

**CITY OF DUNEDIN  
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES  
TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 1, 2020 5:30 PM.  
ZOOM VIRTUAL MEETING**

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

I. **Call to Order-** Meeting was called to order by Tim Knowles at 5:30pm.

II. **Administrative**

- **Review and approval of Architectural Review Committee draft summary minutes for August 4, 2020.**

Motion made by Duane Wright, seconded by Andrew Pavalis to approve the draft summary minutes for the August 4, 2020 meeting. Motion passed 4-0 (Katie was absent at the time of the vote).

III. **New Business**

No Design Review Scheduled

IV. **Old Business**

- **Land Development Code Amendment:**
  - Conditional Exception Language and Submittal Requirements  
Staff informed the Committee the status of the proposed changes to the Code regarding the conditional exception and submittal requirements. The draft is ready for the City Attorney's review and pending dates for ordinance readings to the City Commission.
- **Discussion of the Architectural Guideline for Commercial Uses- Design Exercise (follow up)**
  - Consultant Assistance  
Prior to discussing the Committee's exercise, staff informed the Committee that in efforts to help keep the process moving forward with this project, staff have engaged with a couple of consultants for quotes

to help the Committee in the development and production of the architectural guideline for commercial uses. Staff explained to the Committee that the general thought in obtaining the consultant is to help bringing the information that is gathered from this Committee to them to provide a concise document. Staff also indicated that the Committee will have opportunities to work with the consultant as they develop the document as well as reviewing the final product.

- Corner Lot Provision

As part of the discussion in regards to staff obtaining a consultant to assist the Committee with the architectural guideline for commercial uses, staff also informed the Committee that one of the items that staff would like for the consultant to work with the Committee is the corner lot provision of the code and design guideline. Staff explained to the Committee that the consultant may have some examples from other cities that could be considered for Dunedin's code.

The Committee liked the idea of having a consultant to assist in the effort of developing the design guideline. The Committee liked the idea of having a point person to help organize and consolidate the information provided by the Committee to develop the guideline as well as lending their expertise in the process in developing the document. Staff assured that the City does have funds to obtain the consultant for the requested service. Staff anticipates that a consultant will be chosen and be on board to work with the Committee in the coming weeks. The Committee made a unanimous vote (5-0) to support staff's recommendation obtaining the consultant to help coordinate and assist in developing the commercial guideline with Duane Wright creating the motion and Andrew Pavalis second the motion.

- SR 580

Since the previous meeting, Laura Duplain provided her findings for the SR 580 corridor and placed the documents in the Dropbox folder for the Committee to view for this evening's discussion and exercise. The document that Laura provided was a map of the areas where she identified areas where potential redevelopment could take place along the corridor. The map clouded large parcels where redevelopment could take place. Additionally, the Committee members shared initial comments to the exercise which are provided in the paragraphs below.

Some of the observations that the Committee have for the corridor were of the following:

- Whether building frontage should be taken into consideration in relation to surface parking and setbacks;
- Should the corridor focus on the form instead of function or vice

- versa;
- Some of the parcels in certain places along the corridor are shallow in depth;
  - There is not a dominant architectural style that prevails in this corridor- not quite sure if restricting the style will help provide the quality look of the corridor;
  - There are considerations to looking into how landscaping can provide character along the corridor;
  - There is a building frontage progression- traveling from east to west where the building placement gets closer to the right-of-way heading toward Downtown (progress over time);
  - There is an evidence of evolution from a more urban (Downtown) form to suburban (Belcher Rd) - More consideration should be taken in terms of style for parcels that are in close proximity to Downtown; and
  - Maintaining the same look from Downtown throughout the corridor may not be an appropriate approach.

The Committee sees that the guideline should take into account that there is a progression of style that reflects the time the structures were built throughout the corridor (area before Pinehurst Rd). The Committee suggests that certain architectural style elements should be considered in the development of the guideline as the corridor becomes more suburban in look eastward from Downtown. The Committee also recognizes that the existing architectural guideline does include some nonresidential elements that could be incorporated into this new design guideline for commercial uses.

The Committee asked staff if there is a reason to why there is an extension of the 580 corridor that went up to San Christopher Drive on Pinehurst Rd. Staff explained to the Committee that this particular section of Pinehurst Rd consist mainly nonresidential uses and that it lends itself to a neighborhood center which ultimately acts as an extension from the SR 580 corridor.

The Committee also observed that certain design guideline intervention may not necessarily translate as well from one corridor/area to another corridor. The Committee questions whether the design guideline should be developed by corridor-specific approach. The Committee mentions the staff that this concern may need to be brought to the consultant's attention as the guideline gets developed.

The Committee also asked Staff if there were any studies done to the visioning corridor/areas. Staff responded that there were studies done to each of these corridors/areas, but the studies do not provide specific guidance to the ideal style or look of structures that the City would like

to see in the future; instead the documents are focused on the public realm. Staff indicated that the studies can be shared to the Committee for reference which is located on the City's website. The commercial guideline would be the starting point to help guide development in the expectation that the City would like to see in those key areas. Staff also noted that the guideline is intended to focus on the look of the building rather than the placement and massing of the building which is mainly regulated by Land Development Code. The regulation of the Code could also be modified should the recommendation of the Committee see to be appropriate as well.

The Committee concluded that the discussion is a good starting point for the development of the design guideline. The Committee commented that with the help of a consultant to pull all the Committee's findings and ideas from each corridor/areas will provide better guidance to the development and approach (style, proximity/radius, do's/don'ts, etc.) of the document.

For the next meeting, the Committee decided to evaluate the Patricia Avenue corridor. Staff will upload any documents on the Dropbox that pertain to the corridor for the Committee's review and feedback.

## **V. Open Discussion, Input**

- **Other Discussion**

- November Meeting

The Committee have brought to the Staff's attention that the scheduled meeting in November is Election Day. The Committee asked if that meeting date can be rescheduled to a later date. Staff asked if the following Tuesday (November 10th) would work for everyone. The Committee made a consensus that November 10<sup>th</sup> would work. Staff informed the Committee that the proposed rescheduled date will be confirmed at the next meeting.

- **Next meeting- October 6, 2020**

- Pending Applications for Design Review- None to date

## **VI. Adjourn Meeting – Meeting was adjourned at 7:01pm.**