



MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, July 23, 2025

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Cotter, Chair, called the July 23, 2025 Architectural Review Board (ARB) meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. in Council Chamber, 5555 Perimeter Drive. He welcomed everyone and stated that the livestream video of the meeting can also be accessed at the City's website. Public comments on the cases are welcome from both in-person meeting attendees and those viewing at the City's website. He reviewed the meeting procedures for meeting attendees.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. Cotter led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Board members present: Sean Cotter, Martha Cooper, Hilary Damaser, Lisa Patt-McDaniel, Mark Stechschulte

Staff members present: Sarah Holt, Rati Singh, Taylor Mullinax, Donavan Trimble, Mara Hunter

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Cotter moved, Ms. Patt-McDaniel seconded acceptance of the documents into the record and approval of the June 25, 2025 ARB meeting minutes.

Vote: Ms. Patt-McDaniel, yes; Ms. Damaser, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Dr. Stechschulte, yes.

[Motion carried 5-0]

Mr. Cotter stated that the Architectural Review Board (ARB) is responsible for review of construction, modifications or alterations to any site in the Review District or area subject to ARB under the provision of Zoning Code Section 153.170. The Board has the decision-making responsibility on these cases. The Chair swore in staff and applicants who planned to address the Board on any of the cases on the agenda.

AMEND AGENDA ORDER

Mr. Cotter stated that staff has indicated the applicant for Case #25-059MPR is not in attendance yet and has requested her item be heard later in the evening.

Mr. Cotter moved, Ms. Patt-McDaniel seconded to change the agenda order to hear Case #25-059MPR regarding Boho 72, 55 S. High Street, last.

Vote: Dr. Stechschulte, yes; Ms. Damaser, yes; Ms. Patt-McDaniel, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes.

[Motion carried 5-0]

CASE REVIEWS

Case #25-062MPR – 109 S. High Street, Minor Project Review

Request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review for a roof material change on a Landmark Building. The .23-acre site is zoned Historic District South and is located at 109 S High Street.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Trimble stated that this site is located within the Historical South Zoning District. The proposed roofing material change applies to both the primary structure and the accessory structure on the property. The Black Horse Tavern was constructed in 1842. [Historical images of the site were displayed.] Early photos show a standing seam metal roof. A later image dated 1879 shows the tavern with a cedar shake shingle roof. A later image dated 1982 depicts the building once again with a standing seam metal roof. The current roof has uneven framing. Because of this, standing seam is not advisable as standing seam requires a level and uniform surface to install properly and maintain the intended appearance. While cedar shake shingles have historically been used on these structures and are more forgiving of the uneven surface, the proposed asphalt shingles offer a balanced solution compatible with the existing uneven roof structure, maintaining the historical aesthetic and visual character of the existing cedar shake shingles. The color was chosen to more closely reflect the original dark hue of the cedar shake shingles before they were weathered and bleached. All applicable criteria have been met and staff recommends approval with no conditions.

Applicant Presentation

Richard S. Gerber, 109 S. High Street, Dublin, stated that he is in attendance to answer any questions.

Board Questions

Dr. Stechschulte asked for more information about cedar shingles now. Mr. Gerber stated the shake shingles on the roof are very thin and are not weathering well. Many are lost with each wind event. Ms. Holt added that cedar shake shingles are no longer old growth wood with close grain as they were when historically installed. They are now made of faster-growing, more porous wood that is not durable.

Public Comments

There were no public comments on the case.

Ms. Damaser moved, Ms. Cooper seconded approval of the Minor Project Review.

Vote: Ms. Damaser, yes; Dr. Stechschulte, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Ms. Patt-McDaniel, yes; Mr. Cotter, yes.

[Motion Carried 5-0]

Case #25-072MPR – 48-52 S. High Street, Minor Project Review
Request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review for door modifications to a Landmark Building. The 0.25-acre site is zoned HD-HS, Historic South District.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Singh stated that this request is for door replacements for the entire façade. The 0.25-acre site is zoned Historic District South and is located southwest of the intersection of Spring Hill Lane and South High Street. In the most recent case history, the Board approved the façade improvements for 48 South High Street earlier this year to allow access from High Street with the addition of awnings on the door and window. The property consists of two adjacent parcels which are located at 48 and 52 South High Street. The structures were added to the National Register of Historic Places in 1979. Over time there have been several alterations to these buildings. With the most recent proposal, the Board approved removal of two bay windows and allowed the addition of a door and storefront window. The applicant is now requesting to replace the three doors to ensure they match and enhance the visual appeal of the building. The doors (style and material) would match what the Board recently approved. The door is a Pinnacle Clad Windsor Aluminum clad wood front door. The door color and trim is black with a neutral trim. All applicable review criteria have been met or are not applicable and staff recommends approval with no conditions.

Applicant Presentation

John Leff, 48-52 South High Street, Dublin, stated that he is one of the owners of the building. They bought the building in 2014 with the intention to restore it to its original form. They had a tenant that was not interested and now they are switching tenants. The existing doors do not fit right. They realized that once the doors on 48 S. High Street were changed, it will make the others stand out. They want to improve the whole front and make this building look more appropriate to the character of Historic Dublin. He recognized Ms. Singh and staff for their guidance and help with this project.

Board Questions

Mr. Cotter thanked applicant for his efforts to maintain the district.

Public Comments

There were no public comments on the case.

Ms. Cooper moved, Ms. Patt-McDaniel seconded approval of the Minor Project Review.

Vote: Mr. Cotter, yes; Ms. Damaser, yes; Dr. Stechschulte, yes; Ms. Patt-McDaniel, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes.

[Motion Carried 5-0]

Case #25-059MPR - Boho 72 Awnings, Minor Project Review
Request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review to allow awnings over the tenant storefronts. The 0.25-acre site is zoned Historic South District and is located at 55 S. High Street.

Ms. Cooper stated that she believes the following case should be tabled prior to any presentation as the applicant is not in attendance.

Ms. Cooper moved to postpone Case #25-059MPR to the August 27, 2025 meeting. Ms. Damaser seconded the motion.

Ms. Patt-McDaniel stated that she thinks the Board should hear staff's presentation tonight.

Vote: Mr. Cotter, no; Ms. Patt-McDaniel, no; Ms. Cooper, yes; Dr. Stechschulte, yes; Ms. Damaser, no.

[Motion failed 2-3]

Mr. Cotter recused himself and left the room.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Mullinax stated that the 0.258-acre site is located southwest of the intersection of South High Street and Spring Hill Lane and is zoned Historic District, Historic South. It contains a two-story, multi-tenant background commercial building built in 1979. The building is a background resource and does not add to the historic associations, architectural qualities, or archeological value of the area. Since this building is adjacent to landmark buildings, its design elements should be stylistically compatible with them per the Guidelines. Relevant case history includes a recent administrative approval for a black and white wall sign for the tenant. Additionally, ARB approved the building to be painted "China Doll" with a brown trim in 2017. The proposal includes adding two awnings, one above each storefront to improve visibility. Each will be 12 feet wide, sloped and open underneath, which meets Code requirements. The awnings will have seven feet of clearance above the sidewalk, which does not meet the eight-foot Code requirement. A waiver is required for the reduced clearance and staff supports this due to the building's low soffit height, which prevents compliance without compromising the scale or functionality of the awning and the building's appearance. Awnings must complement the building and be placed consistently, either within window frames or above openings. The Guidelines recommend one awning per window or door rather than a single full-width awning across the façade. Staff finds that the proposed design is appropriate. Each storefront has a single awning that fits the building's modern windows. Awnings will be supported by an aluminum frame and are a matte classic cream and charcoal black pinstripe Sunbrella fabric. The material and durability requirements are met. However, the color and pinstripe pattern deviate from the Guidelines which advise against any ornate patterns and recommend awning colors that complement the building. This is a unique multi-tenant building in the District. Staff and the Board must consider the appropriateness and visual impacts that striped awnings, if used by other tenants, could have on this building. Currently, no other landmark buildings in the District feature striped awnings, which are not appropriate given the simple vernacular style of buildings in the District. The striped awnings would set a precedent for the rest of the building and the combination of the stripe pattern at both storefronts against the building's horizontal and diagonal details, as well as the paint colors, is too busy on this building. Staff recommends solid black awnings to better address the intent of the Guidelines and to align with the recently approved black and white wall sign. All waiver criteria are met, met with the condition or not applicable, and all Minor Project Review (MPR) criteria are met with waiver and condition, or not applicable. Staff recommends approval of the awning clearance waiver and the MPR with condition that the color and pattern of the proposed awnings be revised to a solid black.

Ms. Cooper asked what the consideration was when staff recommended solid black. Ms. Mullinax stated that solid color awnings are used in the surrounding area on landmark buildings. How the awnings look on this building is also considered as it relates to the recently approved wall sign. More importantly, if another tenant were to come forward for awnings as well, the precedent that this sets would have to be considered. Ms. Cooper asked if any other colors were considered. Ms. Mullinax stated they discussed earthtone colors and black.

Ms. Damaser sought confirmation that Code allows two colors. Ms. Mullinax answered that it does. Ms. Damaser asked if staff considered a two-color pattern that they consider to be less ornate. Ms. Mullinax stated that they did not; awnings in the surrounding area are solid colors. Ms. Damaser asked if staff believed the colors of the awnings as proposed complemented the building. Ms. Mullinax stated that the façade of the building is very warm. It is staff's opinion that charcoal and white is not the best option. The roof color is a darker charcoal gray.

Applicant Presentation

Ms. Mollwitz was sworn in.

Jamie Mollwitz, Boho 72, 55 South High Street, apologized for her tardiness due to a family emergency trip overseas. This project has been in process for a year. The black awnings do nothing for the building. Across the street, those black awnings have visual impact on the white house. The goal is to bring interest and character to Historic Dublin. The new build at 34 and 38 North High Street has bronze awnings. No one else has metal awnings. The architecture of her building is not the same as any other buildings in the area, and hers is the only commercial building there. She chose this fabric because the charcoal matches the roof color, and the cream complements the warm tones already on the building. This fabric is historically accurate for a Tudor-style building when there is not a lot of heavy detail. She has spoken with the owner of Missing Jimmy's next door, and he has no interest in awnings. She has only four more years on her lease. She was previously located downtown next to Oscar's for 13 years. We need to keep small businesses in Historic Dublin. She struggles with visibility due to parked vehicles. The awning will provide visibility and elevate the building with a freshness.

Board Questions

Ms. Patt-McDaniel asked where the new sign will be located. Ms. Mollwitz stated that it will be placed between the windows on the first floor as indicated in packet materials. Ms. Patt-McDaniel stated that the striped awning reflects the sign.

Ms. Cooper asked if other colors or patterns were considered. Ms. Mollwitz stated that she would consider other colors if they would show up against the building. She would prefer a color that would add visual interest and not the neutral color palette as suggested by staff. She felt that the charcoal and cream stripe was the most neutral option that still provides interest. The Guidelines say no more than two colors. She does not see this as ornate but very classic and historical. Ms. Cooper asked if the applicant agrees that the awnings as proposed are not in line with Tudor style. Ms. Mollwitz disagreed. She found examples from different design groups that stated stripes or bold colors are appropriate with Tudor style when the trim is not ornate. Capital Awning suggested the stripe.

Board Discussion

Ms. Cooper stated that in the Historic District there are black, green, blue and clay-colored awnings. La Chatelaine has a muted red awning with a white border at the bottom. To her, those seem appropriate, which is why she asked if other colors had been considered. She noted it is difficult to see the front of the building at 55 S. High Street. She appreciates the lack of visibility from the street. She also appreciates the concerns of staff regarding vertical stripes being counter to the Tudor design and the fact that other tenants may want stripes. She agrees that black gets lost on the building.

Ms. Damaser stated that black blends in too much and any single earth tone would have the same problem. She stated that she does not think stripes are outlandish. The rendering by staff of all windows with striped awnings was a bit much but weighing the concerns, that is not so bad. This site is in a different wing, if the Board wanted to make that distinction in the future.

Ms. Patt-McDaniel stated that if that building were to be renovated, her guess is the top would change, and the bottom would stay the same because of the stone. She stated that she sympathizes with the desire for the awnings and thinks it looks fine. Black awnings would not help. The Board is here to make sure the District maintains its character but there is room in the Guidelines for discretion, including allowing two colors. She might think differently of a thin stripe pattern but she thinks the awnings as presented would be appropriate. Ms. Mollwitz noted that there is no other Tudor building in that vicinity.

Dr. Stechschulte stated that he disagrees. The applicant stated that nothing can be seen below the second level. His concern is that striped awnings are distinctly different from any other building in the Historic District. J Liu has stiped awnings but they are very subtle and off to the side of the building. Striped awnings are significantly different from the landmark buildings around this building. He does not think this will become a landmark building because Tudor is not typical to the history of Dublin. There are some nice other awnings in District. He thinks other options could be pursued. They are being asked to decide between striped or black awnings. His concern is about making an exception. The striped awnings are so distinctly different from what the landmark buildings have that they distract from the Historic District. He is inclined to vote for the waiver and the black rather than striped awnings.

Ms. Damaser asked for specific language from the Guidelines regarding awnings. Ms. Patt-McDaniel stated the Guidelines suggest a maximum of two colors and the pattern cannot be ornate or complex, which she believes the awnings in question are neither. Ms. Damaser stated that she believes this design is not ornate or complex. Ms. Mullinax added that Code does not speak to the color or pattern of awnings, that guidance comes from the Guidelines.

Ms. Patt-McDaniel stated that this is not a landmark building and will never be a landmark building. One of the principles of a historic district is that each building is in its own time and she would not want to treat a non-landmark building as if it were.

Ms. Damaser asked if staff had done research about awnings on Tudor buildings. Ms. Mullinax stated that staff found from the American Planning Association some background on the history, colors, and patterns of awnings. It does not specifically mention the Tudor architectural style, but

it does stated that striped awnings were a commonality for historic buildings in the 19th and early 20th centuries.

Dr. Stechschulte summarized his point by stating that he feels the applicant would be getting an exception to install unconventional awnings on a site that would not gain any visibility. He is also concerned about precedent. He does not think awnings will have a significant impact on business as much as he would like for that to happen.

Ms. Cooper stated that she is not in favor of the striped pattern. She is also not comfortable restricting the awning color to just black because she does not think black will stand out. Another solid or different two-color design may accomplish the goal of staying within the spirit of the District and bringing attention to the business. It is not her purview to suggest the color.

Ms. Mollwitz stated that a neutral would disappear like black.

Ms. Holt suggested the condition of approval be modified to allow staff to work with the applicant to select a single color.

Ms. Patt-McDaniel stated that just because she would vote for striped awnings in this instance does not mean she would vote for it on other buildings.

Dr. Stechschulte stated that he is not opposed to two colors, he is opposed to the vertical stripe in black and white as shown.

Ms. Patt-McDaniel moved, Ms. Cooper seconded approval of a waiver to Section 153.174(F)(1) Canopies and Awnings to allow the installation with a 7-foot clearance where 8 feet is required.

Vote: Ms. Patt-McDaniel, yes; Ms. Damaser, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Dr. Stechschulte, yes.
[Motion carried 4-0]

In response to a question about the timeline, Ms. Mullinax stated that the MPR is a six-week process. Ms. Patt-McDaniel asked why this project has been in discussion for much longer than that. Ms. Mollwitz stated that she contacted the awning contractor in July 2024. Ms. Holt stated this application came before staff about 6 weeks ago. In this case, since we are not starting from scratch, no matter what happens, she would not see this taking the full six weeks if postponed.

Ms. Mollwitz requested the application be postponed to work with staff.

Public Comments

There were no public comments.

Ms. Cooper moved to table Case#25-059MPR for staff and the applicant to review color combinations. Ms. Patt-McDaniel seconded the motion.

Ms. Patt-McDaniel suggested an amendment to the motion to postpone the Minor Project Review to the August 27, 2025 ARB meeting for further discussion.

Ms. Damaser asked if that was a friendly amendment. Ms. Cooper and Ms. Patt-McDaniel both accepted the amendment as friendly.

Amended Motion: to postpone Case#25-059MPR to August 27, 2025 to allow for further discussion between staff and the applicant.

Vote: Ms. Cooper, yes; Ms. Damaser, yes; Dr. Stechschulte, yes; Ms. Patt-McDaniel, yes.
[Motion carried 4-0]

Mr. Cotter returned to the dais.

COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Holt shared the following:

- There has been a distinct uptick in the number of administrative approvals. That was anticipated with the Code updates done in 2024. Staff is excited to offer a larger number of administrative approvals in the District. General feedback so far has been positive.
- Newton Domini created a hand drawn map in the 1950s of downtown Dublin based on his memories growing up here. He was a very well-known Dublin historian. The City, in partnership with Historic Dublin, will be working to save this paper map into an electronic resource.
- The Historic and Cultural Assessment (HCA) did not cover outbuildings or historic objects, so staff has contracted with Karen Bokor, Design Consultant to research these and create separate HCA pages for them. Ms. Bokor is also helping to review additional Appendix G properties.
- In September, there is a joint meeting with City Council where they are very interested in hearing from the boards and Commission about strengths and struggles.
- Mr. Cotter will not be in attendance on August 27 or September 2, 2025.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:57 p.m.



Chair, Architectural Review Board

Deputy Clerk of Council