



SPECIAL MEETING NOTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, March 8, 2017 | 8:00 am

Dublin City Development Building
5800 Shier Rings Road

ARB Members Present: David Rinaldi, Jane Fox, Everett Musser, and Shannon Stenberg (Thomas Munhall was absent.)

Presenters: Leslie Oberholtzer, Codametrics and Mary Roberts and Don Elliott, Clarion Associates.

Staff Present: Jennifer Readler, Law Director, Vince Papsidero, Planning Director, Jennifer Rauch, Planning Manager, Nichole Martin, Planner I, JM Rayburn, Planner I; and Laurie Wright, Administrative Support II.

Meeting began at 8:07 am.

WORK SESSION

Jennifer Readler provided additional clarification regarding the use of the Historic Dublin Design Guidelines and the applicable review criteria during ARB reviews.

Review of the proposed revision recommendations to the existing Bridge Street District zoning regulations for Historic Dublin.

Leslie Oberholtzer explained there have been two community workshops to discuss the potential revisions of the BSD Code within the Historic District. She reviewed the format of the two meetings, and stated at the last workshop a survey was distributed and all attendees had a sheet to write in comments. She indicated this review of the recommendations is based on the results of these meetings.

Historic Core II

She asked the Board to look at the area south of Bridge Street and to think about how High Street interacts with residents to the south. The first recommendation brought forward in October indicated the desire to sensitively transition between the commercial and residential since there is a change in scale. The first station focused on the introduction of a new district along S. High Street from Eberly Hill south to John Wright Lane. The results of the last workshop indicate an interest in extending the new district north of Eberly Hill. She asked the Board members to reflect on the following question...*Should the district extend further north?*

The first question on the Survey provided at the public meeting was...*Do you agree with the Location of the new District (BSD Historic Core II)?* There were no positive responses to location:

- Initial comments "not at all" and "other"
- Include building north to 55 S High
- Extend to Spring Alley
- Extend all the way to the library

She stated overall the proposed major changes with creation of the Historic Core II District would be to

1. Building type
2. Uses



She stated the building types permitted in BSD Historic Core II would be limited to the Historic Cottage Commercial and Civic Building. The character in the area proposed for the new district is smaller in scale and has more space between buildings. The proposed building types would reflect these characteristics. The new district would not include the Historic Mixed-Use building type. The uses would be more limited as follows, based on the feedback from the public meetings:

Same uses permitted in the Historic Core, EXCEPT:

- No Hotels (Bed & Breakfast permitted with limited number of rooms)
- Eating & Drinking Places, allowed but with a limitation on hours of operation
- No Principal Use Surface Parking or Structured Parking
- Allow Residential on the ground story

Building:

- Revise Building Types to allow for multiple cottages
- Limit linkages between buildings
- Ensure open space between cottages, especially along the street
- Step down the scale towards existing single-family

Additional Requirements

Ms. Oberholtzer stated additional site and building requirements were discussed at the two public meetings that impacted the entire Historic District and those items would be included with the larger Code amendment. She said the design guidelines elements would also be removed from the Zoning Code.

Shopfront design elements:

- MAINTAIN existing minimum requirements for ground story glass (40% for Historic Mixed Use, 25% for Historic Cottage Commercial)
- Apply a MAXIMUM amount of ground story glass
- Prohibit use of standard storefront systems
- MAINTAIN window requirements for lintels, sills, and trim/casing.
- Eliminate the requirement for shopfront on all street faces
- Allow either a shopfront or a more general ground story
- Allow residential uses to be located on the ground story on side streets
- Minimum transparency will still be required on side street facades

Revision to Design Standards:

- Building types will be revised, mainly to define bulk and massing, basic requirements
- Design requirements will be revised to be guidelines, separate from Code
- More flexibility for ARB review

Building Scale and Massing

Ms. Oberholtzer said a variety of site mock ups were provided for review at the public meeting. The goal of the exercise was to model potential building massing that will relate appropriately to residential parcels to the rear. The study site has a lane behind it similar to Mill or Blacksmith Lane. The consensus of those surveyed selected generic site study 3. The site was designed with a Historic Mixed Use building type at the front and smaller scale buildings to the rear. In most cases, existing historic building will exist at the front of the site.

Elements of design:

- Regardless of High Street frontage, multiple cottage type buildings in the rear
- Step down the heights to 1.5 stories at the lanes parallel to High Street
- Provide for landscaped space between the buildings
- Create "niches" of landscaped areas, instead of continuous street wall

- Screen parking from side streets
- Allow mix of uses within the cottages including office, residential, retail, service

Board Discussion

The Board agreed the Historic Core II should be extended as recommended by the public input, and discussed how far it should extend. The Board expressed concerns about ensuring larger scale infill development was limited, based on challenges with existing development applications.

Staff reminded the Board that City Council directed staff to focus the amendments within the area south of Bridge Street, given the predominantly residential uses to the rear.

The Board discussed the character of the district and the proposed changes to the building types. Ms. Oberholtzer stated the district has distinct character and the amendments are aimed at addressing the scale. They focus on infill behind and stepping down toward the residential.

Concerns were raised about the use of the Historic Mixed Use building type to the rear, as it is permitted under the current Code. Discussion focused on a desire to ensure smaller scale buildings were permitted behind as it transitions to residential, because that is complementary to the existing character of the district. Ms. Oberholtzer confirmed this would be addressed with the modifications to the building type requirements.

The Board discussed how far the proposed new district should extend to the north. It was suggested that Historic Core II be extended to Spring Hill, and a majority of the Board agreed.

Concerns were raised about ensuring parcels stay small to fit with the existing character. Staff clarified that an applicant can develop more than one parcel, but the Code can outline how the parcel or parcels can be built.

The Board agreed it should follow the public input. Ms. Oberholtzer agreed and said the Code needs a sensitivity to scale which can be addressed through changes to the building type requirements. She stated that addressing building height and building spacing are two separate issues that get to the character issues and concerns.

The Board agreed with the recommendations to limiting the size and hours of the eat/drink establishments and limiting. The Board discussed the challenges of ensuring uses that are compatible with the residential but also allow for a vibrant and active district. Ms. Oberholtzer also ensured the revised Code would allow residential on the ground floor. The Board agreed.

A draft version of the Code requirements will be provided to the Board in May or June.

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 9:40 am.