building is a lot smaller than the first one they proposed.

The Chair invited public comments.

David Hahm, 83 S. Riverview Street, said he totally agrees with the recommendation of the Planning staff; three stories is too high and overshadows the existing historic buildings on High Street. He suggested the building should drop down as it approaches the river. He emphasized that there is a single-lane right-of-way on Blacksmith Lane and Eberly Hill Lane. He explained that in some areas the road is only 13 feet wide but works as a two-way road because people can pass by going onto private

property. He said this means that everybody that owns property along there contributes something of their private property to the functionality of single-lane roads. He said if one property actually claims and completely privatizes right up to the property line, the turns become impossible and the driver has to rely on somebody else to provide the passing space. He indicated this needs to be addressed more seriously. He said he is happy to see the revised plan where the proposed building is moved back but by putting structures there and adding landscaping it does not do anything to solve the single-lane right-of-way issue for two-way traffic. He suggested that maybe permitting the removal of three parking spaces could be the solution; a sacrifice that should be considered. He concluded traffic maneuverability is as important as the building height issue.

Steve Rudy, 129 S. Riverview Street, questioned the Waivers permitting the building to go all the way to the corner of the lot. Ms. Rauch confirmed there were three Waivers to cover the layout.

Mr. Rudy asked if there is a way to split this building into two parts, make each two stories, permitting parking in between the buildings that end up facing the residents with two stories instead of three. He said he thought that would solve the aesthetic problem, the Code issue, and two or three of the Waivers could be eliminated plus the scale/massing issue would be resolved. He added this would permit the applicant the square footage desired while compromising on parking to provide same rental space but less parking. He said this would also provide the side entry and a more consistent façade. He indicated he anticipates the next developers will want three stories as well if this is approved, going all the way down the alley.

David Meleca, 144 E. State Street, Columbus, said they compromised by moving the building back. He said they can meet the building height requirements on the back but it will cause the building to creep forward in order to get the square footage desired on the upper stories. He said they meet the 2.5 story requirement on three sides of the building with the fourth side/back containing the garage designated for the residents above. He said the Waivers are requested to address the neighbors' concerns. He said he does not want to make two buildings out of one when it is a small building to begin with and the infrastructure would make it even more expensive with dual elevators and mechanical systems, etc. He indicated the floor plan is not that large for office use and two residences. He stated they are held to the roof height of the (former) Biddies so even the graphic showing alignment with their roof, in perspective, will recede because the roof is going to fall back so the building will look smaller from High Street than it even shows in the graphics. He concluded that a three, or three and a half story building with a one and a half story behind it is not in keeping with what this building will be.

Mr. Munhall inquired about the number of feet between the proposed building and the end of the parking lot and how many feet the applicant would need to kick out the building to achieve two stories. Mr. Meleca answered he thought ± 18 feet in the back, losing two rows of parking. Additionally, he said they would have to condense the roof into the floor plate, creating dormers.

Everett Musser suggested instead of having landscaping at the alley, to leave it open to alleviate the two-way traffic encroaching on private properties. Ms. Rauch said screening for the parking lot is required. She said Engineering understands the characters of these roads and are not requiring a change.

Tom Holton, 5957 Roundstone Place, indicated the photos comparing the existing rooflines to what is proposed is compelling. He suggested turning the building so the roofline is divided and turned so from the other side of the street which is uphill, instead of seeing one massive roofline they would see a smaller roofline with a break in the middle.

Jane Fox said the ARB is bound to look at the BSD Code but also *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*, from which she read an excerpt. She said she does not believe that a building this size is enhancing the buildings in front, enhancing the site, enhancing the view down the alley, or enhancing the elevation looking from the east side of the river. She said the BSD Code is directly causing problems by requiring

landscaping and curb cuts. She said fundamentally, we are trying to fit a square peg into a round hole. She said these massive buildings do not comply with the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*. She said in the wake of all these conditions, we are allowing a structure that does not fit by trying to make it fit. She emphasized that if the Board is to preserve this historic character with unique elements, smaller buildings that are broken apart, with vistas that matter we should be considering the surroundings. She said with this proposal, traffic patterns will substantially change and the appearance of the alleys will change as all of this comes into conflict when permitting a mass of that size. She indicated she could go point by point in the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* and explain how this proposal does not comply. She added the Code requires any new fencing has to be dry laid stone and the applicant is proposing anything but. She concluded this proposal does not fit the site or the character of the district. She encouraged the public to comment on this application.

David Rinaldi said the details will be worked out later in the process. Ms. Fox said it is not fair to the applicant to lead him on when this proposed building is not designed appropriately for this space.

Mary Szuter, 80 Franklin Street, said she has resided in the downtown area for the past nine years. She asked if smaller homes or separate buildings could be the solution for this area. She said she agreed with Ms. Fox in that this proposed building is too massive.

Mr. Rinaldi indicated he appreciates the reduction in scale. He said he could support all the Waivers except for the one addressing the height as three stories is not going to work here. He said three stories and mass were discussed extensively on the other case heard this evening. He said this is one large roof over three buildings essentially, and the proposed building will overpower that area and not be subordinate to the historic buildings on High Street. He indicated the rooflines could be broken up without needing multiple systems for each section. He said he thought some of the parking spaces proposed are not realistic.

Mr. Musser said he agreed with the architect that the view from High Street will recede because we are looking at the elevation instead of in perspective. He said the west elevation probably will not be visible because of the Biddies building. He said he has concerns with the east elevation that is three stories in height while appreciating the reduction in size of the building. He said an 11,000-square-foot building is not a large building, although it appears so in the elevations. He suggested the building be reduced in size even more as the Board has stated they cannot support three stories on one side. He questioned the maneuverability for parking.

Ms. Rauch clarified the parking requirements. She said the applicant could file a Parking Plan requesting less parking with future development.

Mr. Munhall suggested how to solve the height challenge. Mr. Meleca said it would be feasible but there would be a balancing act with parking because by picking up 18 feet, 6 parking spaces would be lost. Mr. Munhall asked if additional underground parking was possible. Mr. Meleca said the parking garage would be more compressed and enclosed, and it would affect the air circulation. Currently, there is a single row of parking proposed he said.

Ms. Fox said the whole idea of the Historic District is to keep the Historic Core preserved. She said when new construction is added to a site with existing historic structures, the ARB must ensure the new building is subordinate to the historic structures and matches the character of the surrounding buildings. She said this building is located right in the middle of the Historic Core and mass, scale, height, simplification of design, and the subordination to the original site are not being addressed by this style of building. She said even though this might be permitted per the BSD Code, the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* are just as important to be abided by. She added she is very worried about getting fire equipment to the site along with the general problems of maneuverability for any vehicle. She stated she could support giving up landscaping and fencing if it would make it easier on the neighbors. She

concluded she could not support a building of this size and the way it works functionally for the neighborhood.

Julie Seel, 83 S. High Street, said she lives directly opposite of this building and everything that Ms. Fox said reflects her thoughts. She stated the design and size concerns her a lot. She said at that height the roofline will have a considerable impact and completely overpower High Street. She reported she talked to a lot of the elderly people who live in this neighborhood who do not necessarily come to the meetings or have access to the internet. She indicated a lot of them have expressed concern about a building of this size coming into this small area.

Mr. Hahm noted there is a conflict between the BSD Code and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*. He said the Historic District has always been heavily populated with residences and permitted on the first floor, businesses and residences mixed. He said all of a sudden we have a rule that residential use cannot be on the first floor, which is completely out of character with the Historic District and that creates a problem for infill development. He asked if that rule can be waived to give developers another option.

Ms. Fox said the ARB has the ability to make suggestions to City Council about changes such as that. She said she agreed, people should be able to live on the first floor and it would be easier to get a small cottage or a condominium built.

Ms. Rauch clarified the City is in the process of modifying the BSD Code and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* but this application has to be reviewed against the current Code.

Ms. Fox said the applicant submitted an application to be reviewed under the BSD Code but also to be reviewed by the ARB under the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*. She said the *Guidelines* are quoted in the BSD Code to be utilized equally. She said overall, we have to decide if a site plan is correct, or that the building style, character, and impact are just as heavily weighted as a zoning issue like parking or whether or not a building is so many feet from frontage.

The Chair said there are three motions before the Board.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Munhall moved, Mr. Musser seconded, to approve four Waivers as part of a request for a Basic Plan Review:

1. §153.062(0)(9) – Building Type – Parking Location - parking area in the rear yard of the building (required); off-street parking area to the side of the proposed project (requested); and §153.062(0)(9) – Building Type – Parking within the Building - parking is not permitted within the building (required); parking spaces within the ground level of the building (requested).
2. §153.062(0)(9) – Building Type – Front Property Line Coverage - minimum 80% of the front property line covered (required); 62% (requested).
3. §153.062(0)(9) – Building Type – Occupancy of Corner (requirement); non-occupancy of corner (requested).
4. §153.062(0)(9) – Building Type – Corner Side RBZ - location within RBZ (required); not to be located within RBZ (requested).

The vote was as follows: Ms. Fox, no; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Musser, yes; and Mr. Munhall, yes. (Approved 3 – 1)

Motion and Vote

Ms. Fox moved, Mr. Rinaldi seconded, to approve a fifth Waiver as part of a request for a Basic Plan Review:

5. §153.062(0)(9) – Building Type – Maximum Building Height - 2.5 stories maximum (permitted); 2.5 to 3 – stories (requested).

The vote was as follows: Mr. Munhall, no; Mr. Musser, no; Mr. Rinaldi, no; and Ms. Fox, no. (Disapproved 0 – 4)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Musser moved, Mr. Munhall seconded, to approve a request for a Basic Plan Review with the eight conditions:

- 1) That the applicant submit a demolition application for review and approval by the ARB, prior to the approval of the Site Plan Review for the site;
- 2) That the applicant obtain a lot combination to create a single parcel for the site, prior to the issuance of a building permit;
- 3) That the plans be revised to increase the width of the ADA accessible space from 5 feet to 8 feet;
- 4) That the applicant continue to work with staff on the off-street parking layout and maneuverability;
- 5) That the applicant provide auto-turn data for the site, Eberly Hill Lane, and Blacksmith Lane with the submission of the Site Plan Review application;
- 6) That the applicant work with staff to identify an opportunity to provide a principal entrance along Eberly Hill Lane as part of the Site Plan Review;
- 7) That the applicant continues to provide additional material and design details with the Site Plan Review; and
- 8) That the final details regarding open space provision, landscaping, street wall, lighting, utilities, and stormwater will be required with the Site Plan Review.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Ms. Fox, no; Mr. Musser, yes; and Mr. Munhall, yes. (Approved 3 – 1)

**3. R-1 – Kittrell Residence
16-089ARB**

**5051 Brand Road
New Construction**

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following application is a request for new construction of a single-family dwelling on a 4.91-acre parcel on the south side of Brand Road, approximately 1,000 feet east of the intersection with Coffman Road. He said this is a request for a review and approval of an Architectural Review Board Application for the designated property located outside of the Historic District and under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.170, Appendix G and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

JM Rayburn presented an aerial view of the site and the proposed Site Plan. He noted the plans indicate the use of the existing gravel driveway and a new loop in front of the house to be added to lead to the

attached garage at which time the applicant will make the addition out of concrete or asphalt but could leave the existing gravel section.

Mr. Rayburn presented the proposed elevations of a two-story, Craftsman-style farmhouse structure with an attached garage. He said the floor plans are often organized around a spacious eat-in kitchen and usually include metal gabled roofs, cupolas, wood-fixed barn doors, and board and batten siding. He said the Craftsman touch includes features such as a stone base, shake siding, timber posts, asphalt shingles, and masonry work. All of the proposed windows he said are clad-wood windows with painted wood shutters. He added the south elevation features a rear porch with a metal roof and exposed heavy timber beams.

Mr. Rayburn noted traditional colors and combinations of those colors are both identified with the origin or the era in which the structure was originally built. He presented the proposed exterior materials including colors as follows:

- Window selection: Windsor, Gun Metal Grey
- Siding: BM Iron Mountain 2134-30
- Dormer Trim: North Shore Thin
- Outdoor Lighting: Bevelo, Modernist Flush Mount

Mr. Rayburn presented the proposed architectural character desired.

Mr. Rayburn said the building height could not be determined as the plans submitted were not to scale so the elevations will need to be revised to include this information with the building permit submission.

Mr. Rayburn said approval is recommended with four conditions:

- 1) That the future accessory structure and future house addition be removed from the plans, prior to the submission of building permits;
- 2) That the plans be revised to show the required setbacks, building height, dimensions, lot coverage, septic tank location, and driveway materials and width;
- 3) That a survey be submitted with the submission of building permits; and
- 4) That the plans be revised to ensure all new portions of the driveway incorporate an approved driveway material, subject to Planning approval.

Jessica Kittrell, 8888 Cruden Bay Court, said she is available for any questions as well as her architect.

Jane Fox said the house proposed is beautiful. She inquired about the existing house because it will be demolished and as it is historic, she asked if the applicant had an opportunity to work with the Dublin Historic Society about preserving any of the historical elements or documenting/photographing any of the historical elements. Ms. Kittrell said they have not at this point but would be willing to do that. She added they just hired their builder so they will go through the house with them and see if there is anything that could be preserved and available to the Dublin Historical Society.

Ms. Fox said the ARB did not want to see the existing home demolished so if there is anything that can be done to preserve the history in our documentation, she would like to see that as a condition.

Everett Musser asked the applicant is she planned to save the buttresses at the street entrance. Ms. Kittrell said they absolutely will and hope to install new lighting.

Mr. Musser indicated he liked the country home proposed and asked if the existing drive will be used solely as the construction entrance. He asked if it will be paved after the construction is completed. Ms. Kittrell answered affirmatively.

The Chair invited public comment. [Hearing none.]

David Rinaldi said this was a beautiful home proposed. He inquired about the huge setback of the home on the property. Ms. Kittrell explained it incorporates the home better into the Coventry Woods neighborhood since the existing home already sits so far from Brand Road. She said there are also grade issues to contend with.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Munhall moved, Mr. Musser seconded, to approve a request for new construction with five conditions:

- 1) That the future accessory structure and future house addition be removed from the plans, prior to the submission of building permits;
- 2) That the plans be revised to show the required setbacks, building height, dimensions, lot coverage, septic tank location, and driveway materials and width;
- 3) That a survey be submitted with the submission of building permits;
- 4) That the plans be revised to ensure all new portions of the driveway incorporate an approved driveway material, subject to Planning approval; and
- 5) That the applicant work with the Dublin Historical Society to document and/or salvage any historic elements, prior to demolition.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Musser, yes; and Mr. Munhall, yes. (Approved 4 – 0)

Communications

Jennifer Rauch said the Historic Dublin Code Workshop was conducted. She said the summary of that information should be added to the City's website soon and there is still time for the public to submit comments. She said a follow-up is scheduled for the consultant to compile the information and make recommendations for how the Code could be potentially changed. She said a public forum is scheduled for December 8, 2016, where more public feedback will be obtained. Following that discussion, she said the formal review process would be worked through. Jane Fox asked what the top recommendations were based on the initial feedback. Ms. Rauch answered preserving two stories and possibly splitting the Historic Core into two separate districts, which came in with mixed reviews. Ms. Fox said there are about 500 residents in the district and asked if a simple questionnaire could be mailed out to them as this directly impacts them to gain a cohesive consensus. Ms. Rauch answered that is not part of the scope.

Mr. Rinaldi said we have to keep in mind that whatever happens there this will serve all 45,000 residents of Dublin.

Ms. Fox asked to talk with the Board this evening about the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* and the BSD Code. She said she thinks the standard of review is on the BSD Code and not being applied equally by the ARB *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*. She indicated that is why the ARB is coming up against some difficult decision making and awkwardness; we need to support more the integrity of character. She distributed a handout to the Board and asked them to review it at home. Unless the ARB uses the *Guidelines* equally, she said they will not be able to slow down all the new infill happening in the Historic Core. She indicated that the BSD Code is thought of as the rule but upon closer review, the BSD Code

states both documents shall be used. She emphasized that the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* support the ARB in making the preservation decisions in the Historic District. She indicated it is easier to check off the boxes in the BSD Code but the *Guidelines* are more subjective and much more difficult.

Mr. Rinaldi said he did not believe the Board violated anything in the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* this evening. He said he disagrees that there is a clash right now. He reasoned character and style were not discussed tonight but rather height and massing.

Ms. Rauch said the BSD Code is the law and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* are guidelines but important. She said everyone on the Board brings expertise and information they believe is important to make decisions.

Ms. Rauch concluded that as part of this Code Amendment, if this needs to be stronger or changes should be made to the Code that align better with the *Guidelines*, then that should be done.

Mr. Munhall suggested saving a subjective opinion to the very last thought in the review process.

Ms. Rauch said the BSD Code is meant to be as predictable as possible so there is not negotiating. She said there is a history of negotiating projects and the BSD Code is meant to be very straightforward with particular requirements and if those are met, it should not be a subjective decision on what is permitted.

Ms. Fox said the BSD Code allows the reviewer to check off what is allowed by following criteria but Council's intent was always to look at this as a moveable document. She reported when Council spoke about the ARB and its role, City Council said they would prefer the ARB have final ruling over the BSD Code in order to preserve the district. She said there is intent behind these *Guidelines* more than determining aesthetics. She said if we can make this more clear-cut about what we expect in the Historic District in the beginning we can make their process so much easier. She concluded if this Board does not know the Code and does not understand what the duties and standards of review are, we are doing our applicants a disservice. She said we are Historic District guardians, not zoning people.

Ms. Rauch said the consultant Greg Dale, has offered to speak to the ARB about this topic as well as some general Board training at a subsequent meeting.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 8:52 pm.

As approved by the Architectural Review Board on January 25, 2017.