BOARD ORDER

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, July 26, 2017 | 6:30 pm

The Architectural Review Board took the following action at this meeting:

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

Proposal:	An amendment to the Zoning Map to establish Bridge Street District Historic South as a new zoning district.
Location:	The sites are located within Historic Dublin along S. High Street, south of Spring Hill and north of John Wright Lane.
Request:	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.
Applicant:	Dana L. McDaniel, City Manager, City of Dublin.
Planning Contact:	Nichole M. Martin, Planner I
Contact Information:	(614) 410-4635, nmartin@dublin.oh.us

MOTION: Mr. Rinaldi moved, Ms. Stenberg seconded, to recommend approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the modified zoning map with no conditions.

VOTE: 3 – 1

RESULT: The request for a Standard District Rezoning was recommended for approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission to permit a new zoning district – Historic South but City Council is the final reviewing body.

RECORDED VOTES:

David Rinaldi	Yes
Shannon Stenberg	Yes
Everett Musser	Yes
Jeffrey Leonhard	No

STAFF CERTIFICATION

_____

Nichole M. Martin, Planner I

DRAFT

~~**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:

DRAFT

§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 grandfathers 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.

He 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 then 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 forth to 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 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 _____, 2017.

DRAFT

RECORD OF DETERMINATION

Administrative Review Team

Thursday, July 20, 2017

The Administrative Review Team made the following determination at this meeting:

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

Proposal:	An amendment to the Zoning Map to establish Bridge Street District Historic South as a new zoning district.
Location:	The related sites are located within Historic Dublin, west of the Scioto River.
Request:	Review and recommendation of approval to City Council for a Standard District Rezoning under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.232 and 153.234.
Applicant:	Dana L. McDaniel, City Manager, City of Dublin.
Planning Contact:	Nichole M. Martin, Planner I; (614) 410-4635, nmartin@dublin.oh.us

REQUEST: Recommendation of approval to the Architectural Review Board for an amendment to the Zoning Map with no conditions for the inclusion of the Historic South Zoning District.

Determination: Rezoning was forwarded to the Architectural Review Board with a recommendation of approval as the next step in the approval process.

STAFF CERTIFICATION

_____

Vince A. Papsidero, FAICP
Director of Planning

walkable, mixed-use community. She said the following sections summarize the proposal and major components and considerations of each section of the zoning regulations proposed for the amendment.

Ms. Martin explained the proposed Code changes place limits on the size and scale of all future development within a new sub-district (BSD – Historic South) and the proposed amendments define the new zoning district and outline permitted uses for the new district. Additionally, permitted building types are defined for the district, she said, which are proposed to include building types: Single-Family Detached, Historic Cottage Commercial, and Civic. She explained the Historic Cottage Commercial building type is refined to more closely align with the existing character in the southern portion of Historic Dublin that is dominated by 1.5 - to 2-story "cottage" type residential-style buildings.

Code Changes proposed per Section are summarized as follows:

§153.058
- Creation of the Historic South District and identification of the sub-district's intent.

§153.059
- 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
- 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 approval is recommended to the Architectural Review Board for the BSD Code amendments.

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He called for a vote, the motion carried, and the Administrative Request for Zoning Code Amendments was recommended for approval by the ART and forwarded to the Architectural Review Board for the meeting on July 26th.

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

Nichole Martin said this is a proposal for an amendment to the Zoning Map to establish Bridge Street District Historic South as a new zoning district. She noted the sites are located within Historic Dublin along S. High Street, south of Spring Hill and north of John Wright Lane. She said this is a request for a review and approval of proposed Zoning Code amendments under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.232, 153.234 and 153.066.

Ms. Martin reported the City of Dublin is sponsoring this application to rezone 25 parcels (and portions of parcels) to the new BSD Historic South District.

Ms. Martin presented the Proposed Zoning Map, showing the existing and proposed BSD zoning districts. She stated the new BSD Historic South District will be applied to land generally along S. High Street, south of Spring Hill and north of John Wright Lane. The proposed Zoning Map amendment to the BSD Historic Core, she said, will facilitate implementation of the land use, transportation, and open space objectives of the Bridge Street District Area Plan of the Dublin Community Plan.

Ms. Martin said approval is recommended to the Architectural Review Board for an amendment to the Zoning Map for the inclusion of the Historic South Zoning District.

Vince Papsidero asked if there were any questions or concerns regarding this application. [There were none.] He called for a vote, the motion carried, and the Rezoning was recommended for approval by the ART and forwarded to the Architectural Review Board for the meeting on July 26th.

~~5. Downtown Dublin Parking Garage 75 N. High Street~~
~~17-075CU Conditional Use~~

~~Jennifer Rauch said this is a proposal to permit a parking structure within the BSD Public District in Historic Dublin. She said the site is approximately 250 feet northwest of the intersection of N. High Street and North Street. She said this is a request for a review and recommendation of approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Conditional Use under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.066 and 153.236.~~

~~Ms. Rauch noted the site features:~~

- ~~Significant grade change across the site, with the largest change from west to east along the northern boundary.~~
- ~~Existing library building located in the northeastern portion of the site.~~
- ~~Off-street parking located to the south and west of the existing building.~~

~~Ms. Rauch noted future improvements:~~

- ~~Creation of two new parcels for the library and garage.~~
- ~~Street network improvements: (future) Rock Cress Parkway along the north, (future) Franklin Street extension along the west, and modifications to existing North Street to the south and N. High Street to the east.~~
- ~~Future improvements under review as a separate application (17-068PP/FP)~~

~~Ms. Rauch stated that additions to the street network will occur in conjunction with the proposed library and parking garage applications; utilities and stormwater management will be addressed as the proposals move forward.~~

~~Ms. Rauch said this is a proposal to permit a parking garage that is not lined by occupied space along a public street frontage, as is required by Code. She said the BSD Public District permits institutional use, such as libraries, schools, and parks but stand-alone parking structures require a Conditional Use.~~

~~Ms. Rauch said the parking garage is located on the west side of the proposed library building and plaza site, and extends west toward the (future) Franklin Street extension. She noted the garage site has frontage along three public rights-of-way: (future) Rock Cress Parkway, North Street, and (future) Franklin Street extension. She stated the BSD Code requires parking structures to be lined with occupied space along a~~

City of Dublin
OHIO, USA

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 BnB is for overnight stays and the breakfasts are typically served to the guests staying there; the BnB 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 Donatoes 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 _____, 2017.