



SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, June 14, 2017

AGENDA

Work Session to review proposed amendments of the Bridge Street District Code as they relate to the Historic District.

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, Shannon Stenberg, and Everett Musser. City representatives were: Vince Papsidero, Lori Burchett, Nichole Martin, Lia Yakumithis, Cameron Roberts, Donna Goss, and Laurie Wright.

Administrative Business

Motion and Vote

Ms. Fox moved, Ms. Stenberg seconded, to accept the documents into the record. The vote was as follows: Mr. Musser, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Ms. Stenberg, 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.

WORK SESSION

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said this is a work session to review proposed amendments to Sections 153.058, 153.059, and 153.062 of the Bridge Street District Code and review a proposed area rezoning. These revisions address the intent, uses, zoning districts, and building types for Historic Dublin core districts.

Vince Papsidero thanked the Board for hosting the Open House prior to this meeting this evening as well as this special work session. He said Staff and the consultant have been working for a number of months on a Code update in response to issues raised by the community relative to the potential new commercial development along S. High Street in the Historic District. He said Leslie Oberholtzer, CodaMetrics, is the City's consultant who also participated in the development of the original Bridge Street Code. The intention, he said, is to get the amendments approved by the end of the summer. He stated that Ms. Oberholtzer will give a presentation and then we will take the Board's comments and questions.



Leslie Oberholtzer, CodaMetrics, reported that revisions had begun in October 2016, and there was a public outreach workshop where Staff created a series of stations for addressing concerns and to promote in-depth discussions. She said the stations available for each participant to rotate through were as follows:

- The first station introduced the potential for a new transitional zoning district between the Bridge and High Street intersection and the residential buildings on neighboring streets and the south end of High Street
- The second station addressed the current Code requirements for materials and design details such as massing, windows, and roofs.
- The third station provided a discussion format for parking provisions in the area, focusing on the difference between the areas north and south of Bridge Street.
- The fourth station presented some design options addressing potential infill development in the rear of the lots along Blacksmith and Mill Lanes.

Ms. Oberholtzer said she was instructed to look specifically at the areas south of High Street and south of Bridge Street. She said Staff was trying to figure out what could happen behind all those historic buildings up and down High Street and what would be appropriate in terms of their relationship to the residential on the other side of the lanes. She provided some images from those four stations to provide a sense of the level of effort. She reported there was a good turnout at that first workshop and a lot of input was received from the community.

Ms. Oberholtzer stated the second workshop was based on the results of the first workshop to discuss details and uses that would be appropriate for this new proposed district. She reported there was some discussion about parameters for hours that eating and drinking establishments could be open. She presented an example of one of the surveys that were distributed at that second workshop. From the information obtained and discussions with Staff, she said, some revisions were drafted. She indicated the first draft of revisions is meant to engage everybody in conversation. She said the focus was on intent, which is to allow for infill since this is the demand to support a mix of uses because it is already a mixed-use area and to ensure the new development fits within the context. She indicated this is a very unique location as it has its own character, form, and materials. She said the Code should be written so everything fits within that context including the surrounding historic residential areas.

Ms. Oberholtzer said four items were focused on for revising the Code.

1. To introduce a new district;
2. To revise the map based on that new district;
3. To revise the building types; and
4. To revise the uses.

Ms. Oberholtzer said this is Code meant to define the building envelopes and regulations but it is not meant to take-away the ARB *Historic Dublin District Guidelines*. To introduce this new BSD Core II District, she stated she is editing the existing Code that lists all the different districts. She explained the revisions follow the language in the Code for the existing Historic Core but limits Core II to the smaller scale cottage feel.

Ms. Oberholtzer noted on a map the location of the new Historic Core II District being proposed and highlighted the areas requiring rezoning. She said that within this new district, single-family detached and historic cottage commercial building types will be permitted, and the existing historic mixed-use building type will not be permitted. She explained the basic difference between the two is that the historic mixed-

use building type has the connected street wall like the new construction at Bridge and High Streets; the cottage commercial has more space and pushback. She added the civic building type is always permitted as it is a flexible building for specific uses.

Ms. Oberholtzer said there are issues with the current mixed-use building type. She said the focus is mainly to address what is happening in the back portion of the lots. She said the area along High Street remains the same with one main exception – the buildings are now limited to two stories instead of two and a half stories in height. The second exception is that an overall revision to the BSD and one of the items to be likely removed from the Code is the transparency requirement on the back and interior sides of buildings. She presented graphics to illustrate the revisions proposed from the backs of mixed-use buildings measured approximately 100 feet to the lane:

- Building footprint is limited to 1800 square feet;
- Building length is limited to 50 square feet;
- 18 feet should be between separate buildings in the rear; and
- An enclosed connection is permitted.

These revisions above, she said, are to allow cottages in the rear of these lots and presented graphics. She noted the maximum 12-foot connections between the cottages is to allow for a business to expand. She said the cottages are limited to a single story in height and required to be 15 feet back from the face of the building so the additional setback allows for more landscaping or a courtyard area. Additionally, she said coverage is limited to 50%. She said there is a maximum height of 1.5 stories in the last 50 feet so there is a swath along each lane that is limited to 1.5 stories since they would abut residential. She emphasized the series of buildings is stepping back from the 2 stories permitted along High Street to 1.5 stories in the rear 50 feet of the lot along the lanes. She summarized the building massing in the rear, height, and the amount of coverage of the lots have been focused on. She referred to a matrix, which demonstrated how the uses are managed on the lots. She noted there is only a limitation of residential uses along the principal frontage occupied space, which is a 20-foot depth along High Street.

Everett Musser inquired about parking requirements for Historic Core II to which Ms. Oberholtzer answered has not been addressed yet.

Ms. Oberholtzer said the same uses are permitted for the new district with three exceptions:

- Banks are not permitted;
- Eating and drinking establishments are limited; and
- Surface parking lots as a principal use and parking structures are not permitted.

Ms. Oberholtzer further proposed that conditional use applications would no longer go to the Planning and Zoning Commission but instead will come to the ARB for the recommendation to City Council at the same time that everything else is being reviewed by the ARB.

Ms. Oberholtzer reported that the public fairly overwhelmingly said that eating and drinking establishments were desired in this district but the use needed to be limited:

- 3,500 square feet (already exists in the Code)
- Hours are 7 am to 10 pm
- Deliveries and refuge pick-up between the hours of 8 am – 5 pm

Ms. Oberholtzer said that landscaping, parking, design guidelines in terms of materials, window, etc. will be addressed with the overall BSD revisions to move the design standards to a handbook that will contain softer language. She indicated that is already addressed with the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* so the design standards will be reviewed during a later phase of work.

Ms. Oberholtzer indicated she hopes the following are discussed this evening:

1. Whether or not this proposal is in character with the existing context; and
2. Height and massing

The Chair invited public comment.

Jeff Leonhard, 55 S. Riverview Street, said he has resided there for almost four years and the area proposed as Historic Core II is right by his house. He indicated he did not disagree with a lot of the revisions but thought it was overkill for three empty lots. He said some limitations are good for these empty spaces but he is concerned these revisions may restrict new development. He said there are so many empty buildings up there now and even in the new construction at Bridge and High there are empty spaces. He suggested that too many restrictions have already kept new businesses away and developers are trying to avoid those restrictions by building new. There are buildings that are one storm away from falling down or burning down, he said, and it has been that way since he has lived here.

Steve Rudy, 129 S. Riverview Street, thanked everyone for their hard work. He said he likes the shared open space in this district, currently. He said he likes the revisions for permitting detached homes and the maximum story height but would prefer absolute height. He said the following are not being protected: topography, sight lines, or the openness. He said the Code looks great here but enforcement is a different matter so he is not confident that the infill will be built as written here so he would like to see the new development as far away from residential as possible.

Michael Carrol, 190 S. High Street, said he did not understand what was just presented. He said if the intent is to get the community to say this is a good idea, then it needs to be presented in a way that looks at the big picture instead of all these little details. He said he does not know what Dublin wants the Historic District to look like or the traffic to be like; the historic buildings are not being protected. He suggested the City provide incentives so people will keep up the old buildings. He said it is not fair to ask this Board to say something cannot be demolished and then it just rots because it is not economically feasible to fix it up. He affirmed the City put a lot of time and effort into these proposed revisions but he is not certain it is a fix because he does not understand it.

Christina Wentz, 54 S. High Street, said she is a business owner in the district right now. She asked that the parking minimum should be increased, especially for the areas farthest away from the public lots. She stated she is a retail establishment and she needs those parallel spots on High Street for her staff and drop in customers. With more businesses moving into the area, parking will just become worse.

Garrick Daft, 21 Indian Run Drive, said he does not understand the 7 am – 10 pm eating/drinking establishment limitation. He suggested the limitation should be expanded to 6 am – 11 pm. He inquired about uses because he did not understand what type of businesses are to be attracted. He said the area is dead after the Village Tavern. He asked for clarification on some other revisions, too.

Jane Fox asked if his questions could be answered.

Ms. Oberholtzer said the difference between a Bed and Breakfast and eating/drinking establishments is that the B&B is for overnight stays and the breakfasts are typically served to the guests staying there; the B&B would not be open to the public unless an eating/drinking establishment was permitted in that location. She said the reason behind the exclusion of entertainment, recreation, indoor exercise and fitness use is the scale of those spaces, typically. She said potentially, the exercise and fitness could be permitted as a conditional use just like the Historic Core District.

Mr. Daft indicated that Harbor Yoga was an interesting place and a yoga studio would easily fit into a 3,500-square-foot space to which Ms. Oberholtzer agreed. He said it is a beautiful area and is thankful that all this planning and attention is being paid to this area to conserve the historic nature and to also attract people.

The Chair asked for anyone else from the public that wanted to speak. [Hearing none.] He closed the public portion and moved onto Board discussion. The Chair said he appreciated the comments and asked the Board if they had any opinions on the uses or other revisions proposed. He asked if this proposal has gone far enough.

David Rinaldi suggested that the uses be revisited as there could be more uses permitted, potentially that would not be objectionable to this scale of buildings. Overall, he said he thought this addressed a lot of the concerns that have been voiced and the scale of what is happening behind the Historic District. He stated he liked the limitation of height on High Street, the footprint sizes, and more open space.

Jane Fox said there is some improvement but she would like to see that area go all the way up to SR 161 because there is a lot of area behind Donatos that is open for development and that abuts residential. She said she liked that the floor minimum heights were decreased but the revision only brought them down one foot – from 10 feet to 9 feet. She suggested we consider a height maximum clarified in footage because the height of the building cannot always be controlled by the floor minimum heights. She liked that Ms. Oberholtzer stated the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* still apply as they have to be an overriding review standard more so than just the specifics of the Code because they state what the ARB is supposed to be doing. That, she said, is that the Historic District has a sense of place and in order to maintain that, the ARB has to look at the vernacular architecture but also at the intimate village scale and the spaces between the buildings and that is where the linkages become a problem for her.

Ms. Fox noted the following have not been addressed at all:

- Variations in land form;
- Topography;
- Patterns of streets, alleys, and sidewalks;
- Kind of paving materials permitted;
- Stone walls;
- Mature street trees; and
- Other environmental features that create the visually interesting community.

Ms. Fox said even though we are looking at the architectural massing details, we are not looking holistically at what we are trying to preserve here. We could approve the proposal as it stands she said but there will not be protection for historic character. She presented some photographs of examples to demonstrate.

Ms. Fox asked the following question:

If you imagine your favorite block or place in the Historic District and it did not exist tomorrow, would the present proposed Bridge Street District Zoning Code allow it to be rebuilt again.

Ms. Fox said if we are going to change the Code, and there are particular aspects and characteristics of this Historic District that are to be preserved. She added if this Code does not allow us to maintain, preserve, protect, or recreate it, then we are missing the boat.

Ms. Fox restated that she is concerned with the linkages, the lot coverage, and the density this type of infill would bring. She indicated that a 50% lot coverage is not characteristic of the Historic District. She said she is also concerned with allowing impervious material to reach a maximum of 85%. She presented several photographs to demonstrate her point. She said the Historic District has a lot of open green spaces with disconnected structures. She emphasized that the characteristics need to be made clearer and considered. She said if areas are filled in with linkages, the sightlines will be decreased and if 85% impervious is permitted there will be a lot of hardscape with no room for grass or mature trees. She stressed that the linkages do not currently exist in the Historic District and if these linkages are permitted to be chained together, the character of the District changes. She said there will no longer be as much green space, mature trees, sightlines, or vistas that everyone finds so precious down there. She emphasized this is important and needs to be addressed.

Ms. Oberholtzer restated that 18 feet is required between buildings and the connections/linkages are meant to be 15 feet back and intended to create a little inset or courtyard and the building could only be a single story. She suggested that maybe the Code be revised to state the 18- by 15-foot courtyard would have to have a certain percentage limitation of impervious material.

Mr. Musser inquired further about the linkages. Ms. Oberholtzer said from an economic perspective, an 1,800-square-foot building could be allowed to expand for the businesses by connecting buildings. On a Google map, she pointed out areas that do not have much room between buildings - it is not the proposed 18 feet but rather more like 5 or 10 feet at the most. She said the point is to offset the development in the rear of the lots. She said all of the cottages that exist up and down High Street are all very close together with the green space in the back. She proposed that maybe the linkages could exist along the High Street buildings but not in the rear buildings.

Shannon Stenberg recalled a discussion whereas parcels could not be combined in the Historic District Core II. She asked if that could be added to these revisions. Ms. Oberholtzer explained that could be done but by setting the maximum width of the building that was meant to be the solution.

Mr. Papsidero said Staff was responding to the concerns of the neighbors who did not want large scale buildings so that is why these limitations are proposed.

Mr. Musser asked how the 50% lot coverage was determined by the consultant and if it was based on research or other historic areas. Ms. Oberholtzer explained the illustrations in the proposed Code are the same that were presented at the First Community Workshop, but simplified. She reported that during that first workshop, she presented a typical lot with the coverage, (an appropriate) space between the buildings which is about 18 feet, that included a series of cottage commercial buildings and then she removed one of them in the rear to create a green space as another option. Throughout the whole process she reported she kept requesting input from the residents and the consensus was as long as the buildings that were in the rear had that scale, reduced in height, and matched the cottage feel, the green space was not necessary.

Mr. Musser stated 50% lot coverage is okay. He said he likes the revised Code, the cottage concept, and has no trouble with the linkages. He indicated he is concerned about the parking, landscaping, and materials but understands that will be addressed at a later date.

Ms. Stenberg inquired about setbacks for the commercial buildings. Ms. Oberholtzer explained the zero setback was to create the street wall and the rear has a setback because the lanes are so narrow. She said there could be an issue when determining what façade is the front and what is considered to be the rear so that should be clarified.

Ms. Stenberg inquired about floor height. Ms. Oberholtzer explained that 15 feet is typically desired for the ground floor height of commercial businesses (such as chain restaurants) so 12 feet is fairly low but it is more consistent with the existing buildings.

Mr. Rinaldi said it might be nice to explore the uses permitted to allow more flexibility in the Historic Core II District. He noted that the 85% impervious number probably includes where some of the parking will go; if we restrict that, then parking needs to be found elsewhere.

Ms. Fox indicated that if parking is an issue, then 50% lot coverage is too much and she would also like to see a limitation on overall height of buildings because they are supposed to be subordinate to contextually adjacent historic buildings.

Ms. Stenberg suggested that a definition of a half-story be included in the Code. She said a half story of 12 feet versus a half story of 9 feet is a big difference.

Mr. Rinaldi stated the overall height needs to be established. Ms. Fox said that even when there was a case where the proposed building met the height requirement, the subordination to existing historic buildings did not occur. She added she does not want to see the historic building become the least important building.

The Chair concluded there have been some diverse comments made this evening.

Mr. Musser responded to the lot coverage. He said if economic development is desired, there needs to be a certain amount of lot coverage, otherwise it is not economically feasible. He indicated there is a fine line between preserving the Historic District and inviting new economic development.

Ms. Fox agreed but said even though we can see incremental improvements on these lots it has to be restricted in some ways because she does not want to see economic development placed in front of preserving a Historic District. This is a big city she emphasized and there are plenty of other places to gain taxpayer money but once the Historic District is destroyed by insensitive infill, then the Historic District is gone. She said 10% of historic structures have now been eliminated.

Mr. Musser said he did not think this Code would promote insensitive infill.

Ms. Fox repeated she wanted to see less density on the lots.

The Chair confirmed that the consultant received all the public input desired and research completed.

Mr. Papsidero said this was a very good conversation and all the comments will be evaluated. He said the intent is to come back to the Board in July with a revised proposal to start the adoption process. He said the revised Code will be posted online for the public beforehand. Notices, he said, will be sent to the same neighbors as were invited this evening.

Ms. Burchett asked the audience if they had any additional comments to please put them on the comment cards and they will be collected. She said if there are further comments, please feel free to contact Planning Staff and they will forward them to Ms. Oberholtzer as well.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 8:19 pm.

As approved by the Architectural Review Board on July 26, 2017.