City of Dublin
OHIO, USA

MEETING MINUTES

Architectural Review Board

Wednesday, October 21, 2026

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Patt-McDaniel, Vice Chair, called the Architectural Review Board (ARB) meeting to order at 6:31 p.m. in the Council Chamber at 5555 Perimeter Drive, Dublin, Ohio. She noted that the meeting was also available by livestream on the City of Dublin website. She explained the procedure for each case: a staff presentation, followed by an applicant presentation if desired, clarifying questions from the Board, public comment, and Board deliberation. Members of the public were asked to state their name and address and to limit comments to three minutes.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Ms. Patt-McDaniel led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Board members present:	Lisa Patt-McDaniel, Mark Stechschulte, Terry Seidel, Stasia Suleiman
Board members absent:	Sean Cotter
Staff members present:	Sarah Holt, Rati Singh, Bassem Bitar

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Dr. Stechschulte moved, Ms. Suleiman seconded acceptance of the documents into the record and approval of minutes of the September 23 Regular Meeting.

Vote: Ms. Patt-McDaniel, yes; Dr. Stechschulte, yes; Ms. Suleiman, yes; Mr. Seidel, yes.
[Motion carried 4-0]

Ms. Patt-McDaniel explained that the Board is responsible for reviewing construction, modifications, and alterations in the area subject to architectural review under Zoning Code Section 153.170, and that the Board holds decision-making responsibility on these cases. All persons intending to address the Board were administered the oath.

CASE REVIEWS

Case #26-058ARB-AFDP
Riverview Village - 62 N. Riverview Street
Amended Final Development Plan
Request for review and approval of an Amended Final Development Plan for a previously-approved mixed-use development to allow the reconstruction of one of the structures. The combined +/- 0.86-acre overall site is zoned HD-HC, Historic District - Historic Core and is located on both sides of N. Riverview Street, south of North Street and north of Wing Hill Lane.

Dr. Stechschulte moved, Ms. Suleiman seconded to postpone Case #26-058ARB-AFDP to the next Architectural Review Board meeting.

Vote: Dr. Stechschulte, yes; Ms. Suleiman, yes; Ms. Patt-McDaniel, yes; Mr. Seidel, yes. [Motion carried 4-0]

Case #26-043ARB-INF
25 S. Riverview Street
Informal review and feedback for the construction of a two-story addition to a single-family home in the Historic District. The 0.26 -acre site is zoned HD-HR, Historic Residential District, and is located at 25 S. Riverview Street.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Singh presented a request for informal review and feedback on an addition to a single-family home at 25 S. Riverview Street. The 0.26-acre site is zoned HD-HR, Historic Residential District. The existing house is a landmark building. It is a vernacular bungalow of approximately 1900 with a one-and-one-half-story front gable, a one-story side gable on the south elevation, stone cladding, and a standing seam metal roof. A 1970 addition containing a porch and garage is not considered a landmark portion of the structure. The Board approved site modifications for the property in 2016.
Ms. Singh reviewed the applicable guidelines, including Section 4.12 on building additions and Chapter 5 on new construction. She stated that additions should be clearly distinguishable, subordinate, and secondary to the primary structure. They should also be located to the rear, set back from the original facade, and separated from the historic building by a physical break or hyphen. They should respect prevailing heights, massing, and lot coverage.
The applicant proposed to remove the 1970 addition and relocate vehicular access to South Blacksmith Lane. Staff noted that this aligns with the Guidelines, which discourage front-facing vehicular access. The applicant also proposed to open the non-historic stone wall along Blacksmith Lane and continue it along the driveway.
Staff identified the following concerns and requirements:

- Pool: A rear-yard pool was proposed. It would require building code review, and a waiver would most likely be needed for its location.
- Fireplace and chimney: Staff recommended redesigning or relocating the freestanding fireplace and chimney so that it integrates with the building.
- Massing: The two-story element facing South Riverview Street projects beyond the historic structure and competes with the one-and-one-half-story landmark rather than appearing subordinate. Staff recommended reducing the projection and relocating larger elements behind the historic building so that only a one-story addition is visible from the street.
- Lot coverage: The building footprint exceeds 25 percent and would require a waiver.
- Grading: Finished floor elevations and proposed grades would be required, because the site slopes toward the east.
- Rear massing: The multiple rear volumes should be simplified under Sections 5.3 A and 5.3 B.
- Fenestration: Window groupings should be more proportional and consistent with the orderly pattern of the existing home under Section 5.6 A.
- Hyphen and materials: The proposed hyphen lacks material change, transparency, or setback to clearly distinguish the addition under Sections 4.12 A and 4.12 C.

Ms. Singh posed four questions for the Board: support for the relocated access, the massing, location, height, and visibility of the additions, the architectural details and material palette, and the associated site modifications, including the pool and chimney. No clarifying questions for staff were raised at that time.

Applicant Presentation

Richard Taylor, Richard Taylor Architects, 48 South High Street, Dublin, represented the owners. He stated that the home is currently a rental, and the owners wish to return it to their primary residence with primarily first-floor living. Mr. Taylor stated that the intent was to break the addition into pieces comparable in scale to the existing house. He took exception to describing the garage section as two stories, stating it is one and one-half stories with two dormers, with ridge and eave lines nearly matching the existing house. He stated the largest mass sits 40 feet behind the main house, and that subordinate can also mean behind.

Mr. Taylor explained that the L-shaped arrangement defines outdoor space using the buildings rather than landscape screening. He cited several reasons for the garage location:

- It produces the shortest driveway from Blacksmith Lane.
- It sits at the point of least grade change.
- It uses an existing break in the stone wall.
- It places the driveway between two commercial parking lots rather than directly across from one.

He presented precedent examples from the District in which main buildings were expanded through a series of connected masses, some projecting beyond the front of the original structure. He also noted that the existing house and the garage mass are the same height. He questioned why the fenestration of an addition meant to be distinguishable should mimic that of the original building.

Board Questions

Dr. Stechschulte asked for the addresses of the cited examples. Ms. Patt-McDaniel and Ms. Singh clarified that only 55 South Riverview had been approved under the new code, that the others predated the code, and that one example had led to a zoning change because of its massing.

Dr. Stechschulte asked about existing trees. Mr. Taylor responded that no trees would be affected and that the driveway would fall between trees on the rear property line. Mr. Taylor also confirmed that the stone wall would be carried along the driveway as it steps down about one and one-half to two feet.

Mr. Seidel asked about the 55 South Riverview garage. Ms. Singh explained that the Board approved it with a waiver allowing projection beyond the side of the house because the house is very linear and the mass was pushed back from the front entrance.

Mr. Seidel asked about the height discrepancy noted by staff. Ms. Singh stated that staff had not received the second-floor plan, that the second floor is expected to be a bedroom, and that finished floor elevations are needed to confirm height because the house sits below grade. Mr. Taylor responded that the drawing he supplied after the planning report shows actual site grade, that the driveway sits at grade, and that wall heights were adjusted so the heights remain the same. Ms. Patt-McDaniel stated that the Board's preference is that the addition be at the same height or lower.

Mr. Seidel asked about staff concerns regarding the hyphen. Ms. Singh stated it is too small and lacks clear demarcation. Ms. Patt-McDaniel noted that lot coverage is already 25.3 percent, so

enlarging the hyphen would require reducing other areas. Mr. Seidel summarized that the one-story addition could be made smaller to allow a larger hyphen, which Ms. Singh confirmed. Ms. Singh clarified that projection beyond the historic facade is acceptable to staff. The concern is that a one and one-half story mass sits directly behind the one-story element, so that what is visible from the street is the existing home with a one-story element pushed back.

Public Comment

David Venne, 56 S. Riverview Street, Dublin, stated that he was not opposed to the proposal but was concerned about stormwater. He explained that runoff from the commercial area and Spring Hill Lane washes down and forms a waterfall and erosion on his property, which is the last house before the bridge. He asked that any drainage mitigation for the new driveway be directed toward the north side of the property, noting that the grade runs south and that an underutilized drain exists near the bridge.

Ms. Patt-McDaniel, Chair, observed that a neighboring property had installed a drain and suggested similar treatment, and that the broader issue should be raised again with the City. Dr. Stechschulte asked whom the matter could be referred to. Ms. Holt stated that drainage for this property would be reviewed at the next stage, that engineering is aware of the larger area issue, and that it is a difficult balancing act. Dr. Stechschulte added that his own house experienced similar flooding when originally built.

Board Discussion

Ms. Patt-McDaniel, Dr. Stechschulte, and the other members present expressed support for relocating vehicular access to Blacksmith Lane. Ms. Patt-McDaniel stated that it was appropriate given the commercial uses behind the property.

On massing and location, Dr. Stechschulte stated that the proposed garage location was acceptable for this particular lot. He cited the privacy benefit relative to the neighboring apothecary parking lot and patio, consistency with development patterns in the District, and the Eli Pinney house as an example of a treasured home with a side addition.

Ms. Suleiman agreed with the garage location but was concerned about the number of separate volumes seen from South Blacksmith Lane and the competing palette. She suggested simplifying the composition into one larger element complemented by two smaller pieces, simplifying the roof details, and softening the visual prominence of the red garage through a neutral facade or stonework while still honoring the red roof. Ms. Patt-McDaniel and Mr. Seidel agreed that the rear view appeared as a jumble of buildings. Mr. Taylor acknowledged that a late change to the central piece had not been fully resolved, agreed that the view required clean-up, and stated that materials and colors were open to revision.

Dr. Stechschulte shared that the historical society record describes the house as an 1821 log structure covered with walnut siding that was reportedly painted red at one time and later converted to stone by Mr. Frank Pinney in the 1920s. Ms. Patt-McDaniel stated that this supported red on the addition, but that she preferred to see the redesign of the rear before commenting on materials.

Regarding site modifications, Mr. Taylor stated that the fireplace and chimney had been eliminated and that the pool, a plunge pool included primarily to calculate lot coverage, would be relocated with a revised patio configuration.

Ms. Suleiman recommended simplifying the jogging fence or railing line into a clean rectangle aligned with the edge of the garage.

Dr. Stechschulte had no objection to a pool and noted only fencing and privacy considerations. Mr. Seidel supported relocating the pool.

Regarding the shed gables of the rear one and one-half story mass, Mr. Seidel asked whether members had concerns. Ms. Patt-McDaniel and Ms. Suleiman stated they had no objection provided the whole building remains subordinate.

No formal action was taken on this informal review. Mr. Taylor thanked the Board for the feedback.

COMMUNICATIONS

Pre-Approved Paint Colors

Ms. Holt stated that no presentation had been prepared, but that staff had provided a memo covering the history of the paint color document, an analysis of recent applications, ideas for improvement, and discussion questions. She asked the Board its level of comfort with reviewing color.

Dr. Stechschulte stated that color review is one of the Board's main functions. He explained that the recent applicant had proposed a color that conflicted with the wording of Section 5.2 regarding popular colors for the 1890 to 1940 period, yet which the applicant believed existed in that era. Dr. Stechschulte supported that applicant's request and considered it reasonable for staff to bring the matter to the Board. He noted that Section 5.2 uses the word eclectic twice and that prior discussions, including remarks by Council Member Kramb, sought to avoid colors at the funky end of the spectrum. He favored keeping the color choices as written and stated that review was neither a failure of staff nor punitive to applicants.

Ms. Patt-McDaniel agreed that the Board should review color and stated that the dispute in the recent case (#26-042) turned on the syntax of the Guidelines sentence. She added that the Board would benefit from seeing the full palette when considering such cases.

Mr. Seidel stated that the confusion centered on light gray versus gray, whereas the trim issue was clear and the Board had authorized the trim change. He said that some recently approved palettes were bland, that he favored more variety, and that he cited the red of the old tavern as a welcome addition.

Ms. Suleiman stated that if the Board is asked to decide based on the era of the house, the colors proposed for each era should be clearly presented so that homeowners have a defined range and the Board has guardrails for its decisions.

Dr. Stechschulte acknowledged that he had overlooked the trim color in the earlier case. Mr. Seidel observed that the house was now for sale and appeared darker than approved. Ms. Patt-McDaniel and Dr. Stechschulte commented that painted colors often differ from swatches. Dr. Stechschulte also noted that homeowners will live with their color choices longer than board members will serve.

Ms. Holt described two staff ideas for reorganizing the document. First, the timeline, which currently uses arbitrary 50-year marks beginning in 1800, could be tied to the actual guideline chapters, for example 1861 to 1890. Second, a sample Section 4.0 prepared by Anthony would display actual body colors that may be approved administratively, followed by trim and, where applicable, sash colors, allowing an unusual proposal to be compared against the approved palette.

Ms. Patt-McDaniel stated that she would rather see actual colors than names alone. Ms. Suleiman described the approach as a kit of parts and suggested organizing by era. Board members affirmed that this would give them adequate comfort.

Ms. Holt stated that staff would continue the work and hoped to provide a draft by the end of the year, followed by the process of updating and adopting the document.

David Venne, 56 S. Riverview Street, Dublin, stated that his 1978 home, which is not historic, offered only seven color choices, mostly neutral, and that he repainted white to avoid the approval process. He urged the Board to expand the palette, noting that the 1941 to 1990 era appeared to have the fewest colors. He stated that a broader palette would reduce the number of cases and allow more administrative approvals, and he noted that delays in scheduling can be frustrating for residents. Ms. Patt-McDaniel acknowledged the comments.

Ms. Holt reminded Board members to carry their badges when viewing applicant properties in the district, given recent concerns about unidentified persons taking photographs.

Mr. Seidel asked about the north facade of the former Oscars building, where an approved large window had not been installed. Ms. Holt responded that a support beam was discovered at that location, that the applicant was pivoting, and that an administrative approval was under review that would return the facade largely to what was originally approved.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 7:42 p.m.

Vice Chair, Architectural Review Board

Deputy Clerk of Council