



Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes

Thursday, February 11, 2021

6:00 PM

1) Call to Order

A) Zoom link for meeting participation: [click here](#)

The meeting started at 6:00 pm. To view the recording on our YouTube channel, click here: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iEKLZ1pKQzc>

2) Roll Call of Members

Larry Helman, Peter Bardwell, Pete Scott, Bill Heyer, and Suzanne Toney

Bill Heyer was present but arrived after roll call was taken.

3) Approval of Minutes

Bardwell moved to approve the Minutes, seconded by Larry Helman.

Vote: Helman, Toney, Bardwell, Scott, Toney

4) Public Comments

Kurt Lape said he had an application he submitted and hoped to get on this month's agenda for 2699 E. Main Street. He was not familiar with the processes for submittals and wanted to make sure he was doing the right thing. Rose said after reviewing that it was for staff review and approval and staff will follow up with him. Bokor said that staff approved it on February 3rd and can call him to go over the details.

Rose said that 50 N Drexel had been brought before BZAP and was remanded back to the ARB for final design review and approval. 2404 Fair will also proceed to BZAP. Bokor said staff worked hard with the applicants but wanted to restate why they are Consent Agenda items. For 50 N. Drexel, it was approved for a variance by BZAP with a remand back to the ARB. They changed the treatment of the façade per the Board's request and took the final step to making the entire wall facing Drexel all stone. For 2404 Fair, the consensus on the connector piece was that the Board liked the new design and would forward as a recommendation to BZAP.

Helman asked about the stone facing Drexel. Bokor said it was on the west elevation. Helman asked what would happen if they lose landscaping. Bokor said both materials will be blocked and the original structure has full walls of stone and stucco, that the glass and sides match house, and

are the same proportions more consistent with the original home.

Todd Parker, applicant for 50 N. Drexel, was sworn in. He wanted to rebut what was mentioned and said that in the latest drawings the entire west face is all stone, and the north and south faces of the pool house are all stucco and no stone. Scott said that what was reviewed prior to the Consent Agenda are not accurate. Bokor said staff did not get the drawings until this morning, and she shared the drawings with the Board now. The side elevations will be stucco to match the house. Toney asked if this application should be taken off the Consent Agenda. Bokor said after talking with the applicant, the block of the whole wall is more in-keeping with the architecture of the original house. Scott said he did not disagree with that and is okay with the drawings, he just had not seen them until now. Bokor said the application can stay on the Consent Agenda or could be moved to the regular agenda for review.

5) Old Business

A) Application No.: BZAP-20-47 – **Consent Agenda Item**

Applicant: Todd Parker

Owner: Shylee Grossman

Location: 50 N. Drexel Ave.

ARB Request: The applicant is seeking architectural review and a recommendation to the Board of Zoning and Planning, to allow a pool house in the front side yard.

B) Application No.: BZAP-20-46 – **Consent Agenda Item**

Applicant: Brenda Parker

Owner: Tyler & Allizon Chamblin

Address: 2404 Fair Ave.

ARB Request: The applicant is seeking architectural review and a recommendation of a Certificate of Appropriateness to the BZAP for a new 2-story addition to the rear of the principal structure.

6) New Business

A) **Application No.:** ARB-20-48 (Tabled and will be removed from ARB Agenda, as under the jurisdiction of BZAP)

Applicant: Mike Shannon

Owner: St. Charles Preparatory School

Address: 2010 E. Broad St.

ARB Request: The applicant is seeking architectural review and approval to allow addition parking on the east side of the building, which will include underground water detention.

B) **Application No.:** ARB-21-1 – **Consent Agenda Item**

Applicant: Brenda Parker

Owner: Demetrios Michaelides

Address: 160 S. Merkle

ARB Request: The applicant is seeking architectural review and approval for a new front porch.

C) **Application No.:** ARB-21-2 – **Consent Agenda Item**

Applicant: Brenda Parker

Owner: Godfrey Mendes

Address: 112 S. Parkview

ARB Request: The applicant is seeking architectural review and a Certificate of Appropriateness to allow a first floor addition with a bay above. The applicant is also seeking architectural review to allow a second-floor addition with exterior staircase at the east end of the detached garage.

D) **Application No.:** ARB-21-4 – **Consent Agenda Item**

Applicant: John Hamlett

Owner: Doug & Amy Grace Ulman

Address: 2371 Commonwealth Pk. S.

ARB Request: The applicant is seeking architectural review and a Certificate of Appropriateness for a new 1-story screened porch addition to the rear of the principal structure and skylights on garage roof.

E) **Application No.:** ARB-21-5

Applicant: Tom Beardsley

Owner: Russel Abrams

Address: 929 Vernon

ARB Request: The applicant is seeking architectural review and approval to allow a pergola on a portion of the existing deck.

Bokor reviewed staff comments with the Board, which were as follows: This application is for a trellis that would be near or up against the house. Staff did get drawings after the agenda was posted and were included in the staff report. Staff is confused about the look of a trellis on top of a trellis and where the exact placement is.

Rose added that the location of the existing hot tub and pool previously had a room addition. While creating that, they removed the trellis and included a deck, which would be partially covered with the proposed trellis. It would abut the principal structure.

Keith Moeller was sworn in. The applicant reviewed comments with the board, which were as follows: The proposal is to build a pergola structure working with existing posts which is why it would be double stacked. There are two sets of beams. The existing posts are in line with each other. The first set of beams were created to get to the posts and the second set are to get the rafters in an appropriate direction, which would attach to the house in two spots. The addition sits past pergola. The roof line bumps out and is not able to attach to that area but is attached to the house on the back wall. Above the window where the double beam is a new post will be put pocketed to the wall. Toney asked what

the reason was for boards to go both ways. The applicant said they wanted the top rafters going in a certain direction and were working with existing posts. They are not in line with each other so they could not run a single beam connecting to house. They ran in opposite directions so they have to put a new beam on top of that. If the deck was not there and they were starting from scratch they would not do a double stack but proposed this rendering due to the location of the current posts.

Bardwell said he sensed this needed to go into extraordinary detail and was hard to absorb in the time allotted. He suggested remanding this to the City's Design Consultant if allowable.

Rose asked about along the fence line and how it exceeded 6' in height. She wanted to know if they will be cut to a typical height for a fence. The applicant said he had intended to use them for attaching a sail to, and that they were there before this design was proposed. He is cutting them to the height the homeowner requested. Rose said she was just surprised why they are sticking up so high along the fence line and was not sure who approved that. Bokor asked the Board if they were okay to attach the pergola. Scott said he cannot approve it in this state, and there were other ways to achieve this. The double structure is a problem and he does not see how that is appropriate. Scott respects that the applicants are trying to find a solution but there are other ways. He is reluctant to remand this back to the Residential Design Consultant. Bardwell agreed and stated that it did not make sense to take up the Board's time to solve something relatively obscure. He asked if there was a desire among the members to call for a Table or a remand but said discussion at this point is futile.

Helman agreed and said that there were unresolved issues. He was not sure how it meets the roof on the side and that there should be additional posts to balance this out. He is not sure of the height and does not find the current design acceptable. Helman added it may be wise to start a new design. Bardwell asked to call for a Table. Toney said that the applicant can ask for a Table and bring the application back with a new design or he could ask the members to vote on this. If the application were voted down, the applicant would have to submit a new application. The applicant said that the best solution is to find a new solution and said there was no reason to vote on it. Toney said staff could help him simplify the proposal but cannot design it for him. The applicant agreed to Table the application.

Bardwell moved to Table, seconded by Helman

Vote: Helman, Heyer, Bardwell, Scott, Toney

F) **Application No.:** ARB-21-6 – **Consent Agenda Item**

Applicant: Michael Steele

Owner: Michael Steele

Address: 93 S. Cassingham

ARB Request: The applicant is seeking architectural review and approval for a 3rd floor dormer addition.

G) **Application No.:** BZAP-21-01

Applicant: Robert Miller

Owner: Georgia Ruch

Address: 46 N. Parkview

ARB Request: The applicant is seeking architectural review and a recommendation for a Certificate of Appropriateness to the BZAP for an addition connecting the principal structure to the detached garage.

Bokor reviewed staff comments, which were as follows: This application is for a recommendation to BZAP for a connector piece that connects the house to the garage. There were some concerns noted in the staff report and to the designer, among them being the grid pattern on the windows are different from one side to the next. The applicant agreed to match the grid patterns. Staff does not completely understand the variation in roof line and feel that there could be more of a simple connector piece designed for this application.

Brent Racer was sworn in. The applicant discussed the design details with the Board for this application which were as follows: The designer was originally trying to cascade from the upper level to the pool level, that's where there is the stepping down of eaves heights. After talking about this, it has been revised and put into a much simpler design. Looking at the addition, on the top right, that roof profile is to be consistent all the way across to create a singular roof profile from the garage to the original addition and will tie into the existing porch at the garage. Bardwell said that this is difficult to understand drawn as two-dimensional. He will review additional information but what is presented is not sufficient to render a decision. Helman asked for clarification to what part of the addition and structure this is proposed from. The applicant said from the two-story addition to the garage. Bardwell said that two-dimensional representation does not afford a clear understanding of what is intended. Heyer said he would like to see the site plan and see the beam system this tucks into. He asked where the columns were for support. The applicant said there were columns coming off the existing garage. Heyer said he did not see them in this plan. Bardwell said there were unanswered questions and that this was not ready for public review. He suggested to remand this to the City's Design Consultant for further refinement and is content with this not coming back to the Board. Helman said this is a special house and the design needs to be done well. Bokor said she would be more comfortable if the applicant sent an email with revisions and if she can not understand the drawings, she would feel more comfortable Tabling this. Rose wanted to clarify that this is a recommendation for review and Zoning approval. Bokor said it could go to BZAP and see if the variance is acceptable, and then remand back to ARB for final design review. Scott said there is a complex challenge with the connection and the building heights. He would like the applicant to work with staff and continue design development, and if it gets through BZAP then have it return to the ARB. Heyer would like to see it come back. Toney said it could get recommended to BZAP to see if the variance is approved and if so, it could come back to the ARB meeting in March with a revised design.

The Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law for Application No. BZAP-21-01 for the property located at 46 N. Parkview: Based on the testimony presented, the Board finds is appropriate to recommend this application to the Board of Zoning and Planning with the condition that it be remanded to the Architectural Review Board for final design review.

Scott moved to approve, seconded by Bardwell

Vote: Helman, Scott, Bardwell, Heyer, Toney

Scott said to add last minute submittals to the ARB retreat agenda. Bardwell agreed and said to resist temptation to design or accept designs on the fly. Bokor said she put out a Doodle poll for the next workshop and they can discuss that.

Russ Abrams, homeowner of 929 Vernon, asked why his application was Tabled. Bokor said that there was not enough detail to understand what was being built, which is why the application was Tabled. Helman said he had not been sworn in and this is at the end of the agenda. Bokor said that the case is done. Toney said they will adjourn the meeting and that Mr. Abrams can contact staff to review the Board's decision.

7) Adjourn

The meeting ended at 6:51 pm.