



MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, June 28, 2017

AGENDA

- 1. BSD HC – Harvest Pizza – Patio** **45 N. High Street**
17-042ARB-MPR **Minor Project Review (Approved 3 – 0)**
- 2. BSD P – Columbus Metropolitan Library, Dublin Branch – Demolition** **75 N. High St.**
17-060ARB **Demolition (Approved 3 – 0)**
- 3. BSD-HTN – Riverside Park, Phase 1 – West Plaza** **N. High Street**
17-019ARB-SP **Site Plan Informal (Discussion Only)**

The Chair, David Rinaldi, called the meeting to order at 6:32 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Board members present were: Jane Fox and Shannon Stenberg. Everett Musser was absent. City representatives were: Jennifer Rauch, Lori Burchett, Logan Stang, JM Rayburn, Joanne Shelly, Matt Earman, Shawn Krawetzki, 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. Rinaldi, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; and Ms. Fox, yes. (Approved 3 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Ms. Stenberg moved, Ms. Fox seconded, to accept the May 24, 2017, meeting minutes as presented. The vote was as follows: Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; and Ms. Stenberg, yes. (Approved 3 – 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 – Harvest Pizza – Patio** **45 N. High Street**
17-042ARB-MPR **Minor Project Review**

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following application is a request for a patio addition and associated site improvements to an existing restaurant space on a 0.25-acre parcel. He said the site is on the west side of N. High Street, approximately 125 feet south of the intersection with North Street. He stated this is a request for a review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.



Logan Stang presented an aerial view of the site as well as the proposed site plan. He said the applicant is proposing to install a paver patio along N. High Street extending around the southern portion of the building. He said the patio will consist of red brick pavers with a limestone wall located along the interior edge due to the grade change. The patio will have one connection directly in front of the porch located on N. High Street with a second location to the public walkway that lies between Harvest Pizza and Tucci's Restaurant to the south. Additionally, the applicant is proposing a wood picket fence around the perimeter of the patio painted to match the trim of the building.

Mr. Stang presented some context slides showing the front façade along N. High Street. He noted the number of mature trees that will fall within the patio area and the applicant will be required to work with staff to help preserve the existing trees or replace, if the existing trees have to be removed with the construction of the patio. He showed the southern façade and public walkway as well as the existing ground sign that will be relocated near the porch entrance with no additional modifications proposed to the sign.

Mr. Stang presented the fence that would be painted white to match the trim of the building. Staff is conditioning that this be replaced, he said, with a black metal wrought iron design to correspond with the character of the surrounding properties within the Historic District, prior to issuance of a permit.

Mr. Stang presented the proposed patio furniture that consists of a black metal chair with Trex composite manufactured tables. Additionally, he said, a dark umbrella is proposed to correspond to the color palette of the building. He reported that Staff is conditioning that the tables be replaced with a black metal wrought iron design to complement the proposed chair design.

Based on the listed Architectural Review Board Standards as well as the Minor Project Review criteria, Mr. Stang said approval is recommended for the Minor Project Review with four conditions:

- 1) That the proposed fence material be changed to a black metal wrought iron design prior to issuance of a permit, subject to staff approval;
- 2) That the proposed table material be changed to a black metal wrought iron design prior to issuance of a permit, subject to staff approval;
- 3) That the applicant continue to work with staff to redesign the proposal to preserve or replace existing trees, to the extent practicable, prior to issuance of a permit; and
- 4) That the applicant provide revised fence and furniture details prior to review by the Architectural Review Board.

Mr. Stang presented the revised details for the furniture and the fence as the ART had requested in condition #4 for the ARB's review this evening.

The Chair asked the applicant if they had anything to add to the presentation, which they responded they did not. He invited public comment.

Steve Rudy, 129 S. Riverview Street, asked where the fence will be installed, specifically. Mr. Stang responded along the outer edge of the patio, adjacent to the public walkways.

Jane Fox indicated she sees they are not using the maximum amount of space that they can get for the patio. Mr. Stang explained the reason the patio is not closer to the sidewalk on N. High Street is because it would encroach into the right-of-way. He added the applicant is building to their front property line on N. High Street and noted the southern and northern setbacks as well.

Ms. Fox asked how the brick paver looks next to the brick sidewalk. She indicated she noticed that Tucci's Restaurant has two colors of brick on their patio. Mr. Stang said he did not think the color of the paver

would match the color of the brick on the sidewalk and the walkway, but that is due partially to some fading over time but the selected paver would be complementary to the brick.

Ms. Fox inquired about the request to change the tables proposed. She indicated the Board would not want every business to look alike. She asked if options could be put together for applicants within the Historic District. She suggested a tile top table with the black iron base or cast aluminum tables, something to provide some variety and offer our applicants something a little bit different. Jennifer Rauch said that has been discussed as part of some of the updates to the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*. Ms. Fox said she wanted to make sure the applicant was comfortable with the options given for tables.

Matt Torchia, 1208 S. Washington Avenue, Columbus, Ohio, 43206, said he was fine with the options recommended by Staff but he was hoping for something that would set their patio area apart from the other businesses.

Ms. Fox said if the applicant felt there were other options that would make them feel comfortable and that they would like to bring forward that are made of natural, quality materials that have an older appearance that should be allowed. She clarified that the umbrella would be brown and the one-foot wall would be made of the tumbled limestone. She encouraged Planning to come up with a variety of stone wall options for applicants that are characteristic to the Historic District.

The Chair asked for any further public comment with regard to this case. [Hearing none.] He closed the public portion of the meeting.

Shannon Stenberg said she is appreciative of the four conditions of approval; switching out the Trex furniture and having a wrought iron style fence is a good idea as well as the landscape.

David Rinaldi suggested it would be nice to have tree wells or something to help salvage the mature trees that are existing.

Ms. Fox suggested that even if there is not enough space for the trees, trees in planters would be good – anything to provide softness around the edge of the patio to make it really inviting.

Mr. Torchia said he loves the trees and hopes they can preserve them by working with staff.

Ms. Fox asked for the design detail of the fencing proposed as it appears straight on. She also asked how it will appear next to the fence style of Tucci's. Mr. Stang presented the fence used at Tucci's and noted it is rounded on the top with the straight pickets in the center. He showed a photograph of Brazenhead's fence across the street for context.

Motion and Vote

Ms. Fox moved, Ms. Stenberg seconded, to approve a request for a Minor Project Review with four conditions:

- 1) That the proposed fence material be changed to a black metal wrought iron design prior to issuance of a permit, subject to staff approval;
- 2) That the proposed table material be changed to a black metal wrought iron design prior to issuance of a permit, subject to staff approval;
- 3) That the applicant continue to work with staff to redesign the proposal to preserve or replace the existing trees, to the extent practicable, prior to issuance of a permit; and
- 4) That the applicant provide revised fence and furniture details prior to review by the Architectural

Review Board.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; and Ms. Fox, yes. (Approved 3 – 0)

**2. BSD P – Columbus Metropolitan Library, Dublin Branch – Demolition 75 N. High St.
17-060ARB Demolition**

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following application is a request for a Demolition of the existing Columbus Metropolitan Library, Dublin Branch building at the northwest corner of the intersection of N. High Street and North Street. He said this is a request for a review and approval of a Demolition under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.176 and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Lori Burchett presented an aerial view of the site and photographs of the one-story structure as it exists today. She said the existing structure that is proposed to be demolished was constructed in 1980 according to the County Auditor's information. She explained this structure had replaced the historic structure that had been demolished in the 1970s. The structure is not considered to be architecturally or historically significant she said, nor is the property listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

Although the Site Plan for the future library has been approved by City Council, Ms. Burchett said, this proposal is solely for the existing building and whether the criteria for Demolition has been met. She reported that Staff has reviewed the criteria for Demolition and finds the proposal consistent in that a) there are no significant architectural and historic features; b) no reasonable economic use or alternatives to demolition exists; c) there is no willful neglect; and d) the location of the structure impedes development.

Ms. Burchett said approval is recommended with two conditions:

- 1) That prior to actual demolition, the owner shall permit the Dublin Historical Society to enter the premises and salvage any architectural features worthy of preservation; and
- 2) That the order to allow a Demolition shall not be issued by the City until a replacement use or building has been approved by the Required Reviewing Body and an application for a building permit has been submitted for the replacement building to the City.

The Chair asked to see again the four criteria of which two have to be met. He asked the applicant if they had anything to add and they responded they did not. The Chair then called for public comment.

Tom Holton, 5957 Roundstone Place, said there is a time capsule the Dublin Historical Society is interested in and they are pretty sure they know where it is located on the premises. He said they want to ensure that the time capsule is preserved before demolition is completed. He indicated it is located in the north wall by the staff entrance.

Ms. Burchett indicated the time capsule had been noted in the Ohio Historical Inventory.

Jane Fox asked Mr. Holton how practical it is for the Dublin Historical Society to go into a structure and salvage significant elements. Mr. Holton answered he has not heard a request from anyone yet. Ms. Fox asked if it is feasible for the Historical Society to salvage items and Mr. Holton said they could not by themselves but could work something out with the applicant. He added the Historical Society would not have any place to store anything of significance or size currently but that they are working on it.

Steve Rudy 129 S. Riverview Street, asked for clarification on criteria 'd'. Ms. Fox read the criteria directly from the Code as the one Ms. Burchett had presented was paraphrased.

Mr. Rudy said the architectural intent of the replacement was found to violate the historic standards of the district numerous times. He indicated the replacement library was meant to dominate the district per the words of the architect and it was not to blend in, etc.

The Chair asked if there was further public comments [there were none.] He closed the public portion of the meeting and opened the discussion up for the Board.

Shannon Stenberg said she totally agreed with Mr. Rudy as she also felt the fourth criteria was not met. She explained the proposed construction did not qualify and it does impede development.

David Rinaldi said are no significant architectural and historic features and the structure impedes development.

Ms. Fox indicated this decision is awkward for the ARB because the Board already knows what the outcome is going to be. She said she is looking at the history of the ARB saying that we wanted to see the new construction of the library become a more historical piece to fit in to the district. She noted the fourth criteria is met according to what historically has been said by the ARB so at least in part it does not meet that. She said there could be a reasonable economical use for the structure as it exists but could not be remodeled to be what the City is seeking for a library. She restated that the ARB is in an awkward position because it has already been decided that the existing library be demolished to make way for the new library.

Ms. Stenberg concluded the proposal still meets two of the four criteria.

Ms. Fox clarified that the current library has to be demolished or it will impede orderly development. She said the current library does not distract from the historic character of the immediate vicinity; it has been there for a while and everyone liked it. She added 'the proposed construction improves the overall quality', she finds subjective.

The Chair recapped that the proposal meets two of the four criteria.

Ms. Fox suggested each member of the Board go through each criteria and state why one does or does not meet the requirements so there is complete understanding.

Criteria #1 – All three Board members agreed it is met.

Criteria #2 – Mr. Rinaldi said it is not met because there could be another use for the existing structure.

Criteria #3 – Ms. Stenberg said there has not been willful neglect and Mr. Rinaldi agreed. Ms. Fox said they are to consider the deterioration. Ms. Stenberg said the economic feasibility to restore is to be considered and that has been the argument the Board has on every single Demolition because it is always going to cost more to restore, add on, or renovate. She said in this case, since it is not historic or architecturally significant then why someone would want to restore it is the question.

Motion and Vote

Ms. Stenberg moved, Mr. Rinaldi seconded, to approve a Demolition request with two conditions:

- 1) That prior to actual demolition, the owner shall permit the Dublin Historical Society to enter the premises and salvage any architectural features worthy of preservation; and
- 2) That the order to allow a Demolition shall not be issued by the City until a replacement use or building has been approved by the Required Reviewing Body and an application for a building permit has been submitted for the replacement building to the City.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; and Ms. Stenberg, yes. (Approved 3 – 0)

**3. BSD-HTN – Riverside Park, Phase 1 – West Plaza
17-019ARB-SP**

**N. High Street
Site Plan Informal**

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following application is a request for the first phase for the City of Dublin Riverside Park, West Plaza and associated site improvements based on the approved Master Plan. The West Plaza site is on the east side of North High Street, approximately 400 feet north of North Street. This is a request for an informal review and feedback of a Site Plan Review application under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.066(F) and (J) and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Jennifer Rauch presented an aerial view of the site and the proposed site plan.

Ms. Rauch noted the Basic Site Plan was approved December 5, 2016, which included both the East and West Plazas but the case being heard this evening is only related to the West Plaza. She presented the previously approved Basic Site Plan that included the (future) Pedestrian Bridge landing, paver materials, seating, green areas, walls, stairs, and granite planter curb. She pointed out the West Plaza is adjacent to the Z building so there have been some modifications to the seating area as well as the spacing for accessibility. She noted the grade is significant in this area and the grade will need to coordinate with the construction on High Street as well as the previously approved adjacent buildings.

Ms. Rauch presented the proposed designs that include concrete formed planters with seating due to maintenance concerns but making the area soft and inviting. She explained the brick pavers match those used in Historic Dublin. Similar to before are the bollards she presented and steps as needed. She noted the accommodation of a future patio expansion for a specific tenant from the Z building, which will come forward as a separate review. She presented the various stone materials and noted their locations as well as the bridge handrail selection to ensure coordination amongst all the materials.

Ms. Rauch presented the previously proposed planting design to compare to the proposed design that has been modified.

Ms. Rauch presented the lighting elements that are being proposed, which include light from the buildings as well as various options for subtle light across the plaza to soften the space and make folks feel invited and safe.

In conclusion, Ms. Rauch presented several renderings of the proposed West Plaza from various viewpoints that include the surrounding buildings and the (future) Pedestrian Bridge.

Ms. Rauch presented several questions for the Board to consider:

1. Does the design and layout of the plaza provide safe and efficient circulation, particularly given the high pedestrian traffic?
2. Does the proposed design and layout integrate with the surrounding buildings and context?
3. Does the proposal provide appropriate seating, amenities, and design elements? What other elements should be considered?
4. Are there other considerations by the Board?

Ms. Rauch said the Board's comments and concerns would be passed onto City Council for their final review at the end of July 2017.

The Chair asked that applicant if they had anything to add to Ms. Rauch's presentation to which they responded they did not.

David Rinaldi said he works in downtown Columbus and walks the Scioto Mile, which has a lovely limestone fence but stainless steel studs have been added every four feet to prohibit skateboarders from

skating on it. He said he loves the proposed planters and seating for the West Plaza and asked if there is a way to deter skateboarders at the start.

Matt Earman said this was discussed. He said the advantage to this design is that the planters will be pre-formed so the ledges/indentations can be created inside the concrete itself instead of having an additional component added to it to deter the skateboarders.

The Chair called for public comments.

Tom Holton, 5957 Roundstone Place, indicated he liked the sweep of the design for seating.

Shannon Stenberg said the sweeping seating area looks great and she likes the cool lighting proposed. She said these are gorgeous elements but then the bollards are added, which appear to detract from this beautiful area.

Ms. Rauch said the bollards are placed at Rock Cress to ensure nobody is able to drive directly into this area and associated lighting is also being considered. Mr. Rinaldi indicated the bollards are an improvement over a guardrail.

Jane Fox indicated that form needs to follow function and asked what the hope of the City is trying to accomplish with this wonderful entrance to the bridge. She said this is a transitional space coming from the newer side of development over to the older side of the river and sees this as an outdoor room and a perfect place for farmer's markets, festivals, and children's performances. When she looks at the planter designs, she sees people sitting around perimeters, she said, and not looking at each other or relating to each other but rather looking away from each other as they are positioned in a line. She suggested situating the seating so folks can walk through the 'room' to get to the bridge without impeding any sight lines of the bridge. She said she envisions people stopping and visiting for a while before moving forward to cross the bridge and does not see the current design accomplishing that goal. She said it appears as a place to rest but not engage or to play a game of chess, or permit a group of guys to sit around and enjoy a cup of coffee together.

Ms. Fox referred to a conference report about European Squares that stated physical design elements that include a visual enclosure have to have a human scale architectural frame, fountains, sculptures, street furnishes that focus on activities, seating that is formal or informal, sunlight and shelter from the elements in the form of arcades, trees, etc. She suggested we consider this as a flexible space whereas some of the elements can be moved to the side if we wanted to have a street festival. She indicated that people like to sit under umbrellas, canopies, or pergolas, to talk or enjoy a beverage.

Ms. Fox said it would be nice for the people sitting in these outside patio areas of the eating/drinking establishments to see out to a lot of people gathering and talking instead of just sitting around edges of things. Traditionally, she said this proposed design does not give us what we are looking for in function and believes this could be made much more inviting. She said she would like to see a sculptural water fountain, which would make people stop and gaze but understands the fountains can be expensive.

Mr. Rinaldi said it is a small space as a landing and a pathway through and not a full plaza. He indicated that it cannot stay a pathway with much more put in there. He said the intent is to provide a flow through this area but where there is also a place to gather along the edges.

Ms. Stenberg asked if there is a way to provide Wi-Fi hotspots or places to charge electronics so it would permit people to sit and do that before moving to the next destination, which could be the bridge or one of these restaurants.

Ms. Fox said 91 feet across is a decent amount of space, which could still be flexible. She said there is no landscaping along here. She emphasized she did not want to miss an opportunity to provide a gathering space.

Mr. Rinaldi indicated that a more flexible plaza or community space is being planned at the library across the street to which Ms. Fox agreed. She said even the little frog patio attracts a lot of people. She emphasized that pocket parks are essential to the character and vibrancy of an area and sitting on a perimeter of an area does not engage one to want to stay in that space. She recognized that the walk from one side of the bridge to the other is long so we want to make the landings as inviting as possible for respite and a prime opportunity for the patrons of the restaurants to see activity happening.

Mr. Rinaldi confirmed the (future) Pedestrian Bridge will still include a cycle track. Ms. Rauch affirmed that the City is trying to move people across the bridge in a safe way while preserving the views and the landings are part of that.

Ms. Fox suggested more traditional plantings be used as an indicator that this transitional space opens to the Historic District such as posts with finials at the top to hang planters from to soften this area because the concrete planters are contemporary.

Mr. Earman said all of the points are very well taken as staff has struggled with these same issues. He emphasized we are dealing with two sides of the river and want to offer as much as we can on both sides. He explained that the West Plaza is just one component of a park that is going to come before this Board for multiple conversations about other amenities that will come, some of which will be on the east side. He said there are a lot of restrictions from the real estate aspect of it all as they are trying to create a grid here that creates bicycle and pedestrian flow without impeding the visual aspects of the bridge.

Mr. Earman said farmer's markets and tables tend to impede traffic rather enhancing the ability to move people throughout. He said with restaurants on both sides, they anticipate a lot of people in this area regardless of whether tables & seating are provided. He reported staff consulted with an artist to define ways people can actually be sitting and facing each other rather than in a linear form. He said they respect the perspective for wanting artwork. He indicated the east side will better define programmatic activity and structures to happen. He said staff is trying to capture all the dynamics and complexities of this space but it will be very difficult to accommodate everything so this is what they came up with in the way of flow. They are anticipating a lot of events, he said, either starting or finishing on the bridge.

Mr. Earman added the biggest problem with water features is the expense behind it, whether that be in the design itself and the mechanics or structure that has to happen for functionality. He indicated staff is exploring some dynamic water features for the east side because the real estate is available and the physical components in which to house the mechanics to accommodate such an amenity. He said the West Plaza contains public and private space within the same context, whereas the east side is all public that allows more liberties.

Ms. Fox asked if trees could be planted within those concrete planters to provide some verticality but not impede the view, something that shows this is not just a flat open space. Mr. Earman said they have asked their landscape consultants to consider that but they have not gotten to the point of determining how they would look from the various vantage points, if they were to plant trees. He indicated they have not fully defined what will go in those planters as they are still in the conceptual stage but anticipates they may be able to bring more vertical lift to some of those planters without impeding the sight lines but from a tree standpoint, it might be very difficult to do. Ms. Fox said she wants to make sure people are comfortable in the space and not just baking in the sun. She indicated she would also like to see more traditional bollards used on the west side of the river as she sees this as an entrance door to the Historic District.

Ms. Stenberg asked Ms. Fox how she feels about the concrete material, itself. Ms. Fox said she did not have a problem with concrete as it can be shaped for a softer appearance. She said she now understands that flow is more important than gathering in this space. Mr. Earman interjected that staff can go back to the drawing board to create an atmosphere for people to face each other for an engaging environment. Ms. Fox stated that people will find places to gather in general, if they are comfortable in a space.

Mr. Rinaldi concluded he understood this plan as a pathway but he would like to see more verticality in the planters to provide a green presence, not necessarily trees.

Historic and Cultural Assessment

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following is a comprehensive review of the results from the Historic and Cultural Assessment of the built resources, landscape features, and archaeological sites within the entire Dublin Planning Area, and a list of preservation strategies appropriate to Dublin. He said JM Rayburn will introduce the presenters this evening.

JM Rayburn reported the Historic and Cultural Assessment began in 2015, as part of the update of the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*. He said City Staff and the ARB at the time, agreed the existing Ohio Historic Inventory needed to be updated and to provide additional information and analysis regarding historic and cultural assets within the City. Commonwealth Heritage Group was selected to help with this process. He reported that this assessment covers five different areas:

1. Detailed inventory
2. Evaluation of relevant and historic structures and cultural resources within the City of Dublin and the Dublin Planning Area
3. Development of strategies to encourage the preservation efforts by property owners
4. An assessment of contributing and non-contributing buildings in historic Dublin
5. Historic architectural understandings

Mr. Rayburn said the final deliverables were contained in a report with 8 appendices; it details the study process, the assessment itself, the summary of stakeholder engagements and interviews conducted, Planning recommendations, and a GIS data package to incorporate into the GIS system and resources that the City has.

Currently, the website is available, Mr. Rayburn said, that contains the report of the executive summary and appendices available for download.

Mr. Rayburn introduced the consultants present, Anne B. Lee and Scott E. Slagor from Commonwealth Heritage Group.

Anne B. Lee said she is the archeologist on the project and Scott E. Slagor is one of the architectural historians assisted by two other architectural historians and two GIS archeologists. She said the report is massive as it encompasses 34 square miles in the Dublin Planning Area covering parts of three counties. She said they prepared a detailed inventory of above-ground-like buildings and structures but also what else might be important for creating a 'sense of place' here or contribute to the historic character and key elements of resources that gave Dublin a distinctive flavor in this part of central Ohio. She stated this assessment was meant to provide City Planners with more resources.

Ms. Lee said they developed historic context based on identified buildings and structures as well as archeological sites as important items to review. The 1979 Washington Township multiple resources area, she explained, is kind of a massive national register combination that takes a bunch of collections of things and puts them altogether. That, identified in addition to buildings and structures, farm buildings and stone walls. She reported The Ohio Historic Preservation Office puts resources underneath 9 historic

themes and the 3 most important for Dublin were domestic architecture, commerce/finance, and agriculture. In order to come up with a list of everything that has already been documented plus what they thought might be out there, she said entailed extensive background research that included looking at all the resources from the Ohio Historic Preservation Office, the Historical Society, conversations with people, histories from the 1800s, maps, and aerials. She indicated they put all the information into a GIS database where it links all the attributes together with a location. The approach, she explained, was to divide the entire 34 square miles into a grid system and all deliverables are key to this grid. She said they visited almost 167 half-mile grids.

Scott E. Slagor indicated they made a good faith effort to visit resources 1970 or prior in age. However, through data collection through photography, he said some resources were not possible to document from the public right-of-way because of dense tree cover and set backs but they captured just about everything. Resources were evaluated for their historic significance using criteria from the National Register of Historic Places, which is published by the National Park Service and is used by other communities across the state. He affirmed this criteria provides a solid foundation and a method for determining what resources are historically significant or why in turn, they are not historically significant. This information provided in this report, he stated, will enable the City to use a recognized system to make decisions as it is described in immense detail along with all the criteria considerations and various rules and recommendations. The criteria is as follows:

Criterion A – significant for historic events (specific event or broad pattern of events)

Criterion B – persons significant to our past (this person was associated with a resource and that resource was an important component to their productive life ex. Studio of an artist)

Criterion C – resource is known for architecture or engineering

Criterion D – archeology (site has potential to yield information)

Mr. Slagor explained they weighed properties against our historic context to determine if the property was significant within the context of the research and whether these resources retain historic integrity to convey their significance. There are seven aspects of historic integrity:

1. Location
2. Setting
3. Design
4. Materials
5. Workmanship
6. Integrity feeling
7. Association

Property does not have to retain all seven aspects of integrity, Mr. Slagor said, but it does need to retain sufficient integrity to convey its historic significance. Within the Historic Districts, he said they identified contributing and non-contributing resources, determined on why the Historic District is significant. Generally, he indicated, those are resources that are constructed during the district's period of significance or conveyed why the district is significant. While a resource may not look dazzling, if it retains its historical integrity and contributes to the overall story or sense of place of that district, then it is considered contributing, he said.

Mr. Slagor said they looked at 897 buildings, 4 bridges and culverts, 9 cemeteries, and 54 stone walls. He said the fieldwork also resulted in the investigation of 5 probable mill locations, 6 probable quarries, and 359 archeological sites. He added they identified 93 buildings and structures that would be contributing, as well as landscape features including a carriage step and stone walls. He said they were not asked to look at modern buildings with this study so there is a fair number of non-contributing modern buildings in the district that they did not capture in this report. He continued they identified resources and types of resources that are not historically significant in terms of the National Registry but still contribute to

Dublin's unique sense of place, such as an old barn or associated farmstead buildings that convey significance of architecture from a community standpoint. He said it says something was here prior to what is here now and it is a reminder of Dublin's past and heritage. He said the rural Ashfall Road Bridge is part of the bike trail that is the historic rural transportation route and still conveys a sense that this is what the roads were like here historically.

Ms. Lee said there are a couple of areas that they visited that were supposed to contain cemeteries but the consultants were not able to say one way or another based on just visiting them. She said one of the locations was reported as a burial ground. Some resources were on private property so they did not have access but the idea that they are potentially there is in the report so if the City gets a development happening, those should be considered.

After completing archival research and field investigations of buildings and structures, the investigation of the historic and cultural resources resulted in the following:

- 23 buildings within the Dublin Planning Area are recommended individually eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP);
- An additional 17 buildings within the Planning Area may be individually eligible for listing in the NRHP, but require additional research;
- Two new historic districts (Frasier Estates and Indian Run Subdivision) within the Planning Area are recommended eligible for listing in the NRHP;
- One additional historic district within the Planning Area is recommended eligible for listing in the NRHP, pending additional research;
- The Dublin High Street Historic District should have its boundary increased, which is currently just two blocks of High Street south of Bridge Street to be expanded to include much of the original village plat and capture the essence and historic character of Dublin prior to the large suburbanization period that occurred after I-270 was put in (circa 1970) and the period of significance extended as the purest significance is from the oldest constructed building in the district (1820 until 1966), which is the latest building within that period as well as the National Register's guideline of 50 years;
- Six other resources, or groups of resources, within the Planning Area are recommended as contributing to Dublin's unique character and sense of place - Dublin Heights Subdivision, which is located just west of the cemetery, has a fascinating collection of mid-century duplexes that are all identical and mirror each other, and the consultants thought that was very unique and eligible under Criterion C;
- Verification of seven cemeteries and two markers within the Planning Area;
- Verification of the location of one historic limestone quarry that can be visited today - Snouffer Quarry Number 3 in Donegal Cliff's Park but they made a list of 6 quarries that could be identified through historical research along with the probable verification of the remnants of one historic mill but identified 8 possible mills along the Scioto River, which would have been important in terms of the early industrial commerce in Dublin. The Joshua Corbin Stone Mill is a famous one just south of downtown; and
- Two significant prehistoric archaeological sites that are worthy of preservation and study are the NRHP-listed Wright Holder Earthworks and associated sites, owned by the City, and the privately-owned Davis Mound located just outside the Dublin Planning Area (OAI# 33FR2386, located on the east side of Riverside Drive, south of Martin Road), which may be at risk of erosion damage. The City may want to talk to the property owner about that because it probably has human remains in it.

The consultants provided recommendations for the preservation of Dublin's resources and proposed changes to the planning process, which would provide greater consideration for Dublin's historic and cultural resources. The following recommendations were made:

- Consider adding properties that are recommended individually eligible for NRHP listing to the Architectural Review Board process and giving them special consideration during Planning Division review of projects.
- Consider adding properties that are recommended as contributing resources to proposed historic districts and to the Dublin High Street Historic District boundary increase, to the Architectural Review Board process and giving them special consideration during Planning Division review of projects.
- Consider an intensive-level survey of properties - Older homes with ancillary structures like old outhouses and garages that may be individually eligible for the NRHP, prior to authorizing actions in their vicinity. Some of those have parts of the lot where the outhouses might have been but some of them did not so there are areas that may contain significant historical archeological sites that would contribute to understanding about how people in Dublin lived, and what was the socio-economic status. If the City did a couple of backyards and if the remains were there to permit information to be extracted, which people were richer than others and where there were different ethnic backgrounds could be determined.
- Consider an intensive-level survey of the proposed Frazier Estates Historic District prior to authorizing actions in the proposed district's vicinity (this district is currently located outside of the municipal boundaries).
- Consider completing a formal update and amendment to the existing Dublin High Street Historic District, in consultation with the Ohio Historic Preservation Office.
- Consider pursuing a formal NRHP nomination for the recommended Indian Run Historic District and the recommended Dublin Heights Historic District, in consultation with the Ohio Historic Preservation Office.
- Consider undertaking restoration of the Indian Run Cemetery, including restoration of stones. This may require an interpretive plan because exact locations of each person's interment are unknown. This may also be a good opportunity to further develop an understanding of who is interred in the cemetery, which may result in individual eligibility for the NRHP. The consultants think the earliest settlers were buried there but are not concrete on all the information they have so they do not have a good sense to dig next to the stone wall and not hit a burial site.
- Although outside the boundaries of the Dublin Planning Area, consider taking the lead to coordinate discussions to engage the property owner of the Davis Mound in conversations with the City and professionals at the Ohio Historic Preservation Office, the Ohio History Connection, and the Archaeological Conservancy regarding long term stabilization and preservation strategies.
- Consider exploring an ordinance that requires property owners to take into consideration impacts to potential archaeological sites on properties within the Dublin High Street Historic District, and at the potential locations of unverified cemeteries, mill ruins and potentially significant archaeological sites.
- Consider adding some or all of the stone walls to the Architectural Review Board process and give them special consideration during Planning Division review of projects.
- Consider developing public outreach materials for all Dublin residents emphasizing the historic and cultural resources of Dublin as well as materials for owner's properties itself within one of the historic districts and how to take care of it or where they can go to get funding or financing or an expert with their type of home.
- Affirm the importance of the Historic Core and Historic Residential Areas (aka "Historic Dublin") and take active steps to protect their character-defining features.
- Use public lots/garages to improve parking and lessen the burden on developing commercial properties in Historic Dublin.
- Utilize some of the financing mechanisms for the Bridge Street District to update the infrastructure of Historic Dublin. Be particularly concerned about the Historic District and locations where there could have been a cemetery, a mill ruin, or a potentially significant archeological site.

- Utilize some of the financing mechanisms for the Bridge Street District to provide incentives to improve existing properties in Historic Dublin before one might put an addition on a house or put in a garage.
- Improve the Architectural Review Board process with a small project/maintenance process (e.g. staff-approvable items) and more frequent opportunities for property owners to obtain approval.

Mr. Rayburn said no action is required of the Board this evening but certainly this is a forum for a dialogue.

Jane Fox said after waiting all this time, she was hoping to see something historic presented but it is great to hear the consultants saw so many things. She was told that her property is next to the property that used to contain an Indian meeting house ground.

Ms. Lee said places they identified were based on written testimony; there may be an archeological site there.

Mr. Rayburn reiterated that the website is up. He said the Executive Summary and the full report can be accessed. He said Appendix A contains the listing of all the individual property sheets for each structure the consultants surveyed and they are very informative.

Ms. Fox indicated that for people that are interested in the history of Dublin, that once this report gets published, we will start hearing from those folks about all the things that the consultants were not aware of and did not get to see. She asked what we should do as we encounter these people and their stories. Ms. Rauch answered that we should encourage people to meet with planning staff and they will figure out how to verify add information to the report. Mr. Holton asked if they find errors or have questions, if this is already a done deal or if the report can be modified. Ms. Rauch answered the report is out for review and a final draft is still being worked through.

Ms. Rauch encouraged the Board to read what is out there, talk through the recommendations, and decide what they want to pursue to determine what should be forwarded to Council for approval. She said Council expressed interest but she does not know yet if they are expecting a presentation or discussions. She stated it will take Council's approval to extend the Historic District boundary or to incorporate more properties.

Ms. Fox inquired about the recommendations for expanding the Historic District because up along the Scioto River, north of what is considered the Historic District currently, she suggested should be part of the district. Apparently, in the 1800s, there were quite a few homes for the very early settlers, 1802 – 1830, spread along the river she said, due to the height of the ground on the banks of the river. She asked if there was any reason these riverfront areas were not chosen to be included in the report or if the consultant did not find enough remains that would be considered historic. She said a log cabin built in 1800 was found right on the river so there were early settlers there.

Mr. Slagor said, in his experience surveying both Riverside Drive and Dublin Road, a lot of those settlements could have been very old but based on their placement, dealing with tree cover, setbacks, and no access to private property, the consultants could not identify those settlements but additional information can always be gathered and investigated. Significant archeologically that is not present could be added as an area of concern, considered an area to watch during future development, or discovered but that would take additional investigation. Ms. Lee emphasized that anything not visible from the public right-of-way and not accessible as it is private property was only considered historic through conversations with a lot of people. She indicated there is a lot in Dublin the City does not know about. She then mentioned the house that incorporated part of a log cabin that they found about through dialogue.

Ms. Fox suggested that the City ask the person that covers Dublin media to put something out to say this is an exciting new history we can share with the public but maybe someone knows more and to encourage the public to come forward with any knowledge they may have. She indicated this might be a quick and easy way for historic property owners to add to the list.

Communications

Jennifer Rauch said this is Jane Fox's last meeting. A new member, Jeffrey Leonhard, who lives on S. Riverview Street, will be appointed to fill Tom Munhall's position first, she said.

Ms. Rauch announced that Lori Burchett is transitioning to take over the Board Liaison responsibilities for Ms. Rauch so comments and questions should be directed to Lori from now on.

With no further communications to share, the Chair adjourned the meeting at 8:18 pm.

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