



MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, December 19, 2018

AGENDA

1. **BSD HR - Vessels' Residence** **63 S. Riverview Street**
18-073ARB-MPR **Minor Project Review (Approved 4 – 0)**
2. **BSD HR – Schmitt Residence** **109 S. Riverview Street**
18-074ARB-MPR **Minor Project Review (Approved 4 – 0)**
3. **Historic and Cultural Assessment**
Special Project – Prioritized list (**Identified and Approved 4 – 0**) to be forwarded to Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council.

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: Gary Alexander, Andrew Keeler and Shannon Stenberg. City representatives were: Jennifer Rauch, Nichole Martin, Jimmy Hoppel, and Laurie Wright.

Administrative Business

Motion and Vote

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

Motion and Vote

Ms. Stenberg moved, Mr. Keeler seconded, to approve the November 28, 2018, meeting minutes as presented. The vote was as follows: Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; and Ms. Stenberg, yes. (Approved 4 – 0)

The Chair briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Architectural Review Board. He swore in anyone planning to address the Board during this meeting.

1. **BSD HR - Vessels' Residence** **63 S. Riverview Street**
18-073ARB-MPR **Minor Project Review**

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said this application is a proposal for the construction of a 1,020-square-foot, two-story addition with a first floor mudroom and attached three-car garage with finished attic space on an existing single-family lot zoned Bridge Street District Historic - Residential.



Nichole Martin said this is a request for a review and approval of a Minor Project Review with a Waiver Review. She recalled the ARB's review in November 2018 as well as a companion application for the demolition of the detached garage and the latter was approved but cannot be carried out until there is an approved application for a structure replacement in that location that has building permits. At that meeting, she said the members had a number of concerns, which the applicant has addressed.

Ms. Martin presented an aerial view of the site that is on the west side of S. Riverview Street just north of Eberly Hill Lane. She presented the site in context with four of its neighboring properties.

Ms. Martin presented a photograph of the south elevation of the existing residence and noted the historic portion of the home while looking to the west is a story and a half and single story additions to that building and finally the garage. She presented a photograph of the east elevation facing S. Riverview St., which is the front façade of the historic portion and a photograph of the west elevation facing Blacksmith Lane that shows the existing garage and brick driveway.

Ms. Martin presented the existing site plan and proposed site plan, which remained unchanged from the November meeting.

Ms. Martin presented drawings of each of the elevations and noted the historic portion is simple and vernacular as are the subsequent additions. She recalled the Board encouraged the applicant to simplify the proposed elevations and presented drawings of the east and west elevations from the November meeting along with currently proposed elevations side-by-side for comparison. She presented the drawings of the south and north elevations for comparison between the November submittal and now. She reported the applicant took the recommendations from the Board and provided a simplified roof design with a shed dormer and a symmetrical window pattern for the southern view. She said the applicant also changed the north elevation per the advice of the Board to provide two shed dormers and removed some of the complexities there as well. She said the garage and mud room remain unchanged.

Ms. Martin presented the materials as submitted in November and stated the limestone will be changed as proposed with this application tonight.

Ms. Martin said a Waiver Review and approval is required for a side yard setback to permit encroachment of one foot into a required three-foot side yard setback.

Ms. Martin reported this application has been reviewed against the Zoning Code, Waiver Review Criteria, Minor Project Review Criteria, the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*, and the Architectural Review Board Standards and found that the application has met all the applicable requirements, and those met with the Waiver and Conditions.

Ms. Martin said approval is recommended for the Waiver:

1. §153.063(A) – Minimum Yard Requirements for BSD Historic Residential District
Request: Encroach one foot into a required three-foot side yard setback.

Ms. Martin said approval is recommended for the Minor Project Review with the following condition:

- 1) That the applicant ensures the existing stone wall is protected during construction.

Ms. Martin concluded by stating she and the applicant were available to answer any questions.

The Chair asked the applicant if they had anything to add to Staff's presentation and they responded they did not.

The Chair asked if there was anyone from the public that wanted to speak in regard to this case. [Hearing none.] He opened up the discussion to the Board.

Shannon Stenberg said the applicant has addressed everything that was discussed at the November meeting.

Andrew Keeler asked if the windows were divided lite. He said it appears as grills can be added, which means to him the windows are not true divided lite.

Heidi Bolyard, Simplified Living Architecture, answered the windows do not appear to be true divided lite but they will have the grids between the glass panels. She explained if the grids are on the exterior of the glass panel that can be removed and always get broken. Mr. Keeler asked the rest of the Board to weigh in.

Gary Alexander said a better option is a simulated divided lite (SDL), which is fused both on the outside and the inside the glass panel and would have a spacer bar. He indicated a true divided lite is not fair to ask of the applicant and the SDL is a better option. Ms. Rauch noted that is the same recommendation that was made at the November meeting. Mr. Keeler asked that it be specified somewhere. Ms. Rauch said a condition of approval can be added.

Mr. Rinaldi asked if all the windows were being replaced on the existing structures as well as the new. Ms. Bolyard answered there is a door that is being replaced with one window in the existing structure. She said she was uncertain if those windows were true divided lite. Mr. Rinaldi was concerned that divided lite would be used on the second floor but the first floor windows would have snap-in grilles. Mr. Alexander indicated the historic portion of the home probably does not have the snap-in grilles unless they have been replaced at some point. Mr. Rinaldi specified he was talking about the existing, one-story link. He said he did not want to put a burden on the applicant that went above and beyond what is necessary.

Ms. Vessel confirmed the grill is on the exterior of the glass and not sandwiched in between the two panes. Mr. Alexander asked if she meant the exterior of the glass meant from the outside or the inside of the structure. He said if they are on the inside they are probably snap-in grilles. Mr. Rinaldi emphasized he did not want the Board to require another type of window as they should all match. After further discussion about windows, it was determined the new condition was appropriate.

The Chair called for a motion to approve the Waiver.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Alexander moved, Ms. Stenberg seconded, to approve the following Waiver:

1. §153.063(A) – Minimum Yard Requirements for BSD Historic Residential District
Request: Encroach one foot into a required three-foot side yard setback.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; and Mr. Alexander, yes. (Approved 4 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Mr. Keeler moved, Ms. Stenberg seconded, to approve the Minor Project Review with two conditions:

- 1) That the applicant ensures the existing stone wall is protected during construction; and
- 2) That the applicant use a simulated divided lite window with a spacer bar for all new and replacement windows.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; and Mr. Keeler, yes.
(Approved 4 – 0)

**2. BSD HR – Schmitt Residence
18-074ARB-MPR**

**109 S. Riverview Street
Minor Project Review**

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said this application is a proposal for a 720-square-foot building addition, covered porch, and associated site improvements for a 0.74-acre parcel zoned Bridge Street District Historic Residential.

Nichole Martin said this is a request for a review and approval of a Minor Project Review. She said the ART is recommending approval with two conditions:

- 1) That the applicant reduce the size and scale of the chimney on the proposed addition; and
- 2) That the final details associated with the at-grade patio be approvable by Planning through issuance of a Certificate of Zoning Plan Approval provided the design is deemed appropriate, and the general size and location do not change

Ms. Martin provided background information in terms of this site. She said it includes an 1820's historic home and in 1842, a one-story addition was constructed immediately behind. She stated the ARB approved the 1½-story garage addition and alternate exterior paint colors on non-historic portions of the home in 2006. She said at the same time, the BZA approved a Variance to permit a reduced side yard setback along Pinneyhill, necessitated by the location of the existing structures. She said the ARB approved new windows, roof, and gutters for the historic home as general maintenance items in 2017.

Ms. Martin presented an aerial view of the site on the west side of S. Riverview Street at the intersection with Pinneyhill Lane. She presented photographs for site context of four of the surrounding properties. She noted this is a very large lot for the Historic District so there is a bit of separation between this home and the other homes in the area.

Ms. Martin presented the proposed site plan and highlighted the existing home to distinguish between that and the proposed addition as well as noting the original, rectilinear portion of the home that fronts S. Riverview Street. She presented an image of the proposed east elevation that shows both the existing home as well as how the proposed addition would appear with vertical board and batten siding in white, iron ore simulated divided lite windows, a standing seam metal roof, and a chimney that serves as an amenity to the master suite to be added there with a fireplace. She recalled there has been a lot of discussion about the proportionality of this chimney compared to the two chimneys on the historic residence.

Ms. Martin presented an image of the proposed south elevation, which faces the interior property line to the south so there is quite a bit of separation. She noted the location of the proposed master suite addition just mentioned, the porch or covered patio for the master suite, and an enclosed patio – screened in that was previously submitted as unenclosed.

Ms. Martin presented an image of the proposed north elevation that is heavily screened by landscaping; however, the applicant is proposing holistic material changes across this elevation. She said all the existing siding on the previous additions and story and a half garage will be exchanged for the vertical board and batten siding as well as the iron ore windows. She said the garage door will also be updated in iron ore with gooseneck fixtures as well as new iron ore shutters with operable hardware. She noted there is an existing deck on the east entrance with the wood door, which will be exchanged for a timber-tech material and the enclosed patio will also be clad with timber-tech.

Ms. Martin presented images of the paint colors and exterior material samples. She said the proposal reflects a two-tone color palette with a standing seam metal roof in a matte black finish - proposed for all the previous additions. She said this roof matches what the Board approved in 2017 for the historic structure for continuity.

Ms. Martin restated this is a Minor Project Review and it has been reviewed against the Zoning Code, the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*, Minor Project Review Criteria, and the Architectural Review Board Standards and found that the application has met all the applicable requirements, and those met with Conditions.

Ms. Martin said the Administrative Review Team has recommended approval to the ARB for a Minor Project Review with two conditions:

- 1) That the applicant reduce the size and scale of the chimney on the proposed addition; and
- 2) That the final details associated with the at-grade patio be approvable by Planning at a future date through issuance of a Certificate of Zoning Plan Approval provided the design is deemed appropriate and the general size and location do not change.

Ms. Martin concluded her presentation by stating she and the applicant were available to answer any questions.

The Chair asked the applicant if they had anything to add to Staff's presentation and they responded they had a couple of small clarifications.

Nathan Sampson, Biehl, Sampson, and Dietz, said the horizontal, lap siding on the detached garage will remain but will be painted to match the new board and batten siding proposed for the single story structure. He explained the chimneys on the historic structure on the previous drawings were drawn inaccurately as they were shown to be narrower when in actuality, they are four inches wider in terms of the brick coursing as viewed from the front. When viewed from the side, he said, the chimney they are proposing is within 2 inches of the width of the historical chimneys. He indicated they are limited by Code requirements for an insert chimney fireplace for the flue, the space around the flue, and they wanted to use a full-course brick to be consistent with the historical materials on the original house. He reported they switched out the firebox model that allowed them to inset the fireplace further up the roof by a few inches and also moved the chimney up the roof five or six inches, which then cut down the overall exposure of the brick above the roofline to reduce the material massing even further.

The Chair asked if there were any questions for the applicant.

Gary Alexander asked how the exposed part of the foundation in the front was being treated. Mr. Sampson answered the exposed foundation in the front is a block foundation and the siding comes down within six inches of the grade level; they intend for extensive planting there. He said there is an option for split-face block that has texture but with the limited exposure they did not pursue that material.

Mr. Rinaldi said they ran into this on a commercial property on High Street where block was not permitted. He asked if that was just because it was commercial. He recalled one of the conditions proposed by Staff was that stone had to be used at the foundation and that turned out to be a fantastic project and thought it was strange they had to force that but he cannot recall the particulars. Ms. Martin said in terms of this application versus 113 S. High Street that Mr. Rinaldi noted, since this is zoned BSD Historic Residential, none of the BSD zoning requirements apply.

Mr. Alexander said the reaction to the chimney partly has to do with the contrast in that part of the composition because that chimney just stands out. He said Staff and the consultant also noted the prominence that is magnified by the contrast. He asked why the applicant is not open to thin cut brick because the siding he is proposing is essentially plastic, it is not a true wooden material. He said if thin cut brick was used he would save approximately six inches or maybe more. He said it is a contemporary material and the applicant is already using a contemporary material. He said if brick were used for the foundation then the chimney would not appear as prominent. He said overall, he really likes the project and the addition really helps the property.

Mr. Sampson said along the single story addition, there is a chimney in the back that is also an existing brick chimney. In this case, he said there is a little bit of brick at that opening but in general, he said they are trying to be consistent. He explained he has a hesitation with thin brick used for the foundation. He said he is trying to be consistent with how the single-story addition was treated before. He indicated the plantings in the front will help separate the addition but will also screen that foundation so his clients would be paying for a material that would not be visible. Mr. Alexander agreed - it depends on how it is landscaped. He said his clients are adverse to the thin brick as it is not as robust of a system for the chimney as full course brick would be. Mr. Alexander said that was fine.

The Chair called for public comment for this application.

Tom Holton, 5957 Roundstone Place, said this building is the last of the brick historic houses. He said it is unique in its perspective from the front that gives it its character and dignity. He said to allow this addition, takes that away. He said every time the Historic Society gives tours, and talk about this house, its history, including Underground Railroad, they talk about that pipe/tube on the south side and how it was used by escaping slaves. He noted the reason the property is so large is because it was a farm and now we are taking that away by adding something that removes all that history. He said it would be difficult to tell that story if they bothered telling it at all any more. He said in contrast to his comments as a Historical Society President, Steve Rudy, who is the next door neighbor, is happy with the project. He said he could not be here tonight but asked Mr. Holton if he would read his comments.

Dear ARB,

This is from Steve Rudy, 129 S. Riverview St., the proposed addition appears to be respectful of the existing historic structure in its size, position, and character, and to be respectful of the neighborhood setting as well including site lines, etc. He said S. Riverview St. will be enhanced by this addition and hopes the ARB agrees.

Steve and Linda Rudy

Mr. Sampson inquired about Condition #2. He said they wanted to show an intent of the general size and layout of the hardscaping but that space is not designed yet. He said if it were to be flushed out in the future, come back for approval, it may be slightly different in shape. He said he did not want to be locked into that particular footprint.

Mr. Sampson said with the addition coming into the side yard, both he and his clients were aware of the prominence and the importance of the Historical Structure that sits on the corner. He said part of their intent in making this design and layout work, was to try and push that addition back as far as possible so the addition did not come off of the original structure. He said it is set back further than the back face of the brick structure.

Greg Schmidt, 109 S. Riverview Street, said the modifications that they did were all historically accurate; they went to great pains to make sure everything they did was a 50-plus year fix with that building. He said it was in some state of disrepair when they purchased the structure, and as a family, they made a commitment to ensure the structure will be sound for the next 50-plus years. He said they put a significant amount of time and effort into it. He said they hired the best masonry restoration folks they could find, and used significantly thicker metal roof material than they actually needed to, to be as historically accurate as possible. He said they fell in love with the historic character. He said the pipe was of much concern to them and made sure the masonry restoration folks did not touch it; it is part of the Historic Underground Railroad. He said it was covered by the previous owner with mulch. He said they have ensured that pipe has not been changed or modified in any way because it is important to them as much as everyone else in the community.

Mr. Keeler said he is a purist and owns a very old house so he understands the concept of using three course brick but because this is on an addition, he does not see the necessity to do that. He said if the applicant could shrink the size of the chimney to make it a little bit more appealing to the eye by using a veneer, he would be open to that whereas he would not recommend that on the historic structure. He said he also cringes at seeing concrete block, even if only six inches is exposed. He said Mr. Alexander's suggestion was a good one; if the foundation was faced with brick it would be a nice accent and if you do not care for it, you are not going to see much of it anyway, eventually. He concluded he echoes Mr. Alexander's comments.

Mr. Rinaldi said he read through the consultant's report where he basically recommended this addition not happen. He said he thought the position of the addition was appropriate and did not touch the historic structure so he appreciated that. He said he has concern with the fenestration as that was a pretty stark comment on the preservation consultant's report and it jumped out at him as well that the windows are out of scale with the historic structure. He asked the members what they thought. He said the chimney did not bother him as much as some of the other folks. He said he would appreciate it to be smaller and thinner but the windows are more of an issue.

Ms. Stenberg said the windows are definitely prominent and indicated the iron ore color might be causing that. She thought that the additions and historic structure seemed to be tied together well and called out the fact that one was historic and one was not but the color certainly made it pop out to make it more obvious.

Mr. Rinaldi indicated he assumed the transoms in these windows is to get additional lighting into the space.

Mr. Sampson said newer buildings or additions that have transoms are right across the street. He said for historic, wood-sided structures, the window sashes or frames often were a different color. He said they chose iron ore because having a different color is probably within the bounds of historical accuracy. He said the darker window is a way to aesthetically work through how those differences work but not fear too greatly from the context from which it is in.

Mr. Rinaldi asked for the ceiling height of the master bedroom. Mr. Sampson answered 7 feet at its lowest to 15 feet in the middle. Ms. Martin said to the top of the peak of the roof is 17 feet, 11 inches.

She said the total occupiable space inside is 9 feet in the master closet and reduced to 7 feet, 3 inches in the powder room. Mr. Sampson said they were trying to keep that roofline down. Mr. Rinaldi asked if there was any way to reduce the overall mass. Mr. Sampson said he needs elevations to talk about material, size, and scale. With the positioning of the setback, the addition will not appear as prominent.

Ms. Stenberg asked why the HVAC and AC condenser need to be moved to the front of the house. Mr. Sampson answered more than likely they will need two condensers to the house with the addition so they tried to tuck them into the corner and also changed the arrangement so the smallest face was exposed to the street side and also developed a strategy for the landscaping in that location to hide those throughout the year.

Mr. Alexander said he did not agree with the consultant's report for a couple of reasons. He said the addition is setback considerably and it is hard to show the true perspective in a drawing. He indicated a different approach could have been taken for the windows that may have had more similarities to the house; the windows with the transoms do not create a scale or issue with the house. He said if something was designed smaller next to that big brick wall, it would appear as a shed; there is a balancing act there. He said being able to live on the first floor really enhances the tenure that someone can stay in a home and it also opens the stability of this to accommodate extended family or a family member who is ill. He said he sees a lot of benefits, programmatically, to what is being proposed and was not sure there were any other options. He said in terms of the chimney, for the non-architects, there are fireplaces that do not burn wood and the chimney is no longer needed. He said if the chimney is a sticking point for someone, the chimney can be eliminated, which may not be what the applicant had in mind, however.

The Chair asked to refer back to the conditions of approval. He asked if the Board wanted to revise Condition #1 about the size of the chimney. Mr. Keeler repeated that it is a new addition for an old house so he does not mind using new materials on the new addition. He said if a lot of people looked at the drawings and said the chimney looked kind of funny, he would value everyone's input and try to reduce the size as much as possible.

Mr. Sampson said in terms of the thin brick versus the full course brick, given the other decisions that have been made, taking into consideration of the maintenance of the historic structure in the last year, in with the materials being proposed for the addition for the switch out and the windows and such, those materials were chosen for longevity and respect for the original house.

Mr. Rinaldi said it seems the effort has been made with true brick to make it as small as possible.

Mr. Alexander said he has not seen a lot of flexibility on the part of the applicant and the chimney is area to move. He said it is something that everyone has weighed in on - the chimney sticks out like a sore thumb. He said the applicant can use the product the Board is proposing or look for a different kind of fireplace option or it can be removed. He concluded some flexibility could be shown. Mr. Keeler said he agreed with Mr. Alexander. Ms. Stenberg said the chimney does stick out quite a bit. Mr. Rinaldi asked for the chimney's dimensions. Mr. Sampson said the chimney width on both sides is 2 feet, 8 inches and the original chimney width on that side is 2 feet, 6 inches. He said Staff brought up the issue with the chimney early on and they have been working to make a different insert selection that would still allow it to be a wood-burning fireplace. Mr. Sampson indicated the homeowners might be open to finding a different location for the fireplace in the bedroom. He said if he can locate it behind the peak, further up the roof for less brick exposure, they would be willing to consider that after reviewing the floor plan.

The Board and the applicant decided to table the chimney element but approve the rest.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Keeler moved, Mr. Alexander seconded, to approve the Minor Project Review with two conditions as amended:

- 1) That the applicant return to the Board with a revised chimney design prior to issuance of a building permit; and
- 2) That the final details associated with the at-grade patio be approvable by Planning through issuance of a Certificate of Zoning Plan Approval provided the design is deemed appropriate and the general size and location do not change.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Stenberg, yes; Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; and Mr. Keeler, yes. (Approved 4 – 0)

3. Historic and Cultural Assessment Special Project

The Chair, David Rinaldi, said this is a proposal for a review and recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission of recommended priorities that should be considered in 2019 that will then be forwarded to City Council.

Jennifer Rauch reminded everyone that the assessment was an investigation into buildings, bridges, cemeteries, stone walls, mills, quarries, and archaeological sites covering 34 square miles that included three counties. She said the consultant was hired in 2015 to conduct the inventory and the Historic and Cultural Assessment was accepted by Council in 2017. She stated the goal this evening is to review and identify a prioritized list of the top three to five items for consideration in 2019 and the recommendations will be forwarded to the Planning and Zoning Commission with final review and approval by City Council.

Ms. Rauch stated she listed the 15 recommendations as a result of the assessment and Staff's perspective on what that might take while some of the items are currently underway and some are outside the Architectural Review Board's purview. She said the few that are selected by this Board will be those that are believed to need time focused on for the next year with the goal of going to the Planning Commission so they can review the list and add or comment on for recommendations to Council. She said some items may require some funding and timing that should be in line with Council's priorities. She said the items identified are listed out of order based on Staff's assessment. She said numbers 1, 2, 3, and 5 are of a similar nature:

- 1) Consider adding properties that are recommended individually eligible for National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) listing to the Architectural Review Board process and giving them special consideration during Planning Department review of projects.
- 2) Consider adding properties that are recommended as contributing resources to proposed historic districts and to the Dublin High Street Historic District, boundary increase, to the Architectural Review Board process and giving them special consideration during Planning Department review of projects.
- 3) Consider an intensive-level survey of properties that may be individually eligible for the NRHP prior to authorizing actions in their vicinity.
- 5) Consider completing a formal update and amendment to the existing Dublin High Street Historic District, in consultation with the Ohio Historic Preservation Office (OHPH).

David Rinaldi asked Staff if they have received any feedback from Council or Legal Staff on how the area would be expanded. He said it is a great goal but questions whether this is something the City can achieve. Ms. Rauch said Staff has not discussed this with Council in a formal capacity but if this is one or several of the recommendations to be pursued, Staff could investigate but not necessarily do anything.

Shannon Stenberg asked if there is precedent to adding properties to Appendix G. Ms. Rauch answered Staff has not added properties to that list in quite some time. She explained it was to be part of the Code revision but then it was removed but certainly Council could push that along.

Gary Alexander asked if #5 is just the formalization of #2. Ms. Rauch answered affirmatively and said that is why those items were grouped together.

Ms. Rauch said numbers 6 and 7 relate to Indian Run Historic District, which are currently outside the Historic District but they could be added so the area is preserved and intact under ARB's purview.

- 6) Consider pursuing a formal NRHP nomination for the recommended Indian Run Historic District and the recommended Dublin Heights Historic District, in consultation with the Ohio Historic Preservation Office.
- 7) Consider undertaking restoration of Indian Run Cemetery, including restoration of stones. This may require an interpretive plan because exact locations of each person's interment are unknown. This may also be a good opportunity to further develop an understanding of who is interred in the cemetery, which may result in individual eligibility for the NRHP.
- 9) Consider exploring an ordinance that requires property owners to take into consideration impacts to potential archaeological sites on properties within the Dublin High Street Historic District, and at the potential locations of unverified cemeteries, mill ruins, and potentially significant archaeological sites.
- 10) Consider adding some or all of the stone walls to the Architectural Review Board process and give them special consideration during Planning Department review of projects.
- 11) Consider developing public outreach materials for all Dublin residents emphasizing the historical and cultural resources of Dublin and materials for owners of properties within one of the historic districts.

Ms. Rauch noted numbers 14 and 15 deal with the financial mechanisms for Bridge Street. She said since the Historic District is coming out of Bridge Street; what that means in terms of financing will need to be determined. She emphasized the point needs to be made that the City is investing in the district. She said the parking garage is an example of public funding. She said a matching grant program is in place, also, which helps business owners make improvements to the appearance of their building, as necessary, when they may not have the resources to achieve that goal. At this point, she reported the grant is only at the commercial level.

- 14) Utilize some of the financing mechanisms for the new Bridge Street District to update the infrastructure of Historic Dublin.
- 15) Utilize some of the financing mechanisms for the new Bridge Street District to provide incentives to improve existing properties in Historic Dublin.

Ms. Rauch said, in terms of outlying recommendations, numbers 4 and 8 are related to properties that are not within the City; Frazier Estates is located in the Jerome Township area on Industrial Parkway and

the Davis Mound is on private property along Riverside Drive. She said the owners could be encouraged to make sure those resources are preserved and the City could partner with them.

Ms. Rauch said numbers 12, 13, and 16 are items the City is already doing or are underway.

12) Affirm the importance of the Historic Core and Historic Residential Areas (aka "Historic Dublin") and take active steps to protect their character-defining features.

13) Use public lots/garages to improve parking and lessen the burden on developing commercial properties in Historic Dublin.

16) Improve the Architectural Review Board (ARB) process with a small project/ maintenance process and more frequent opportunities for property owners to obtain approval.

Ms. Rauch said those are all the recommendations as a result of the assessment and again the objective is to gain the Board's identified priorities.

Ms. Stenberg said some of these items require funds or hiring a consultant and a lot more involved than others so are they being asked to just making a priority list or what is feasible at this point. She asked if they should determine what they 'want' to do or what they 'should' do. Ms. Rauch answered the Board should determine the most pressing issues, or would accomplish the most, or are more in line with issues this Board is seeing specifically that people are not doing or the Board wants them to do. Ms. Rauch said the City has a budget and consultant money can be allocated towards this but she does not know what that amount is and that would probably be part of the final recommendation made by Council. She suggested the Board not be limited based on the consideration of available or unavailable funds.

Mr. Rinaldi said the first item is about expanding either Appendix G or the boundaries and those are great goals and should be on-going no matter what but said he was uncertain as to how they can or will be achieved. He said some simple items that have been touched upon during the review of the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*, #11 was just education where the Board had suggested just mailing out next year's approved meeting dates for the ARB to every property owner within the district and state, by the way, if you are doing next year modifications to your property, you have to come to the Board meetings and submit an application. He said it is a very simple way that alleviates putting up signs and say "Oh, I did not know" for example. He stated it would be an achievable outreach emphasizing to people they are in a special district and this is when the Board meets. He said this would be just a start but obviously, more could be done.

Ms. Stenberg said she liked that one because from a residential standpoint, it would be very helpful for education on what resources are available out there already – how to apply if the property is on the National Registry.

Mr. Alexander asked if application guidelines could be distributed to every property owner in the district or if it is under the auspices of the Board when property is purchased stating the responsibilities and opportunities that come with that ownership of the structure. He said not only does the City need to provide the process for going under the architectural review but state homes are protected and this is how. He said it could be handled in a positive way and help people to be more aware. He said maybe something like this is on the website.

Mr. Rinaldi said the Board has discussed this before in terms of the real estate market. He said the problem is the real estate agent may not be marketing the house on Riverview Street as a historic property that entails other attachments that have to be done. He said he is not sure how the City can get

ahead of that. He said he has heard applicants state “they own the property, why is the City telling me what to do with it”.

Mr. Keeler said within a community association, obviously, that is part of the closing. He said he purchased a house in Newark in a historic district and when they closed, they were made aware at closing that it was within a historic district and given contact numbers for the people that were the head of the district. He said there could be a mechanism to relate information during a real estate transaction as the property owner really needs to know if there were certain things they could or could not do.

Mr. Alexander suggested doing this annually because the auditor’s website has the property owner’s names so this could be sent out as a reminder to help them understand.

Ms. Rauch identified #11 based on their discussion.

Mr. Rinaldi said he was intrigued by #6 – Indian Run.

Ms. Stenberg identified #1.

Mr. Rinaldi said he would like to expand Appendix G and Ms. Stenberg agreed. Ms. Rauch indicated maybe this could start on a voluntary basis because a detailed inventory was provided by the assessment and also in the previous Community Plan.

Mr. Alexander asked about Staff’s list and if it was prioritized. Ms. Rauch said they were listed in the order of the document as she did not want to impose any bias. Mr. Alexander said clustering the first four all makes sense and everyone agreed. He said that is what he thinks the community wants them to do.

Mr. Rinaldi noted the one already being done like the grants, which he believes will help off-set costs of maintaining properties. He indicated it might be more challenging to extend grants to residential properties as a determination would need to be made to say what a prudent use of funds is. Ms. Rauch said maybe it is not just what the City can do for them but learning about other resources that could assist with funding.

Ms. Rauch said she grouped 1 – 5 together as potentially there could be some overlapping. She added #6, which is the Indian Run item and then item #15.

Mr. Rinaldi said anything to preserve the cemetery is desired as he is personally fascinated by old cemeteries but he is not speaking for the Board. He indicated he thought there was not anything in the list that was not important. He said there has been a lot of interest about maintaining and preserving the stone walls.

Mr. Alexander asked if the age of the stone walls was tracked. Ms. Rauch said that information may have been provided per the assessment and asked Mr. Holton if he had that. (he is off mic) Mr. Alexander said the new developers are putting them in and you can tell where the new walls are but when they weather for a while, he said, it will be hard to tell which ones are historic. Mr. Rinaldi remarked how quickly the walls patina. He said there is heartburn when you lose them but it is amazing how some of the well-done walls look old pretty quickly.

Ms. Rauch said there will be a similar conversation with the Planning Commission. She said then Staff will see where the lists align to be prioritized and provided to Council.

The Chair asked if there was any further public comment. [Hearing none.] He asked the Board if they had any further comments. [There were none.]

Ms. Rauch said the recommendations have been identified and a prioritized list of items to be considered in 2019 are outlined as follows:

- 1) Item #11 – Public outreach and education
- 2) Items #1-3 and 5 – Research and addition of properties
- 3) Item #6 – Indian Run NRHP designation
- 4) Item #15 – Highlight additional funding sources for historic properties
- 5) Item #7 – Investigate the potential restoration of Indian Run Cemetery
- 6) Item #10 – Formal recognition and protection of historic stone walls

The Chair called for a motion.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Keeler moved, Ms. Stenberg seconded, to approve the list of priorities for 2019, as compiled and to be forwarded to the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council. The vote was as follows: Mr. Rinaldi, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Stenberg, yes; and Mr. Keeler, yes. (Identified and Approved 4 – 0)

Communications

The Chair asked if there was any business to report. Jennifer Rauch answered there was not and they were finished for the year of 2018.

Adjournment

With no further communications to share, the Chair adjourned the meeting at 8:19 pm.

As approved by the Architectural Review Board on January 23, 2019