



**Architectural Review Board  
Meeting Minutes  
June 8, 2023 6:00 PM**

**1) Call to Order**

The meeting was Called to Order by Chairperson Toney.

**2) Roll Call of Members**

Members present: Mr. Scott, Ms. Strasser, Ms. Krosky, Mr. Heyer, Chairperson Toney

**3) Approval of Minutes**

**Motion to approve the April and May, 2023 Meeting Minutes by Strasser, second by Heyer; Roll Call: Scott - Yes, Heyer – Yes, Krosky – Yes, Strasser – Yes, Toney – Yes**

**4) Public Comments**

There were no Public Comments.

**Motion to approve Consent Agenda (BZAP-23-11 and ARB-23-15) by Krosky, second by Heyer; Roll Call: Strasser – Yes, Scott – Yes, Heyer – Yes, Krosky – Yes, Toney – Yes**

**5) Old Business**

1 Application Number: BZAP-23-8

Address: 2691 E Main Street

Applicant: Sarah Montague

Owner: Matt Davis

Request: The applicant is seeking (per remand of the Board of Zoning and Planning) Architectural review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for a 2 story addition to the front facade and building and site modifications

Ms. Bokor explained this application was previously before the Board and required a Zoning Variance; Ms. Rose stated the BZAP approved a variance to allow a parking space reduction and allow greenspace with conditions. Ms. Bokor displayed changes to the plan including bike racks.

Sarah Montague was sworn in and explained the project.

Mr. Scott shared he feels the improvements to the parking lot facade are better. He also said he feels the branding is much better.

Ms. Krosky stated she really likes the project and feels the modifications are great; she said she loves the branding created relief mimicking the windows.

Mr. Heyer asked how the limestone veneer will adhere to the building; this was discussed by Ms. Montague, who explained the veneer won't be self supporting. There will not be a cavity or drainage channel behind; Mr. Heyer stated he doesn't think this will last. He said he is looking for panels suspended off the building with a cavity or drainage board. He explained he doesn't feel an adhesive will hold this together over a long period of time. Ms. Montague discussed weathering and Mr. Scott shared he has never seen real limestone used in this way, but has seen it as a composite. Warranty and masons were discussed.

Mr. Heyer stated he feels the design is nice but believes this will be an eyesore in 20 years.

Ms. Krosky asked the applicant to view WJE.com for information on adhered stone.

Ms. Strasser thanked the applicant for making the changes on the design but she explained that listening to Mr. Heyer is making her rethink her vote.

Chairperson Toney said that this design looks great but she would like the applicant to reconsider the limestone and perhaps that aspect of the plan comes back to Ms. Bokor. She suggested faux material. Ms. Bokor explained she feels comfortable reviewing this, but in the event something comes up and she feels uncomfortable, she will bring the applicant back to the Board. She also explained that if the applicant devises a system or installation method, the Board can review it.

Mr. Scott explained the Board will look at design details, which can include construction drawings, quality of installation, and product failure. He stated he feels that if the applicant can prove the product will last, then he can move forward with this.

Mr. Heyer stated he would like to see product samples and Mr. Scott agreed.

Ms. Krosky suggested a mock-up be required that would be appropriately sized for the type of material and components of the wall system.

Ms. Bokor indicated technical discussion is usually above the level of this Board. She said she feels it is important to listen to Mr. Heyer's comments and that there be a condition of interim work by the applicant on the technical side; if there are aesthetic changes, Ms. Bokor will share that. Ms. Bokor explained that interim checkpoints will happen before construction and she is not worried about a conditional approval.

Ms. Strasser indicated the Board is making a decision based on the aesthetic of the shallow stone in front of an adhesive, and that is important.

The findings and decisions of the Board for application number BZAP-23-8 for the property located at 2691 E Main: That the Architectural Review Board issues a Certificate of Appropriateness for a 2 story addition to the front facade and building and site modifications with the condition that the applicant return to the Architectural Review Board with facade and material details.

Chairperson Toney explained the Board is asking for a justification of how the product will be used or an alternate product, and they're assuming the look will stay the same.

Ms. Bokor explained that if the applicant works with her, she will only approve the design if the aesthetics are very similar to what is being discussed during this meeting and that the project can be brought back to the Board if necessary. Ms. Rose said she assumes Ms. Bokor would verify the design with one or two Board members, but if three or more board members are unhappy, it will be brought back.

There was discussion about how to proceed and it was decided that the project would be approved with the condition to return to the Board to provide the technical details of the installation.

Ms. Rose read the final FOFs.

The applicant understood the Finding of Facts.

**Motion to approve Findings of Fact by Ms. Krosky, second by Ms. Strasser; Roll Call: Scott -Yes, Heyer – Yes, Krosky – Yes, Strasser – Yes, Chairperson Toney – Yes**

The final material product will be tabled until the July 13, 2023 meeting, at which point it will be announced if the project will be heard the next month. Mr. Heyer asked if Board members can get material examples.

2) Application Number: ARB-23-10

Address: 266 S Stanwood

Applicant: Daniel Momot

Owner: Paul Lamb

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for an addition and expansion of the existing sunroom.

Ms. Bokor indicated this application was before the Board in May and was tabled for a variety of reasons. She said she has since visited the site and understands the complicating factors; the applicant and owner have agreed to redig the entire basement. The details have been ironed out and Ms. Bokor is happy to work with the applicant on this. The applicant was considering a railing over the top and that is one of the reasons for a flat, instead of shed, roof. Ms. Bokor explained she is concerned about the quality of materials, although he wanted to get some feedback.

Mr. Momot was sworn in and explained the changes to the application including the flat roof and product that looks like wood. The applicant is not interested in a railing at this time.

Paul Lamb was sworn in and stated the item shown on the left is the drawing being discussed. Mr. Lamb thanked the Board for their comments at the last meeting. Ms. Bokor said she believes the massing and placing are correct but the exterior details need to be finalized. She explained the windows are the way they are because half of the windows are already existing.

Mr. Lamb explained the windows facing the front and back will be reused and the long wall with the four windows will be replaced; the cost savings will be a few hundred dollars. Ms. Strasser shared her opinion that letting the old windows drive the decisions is a mistake. She suggested getting all new windows.

Mr. Heyer said he appreciates the rendering of the home and also that he agrees with Ms. Strasser. He discussed varying window options as well as other design options that the applicant can work on with Ms. Bokor. Additional window options were discussed.

Ms. Krosky indicated she is fine with conditioning this application, and encouraged the applicant to consider landscaping on the three sides and have a buffer before the walkway and asphalt drive.

Mr. Scott stated the proportion and massing of the addition is appropriate. He said the addition feels like a sunroom but is larger than a typical sunroom addition and he questions the aesthetic of the overall design. He explained he feels there would be a better quality with a different type of windows, and discussed other things about the windows. He said the scale of the drawings and scale need to be worked out.

Mr. Heyer and Mr. Scott posed questions about potential future usage of the roof and a photo was discussed. Ms. Strasser said a door and railing can only be installed if the roof is built to handle a load; the applicant explained they are more than willing to lose that as an opportunity because the photo shown looked nice. A vaulted ceiling was discussed.

Ms. Bokor explained the timing of the next steps.

The applicant asked for a table.

**Motion to table until the July 13, 2023 meeting by Strasser, second by Krosky; roll call: Stasser – Yes, Krosky – Yes, Heyer – Yes, Scott – Yes, Toney – Yes**

3) Application Number: BZAP-23-11

Address: 2444 Bexley Park

Applicant: Valerie Halas

Owner: Kacy King

Request: The applicant is seeking (per remand of the Board of Zoning and Planning) Architectural review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness Architectural review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace the attached garage with a 2nd floor addition and new front copper awning.

**Motion to approve Consent Agenda (BZAP-23-11 and ARB-23-15) by Krosky, second by Heyer; Roll Call: Strasser – Yes, Scott – Yes, Heyer – Yes, Krosky – Yes, Toney – Yes**

**6) New Business:**

4) Application Number: ARB-23-12

Address: 2724 Bellwood

Applicant: Kelly Neff

Owner: Herbert Jackson

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for a 3 season porch addition to the rear of the house.

Ms. Bokor explained this is a typical patio-enclosure project that will be an improvement to what is there now and that Board members would like to see information about how the details will be worked out and other projects from the applicant.

Preston Homes was sworn in and said he can provide skirting and examples of previous projects. He stated this is a typical three season room project.

Mr. Homes explained a superfoam roof and answered Mr. Heyer's questions regarding the panelized roof system with aluminum on top. Mr. Heyer stated he can't envision the aesthetics of what the product will look like.

Mr. Heyer said he is okay with the look and a skirt; it will be a vertical vinyl soffit but there are other options and there will be a vertical member between the two sliding window systems.

Shingles can be used, but there is no benefit to this.

Mr. Heyer said this fits into the category of a manufactured product that is assembled on site. He said this has a shelf life and feels having the underneath skirted is appropriate. He is indifferent to the roof.

Board members said this fits with the neighborhood.

Various roof options were discussed and triangular glass facing out from the home can be discussed with the homeowner.

Ms. Krosky said she agrees with many of the comments made and said that depending on the roof changes, making the transitions with the chimney and flashing is important.

The findings and decisions of the Board for application number ARB-23-12 for the property located at 2724 Bellwood: That the Architectural Review Board issues a Certificate of Appropriateness for a 3 season porch addition to the rear of the house with the condition that lattice is used to skirt the bottom.

The applicant understood the Findings of Fact.

**Motion to approve the Findings of Fact by Krosky, second by Scott; Roll Call: Heyer – Yes, Scott – Yes, Kroksy – Yes, Strasser – Yes, Toney – Yes**

5) Application Number: ARB-23-13

Address: 272 N Stanwood

Applicant: Brian Zingelmann

Owner: Matt and Amy Creith

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for a 2 story addition to the house.

Brian Zinglemann was sworn in. He said there is an existing 1.5 story home; the proposed addition will fill in the L shape coming out of the one story. The first floor will be a half bath and mudroom and the second story will be a closet and bath to add to an existing bedroom to create a master suite. They are proposing new siding and new roofing on the entire house so everything matches; the color will be gray.

Ms. Krosky said she likes the project and feels they picked good material.

Mr. Heyer asked if the applicant can change the bathroom and closet windows on the east elevation as they look out of scale, and he offered suggestions about how to accomplish this. The applicant explained there is available height. Mr. Heyer encouraged the applicant to be careful regarding the gray color and various shades were discussed. Ms. Bokor suggested the applicant place samples on the home.

Mr. Scott stated he agreed with the upper windows and suggested shifting them off of the counter and said it is an interesting detail to bring the window down in the closet and have it integrate with the trim. He said he feels this project gives a big bang for the buck and does a great job of not destroying the aesthetic of the house. He suggested considering windows of other shapes. Mr. Scott said he does not think the window needs to be smaller.

Chairperson Toney did not have anything else to add.

The findings and decisions of the Board for application number ARB-23-13 for the property located at 272 N Stanwood: That the Architectural Review Board issues a Certificate of Appropriateness for a 2 story addition to the house with the condition that the applicant work with the design consultant on final details.

The applicant understood the Findings of Fact.

**Motion to approve the Findings of Fact by Ms. Strasser, second by Mr. Scott; Strasser – Yes, Krosky – Yes, Heyer – Yes, Scott – Yes, Toney – Yes**

6) Application Number: ARB-23-14

Address: 205 S Cassingham

Applicant: Ken Williams

Owner: Jonathan and Kayla George

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for an addition to the rear of the house.

Ms. Bokor stated this project is “almost there” and mentioned the questions are generally due to unlabeled drawings.

Mr. Williams was sworn in and said they are adding a second floor to an existing first floor which will allow for a bedroom suite, changing a hallway, and decreasing the width of one bedroom. He explained this addition is nestled in the back of the house and is not visible from the front. Window placements were mentioned and the proposed plans work for the space; the applicant would like to proceed as the drawings are shown.

Mr. Heyer indicated there is much potential to this home and the layout of the home as it currently stands was intentional. He suggested leaving the eave condition and having simply a skirt or making this a one and a half story with a shaped roof. He strongly suggested incorporating details with the Design Consultant.

The applicant indicated the interior of the kitchen and dining room will be rearranged to be more modern, so the windows seen in the elevation will be removed. He said all of the siding will be removed and are plans for a new hardie cement board. The cost of the roof detail will be substantial; this version of the design will cost more money than originally anticipated. The windows shown on the first floor will be covered with siding from the back.

Window placement was discussed and the applicant said their future plan is to replace all of the siding in a second phase.

Mr. Heyer stated a corner window will result in long term problems and he said he feels the character is being lost, which he believes is unfortunate.

The applicant stated that with the kitchen layout, the windows will need to be changed; it was suggested to keep one window.

Ms. Krosky mentioned she agrees with the comments made about the upper windows and suggested potentially changing the sizes. She indicated trying to adjust things and see if the applicant can still achieve what they're wanting but keep windows.

The applicant said he could fake windows but Board members did not find this favorable.

Mr. Heyer suggested trying to bring more height into the space. Mr. Scott stated the eating area looks like it will be dark and he suggested expanding the windows in that space.

Mr. George was sworn in and explained the reasons behind the choices made in creating these plans.

The applicant explained other changes which will allow more light to enter the area.

Mr. Scott discussed the window in the master bath and aligning it to the window below and agreed with Ms. Krosky's comments about window size and the window in the corner. He also indicated the first floor elevation is a big, blank wall; he suggested adding a window.

Mr. Heyer suggested this application be revisited at a future meeting.

Mr. Scott highly recommended expanding the patio and explained why he thinks this will be beneficial.

The garage was discussed.

Mr. Scott encouraged a handrail to dress up the patio.

Ms. Strasser stated she is in agreement and discussed various window options.

The applicant mentioned the limitations with changing the windows and discussed the windows in the bathroom. He said some of the windows will be repurposed and gave some instances in which changes could be made.

Ms. Krosky suggested exploring the light in the eating area.

Continuing the eave was discussed. The applicant explained that significantly altering the kitchen will be a big challenge.

Ms. Toney suggested rotating the island 90 degrees, keeping but shortening the windows in front of the counter, and decreasing the size of the window above the sink, as well as thinking outside of the box. She encouraged the applicant to look at what the house will tell them the windows should look like and rethink the windows.

It was suggested that the applicant revisit the drawings and next steps were discussed.

The applicant asked for the project to be tabled.

**Motion to Table by Ms. Krosky, second by Ms. Strasser; Roll Call: Scott – Yes, Heyer – Yes, Krosky – Yes, Strasser – Yes, Toney – Yes**

7) Application Number: ARB-23-15 Address: 825 S Roosevelt Applicant: Amy Lauerhass Owner: Zettler  
Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for front porch addition to house.

**Motion to approve Consent Agenda (BZAP-23-11 and ARB-23-15) by Krosky, second by Heyer; Roll Call: Strasser – Yes, Scott – Yes, Heyer – Yes, Krosky – Yes, Toney – Yes**

#### **7) Other Business**

#### **8) Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned.