



MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, July 21, 2021

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Alexander, Chair, called the July 21, 2021, meeting of the City of Dublin Architectural Review Board (ARB) to order at 6:30 p.m. and noted this is the last in-person meeting of the ARB to be held in the Council Chamber at 5200 Emerald Parkway. This meeting was also live-streamed on the City's website; public participation and comments relayed to the Board by the meeting moderator using an online form. Beginning in August, all the Board and Commission meetings will be held at 5555 Perimeter Drive in the new Council Chamber in the new City Hall location.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Chair led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Board Members present: Mr. Alexander, Mr. Cotter, Ms. Kramb, and Ms. Cooper.
Staff present: Ms. Holt, Mr. Ridge, Ms. Rauch, Mr. Hounshell, Ms. Richard, and Ms. Capka

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Kramb moved, Mr. Cotter seconded, to accept the documents into the record and to approve the Board Minutes, as submitted, from the meetings held on May 26 and June 23, 2021.

Vote: Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; and Ms. Kramb, yes.
[Motion carried 4-0]

CASE PROCEDURES

The Chair stated that the Architectural Review Board is responsible for review of construction, modifications or alterations to any site in the Review District or area subject to Architectural Board Review under the provision of Zoning Code §153.170. The Board has the decision-making responsibility on these cases. Anyone who intends to address the Board on any of these cases will be sworn in. The agenda order is typically determined at the beginning of the meeting by the Chair.

The Chair briefly explained the rules and procedures of the ARB. He swore in anyone planning to address the Board on any of the cases reviewed this evening.

INFORMAL REVIEW CASES

1. Kuraly Residence at 179 S. Riverview Street, 20-095INF, Informal Review

The Chair stated this application is a request for exterior modifications to a single-family home on a 0.36-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic Residential. The site is west of S. Riverview Street, ±400 feet south of the intersection with Pinneyhill Lane. Mr. Hounshell will be our presenter.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Hounshell presented an aerial view of the site and photographs of the four adjacent properties to provide context. This two-story, single-family structure with a three-car attached garage was built in 1997. The majority of the existing house is beige, to be repainted a green color (SW - Seaweed Wrap). The 1.5-story front entry feature is proposed to be more enclosed, requiring the construction of two small vertical board and batten walls on the north and south sides of the existing front porch, between the columns, matching the vertical board and batten over the two-car garage door. The single front door will be replaced with a double-door stained a dark color with the transom window above, remaining. New wood shutters are proposed for the front elevation, stained to match the front door entry. New, dark bronze lighting fixtures for the front entry and garage door entries, matching the new gutters and downspouts were proposed. The horizontal siding on the front of the home will be replaced with a vertical board and batten painted a beige color (SW – Natural Choice). All existing trim will be painted white (SW – Pearly White or similar). Existing garage doors will be replaced with new overhead garage doors with a similar design to the existing but will contain glazing across the top. New charcoal, dimensional-asphalt shingles are proposed for the roof, and the existing roof returns will be removed for a simpler design, which is more in line with the majority of the home.

Board Discussion Questions

The following discussion questions have been provided for the Board to consider during the review:

1. Is the Board supportive of the proposed front entry modifications?
2. Is the Board supportive of the installation of board and batten siding and shutters on the home?
3. Is the Board supportive of the proposed paint colors?
4. Are there additional considerations by the Board?

Applicant Presentation

Taylor Pfeffenberger, His & Hers Architects, stated her client is not fond of the two columns at her front entry that take up too much of the small porch [shown.] They are proposing a wall around to provide more room for the entry way and lessen the appearance of large massing. The house in general is bland so they are proposing new colors to give more dimension: a historical green, a light beige for the board and batten, and white for trim.

Board Questions

Mr. Cotter inquired about past modifications proposed that do not appear to have been completed. He asked if those modifications were abandoned.

Mr. Hounshell clarified in 2019, this site was approved for massive building modifications but the applicant did not move forward with that application. This application is entirely separate. There was a discussion with that case that the board and batten was approved. Ms. Pfeffenberger said they plan to use cedar for the board and batten to match the house.

Ms. Krumb asked if they were proposing to remove the base and columns at the front entry and not just filling in the gaps to create a solid wall.

Ms. Pfeffenberger answered affirmatively.

Mr. Alexander recalled staff has made comments in the past about certain door styles. He requested staff's position on this door re: glass.

Mr. Hounshell indicated that comments about the type of door that will be appropriate here will be provided in the final application for review. Tonight's focus is on the shell of the building.

Ms. Pfeffenberger added they are not changing the color of the grids in the windows.

Mr. Alexander asked why the applicant is bringing focus to the gutters and downspouts with a dark bronze color as opposed to allowing them disappear into the trim color.

Ms. Pfeffenberger answered they are using bronze for the lights and thought it would be nice if they tied in a warm color to complement the green.

Mr. Cotter asked why a dark wood color is now proposed instead of black.

Ms. Pfeffenberger confirmed the dark stain would be closer to brown than black.

Ms. Cooper inquired about the location of the double door.

Ms. Pfeffenberger said the door is staying where it is; it is not being pushed forward on the front of the porch.

Ms. Cooper clarified the board and batten wraps around to the front of the porch but the door is staying flush against the house. She asked why shutters are just for the windows in the center of the façade and not for the windows to the left of the porch.

Ms. Pfeffenberger clarified there will still be a porch and the double door will be wider than the current transom. Shutters for the windows on the left would be a challenge to make them appear like they could cover the windows since the windows are a completely different type and style.

Mr. Alexander said since the door is staying where it is, he asked what the interior of the porch walls were going to look like.

Ms. Pfeffenberger indicated the interior with the wrapped walls had not been definitively decided but leaning towards a lighter stained wood than the shutters and door.

The Chair requested a floor plan of that area when the applicant returns for review and stipulated it does not have to be a rendering in color.

Board Discussion

Mr. Cotter said he was supportive of the front entry as proposed. He is interested to see the intended design for the interior of the 'alcove'.

Ms. Kramb said she would have preferred to have the door forward so it could be visible. Presently, it is hidden and believes it will become more concealed when the porch is blocked off from the north and south. This is a more modern home that is not very decorative; she could be supportive of the modification. A darker door will be even less visible. She wants to see all the details at the next review.

Ms. Pfeffenberger said the door is currently beige, lined up and matching the beige siding so there is no current contrast.

Ms. Cooper said she is supportive of the modifications proposed. She suggested lighting could enhance the interior of the alcove, as it will be absent of sunlight.

Mr. Alexander concurred with everything that was stated by his colleagues. The front modifications will help the look for an older house. He could be supportive, if the door is still recessed but would prefer that the door be pushed forward, in line with the front of the porch.

Ms. Kramb said she was fine with the board and batten modifications. Both Mr. Cotter and Ms. Cooper agreed these changes would aid contrast. Mr. Alexander suggested looking at all the homes in the area that have board and batten siding, as that material was approved a significant number of times and it is very trendy. This material was supported in the past and it appears everyone would support that design today.

Ms. Krumb said her preference is no shutters because one would not put shutters on some windows and not the others, on a house.

Mr. Cotter said the dark shutters would aid the contrast.

Ms. Cooper said she has no specific objections to the shutters.

Mr. Alexander said he was okay with the shutters, reluctantly. The Board has approved designs on the newer houses proposing some shutters while not requiring all the windows to have shutters. He does not like that practice but in this instance, it helps break up the wall and the applicant is at a disadvantage of not building a new house. Visually, there is some value to that shutter being added to the center of the facade. As noted in the staff report, the guidelines are that the shutters have to appear as they are able to cover the window.

Ms. Krumb said she has no objection to the proposed paint colors.

Mr. Cotter said he could not distinguish between the beige and the white colors, online.

Ms. Pfeffenberger said it was a very light contrast; she did not want three different paint colors to be apparent on the structure.

Mr. Cotter clarified there is the fourth color with the dark stained shutters and doors.

Mr. Alexander requested actual paint chips, to which the applicant provided.

Summary of the Board's Comments

The Chair stated the Board is supportive of the changes to the front entry.

There is some desire to see the doors moved forward.

All members are comfortable with the board and batten and the paint colors.

There is some disagreement on the shutters but the applicant may have enough support for that plan to be accepted.

Public Comment

There were no public comments received.

2. Fairy Garden at 28 N. High Street, 21-100INF, Informal Review

The Chair said this is a request for site modifications for an open space associated with an existing commercial building on a 0.15-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic Core. The site is east of N. High Street, ±175 feet north of the intersection with Bridge Street. Mr. Ridge will be our presenter on the behalf of Ms. Martin.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Ridge presented an aerial view of the overall site, as well as a zoomed-in view of the layout and the existing conditions. The zoomed-in aerial provided context to the focus area of this application - located between the primary structure on 28 N. High Street and bound by the neighboring structure on 24 N. High Street. There was a photograph of the vacant open space that is ±275 square feet in size, surrounded by concrete walls of the buildings on three sides [shown] with a gravel surface. Unlike residential landscaping in the Historic District, commercial landscaping is regulated by the standard landscape Code.

The proposed character [shown] includes: a three-foot tall, wrought-iron fence on either side of a concrete paver path; a wrought-iron tree bench; artificial ivy privacy screens along the concrete walls; and outdoor LED string lights; all with the focus on showcasing fairy houses intermingled with stumps, river rocks, and artificial succulents, etc. The standard Code prohibits artificial plants. Detail of specific materials proposed for the area [shown.]

Staff identified the following questions for discussion amongst the Board:

1. Does the Board support activating open space in Historic Dublin?
2. Is the Board supportive of the proposed landscape modifications?
3. Is the Board supportive of the proposed design details including plant, fence, and accent materials?
4. Are there other considerations by the Board?

Board Questions for Staff

Mr. Cotter asked if this proposed garden area was counted towards the overall covered area calculation for this site.

Mr. Ridge answered not currently but any impervious material added like a concrete walk, would need to be included in the lot coverage limit of 85%. These calculations would be provided with the formal review.

Mr. Alexander asked if staff had a sense that if this garden were added, if it would exceed the 85% lot coverage allowable.

Mr. Ridge answered based on aerial photography alone, at this point, the site could already be over the 85% limit on lot coverage. With a formal application, a Waiver would need to be considered.

Applicant Presentation

Enas Lanham, owner of Dublin Toy Emporium, said a Fairy Garden is something she wanted to do since acquiring the space. She explained the business is on the Fairy Trail and they get a lot of people from all over that will follow the Fairy Trail and thought this would be a nice additional attraction and a way to engage the community. Money is a factor so her choices have been driven to be aesthetically pleasing while fitting within a limited budget. She is a new business (open three years) but would like to create something special for the community. Another concern is that she is not a gardener and keeping the attraction fresh with natural plants could be problematic for her. She is hoping that some of the unique products she considered to provide seating will still be available, if this application is approved.

Board Questions for the Applicant

Mr. Cotter indicated he was trying to picture how this area would be used both during the day and perhaps after dinner on a Friday - if people would go in to the garden to sit and possibly enjoy a beverage.

Ms. Lanham answered she thought they would. In addition, inside the store there is a giant fairy door and little fairy items that the kids pretend play with. She indicated the parents would sit while their children enjoyed the Fairy Garden – seeing this as being interactive. The hope is that people will not be reluctant to enter the garden with a closed gate. Being visible right on High Street does not raise concerns with vandalism.

Ms. Krumb asked if the applicant owns the southern wall.

Ms. Lanham answered she owns all of the space.

Mr. Alexander asked if the applicant considered having a door from her building that would open up directly to this Fairy Garden.

Ms. Lanham answered she is keeping the project minimal at this point. There is a window, however.

Board Discussion

Ms. Cooper asked if murals would be allowed.

Ms. Lanham explained she considered a mural at the conception but found working with an artist was expensive and time consuming.

Ms. Krumb said a mural would be the applicant's best option and encouraged her to contact the Dublin Arts Council, who could put her in touch with artists who might give their time for free or a significantly reduced

rate. There are also wonderful artists in the Dublin schools. Ms. Kramb was not in favor of the artificial privacy screens but would be extremely supportive of a mural.

Ms. Lanham said they spent a lot of time trying to find someone to paint a mural and had also explored enlisting volunteers.

Ms. Cooper recommended exploring the mural option with the Dublin Arts Council. School students and art teachers do shows in conjunction with the Arts Council. A mural would not look odd during winter as opposed to using artificial plants. In addition, 614 Artists that generally work in Columbus were suggested as an option. Given the opportunity to paint a mural that will last years for someone early in their career would be immense and suggested contacting the Columbus School of Art & Design. This vision could also be considered for a class project.

All members thought this was a splendid use for an open space of this type but are not supportive of artificial plants.

Ms. Lanham asked for clarification.

Ms. Kramb said if artificial material was incorporated into displaying fairy houses they could work but large artificial plants would not be supported.

Members were supportive of the gravel, rocks, or mulch integrated into the displays.

Mr. Alexander encouraged the applicant to look at fences that do not have sharp points where possibly someone could get injured. He would also be supportive of a natural landscape, but that was not discussed.

Ms. Cooper understood the applicant's hesitancy toward natural plants and encouraged the applicant to explore gardening opportunities through local gardening groups. They could suggest specific plants that would survive better than others in this area with limited light exposure. Consider other vining/climbing plants appropriate for walls or trellises and perhaps those that may flower in the spring or summer.

Ms. Lanham said she was reluctant to have others care for live plants as they may not be as attentive as she would hope.

Mr. Ridge asked the Board if this concept would move forward in a formal capacity and lot coverage is exceeded, would they be supportive of a Waiver to that requirement.

Ms. Kramb answered she was supportive of this concept for this space; otherwise, it would remain vacant and Ms. Cooper agreed.

Mr. Ridge asked the Board what they thought of the concrete path.

Mr. Alexander and Mr. Cotter both answered they were in favor.

The Chair confirmed the Board would support a Waiver for the addition of an impervious path.

Summary of the Board's Comments

The Chair stated all members are supportive of the concept plan.

All members have concerns about using artificial ivy.

The biggest reservation of the Board is what will be placed on the walls.

NEW CASES

3. Berkshire Hathaway - Sign at 123 S. High Street, 21-090MSP, Master Sign Plan

The Chair said this application is a request for the installation of a multi-tenant ground sign for an existing tenant space on a 0.11-acre site zoned Historic District, Historic South. The site is northwest of the intersection of S. High Street with John Wright Lane. Mr. Hounshell will present this case.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Hounshell presented an aerial view of the fairly narrow site and noted the location where the previous sign post was located for many years, predating the records found for the District. This location is out of the site boundary and in the right-of-way, therefore, the existing location is non-compliant; hence the request for a Master Sign Plan. Existing conditions of the area for the previous sign post were shown with the post removed, approximately 1 foot away from the sidewalk along S. High Street. The right-of-way extends ± 5 feet past the sidewalk. Proposed sign plan [shown] for this Master Sign Plan is for the location only to allow for a deviation from the 8-foot setback requirement. A 3-foot radius of landscaping around the base of the post is proposed to meet regulations. Lighting is currently not provided on the sign plan, but that is the intention of the applicant.

The signs meet all other requirements in the Historic District Code. The white sign post will be placed perpendicular to the street at 6 feet in height from the top of the post to grade, constructed of 4-inch-by-4-inch treated wood with a bevelled top. The larger primary sign and a smaller secondary sign will hang from a white, powder-coated aluminium bracket. Both signs combined meet the 8-square-foot ground sign size requirement. The primary 5.75-square-foot Berkshire Hathaway sign was approved in 2016 for a different location. The new 2.25-square-foot secondary sign for ACS Title Agency will hang below. Both signs are comprised of a 2-inch deep, double-sided high density urethane (HDU) material with dimensional copy and borders finished in gray (Ambler Slate; Benjamin Moore CW685) and white (Capital White; Benjamin Moore CW10). The applicant should revise the secondary sign to provide 0.5-inch relief to the border, logo, and copy per the Zoning Code instead of the proposed 3/8-inch relief.

This application was reviewed against the Master Sign Plan criteria and approval is recommended with four conditions:

- 1) That the applicant revise the sign plan to provide 0.5 inches of relief to the border, logo, and copy of the secondary sign and work with Staff to finalize sign lighting details, subject to Staff approval;
- 2) That the applicant remove the existing sign post and restore the disturbed area, with the installation of the new post sign;
- 3) That the applicant verify that the proposed sign will not be installed within an easement; and
- 4) That the applicant apply for and successfully obtain approval of a Permanent Sign Permit through Building Standards, prior to installation.

Applicant Presentation

Aaron Schlagbaum, Next Day Signs, stated the client is interested in getting this sign as close to the street as possible for the best visibility; this building is set back from the buildings on either side.

Public Comment

No public comment has been received for this application.

Board Discussion

The Chair asked Mr. Schlagbaum if he was in agreement with the conditions as presented to which he answered affirmatively.

Mr. Cotter moved and Ms. Krumb seconded, to approve the Master Sign Plan with the four conditions, as presented.

Vote: Mr. Alexander, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Ms. Krumb, yes; and Mr. Cotter, yes.

[Motion carried 4-0]

OTHER

4. Dublin 2035 Framework

The Chair said this is an overview of the Dublin 2035 Framework visioning process and a facilitated discussion with the Board to provide their transformative ideas for the future of the City of Dublin. Ms. Rauch will be our presenter.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Rauch explained what, why, and how this vision plan project for the City will move forward through the next 15 years. City Council will prioritize how this will be completed, which will translate to Community Plan Updates and all the big policy documents. Dublin 2035 was started prior to February of 2021 when it was officially initiated by City Council. There are three major milestones: 1. Initial generation of 'Big Ideas' at the City Council level. The Council committees engaged the Department Directors through two rounds of discussion in April and May, furthering ideas; 2. Additional Ideas, Research, and Insights is the milestone they are currently operating, incorporating additional stakeholders (residents, business communities, and schools) for expert perspectives along with the Board and Commission Members; and 3. Refinement and Priorities derived from all this public engagement to refine the initial 'Big Ideas' based on key findings. A preliminary list was created for Council's review to determine which initiatives should move forward [shown.] Ultimately, the goals will be adopted and implemented through Council's direction starting in 2022.

City Council identified 10 Guiding Principles and the action associated with each [shown.] They divided the 'Big Ideas' into four themes: Quality of Life; Infrastructure; Land Use; and Economics. A significant number of topics were interrelated, providing opportunities for overlap, ultimately coming together as one group of 'Big Ideas'. These were listed in the Potential, Elevated Big Ideas Matrix [shown], and organized under the four themes. No ideas from the initial list have been discounted but have been preliminarily identified as primary or secondary ideas. Additional ideas from the community and committee will be added to this list throughout the process.

In June 2021, Council engaged an expert, Futurist – Nik Badminton, for a work session and a robust discussion. Public Engagement, which is active now (July and August 2021) in staffed and unstaffed locations (plazas, farmer's market, etc.) gather input or answer questions through the engagement of the public and stakeholders; a 2035 Questionnaire, web presence and social media push; postcards to all residents; the Dublin business community and Township; Dublin City Schools; and the Boards and Commission. There have been over 500 responses in just a couple of weeks. The Board Members were asked if they have had time to consider transformative big ideas of their own with no concern for cost or how the ideas could become a reality. No idea is too big or too small to share and encouraged the Board to include inspirational pictures to help tell their idea for how they envision the Dublin Community in the future.

Ms. Krumb was first to share an idea. Provide internet access at a discounted rate as an advantage to our students and communities in need.

Mr. Alexander appreciated when Emerald Parkway was finished; it created a link all the way across much of the community, which has been successful in tying very different parts of the community together. Nothing has really been done with Dublin Road, which is a major arterial street. He suggested creating additional transportation networks or enhancing the ones we have so they appear and function as a civic connector for the City. Adding a low median creates a visual connection between both sides of a street which should have sidewalks on both sides, creating a social space. The south end of Dublin Road has no sidewalks for people to walk their dogs. The Scioto River can be used as a landscape feature to connect the different communities. The physical fabric could be better connected through our community.

Ms. Cooper said she really liked Mr. Alexander's great idea. If roads cannot connect to the Scioto River, perhaps bike trails could. She said there is a lack of public transportation available, whether it is getting around within the City or getting from Dublin to downtown Columbus. There could be a small transport system like using a couple of trolley cars or double-decker buses that could loop around through the Historic District and Bridge Park area. People want to get around but is problematic during a very harsh winter, which would impact parking in a public garage to transverse over from west to east, for example. If a loop started in the library area, continued down South High Street, around back towards the end of the Historic District at the old fire station, across the bridge, looping around the Bridge Park area, and back across the bridge, it would be really cool. The loop might facilitate interaction between the two sides of the Scioto River during inclement weather or evening times when it is dark at 5 pm; this would allow the public to continue to patronize these businesses.

Ms. Cooper said the elderly and those on fixed incomes, living on pensions, are generally priced out of the market for places to live in Dublin. People are staying in their houses longer because going to any new place would cost so much more, even if downsizing. Developers state they are going to provide affordable housing but the development costs significantly more in the end. The cost of land is high. Offices could be converted to more affordable housing units, especially post-Covid as less office space is desired. This would allow residents to be close enough to participate in a community without having to drive a great distance.

Ms. Cooper was supportive of any and all green energy efforts that could be implemented. Dublin is not currently being impacted by severe climate change and extremes but we do not need to contribute, either. Continue to look for ways to implement green energy and reduce carbon emissions.

Ms. Cooper indicated for older residents to find out what services are available is not always apparent. For those that are more senior in years and less savvy to the technology, where this information is available? There needs to be some way to communicate with them so they can find these services that are available in our community such as health services, transportation services, and essential activities for those groups. People that are isolated in their home should not have the only option to go directly to the nursing home as they age. There should be some kind of happy medium options in there for people who are getting older. The effort made with postcards and notices mailed out to people for their input on this project for a city of 35,000 people, produced only 500 responses, which is not a very high percentage.

Ms. Kramb added she runs the East Dublin Civic Association and they have a lot of older people involved. The number one complaint she gets from people of all ages is "I don't know who to call or contact" and "I cannot find the information on the website". They want a person they can talk directly to and do not want to enter personal information into blank fields to a generic email address on the internet. We would benefit greatly if there was a phone number people could call and talk to a live person that could answer their questions. Those could be "my trash didn't get picked up", "I want to file a permit but need help" or "I'm having an issue with my neighbor not mowing their grass". They are instructed to use the GoDublin App or find it on their smart phone but they cannot find it on the app and may not have a smart phone. They are exasperated and ask "Can you just give me a phone number". A Hotline would be a huge benefit to a large section of our residents. Our city's website is not user-friendly.

Ms. Cooper added there is also a diverse cultural community here where there could be a lack of understanding about what they are trying to accomplish or what they need to do.

Mr. Cotter said as the country is thinking about zero carbon emissions, Dublin should find a way to reach that goal. Students could be connected from Coffman, Scioto, and Jerome High Schools because before and after school, if they are not riding large school buses, each of them are driving somewhere. Another example is the people in the Bridge Street District that need to go out to the campus on Frantz Road. If we think about reaching zero emissions by a certain date, we might be able to achieve that goal rather than thinking "we know some day we will have zero emissions." Dublin should consider future industries

for a diverse workforce, allowing them to stay right here versus living in Dublin but driving to Honda or working in Marysville. He asked if it should be technology or the next generation to draw people in. If Dublin is a place that thinks about carbon neutrality, we will need to draw in people that will work on that.

Mr. Cotter stated Dublin has zoning issues. Homes are \$400,000 and up because the developers want to make money. We should consider higher density options. Bridge Street has higher density but the units are on the higher end. It would not be easy to live in Dublin, if you were a fireman, for example. Historically, we want developments to have green space, be beautiful, and have certain things but that all can really drive an increase in cost. There seems to be a mismatch of wanting a diverse workforce but not offering diverse living options to accommodate those individuals. We need dense housing so people who are 25 years old have somewhere to live as they are starting out. He agreed, research is needed with this 2035 Framework. Look at zoning to accomplish the ability to offer housing for the youngest, oldest, and diverse workforce. Bridge Park might have been initially developed with that thought process in mind.

Ms. Cooper added residents 75 years old should have affordable options to continue to live in Dublin.

Ms. Cooper asked staff what it means to be a 'Blue Zone City'.

Ms. Rauch answered there are some cities, internationally, that are considered a Blue Zone. They have achieved certain factors such as the longest living people, or the healthiest residents - mentally, physically, and spiritually - to name a few. The way the community is structured attains all the factors. She asked the Board to consider how Dublin could incorporate those factors into the 'Big Ideas'.

Ms. Kramb said she has heard all these ideas for ±10 years. It could have been during the time they were revising the Community Plan. They gathered community input and half of the ideas mentioned tonight had been mentioned then. Move forward by acting instead of conversing to see ideas being implemented. All these years it has been said "Dublin needs an intercity connector." People that worked at Metro Place need restaurants for lunch options. The biggest complaint she hears from kids that want to work in Dublin is they cannot walk to lunch like they can in downtown Columbus.

Mr. Cotter said considering the ±39 items on this list can be overwhelming. If there is too much, it is hard to comprehend; focus brings closure. If the next step is refining the list that would be beneficial. If there is a top ten, those have a better chance of getting accomplished. These same ideas should not be revisited again in ±10 years as not having met the goals.

Ms. Cooper asked about items that may be cost prohibitive for a suburban area but people want to live in our suburban area. Residents of Dublin value their cars and want to drive places. They would rather park in front of Kroger than schlepping groceries on a bus. In Chicago for example, people walk everywhere because they do not want to give up their parking spot close to where they reside or work.

Ms. Cooper said there are opportunities for a Super Greenway, in Dublin, Ohio and Bridge Park is an excellent example. The Dublin Bridge has put Dublin on the map. It is even being used for marketing purposes for the City of Columbus. "Come to Columbus and see the cool footbridge." The bridge can be found in backgrounds and in shots promoting tourism or Columbus in general and as a backdrop for the news outlets. The bridge exceeded expectations from its conception but was an outlier at the time it was proposed. If all the areas are accessible and have not created more parking problems, growth will continue.

In the end, Ms. Rauch stated she was very pleased with the feedback and wonderful ideas she received tonight. She agreed with Ms. Kramb when she had said to stop talking and start doing. City Council wants to see this happen. Paring the list down to a manageable number can be challenging. Ideas can be continually shared and she will get them relayed.

Public Comment

No public comment has been received for this application.

COMMUNICATIONS

The Chair stated Ms. Holt will be presenting an update on discussions from last month on unauthorized demolitions and construction impacts on residential neighborhoods.

Ms. Holt stated that there were three critical items discussed.

Fines and Violations

A couple of unfortunate demolitions that happened recently and the discussion of the Minor Misdemeanor penalty was of no consequence to anyone who demolished valuable structures. Staff has been working with the Law Office considering a modification to Codes. The Minor Misdemeanor is under consideration to be removed from our lexicon of tools, considering a higher class of misdemeanor. Either second or fourth degree that would raise the potential fines to \$250 or \$750 per day, and could be limited to a ten-day window. We will keep you updated on that approach.

Construction Impacts

Staff met with the Police Department, Engineering, and Building Standard Services to address the problems of parking in private areas, storage of materials, and blocking roads during construction in the Historic District. Currently, Police enforce a 20-foot minimum for road access but they cannot enforce private trespassing issues but will assist in resolution. Residents can post "No Trespassing" signs on their properties. Building Standard Services requires staging areas and traffic plans for larger projects. Building Standard Services will provide additional solutions such as emphasizing concerns from the Board to Inspectors to carry to the field, direct them to ensure all materials/vehicles are within property lines, and when necessary, require construction fencing to protect adjacent property from materials and vehicles.

Historic Structure Information

The Board expressed concerns about owners of historic properties/structures not having the information needed for ownership for those special conditions. Staff is currently working with the Community and Public Information Department to create two new flyers to disseminate information. One to be included in the City's Welcome Packet for new residents, as a supplemental insert for the Historic Dublin boundaries and Appendix G properties. The other for separate use as an annual mailer to remind owners of responsibilities, staff resources, and on-line information in a friendly, helpful approach and thank residents for their stewardship.

A pending new project is to capture and log photographs of all outbuildings in Historic Dublin or Appendix G properties through Code Enforcement, after an informational notice/flyer has been mailed.

The goal of both projects is to demonstrate additional City interest and ways for owners of historic properties to meet some staff to help with maintenance ideas and resources for compliance and to prevent future demolitions. The Board will be updated on the progress of this on-going endeavor.

Mr. Alexander inquired about the fine mechanism.

Ms. Holt explained the owner would be fined each day, up to ten days, as suggested by the Law Office. It's similar for not maintaining the upkeep of property: like overgrown green space/lawn until the issue was taken care of. The City cannot replace a lost structure, hence working proactively instead.

Ms. Krumb stated many businesses on High Street have absentee owners and suggested sending the information to both the owner (in Florida for example) and the tenants.

The Chair requested any further communications.

Ms. Holt announced Chase Ridge's promotion to a Planner II. She introduced two new Planning Assistants in attendance – Madison Richard and Madeline Capka. There is a third Planning Assistant that could not attend this evening and her name is Nicole Hall.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

Chair, Architectural Review Board

Administrative Assistant II, Recorder