



MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, July 26, 2017

AGENDA

- 1. BSD P – Columbus Metropolitan Library, Dublin Branch** **75 N. High Street**
17-069Z **Rezoning (Recommended for Approval 4 – 0)**
- 2. Downtown Dublin Parking Garage** **75 N. High Street**
17-075CU **Conditional Use (Recommended for Approval 4 – 0)**
- 3. Historic Dublin – BSD Code Amendment** **Historic Dublin**
17-052ADMC **Administrative Request – Code (Recommended for Approval 3 – 1)**
- 4. Historic Dublin – Zoning Map Amendment** **Historic Dublin**
17-074Z **Rezoning (Recommended for Approval 3 – 1)**

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: Shannon Stenberg, Everett Musser, and Jeffrey Leonhard. City representatives were: Mayor, Greg Peterson, Jennifer Rauch, Lori Burchett, Nichole Martin, and Laurie Wright.

Administrative Business

The Chair introduced Mayor, Greg Peterson to swear in Mr. Jeffrey Leonhard as he was appointed by City Council.

Mayor Peterson expressed his appreciation of the Board members' service on behalf of the City and City Council. He said development seems to increase every month in the Historic District and this Board is a watchful guard at the gate. He performed the Oath of Office for Mr. Leonhard.

Motion and Vote

Ms. Stenberg moved, Mr. Musser seconded, to adjourn to the Executive Session to consider the appointment of the public employee or official and the election of the Vice Chair. The vote was as follows: Mr. Leonhard, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Musser, yes; and Ms. Stenberg, yes. (Approved 4 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Rinaldi moved, Ms. Stenberg seconded, to return from the Executive Session. The vote was as follows: Mr. Musser, yes; Mr. Leonhard, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; and Mr. Rinaldi, yes. (Approved 4 – 0)

The Chair reconvened the meeting.



Motion and Vote

Mr. Rinaldi moved, Mr. Musser seconded, to elect Shannon Stenberg as the 2017 – 2018 Vice Chair. The vote was as follows: Mr. Leonhard, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; Mr. Musser, yes; and Mr. Rinaldi, yes. (Approved 4 – 0)

Motion and Vote

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

Motion and Vote

Mr. Musser moved, Mr. Rinaldi seconded, to approve the meeting minutes from June 14th and June 28th as presented. The vote was as follows: Ms. Stenberg, yes; Mr. Leonhard, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; and Mr. Musser, 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-P – Columbus Metropolitan Library, Dublin Branch 75 N. High Street Rezoning
17-069Z**

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following application is a request for a Rezoning of two parcels totaling 2.39 acres from BSD-P, Bridge Street District Public to BSD-HTN, Bridge Street District Historic Transition District. He said the site is on the northwest corner of the intersection of N. High Street and North Street. He said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Standard District Rezoning under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.232, 153.234, and 153.066.

Jennifer Rauch added the Rezoning is for the Columbus Metropolitan Library site as well as the new parcel for the Downtown Dublin Parking Garage within the Historic District. She stated the Development Agreement between the City and the library includes a provision to rezone these properties to Historic Transition to provide additional uses upon future redevelopment of that site. She specified the two parcels involved that were created with a separate plat currently under review.

Ms. Rauch presented the proposed rezoning and noted the area that is currently zoned Bridge Street District Public and the request for rezoning is to the BSD Historic Transition District. She stated the proposed library and parking garage would be able to be developed under both zoning classifications. She presented the Special Area Plan, the Future Land Use Map that outlines the site as Mixed-Use Village Center, and the Thoroughfare Plan, which are met with the proposal.

Ms. Rauch said the Administrative Review Team made a recommendation of approval for the Standard District Rezoning with no conditions. She stated the recommendation of approval is recommended to the Planning and Zoning Commission. She said following their review, the application will be forwarded onto City Council for final review and determination.

The Chair invited public comment [Hearing none.] He asked for questions or comments from the Board [Hearing none.]

Motion and Vote

Mr. Musser moved, Ms. Stenberg seconded, to recommend approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Standard District Rezoning with no conditions. The vote was as follows: Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Leonhard, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; and Mr. Musser, yes. (Recommended for Approval 4 – 0)

**2. Downtown Dublin Parking Garage
17-075CU**

**75 N. High Street
Conditional Use**

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following application is a request for a Conditional Use to permit a parking structure within the BSD Public District in Historic Dublin. He said the site is approximately 250 feet northwest of the intersection of N. High Street and North Street. He said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Conditional Use under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.066 and 153.236.

Jennifer Rauch presented an aerial view of the site as well as the proposed site plans. She reported the Basic Plan Review was approved in April 2017. She explained the request for a Conditional Use is due to the Zoning Code requiring a parking garage to be aligned with occupied space along street frontages. She stated the proposal is to permit a parking garage that is not lined by occupied space along the street frontages, as is required by Code. She said the garage site has frontage along three public rights-of-way: (future) Rock Cress Parkway, North Street, and (future) Franklin Street extension. She explained the required location for occupied space would decrease the number of spaces, which is one of the main goals of this public parking garage.

Ms. Rauch reported the Administrative Review Team (ART) made a recommendation of approval for the Conditional Use with no conditions. She stated a recommendation of approval is recommended to City Council for final review and determination.

The Chair invited comments from the public [Hearing none.] The public portion was closed and the meeting was opened to discussion by the Board.

Motion and Vote

Ms. Stenberg moved, Mr. Leonhard seconded, to recommend approval to City Council for a Conditional Use with no conditions. The vote was as follows: Mr. Musser, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Leonhard, yes; and Ms. Stenberg, yes. (Recommended for Approval 4 – 0)

**3. Historic Dublin – BSD Code Amendment
17-052ADMC**

**Historic Dublin
Administrative Request – Code**

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following application is a request for Amendments to Sections 153.058, 153.059, and 153.062 of the Bridge Street District Zoning Code. He indicated these revisions address the structural components to the BSD Zoning Code to add a new district and to address building type requirements for the Historic Cottage Commercial building. He said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission regarding proposed amendments under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.232, 153.234 and 153.066, and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

Nichole Martin said she has prepared a consolidated presentation of the Administrative Request for Amendments to the Zoning Code as well as Rezoning to permit a new zoning district – Historic South as one case cannot really stand without the other.

The Chair introduced the other case below, which is combined with the case 17-052ADMC for purposes of review.

**4. Historic Dublin – Zoning Map Amendment
17-074Z**

**Historic Dublin
Rezoning**

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said the following application is a request for an amendment to the Zoning Map to establish Bridge Street District Historic South as a new zoning district. He said the sites are located within Historic Dublin along S. High Street, south of Spring Hill and north of John Wright Lane. He said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Standard District Rezoning under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.232, 153.234 and 153.066.

Ms. Martin presented a potential process/timeline dependent on the recommendation being made this evening:

7/26/17

Cases reviewed by the Architectural Review Board (ARB) to make a recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC).

8/10/17

Cases reviewed by the PZC to make a recommendation to City Council (CC).

8/28/17

Cases reviewed by CC and a determination made for the Code Amendments and Rezoning.

Ms. Martin presented an aerial view of the boundaries of the Historic District and noted only that area will be affected within the BSD.

Ms. Martin said the Code changes proposed per Section are summarized as follows:

§153.058 – BSD Scope and Intent

- Creation of the Historic South District and identification of the sub-district's intent.

§153.059 – Uses

- Identification of permitted and conditional uses for the Historic South District.
- Application of use-specific standards for Eating and Drinking facilities, and Exercise and Fitness facilities.
 - Eating and Drinking facilities are size-limited, with limited hours of operation, and limited hours for commercial deliveries and refuse collections. The hours of operation can be modified as part of a request for a Conditional Use.
 - Exercise and Fitness facilities are size-limited.

§153.062 – Building Types

- Revisions to the building type standards for the Historic Cottage Commercial building.
- Building height is limited to two stories or a maximum of 24-feet to the eave; and one and half stories or a maximum of 18-feet to the eave within 50-feet of the rear lot line.
- A reduction in the footprint of any individual building to 1,800 square feet to ensure scale is consistent with the existing character of the sub-district (individual buildings on the same parcel can be connected via an "enclosed connection" or hallway).
- Maximum building coverage is limited to 50 percent of a site, and maximum impervious coverage has been reduced to 65 percent (from the earlier proposal of 75 percent).
- On-site parking cannot be visible from High Street; it must be located behind buildings.

Ms. Martin said the Code does not identify specific criteria for reviewing Code Amendments, however, the Planning Report has outlined considerations based on the BSD Special Area Plan for the Historic District's existing character. She said Staff and the ART are supportive of these modifications, therefore, approval is recommended to this Board for the BSD Code amendments. She also stated that the ARB's recommendation will be forwarded to the Planning and Zoning Commission but City Council will then be the final reviewing body.

Ms. Martin said, in some cases, there may be a creation of non-conformities, given the nature of the district as these structures have been built over time but that will be addressed in the standard section of the Code.

With respect to the Rezoning portion, Ms. Martin said there are 25 parcels proposed to be rezoned, which she noted. She said that these parcels are currently identified as the BSD Historic Core District and are now being proposed to be located within the Historic South District, which will be applied to land along S. High Street, south of Spring Hill, and north of John Wright Lane. With the creation of this district, she said all of the aforementioned uses and permitted building types will now be permitted in this district but this district does not permit the Historic Mixed-Use Building type; therefore, some of the concerns about the character of development that will occur in this district is significantly limited; and, the Historic Cottage Commercial building, which is permitted in this district, has been modified to address those concerns.

Ms. Martin presented the entire BSD Zoning Map as it would be proposed to Council. She said the ART is recommending the ARB recommend approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission with no conditions for a Standard District Rezoning to permit a new zoning district – Historic South. She restated City Council will be the final reviewing body.

The Chair invited the public to comment.

Kathy Lannan, 37 S. Riverview Street, requested the ARB send this latest draft back for further review with the Planning Department. As a homeowner that lives north of Spring Hill, she said, she would love to see this softer touch extended behind their properties. She said there are foundations there that need tender loving care and the heavy construction is a concern. She inquired about parking structures being permitted as a conditional use in this new area; that was not in the June draft and they feel very strongly that they do not want parking structures permitted.

Ms. Martin indicated parking structures being permitted as an accessory conditional use in this new area must have been an error in the July draft. The Chair clarified a parking structure is not a Conditional Use and the current version needs to be amended. Ms. Martin noted the error in the table and ensured that would be cleaned up prior to submittal to the PZC and suggested additionally, that be made a condition this evening.

Ms. Lannan said she was happy to see the height restriction on the story and a half building but wondered if that went far enough to limit the size of these buildings. She asked if it would make sense to also define "the upper half story as being limited to half of the livable square footage permitted for the first floor" - somehow to limit the height. She referenced the new house on Riverview Street that she described as very beautiful. Supposedly, she said, at a height of a story and a half but it is taller than the two-story buildings around it. She emphasized she would like to see a good solid definition of a one and a half story building in the revised Code amendments.

Ms. Lannan said she sees the development at 35 S. High Street and it has room additions, small buildings in the back, and incorporates parking, but it is all subordinate to the historic structure, which is an example of infill development she would like to see.

Ms. Lannan noted the linkages proposed. She said all these buildings can be linked together as an infill project and she believes that will close up the openness that currently exists; she is looking for a small cottage development. She is concerned that we will end up with a wall of buildings that will close up the area.

Denise Frantz King, 170 S. Riverview Street, said she was deputized by the leadership of the Historic District Association to come and carry the message tonight because they are on vacation. She said there has been a lot of input from residents at public input sessions offered by the City, which they appreciate and it is a credit to staff that they listen and carry the message to Council.

While progress is being made, Ms. King said the revisions to the Code still need some work. She suggested that as much time that everyone has spent on this, it is worth getting it right before Council votes on it. She noted the most important feature is the historic character. She indicated portions of the Historic District have been written off with a great sense of loss so it is important to preserve this community-wide asset. The boundaries for Historic South should include all of the properties east of High Street and south of SR 161, she said, as this backs up to residents of the Historic District. She said Mill Lane, S. Blacksmith Lane, Spring Hill Lane, Eberly Hill Lane, Pinney Hill Lane, and John Wright Lane should not be considered principal or non-principal frontage streets but rather High Street should be considered a principal frontage street. Part of the definition of the BSD Code Section 163.061(D) and Section 153.060 is to preserve the character of the area that has buildings, little green spaces, trees, and parking lots; it is not just a mass of buildings along the alleys for example. She referenced Code Section 153.061(D) that states:

“Alleys and service streets are very low capacity, low speed, and located near the rear lots that minimize the driveway interruptions in the pedestrian realm. Alleys and service streets provide access to parking facilities, loading facilities, and service areas for refuge and utilities.”

Ms. King clarified their point is - that is what the alleys and service streets should be used for. She added Section 153.060 states:

“Alleys and service streets shall not be considered street frontage and shall not be subject to street frontage requirements as described in Sections 153.059 to 153.065.”

Ms. King said linkages between buildings need to be discouraged; linkages may be more favorably considered if the maximum building coverage on the lot is maintained at 40%. She emphasized they did not want buildings around the entire block or property with a courtyard in the middle, which will diminish the historic character and will instead take on this urbanized city block feel, which detracts from the asset that is Historic Dublin.

Ms. King said the major concern of the residents is the proposal for infill density in the Historic District whose inherent character and existing physical conditions are described and protected by the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*, which states:

“Perhaps the most definable characteristic of Historic Dublin is its intimate small village scale. The buildings are located close together along the sidewalk and range from one to one and a half stories in height. Nearly all the buildings have a residential quality and contrast to the centers of many other historical Ohio communities that have a continuous streetscape of commercial buildings with storefronts, cornices, and shared party walls. The spaces between the buildings offer owners and tenants an opportunity to create small gardens, seating areas, and open space. Mature trees also contribute to the character of a well-established community. The combination building materials, physical

setting, and spatial relationships among the historic buildings make Historic Dublin unique.”

Ms. King said this is not something new the residents are advocating, this is something that has been on all of our books and important to a lot of people in this community for over two decades, approximately.

Ms. King said the residents are concerned that the Zoning Code speaks only to the physical measurements of infill and not to the character of the architecture and the new BSD Design Guidelines should define and promote historically appropriate architectural styles. She added the models in the document do not appropriately reflect what we are proposing and therefore should be altered.

Ms. King inquired about principal permitted uses in Table 153.062-A. She asked why Elementary, Middle, and High Schools, as well as a library and civic building are listed under Core 2/Historic South because there is really not enough room for any of those types of building/uses. She said the residents are comfortable with Exercise and Fitness uses and Surface Parking lots. She pointed out that parking is not really addressed in these standards and both the Historic Dublin Business Association and the Resident’s Association feel very strongly that this is half a plan to go forward with these revisions without specifically addressing parking. She reported that the Business Association computed that they have more employees south of SR 161 than there are parking spaces. She said they are working really hard to grow and we want them to succeed. She said their message is that with any new infill development there needs to be a requirement for enough parking onsite to support whatever is built. She reported the businesses have already complained that other business employees are parking in front of their businesses and their customers cannot park there; therefore, she asked the Board not to make the situation worse.

Ms. King inquired about the limits on Eating/Drinking establishments and suggested the hours could be expanded beyond the proposed 7 am – 10 pm hours on the weekends to 11 pm. She cited that at 10:15 at night on several occasions, she has witnessed an empty Village Tavern and they even have a permit to stay open later.

Ms. King indicated the residents are willing to work with the City. She had additional revisions to the table on page 14 that included the zoning conflicts with the *Dublin Historic Design Guidelines*. She said she would like the *Guidelines* to be the definitive outline for the ARB to use as a primary standard for the preservation and maintenance of buildings, landmarks, and landscapes within the Board’s jurisdiction.

Ms. King reported that Mayor Peterson told one of their members that he favored a sit-down with City Council - himself specifically, Staff, and residents to work out what will be presented to Council on this. She indicated she hoped she had given some food for thought to the ARB this evening and maybe the ARB could join them in this meeting, and delay it just a little bit longer to get it right.

Michael B. Steele, said he owns the building at 138 S. High Street that is the southern most commercial property on the east side of Dublin Road. He said they have been there for 11 years and took a year to build it but they were pleased with the outcome. He stressed he has a tremendous amount of experience in construction and building so he understands all the details of what has been discussed this evening.

Mr. Steele referred to Dublin, Ireland and said there is a tremendous range of architectural history in that city and Dublin, Ohio has a very small range. He reported the building he purchased was built in 1877 and it has had minor changes. He indicated there is a fairly good history here in this little pocket. He said even in historic cities there is still variety, change, and evolution of structures. He said he has been very pleased with the location for his business and has no desire to go elsewhere as it is wonderful. He said he likes what he sees with regard to our small little city – business district versus some others that have tried to do it and failed.

Mr. Steele asked what triggered this rezoning proposal and evolution to this point. He agreed that we should go slow with this and not approve it until there are no revisions. He concluded he would like to see this proposed business change to be more formalized and more structured.

Mr. Steele restated he has been here 11 years, 2 blocks from The Village Tavern but he has this habit of driving to lunch at the various eateries here and not once has he driven from his office and not been able to park within 50 feet of the destination at noon, two to three days per week. He said the comments about parking are overrated. He reported he has seven parking spaces available on his property for his tiny little building and the most vehicles he has ever seen in there is three.

Mr. Steele said when he came to the ARB 11 years ago, something bothered him – priorities. He said the first case was for a 2 foot by 3 foot sign for a structure on the east side of Dublin Road and he recalled the ARB spent two hours and five minutes on the sign and turned it down. He said the second proposal was for additions to an existing business and that took 30 minutes to approve. He said he went next and within 15 minutes he was approved for a total 100% gut and redo of an existing structure, inside out, top to bottom. At that time, he concluded there was something wrong with that picture and it impacted him greatly. He tried to figure out what was important to the ARB and what they were trying to accomplish. He said the ARB has been outstanding through history for what it has done but asked what the purpose of this rezoning was when it is working and did this come about because a few people did not want change.

The Chair closed the public portion and thanked everyone for commenting that hit on specific topics that were continuously discussed by this Board.

Ms. Martin said Staff really appreciates the comments from the public. She said some of the areas that were touched on were not part of this application but they are items on-going within the larger BSD Code and Design Guidelines update.

David Rinaldi thanked Staff for all the effort that has gone into this, and at the last ARB meeting, the Board Members thought they really got this down to a handful of comments and Staff has addressed the ones that this Board had, including the limitation of uses and the hours of operation. He asked if the operator would be able to request a conditional use to expand the hours or if this was cut and dry. Ms. Martin answered the use specific standard for operations is 7am – 10pm but any restaurant could request a conditional use from the PZC but the ARB would need to make a recommendation to the Commission, first.

Mr. Rinaldi said he was pleased about the definitive story height because it always raised confusion amongst the public as well as a Board.

Mr. Rinaldi said linkages were discussed at length the last time. He said from his perspective, there is a delicate balance here. If we make everything too restrictive, he indicated, we are not going to have anything happen here and it is not going to help the district but adversely would be detrimental to the district. He concluded he thought the Board struck a balance.

Jeff Leonard asked if there is a provision for existing historic structures that grandfather them in so if a building is not occupied and falls down, the building could be rebuilt to look exactly like it was. He said he did not think (former) Biddies for example could be rebuilt since it is a long building and that we should look at that.

Mr. Leonard said he agrees with his neighbors about linkages because nothing else in Dublin, specifically the Historic District looks like that. He said he agreed with a lot of what Mr. Steele said but parking in the evening is an issue around the commercial structures for sure after 4:30 pm or 5:00 pm. Right behind where he lives, he said, there is parking for the businesses that are there and they are parking on top of

each other already and those are the lots that are potentially up for development. He suggested that if more buildings are added, he does not know where people would park. He mentioned the traffic on the alleys and suggested a traffic study be performed before more construction is permitted. He said in the morning, cars are moving at 40 mph down Blacksmith alley, not stopping at any stop signs and in the evening it is repeated in the opposite direction. He said he agreed with Ms. King in that we have half of a good plan. He agrees with protecting what is historic in the north but thought this would force people to build structures that are just not going to fit in.

Shannon Stenberg explained one of the reasons for several discussions about moving that boundary was because of the Donato's building; if it were to be reconstructed, it would not fit in this historic cottage commercial, which is why the ARB did not support changing the boundary.

Ms. Martin clarified the idea behind these Code amendments is not to recreate history but to allow for the development of new buildings that are consistent with the character that the residents had expressed they would like adjacent to single-family residential areas. With respect to existing structures, she stated, the ARB has purview over all demolitions so an applicant would need to demonstrate that the structure was not salvageable and meets certain criteria prior to redevelopment.

Mr. Leonhard clarified that he was speaking of instances where Mother Nature was the cause or perhaps a fire, etc. He reiterated that the linkages are consistent with what is proposed but not with what is existing.

Mr. Rinaldi reiterated that the building lot coverage is 50% now and so a lot could not be filled. He said the other delicate balance is that people want more parking but the impervious areas are being limited so more green space is attained but there is less parking. He stated they cut back 10% of impervious materials but there will be less room for parking on that lot. He said there are significant trade-offs. He said the overarching theme here is that the new area is being treated with a lighter touch than what is currently permitted. If the fear is more development, he said, he does not believe that is the case here at all.

Ms. Stenberg said she agreed with the intention as Mr. Rinaldi just stated. She said the Board considered what would happen should a demolition request be granted for whatever reason. She said several of the comments regarding parking and traffic and the amount of people that will be coming into this area is going to be conditional on the specific building or a specific use and all of those applications will be coming to the Board. One of the changes she really did appreciate, she said, was the impervious coverage to be reduced to 65% to prevent the entire area that is left to be covered by parking. She said the Board is supporting changes but they are still ensuring that there will be green space and beautiful views of the trees as well as their shadows. She concluded this revised proposal has addressed some of the previous issues very well.

Mr. Rinaldi noted that everyone likes the Donato's building but the lot coverage would not meet this Code at all and maybe we would not have that parking behind there.

Mr. Leonhard indicated that the fear of the residents is - there is an empty space behind Donato's and some of the other buildings and they would not be held to the softer standards should they get developed now.

Mr. Rinaldi asked if they modified somewhat what was allowed within the current Historic Core.

Ms. Martin clarified that the Historic Core amendments were part of the Work Session and Open House but were not specifically part of Council's directive for this Southern Historic District Code amendment so those will come before the Board later for another review as part of the overall BSD Code update.

Mr. Leonhard asked if the process was being done out of order. Ms. Rauch answered Staff was looking at a major Code update but because the City had had a lot of development pressure within the Historic District, Council asked Staff to move forward with addressing this area specifically. She said the request from Council was more to address the current concerns.

Everett Musser stated he agreed with Mr. Rinaldi that this review is a delicate balance. He reported there have been some work sessions back to the first of the year and public input has been gathered and considered as revisions were being made. He suggested that no matter how long we have this process, we will not be able to please everyone. He said they are trying to develop some guidelines so the citizens would be happy as well as attract new business to have a viable Historic District. Right now, he said, we have done that and we will continue to work with it but it is only at a point where it does a pretty good job of protecting the citizens as well as encouraging developers and businesses to come in. As Ms. Stenberg pointed out, he said everything is going to come before the ARB where the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* are followed and historic design is considered. He concluded that these revisions should be moved forward with these proposed recommendations.

Mr. Rinaldi noted that Code diagrams can look like boxes on a block but that is not our goal here as a representation of potential massing. He said the Board is very sensitive to the historic nature of what goes on in terms of architecture. He said if one attends a meeting where the Board is discussing a new proposal, there is a lot of talk about what is going on in terms of materials, scale, and massing. He said the Code tends to be pretty dry but that is not how the Board approaches these elements. They take into consideration the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* extremely and what that means for the district and how these structures look within the rest of the district.

The Chair asked if there was anything with the sub-district itself that still needed to be addressed. He asked if the Board had come as close to a sweet spot as they could. He restated the Board was just down to a handful of comments the last time and believes they have since been addressed.

Ms. Stenberg stated this proposal meets all of the comments and questions that the Board had.

Mr. Rinaldi said he agreed with Mr. Musser in that we are not going to please everybody no matter how restrictive we make the Code. If the Code is too restrictive, he indicated, we would not be able to change anything in the district then that will not make everybody happy either.

Ms. Martin said Staff has prepared the condition for the Zoning Code Amendment portion:

- 1) That the Use Table be updated to reflect that Parking Structures are not permitted or conditional as an Accessory Use in the Historic South District.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Musser moved, Mr. Rinaldi seconded, to recommend approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for an Administrative Request for BSD Code Amendments with one condition:

- 1) That the Use Table be updated to reflect that Parking Structures are not permitted or conditional as an Accessory Use in the Historic South District.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Stenberg, yes; Mr. Leonhard, no; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; and Mr. Musser, yes. (Recommended for Approval 3 – 1)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Rinaldi moved, Ms. Stenberg seconded, to recommend approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the modified zoning map with no conditions. The vote was as follows: Mr. Musser, yes; Mr. Leonhard, no; Ms. Stenberg, yes; and Mr. Rinaldi, yes. (Recommended for Approval 3 – 1)

Communications

Jennifer Rauch said the Parking Garage and the Library in the future will be going forward to City Council and part of their review of a Basic Plan obviously designated them as the required reviewing body but they also wanted some input from the ARB at that City Council meeting. She said Staff is defining whatever that process is going to be and how to make it happen and will relay that to the Board as soon as possible.

With no further communications to share, the Chair adjourned the meeting at 7:53 pm.

As approved by the Architectural Review Board on August 30, 2017.