



MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, August 27, 2025

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Damaser, Vice Chair, called the Architectural Review Board (ARB) meeting to order at 6:34 p.m. in Council Chamber, 5555 Perimeter Drive. She welcomed public participation 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. She explained the meeting procedures, noting that each case would begin with a staff presentation followed by the applicant's presentation, board questions, public comments, and then board deliberation. She requested that public comments be limited to three minutes or less.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Ms. Damaser asked Ms. Patt-McDaniel to lead the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

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

Board members absent: Sean Cotter

Staff members present: Sarah Holt, Joe Batchelor, Bassem Bitar, Tammy Noble

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Cooper moved, Ms. Patt-McDaniel seconded acceptance of the documents into the record and approval of the July 23, 2025 ARB meeting minutes.

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

Ms. Cooper moved, Ms. Patt-McDaniel seconded approval of the July 22, 2025 joint training meeting minutes.

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

Ms. Damaser 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. She administered the oath to all those intending to address the Board on the evening's cases.

CASE REVIEWS

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.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Noble presented this case for awnings over tenant storefronts at 55 South High Street, a 0.5-acre site zoned historic South District. She explained this case had been originally heard in July for two requests: one for a waiver for the height of the awnings which was approved, and the second for a minor review for the color of the awnings which was tabled for further work with staff.

Ms. Noble reported they had reached consensus with the applicant and were prepared to present an alternative. The site is located on the east side of Mill Lane, south of Spring Hill, in a multi-story building containing multiple retail and commercial tenants. The building was built in 1979, is designated as a background building, and is primarily a monotone-colored stucco building surrounded by landmark buildings.

The current proposal amends the original to allow awnings in Sunbrella Aquamarine, a light teal color. Ms. Noble explained this provides accent to the building, accentuates the earth tones, and collaborates with the existing approved sign. She noted the color would be consistent among other storefronts if approved. Staff recommended approval of the Minor Project Review.

Applicant Presentation

Bob Adamack, Representative for the applicant, Dublin, addressed the board. He explained that while the applicant was reluctantly willing to go with the color of the aquamarine, her preference remained the original charcoal and cream striped pattern. He presented results from a social media poll where the applicant had asked her customers which awning colors seemed most suited for Historic Dublin. Of 309 votes received within two days, 233 (75%) chose the striped cream and charcoal, 38 (12%) chose olive green, and only 20 votes (6.5%) selected the proposed aquamarine color.

Board Questions/Discussion

Members expressed varying opinions. Ms. Patt-McDaniel sought confirmation that the original stripe was the applicant's first choice. She noted that the Board does not make decisions based on polls. She stated that she thinks that this color does not look nice on the building and is not appropriate for the building. She would agree with the applicant that the stripes are still the better choice.

Dr. Stechschulte maintained his position from the previous meeting, expressing concern about setting precedent. He stated that he would love to give vote for the stripes but they are not historically consistent with the rest of the District. If stripes are approved, then any other business around there could install striped awnings as well.

Ms. Damaser asked if there are other awnings of this color in the area. Ms. Noble stated that there are no striped awnings in the District. The aquamarine is a compromise. Ms. Damaser asked if

aquamarine was in a palette. Ms. Noble stated that they took deviations of blues and greens and an orange. They all collectively agreed on this color. Ms. Damaser asked of other patterns we considered. Ms. Noble stated that as a single tenant a pattern might not be terribly complex but a whole building of that pattern might get busy so they decided on a solid color.

Ms. Cooper asked if a color block design similar to that at La Chatelaine was considered. Ms. Noble stated that they were trying to focus on a solid color.

Ms. Patt-McDaniel stated the two colors are allowed under the Code and the two colors previously proposed were cream and charcoal. Ms. Damaser stated that the Guidelines stated that awnings cannot be an ostentatious pattern.

Ms. Damaser acknowledged both perspectives, stating that she likes the stripes on the one place but is more concerned if it spreads. She also likes the aquamarine and thinks it quite fits the area, and it stands out. The black does not.

Ms. Cooper agreed she was not opposed to the aquamarine and thought the solid black would be lost on the building due to the elevated parking lot and cars typically blocking the view.

Ms. Patt-McDaniel stated that this decision is on this site, and a decision would be different for others. Mr. Adameck asked if it could be written so that the awnings would come down when the applicant's lease is up. Ms. Holt stated that would be difficult to administer. She noted that as soon as a tenant gets any type of awning, what the entire building would look like with the awning on all must be considered. Ms. Patt-McDaniel stated that she thinks the stripes would look fine on the whole building.

Ms. Noble added that staff is working with the applicant on a tenant panel, which they feel will be successful in gaining visibility.

Public Comments

There were no public comments on the case.

Dr. Stechschulte moved, Ms. Cooper seconded approval of the Minor Project Review as presented with Sunbrella Aquamarine.

Vote: Ms. Damaser, yes; Dr. Stechschulte, yes; Ms. Cooper, yes; Ms. Patt-McDaniel, no.
[Motion Carried 3-1]

**Case #25-074MPR - 56 Franklin Street Solar Panel, Minor Project Review
Request for review and approval of Minor Project Review to allow the installation of roof-mounted solar panels on a single-family structure. The .36-acre site is zoned Historic Residential District.**

Staff Presentation

Ms. Noble presented the first solar panel application for the Historic District, calling it a milestone staff was thrilled to present. The proposal involved installing 40 solar panels on a single-family residential structure at 56 Franklin Street, with panels located only on the side and rear of the property to protect viewsheds from Franklin Street.

Ms. Noble provided extensive background on Dublin's solar regulations, which took two years to develop through collaboration with installers, lobbyists, and the public. She explained that after initial adoption in June 2023, the City modified requirements in December based on approval rates, which improved from 35% to 95%. She commended the applicant for meeting color and configuration requirements even though they weren't required to do so for non-front-facing installations.

The proposed panels featured low-light performance, a 25-year warranty, 30-year performance rating, solid black anti-reflective surface, and would be mounted with a matching black rail system. Ms. Noble emphasized that all components would match the existing dark charcoal shingle roof.

Applicant Presentation

Andrew Christensen, 56 Franklin Street, Dublin, expressed enthusiasm for the project, noting they had worked closely with staff to ensure panels would be as concealed as possible. He explained that they have an alley in the back, Mill Lane, and the vegetation is quite mature, so much so that it will be hard to see that the panels are there.

Board Questions/Discussion

Ms. Patt-McDaniel asked if there is an agreement to sell excess electricity. Mr. Christensen confirmed that AEP requires panel installations not exceed usage demands. Their system will cover approximately 90% of their electricity needs.

Dr. Stechschulte asked if the applicant has had experience with solar panels. Mr. Christensen stated that he owns a roofing company with extensive solar installation experience.

Board members expressed unanimous excitement about the application. Dr. Stechschulte commented that this being the first application for solar, he believes it would be a good example for future applicants. He likes the way the panels are so unobtrusive.

Ms. Damaser added that she is very excited about the application and expressed appreciation for staff and the applicant working together to come up with this solution. It is very well done and should be a prime example for future applications.

Public Comments

There were no public comments on the case.

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

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

Case #25-071MPR - 85 Franklin Street, Minor Project Review

Request for review and approval of construction of a new front porch addition and separate rear shed structure for a residence on a .38-acre site in the Historic District. The site is zoned HD-Historic Residential.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Holt presented a request for a new front porch addition and separate rear shed structure at 85 Franklin Street. She emphasized the necessity of understanding the recent Guideline updates adopted by City Council in 2023-2024. These updates prioritized the maintenance of a consistent

building distance from the road for properties classified as 'background' along Franklin Street. Ms. Holt stated that in this specific location, meaning Franklin Street, the primary goal was to maintain the consistent building distance from the road, which she illustrated with an orange line map showing the intended uniform setback.

Ms. Holt elaborated that the porch as proposed would extend beyond this established building line, thereby contravening the Guidelines designed to preserve neighborhood character. To address this, staff suggested a smaller, inset portico design. She explained that staff does appreciate the desire to have a front porch and the Code encourages this in the historic residential district. However, the significant projection of the proposed porch beyond the existing line posed a challenge to maintaining the historical integrity of the area. Staff had worked with the applicants to present a more conservative portico design option they felt would offer a viable compromise. This alternative emphasized minimized visual impact with a flat or almost flat roof, simplified design, and architectural cohesion with the rest of Franklin Street's historical structures. The porch materials include Glen Gery thin brick in Aberdeen, a ATAS standing seam metal roof in Dove Gray, and Hardie trim, smoot in Cobblestone with 5-inch gutters. The majority of criterion for the porch are not yet met but could be met with design modifications.

Regarding the shed, staff expressed no concerns as it met the district guidelines. The proposed shed would replace an existing non-compliant structure in the backyard, bringing the site into conformity with current codes. Materials include Hardie lap siding, smooth and FAD Timberline asphalt shingle in Weathered Wood. For the shed request, all criteria are met or are not applicable. Ultimately, the issue with the porch was rooted in the need to balance modern residential needs while respecting longstanding community aesthetics and maintaining the character-defining elements outlined in the new Guidelines.

Staff recommended disapproval of the porch request with the findings in the report and approval of the shed with no conditions.

Applicant Presentation

Heidi Bolyard, Simplified Living, 545 Metro Place South, Suite 100, Dublin, explained they had already incorporated several staff recommendations, including pulling the porch in 18 inches on each side and adding dental moulding to match the existing house. However, she stated that other recommendations mentioned in the staff report, particularly the suggestion to significantly reduce the porch size, had not been previously communicated to them. They are well within the front yard setback. They understand keeping homes along that street within that build line and would like to have a front porch to enjoy the community. It was recommended that a porch be placed on the rear of the home, but the owners would much prefer looking at the neighbors' homes instead of cemetery.

Aaron Frank, homeowner, 85 Franklin Street, Dublin, explained their motivations. He stated that they absolutely love the Historic District and would never do anything to discredit or impact the character of the Historic District. He emphasized the solar protection aspect, describing how after losing a large hackberry tree, their front door now reaches 165 degrees Fahrenheit in summer. The proposed porch would span 7 feet deep by approximately 30 feet wide to provide adequate shade across all front windows.

Regarding setback concerns, Mr. Frank noted that while the porch would extend 7 feet beyond the house, it would still be 53 feet from the street at the northeast corner. He also pointed out that houses along Franklin Street have varying setbacks due to their angled positioning relative to the road.

Board Questions/Discussion

Ms. Damaser sought confirmation that the applicant will remove the pediment. Ms. Bolyard answered affirmatively and stated that they are adding a thin cap.

Ms. Patt-McDaniel asked for more detail regarding the applicants' response to staff's recommendations. Ms. Bolyard stated that originally the porch went from corner to corner so the metal roof expanded past the brick. They brought the width in 18" on each side. She clarified they had only learned about suggestions to reduce the porch to cover just the door and two side windows when receiving the staff report on Friday. They explained a smaller porch would not provide needed solar protection.

In response to a question about the roof angle, Ms. Bolyard stated that 3:12 is standard and 2:12 did not create good aesthetic.

Ms. Damaser asked if they considered any other material for the roof to more closely match the existing. Ms. Bolyard stated that other homes in the neighborhood have the standing seam and they like the look of it.

Ms. Patt-McDaniel asked if there is any piece of staff's recommendations that the applicant would consider. Mr. Frank stated that they can live with six columns instead of four. He feels that would be a good addition. An adjustment was made to the elevations and Ms. Bolyard distributed the updated elevations to the Board.

Ms. Bolyard clarified that they had only learned about suggestions to reduce the porch to cover just the door and two side windows when receiving the staff report on Friday. They explained a smaller porch wouldn't provide needed solar protection.

Ms. Holt stated that a smaller porch was mentioned in formal comments for the MPR (2 weeks into the 6-week review process) and discussed at the pre-submittal meeting (before the application was made).

In response to Ms. Damaser's question regarding the similar porch across the street, Ms. Holt stated that those additions were approved in 2017 or 2018 before the current Guidelines. It is an example of what the Board at the time and City Council did not want to continue. With the 2023-2024 Guidelines updates, staff looked closely at Franklin Street because it is the only entirely background neighborhood. 5 foundational elements were identified for preservation (site design, height, massing, form and fenestration). This is where staff is trying to "thread the needle" with regard to the work done with the last Guidelines update and the desires of applicant.

Ms. Cooper asked the width of the porch as the applicant would like to construct it. Ms. Bolyard stated that the width would be 29' 10.5".

Dr. Stechschulte asked if the narrower porch is something the applicant would be willing to consider. Mr. Frank stated that the solar protection is a major goal. Staff recommended plating shade trees but that will take many years to provide benefit. They did put in a large caliper Oak tree. They have always wanted a front porch and love being out and engaging in the community.

Ms. Damaser asked if most of the homes have porches. Ms. Holt answered affirmatively and noted that the porches are within the roof form and setback line. The statement in the Guidelines is to maintain the building setback. Ms. Damaser asked for staff's primary concern. Ms. Holt stated that we are trying to find a compromise because staff believes porches are important but want to honor Guidelines written specifically for this location. The primary concerns are the consistent building location along the street and the form that projects out. Ms. Bolyard stated that the line is not a good comparison to the full street because other homes are much closer. The Guidelines are a suggestion and not Code. This proposal meets Code requirements.

Ms. Cooper stated that she can respect the thermal protection.

Public Comments

Ms. Holt stated that all comments received electronically have been included in the packet materials.

Michael Streng, 75 Franklin Street, Dublin, stated that 56 Franklin's porch has transformed that property and promoted community interaction. He stated the proposal met Dublin City Code with its 25-foot setback requirement and he viewed the 60-foot guideline as effectively a taking without compensation.

Alan Szuter, 80 Franklin Street, Dublin, emphasized how the porch would support neighborhood connectivity enhanced by recent sidewalk improvements. He noted Franklin Street's eclectic collection of houses with widely varying setbacks and argued the porch would add value to this background street.

Andrew Christensen, 56 Franklin Street, Dublin, returned to note his porch at 56 Franklin extends closer to the sidewalk than the Franks' proposed porch would. He confirmed standing seam roofing was appropriate for the low pitch proposed and believed the design would blend cohesively with the home.

Board discussion revealed division over the setback issue but general support for the porch concept. Ms. Patt-McDaniel stated she wasn't as concerned with setback given the house's angle and distance, suggesting the board might accept the submitted drawing showing six columns as more appropriate than four.

Ms. Cooper expressed support for the applicant's desire for a front porch, believing the benefit outweighed the "loss of frontage space." She was indifferent on column count but had concerns about the standing seam roof versus shingles, preferring shingles as more in keeping with the house style.

Dr. Stechschulte acknowledged being initially inclined against the applicant but was swayed by testimony that the porch was within appropriate distance from the street and Guidelines could be flexible. He found six columns attractive and accepted the roofer's testimony about standing seam being more practical.

Ms. Damaser stated the porch was important to the neighborhood and she liked the house better with it than without. She appreciated the solar protection aspect and understood about slow tree growth.

Ms. Cooper moved, Dr. Stechschulte seconded approval of the Minor Project Review for construction of a separate rear shed structure.

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

Ms. Cooper moved, Ms. Patt-McDaniel seconded approval of the Minor Project Review for a new front porch addition at 85 Franklin Street with the option of incorporating either 4 or 6 columns with the overall dimensions to be roughly 7 feet deep and 29 feet 10 inches wide.

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

**Case #25-070MPR - 83 S. Riverview Street, Minor Project Review
Request for review and approval of construction of a new addition to a historic residential structure. The .25-acre site is zoned Historic Residential.**

Staff Presentation

Ms. Holt presented this request for construction of a new addition to a historic residential structure on a 0.25-acre site zoned Historic Residential. The site contains the Eliud Sells house, a landmark building built in 1824 - the oldest stone house in Dublin, built in federal style with 3-bay fenestration. A kitchen ell was added early in the structure's history, and the proposed addition would replace a white enclosed porch on the right side.

Ms. Holt noted the addition protrudes slightly beyond the historic structure (it was equal at informal review), which is contrary to guidelines but can be mitigated with good design and good reasons. The request includes a total building footprint waiver - the district permits up to 25% lot coverage, and they're requesting 28.4%, impacted by two existing outbuildings including one historic blacksmith shop and privy.

The applicant provided two options; staff presented the base option as closest to meeting criteria. Design concerns included: potential for a more transparent hyphen, lower story windows not being proportional per guidelines, the need to flatten the 1930s addition roof form to create greater delineation between the historic L and the addition, centering triple windows between columns, and ensuring classical column details.

Ms. Patt McDaniel asked about the roof pitch. Ms. Holt stated that the roof for the 1930s addition was shorter than the roof for the kitchen ell. The goal is to minimize covering the historic fabric to the greatest extent possible.

Applicant Presentation

Geoffrey Hahm, homeowner, 83 S. Riverview Street, Dublin, thanked the Board and staff for reviewing the application. He shared his consultation with Karen Bokor, the City's expert historic architect. He explained that Ms. Bokor said their addition met all basic Code requirements but suggested tweaks for better cohesion. Based on her feedback, they simplified from board and batten to horizontal siding, replaced multi-unit windows with larger rectangular windows on the second floor, and maintained a uniform color scheme.

Mr. Hahm expressed frustration with the extensive conditions in the staff report, particularly about changing elements that were agreed upon at the informal review, such as the roof pitch. He

strongly objected to staff's suggestion to lower and pull back the hyphen roof, explaining it would create water drainage problems.

There was discussion on adding more windows to the hyphen connecting the master bedroom to the kitchen. Mr. Hahm explained the hyphen was only 8 feet long and already had a glass door with a window.

Regarding windows throughout the addition, Mr. Hahm clarified he was proposing JELD-WEN SightLine windows, which he stated were identical cosmetically to Marvin Ultimate windows but with more custom options. He emphasized these were wood clad windows with aluminum cladding, featuring simulated divided lights with spacer bars, not grills between glass as the submitted documentation incorrectly showed. He emphasized the color would be Baja Beige, not the Mocha Cream shown in staff's materials. Mr. Hahm stated that the patio will be brick.

Board Questions/Discussion

Board members worked through each condition systematically:

Regarding the roof pitch (Condition 1), Ms. Cooper stated that she would be comfortable based on the discussion before of removing this condition given that there was an extensive discussion about it at Informal Review and she specifically remembers talking about having that window exposed. The Board agreed to remove this condition.

Regarding columns: Mr. Hahm provided a photograph of appropriate classical columns. The Board retained this condition requiring detailed drawings.

For windows and doors (Condition 3), discussion revealed most issues stemmed from incomplete plan details. Mr. Hahm would provide specifications proving the windows met requirements. Staff clarified they could accept documentation instead of expensive physical samples.

Regarding adding more windows to the hyphen (Condition 4), Ms. Patt-McDaniel stated that just like we do not want that hyphen to be all glass, she does not want more windows. The Board agreed the existing window and door configuration was appropriate.

For the 1930s addition panels (Condition 5), Mr. Hahm proposed leaving the original poured concrete in place rather than mimicking them. The Board agreed to modify this condition to state the panels would remain as-is.

Regarding paint colors, Mr. Hahm confirmed all elements would be antique white and had brought samples.

The chimney cap color (Condition 11) generated discussion, with the Board agreeing to modify the language to require matte galvanized finish rather than the specific black or bronze originally specified.

For roof seam width (Condition 12), after discussion about Karen Bokor's recommendation to match the existing roof and consideration of visual consistency, Ms. Cooper stated that she agreed with the idea of using the same seam because with the hyphen and the setback and the other things that are going on with the addition, it will differentiate sufficiently. The Board agreed to remove this condition.

After working through all conditions, the Board had reduced the original 12 conditions to 9, with most focusing on providing additional documentation and clarifying details in the plans.

Public Comments

There were no public comments.

Ms. Patt-McDaniel moved, Dr. Stechschulte seconded approval of a waiver of Section 153.173A to allow 28.4% building footprint where 25% is the allowable maximum.

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

Ms. Cooper moved, Dr. Stechschulte seconded approval of the Minor Project Review with the following conditions:

1. Provide classical details for all porch columns (round or square) and architraves. Ensure column spacing and placement is consistent with classical proportions.
2. For windows and doors:
 - a. Adjust window sizes and proportions for the addition as noted.
 - b. Address window and trim details as noted for the historic portion of the house.
 - c. Ensure specified windows meet both Code and Guidelines requirements, including appropriate sash, muntin, and glass proportions.
 - d. Clarify which windows are double-hung, fixed, and casement.
 - e. Provide exact window sample with simulated divided lights and spacers.
 - f. Consider color that provides depth to the windows.
 - g. Provide door specifications, ensuring compliance with items a-f, above, as applicable.
3. Reflect that the 1930s addition panel design will remain: provide materials for, and a detail of, the same. Two windows will remain on the left side of the north elevation.
4. Center the north elevation's existing triple window grouping between the columns.
5. Provide a detail showing paired/tripled windows have casings between.
6. Provide information on foundation/water table mortar and a traditional detail of the stone cap.
7. Coordinate information in application regarding material for new patio: brick vs. stone.
8. Provide actual paint chips for all materials for comparison with the Pre-approved Paint Colors and compatibility with the stone. Specify colors for columns, gutters, and downspouts.
9. Use matte galvanized color for chimney caps and related venting/collars.

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

Ms. Damaser thanked staff and Mr. Hahm for their patience and perseverance.

COMMUNICATIONS

- Ms. Holt announced the joint work session would be held September 2nd at City Hall, officially running from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. with dinner at 5:30 p.m. Board members could RSVP in OnBoard.
- Dr. Stechschulte mentioned Mr. Cotter's letter suggesting having an architect on the Board in the future. He suggested expanding that to include architects, builders, or someone experienced with building, noting how helpful that expertise would be for discussions like roof lines. Ms. Cooper clarified that Mr. Cotter is an engineer involved in construction and they missed his expertise tonight.
- Ms. Damaser mentioned she would bring copies of a Smithsonian magazine article on dry-laid stone walls to share at the next meeting.
- Dr. Stechschulte requested that when meeting materials are revised, they receive specific notice about what pages have been added or changed. Ms. Maxwell explained the system sends emails that include notes about what has been updated, and she could be more specific.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:08 p.m.



Vice Chair, Architectural Review Board



Deputy Clerk of Council