



Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes

Thursday, March 11, 2021

6:00 PM

1) Call to Order

Meeting began at 6:00 pm. Click this link to watch the recorded meeting on YouTube:
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qHL_c9loQZc

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

B) attachment: staff Report on applications

2) Roll Call of Members

Roll Call: Pete Scott, Bill Heyer, Larry Helman, Peter Bardwell, Suzanne Toney

3) Public Comments

There were no public comments.

4) Approval of Minutes

Motion to Approve the Minutes: Peter Bardwell, seconded by Larry Helman

Vote: Pete Scott, Bill Heyer, Larry Helman, Peter Bardwell, Suzanne Toney

5) Consent Agenda

Eloise Buker, resident at 720 Grandon, was sworn in to speak regarding the project proposed for 724 Grandon which is part of the Consent Agenda. Dr. Buker and her husband are pleased with the project and happy with it. They think the design is perfect to protect privacy and the flow between two neighbors. They are both in support of it.

Motion made to Approve the Consent Agenda: Peter Bardwell, seconded by Bill Heyer

Vote: Pete Scott, Bill Heyer, Larry Helman, Peter Bardwell, Suzanne Toney

6) Old Business

7) New Business

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

Address: 929 Vernon Road

Applicant: Tom Beardsley/Keith Moeller

Owner: Russell Abrams

ARB Request: The applicant is seeking architectural review and approval for the addition of a cedar pergola on the existing deck. Please Note: this was tabled on Feb 11, 2021
Please Note: this was tabled on Feb 11, 2021

Consent Agenda Item

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

Address: 46 Parkview

Applicant: Robert Miller

Owner: Georgia Ruch

ARB Request: The applicant is seeking architectural review and approval of an addition that will connect the house to the garage. This application received approval for the variance at the February BZAP hearing with the condition that the applicant return to ARB for final design approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Consent Agenda Item

C) **Application No.:** BZAP -21-03

Address: 269 Ardmore

Applicant: Marica McKeel

Owner: Garrett

ARB Request: Addition and 2 story garage

Bokor reviewed staff comments with the Board, which were as follows: This applicant is for an addition to an existing home. This home is a traditional home and the applicant is proposing a contemporary addition to the back side as well as a contemporary garage. In terms of design, staff strives hard to not dictate a style but does look for things that show relationships between the two. For this addition, the applicant proposed including brick and following some of the shapes of the existing windows. Looking at the elevation, staff is not convinced that the view of the garage from the street speaks to the façade on the original home. Staff is also concerned about its size from an architectural perspective. It looks like a secondary home.

Rose reviewed background information for this application with the Board. Her comments were as follows: This application was originally filed as an ARB application. After going through the plans for the garage, staff noticed that the first floor exceeded the 10' story height limit. The applicant wants to match the addition of the house but also must meet the criteria for the Zoning Code for accessory structures. There is conflicting information. The roof of the addition of the house came within 10' of the detached garage. The applicant provided a survey which conflicts with the information in the application. The applicant is trying to meet all of the Codes so it runs through ARB but thought it was worthwhile to bring this before the ARB to hear discussion regarding the design before making changes to the garage.

Jacob Garrett and Marica McKeel were sworn in. Mr. Garrett grew up in this house and bought it from his parents. There is an existing addition that his parents put on and he is proposing to replace that addition with the one in this proposal. It is time to update the addition and the same with the garage. They are trying to merge classical architecture with a contemporary addition and a new garage. They have no intent submitting a design that is outside of the Zoning Code.

Toney wanted to confirm that the talk about a two-story garage needs to go to BZAP and this

discussion is just for architectural review. Bokor said that was correct. She said staff is concerned about the garage in terms of its massing. Helman said this is a small lot and seeking balance raises two issues: scale and compatibility. He questions the height and slope and said that there is a 6' fence and 14' of wall above that fence and questions its impact on neighboring properties. Helman said if style means the roof has to be 20' in uniformity then there are problems with the design of this garage. Bardwell said that as the garage use is shown it could become a separate residence and offered caution it could become an enforcement issue for the city. He added that in the future it could become a separate multi-family residential use.

Scott said that looking at elevations he did not get the concept how the existing and new relate. He said that the renderings the existing brick veneer on existing house shows that it aligns with the brick veneer proposed on the addition, and traditionally there would be an offset between the existing and new material. Mr. Garrett said that there is a break and it becomes vinyl siding. The applicant said that in her designs it aligns. She said that they were concerned about the lines lining up but also were concerned about two different materials coming together. They wanted to keep the same of the new addition as with the old addition and that the two materials should not butt up against each other. She added that there is a special detail that will come with that. What they cannot see is the wood material on garage.

Heyer said that Bexley garages should like Bexley garages modern or not, and that this needs to be rethought. He is concerned about the second floor eaves alignment on the addition and that the overlap looks disjointed; where the new eaves band is much taller than the existing so the tops of the eaves align. He thinks a nicer detail for them to consider would be breaking down the scale of the eaves, and have two faces instead of one. He understands that modern architecture is meant to be bold but that they should keep the design in the spirit of staying with the detail of the existing home. Mr. Garrett asked if the line of sight from the area above garage where the cars are parked differs from other two-story garages in the alley. He said there is the same concern there and the same vantage point. He said that the proposed garage is in keeping with other garages in the neighborhood but this differentiates from other garages because this has a more defined living space above on the upper floor.

Rose defined the criteria for this to be considered a dwelling unit and said that Code allows for two of three amenities. Proposals which include one or two of those criteria would not be considered a separate dwelling unit.

Helman said the Board has seen garages that have dormers and they are set within a roof. The roof becomes the dominant element and the dormer subsets the roof. He said that this design still has a ridgeline and some compatibility in relation to them but is 20' of the vertical face and does not slope away or change. He suggested the architect provide a rendering which shows the property line on front and shows the proposed height in relation to the surrounding garages. Bardwell echoed Helman and Bokor and said the Board does not dictate style but the issue they are addressing is proximity. This proposal is so very close that sensitivity becomes a major factor. Bokor said staff is not unconvinced that they cannot do a flat roof but the size and lack of relationship to the house are her concerns. Helman said he wondered whether it could be done on a lower level or do a roof pitch to tie with the existing house pitch with dormers coming out of that. He would like to see a drawing to see it in relation to other adjacent garages.

The applicant asked what the Board would think if they brought two designs to the next meeting. Toney said she has no problem with that and the worst that could happen would be to have a split vote, but to do it if the applicant felt it would be helpful to gain more knowledge. The Applicant asked to Table the application and return with revisions to the design.

Motion made to Table this application: Peter Bardwell, seconded by Bill Heyer
Vote: Pete Scott, Bill Heyer, Larry Helman, Peter Bardwell, Suzanne Toney

- D) **Application No.:** ARB-21-8
Address: 987 Francis
Applicant: Suncraft Corporation, Inc.
Owner: John and Julie Mosca
ARB Request: Room addition

Consent Agenda Item

- E) **Application No.:** BZAP-21-8
Address: 489 Northview
Applicant: Josh Predovich
Owner: Amy Wanzo and Chris Bell
ARB Request: Addition

Consent Agenda Item

- F) **Application No.:** ARB-21-9
Address: 724 Grandon
Applicant: Brian Zingleman
Owner: Jeff and Molly Benson
ARB Request: Room Addition and deck

Consent Agenda Item

- G) **Application No.:** ARB-21-10
Address: 821 Grandon
Applicant: Taylor Pfeffenberger
Owner:
ARB Request: 2 ½ story Addition 3rd floor dormer

Bokor reviewed staff comments with the Board, which were as follows: When she saw the first drawings her reaction was that this is a skinny house and a tall roof. She asked the applicant if there was a three-dimensional rendering that more accurately shows the massing. New drawings were submitted and shared. Staff has discomfort with the dormers on the front and the way the windows were situated. The applicant sent two options. One other concern is the back staircase, and she is not sure what to think of it. Staff is comfortable working with the applicant but would like to hear what the Board has to say.

Taylor Pfeffenberger and Lisa Haas were sworn in. The applicant said that the side elevation gives the best idea of what the addition looks like. Bokor said that the applicant did revise the columns and the roof on the addition based on their conversation. Helman asked if there were dimensions to the proposed height. The applicant said 30'. The existing house is 24' and they are proposing to add 6', not to the front of the house but towards the back. Toney asked if the applicant assessed the height of the houses around this property. The applicant said the house to the south is approximately the same height and the one to the north is much shorter. Helman

said it was worth exploring alternatives to the gable proposed on the back of the house. He said it is a small structure leaning into a large structure. He likes the idea of the proposal but has issues with its scale and compatibility. Heyer said he is also concerned with the scale and said this is a street with two-story and one-and-a-half-story homes. He looked at the elevations and does not think it is appropriate for the neighborhood. He recommends to rethink this where the addition is subservient to the two-story house. The applicant the neighbors were contacted and none were offended by the design. They are trying to keep the front looking similar to the way it looks now and keep the addition to the back of the home. It would be a two-and-a-half-story home. The intent for the long roof on the back is to have a place to install solar panels and they do not want to add a dormer in because of that. Heyer said this should be sensitive to the scale and in context with the neighborhood. He said that the character of the neighborhoods are one of the reasons people move to Bexley.

Scott said that scale is one of his concerns and he is not sure they are representing the proportions of property and proposed design accurately. He agrees with Heyer about a dormer on the attic space and would like to see revisions made in terms of options of changes to its scale. He is not a fan of the stairs on the back and that they add to the overall footprint and impact and looks large to the neighboring properties. He added that there is an opportunity for a break of the eaves line or some other feature on the rear elevation that is more appropriate than the proposed balcony on the upper deck. In relation to the long roof, he is not against the idea overall but needs to see more architectural elements to control the scale of the side elevations. The applicant said the owner is trying to get more interior space.

Bardwell said there are solutions here and is optimistic they can be found. He is not comfortable with the exterior stairs and echoes Scott's comments. There is a way to achieve what the owner wants without creating the exterior massing as proposed. He added that it looks awkward and suggested to find an alternative way to create additional space without creating what looks like a large extrusion and mass to the rear of the residence. Helman said that scale and context matters, and so does what the homeowner wants does too. He said that there needed to be a balance to achieve that. Toney said that new builds in South Bexley struggle with scale too and in the past the Board has recommended to break up the mass, like what they are commenting here for the applicant to do. She said to break up the boxiness of this and have it read more with the existing structure. The applicant said that the site is narrow and revising the proposal and turning the gable in the opposite direction would leave no usable room on the third floor. Toney said the applicant could come back next month with a new design and Table the application, and the changes made could be substantial or small. She said that Tabling the application would keep it moving, or the applicant could ask for a vote and if it did not pass, they would have to start over with a new design. The applicant asked to Table the application.

Motion made to Table this application: Peter Bardwell, seconded by Larry Helman
Vote: Pete Scott, Bill Heyer, Peter Bardwell, Larry Helman, Suzanne Toney

H) **Application No.:** ARB-21-11
Address: 887 College
Applicant: Tom Beardsley/Keith Moeller
Owner: Erica R Flinn
ARB Request: Porch replaced and expanded

Consent Agenda Item

- I) **Application No.:** ARB-21-12
Address: 130 S Remington
Applicant: Thaddeus Jones
Owner: John/ Collette Wirthman
ARB Request: Screened porch addition

Consent Agenda Item

- J) **Application No.:** ARB-21-13
Address: 2299 S Commonwealth
Applicant: Robert Raskin
Owner: Kumi & Joy Walker
ARB Request: 2-Story addition

Bokor reviewed staff comments with the Board, which were as follows: This application is for a conversion of an existing garage into a pool house and the addition of a garage onto the primary structure. There was not a lot of criticism on massing and scale but there were questions about color and window choices. Staff would like to be assured that design details would match existing.

Robert Raskin, Kumi Walker, Joy Walker, and Laura Watson were sworn in. The applicant said that the transformation will be amazing and that this project checks all of the boxes the owners were looking for. This is a classic Bexley home and they are excited to improve and update it while keeping its classic charm. Mr. Walker said what is being proposed is taking the best of the house, updating it, and maintaining its classic charm. They would like to screen in the porch and freshen up the home with new paint. They are proposing a sharp white with black window frames. They would like to create more of a carriage house look for the pool house. Helman asked if the existing garage would be removed. The applicant said that it would stay but they are adding insulated garage doors and creating more of a pool house structure by modifying it. The outside would be painted and inside a bathroom and kitchenette would be added. Heyer said there was only one other house that has the stark white paint with black-framed windows. He likes the color scheme but suggested they use a softer colored white paint instead of stark white to be more in character with other homes on the street and suggested using a bronze window frame instead of black. He thinks the current shutters bring proportions to the wall surface and should be kept. He added that the character of the house would change if they were removed and suggested that the eaves details were beautiful, but he did not see them mimicked in the proposed addition. Scott agreed with Heyer about the color palette and gable ends and rake details. He said they do not have to match exactly but there should be some notion of them fitting together. Bardwell said his primary comment was the garage and the south elevation. He echoed what had been stated in prior applications to break down the scale of the additions to be more sensitive to the neighbors. He also suggested that the side façade could be improved by adding some form of dormer that would break up an otherwise stark and tall elevation. He added that there were a number of solutions that would break that up and bring back what is valued about the articulation of planes in Bexley. Toney said that her thoughts aligned with Scott's where the details should match up but does not agree that they have to leave the shutters on. She likes the look of a shutter-less house but does agree to soften the color palette with a warmer white and a dark bronze or soft black for the window frames.

The applicant said they are open to working on the details and coming up with a solution. They will work with staff to accomplish that. Helman said that he sees a lot of houses with black trim

and his only suggestion would be for them to ask themselves in what way do they want their house to be distinctive. Bokor said she was comfortable with the Board remanding this to her to work with the applicant on revisions that touch on the Board's concerns. Heyer said suggested pulling the gable down on the addition to break down the scale.

There were no public comments.

The Findings of Fact and Decision of the Board for Application No. ARB-21-13 for the property located at 2299 Commonwealth Park South: The Board finds that a Certificate of Appropriateness should be issued for the two-story addition and modifications with the following conditions: 1) That the applicant mimic the existing eaves condition details on the addition, 2) That a warmer shade of white be considered, 3) That the roof form on the addition be broken down in massing, and 4) That the conditions for this approval are subject to further review and approval by the Residential Design Consultant.

The applicants understood the Findings of Fact.

Motion made to Approve: Peter Bardwell, seconded by Larry Helman

Vote: Pete Scott, Bill Heyer, Peter Bardwell, Larry Helman, Suzanne Toney

The meeting went into recess at 7:30 pm for a five minute break. The meeting resumed at 7:35 pm.

K) **Application No.:** ARB-21-14
Address: 902 Vernon
Applicant: Amy Lauerhass
Owner: Keith Jorgensen and Sonja Ford
ARB Request: Enclose sunroom

Consent Agenda Item

L) **Application No.:** ARB-21-15
Address: 216 N Roosevelt
Applicant: Amy Lauerhass
Owner: Smith-Conant
ARB Request: 2nd floor addition

Consent Agenda Item

M) **Analysis: Application No.:** ARB-21-16
Address: 2333 Sherwood
Applicant: Amy Lauerhass
Owner: Todd Evert and Jessica Audey
ARB Request: 2 story addition

Consent Agenda Item

N) **Application No.:** ARB-21-17
Address: 946 Vernon
Applicant: Amy Lauerhass
Owner: Rohrs-Dunstan
ARB Request: New Front porch

Bokor reviewed staff comments with the Board, which were as follows: This application is for a new front porch, which makes more sense in the plan but not in the elevation. Staff thinks it is more appropriate to have emphasis over the doorway than on the porch. The applicant revised the proposal and sent to staff.

Amy Lauerhass was sworn in. The applicant spoke about the competing gables and said that the homeowner preferred the double gables. The left side of the project projects out further and does not make sense over the door. Bardwell said either solution may be appropriate, but the applicant might wish to present this in a three-dimensional fashion. Scott likes the revised version better and thinks it is more in the character of the neighborhood. He asked if the trellis would be attached to the columns. The applicant said it would, on the north side. Heyer agreed with Scott and Bardwell and does not mind the focus of the gable on the sitting area. He echoed Bardwell and said a three-dimensional view would make it easier to see where the beam bumps out is unsupported and suggested moving the column to support the inside corner of the beam. Helman said there should be something under where the corners meet and asked how to achieve symmetry for the wall space.

There were no public comments.

The Findings of Fact and Decision of the Board for ARB-21-17 for the property located at 946 Vernon: Based on the testimony presented, the Board finds that the front porch addition should receive a Certificate of Appropriateness, with the condition that the plan with the single gable be used, and that the column to the left of the front door is to shift to the left and to line up behind the center column.

Motion made to Approve: Peter Scott, seconded by Larry Helman
Vote: scott, Larry Helman, Bill Heyer, Peter Bardwell, Suzanne Toney

- O) **Application No.:** ARB-21-18
Address: 394 Columbia
Applicant: John Behal
Owner: Julie and Yoaz Saar
ARB Request: Demo and New House

Bokor reviewed staff comments with the Board for this application, which were as follows: This application includes a demolition and new build. Staff included part of the Code for demolition in the staff report and covered all the things here to look at. The house is an existing house that has issues. A letter from an independent party reviewed those issues as well as confirmed that the house does not have historical or architectural significance. The proposed new build is nice, fits in with the neighborhood, and is appropriate for the streetscape from staff's perspective.

John Behal, Julie Saar, and Yoaz Saar were sworn in.

The applicant reviewed information for this application with the Board. The existing house has been altered with windows on left and in the middle there is another band of windows that have been added. The original porch has been infilled and for this kind of architecture it is common to find porches. The integrity of the architecture of the home has been altered by the addition. The other odd thing from the façade point of view are the horizontal windows and two vertical windows which is a flawed version of the style. That being said, the standards in Bexley to

prohibit demolition of an existing structure is that the architecture and significance are protected. There are many houses in Bexley that are a Bungalow-style and this house is not the only one in the city, and there are many versions of this style throughout the city. Given the statutes of architectural significance it does not meet the mark that would keep this structure from being demolished. The house itself is in need of maintenance and not in great shape. Bokor said the bottom line for that criteria is, is the new proposed structure better than what is there now. The applicant said this house is oddly placed on the lot and the new structure would be further set back on the property, would save the trees in the front, and would maintain the privacy around the yard. There is no proposal to move the driveway or curb cut but it would extend back to meet with the proposed new garage, which would also be set further back in the rear corner of the property. The proposed materials would be stone, some cedar shake, and some metal and dimensional shingles for the roof. There are a variety of homes on this street both in size and in design, and conceptually would fit in with both the smaller and larger homes around it.

Scott said it is difficult to make a decision based on the quality of the submittal. He said that in regard to the existing home the applicant made strong points but not as strong as others have been before the Board for demolition. He does agree that the sketches are in good quality and informative and show a structure that would be in character of the architecture he expects and sees in Bexley, but thinks that things are not perfectly aligned and need to be worked on. Bardwell said he respects the applicant's due diligence on the demolition component, but from a technical perspective, for new builds, he requested that the applicant identify the benchmark of the ridge height to all of the adjoining structures. The applicant said it would be 32' but they put 33' on the renderings for flexibility because they have not set the finished grade. Bardwell said that finished grade has been proven to be elusive and suggested using the curb height to become the desired benchmark. Heyer reiterated Bardwell's comments and said that for new builds the Board asks for street elevations with other houses for context. They have read the letter and been through the reasoning for the project but there is nothing compelling enough to justify the demolition. He does not see that a hardship has been met. Helman said that the new build is appealing and has a richness about it. He likes the detailing and massing and how things are proposed to come together. He did state that an economic case leads to a high bar but agrees that there is not a good interior flow in the existing structure. Toney said that the last project the applicant did was successful, but she is uncomfortable tearing down a bungalow but replacing it with something better.

Rose and Mr. Saar discussed the proposed height of the house of 33' and the difference of level of grade. They need to establish the existing grade because they will lose that once construction starts. The applicant said they surveyed the original house and it is 30' to the ridge. He said that the new house could be 32' or made to 33' with room to move. He is confident they have proposed something that can be accomplished while keeping the house 3' higher than the existing ridge line in the rear elevation. Helman said that policy for a demolition is that a landscape plan be prepared on the front yard and parallel to the house being built, which could solve the issue from the house height. The applicant said that a landscape plan has been started and they can add grading information to that. Bardwell said that it needs to be represented after the ridge is established, and that what needed to be defended is what is represented and not what currently exists.

Alan and Carol Radnor, residents at 44 S. Columbia Ave, were sworn in. They live immediately to the south of this property and they support this application. They are both gardeners and are pleased that their neighbors are proposing to leave excess greenspace to the south of the driveway, and are using the existing driveway, and are respectful of the streetscape and architecture as it relates to adjoining homes. They are willing to go through the construction time for this build to get a house this pretty, and feel that it will improve their house and fit in with how street should look as time moves on. They said that repositioning home on existing sites is better and beneficial. They are conscious of the ridge height issue but have watched the applicant build many homes in this community and believe he will build what he is proposing to build. They would be happy to have the proposed house next to them.

David Westin, resident at 399 S. Columbia, was sworn in. Mr. Westin has no issues with the proposed demolition but offered a word of caution. This block has had work on it for three years, some were things he saw with the applicant's other new build on this block, and are comfortable this proposal will be built to that quality, and know that the applicant will take care of the construction site. The only thing he will say in terms of 3' difference in height is that it is a big issue and his concern stems from another proposal that was not built to what was agreed upon. It heightened his sense of awareness and he would like to know how the applicant would be held accountable if it is not built to the standard that is approved here.

Rose and Toney discussed the protocol for that process. Rose said they asked the owner to put in a grade stake so they know it is at 30' and will not exceed 33'. The neighboring property is at a different grade level than this house and measuring 33' on this lot is not the same on the next lot. They have to establish the existing grade. The current driveway is existing and is not taller than 33' from that grade, and the benchmark has to be something permanent to count on to show existing grade. Bardwell said if they are looking for a consistent benchmark, they can go by curb height when representing height and relative scale and massing to those immediately adjoining properties. The applicant said they have that information. Toney said it would be helpful to bring to the next meeting and asked if there were other comments on the finishes and streetscape. The applicant asked to Table and come back before the Board with the information on grade as well as a landscape plan and a sample board of proposed materials.

Motion made to Table this application: Larry Helman, seconded by Peter Bardwell

Vote: Pete Scott, Larry Helman, Peter Bardwell, Suzanne Toney

Against: Bill Heyer

P) **Application No.:** ARB-21-20
Address: 166 S Roosevelt
Applicant: Anne Seemueller
Owner:
ARB Request: 2nd floor addition

Bokor reviewed staff comments with the Board, which were as follows: This application is for an addition to an existing home which is in need of a fix. The proposal leaves the garage in the same place and shed roof design over that. Staff is excited about the window replacements; this house has had the existing windows for some time. On the site plan the second floor addition, as it wraps around and meets the existing conditions, is pretty boxy and staff would like to see the way to break that down.

Anne Seemueller was sworn in. Ms. Seemueller said that four years ago they received approval for a similar version of this proposal but have since made minor refinements to that original approval. The second floor addition would be on top of the existing first floor. They adjusted the gable the over the home to try to do something a little different, and that is the extent of the changes from the original approval.

Scott said that looking at the side elevation the roof pitch and roof lines are not represented well but the front elevation is going in the right direction. He said that there is a chimney on the home that is not represented in the drawings, which helps balance out the proportions. The applicant said the house to the north of this property did the exact same addition but the pitch was over the garage. Heyer said that in the elevations adding the trim meant to improve the look of the windows but he is not sure they add character to the house and also referenced the proposed vertical boards on the second floor. The applicant said that was not something they would need to keep. Heyer said it was a difficult material and he did not see how to get the stucco and corner boards to work. He asked the applicant work with staff on revisions. Bardwell said that in the side elevations he cannot distinguish what is existing and what is new. He also said that the stucco proposed to mitigate the construction challenges where new meets existing could be a significant issue, even if repainted. The applicant said there was nothing to separate the new from the existing so that was included to break that down. Bardwell said that what looks nice in a drawing can be more difficult once it is constructed, and from that standpoint it is hard to match the material and the color is not easily attained.

Helman asked how far the garage element sticks out from the main house and how does it interface with the front porch and gable. The applicant said about 3'. She added that the addition is flush with the existing frontage of the house and gable and the garage element would be a difference of 3'. Helman said that coming at this from an angle would help give a sense to what it would look like all coming together. Toney said that it is difficult to match the existing to new stucco. The applicant said that she had previously submitted a different material. Toney said to work on that transition. The applicant said she is also looking into doing new windows. Toney stated the submittal was not shown replacing all of the windows but thinks the applicant would be surprised how it would improve the look of the house if she did.

There were no public comments.

The Findings of Fact and Decision of the Board for Application No. ARB-21-20 for the property located at 166 S. Roosevelt: The Board finds that the second floor addition should receive a Certificate of Appropriateness approval, with the condition that final design details go to the Design Consultant for final design approval.

Motion made to Approve: Larry Helman, seconded by Pete Scott

Vote: Peter Bardwell, Larry Helman, Pete Scott, Bill Heyer, Suzanne Toney

- Q) **Application No.:** ARB-21-21
 Address: 295 Dawson
 Applicant: Amy Lauerhass
 Owner: Pollock
 ARB Request: 2nd floor addition

Consent Agenda Item

- R) **Application No.:** ARB-21-22
 Address: 2764 Dale Ave
 Applicant: Amy Lauerhass
 Owner: Shu-Ping Lin
 ARB Request: 2-story addition

Bokor reviewed staff comments with the Board, which were as follows: This application is for an addition to the rear of existing home. Staff likes the proposal for a contemporary addition but thought the proposed design merited discussion with the Board.

Amy Lauerhass remained sworn in from a previous application. The applicant said that this was a first attempt to design a contemporary addition on an older home. All of the windows would be replaced and something would be done to the existing house to bring it more toward a contemporary style. The applicant is proposing a covered porch across the main box of the front of the house with slatted beams and exposed hardware. A translucent roof would continue to get light into the front of the house. On the back of the home they would combine materials, like stone, stucco, and stained wood, to the connector piece where the garage is, and the center piece in the middle would be stained wood to relate to the stained wood on the front porch. The stucco will be added to stone on the back of the house. She tried to break up the massing on a large addition with materials.

Helman said he is so used to her drawings and this is the first time she has come to the Board with something modern. He said that in the renderings it is difficult to tell what is proposed. The applicant said she would normally show materials rendering the new portion but this rendering shows the whole house to show how the materials work together. Scott said the heaviness of the stone is not broken down and there is no supported element to show it is represented and being cut. He said the façade looks flat and that it might not be successful when it is built. Heyer said that he would like the two-story home to give nod to the ranch house next door, and so many like it in the neighborhood. He said that the double hung windows in this feel out of place. He suggested three bays so the connector piece really became a connector piece on the garage, and to have the material use be more uniform.

Toney said she was struggling with horizontal and vertical stone and would like it if the garage doors felt more contemporary. She would also like to see some color added to it to understand how it works. She said she would like to see this come back. Bardwell agreed and said that the Board has confidence in the applicant's skills but the challenge is that is not reflected in what is shown. He said it would be to her benefit to work on some things, like colors and shadows, in a three-dimensional representation to help make her case and give the Board confidence in the end result. The applicant agreed with the feedback and said she was fine with Tabling this and coming back next month. Heyer said to look at the front porch and encouraged her to get away from the traditional beam detail in the elevation and make it a more contemporary structure where the double piers become more dominant in view.

There were no public comments.

Motion made to Table the application: Peter Bardwell, seconded by Heyer
Vote: Pete Scott, Bill Heyer, Larry Helman, Peter Bardwell, Suzanne Toney

- S) **Application No.:** ARB-21-23
Address: 234 N Ardmore
Applicant: Brian Marzich
Owner:
ARB Request: 2-story addition

Consent Agenda Item

- T) **Application No.:** ARB-21-24
Address: 2562 Bexley Park
Applicant: Gary Alexander
Owner: Mr. Jonathan and Ms. Angela Mugler
ARB Request: porch & accessory structure

Bokor reviewed staff comments with the Board, which were as follows: This application is broken into two parts: the porch and the accessory structure. What is before the Board for review is the proposed accessory structure. The proposed porch is in keeping with the architecture of existing structure while the accessory structure is modern. Staff had some questions about choices and stylistic divisions to do it this way. Staff would like to discuss the proportions in more detail.

Gary Alexander was sworn in. There were substantial additions to the house and the applicants was asked to update it. The proposed covered patio is aligned with the current great room and the characteristics are similar. The design rationale for this proposal is to take a different approach and create a pavilion for the office and yoga studio and in the back of that would be a storage area. The intent is to articulate a break into smaller elements and each one represents a function. The trellis on the other side transitions into the screen. The owners would have an open space to exercise on the deck with coverage from the neighbors. The proposed colors and materials would be used to tie the new pieces in with the existing home. The material can be metered at its corners so there would not be a need for corner boards. The only change would be on the corner of the pavilion and would be grey at the height of the window trim and would wrap around the corner. That is why the trellis and deck would wrap around the corner.

Heyer likes the changed perception of the view shown but is trying to figure out how a colonial porch would fit with a modern pavilion. He thinks the porch could be interesting and have more contrast with the pavilion. The applicant said the traditional entry portico was done years ago. They wanted the corner of the pavilion to be as small as possible but the retractable doors have multiple tracks and a diagonal look would have been more minimal. Heyer suggested to set the siding so there is overhang. Scott said he keeps looking at the white column separating the doors. He keeps wanting to make it panelized and would rather see a dark grey and let the siding float above the dark corner. Scott's other suggestion is he not seeing detail in the drawings regarding the trellis. It looks like the trellis butts into the main wall and he suggested where the wood of the screen wall and the height of the siding tie in together. Bardwell said the applicant did a fine job and is supportive of the proposal but offered that this is conveyed as a pristine environment that is free of adjoining structures. He added that in reality this will be located in a dense Bexley neighborhood. The applicant said that the way the yard is developed there is a green portion in front of the pavilion. Helman said it is a small project that is made clear by good renderings and information. Toney said she is concerned about potential denting and a worn look to the proposed metal standing seam on the side. The applicant said it is used frequently in construction and in more contemporary designs.

There were no public comments.

The Findings of Fact and Decision of the Board for Application No. ARB-21-24 for the property located at 2562 Bexley Park: The Board finds it appropriate to approve a Certificate of Appropriateness as submitted, noting that the rear porch addition and accessory structure are architecturally compatible with the existing structure, with a change of color on the southwest corner to be painted a dark color to match the doors.

The applicant understood the Findings of Fact.

Motion made to Approve: Bill Heyer, seconded by Pete Scott

Vote: Pete Scott, Bill Heyer, Larry Helman, Peter Bardwell, Suzanne Toney

The meeting adjourned at 9:54 pm

8) Other Business

9) Adjourn