



**Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes
January 31, 2024
6:00 PM**

1) Call to Order

The meeting was Called to Order by Chairperson Toney.

2) Roll Call of Members

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

3) Approval of Minutes

Minutes will be reviewed at the next meeting.

4) Public Comment

There were no public comments.

5) Old Business

1) Application Number: BZAP - 23-23

Address: 2200 E Main

Applicant: Ryan Pearson

Owner: Continental Real Estate Cos.

Request: The applicant is seeking a recommendation to the Board of Zoning and Planning for a Certificate of Appropriateness to allow demo and redevelopment of the vacant Trinity Lutheran apartment structures at 2160, 2188, & 2186 E Main Street (Parcel No.: 020-000836, 020-000217 & 020-000350). This application was approved with conditions at the December 18, 2024 Board of Zoning and Planning Meeting. A condition of approval was the return of the application to the ARB to review changes that address the ARB conditions for the building design.

Ms. Bokor reviewed the ARB conditions as part of the Record of Action from the December Board of Zoning and Planning meeting. Furthermore, she explained the BZAP did not accept the remand back to the ARB as a final approval but that this is an approval of those conditions, and if those are met, will require a recommendation back to the BZAP for final approval. This is because the overall project has many components that may be affected by design and this plan will ensure all approval falls under one approval from the BZAP.

She said that at this meeting, they are theoretically looking for a recommendation to the BZAP and in the case of outstanding items, there can be a remand back to the ARB for design specifications. She stated the project has been approved, with conditions.

Jason Hockstock provided an update and stated that the applicant is present to address six of the eight conditions; conditions 1 and 8 will not be discussed due to the current state of trying to advance construction documents.

Jason Hockstock was sworn in.

Ms. Bokor explained that the special meeting request was from Staff, not the applicant, and that this is for the benefit of staff and neighbors.

Mr. Hockstock explained Ryan Pearson's absence and thanked the Board for reviewing the case. He stated that in the applicant's opinion, they believe they have addressed all of the comments and have accomplished what has been asked for. Additionally, he wanted to stress that there have been some concerns with the unit count and that to make this project financially work, there will need to be 232 units; there can be additional discussion with pH7 about how to best address this.

Brian Pauling from pH7 was sworn in. He first addressed the sixth floor and stated that the BZAP has granted the variance so the recent strides made continue to move this project forward. He addressed changes to the northeast facade including modified brickwork, a step in the facade, adjustment to the unit mix on the fifth floor to allow for a recession, and a heavier cornice line. He stated the northwest corner changes include mirrored brickwork and massing and more stepping. Inside of the building, they've done a better job of trying to identify how the elevator, trash, and entry come together. On the west elevation, a barrier wall has been added for all headlight screening in the garage. He stated the intention to get confirmation of the six items while recognizing the need to return with materials.

Angela Yock, 2240 Bryden, was sworn in. She said one of the concerns of residents on Bryden is the current driveway that will access the parking lot. She said it was explained to her that this is going to stay as a pedestrian walkway but she has not seen any drawings detailing materials and vehicle traffic. She asked how the site will be accessed during demolition and construction and said residents need to be part of this conversation. She also asked where contractors will be parking and explained her questions are an attempt to be proactive. She asked what the hours of construction will be, to which Ms. Rose explained the allowable times and what the planned traffic is going to be during the process with road closures. Ms. Rose explained there is not currently information on this because it is a matter of the project and what is most necessary and typically the most direct exit from the City will be considered. Ms. Rose stated these questions can be addressed and handled through the Building Department.

Ms. Yock asked about resurfacing of nearby streets after the project is completed; Ms. Rose stated that is a City determination. Ms. Yock expressed her opinion that Bryden should not take on the burden of this project for the City and there has to be open communication. Chairperson Toney stated the Board is listening and will try to address her questions although members do not have all of the answers today. Ms. Yock stated a group of residents want to meet and make sure concerns are heard and addressed.

Ms. Strasser asked for more information about the headlight screening measures; there will be a vehicle barrier. There was discussion about a 42 inch wall which is high enough for a large vehicle. The applicant does not believe a similar wall is necessary on other locations on site because of the topography as well as additional plantings and the headlight levels. The basement level on the north elevation so the headlight screening is at grade and is densely landscaped so there is no plan for a wall. It was determined that there will be a screen fence on the north and also another barrier. There will also be a fence blocking the cars that are parking on that lot.

Mr. Scott asked about the exterior facade material for the crash wall; the applicant imagines right now it will be painted concrete: Mr. Heyer stated his belief that brick would be preferred, especially on the west facade. He asked about the site section on the west elevation; the actual grade isn't represented as a drive aisle. The planting bed will follow the grade. Mr. Scott said the crash wall on the second floor is his biggest concern. He asked about the color of the window of the residential portion; the applicant is still working through this. Mr. Scott shared his belief that white windows would not be the preferred color for the residential spaces and that he would lean towards marking it a condition to be reviewed. Ms. Bokor said she would consider windows part of the material package.

Mr. Heyer asked if the Board can vote on this application without the material package and there was discussion about focusing on the big picture items during this meeting.

Mr. Scott discussed the location of gas and electric meters with the applicant; transformers and master meters were discussed. It was determined that having these meters on the exterior would be a challenge. He confirmed trash is internal to the garage. Brick details on the north elevation were discussed. Mr. Scott said that overall, he feels like the headlight screening has been sufficiently addressed and that he is in support of the massing changes, which he feels are successful. He said the applicant has put together a design which he believes fits into the aesthetics that the Board is looking for.

Mr. Heyer said it is important for him to see color options and wants to know what will make the building Bexley. He would like to see options and details. The applicant said there are many architectural and aesthetic styles in Bexley and they will pull from those as they determine shades of materials. Mr. Heyer gave his opinion that this building's color scheme is a trend and that he is looking for options. He discussed recognizable

brick buildings in Bexley and stated that for buildings of this caliber, it is important that the details be scrutinized; he said he is not giving an approval without having seen material boards and samples.

Ms. Bokor said that the landscape still requires a rigorous review by the Tree and Public Gardens Commission.

Mr. Heyer said he wants to ensure the building can respond to Bexley being a special place. Ms. Rose stated that the Tree and Public Gardens commission will address fences and access. Mr. Hockstock explained they have a plan for the area and it will need to be coordinated with the fire department. He mentioned the Tree and Public Gardens Commission want to see materials. He explained that construction access is intended to be off Main Street and the Alexander and Bryden drives will be blocked off and barricaded. Contractors and employee parking has yet to be determined but they do not intend to allow parking to occur in neighborhoods. There was discussion about the logistics of constructing the parking garage, which can be utilized by contractors for parking. Ms. Bokor stated pre-construction meetings will plan for this and Ms. Rose indicated that the City is concerned about the state of the streets as a result of heavy usage during construction. Golf cart access was discussed.

Mr. Heyer shared the kinds of things he feels are important to incorporate into this project in some way, including brick masonry and detailing.

Mr. Heyer stated his belief that the metal canopies on the southeast elevation do not fit in with the design and discussed the design of the railings. He said he doesn't see how there's room to walk out on all of the balconies and this was discussed.

Mr. Hall said he thinks the building has come a long way and the main thing is that the project has gotten to a good place, but 'quality' and 'sustainable' aren't typically words describing multifamily housing. He said there's a nice approach to the massing, he likes the pedestrian feel along Main Street, and the brickwork and other details will make this building unique. He stated he is concerned about the balconies when they are viewed from underneath and suggested taking a look at the railings. He said he believes the materials are incredibly important and discussed his stone preferences. He explained his belief that windows will be a major issue.

Chairperson Toney stated she doesn't see balconies on the floorplan for the northside; this was addressed by the applicant. The distance between this project and the Alexander was discussed; this building will be 42 feet from the lot line. The parking spaces in the back of the building will be for compact cars only. The length of the parking spaces were discussed, noting there will be 16 feet plus a few feet for overhang. The parking spaces inside the garage will be 9 x 18 feet. There will be 232 units and the applicant still needs to work through the shared parking agreement. Chairperson Toney shared her concern that the 13 units added on the 6th floor will result in perhaps 20

vehicles. The number of spots required is 300 and the project will have 313 based on the zoning text and shared parking agreement. Continental Real Estate explained they intend to keep pH7 involved for the duration of the project. They plan to dive into the documents and create details and will create conceptual plans. Furthermore, there is an understanding that costs will influence some of those details and that details will be presented the next time this application is before the Board.

Ms. Cunningham stated it could be read into the record some kind of consensus that certain conditions have been satisfied, and this would not be a vote. There was discussion about how to move forward and the jurisdiction of various boards.

Ms. Strasser stated her belief that there was a consensus amongst Board members regarding conditions 2 and 4-7, that the massing and scale conditions have been met.

Mr. Scott reiterated his opinion that the applicant has met the specific conditions.

Ms. Rose and Ms. Bokor discussed that condition 1 is all encompassing of details.

Mr. Heyer indicated that each board member has stated his/her opinion that the conditions have been met satisfactorily.

The applicant asked that request be Tabled.

Motion to Table by Ms. Strasser, second by Mr. Hall; roll call: Strasser–Yes, Scott–Yes, Heyer–Yes, Hall–Yes, Toney–Yes.

Ms. Toney stated this application will be on an upcoming regular agenda, not as part of a special meeting.

The project will not be on the agenda for the regular February ARB meeting and will not be on the February 22, 2024 BZAP meeting until details are worked out. However, the project may be back for the March ARB meeting; this will be the earliest that the project will be on the meeting agenda.

6) Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned.