



MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, November 18, 2020

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Bryan called the November 18, 2020 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. 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, Ms. Bryan, Ms. Kramb; Mr. Cotter arrived at 7:30 pm.
Board Members absent: Mr. Kownacki [excused]
Staff present: Ms. Rauch, Ms. Martin, Mr. Ridge, Ms. Noble
Consultant: Greg Dale, Consultant, McBride Dale Clarion

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Kramb moved, Mr. Alexander seconded to accept the documents into the record and approve the October 28, 2020 meeting minutes.

Vote on the motion: Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Bryan, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes.

[Motion carried 3-0]

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 decision-making responsibility on these cases. The Chair swore in staff and applicants who planned to address the Board on any of the cases during the meeting.

APPROVAL OF ARB 2021 MEETING DATES

Mr. Alexander moved, Ms. Bryan seconded approval of the proposed 2021 ARB meeting dates.
Vote on the motion: Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Bryan, yes; Ms. Krumb, yes.

[Motion carried 3-0]

CONSENT CASES

Ms. Bryan stated that two cases were scheduled on the Consent Agenda and inquired if any Board member wished to move them to the regular agenda for discussion.

Per applicant's request, Case 2 was removed from the Consent Agenda to permit discussion.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comments were received regarding Cases 1 and 2.

CONSENT CASE:

1. Tucci's at 35 N. High Street, 20-189ARB-MPR, Minor Project Review

A request for the construction of an approximately 215-square-foot addition to an existing restaurant on a .23-acre site zoned Bridge Street District Historic Core, located northwest of the intersection of N. High Street with Wing Hill Lane.

Ms. Krumb moved, Mr. Alexander seconded approval of the following two waivers:

- 1) Waiver to permit a minimum side yard setback of zero feet for the addition.
- 2) Waiver to permit total building and lot coverage that exceeds the Code permitted maximums.

Vote on the motion: Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Bryan, yes; Ms. Krumb, yes.

[Motion carried 3-0]

Mr. Alexander moved, Ms. Bryan seconded approval of the Minor Project Review with the following three conditions:

- 1) The applicant work with the City to select and install appropriate landscaping adjacent to the public walkway;
- 2) A Real Estate Purchase Agreement is approved by City Council prior to submission of building permits; and
- 3) The applicant provide final lot coverage calculations prior to submitting for building permits, subject to staff approval.

Vote on the motion: Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Bryan, yes; Ms. Krumb, yes.

[Motion carried 3-0]

CASE

2. Ferraro Wealth Management - Sign at 109 S. High Street, 20-165ARB-MPR, Minor Project Review

Ms. Bryan stated that this is a request for the installation of a 4-square-foot, projecting sign for an existing accessory tenant space on a .23-acre site zoned Bridge Street District Historic South, located southwest of the intersection of S. High Street with Pinneyhill Lane.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Ridge stated that this is a proposal for the installation of a new projecting sign for an existing carriage house within Historic Dublin. The site is located south of Pinneyhill Lane, southwest of the intersection with S. High Street. Projecting signs are permitted to be a maximum of 8 square feet in size and 15 feet in height. Projecting signs must be installed within 6 feet of the principal entrance and shall not extend more than 6 feet from the face of the structure to which it is attached. This proposal meets these requirements. The proposed projecting sign is located on the north elevation of the carriage house at the rear of the property, facing Pinneyhill Lane. The sign is to be located above the northern pedestrian entry into the building, replacing an existing sign for the previous tenant. The existing metal hanging bracket would remain to support the new sign. The sign would be 20 inches in height and 30 inches in width, totaling 4.17 square feet where Code permits a maximum of 8 square feet. The sign is constructed of a 1.5-inch thick, routed HDU panel. The raised inline border and graphics are white, and the background and returns are proposed in a dark olive green color. The total height of the sign, as measured from established grade to the top of the sign, will be approximately 9'-3", well within the Code permitted maximum height. However, the proposed clearance is approximately 7.5 feet; 8 feet is required. Staff recommends a bracket be used that will allow for higher installation to provide the required 8 feet of clearance. The sign will not be illuminated; however, an existing light fixture is located next to the pedestrian entry. Staff has reviewed the plan against the applicable criteria and recommends approval with two conditions.

Applicant Presentation

Jim Hartley, SignCom Inc., 527 W. Rich Street Columbus 43215, stated that a simpler and more economical solution could be to reduce the sign height sufficiently to provide the necessary clearance. He would like to request that be an option, if his client is unwilling to purchase another bracket. The bracket is already at the top of the building. The sign design would be the same as shown, but the sign height would be reduced.

Ms. Martin clarified that the Board could not approve two options, only one direction.

Board Discussion

Ms. Krumb stated that reducing the proposed sign height by 5 inches would result in different proportions. Losing 5.5 inches in one direction, and reducing the overall sign proportionally, would result in an extremely small sign.

Mr. Harley responded that is true, but he wanted the option in the event his client was unwilling to purchase a new bracket.

Mr. Alexander stated that the Board could vote on the proposal before them, and assuming it is approved, the applicant has that approved option. If the client is not agreeable, the applicant can return with an application for a revised design; the Board must see an option before approving it. Mr. Hartley indicated that he would like the Board to proceed with consideration of the present proposal. He agrees with the conditions.

Ms. Kramb moved, Mr. Alexander seconded approval of the Minor Project Review with the following two conditions:

- 1) That the applicant select a new hanging bracket which allows the sign to be installed with a minimum clearance of 8 feet.
- 2) That the applicant apply for and successfully obtain a permanent sign permit through the Building Standards Division prior to installation of the sign.

Vote on the motion: Ms. Bryan, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes.
[Motion carried 3-0]

PRESENTATION

- **Historic District Task Force Presentation**

Ms. Noble provided an explanation of the Historic District Task Force's mission and its composition. City Council appointed the Historic District Task Force on October 21, 2019 via Resolution 57-19. Its primary purpose was to update the Historic District Area Plan that was originally adopted in 2007 and subsequently incorporated into the Bridge Street District in 2013. Council was concerned with the massing and density of the BSD and asked the Task Force to re-examine the Historic District Area Plan and recommend changes. The group has met since January 2020 and has examined all the components of an area plan (character, historic preservation, housing, economic vitality, streetscape, wayfinding, etc.). The Task Force engaged with Heritage Ohio to evaluate if their Main Street Program would be acceptable for the City's Historic District. In gathering information, the Task Force has engaged with several City departments, local interest groups and entities and held a public meeting to share proposed recommendations. Because the components align with the ARB, the Task Force recommendations are being provided to the Board for input. The next step will be to present to City Council at its December 7, 2020 meeting. Ms. Noble introduced Task Force Chair Kim Way and Vice Chair Kathy Lannan, who presented the Task Force's recommendations. The three recommendations and associated tasks are as follows:

A. Create an Updated Historic District Area Plan

1. **GATEWAYS:** Consider gateway features at the transition points into the Historic District that differentiate the District from other parts of the City.
2. **STREETSCAPE:** Focus on a streetscape design that is pedestrian friendly and fits the character of the Historic District.
3. **PARKING:** Rely on existing parking lots and on-street parking instead of creating new parking areas/lots, unless required.
4. **OPEN SPACE AND PARKS:** Strongly encourage the preservation of our natural open space and greenways connections.
5. **INDIAN RUN CORRIDOR:** Provide recommendations to ensure the preservation of the Indian Run and adjacent greenways corridor.
6. **SOUTH HIGH STREET VITALITY:** Encourage vitality focused in the south side of the District.
7. **DIVERSITY OF USES.** Encourage mixed-use development that promotes pedestrian movement with a focus on retail and the lack of reliance on vehicular travel.

8. **PRESERVATION:** Highlight the importance of historic preservation as development pressures continue within the District.
9. **PROPER SCALE OF DEVELOPMENT:** Ensure the proper height, scale and massing of buildings within the Historic District to ensure the quaint nature of the area.
10. **CONNECTING THE DISTRICT:** Ensuring adequate transition from the east to the west side of the river and embracing amenities that each has to offer to the District.
11. **WAYFINDING:** Ensuring that both pedestrian and vehicular movement is easily accessible throughout the District through appropriate signage and landmarking.
12. **ARTS AND CULTURE:** Embrace opportunities to provide art and cultural artifacts that represent the history and vitality of the District.

B. Consider Management Options for the Historic District.

MANAGEMENT OF THE DISTRICT: Consider a management program that oversees the goals and objectives of the Historic District and collaborates with the existing organizations in the District including the Dublin Convention and Visitors Bureau, Dublin Chamber of Commerce, Dublin Historical Society, Downtown Alliance, Architectural Review Board, and the Historic District Business Association.

C. Support Existing Efforts That Will Lead to "Short-Term" Successes.

1. **EDUCATIONAL EFFORT:** Provide learning opportunities to the District including historic perspective, cultural diversity and background and significant people and places in the District.
2. **PROCESSES AND REGULATIONS:** Ensure updates to the Historic District Code and Guidelines are compatible with the vision for the District and the development review process is streamlined, clear and fair. Planning staff should finalize and forward these amendments in a timely manner.

Board Discussion

Mr. Alexander stated that in the point re. Diversity of Uses, there was no reference to Residential Uses. Currently in the District, there is only type of Residential use; there are very few small units or rental units. Typically, in Historic Districts, the upper floors of buildings are being converted back to Residential. Those occupants are more likely to walk within the community and increase its vitality. Was this intentionally left out of the discussion regarding Diversity of Uses?

Ms. Lannan responded that the Task Force discussed the use of upper floors for Residential Use, although it inadvertently was not included in the list.

Mr. Way responded that at their meeting yesterday, they also noticed it had not been included. The overarching title in that category is Mixed Use Development, but Residential Use was not included in the list. That item has been updated accordingly.

Mr. Alexander inquired if there was discussion regarding the possibility of increasing physical density in a manner that is complementary to the character of the District, which would also increase vitality. Mr. Way responded that they did discuss the potential for multiple residential units on upper floors of some of the buildings, but they are unsure what the regulations will permit.

Mr. Alexander stated the Board is open to the possibility of other, creative zoning along alleyways or streets where a transition to a residential community frequently occurs. Commercial zoning permits greater lot coverage, so larger buildings or infill development would be permitted.

Mr. Way stated that they would be supportive of doing so, as long as a scale that is appropriate for the Historic District is maintained. The District is slowly losing that scale.

Ms. Bryan inquired if the Task Force has remained up to date on the changes that have been recommended in the Historic District Code and the Historic District Design Guidelines.

Mr. Way responded that they have been apprised of the anticipated changes. Some of the members have reviewed the proposed draft.

Ms. Rauch stated that staff has provided them a copy of the proposed changes to ensure that they were aware and that their efforts were aligned with the ARB revisions.

Ms. Bryan noted that it is also important that the Board of Zoning Appeals be included in these communications, so they can be aligned to the same vision. All the pertinent bodies should have the same vision.

Ms. Lannan and Mr. Way responded that alignment is critical.

Ms. Bryan stated that she likes the Task Force recommendation for a coordinator/manager position. The question is if it should be a volunteer or paid position.

Mr. Way responded that due to the importance of that position, it would need to be a paid position, so that they can invest full effort into the task.

Ms. Krumb stated that Mr. Rose, with whom she serves on the Historical Society, previously shared this presentation with her and she believes he has forwarded her comments to the Task Force. She appreciates this presentation.

Mr. Way noted that the Task Force did receive her comments.

Mr. Cotter stated that he agrees that if it has not occurred, the Task Force should compare their recommendations with the ARB Code and Historic District Design Guideline recommendations and make any adaptations necessary to ensure they are aligned.

The Board agreed that alignment was important and expressed support of the Historic District Task Force recommendations.

3. Historic Dublin Stone Walls, 20-133INF, Informal Review

Ms. Bryan stated that this is a request for a second Informal Review, based on the Board's August 26, 2020 feedback, for the construction of stone walls along S. High Street from Bridge Street to John Wright Lane. The area is zoned Bridge Street District, Historic Core and Historic South.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Ridge stated that this is a request for informal review and feedback on the installation of stonewalls along S. High Street from Bridge Street to John Wright Lane. The site is located along S. High Street between Bridge Street and John Wright Lane. There are brick sidewalks along both the east and west sides of S. High Street. On July 27, 2020, the Parks and Recreation Department presented City Council with an update on the progress of the S. High Street improvements, which included the overall streetscape improvements with proposed landscape material and stone walls. City Council concurred with staff's recommendations but requested that the Architectural Review Board review and provide Informal Review feedback on the stonewall details. At their August 26, 2020 meeting, the Board provided non-binding feedback on the proposed stone walls. While they

acknowledged that there was a functional purpose for the stone walls, the members had a number of concerns, including: (1) The potential tripping hazard created by the lip of the walls along the sidewalk; (2) the walls could divert attention away from the historic buildings in the district, and (3) stone walls in this location were attempting to create history where it did not originally exist. The proposal is for the installation of new stonewalls in various locations along the S. High Street corridor between Bridge Street and John Wright Lane. Additionally, a suspended pavement system will be installed under portions of the street and parking areas to increase the tree lawn soil volume needed to support large trees. The new retaining walls will provide tree access to new soil by lowering the trees to street level. This will provide ability to plant a healthy, homogenous tree-lined street as recommended by the Community Development Committee (CDC). The project will be broken into phases of implementation. The initial phase will be focused on the west side of the street, where most of the street trees were removed by AEP due to power line interference. On the west side of the street, 25 trees will be planted; on the east side, 27 trees will be planted. The walls proposed in this initial phase will be limited to creating tree wells where the existing sidewalk is higher than S. High Street. The purpose of the walls is to retain the existing sidewalk at its current level while allowing the trees to be lowered to curb height for access to the soil under the pavement. The walls will have stone caps and could provide a seat wall along the street for pedestrian use. The applicant has provided three new concepts for consideration. Each design consists of two options: a joined option where adjacent trees can be grouped into longer sections of stonewall where possible, and a separated option where individual trees are surrounded by a smaller stonewalls; all the proposed designs are capped with a stone cap. The design concepts are as follows:

- Design Concept A is a stonewall with 90-degree angles.
- Design Concept B is a similar in design to Concept A, except with chamfered corners.
- Design Concept C is a curved design, hugging the landscaped bed.

Similar to the previous proposal, these retaining walls are proposed to be a maximum of 30 inches in height, will help establish a consistent grade to plant the new trees at a lower elevation, and structurally support the sidewalks. The walls are proposed to be constructed of a cast-in-place concrete core and natural limestone veneer with racked back mortared joints to mimic existing walls in the District. An example of this construction is at the Ground of Remembrance (northwest corner of Rock Cress Pkwy and N. High Street).

Mr. Krawetzki, Parks Department, stated that the three options were provided to break the monotonous visual experience of one tree per tree well. The options could be alternated for variety.

Board Discussion

Mr. Alexander stated that when these trees mature, they will dominate the streetscape and become more prominent than the buildings. There will be a corridor. Have they considered the feasibility of continuing this tree planting pattern north on High Street and on portions of Bridge Street to establish continuity and definition in the Historic District?

Mr. Krawetzki responded that the option of continuing it north on High Street has been discussed, as some of the existing plants are not ideal.

Public Comment

Tom Holton, 5957 Roundstone Place, Dublin, Ohio, stated:

"The multiple photo renderings are very helpful. My preference is for Option C Single Elliptical. It appears to take less space on the slope. There appears to be less wall exposure at the sidewalk level. That would be less of a trip hazard. This single elliptical would leave maximum grass space on the slope, which to me is more appealing. Regarding installation of the pavement suspension system, what is the estimated time for construction with street closure? Is this likely to disrupt businesses very much with loss of parking during the work period?"

Garrick Daft, 21 Indian Run Drive, Dublin, Ohio 43017, stated:

"Can't have trees too large and retaining walls cannot be too high."

Mr. Krawetzki responded to Public Comment #1, noting that it will take approximately two months for digging, construction and re-pavement. Engineering intends to repave the street from the Bridge Street intersection south to John Wright Lane. The Parks Department would work with the Engineering Department on the necessary re-routing of traffic. Parking spaces within the targeted area would be temporarily unavailable.

He noted that, in response to Public Comment #2, the trees potentially can reach 55 feet in height, but their spread is only 25 feet wide. The tree limbs can be trimmed high, and should not create a problem in this narrow corridor.

Board Discussion continued:

Ms. Krumb stated that she much prefers this revised plan, which proposes tree wells versus attempting to imitate a historic wall along the streetscape. She prefers the B or C design, either single or joined.

Mr. Krawetzki stated that Engineering prefers the square formation of A or B, not the ellipse, as the angular formation allows better engagement of the wall with the sidewalk edge.

Ms. Krumb responded that for the Board, it probably would be a matter of personal preference.

Mr. Cotter stated that he is an engineer, so he prefers the square, joined formation. Individual tree walls look more "choppy." He agrees that it is probably more a matter of personal preference.

Mr. Alexander stated that the angled walls look as though an engineer created them, so his preference is the curved walls; they look more natural, less formal. He prefers a variation of both the small and large tree wells. Individual wells seem too "busy." While he did not agree with the need for walls to provide seating for parades, the longer walls would provide more opportunity for that use.

Ms. Bryan stated that this design is a significant improvement over the first. The elliptical design is her least favorite; she prefers the angular design. She agrees it is personal preference. She likes the larger tree wells and the diversity of using both the single and joined formations.

Mr. Krawetzki stated that the tree is a cultivar, which are genetic growths. Every tree will grow the same way, because it is made from the same genetic material. All will grow into the same shape.

Mr. Cotter stated that the Board's concern with the previous design is that it presented a trip hazard. Do the proposed walls have a greater height next to the sidewalk?

Mr. Krawetzki stated that the concept remains the same, but there is less wall engaging with the sidewalk. Per ADA standards, an edge is necessary to prevent wheelchairs, etc. from rolling off the sidewalk. The height must be a minimum of four inches but not so high as to require guardrails. The wall will not reduce the width of the sidewalk, but will engage with its edge.

Ms. Krumb stated that this design does provide opportunities now, however, where a person could step off the sidewalk and into the grassy area. With a solid wall, there would be no opportunity to move out of the way of oncoming pedestrian or bicycle traffic.

Mr. Cotter inquired if there are streetlight poles all the way from the Bridge Street intersection to John Wright Lane.

Mr. Krawetzki responded that they extend to John Wright Lane and perhaps a short distance past it.

Ms. Bryan inquired if staff has the Board input necessary to proceed.

Mr. Krawetzki responded affirmatively.

Ms. Martin explained that the Board is not requested to make a determination, because, typically, improvements within the right-of-way are not under the Board's purview. However, members of Council thought it would be important for the ARB to provide input within the Historic District. She requested clarification of the Board's support for the project.

Ms. Bryan responded that, in general, the Board is supportive of the revised design. Members vary in their preference for elliptical or angular wall formation, and would prefer a mix of large and small tree wells.

4. Architectural Review Board Zoning Code Update, 19-007ADMC, Administrative Request – Code Amendment

Ms. Bryan stated that this is a request for a recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission for an amendment to Zoning Code Sections 153.002, 153.058, 153.059, 153.062, 153.063, 153.065, 153.170 through 153.180, and Appendices F & G to address the Historic Dublin Boundary and Architectural Review Board development standards and procedures.

Board Discussion

Ms. Bryan inquired if members had any other changes to request in the draft Code amendment.

Ms. Krumb requested minor wording changes in the Definitions, including in the Definitions for Contributing and Non-contributing, delete the wording, "It was present during the period of significance and..."

Board members indicated that they had no changes in the text or in Appendices F and G.

Ms. Krumb moved, Mrs. Cotter seconded to request Planning and Zoning Commission review of the proposed Code Amendment and recommendation of approval to City Council

Vote on the motion: Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Bryan, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Ms. Krumb, yes.

[Motion carried 4-0]

5. Historic District Rezoning, 20-188Z, Zoning Review

Ms. Bryan stated that this is a request for a recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission for area rezoning from the Bridge Street District (BSD) to Historic District (HD) designations in conjunction with the Architectural Review Board Zoning Code Updates.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Rauch stated this rezoning is ultimately moving/renaming Historic District properties that had previously been included in the Bridge Street District back to Historic District designations. A list of those parcels with their previous designations and their new designations has been provided in the meeting packet, as well as a map of the related districts and boundaries. The proposed changes are as follow:

HD Rezoning Changes:

- The parcels that contain the development of Bridge Park West Buildings Z1 and Z2, West Plaza, CML Dublin Branch and Downtown Dublin Parking are proposed to be rezoned from Bridge Street District - Historic Transition (BSD-HT) to Bridge Street District - Scioto River Neighborhood (BSD-SRN).
- Properties remaining within the Historic District boundary and previously zoned as a Bridge Street District zoning will be rezoned into new Historic Zoning Districts: HR, Historic Residential, HC, Historic Core, HS, Historic South, and HP, Historic Public. These proposed zoning districts build upon the existing BSD districts (which had previously incorporated zoning standards from the pre-BSD historic zoning districts). This will protect existing property owners by retaining a majority of the existing use and general development standards. However, these new districts will contain certain site development restrictions and will rely heavily on the revised Historic Design Guidelines to ensure compatibility with the surrounding character and design standards within the Historic District.
- The Dublin City Schools property, Dublin Cemetery, Indian Run greenway, Indian Run Cemetery, Riverside Crossing Park West, Dublin Spring Park, and the Karrer Barn property are proposed to be included in a new HD-Public District.
- An updated zoning map has been created for review and an area rezoning of the properties is included with the Zoning Code amendment, which align with the new zoning districts.
- The existing Architectural Review Board section of the Zoning Code has been updated to reflect these changes, as well as approval process changes and updates to the demolition section.

Historic District Boundary Changes & Outlying Properties Updates

- The parcels that contain the development of Bridge Park West Buildings Z1 and Z2, West Plaza, CML Dublin Branch and Downtown Dublin Parking Garage have been removed from the Historic District, and remain within the Bridge Street District and have Bridge Street District zoning. The proposed Historic District boundary has been modified to reflect this proposed change.
- The eastern boundary of the Historic District has been moved to the west side of the Scioto River, with the exception of the Scioto River Bridge, which remains under the Architectural Review Board's purview.
- Appendix F in the proposed Code has been updated to reflect the proposed boundary changes.
- City-owned historic properties have been added to Appendix G, the list of outlying historic properties.

Board Discussion

Mr. Alexander inquired if any consideration had been given to zoning N. Riverview Street the same as the residential district across Bridge Street. As we change the zoning to provide protection for those residential properties, the fabric of the neighborhood is the same on the other side of the bridge. It does not seem appropriate that those homes are not afforded the same protection as the rezoning will provide to the other residential properties.

Ms. Rauch stated that staff has discussed this and agrees, but the Board's discussion and recommendation is necessary.

Ms. Bryan stated that she agrees and would be supportive of rezoning that portion of N. Riverview Street to Historic District Residential, as well.

Ms. Rauch stated that it would involve the six properties that are currently proposed as Historic Core.

Ms. Bryan stated that the zoning would allow commercial development; however, there are some historic homes there. Currently, they have no protection.

Mr. Cotter and Ms. Kramb expressed agreement that there is a need to address the situation for those properties.

Ms. Kramb stated that she disagrees with rezoning Bridge Park West, the Library and the Garage from the BSD Historic Transition District. She prefers those structures remain in a Transition District than be in the Scioto River Neighborhood. If several years in the future the existing buildings were to be torn down, it would be preferable that buildings that are appropriate in a transition neighborhood replace them, not big box retail, as the Scioto River Neighborhood zoning would permit. The type of structures on the east side of the river are not what we desire to have abutting the Historic District.

Consensus of all Board members was that the designated parcels should remain as they are, within the BSD Historic Transition District. No rezoning of those properties should occur.

Ms. Rauch indicated that staff has no objection. That change will be included in the proposed rezoning that will be submitted to the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council.

Public Comment

Garrick Daft, 21 Indian Run Drive, Dublin, OH, stated:

"What is the difference between the Scioto River Neighborhood zoning and the previous Historic Transition zoning?"

Ms. Rauch stated that as has been noted, it would allow for additional Building Types and potentially additional Building Height and Uses different than permitted within the Historic Transition zoning. Retaining the Historic Transition District zoning would be more compatible with a transition into the Historic District.

Ms. Kramb moved, Mr. Alexander seconded to request Planning and Zoning Commission review of the proposed rezoning with the following amendments:

- Newer development areas (Garage, Library, Bridge Park West) remain BSD-Historic Transition (not be rezoned to BSD-Scioto River Neighborhood).

- The six (6) North Riverview Street parcels zoned BSD-Historic Core be rezoned to Historic District - Historic Residential.

and recommendation of approval of City Council.

Vote on the motion: Mr. Cotter, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Bryan, yes.
[Motion carried 4-0]

6. Historic Design Guidelines, 18-037ADM, Administrative Request

Ms. Bryan stated that this is a request for a recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission for new Historic Design Guidelines applicable to properties located within the Architectural Review District and its outlying historic properties.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Martin stated that Planning staff, along with the consultant team have finalized a draft of the updated Historic Design Guidelines based on input from meetings with the Historic District stakeholder committee in 2018 and extensive input from the public and the Architectural Review Board. The public input includes four stakeholder meetings, six public meetings, and 11 public hearings. The Guidelines contain clearer standards that complement the proposed Zoning Code update, as well as incorporate updated graphics. Prior to the July 29, 2020 Board meeting, the ARB conducted four reviews of these initial draft documents on July 10, July 24 and November 20, 2019, and on June 17, 2020. The following is a summary of the revisions made to the Historic Design Guidelines following the July 29, 2020 meeting. Minor clerical changes were also made at the direction of the Board. Tonight's review will focus on the Architectural Styles section. In the Guidelines, there was a discrepancy between Architectural Styles and Building Types. In staff's interpretation, an Architectural Style is based on the elements of a building that make it identifiable to a particular period of time. These elements may include design details and ornamentation. A Building Type is based on the form, floorplan, configuration and number of stories. A Building Type does not determine the Architectural Style. Building Types of a similar form can occur under various Architectural Styles. In July, ARB reviewed the Architectural Styles and Types. She would like to point out the Folk Style, including the gabled front, gabled front wing and side gable. In July, those were identified as Architectural Styles. They are very dissimilar from other Architectural Styles, such as Greek Revival, Gothic Revival, and Queen Anne. The gabled front, gabled wing and side gable are actually a reference to the building form. With the revision to the Architectural Styles section, updates have been made to ensure consistency with the Paint Colors document and provide clarity. [reviewed changes made in Style categories.]

Following discussion, Board members were not supportive of the proposed changes from the July 29 version and recommended that staff return to that version and make a few changes as noted tonight. The Board did not believe there were many issues with that version. Mr. Alexander and Ms. Kramb are available to provide input on the process before the next hearing.

Ms. Kramb moved, Ms. Bryan seconded that the case be tabled.

Vote: Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Bryan, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes.

[Motion approved 4-0]

COMMUNICATIONS

- A joint meeting of Council/PZC/ARB/BZA is scheduled for December 14 to provide an update re. policies, challenges and issues.
- The next regular meeting of the ARB is scheduled for December 16, 2020.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:40 p.m.

Kathleen Bryan

Chair, Architectural Review Board

Judith K. Beal

Deputy Clerk of Council