

# ARB MEETING

## HISTORIC DISTRICT CODE UPDATE AND DESIGN GUIDELINES

### Meeting Notes

July 10, 2019

ARB Members: Shannon Stenberg, Gary Alexander, Kathleen Bryan, Rob Bailey

Staff: Jenny Rauch, Nicki Martin

Consultant: Greg Dale, McBride Dale Clarion

### Key Topics Discussed

- Introduced the purpose and goal of the amendments; specifically, Council's direction regarding the proposed amendments.
- Reviewed the background of the proposed amendments, including the request for removal of the Historic District from the Bridge Street District, concerns and issues raised over time, and the reason for the update.
- Reviewed the difference between the zoning code (shalls) and the design guidelines (shoulds).
- Provided an overview of the memo that highlighted the general organizational changes and significant content changes to the Zoning Code and Historic Design Guidelines (HDG)
- Identified the intent of the discussion was focused on ARB's initial review comments. Public comment was permitted. Staff shared next steps would include public input sessions prior to formal public review and approval process.

### ARB General Comments

- Supportive of proposed documents.
- Supportive of retaining the level of detail found in the Code.
- Minor edits to language.
- Consistency in numbers spelled out v. using the number.

### Public Comments

- Request to provide additional language in several sections to address lot coverage regarding residential development to ensure it is compatible with surrounding properties.
- Similar request related to building setbacks.
- Concerns raised about lot coverage for Historic South properties.



## **Boundary Changes**

- Supportive of the proposed general boundary changes, removal from the BSD, and rezoning of the properties from Bridge Street District Zoning Districts to the Historic Zoning Districts.
- Concerns about removing Buildings Z1 and Z2, etc. as it limits the ability to regulate the design of the sites/buildings as it transitions into the Historic District.
- Discuss with schools about their plans for the site and desire to remain under ARB's purview. ARB prefers to retain school within the boundary to ensure sensitive transition into the District.

## **Zoning Code**

### *153.170 - Applicability*

- Add 'demolition' to applicability section.
- Add language to clarify the applicability of the Code and Historic Design Guidelines.

### *153.072 - Uses*

- Removal of Elementary or Middle School use from Historic Residential uses.

### *153.173 – Site Development Standards*

- Significant discussion about Table 153.173A, specifically related to Historic Residential and Historic South standards.
- Increased side yard and rear yard setbacks, particularly if the house is larger and takes up more space on the lot in Historic Residential.
- Decrease the permitted building height in Historic Residential.
- Decrease the permitted building footprint in Historic Residential to ensure compatibility with existing/historic residential properties.
- Review lot coverage requirements for Historic Residential and Historic South.
- Staff to bring back information about existing conditions in Historic Dublin and additional standards for the ARB to review that address public comment and ARB's concerns.

### *153.174 – Design Standards*

- Under Pitched Roof clarify the intent of numbers 2 & 3 and potentially change it to read 'completed gable end required'.
- Gambrel and mansard roof materials should include dimensional shingles.
- Remove the language 'of at least three steps and a minimum depth of five feet and width of five feet' from entrance designs.



- Shutter section should be clarified to state operable shutters are required.
- Review and clarify the section regarding canopies, as new construction and rehab guidelines do not clearly align. Consider adding language to the new construction section.
- Review balcony requirements allowing 40% of a façade to be made of balcony. Consider eliminating and adding clarifying language in the HDG.
- Stoop dimensions are too specific. Dimensions should be eliminated from the Code and a section should be to the Guidelines to address the design intent and usability of a stoop.
- Under chimneys and vents are permitted to be clad in 'masonry', which needs to be more clearly defined. This could occur in the exterior materials section below.
- Board was supportive of approving a palette of building colors for staff to administer.

#### *153.176 – Review Procedures*

- Clearly define structures identified as non-contributing and contributing to ensure it is clear to the Board and the applicant, as it relates to the demolition criteria.
- Board was supportive of the more stringent demolition review criteria that is based on contributing and non-contributing.
- Clarify that the text 'property owner' under the review criteria for the demolition should also include applicant or representative.

#### *153.178 – Maintenance*

- Include additional language about how to deal with/address the topic of demolition by neglect. Potentially include language to address more stringent property maintenance standards.

### **Guidelines**

#### *General*

- Provide references to applicable Code Sections throughout the Guidelines.
- Ensure Historic Dublin's boundary matches on all maps throughout.

#### *Natural Features*

- Consider revising sections related to the uniqueness of limestone only to Dublin.

#### *Neighborhood Character*

- Add language to Historic Residential Neighborhood about compatibility of lot coverage with surrounding residential properties.



### *User's Guide*

- Clarify the language related to the applicability of the zoning regulations and the guidelines. Want to ensure the potential conflicting regulations and guidelines are minimized.

### *Rehabilitation*

- 4.5 D – Spelling of palate
- 4.6 B – End the sentence after “exterior.”
- 4.7 G – Retain only the first sentence. Delete the subsequent sentence, as is not a feasible construction method.
- 4.10 C and D – Add these sections to the Code.
- 4.11 H – Clarify that materials need to be compatible with the District, but not match the original historic structure. Cross reference with 4.1C should be provided.
- 4.11 K- Concerns about materials appropriate for an addition differ from materials appropriate for rehabilitation (i.e. where does fiber cement siding fit). Discussion about whether additions should be addressed under new construction in the Guidelines versus in the rehabilitation section.
- 4.13 D – Clarify that treated wood needs to be painted on exposed sections only.

### *New Construction*

- 5.1 C – Add language about compatible massing and lot coverage.
- 5.3 A – Add language about lot coverage compatibility and ensure the section references neighboring properties. The districtwide reference is too broad.
- 5.3 B - Ensure the section references neighboring properties. The districtwide reference is too broad.
- Include language addressing setbacks to ensure they match adjacent properties.
- Add section on canopies.

### **Next Steps**

- Make revisions to Code and Guidelines based on the ARB’s comments and public comments.
- Provide additional information regarding the general development standards, particularly lot coverage, residential building height, and residential setbacks.
- Outline schedule and public input opportunities.

