



MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, July 29, 2020

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Bryan, Chair, called the July 29, 2020 Special Meeting of the Architectural Review Board to order at 6:30 p.m. and provided the following opening comments: "Welcome to a virtual meeting of the City of Dublin Architectural Review Board. The Ohio Legislature passed several emergency laws to address the pandemic, including the ability for public entities to have virtual meetings. We appreciate this ability to maintain our continuity of government. For the present time, we are holding our meetings online and live streaming those meetings on YouTube. You can access the live-stream on the City's website. The meeting procedure for each case this evening will begin with staff presentation followed by Public Comment prior to Board review and discussion. No vote will be taken on this evening's agenda items. To submit any questions or comments during the meeting, please use the form under the streaming video on the City's website. These questions and comments will be relayed to the Board by the meeting moderator. We want to accommodate public participation and comment to the greatest extent possible and welcome your comments on cases. Please use a valid name and address when submitting your comments, and please refrain from making any inappropriate comments."

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Ms. Bryan led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Board Members present: Mr. Alexander, Mr. Cotter, Ms. Bryan, Mr. Kownacki and Ms. Kramb
Staff present: Ms. Rauch, Ms. Martin
Consultant: Greg Dale, McBride Dale Clarion

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS

Mr. Cotter moved, Ms. Kramb seconded to accept the documents into the record.

Vote on the motion: Mr. Kownacki, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Bryan, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes.
[Motion carried 5-0]

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Kownacki moved, Mr. Alexander seconded to approve the June 4, 2020 joint ARB-PZC meeting minutes and the June 17, 2020 Special Meeting minutes.

Vote on the motion: Ms. Bryan, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Mr. Kownacki, yes.
[Motion carried 5-0]

Ms. Bryan stated that the Architectural Review Board is responsible for review of construction, modification or alteration to any site in the Review District or area subject to Architectural Board Review under the provision of Zoning Code Section 153.177. The Board has the responsibility to review and make recommendations on the following two Administrative Requests.

CASES:

1. Historic Dublin Zoning Code Amendments, – Historic Dublin, 19-007ADMC, Administrative Request – Code

Ms. Bryan stated that this application is a request for review (no vote) of revisions based on the Board's previous feedback regarding proposed Zoning District modifications, Historic Dublin boundary changes, amendments to the Zoning Code, and revisions to Appendix G under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.232 and 153.234.

2. Historic Dublin Design Guidelines, 18-037ADMC, Administrative Request

Ms. Bryan stated that this application is a request for review (no vote) of revisions based on the Board's previous feedback regarding comprehensive updates to the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* to revise design recommendations and address discrepancies with Zoning Code requirements under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.066 and 153.171.

DRAFT HISTORIC DISTRICT CODE AMENDMENT REVIEW

Mr. Dale stated that the changes the Board requested at the June 17, 2020 Special Meeting have been made, and a revised draft is provided for the Board's review and consideration this evening. There are three items in particular on which the Board's input is requested: conference centers, loading space requirements and lot coverage.

Some of the major changes made include:

Zoning Map Boundary Changes

City Council previously directed staff to change the Historic District boundary. However, at the June 17 meeting, some ARB members indicated that they have concerns and do not support those changes. Based on City Council's direction, the proposed boundary changes remain in the draft map, but staff will communicate the Board's concerns when this document is referred to the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council for their consideration.

Appendix G

The list identifying outlying historic properties has been updated to incorporate the Brown-Harris Cemetery and Ferris Cemetery, as requested.

Uses

Changes were made to the Use Table (Table 153.172A), including removing High Schools as a Permitted Use from the Historic Core (HC) and Historic South (HS) Districts; removing Hotels from the HC District; and adding Accessory Dwellings to the Historic Residential (HR) District.

Conference Centers

Per the Board's request, Conference Centers as a permitted use in the HC District has been added to Table 153.172A. However, staff is seeking additional guidance regarding the use specific standards that should accompany this use. The Zoning Code defines Conference Centers as: "A facility designed to accommodate and support meetings or conferences. The facility may be either freestanding or incorporated into a hotel or office facility, and may include eating and drinking facilities but exclude overnight lodging if not part of a hotel." "Eating and drinking facilities" include food preparation on-site. Staff requests guidance from the Board on how best to regulate Conference Centers that are appropriately scaled for the Historic Core. As a comparison, The Exchange at Bridge Park is an approximately 18,000-square-foot building on a .59-acre site and accommodates up to 500 guests. The recommended standards for Conference Centers in the HC District would be for a slightly smaller facility than The Exchange at Bridge Park. The proposed standards are:

- 1/2-acre maximum site size; 15,000 square foot maximum building size;
- Parking must be provided on site pursuant to a parking plan approved by ARB;
- An access management plan must be approved by ARB demonstrating the site's ability to accommodate vehicular traffic during peak periods;
- Windows must be included on all elevations facing a public right-of-way per the Historic Design Guidelines.

Board members expressed concern with the proposed square footage and lot size. Consensus of the Board was a Conference Center either could be defined as a permitted Accessory Use, size not to exceed 1,800 square feet (consistent with the existing CoHatch facility), or it could remain as a stand-alone facility but with a reduced lot size. Staff will consider those options and revise the language for the next draft.

Bed and Breakfast

The Board had requested that staff survey other communities to determine whether the 8-guest unit limit in the use specific standards for Bed and Breakfast use was reasonable. Other communities in Ohio and the nation were reviewed for reference, and staff determined that the unit limitation varies from 3-9 units. Because the 8-unit limit was found to be common, no changes were made.

Development Standards

The Board requested that a Maximum Building Footprint for Historic Residential properties be included in the Development Standards. Staff conducted a random sampling of residential building footprints throughout the District. Table 153.173A has been revised to include a Maximum Building Footprint in the Historic South (HS) District of 1,800 square feet not to exceed 3,000 square feet and in the Historic Residential (HR) District not to exceed 25%.

Mr. Alexander inquired if "Maximum Building Footprint" is defined in another part of the Code, as it is not included here. He clarified that all the numbers he had provided to Mr. Dale earlier included all other buildings on the site in the calculation.

Ms. Rauch responded that, currently, there is no definition; however, one would be added.

Ms. Martin stated that their calculation included only the house.

Ms. Kramb stated that in her earlier review, she included everything.

Loading Standards

The Board had requested staff to consider revising the loading space requirements in Table 153.173F to be tied to uses, instead of square footage. After study, staff recommends applicants be required to submit a loading space plan as part of the application approval process. The Board requested that clarification be provided that this requirement applies only to new construction.

Minor Project Thresholds

Staff noted that per the direction of the Board, the square footage thresholds for Minor Projects in Section 153.176(I) were reduced. The Board made no further modifications.

Addition of New Section – Food Trucks

Ms. Rauch inquired if the Board would have any objection to including in the next revision a definition and standards for permitting food trucks on a commercial property on a permanent basis. Board members had no objection to that addition.

Ground Mounted Renewable Energy

Mr. Cotter inquired, in regard to Item J (c) on p. 12, if "Ground Mounted Renewable Energy" equipment would count as lot coverage.

Ms. Martin responded that if it is on the ground and does not allow water to percolate through it, or has a hard surface, it would count as lot coverage. In the case of a condenser unit for an air conditioning unit, the dimensions of the concrete pad on which the equipment sits are counted toward lot coverage.

Archaeological/Cultural Assessment

Mr. Alexander inquired if the "architectural assessment," referred to in Item I (4) on page 75 and as a "cultural assessment" on page 77, is the same assessment currently prepared by the City's Architectural Consultant, or is it a report to be provided by the applicant?

Ms. Rauch responded that it is a new, additional report, which the applicant would be responsible for providing.

Ms. Kramb requested that "cultural assessment" in this context be provided, perhaps by stating that, "a professional assessment of the cultural resources is required."

Simplification of Review Process

Mr. Alexander inquired if this process has moved from a focus on making the review process less difficult. With additional, new requirements, will the process be made more difficult?

Ms. Rauch responded that the intent of the amendment is to make the expectations more clear. The Board's review is very detailed, and members have frequently expressed the need for more information and detail to be provided. The new requirements may be more onerous, but the goal is to make the process more straightforward.

Mr. Dale stated that the intent with the amended regulations and guidelines is to provide more predictability.

Ms. Rauch stated that a palette of recommended paint colors in the Historic District also is being developed for the Board's consideration. Staff approval of paint projects within the District utilizing a Board-approved palette should simplify the review process. Staff also is working on simplifying/clarifying the sign approval process for small businesses.

The Board requested that, consistent with the intent in the Historic District, under I (4) Stone Wall Standards, in Item (c), clarification be provided that the stacked stones should be dry laid. In this section, also provide language that clarifies that existing stone walls are a site element, and the ARB has purview over alterations or changes to architectural features of existing sites and structures. Stone walls are also addressed in the Guidelines, under Fences and Walls.

DRAFT HISTORIC DESIGN GUIDELINES REVIEW

The Board reviewed the revisions that had been made to the draft Historic Design Guidelines following direction given at the June 17, 2020 meeting, including:

- Neighborhood Character Description, 2.3, to emphasize preservation in lieu of development.
- Architectural Styles, 2.9, to better address context and vernacular issues.
- Building Additions, 4.12, to incorporate the concept of subordinate and secondary as a key requirement; a definition for subordinate was included.
- Graphic Illustrations - Language was added to clarify they are merely examples of approaches that could be taken that comply with the Guidelines. Limiting architectural and site design creativity should be avoided.

The Board requested minor clarifications and corrections to the Guidelines and updated names and titles under Acknowledgements.

Next Steps

Ms. Rauch stated that a final draft would be prepared for the ARB's final review and recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission for their subsequent review and recommendation to City Council.

Ms. Bryan noted that it would be advisable for one or two ARB members to be present for the PZC and Council reviews to answer any questions that might be raised.

The next meetings of the ARB will be a Special Meeting on August 12, 2020 and a regular meeting on August 26, 2020.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:45 p.m.

Kathleen Bryan

Chair, Architectural Review Board

Judith K. Beal

Deputy Clerk of Council