



## MEETING MINUTES

# Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, August 12, 2020

### CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Bryan, Chair, called the August 12, 2020 Special 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, Mr. Cotter, Ms. Bryan, Mr. Kownacki and Ms. Kramb  
Staff present: Ms. Rauch, Ms. Martin

### ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS

Mr. Cotter moved, Ms. Kramb seconded to accept the documents into the record.

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

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 responsibility to review and make recommendations on the following two Administrative Requests.

### CASES:

#### 1. Temporary Signs, 20-098ADMC, Administrative Request – Code

Ms. Bryan stated that this application is a request for an update to the City of Dublin Sign Code to comply with all requirements of the U.S. and Ohio constitutional, statutory, and case law decisions requiring that sign regulations remain content neutral.

## Case Presentation

Ms. Rauch stated that this is an administrative case regarding a proposed amendment to the Temporary Sign provisions of the City's Zoning Code. ARB and PZC reviewed the City's existing Code at a joint meeting on June 4, 2020, provided feedback, and proposed modifications, which staff has incorporated into a draft amendment for the Board's consideration. One of the sections provided to the Board was the Definitions portion of the Zoning Code. Significant changes were not made to this section, only the clarifications requested. General changes were made in the Regulations as requested, in regard to colors and duration timeframes for sign types, if missing.

Under Temporary Signs, Section 153.159, the following changes were made:

- Banners – Language added under (A)(1) to permit use of Banners during the time between permanent sign permit approval and the installation, and under (4) Size, Height. Such signs shall be limited to 30 square feet in area. If located on the building, it cannot be located higher than 15 feet to the top of the banner.

Mr. Cotter stated that at the previous discussion, the large temporary banner on the AC Marriott was mentioned. Was it determined that it was necessary to handle that as a Special Request, not within this category?

Ms. Rauch responded that is correct. It is considered as a special request considered directly by City Council. It is not possible to incorporate it in the general Banners category.

Other changes made include:

- Construction Trailer Signs (C). Language from Definitions section also included here that "Decorative inserts or wraps on construction or site fencing are not considered a sign."
- Development Period Sign (D). General clarifications added regarding illumination, number, size and duration.
- Garage or Yard Sale Period Signs (E). Clarifications made; Duration added: Erected within 24 hours before a garage or yard sale and removed not later than two hours after the sale has ended.
- Model Home Period Sign (G). Requirement added that the Location is limited to the lot or parcel where homes are being constructed; Height is limited to 8 square feet in area and 6 feet in height; Duration during any period when an approved residential development is under construction, until the development is complete or the model home is discontinued.
- Non-residential Sale or Leasing Period Signs (H). Changes made:
  - Number - only one sign permitted per parcel, either ground, wall or window.
  - Size – Ground signs are limited to 32 square feet in area and 8 feet in height; wall signs shall be limited to 16 square feet in area with a maximum height of 15 feet to the top of the sign. Window signs shall not exceed 10% of the total window area of the establishment or 6 square feet, whichever is less.
  - Duration – These signs are permitted for 14 number of days consecutively and no more than 90 days in a calendar year.
  - Materials/Design – must incorporate high quality design and materials.

Per discussion, the Board requested that the number of days under Duration be changed from 14 days to 30 days. Under Materials/Design, delete "high quality design and materials," as the duration of these signs is short term. Appropriate materials could be determined by staff.

- Residential Sale or Leasing Period Sign (I). Duration added that signs are permitted during any period when any premise or part thereof is actively offered for sale or lease, and removed no later than 14 days after the premises or part thereof is occupied by a new owner or tenant.

The Board requested that 14 days be changed to 30 days for consistency with the previous section.

- 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