



MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, September 5, 2019

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Newell, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Ms. Newell led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Commission members present: Victoria Newell, William Wilson, Mark Supelak, Rebecca Call, and Warren Fishman
Commission members absent: Jane Fox and Kristina Kennedy
Staff members present: Jennifer Rauch, Chase Ridge, Phil Hartmann
Consultant: Greg Dale, McBride Dale Clarion

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS

Mr. Fishman moved, Mr. Wilson seconded to accept the documents into the record.

Vote: Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Wilson (Motion passed 5-0)

Ms. Newell stated the Planning and Zoning Commission is an advisory board to City Council when rezoning and platting of property is under consideration. For those cases, City Council will receive recommendations from the Commission. For other cases, the Commission has the decision-making responsibility, and anyone who wishes to address the Commission on any of the administrative cases must be sworn in.

Ms. Newell stated that the agenda order is typically determined at the beginning of the meeting by the Chair. All of the cases tonight are Administrative Review and will be heard in the order in which they were published.

V. ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEWS

Ms. Rauch requested that the two cases be considered together.

1. Historic Dublin – ARB Code Amendments, 19-007ADMN

Ms. Newell stated that this case is an introduction of amendments to Zoning Code Sections 153.170 through 153.180, and Appendices F and G that include the creation of Historic Zoning Districts, associated requirements, and revisions to the procedures of the Architectural Review Board.

2. Historic Dublin Design Guidelines 18-037ADMN

Ms. Newell stated that this case introduces proposed amendments to the Historic Dublin Design Guidelines that govern Historic Dublin properties and properties identified on Appendix G.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Rauch stated that the amendments to the Code and the Design Guidelines that govern the Historic District are in response to Council's direction to staff last year. A stakeholders committee was established to help work through the Design Guidelines. Council's direction also was to remove the Historic District from the Bridge Street Code, ensuring that it aligns with the vision of Council and the community for the District. Council was concerned about the development pressures in that area not aligning with the scale and character that Council and the community wanted to be preserved there. In the Commission's packet, drafts of the proposed amendments to the Code and Guidelines were provided, including potential boundary changes. The goal is to rezone these properties back to a Historic Zoning District, and attempt to retain the uses and development standards similar to what was in Bridge Street District, but remove building type tables that promoted a high-density feel and return the historic districts to traditional zoning code standards, which are more user friendly. The drafts for both documents and the Historic District boundaries are the same as were provided to the ARB, which that Board reviewed in June and July. A public review meeting was held in August and four "office hour" opportunities in the District on Wednesdays during the month of August. Following's PZC's review today, all feedback received will be incorporated into revised drafts for the ARB and PZC's formal reviews and recommendation to City Council.

Boundary Map

Ms. Rauch described the current boundary and zoning for the Historic District. Staff is in discussions with Dublin Schools to determine if the boundary that bisects the school site should be extended further to the west or further to the east and place the 1919 Building and the Indian Run Cemetery in Appendix G and under ARB's purview. The overall intent is to keep the boundaries close to the same. The eastern boundary was moved from the east side to the west side of the river, retaining the bridge within the boundary. Council also has directed that the library, the parking garage, the Bridge Park West Z1 and Z2 buildings, and the plaza be removed from the Historic District. The proposed boundary map shows all proposed changes except any related to the school site, while those discussions continue. With the amendments, it will be essential to rezone these properties to a Historic District zoning classification. The area that is currently Bridge Street Historic Core will become Historic District Core, Historic District South and Historic Residential. The properties that Council wanted to be removed from the Historic District would be zoned Scioto River Neighborhood, which is consistent with what is across the street. The Code amendment will establish the zoning changes.

Historic Dublin – ARB Code Amendments, 19-007ADMN

Mr. Dale stated that he would highlight the recommended changes in each section. To clarify, the Commission will be reviewing proposed amendments to the Historic District Code, which are part of the overall zoning regulations. The amendments will be adopted by ordinance. The Commission will also review the proposed Historic District Design Guidelines, which reside outside of the Code at the policy level, but are linked to the Code. The Design Guidelines provide guidance on how to

apply the Code. An 85-page draft of the proposed Code amendments has been provided to the Commission for their review, approximately half of which are site development standards that were carried over from the previous districts. Those pages received very little comment from the ARB or the public. [Review per section ensued.]

§153.170 Historic Districts Applicability.

§153.171 Historic Zoning Districts Purpose and Intent.

No additional changes were recommended in the above two sections.

§153.172 – Uses.

Mr. Dale noted that the Use Table 153.172A, on pp. 4-5, was also pulled forward from the previous version.

- Hotels – p. 5

ARB recommended that hotels be removed as a Permitted Use in the Historic South District. Hotels in the Historic Core would remain; however, use-specific standards will be added.

- Schools – p.4

ARB also requested that Elementary and Middle Schools be removed as Permitted Uses in the Historic Core, Historic South and Historic Residential Districts, and permitted in the Historic Public District only (subject to School boundary determination).

Ms. Call requested definition of a Hotel. Does it also include the Airbnb use?

Mr. Dale responded that the City has been looking at short-term rentals as a zoning question. His assumption is that Hotels would not be defined to include that use; it will be a separate category.

Ms. Call stated that most of her concern revolves around the use type and ancillary implications, such as parking structures and hours. If it is being handled as a separate item, she has no further questions on that matter.

Mr. Dale responded that this is an item that use specific standards could address.

Ms. Newell requested clarification as to where hotels would be permitted.

Mr. Dale responded that it would only be in the Historic Core.

Ms. Newell stated that she does not believe a hotel in the Historic Core is appropriate.

Ms. Rauch stated that concern was also raised in a public meeting. It could be removed from that district, as well.

Ms. Newell stated that a hotel is out of scale with the character of the Historic District. A hotel would dwarf most of the structures in the Historic Core or anywhere in the Historic District.

Ms. Call inquired if the Code provides the Commission the ability to limit hotel structure types. She can envision a quaint, two-story bed and breakfast with an architectural historic character in the Historic District, but if a hotel could be more than that, it would not be appropriate. If the definition required a hotel to be fitting for the Historic District, she would have no objection to it there.

Mr. Dale stated that it would be within the realm of the Commission's perspective to do so. Some of the issue could be addressed by setback, building height and building scale compliance. However, if the Commission is not satisfied that type of safety net is sufficiently tight to catch

potential issues, a definition of a hotel with the type of character fitting to the District could be created. For instance, the use could be called an inn or a bed and breakfast establishment. It would be a separate category with a separate definition that would prohibit a structure of the scale of a national chain product.

Ms. Newell stated that bed and breakfast is listed, which is the type of business that can be run in a residential home. While the first floor of a home would be eight to nine feet in height, the scale of a typical hotel is a concern. A commercial building, such as a hotel, would have a taller plate height – 12-14 feet up to the second floor level. That expands the scale of the structure and results in a height that is double that of a typical 2.0 or 1.5-story building in the Historic District.

Mr. Supelak stated that if a bed and breakfast or a boutique hotel was done in a way to fit the District, it could be good. The ancillaries that go with it – porte cochere, parking spaces, etc., impact the District, as well.

Ms. Newell stated that she likes the description as “boutique.” There are cases of historic structures, such as an old jail, that have been turned into exclusive places to stay while also preserving a very historic facility. She would prefer not to preclude that type of creativity.

Mr. Dale stated that they could draft a provision that would permit a boutique-type hotel and include definition, height, setback and scale requirements.

Ms. Call inquired if that would be handled within the zoning, or could there be separate design standards relative to that zoning to address it.

Mr. Dale responded that it could be listed as a Permitted Use, and then the Design Guidelines would apply. With those, the ARB will be able to consider scale, massing, relationship with surrounding buildings, materials and compatibility issues.

Ms. Call inquired if the Design Guidelines would apply based upon the zoning. Is it possible to be specific regarding in which historic districts the hotel design guidelines would apply?

Mr. Dale responded that would be addressed in a use specific standards category. It would be possible to define the circumstances under which a boutique hotel would be acceptable in certain districts and not in other districts.

Mr. Fishman stated that he has been in boutique hotels that are four stories high. Nothing that resembles a hotel would be appropriate in the Historic District. The composition of the ARB will be different in the future, so this definition would need to be very specific.

Mr. Supelak stated that Commissioners are very concerned about possible issues with this use, but he is willing to withhold judgment until he has seen the consultant’s draft of this standard.

Ms. Call stated that it would be necessary to have use-specific standards.

Mr. Dale responded that if the Commission continues to see some risk after reviewing the standard, they could make the decision not to include it. There is also the option of making it a Conditional Use, which would subject it to an additional level of review.

§153.172 – Site Development Standards

- (A) Intent
- (B) Applicability
- (C) General Development Standards

Table 153.173A provides regulations for land and structures within the historic zoning districts. Generally speaking, all of the measurements in this table already are in place and have been incorporated into the amendment.

Three points of concern:

1. Maximum building height – 35 feet in Historic Residential District. While that is a standard residential building height standard, there is concern that it is not appropriate in this particular district. The consensus seems to be that is too tall compared to what currently exists. 29-30 feet may be more compatible with existing buildings.
2. Maximum lot coverage – An impervious surface (buildings, driveways, etc.) of 65% in the Historic South District and 50% in the Historic Residential District. There is concern that percentage is too high in those districts. The direction they have been hearing is to reduce both the height and the maximum lot coverage.

Ms. Call stated that there is a minimum lot size of 8,700 feet in the Historic District. What is the standard for the rest of the City?

Ms. Rauch stated that it depends on the zoning.

Mr. Dale inquired if 8,700 feet would be on the low end.

Ms. Call stated that there are no huge yards in historic districts. The 50% maximum lot coverage allows for a livable structure on a smaller lot.

Ms. Rauch noted that the City has many lots that are very narrow but long. There are concerns about new development in the Historic District. Fitting long houses with large footprints on these lots is out of character in the District. Although it is important to have zoning that allows people to redevelop or make appropriate additions, there is a need to ensure that it is appropriate within the district.

Mr. Dale clarified the relationship between the zoning standards and the Design Guidelines. When a proposal does not meet zoning standards, a waiver can be requested. Design Guidelines address respect for context and compatibility. If in applying the Guidelines, ARB believes certain modifications should be made, they will be able to condition their approval on that modification being made.

3. Side Yard and Rear Yard Setbacks – Residents expressed concerns. What happens to the rear of their homes is a very important part of the character of that neighborhood, although the public may not see rear yards from the public right-of-way. They are continuing to work on those numbers.

Mr. Wilson inquired if the maximum lot coverage numbers in the Historic South District are near the coverage that exists today.

Ms. Rauch responded that staff currently is conducting an audit of the numbers.

Mr. Fishman stated that in the Historic Residential District the lot coverage is 50%; however, with some of those new houses, there is actually 90% lot coverage. He observed an addition being made to a garage that impacts the neighbor's ability to use that portion of his yard.

Ms. Rauch stated that most of those large homes do meet lot coverage requirements without need for a waiver. The lots are small. If the Commission is not satisfied with the standards, they can revisit them.

Mr. Fishman inquired how the requirement for 50% lot coverage would be controlled.

Mr. Dale stated that they need to calibrate the numbers as closely as possible to an overall prevailing condition in the area. From block to block, they will vary. The approach is to allow the ARB the flexibility to grant waivers where the amount is exceeded or to make it more restrictive based upon surrounding context. This provides a standard for District-wide conditions.

Mr. Fishman stated that suggestion would appear to exasperate the problem. He would prefer to make restrictions differently. It would seem if lots are close in proximity, the next applicant within that area should be permitted only 50% coverage. Otherwise, the greenspace will disappear in the District.

Mr. Dale stated that greenspace is one of the factors that the ARB would be asked to consider. Ultimately, there need to be guidelines. ARB exists to exercise discretion, to look at the conditions and make certain choices.

Ms. Call stated that he has mentioned two options, either more restrictive, not permitting waivers or to grant waivers. Is there opportunity for a hybrid, whereby a waiver could be granted up to a certain percent? For example, if they meet certain standards, ARB has the ability to flex from 50% -- perhaps even 40%, maximum lot coverage up to 60%, given those standards.

Mr. Dale responded that it could be written in that manner. It could be specific to lot coverage, lot width, or by creating a limitation on the increment up to which the Board could grant waivers.

Ms. Call responded that she would prefer the requirements be more restricted and grant them more flexibility up to a certain number with which we all have a comfort level.

Ms. Newell stated that she likes the waiver process. There was a time when residents in the Historic District were required to come before the BZA due to simple issues, such as the fact that their homes were a couple of feet off the property line, and that was preventing them from being able to add simple decks, etc. She likes having the waiver process in the hands of the ARB, as opposed to requiring residents to go to multiple boards.

Mr. Dale stated that the waiver could be limited to a certain ceiling, and granting of the waiver could be tied to context-based decisions.

Mr. Fishman stated that on page one, number 3 under Historic Zoning Districts Purpose and Intent, item B-3 states that the Historical Residential District applies to the residential area of Historic Dublin and encourages the preservation and development of homes on existing or new lots that are comparable in size, mass and scale, while maintaining and promoting the traditional residential character of the Historic Dublin area. On page 3, item 5-3 under "Similar Use Determination" requires that the use will not materially impair the present or potential use of other properties within the same district or bordering districts. Certainly, we would not be abiding by the latter provision.

Mr. Dale stated that the Similar Use Determination is different. It is intended to allow for the possibility of uses that did not previously exist, i.e. record stores versus CD stores. In regard to mass and scale, the core standard for the Design Guidelines is that things need to be similar in size, scale and massing. If waivers are limited to a certain percentage, and it is clear that they need to be context sensitive, the Guidelines should achieve the desired result.

Ms. Newell stated that in the Historic District, each property has an individual character with buildings reflective of different architectural periods. It is important to have the flexibility to judge each property individually within context with surrounding properties. A waiver gives the ARB ability to do so. The Code for the District must not be so rigid that it prevents that opportunity.

Mr. Dale stated that there are Waiver Standards and Criteria in the draft document. He is hearing that the Commission wants some limited flexibility.

Ms. Call stated that there might be new architectural ideas that violate Code. If the Code is so strict that it does not allow for those type of variances, there is no other mechanism by which to consider such opportunities.

Mr. Fishman inquired if it is possible to add a condition for how the proposal would affect the surrounding properties.

Mr. Dale responded affirmatively. He noted that in the remainder of the section up to page 50, General Standards are addressed, such as landscaping, lighting and parking. Those regulations already exist and were carried forward into this draft. Neither the public nor ARB offered comments on those items.

Ms. Call stated that new parking garages recently were added in the area immediately adjacent to these Districts. Since their addition, have there been any suggestions from ARB or the public to revisit the topic of parking?

Mr. Dale responded that there has been no such suggestion. However, communities should continue to monitor their parking situation. Due to shared and autonomous vehicles, etc., parking needs will be changing substantially in the next few years.

Mr. Supelak inquired if she is concerned that these are relaxed or reduced standards.

Ms. Call responded that the minimum parking requirement for a historic residential property was two spaces per home. Now, many of the homes are larger. As the occupant profile per home changes, the parking profile per home changes, as well.

Ms. Rauch responded that this is the parking standard for Bridge Street; it is not specific to historic structures. It is in line with the rest of the community.

Mr. Wilson stated that this is the Historic District. Do we want to preserve it to continue to be historic? When waivers are issued, modernization occurs. The historic character may be lost. Most of us have visited cities in Europe where buildings have existed 200 – 300 years. Those cities have strict rules prohibiting changes to their historic buildings. Although interior changes are permitted, nothing on the façade or the foundation can be changed. They also want to preserve the existing greenspace. Dublin has other areas that can accommodate modern and larger homes. The Historic District is a very important portion of this city. Do we want to keep it the same for many years, or do we want to permit it to transform over time and lose the specific attractiveness that it has had?

Mr. Dale responded that, based on the feedback received during the committee, public and ARB review process, this is a historic preservation effort. However, it will also accommodate property owners making exterior changes to their buildings subject to tight standards that will require preservation of the historic character of the buildings. There may be instances where new structures are desired, as well. Based on their understanding of the values of this community, there is no intent that the district will be transitioning out of its historic character.

§ 153.174 Design Standards

Mr. Dale stated that the intent was to have consistency between the Code standards and the Design Guidelines. The Code standards are the "shalls"; the Design Guidelines are the "shoulds." ARB requested that any "shalls" be removed from the Guidelines. Essentially, numbers and other details in this section have been cleaned up. For instance, ARB requested clarification that shutters must be operable.

Ms. Call inquired if there is a list of the "shall" items that were removed from the Guidelines.

Mr. Dale responded that there were only two:

1. On page 53, Entrance Design – pedestrian entrances on all buildings shall be pedestrian scale.
2. Balconies, Stoops and Canopies. These items should be more character-driven than have specific numbers.

Ms. Rauch stated that, currently, making any change to the color of a building in the Historic District requires ARB review. ARB has suggested compiling a color palette that the Board will approve, which would enable administrative reviews of color by staff.

Mr. Fishman noted that some communities have had those in place, such as Muirfield. Over time, colors evolve and color palettes may need to change.

Mr. Dale responded that, periodically, ARB could modify that color palette, if desired.

Ms. Newell stated that the stakeholders committee discussed this topic at length. While on a Victorian home, five colors could be appropriate, on a vernacular building, perhaps only one color would be appropriate. It is difficult to incorporate that into guidelines.

Ms. Rauch stated that the existing Guidelines do address the need for consistency with the appropriate time frame.

Mr. Supelak inquired if, potentially, the approved color palettes could be incorporated into the Design Guidelines.

Ms. Rauch responded that there is opportunity to include it or provide as a separate document.

Mr. Dale stated that although staff would administer the color palette, an application could be referred to ARB, if the request warranted their review.

J. Demolition

Mr. Dale stated that the Code revision provides a set of criteria for contributing versus non-contributing buildings. The City has conducted an extensive survey of the District. They are attempting to reduce that to a simple inventory list of contributing versus non-contributing buildings. Contributing buildings must provide proof of economic hardship for their demolition request. If the building is non-contributing, the standards are less rigid.

Ms. Newell inquired about the ability to address properties where the owner has intentionally permitted their historic property to decline, because they have other plans for that property.

Mr. Dale responded that the term for that practice is demolition by neglect. The Zoning Code is not a maintenance document. Many communities have tried to supplement their zoning regulations with maintenance requirements. Some communities have required owners to license any empty buildings and maintain them. Additional guidelines or standards would be included to attempt to minimize that possibility; however, it is difficult to enforce.

Mr. Supelak stated that under Review Criteria, item 4-d refers to, "Any evidence of self-created hardship through deliberate neglect or inadequate maintenance of the property."

Mr. Dale stated that is the pertinent section. It may be difficult to use as the basis for denial, if it is the only reason.

Ms. Rauch stated that this issue also is being reviewed from a City-wide perspective. That effort will dovetail with this.

Mr. Fishman stated that there are incidences where an aging homeowner passes. That individual's home, which has declined from lack of maintenance, is purchased, and the new owner wants to tear it down with the argument that the deterioration was not due to their neglect.

Mr. Dale stated that is sometimes a legitimate argument. This has been the Achilles Heel of preservation efforts. Aging historic buildings are expensive to maintain. The best direction is to supplement City standards with strong maintenance requirements.

Ms. Newell stated that she likes the suggestion to provide notification when a building is vacated. Empty buildings need to have a minimum temperature inside, or mold and other issues will develop. Even a new building will deteriorate in such conditions.

Mr. Fishman stated that the City of Columbus has a process to address empty buildings following a fire. Thirty days after a fire event, an inspector checks the building to see if any re-construction of the damaged building has begun or if said construction has proceeded without a license. In either case, the building owner is cited. He would assume there could be a similar inspection process for maintenance, not fire inspections.

Mr. Dale stated that this would be an appropriate policy issue for the Commission to raise. There are other policy areas related to enforcement and maintenance that are important for a holistic approach.

Public Comment

Denise Franz King, 170 S. Riverview Street, Dublin stated that she appreciates the Commission's emphasis on preserving the character of the open space in the Historic District. The residents appreciate that the Commission has listened to their concerns. Their primary concern is with the new, long homes being placed on the small lots in the district. There is a structure on S. Riverview that is so close to the house next door that she would have assumed the Fire Department would have considered that proximity unacceptable. She appreciates the authority being given to ARB to take context with the neighborhood into account, so that a 35-ft. house is not permitted on the south end of the street where the diminutive ranch homes are located. The scale, lot coverage and height are very important. They would request that no additional over-sized buildings be

added to their neighborhood, cutting off the sunlight and air to the adjacent properties. She invited Commission members to join her on a walk through the neighborhood.

Historic Dublin Design Guidelines, 18-037ADMN

Mr. Dale stated that one of the main objectives of this revision was to take the City's existing Guidelines and turn them into a more user-friendly document. Currently, substantial language in the Guidelines is essentially background information, and within that information, there may be only two guidelines. In addition, the operative words are not consistent. They have attempted to clean up that language for clarification purposes. They also cleaned up some internal inconsistencies, eliminated duplications, etc. They did not attempt to change the Guidelines. They are sufficiently strong, but will now be more effective. The document has seven chapters. The first three chapters consist of the Introduction, History and Intent, and Context and Character. The actual Guidelines are in chapters four through seven and provide guidelines for Rehabilitation, New Construction, Site Considerations and Signs.

3.2 Using the Guidelines

This item states that, "the underlying premise of the Guidelines is preservation and rehabilitation." It is not to transition away from Historic. There has been some discussion about the relationship of these Guidelines to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. That document provides 8-9 standards for the treatment of historic properties. Although the standards are broad, guiding principles, that Office has published guidance that is more specific to each.

Ms. Newell noted that there are actually a total of 10 standards.

Mr. Dale stated that they are quite familiar with those standards and believe these Guidelines are consistent with those. As a local government, Dublin has the opportunity to customize its Guidelines, although they are based on the national standards. Beginning with the Overview section on page 37, additional guidance was provided in regard to the discretionary nature of the Architectural Review Board's (ARB) decisions. The operative words used in these Guidelines are "should," "should not" and "avoid".

4.1 General

In item 1.C, alternative materials are addressed. This item states that, "If it is not practical to retain the original materials or features due to the condition, availability, safety or energy efficiency of original materials, then quality contemporary substitute materials, when approved by the Board, should replicate the material being replaced. Those materials may be selected from a pre-approved list of alternative materials if it is demonstrated that they have the same characteristics of pre-approved materials." New and often better materials continue to be developed.

4.11 Building Additions

Items C and D address additions to an original building. The ARB requested that both items be converted to Code standards, where they would have more force.

New Construction

With this item, effort was extended to obtain the consensus of the community. At an earlier public meeting, residents were asked, using visual examples, to indicate their preference for new construction in the Historic District, i.e. historical replications, modern, but in scale with the area, or historically representative – similar to. The majority opinion centered between historical replication and historically representative. Residents indicated that there were other places in the City appropriate for bold architectural construction; Historical Dublin was not the place. The intent of historical representation is to be very respectful of the historical fabric, similar to, yet discernable as a new construction.

In summary, the revised Design Guidelines are a cleaned-up checklist of what previously existed, which should be more user-friendly for staff and the public.

Commission Discussion

Ms. Call stated that she believes Signs are difficult to get right, and he has done a remarkable job on this section of the Guidelines. She appreciates the emphasis placed on respect for the historical community.

Mr. Dale thanked her for the comment.

Ms. Newell stated that she has a great love for historical properties. She is curious as to the reason he would not want to incorporate a reference to the Secretary of Interior's Guidelines for Historic Preservation. They are very good standards.

Mr. Dale responded that these standards are consistent with the national guidelines, but they are based upon those previously written specifically for Dublin. Although the Secretary of the Interior's guidelines are broad, they do provide other documents with more details, which offer models for community use. Those documents are much more detailed than what is proposed tonight. What they learned from all the input received is the general opinion that, for the most part, the current process works. It is not broken but simply needs to be improved. To discard what the City has and begin over with the Secretary of the Interior's standards was not necessary.

Ms. Newell stated that she was not suggesting the current standards be discarded, but there are helpful details in the Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines – masonry, for example. Historic structures have historic masonry and mortar, which are very high in lime content. Historic bricks were fired at different temperatures than bricks are fired today. If contemporary mortar is used on historic and aged brick, it deteriorates the brick. The mortar will not expand and contract in the same way the original mortar did. In addition, it is possible to over tuck-point a building. There are styles of grout lines consistent with historic structures. There were grapevine-type mortar joints, and mortar joints were intentionally recessed from the face of the brick, which contribute to the character of the building. The inclination is to "butter" those joints, thinking they are inadequate, when in fact, there may be nothing wrong with masonry. This is one of the details provided by the Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines that are not reflected in these proposed documents.

Mr. Dale responded that in any community, the level of review followed is a matter of local culture and acceptance. Some communities would consider the details to which she referred too onerous to follow. They attempted to listen to the community's input, and residents expressed satisfaction

with the level of detail in the current review system. That is a policy question, however, for the Commission to determine.

Mr. Supelak stated that those details would appear to reflect technical expertise in the review. Ms. Newell responded that it relates somewhat to the maintenance of the structures. The purpose of the Secretary of Interior's Guidelines was to provide ways to protect historic property. When federal funds are involved, the federal government can control what occurs on projects that are deemed historic properties. Some neighborhoods can fall into that classification and become protected properties. Their intent was to prevent projects that would destroy the original historic character of buildings. It does not prevent renovation of the building or accommodating new uses for the building. The goal was to preserve, not restore, to recognize and preserve the significant architectural characters that distinguish the buildings as historic. For instance, masonry sealants should never be applied to historic masonry buildings. It will seal the moisture in and the brick will deteriorate. Often, it is not appropriate to use contemporary materials on historic material, as it can be devastating to the original material.

Mr. Supelak stated that reflects a need for a technical knowledge base, which has its place. It may be a different document, separate from the Design Guidelines, but made available for the ARB's review considerations. However, including it in the Guidelines would make that information available to the public. The typical bricklayer would not be aware of such information.

Mr. Fishman stated that, previously, the German Village ARB standards provided this level of specificity, i.e. the type of mortar to use, not sealing or painting the brick. Could the ARB have a set of those standards to consider when renovations are proposed? Those types of specifics are important. He has seen brick crumble because it had been sealed, painted or mortared incorrectly. Mr. Dale stated that these are maintenance standards for historic buildings.

Ms. Newell stated that some of those actions could destroy the historic character of a building. If the Board cannot recognize those features in a building and know how to protect them, then those structures will be placed at risk.

Mr. Dale responded that it would require the ARB and staff to administer and enforce those standards, if they were made part of the approval process. Some communities provide a historic properties maintenance guide.

Ms. Newell stated that could be appropriate, if staff would incorporate it in their review.

Mr. Fishman stated that while it is appropriate to provide it as maintenance information, applicants for new projects should be told that it is essential for their approval. If not, a few years hence, the brick will have deteriorated and be falling off.

Ms. Rauch stated that the Guidelines originally provided maintenance standards; however, those were removed from the proposed document, as there are other guidance and reference resources available. The City can provide those resources online for users and homeowners.

Ms. Newell stated that some communities will incorporate examples into their Guidelines.

Mr. Fishman suggested that staff look at German Village's Guidelines. They have done a good job in addressing the preservation of their historical brick buildings.

Mr. Dale responded that German Village's Guidelines are very similar to what has been proposed. Years ago, the City of Cincinnati published "The Old House Handbook," which provides the type of guidance to which Mr. Fishman is referring. Perhaps that reference could be provided as a companion to the Design Guidelines.

Mr. Fishman responded that the City might not be able to control the maintenance, or how a homeowner tuck-points his home. However, when applications for new projects are submitted, the Board could require it for approval of those projects.

Ms. Call stated that the Zoning and Design Guidelines should have those specific areas covered, but guidance for the maintenance of historical buildings is lacking.

Mr. Fishman responded that an application for restoration of a building is the opportunity to require that the brick material on the building exterior be handled in a particular way. Guidelines can be provided to the applicant on the type of mortar necessary, avoidance of sealant, etc.

Ms. Rauch responded that level of guidance previously existed in the Guidelines but was removed. Ms. Newell suggested that people view the masonry on the 1919 Building, which has been very poorly tuck-pointed over the years. It is possible to remove that tuck-pointing, and the building could be restored to what it should be. Looking at the rear of that building, in particular, will provide adequate proof of the importance of providing this type of guidance.

Mr. Dale stated that he would try to summarize and add that information in the Rehabilitation section. He would add a section that would essentially require the applicant or allow the ARB to review the technical nature of the rehabilitation. The applicant can be required to demonstrate that they will be using acceptable historically sensitive rehabilitation techniques. Although this discussion is focusing on masonry, the same situation can be present with a wood, shingles or foundation block. The applicant can be provided information on available guidance resources.

Mr. Supelak inquired if there would be value in adding that reference in the Guidelines or in the Building Permit process, so that there is technical expertise available to the user.

Mr. Fishman stated that ARB would need to be aware of the standards to require adherence to them.

Mr. Dale responded that it would begin at the staff level.

Mr. Wilson stated that this item could be referred to as appropriate construction methods. He participated in the Bridge Street District Code amendment. This is following a similar process. He is happy that both the Historic District Code and the Design Guidelines will be in accord.

Mr. Dale responded that "Appropriate Construction Methods" would be a good title for the additional section.

Ms. Newell expressed appreciation on behalf of the Commission for Mr. Dale and staff's work on the revisions.

Mr. Dale responded that the ARB has provided valuable input in their two previous reviews, and the Commission's guidance will further improve the amendments to these documents.

Next Steps

Ms. Rauch stated that the Site Development Standards would be provided to the ARB for their review. Following that discussion, all of the input will be incorporated into final amended documents. Those documents will be reviewed by ARB, and they will make a recommendation for approval to the Commission. At that point, the Commission will conduct a final review and make a recommendation for approval to City Council. The goal is to complete this by year end.

Ms. Newell requested that staff provide an opportunity for absent Commissioners, Ms. Fox and Ms. Kennedy, to offer comments. When developing a new Code for the City, it is important to have all Commissioners' input.

Ms. Rauch stated that she met with Ms. Fox last week. She provided some questions that were touched upon in this discussion, but they may need clarification. Staff could offer opportunity to Ms. Fox and Ms. Kennedy for additional comments.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:16 p.m.

Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission

Deputy Clerk of Council