



# BOARD DISCUSSION

## Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, August 25, 2021 | 6:30 pm

The Architectural Review Board took the following action at this meeting:

### 5. Historic Paint Colors 20-130ADM

### Administrative Request

Proposal: Informal review for a proposal to establish pre-approved paint colors for the Architectural Review District and outlying historic properties listed on Appendix G.

Request: Informal review with non-binding feedback under the provisions of the Historic District Zoning Code and the *Historic Design Guidelines*.

Applicant: Dana L. McDaniel, City Manager, City of Dublin

Planning Contact: Nichole M. Martin, AICP, Senior Planner

Contact Information: 614.410.4635, nmartin@dublin.oh.us

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/20-130

**RESULT:** The Board reviewed and provided informal feedback on a proposal to establish pre-approved paint colors for the Architectural Review District and outlying historic properties on Appendix G. Board members were supportive of the idea of a pre-approved list of paint colors. Members expressed that they were generally supportive of the proposed organization of the paint color document. Board members stated that they are not concerned with neutral colors such as tans, creams, white or off-white colors, and suggested that further refinement of bold, non-neutral colors would be appropriate.

### MEMBERS PRESENT:

Gary Alexander	Yes
Amy Kramb	Yes
Sean Cotter	Absent
Martha Cooper	Yes

### STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:  
  
 Nichole M. Martin, AICP, Senior Planner



Architectural Review Board  
Meeting Minutes of August 25, 2021  
Page 13 of 16

Mr. Alexander asked if the City has documentation on the significant number of stone walls, (some may not be original). That distinction should be included.

### **Public Comment**

~~Tom Holton, 5957 Roundstone Place, Dublin, OH, stated he did not know how to apply a date of installation for the stone walls.~~

~~There was a site on Riverside Drive, where the log cabin was discovered and taken apart by the City. The house was later demolished. There was a smoke house, intact and in very good condition (unsure of date) on the same property. According to the property owner, during the excavation for the new build, a contractor backed into the smoke house and destroyed it. Under these rules, the property owner would have been responsible, even though they did not do the damage, themselves. That is a real case he wanted to point out.~~

~~Ms. Kramb moved, Ms. Cooper seconded, to recommend approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the Administrative Request for an Amendment to the Penalty Code.~~

~~Vote: Ms. Cooper, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; and Mr. Alexander, yes.~~

~~[Motion carried 3-0]~~

## **5. Historic Paint Colors, 20-130ADM, Administrative Request**

The Chair said this informal review application is a proposal to establish pre-approved paint colors for the Architectural Review District and outlying historic properties listed on Appendix G.

### **Staff Presentation**

Ms. Martin stated this was a re-introduction of this particular Administrative Request; it was brought before the ARB, August 2020. At the time, Staff and the Board discussed paint colors, the Historic District Code Amendments, and the *Historic Design Guidelines*.

The ARB decided it was best to prioritize the Code Amendments and the *Historic Design Guidelines* as an immediate need. After the adoption of those two documents in Feb 2021, the ARB had another opportunity to look at the Historic District paint color document. There are now new members on the Board, and all have had time to reflect. The Historic District Code provides an opportunity for the ARB to establish a set of approved paint colors. The intent is to create clarity, streamline the process, and make it user-friendly for both residential and commercial property owners, provided they are able to select a paint color that is on the list and architecturally appropriate for their structure. This evening, Staff is requesting the Board's affirmation on how this document should be reorganized, specifically, in regard to time period versus organizing the list by architectural style, which was the way it was presented at the August 2020 meeting. The way the document was structured [shown] was reviewed. The document was intended to be a companion document to the Historic District Code and the *Historic Design Guidelines*. That intent would continue to remain the same. The architectural design section of the *Historic Design Guidelines* that were ultimately adopted, de-emphasized architectural styles while acknowledging them, as well as acknowledging all building types. The paint color document was predicated on the original structure of the guidelines that prioritized architectural styles to provide a road map. That document no longer emphasizes architectural styles and the companion to the paint colors document, no longer exists. The paint colors document includes architectural styles through a period of time, and also includes history about what would be traditional to an architectural style or indicative of that period of time, due to technology and trends. Body, trim, door, shutter and outbuilding color recommendations are listed for a particular style period of time. The document specifies paint colors from historic paint palettes obtained from three different manufacturers. A property owner would not be required to purchase paint from one of these manufacturers but would be required to use the color code, in order to purchase an alternate brand. Staff has considered what some of these opportunities may be to reassess the structure of this document and organize it by

Architectural Review Board  
Meeting Minutes of August 25, 2021  
Page 14 of 16

time-period. Acknowledging certain architectural styles that are prevalent at certain times, makes sense. Staff worked with their historic preservation consultant to establish this timeline. Staff is requesting feedback from the Board as to how this document could be a backbone by which to potentially structure recommendations. The primary recommendation could be based on a year or decades but within that recommendation acknowledging that within a 40-year span, these three architectural styles occurred and these were some of the trends associated with those architectural styles, prevalent at the time and these are paint color palettes that a property owner could refer to.

Ms. Martin presented the following Discussion Questions:

1. Does the Board affirm the direction to restructure the proposed Historic District Paint Colors document by time period?
2. What is the appropriate amount of context or additional detail that should be included in this document for each era (i.e. text regarding popular trends of the time)?

The existing document contains a fair amount of background information that potentially, for someone who is less well-versed in historic preservation, may find useful in considering which paint colors would be appropriate. The added information could also be perceived as overwhelming or not helpful to the task at hand.

3. How would the Board like to review specific colors from these palettes to determine acceptability in Historic Dublin?

There are a number of colors identified. Some of which the Board may or may not be comfortable with. Some of the 20<sup>th</sup>, mid-century styles used a more vibrant and eclectic color palette. We have acknowledged over time, that one of the greatest assets of Historic Dublin is how eclectic the community is. How should the City account for that variability in these paint colors?

4. How would the Board like to continue to advance this project? Should a working group, similar to the collaboration on the *Historic Design Guidelines*, be established by the Board to review any changes prior to a subsequent review?

The working group could include Ms. Martin and two Board Members to discuss how to shepherd the project forward and bring it to the Board in a manner that would be approvable. Is that something the Board would be interested in or is the preference for Staff to propose changes the Board would reassess?

5. Are there other considerations or alternatives identified by the Board?

### **Board Discussion**

Ms. Krumb stated she was a big advocate to go to time periods, (back in the summer of 2020) because there are so few high-style examples of architecture in Dublin. Most is of a vernacular/eclectic mix; no clear academic style. To ask someone to pigeon hole their house to a certain architectural style is nearly impossible. Whereas, it is very easy to find out what paint colors existed during certain decades. That is a very easy way determine the correct colors. It is rather easy to determine the age of a building, within a decade that translates to the correct paint colors used at that time. Making this process as simple as possible, is necessary. A little background was provided to Ms. Cooper, who is new to this project. In that first document, there was a lot of language pertaining to why a certain color probably would have been used. Too much time was spent on that part of the process; everything got put on pause.

Ms. Cooper said the approach that Ms. Krumb advocated for, about identifying colors that were representative or popular or attributed to that time period, however you want to describe it, seems fine. There are always exceptions. If this document is just for an applicant to come in and say they want to

Architectural Review Board  
Meeting Minutes of August 25, 2021  
Page 15 of 16

repaint their house; they no longer want Sage Green they want Colonial Cream, or whatever, and do not want to come to the ARB to say that is what they intend, because the colors are on an approved list. She understood and believes that is an appropriate goal. It is still appropriate for property owners to propose different colors and not be bound by something because it exists. The concern is that people will still have the opportunity to come in.

Ms. Kramb said any property can come before the ARB and request a color.

Mr. Alexander said Staff takes care of it, but if the homeowner essentially appeals, the Board would review. The system should simplify what the ARB is doing, once everything is established.

Ms. Cooper said there are no color swatches from 1810 and whatever is available is probably faded.

Mr. Alexander said the pre-approved list from before is enormous.

Mr. Cotter's input was relayed that there should be flexibility in the process.

Ms. Cooper said these numbers and swatches change all the time by the companies. The names get more and more creative.

Ms. Kramb stated the same numbers are not reused but new colors are created. Most of these colors on a list may not exist anymore by the same name or were discontinued.

The Chair stated there needs to be some closure to this process.

Ms. Cooper asked if there have been a lot of issues with this in the past - people trying to understand why they cannot paint their house a particular color and have to go before the ARB.

Ms. Martin – yes, from time to time. The process is more daunting than the question. By in large, residents are cognizant that they live in the Historic District and are aware of the process.

Ms. Kramb stated the biggest complaint heard from residents is they have to come up with drawings of their house noting where color A is going to be, etc., which is time-consuming. They probably have to hire someone to do it; spending \$1,000 to show the ARB they are putting paint of a certain color on the north façade, for example. The process needs to be easier for residents.

The Chair stated the Board is comfortable with the structure Staff proposed.

Ms. Kramb liked the timeframe that showed the styles and the types this group discussed while revising the *Historic District Guidelines*. The styles do not have to be duplicated, by providing a description; the Guidelines provide that information. Less is better on the history of the paint. There are a significant number of generalities that are common. This guide should be as broad as possible and note that the City wants contrast between the trim color and the main color.

Ms. Kramb stated "trim was darker" is a broad enough statement. Terms such as "lighter", "darker", "complimentary", "not identical", or "typically the trim is not the same color as the wall" could be used.

Ms. Cooper agreed.

The Chair summarized the Board seeks a limited amount of text. Mr. Cotter's comment was relayed "less text is better".

Ms. Kramb restated she loved the bar timeline that showed styles and types. Text could be provided such as "yellow pigment was not available during this era"; do not select a yellow tone. In another era, "red pigment was not available". That is enough detail needed for color selection.

Mr. Alexander proposed a sub-committee could work with staff and make a recommendation. It would be challenging for the five Board Members to put paint colors together. He suggested Ms. Kramb should be on that committee; she is a historian.

Ms. Kramb suggested Staff work with the Ohio History Connection's Building Doctor Program. Tutorials can be provided on painting old houses and recommend colors specific to Ohio.

The Chair stated Staff is requesting direct input from the Board with this process as soon as possible. If there is not going to be a sub-committee, then Board Members could meet at the office.

Ms. Kramb agreed that could be an easier solution as long as every member is not expected to meet with Staff and not during an ARB meeting. There are not color swatches for each and every color but possibly color swatches for color tone for comparison.

Ms. Martin stated the proposal was to present a wide variety of color. All the ones submitted in August 2020 or ones Staff was recommending for approval, although Staff was seeking specific direction on whether or not the Board was comfortable with all of those colors.

Architectural Review Board  
Meeting Minutes of August 25, 2021  
Page 16 of 16

Ms. Kramb indicated the only colors Staff should be concerned with are the funky, end of the spectrum colors (pinks, purples, pastels). White and cream do not need review for approval.

Ms. Martin is agreeing with Ms. Kramb's analysis. Staff and the Board can look at specific colors, such as the Frank Lloyd Wright PPG rich colors of the Heritage Palette.

Ms. Kramb said her house is painted in a Frank Lloyd Wright, Cherokee Red, which might not be acceptable in the Historic District.

Ms. Martin said that is very important because Frank Lloyd Wright, Cherokee Red is one of those identified on page 11 of the draft. Some of the colors can be removed from the list altogether because if you really want to use Cherokee Red or use Safe Harbor (bright teal) maybe that does warrant a case by case review. A sub-list of any colors could be provided, only to be used for a front door, for example. Painting all the trim on a house could not be painted bright teal. Staff seeks a sense from the Board, what kind of guardrails are desired and the number of options to offer. Staff wants to have enough flexibility to make this an asset for the people that reside in Historic Dublin as well as the Board, given the increase in volume of applications. Staff is not comfortable making a recommendation on behalf of the Board.

Ms. Kramb asked if the Board would be agreeable with the extreme colors that are acceptable in that genre of colors.

Ms. Martin suggested that maybe Cherokee Red would look good on an accessory building.

Ms. Kramb thought there should be a limit. The Board does not need to review colors in the tan, white, and cream categories.

Ms. Martin stated the colors in the packet are the first cut but are not currently listed clearly by date; this list requires revision.

Ms. Kramb suggested a working session outside of this setting, where the members determine the limits on the extremes. For example, Harvest Gold that was used in mid-century housing - would the Board be comfortable with a resident painting their whole house that color or not. Or can it be permitted on just the trim. Staff could identify those and provide to the members.

Ms. Cooper stated Staff is still seeking pre-approved colors so a resident does not come before the Board. Ms. Kramb was concerned that if the Board limits the list by only the tan and white spectrum for the people that want to avoid coming to the Board, every house would be those colors and the result would be bland and boring. There should be a little bit of flexibility.

The Chair stated everyone is stating similar ideas and relayed Mr. Cotter had said he was willing to help with the color choices and supports where Staff is going with this project.

### Summary of the Board's Comments

The Chair stated Staff already has some colors selected and the Board will allow Staff to organize the list in a way they have established; they are on the right track. When Staff is ready for the Board Members' assistance, they will help, in an environment outside of the ARB meetings.

### Public Comment

There were no public comments received.

### COMMUNICATIONS

[Hearing none] the meeting was adjourned at 9:07 p.m.

DocuSigned by:

*Gary Alexander*

8949DEE6D4F0435...

Chair, Architectural Review Board

DocuSigned by:

*Laurie Wright*

8949DEE6D4F0435...

Administrative Assistant II, Recorder



# BOARD DISCUSSION

## Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, August 12, 2020 | 6:30 pm

The Architectural Review Board took the following action at this meeting:

### 2. **Historic District Paint Colors and Alternative Materials 20-130ADM** **Administrative Request – Code**

Proposal: Establish a palette of pre-approved, historically appropriate paint colors and options for a list of recommended alternative material guidelines for the Architectural Review District and outlying historic properties.

Request: Discussion of this introduction (no vote) of the Administrative Request for proposed amendments to the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* and the Zoning Code under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.174.

Applicant: Dana L. McDaniel, City Manager, City of Dublin

Planning Contact: Nichole M. Martin, AICP, Planner II

Contact Information: 614.410.4635, nmartin@dublin.oh.us

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/arb/20-130

**RESULT:** The Board reviewed and provided feedback on updates to the proposed approved Paint Colors and Alternative Materials Document for historic properties. The Board provided direction that alternative materials should be defined in the Code and not be included in a separate document. The Board provided direction to proceed with the approved Paint Colors and Alternative Materials Document. The Board suggested the architectural styles defined in the proposed Paint Colors and Alternative Materials Document more closely align with the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*.

#### MEMBERS PRESENT:

Gary Alexander	Yes
Kathleen Bryan	Yes
Amy Kramb	Yes
Sean Cotter	Yes
Frank Kownacki	Yes

#### STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:  
  
 294AB0C6363F490...  
 Nichole M. Martin, AICP, Planner II



- ~~Sandwich Board Signs (J). This Sign Type was added, per the direction given at the previous review that this sign type should be permitted in all commercial districts. This section will match the update being made to the Historic District Code.~~

~~The Board requested that the size and height restrictions be clarified to indicate per side of a sign.~~

~~Ms. Kramb inquired how or where penalties for violations of this Code are handled.~~

~~Ms. Rauch responded that it is handled by Code Enforcement. She would clarify if it should be referenced in that section of the Code, as well.~~

### **Public Comment**

~~There were no public comments.~~

~~Ms. Kramb moved, Mr. Kownacki seconded to recommend to the Planning and Zoning Commission that it recommend approval of the Temporary Sign Code amendment to City Council.~~

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

## **2. Historic District Paint Colors and Alternative Materials, 20-130ADM, Administrative Request**

Ms. Bryan stated that this application is a request to establish pre-approved paint colors and recommended alternative material guidelines for the Architectural Review District and outlying historic properties. No vote will be taken on these items tonight.

### **Case Presentation**

Ms. Martin stated that over the last few years, the ARB has been engaged in reviewing proposed amendments to the Historic District Code and Historic District Design Guidelines. As part of that process, the goal was established to add clarity, create predictability and streamline the process. As part of that, the Board requested to establish a palette of pre-approved paint colors for residential and commercial property owners to select from, eliminating the need for ARB approval. Staff has prepared and requests the Board's feedback on a proposed list of pre-approved paint colors and also consideration of options to proceed with a recommended materials list. Staff has worked with the Historic Preservation consultant on preparation of this document.

The color palette provided for the Board's consideration includes historically appropriate colors, organized by architectural style or building type. If approved by the Board, staff will be able to approve administratively requests to change a paint color selected from the pre-approved palette. This will remove the need for the color request to be heard by the ARB. As proposed, the applicant would identify their building type or style from the list included in Chapter 2 of the Historic Dublin Design Guidelines. Once the type/style is determined, they would use the corresponding palette to select their preferred color for the body, trim, doors or outbuildings.

Additionally, the Board discussed establishing a pre-approved list of recommended alternative materials. However, in developing that list, some materials were identified that could be eligible for regulation. Staff requests further direction on the preparation of that list and requests that the Board consider the following options on how to move forward:

- 1) Should the list of materials and their application be included as a reference in an appendix to the Guidelines as supporting information?
- 2) Should the list of materials and their application be incorporated as clarifying language into the Code and Guidelines?
- 3) Should the ARB continue to review all exterior material changes?

- 4) Should the pre-approved list allow for staff approval capabilities if the application of the materials meets the recommendations?
- 5) Other considerations or alternatives?

### **Board Discussion**

- Color Palette

Ms. Bryan inquired if the palette is limited to the use of Sherwin Williams as the vendor (as reflected in the example), or could the applicant use another vendor.

Ms. Martin responded that the resident could take the color sample to another vendor and identify the equivalent color from that vendor. If they wanted to request a different color, however, they would need to submit an application for consideration by the ARB.

Mr. Alexander stated that under the Introduction, at the end of paragraph three is the statement, "Rather, paint colors were selected to complement these materials, such as dark trim colors to complement brick or creams or off-whites to highlight stone colors." That is not consistent with Federal buildings. For example, in New Albany, no dark trim colors are used on their brick structures. They are attempting to have period buildings, and the use of light trim with brick is for a reason. Also, in Section 2.1 is the requirement that the trim should be white or off white. Some believe that dark trim on stone buildings pulls out the contrasting colors in the stone. On another note, the stylistic classification of many structures is somewhat tenuous. In a number of cases, that has been based on one detail. How will staff provide guidance in terms of use to a homeowner? Will they be referred to the Historic Building Inventory as a standard for making such judgments or assessments?

Ms. Martin responded that in the Historic Dublin Design Guidelines, Chapter 2, under each Architectural Style/Building Type, staff has pre-listed the addresses under the recommended Building Type. If the homeowner disagrees with the type, staff would re-visit the designation.

Mr. Alexander inquired the reason that under Modern Style, white is listed as a popular color for the body, yet it is not listed as a body color option in the palette for that type.

Ms. Martin responded that it would be added to the palette as an optional body color.

Mr. Kownacki inquired if a limit is imposed as to the number of colors that can be used on a house; if not, should there be a limit?

Ms. Martin responded that it has not been limited in the Code, nor in the Guidelines. A limit could be included in the Code.

Ms. Kramb stated that she does not believe designating the Color Palettes by Architectural Style is the best approach. It would be easier to designate and administer by age of construction of the home and what paint was available during that era. While there are one or two examples of each of these styles in the District, over half of the buildings do not fit with any of the styles. Because those buildings are a vernacular style, will they need to bring their color choices before ARB for approval? Building Types are listed in Chapter 2, and most buildings are a certain Building Type, but those are not given paint colors in this document; only Architectural Styles. She believes that there will be a problem designating colors by Architectural Style, as it will not include half of the District. She would recommend designing Color Palettes by genre or era, then the homeowner would not have to determine the style of their home, only when it was built. It would simplify the document.

Ms. Martin responded that is how the Guidelines currently read, but they are less comprehensive. Architectural Styles are categorized in the Guidelines, but they could be clarified or expanded in the document. She would recommend continuing the alignment that is already included in the Guidelines.

Mr. Kownacki inquired if the buildings are currently listed in the inventory by age or by style. Many of the homes have had later additions, which could have changed the style of the structure.



Ms. Martin responded that buildings are categorized by the predominant Architectural Style of the original historic structure. It is not identified by the addition, unless it changed the appearance of the architectural style from the street front. Information regarding when the homes in the District were built is available in the Historic and Cultural Assessment.

Ms. Bryan stated that every building is listed by address.

Ms. Kramb stated that the Building Type is given per address, but not the Architectural Style.

Ms. Martin noted that all the building types are included under a style.

Ms. Rauch responded that an attempt has been to align the two. In the past, the Building Type and Style have been difficult to identify. Many of the buildings are vernacular.

Ms. Martin stated that the homeowner would not be expected to identify that on their own. Staff would provide assistance.

Mr. Cotter stated that the goal is to have predictability and clarification, and this document does that. However, it is also desirable that staff not likely be challenged over the style that has been designated.

Ms. Rauch responded that if staff sees that applications are submitted for Board review because the applicant does not agree with the palette recommendations, the document could be revised/updated accordingly.

Ms. Kramb stated that the attempt has been made to align this with the Historic Design Guidelines. In Section 2.9, seven primary categories of Architectural Styles are listed, each with sub categories. However, those seven categories do not match what has been provided in this draft. The proposed draft provides some sub categories, but not all. If a homeowner had a gabled front-wing house, which is a type and not a style, there is no corresponding description in the document provided. The homeowner would be unable to determine the appropriate Color Palette for their home. Therefore, it would be necessary to list all the sub categories. It also is important to use the same terms to avoid confusion. If paint colors are to be determined according to both Style and Type, the header should reflect that. In her opinion, that using that method is too cumbersome. It would be simpler to designate the color palette by years, as every Building Type coincides with years.

Ms. Rauch stated that staff would look further at the two options and will bring back the best approach determined.

Ms. Martin requested that the Board look over the recommended colors in the categories. If there are colors the Board would not want to see in Historic Dublin, those should be pointed out in the next review.

Ms. Kramb requested that subjectivity be removed from the document to the extent possible, and references to website sources not be cited. It would be preferable to cite highly regarded publications, rather than websites.

Mr. Alexander stated that it is difficult to judge paint colors until a section of the building has been painted onsite and viewed in that setting with the existing conditions. Is it possible to make the approval subject to review of a sample painted on the property?

Ms. Martin responded that applicants do frequently provide a sample of the paint on the specific material. Other Board members opined that requiring that the proposed color be reviewed on site would make the process onerous.

- Exterior Material Recommendations

The Board had no issue with staff approval of "like for like" material replacements, which are typically maintenance items. However, new materials become available frequently, and those should be considered

by ARB. The Board requested that staff conduct benchmarking and provide a recommended list of prohibited materials for consideration.

Ms. Martin responded that a list of prohibited materials would be compiled for the Board's consideration.

### **Public Comments**

There were no public comments.

Consensus of the Board was that staff approval of exterior materials would be limited to "like for like." Any deviation from like for like exterior materials should be reviewed by the Board.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

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

*Kathleen Bryan*  
Chair, Architectural Review Board

*Judith K. Beal*  
Deputy Clerk of Council