

**CITY OF DUNEDIN
 ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
 TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 2020 5:30 PM.
 PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT CONFERENCE ROOM
 1415 PINEHURST RD, DUNEDIN FL 34698**

Members Present-	Members Absent-	City of Dunedin-	Guests Present-
Timothy Knowles		Frances Leong Sharp (Staff Liaison)	Doug Hutchens, Deputy City Manager
Andrew Pavalis			
Laura Duplain			
Katie Ducharme			
Duane Wright			
Roger Leibin (Alternate)			

I. **Call to Order-** Meeting was called to order by Tim Knowles at 5:31pm.

II. **Administrative**

- **Review and approval of Architectural Review Committee draft summary minutes for January 14, 2020.**

Motion made by Duane Wright, seconded by Laura Duplain to approve the draft summary minutes for the January 14, 2020 meeting. Motion passed 5-0.

III. **New Business**

- **Updated City Hall Renderings- Doug Hutchens**

Project Overview

Doug Hutchens, Deputy City Manager, provided an overview of the City Hall project and briefed the Committee in regards to where in the process the project is at. Since the Committee's preliminary review of the seven concept designs of City Hall on October 1, 2019, staff presented the concept designs and recommendations provided by the advisory committees, including the Architectural Review Committee, to the City Commission for further feedback and consensus on November 4, 2019. As a result, the City Commission narrowed down the design options to 2, 3 and 7 and directed staff to work with the consultant to provide massing diagrams for those options to further deliberate on the final concept design option.

The final three design options showing the mass and scale in relation to its surrounding area were presented to the Committee to provide initial feedback and recommendation to which design option is best suited for the site. There are changes made to the main design of each concept from the last set of drawings provided. For example, the Canopy design removed the tower and the Rotunda design provided a more subtle look of the rotunda.

Preliminary floor plans of each design were also presented to the Committee to give a better idea of the programming and circulation of the layout. The ground level view perspective drawings were not included within this presentation due to time constraints and the images will be produced in the near future.

Canopy:



Rotunda:



Wave:



Doug informed the Committee that these drawings will be presented to the City Commission on February 6th for feedback. There will be a two week period for the City Commission to deliberate on the design options with their constituents for vote at the next City Commission meeting. He is seeking recommendation from the Committee based on the recent drawing of the three design options.

Doug also informed the Committee that discussion regarding parking for the City Hall will take place at a City Commission work session in March to determine whether a structure parking or surface parking will be the best fit

with the New City Hall project. The drawings presented to the Committee are contingent upon the parking discussion and is currently represented as a structured parking for massing purposes. For clarification, Doug mentioned that the opportunities to provide solar shade structures for surface parking is a possibility, but will depend on the budget of the project and the placement of the required landscaping for the site. Additionally, the different zoning designation of the two parcels may affect the setbacks for any structures placed on site which will also be considered in the design process.

Comments-

The Committee recommended for the purposes of orienting the viewer of the perspectives in presentation to label the street names or key landmarks within the images for clarification. The Committee stressed that the ground level perspective drawings are very important to be included as part of the presentation to show the human scale in relation to the design of the project. The Committee also recommended that the consultant should show the previous drawings of the three options chosen to show the changes done to the most recent drawings.

The Committee commented that the Rotunda design does not look like the rotunda. The Committee explained that the initial thought of the Rotunda design is to clearly identify the function of the building by indicating the round-shaped chamber to signify the City Commission chamber apart from the administrative function of the City.

The Committee provided a suggestion to make the rooftop area above the City Commission chamber as a functional outdoor space for people to gather.

The Committee appreciates that the Rotunda design entrance to the building feels more like a plaza than the other two design layout, where there is not a big waterfall of steps leading up to the entrance of the building. This can also be achieved in the other two design options.

The Committee commented that the Wave design entryway looks more like an entrance as compared to the other two designs. The Committee suggested that some of the stairs leading up to the entrance could be cut back to provide more green space in front of City Hall.

The Committee also commented that the consultant's evaluation of each design concept is subjective. There is not a clear indication or explanation to what defines "good" or "excellent".

The Committee came to a consensus that the Wave design is what they choose to recommend to the City Commission on the basis of the unique, eclectic look as compared to the other two designs. The other two designs do not appear to be as iconic as the Wave design since they can easily be done

in other cities. The Rotunda design lost its character by reducing the look of an actual rotunda from its initial design which could have brought prominence to where the chamber is located by visually looking at the building externally. The price differences between the three design options are negligible since there is about a one percent change among the designs. The Committee recognized that the concept designs will be developed further during the actual design phase of the project and changes will happen as a result of it.

A motion was made by Katie Ducharme and seconded by Andrew Pavalis to recommend the wave concept to the City Commission for the preferred design of the New City Hall. The motion was approved 5-0.

IV. Old Business

- **Architectural Guidelines- Conditional Exception Language (update)**
Staff presented the draft language of the conditional exception language for the Land Development Code to the Committee at the last meeting. Staff presented the recent draft of the proposed amendment based on the feedback provided from the last meeting and asked the Committee to provide any additional comments or changes to the proposed amendment by February 14th via email.
- **Discussion of the Architectural Guideline for Commercial Uses- Design Exercise (follow up)**
As previously discussed, the Committee conducted an exercise which each member took an inventory of the existing structures in each of the visioning corridors/areas and provided an analysis of what prominent architecture styles are present in these areas. As a result, the Committee found that there were no specific dominant styles of architecture that can be identified in these areas and that the City as a whole has an eclectic mixture of styles that cannot be replicated by strict style guidelines. For the next steps, the Committee decided to provide examples of what features that they will like to see and what they do not want to see as part of the development of the commercial guideline for further discussion in the next meeting.

V. Open Discussion, Input

- **Open Discussion**
Historic Preservation Workshop
Tim and Duane shared with the Committee that they attended the Historic Preservation Training workshop on January 29th. Both shared that the training provided some guidelines in how to evaluate historic structures and process the local designation. Both anticipated that the Committee may be asked to provide assistance in evaluating the structures as part of the local historic preservation program.
- **Next meeting- March 3, 2020**

VI. **Adjourn Meeting** – Meeting was adjourned at 6:58pm.

DRAFT