



## **Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes**

**May 9, 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, Mr. Scott, Chairperson Toney

### **3) Approval of Minutes**

Ms. Bokor indicated that Chairperson Toney's requested changes to the April meeting Minutes had been made and the revised document was posted online.

**Motion to approve Minutes from the March, 2024 meeting by Mr. Heyer, second by Mr. Scott; Hall–Yes, Heyer–Yes, Scott–Yes, Toney–Yes.**

**Motion to approve Minutes from the April, 2024 meeting by Mr. Hall, second by Mr. Heyer; Heyer–Yes, Hall–Yes, Scott–Yes, Toney–Yes.**

### **4) Public Comment**

There were no Public Comments.

### **5) Old Business**

Chairperson Toney asked that there not be repeat testimony from prior meetings and that Board and audience members refrain from discussion after the meeting has adjourned.

**Motion to approve ARB-24-2, ARB-24-8, ARB-24-13, ARB-24-16, BZAP-24-12 as Consent Agenda items by Mr. Hall, second by Mr. Scott; Hall–Yes, Heyer–Yes, Scott–Yes, Toney–Yes.**

1) Application Number: BZAP - 23-23

Address: 2200 E Main

Applicant: Ryan Pearson

Owner: Continental Real Estate Cos.

Request: The applicant is seeking design review and a recommendation to the Board of Zoning and Planning for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the 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 Special Meeting. A condition of approval was the return of the applicant to the ARB to review changes that address the ARB conditions for the building design. The applicant will be giving the Board an update on progress and conditions of approval.

Chairperson Toney explained that the Board would be hearing an update on the conditions but would not be discussing the overall project.

Ms. Bokor recounted the history of this application before the Board, the various conditions that had been addressed, and explained the outstanding condition was ARB-1: The Applicant returns to the ARB with material boards and samples.

Mr. Hockstock was sworn in and stated he was present to discuss materials, and that the applicant will be back before the board at a future date to discuss ARB 8.

Mr. Pauling was sworn in and discussed the physical materials and digital images he would be presenting. He explained that there will be two colors of brick and associated mortar colors; these will be guides in the event anything needs to change. Mr. Pauling stated other materials are aluminum railings with double top style, metal louvers, aluminum storefront anodized black color, black vinyl windows, canamould trim, and aluminum composite material canopy. He discussed the cementitious siding and random Plank. Grout colors for the brick were mentioned, and he explained locations for brick detailing along the Main Street facade, as well as coursing, a medallion, and recesses.

Kathy Skolnik was sworn in and asked if the building would be real brick; Mr. Pauling indicated that standard brick would be used throughout the entire building.

Gloria Higgins, 2202 Bryden, was sworn in and asked if the overhang above the first story would be blue; Mr. Pauling confirmed that the item will be blue.

Janie Blank, 500 S. Parkview, was sworn in and stated she enjoys the red brick and feels it would be better over the darker color.

Mr. Hall shared that he likes the color and direction in which the design is going, including the brick color. He asked about the use of metal and if elevations were lining up with the renderings.

Mr. Pauling detailed the 6 inch exposure metal siding, cast stone, cementitious siding, and random lay metal vertical siding. Mr. Hall stated he would like to see a better depiction in the renderings.

Mr. Heyer shared he was disappointed that there was not follow through on his request to look at various brick colors. Mr. Pauling said various color combinations were studied and the presented choice was preferred by the client.

Mr. Heyer explained he feels the pittedness of the red brick is problematic and that the brick needs to be one that has straight definition for safety purposes. He said the definition will disappear with the pittedness of the brick, and the joints will look terrible. He said he feels this is the wrong facing for an urban structure. Mr. Heyer said the details for the darker brick had been modified at the retail and restaurant level, and he said he feels this is going in the wrong direction in terms of human proportion. He commented on the misproportion of the window on the second floor of the two story element. Mr. Heyer reiterated that he would have liked to see different brick combinations and that the red brick is too rough.

Mr. Scott indicated he appreciated the material quality and stated he agrees with many of Mr. Heyer's comments. He said he appreciates the attention to details but in the particular facade, there is a lot going on; Mr. Scott mentioned he appreciates that these are included in the design. Mr. Scott discussed the variety of colors and materials and said he feels like the design is busy; he stated he would like to see a more realistic rendering. Mr. Scott questioned the permanence of the blue awning; he said he would rather this be a more neutral highlight, and one material was referenced and discussed. Mr. Pauling explained why the variety of materials were chosen. Mr. Scott said he would like to see things more finetuned. Mr. Scott mentioned the various railings and said he would expect different railings in the commercial and residential areas of the building. Mr. Pauling gave rationale for the railing choices and he and Mr. Scott discussed this.

Per Mr. Scott's request, Mr. Pauling described the proposed brickwork and other elements of the design on the west elevation, including the proposed addition of a steel beam. Mr. Scott stated that he is not convinced the proposed infill panels are the correct material and that he does not feel the panels between the windows are necessary. Mr. Pauling described some pieces are intentional to create verticality; Mr. Heyer said that recessed brick would achieve the same result, and Mr. Scott agreed. Mr. Pauling expressed his thoughts on this.

Chairperson Toney said she agreed with much of what had already been said, and indicated she was worried about the proposed windows for a variety of reasons and asked if other options had been explored. Mr. Pauling mentioned other colors will fade and said they felt the black was a better baseline because it tied in with other colors. He mentioned cost and said they have found a product that they like, fits within the budget, and that he can bring in a sample. The Main Street facade windows will have different windows, although they will still be black. Chairperson Toney wanted to ensure that all details will be incorporated into the drawings.

Mr. Heyer discussed colors that would enhance the red brick.

Mr. Hall stated his concern about the details around the parking garage on the west elevation. Mr. Pauling clarified the vehicular entrances and answered Mr. Hall's questions.

Mr. Pauling answered Mr. Heyer's question regarding Juliet balcony railings.

Kathy Sklonik asked why there was time and detail put into the front facade but less so put into the side that faces The Alexander; she asked if it could be softened. Chairperson Toney indicated that prior conversation led to this, that there will be plantings, and that typically, buildings are more ornate on the front. Board members indicated they were grateful for the brick. Ms. Skolnik said she was hoping for more softness.

The Alexander's footprint was discussed.

Mr. Scott summarized that he appreciates the materials and would like to see revisions to the details and the next level of renderings.

Mr. Pauling mentioned the schedule for moving the project forward and stated they will need to address concerns while continuing to progress to get things moving in the field; there is an expectation that most of the conditions are met and they are looking for some relief to receive permission to demolish from the ZAP.

Mr. Heyer said conditions 1-7 have been satisfied and 8 will need to wait, but that they should be able to go back to BZAP. He explained it is not uncommon for the ARB to continue looking at these types of details.

Ms. Cunningham described the procedure for moving forward and suggested a Findings of Fact with specific nuances and Ms. Bokor and Ms. Rose gave additional information.

Chairperson Toney said information is available on the City's website and that some details may change.

The Findings of Fact and Decision of the Board for Application Number BZAP-23-23 for property located at 2200 East Main Street: The Architecture Review Board recommends to the Board of Zoning and Planning that the conditions number 1-7 have been met, subject to all additional architecture refinement, return for recommendations to the Board of Zoning and Planning, and condition 8 cannot yet be determined and is subject to future tenant.

The applicant understood the Findings of Fact.

**Motion to approve Findings of Fact by Mr. Heyer, second by Mr. Hall; roll call: Hall–Yes, Scott–Yes, Heyer–Yes, Toney–Yes.**

Ms. Bokor discussed availability of drawings online and Ms. Rose mentioned an upcoming meeting.

2) Consent Agenda Item

Application Number: ARB-24-2

Address: 148 S. Ardmore

Applicant: Seth Hanft

Owner: Seth Hanft

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural Review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for 2nd story addition at the rear of the principal structure. This applicant was before the Board for a conceptual review in March.

**Motion to approve ARB-24-2, ARB-24-8, ARB-24-13, ARB-24-16, BZAP-24-12 as Consent Agenda items by Mr. Hall, second by Mr. Scott; Hall–Yes, Heyer–Yes, Scott–Yes, Toney–Yes.**

3) Consent Agenda Item

Application Number: ARB-24- 8

Address: 505 N Drexel

Applicant: Brenda Parker

Owner: John & Abby Mally

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural Review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of a new second floor dormer at the front & rear of the house to add a third bedroom, bath, & laundry and a new front porch, an office addition to the south, and a mudroom addition at the north.

**Motion to approve ARB-24-2, ARB-24-8, ARB-24-13, ARB-24-16, BZAP-24-12 as Consent Agenda items by Mr. Hall, second by Mr. Scott; Hall–Yes, Heyer–Yes, Scott–Yes, Toney–Yes.**

4) Application Number: BZAP-24- 9

Address: 129 S Cassingham

Applicant: Brenda Parker

Owner: John & Stacey Barnard

Request: The applicant is seeking a recommendation to BZAP for a Certificate of Appropriateness to allow second & third floor additions as well as single-story addition at the south.

Ms. Parker was sworn in.

Ms. Bokor said this application had been before the Board at the previous meeting and said the Board agreed that there needed to be changes to the massing. Ms. Bokor said the roofline should still be brought down and mentioned changing some of the windows.

Ms. Parker displayed and explained resubmitted drawings.

Mr. Scott said the front porch will be a dominating feature and stated the lower elevation is more successful. He discussed the bay window. Ms. Parker described the way the bays join.

Chairperson Toney suggested reducing the size of the window but Mr. Scott suggested this is more of a massing issue. Mr. Heyer stated his opinion that this is a problem of the eaves of the second floor. He suggested rafter tails and larger overhang with a low sloped roof. He said he is not convinced that this is too tall.

The creation of additional site plans was discussed.

Mr. Heyer stated his belief that the proportions are fine but the roof condition should be resolved.

Mr. Hall said he believes this is a better approach and that he is fine with the height and the hip roof. He said that a three dimensional study will help finesse this project.

The applicant requested the application be Tabled.

**Motion to Table this application to the June 13, 2024 meeting by Mr. Hall, second by Mr. Scott; Scott–Yes, Heyer–Yes, Hall–Yes, Toney–Yes.**

5) Application Number: ARB-24- 9

Address: 236 N Columbia

Applicant: John Behal

Owner: Yoaz Saar

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural Review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish an existing home and replace with a new home.

Ms. Bokor reviewed the process for removal of existing structures and displayed a flow Chart.

Kyle Katz, John Behal, and Yoaz Saar were sworn in.

Mr. Behal and Ms. Bokor discussed the engineering report and the Board's processes.

Mr. Behal stated the applicant did look at renovating the house but that this was not done due to the client's needs. He mentioned historical significance and acknowledged that there are a few interesting things about the home but stated it is average and does not meet Bexley's bar for

significance. He said many other homes that received permission for demolition were in much worse condition than this house but said that “shape” does not determine whether or not something can be demolished, as per the Bexley code.

Ms. Bokor explained that Board members who were absent at the last meeting have reviewed the testimony, video, and minutes from that meeting. She stated she felt it was necessary to have a City-hired architect complete an evaluation and therefore Joe Kuspan is present. Furthermore, she mentioned the structural report and that there is additional information in the file.

Mr. Behal said he did not have new things to discuss based on architectural significance.

Ms. Cunningham discussed the validity of a letter without the author present to testify. Mr. Scott stated that the majority of the letter in question is based on professional opinion, and he is comfortable considering the letter because it arrived sealed, although he did not want to set a precedent. Ms. Bokor discussed another letter that had been accepted. Mr. Behal said members had asked for a structural report but did not state that the engineer needed to be present. Chairperson Toney apologized for this and indicated that navigating the legal requirements has been challenging for Board members. Ms. Cunningham stated that it would typically be required that the author or expert be present, but the Board can choose to accept the letter even if he/she is not. It was determined that the applicant would present information and then Board questions would be heard.

Kyle Katz, 271 N. Columbia—stated his history of living nearby this property and his background as a commercial real estate developer typically involves adaptive reuse. He said he supports the demolition of this property based on the proposed replacement.

Mr. Behal mentioned the economic hardship that preserving this house would create and said that the applicant does not feel this home is architecturally significant. He stated he did not ask the neighbors to come again but that everyone living on the block feels the existing home should come down.

Joe Kuspan was sworn in and stated his opinion that the architect's work is spotty in terms of quality and variety of stylistic approaches. He said this home is not an exemplary example of the architect's work and mentioned the structural issue. He indicated that architects can transform the current home into a wonderful home; he stated he believes the home is salvageable, so long as any structural issues are resolved. He said that in terms of architectural significance, he does not believe it meets the criteria. Mr. Kuspan reiterated that he was not looking for structural deficiencies during the walk through, but structural issues would be problematic.

Mr. Scott asked the philosophical question about how many homes can be demolished before the Board comes to the conclusion that no more should be torn down. Regarding the historical or architectural significance, he stated that knowing this architect's influence in the neighborhood, he wondered how many homes the Board would feel comfortable demolishing.

Mr. Kuspan reiterated his belief that the home is worthy of preservation but that he does not believe this is the poster child for mid century modern architecture, but could be.

Ms. Cunningham described procedure.

Mr. Hall stated he listened to the testimony from the last meeting despite not being present. He said he has spent time looking at the home and stated he feels the home is architecturally significant and relevant because the Lazarus family commissioned this home. He said he feels the home is historically relevant and the home will need a special owner to take on a project like this, but the home does not have that person. He said he would like to know from the Lazarus family why they chose to build this house. He reiterated his belief that this home is architecturally significant.

Mr. Heyer explained he was not at the last meeting but did listen to the recording. He stated he was asked to serve as a Board member due to his experience as an architect. He said he feels everything needed to be said in the prior meeting was stated by Mr. Scott and Chairperson Toney. He mentioned he feels the home is architecturally and historically significant for the architect and history, and worthy of preservation. He also stated that there are a number of things he would like to see changed regarding how the Board process for demolition works, and that this process needs further adjustment and refinement, questioning why the applicant representing the homeowner in demolition is also the one promoting the new design. He said he would like to ask the City what the status of the historic preservation working group is and would be more appropriate in determining the demolition ordinance.

Mr. Scott said he also believes that the current home has architectural significance and history, and it should be discussed whether or not it is worthy of preservation.

Chairperson Toney shared she is in agreement with other Board members and referred to her comments from the previous meeting. She said she feels even more strongly about it given additional time to think about it.

**Motion to state Board members feel the current home is historically or architecturally significant by Mr. Scott, second by Mr. Hall; roll call: Hall–Yes, Heyer–Yes, Scott–Yes, Toney–Yes.**

Mr. Behal discussed the engineer's report and explained that the issue is that the home is built very low, although it is not built the way it was drawn. He mentioned the grade and that it does not meet code requirements and that there are rotten structural components. Mr. Behal said this was not visible because the home is mostly crawl space. It was stated this is the condition on one wall in the basement, but that it is hard to see without looking for it. Mr. Behal said the home has a faulty first floor and fault bearing walls.



Methods for fixing the issues and the challenges associated with them were discussed including lifting the home, lowering the grade on the entire lot, installing a \$3 million dollars renovation and addition, and demolition. He said that if the Board requires the property owner to retain the home on the lot given this engineer's report, that they have reduced the value of this property to zero.

Regarding property value, Mr. Scott stated that it is his belief that in its current state, the home will reduce value with its conditional wear. He said he feels that the home will lose value without significant improvements. Mr. Hall concurred with Mr. Scott's statements. Mr. Heyer said that reduction of property value is a guess but also stated he is not an expert in this field. However, generally, he said would agree but there are cases that are different. Mr. Scott said that the land value will not go down, but Mr. Hall stated this is dependent on the house. Chairperson Toney explained that she struggles because she is not a real estate agent but knows that the home did not go on the market. Mr. Saar explained he did not have an inspector prior to purchasing the home. Mr. Behal said they expected some issues with the home but did not know the extent until receiving this report.

Chairperson Toney stated that everything shared by the applicant is part of the applicant's agenda, and she would like to have a neutral party do an evaluation. Ms. Cunningham and Board members discussed expert testimony, witnesses, and the demolition criteria.

Mr. Behal stated the photos are not falsified.

Mr. Heyer said that what he is seeing in the photos and report is not the dire situation that the applicant is discussing. He also justified common details regarding the grade. He said in his opinion, the damage is minimal and repairable and that another opinion is warranted.

Ms. Bokor said she believes the ARB is the body that should be looking at this, but that if they do not feel they do not have enough information, Staff can get an expert. Ms. Cunningham stated this is the decision making board for this issue; members just need to apply the evidence and that they should ask for additional expertise if needed. Board members shared additional thoughts, as did Staff.

Mr. Hall gave his thoughts about the potential solutions stated in the engineer's report. He asked Mr. Saar about his intent when purchasing the home, who explained he and his wife wanted to purchase the home to be fixed or do something else. As they looked at the repair costs and problems, they realized it was not economically feasible to repair the home.

Mr. Behal stated he would prefer that the ARB vote with the option to take the BZAP for an appeal should the Board vote against the demolition. He also stated that he feels it would be illegal for the ARB to make the homeowner's keep the home.

Mr. Behal discussed costs for renovating this home versus a the proposal of a new home with the current client's program, and that remediation would cost more than a new home would cost. He said that he likes to renovate houses when he can, but the cost exceeds new construction.

Mr. Scott mentioned the new home was submitted for evaluation in relationship to demolition and the contextual siding relating to the unique siding of the house.

Mr. Hall said he wishes the architect would have gone through the efforts for the proposed house on the existing house. Mr. Hall discussed this further with Mr. Behal.

Mr. Saar indicated the potential safety impacts of the home.

Mr. Heyer indicated the criteria to approve a demolition is subjective and he doesn't feel the evaluation has strength for saving the current home.

Chairperson Toney agreed with what had been said and suggested waiting another month before making a decision and hearing a report from another engineer.

Mr. Behal indicated that he would like a vote.

Mr. Behal described his history before Boards for appeals for previous projects.

There was clarification about the criteria for demolition and potential remand back to the ARB.

Ms. Rose explained the timeline.

**Motion in the affirmative to put this to a vote by Mr. Heyer, second by Mr. Hall.**

There was discussion about the most appropriate motion.

**Motion that the additional criteria to determine the case for demolition being the evaluation of sustainable economic hardship has been met by Mr. Heyer, second by Mr. Hall; roll call: Heyer–No, due to lack of evidence and needing more substantiation for numbers 1, 2, and 3; Scott–No, due to lack of reduction of property value evidence submitted unreasonable short or long term maintenance cost submitted, the probably cost of construction for renovation and addition as submitted recently is unclear as comparable to the relationship of the new cost of construction and isn't a compelling reason for meeting the economic hardship criteria; Hall–No, due to lack of evidence to show that a reduction in property value, unreasonable maintenance cost, or the submitted estimated costs for restoration and addition but the cost comparatively speaking has not been presented and there is not enough evidence to make a decision; Toney–No, due to lacking evidence of reduction of property value, unreasonable maintenance costs, and enough information to show that the restoration preservation imposes unreasonable costs.**

Motion that the additional criteria to determine cause for demolition base on evaluation of unusual and compelling circumstances has been met by Mr. Heyer, second by Mr. Hall; roll call: Heyer–No, because structurally not a feasible replacement plan is superior to existing structure replacement plan more contextually compatible existing structure has adverse effect on neighbors structurally not feasible, the criteria has not been corroborated, replacement plan is superior to existing structure, the criteria has not been set or defined what superior, is replacement plan more contextually compatible, also the criteria has not been set for what more contextually compatible means, existing structure has adverse effect on neighbors and feels it is uncorroborated or not substantial criteria for passing; Scott–No, structurally it is not feasible and the letter looks towards future conditions and not adverse existing conditions and has not been corroborated by an independent structural engineer, the replacement plan is superior to the existing structure is subjective but is better contextual to the neighboring properties though not believing this is a strong enough argument for the uniqueness of the existing site, replacement plan is superior to existing structure which is related to design and maybe size and it is subjective to not outweighing the decision, replacement plan is more contextual and compatible – agrees that it fits in with the existing community and housing but does not claim or make the statement that the existing is negatively impacting the neighborhood, no evidence was submitted other than opinion that the existing structure has an adverse effect on neighbors, though it is recognized that a new structure would most likely improve the property value of the surrounding properties. Mr. Hall–No, due to insufficient evidence to show that it is structurally not feasible, replacement plan superiority to the replacement structure is subjective because the existing structure has not been evaluated from the perspective of a new design and there has been no due diligence about what can be done in comparison to the proposed replacement, and contextual compatibility, and there has not been evidence presented about an adverse effect to neighbors; Toney–No, structural infeasibility has not been substantiated by an independent party, the replacement plan is not superior to the existing structure because it is not a Van Fossen home of which there are only three in the city, replacement plan is not more architecturally compatible, there is no proof that the structure has adverse effects on neighbors.

Ms. Rose discussed next steps.

## **6) New Business:**

6) Application Number: ARB-24-12

Address: 2172 E Livingston

Applicant: Eric Jenison

Owner: Robert Dean Huffman

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural Review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for an addition to the front, modifications and a variance form the required front setback.

Eric Jenison was sworn in.

Mr. Sudy said the building plans have been adjusted and the applicant is intending to meet the ten foot setback and therefore is no longer seeking a variance. He stated the location has an existing pad and he highlighted site elements including curb cuts, the CS Zoning and guidelines about the Joint Livingston Avenue Plan which may become standards in the future. He mentioned designated parking spots and parking requirements, and the site is looking for greenspace. He explained these changes will start to set a precedent.

This project does not need to go to the BZAP but does need to go to the Tree and Public Gardens Commission.

Ms. Bokor gave a brief Staff Report and Mr. Jenison explained the owner wants to enhance the space with a more approachable entrance. Mr. Jenison stated a ribbed metal panel is being requested.

Mr. Huffman was sworn in and said there was greenspace on the corner of the parking lot when he acquired the building but he removed it for parking spaces because there is not enough room in the parking lot, and therefore cars are parked on the sidestreets. He explained he would like to purchase the lot behind his shop to create a parking lot and said he has grown out of the location but does not intend to leave because he owns the building. It was explained that the existing sign will be replaced and Mr. Sudy said that the advantage of gaining greenspace is greater than parking issues. Mr. Hoffman explained that his business is busy.

Mr. Sudy stated that the current configuration of the property would not be allowed today if it was being built.

Mr. Scott stated that he supports the screening but noted that there is an issue with the ramp and lack of ADA parking. It was determined that parking may need to be adjusted. Mr. Scott mentioned he feels this design is an improvement over the existing facade but it feels like an enclosed screened in porch and Mr. Hoffman explained. Mr. Scott stated he is not sold on the new look.

Mr. Hall said the proposed project is a definite improvement but wonders if the ramp could be better configured and gave ideas about the roof.

Ramp and accessibility were discussed, particularly door width, and interior designs were discussed.

Mr. Heyer made suggestions to the proposed design and windows were discussed. He gave examples of ways the building can be freshened up with siding. Mr. Huffman discussed his desire for a public bathroom. Mr. Heyer said he feels the design may be incomplete and future plans should be considered now.

Chairperson Toney said she is in agreement with Mr. Heyer and she encouraged the applicant to fix existing windows instead of creating a hallway that will act as a storage location.

Findings of Fact and Decision of the Board for Application Number BZAP-24-12 for property located at 2172 E Livingston Ave.: The Architecture Review Board finds that a Certificate of Appropriateness should be issued for the proposed Improvements, which are architecturally compatible, subject to the condition that the applicant work with the Design Consultant on modifications referenced in the meeting on May 9, 2024, and that there be a landscape plan in accordance with the Joint Livingston Avenue plan subject to review by the Landscape Consultant.

The applicant understood the Findings of Fact.

**Motion to approve the Findings of Fact by Mr. Heyer, second by Mr. Hall; roll call: Scott–Yes, Hall–Yes, Heyer–Yes, Toney–Yes.**

7) Consent Agenda Item Application

Number: ARB-24-13

Address: 176 S Stanwood

Applicant: Amy Lauerhass

Owner: Ed & Sheila Straub

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural Review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for a one story addition to the rear of the principal structure and a garage addition.

**Motion to approve ARB-24-2, ARB-24-8, ARB-24-13, ARB-24-16, BZAP-24-12 as Consent Agenda items by Mr. Hall, second by Mr. Scott; Hall–Yes, Heyer–Yes, Scott–Yes, Toney–Yes.**

8) Application Number: ARB-24-14

Address: 2357 Bexley Park

Applicant: Guy Allison

Owner: Meara Alexa Simon

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural Review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish deteriorated garage structure and existing wood deck and replace with attached garage addition and covered patio.

Ms. Rose detailed the original design and stated that this is a new design.

Mr. Simon was sworn in.

Ms. Rose indicated that the new design meets lot coverage limits; the design was viewed and displayed and challenges were discussed, including the setback.

Mr. Hall commented on the transitions and said he feels the design can be cleaner. He stated that the massing of the rear elevation looks good.

Mr. Heyer asked about next steps and stated he would like to see this again, but he would feel comfortable if it was approved with conditions. Mr. Heyer indicated this will effectively be a two-story garage and extra height is being requested. The master suite addition was discussed, as were other aspects of the design. Mr. Heyer stated it would be helpful to see the floorplan. He discussed the dormer and a lowered roof, as well as details.

It was determined that this would be reviewed again.

Ms. Rose explained that she would send out a notice about this application and that it did not need to be Tabled to a specific new date.

This application will be Tabled.

**Agreement to Table; roll call: Scott–Yes, Hall–Yes, Heyer–Yes, Toney-Yes.**

9) Application Number: ARB-24-15

Address: 1004 Vernon

Applicant: Cory Smith

Owner: Cory Smith

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural Review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for a two story addition to the rear of the principal structure.

Mr. Smith and Mr. Babo were sworn in. Ms. Bokor said she has no conceptual issues with this project but that she would like to work with the applicant on proportions and aspects; she is comfortable working with the applicant on the project.

Mr. Heyer asked Ms. Bokor to clarify her thoughts about the dormers; she mentioned changing the pitch and bringing the eave down so that it is lower than the home, and including a real dormer. Ms. Bokor indicated she did not believe the dormers were drawn correctly.

The roof is new and it will be matched; the siding is vinyl.

Findings of Fact and Decision of the Board for Application Number 24-15 for property located at 1004 Vernon: The Board finds that a Certificate of Appropriateness should be issued for the two-story addition with the following condition: that the modifications discussed at the May ARB meeting be reflected in new plans subject to final review and approval by the Design Consultant.

The applicant understood the Findings of Fact.

**Motion to approve the Findings of Fact by Mr. Scott, second by Mr. Hall; roll call: Heyer–Yes, Scott–Yes, Hall–Yes, Toney–Yes.**

10) Consent Agenda Item

Application Number: ARB-24-16

Address: 2557 East Broad

Applicant: Stephanie Hayward

Owner: Kelly Gebert

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural Review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for a sunroom addition to the rear of the principal structure.

**Motion to approve ARB-24-2, ARB-24-8, ARB-24-13, ARB-24-16, BZAP-24-12 as Consent Agenda items by Mr. Hall, second by Mr. Scott; Hall–Yes, Heyer–Yes, Scott–Yes, Toney–Yes.**

11) Consent Agenda Item

Application Number: BZAP-24-12

Address: 319 S Columbia

Applicant: Amy Lauerhass

Owner: Debbie & Mike Nickoli

Request: The applicant is seeking a recommendation to the Board of Zoning and Planning for a Certificate of Appropriateness for an addition to the home and a variance for the replacement garage to include a 2nd floor.

**Motion to approve ARB-24-2, ARB-24-8, ARB-24-13, ARB-24-16, BZAP-24-12 as Consent Agenda items by Mr. Hall, second by Mr. Scott; Hall–Yes, Heyer–Yes, Scott–Yes, Toney–Yes.**

**7) Other Business**

Discussion: Murals on Main Street, Megan Meyer, Development Director

Ms. Meyer introduced herself and stated she is helping orchestrate the Mural Fest planning committee. She indicated her intent to make the Board aware of the project. She stated a BZAP application will be submitted next month which will include actual concepts. She explained the concept of the project is to bring energy to pockets where energy is lacking; she mentioned the members of the volunteer planning committee. Ms. Meyer gave an update to the artist selection process, site location, and site maintenance.

Mr. Scott stated he is in support, as did Chairperson Toney.

**8) Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned.

