



Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes

Thursday, April 8, 2021

6:00 PM

1) Call to Order

The meeting started at 6:01 pm. To view the recording, click here:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cscD58T533U>

2) Roll Call of Members

Jocelyn Krosky, Pete Scott, Larry Helman, Peter Bardwell, Suzanne Toney

3) Public Comments

Julie Saar asked about Consent Agenda Items.

Staff comments on Consent Agenda items were as follows: Consent Agenda items are approved as a group. There were no comments from the Board members, or comments that were made to staff were proactively worked on with the applicants.

Rose said that for Application No. ARB-21-30 for 2467 Sherwood, in the last couple of days staff determined there is a variance request because the 2nd floor is over 10' in height. The applicant filed a BZAP application prior to this meeting. This application is not just for a Certificate of Appropriateness but also for a recommendation to BZAP and notice was sent out two weeks prior to BZAP's 4/22/2021 meeting.

Suzanne Toney recused herself from voting on ARB-21-29.

Peter Bardwell recused himself from voting on Application No. ARB-21-30.

Motion to Approve Consent Agenda Items: Jocelyn Krosky, seconded by Larry Helman

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

4) Approval of Minutes

Motion to Approve the March 8th, 2021 Minutes: Larry Helman, seconded by Pete Scott

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

5) Staff Report

A) Staff Report

6) Old Business

- A) Application Number: ARB 21-7
Address: 269 South Ardmore
Applicant: Marica McKeel
Owner: Jacob and Elizabeth Garrett

Request: The applicant is seeking architectural review and a Certificate of Appropriateness for an addition to the rear of the principal structure and a new garage.

Bokor reviewed staff comments with the Board, which are as follows: This application was before the ARB in the March 8th, 2021 meeting and the Board had a few comments about the project. The application could be approved with conditions, which the majority of the comments having to do with the massing of the garage for this residential district as well as the proposal of it having a flat roof. The concerns were looking to redesign the garage to better blend the modern addition with the traditional, existing structure. The revised drawings include a pitch added to the front of the garage, which is a better adherence to mixing both styles. There were concerns about the massing and glazing to the neighboring properties, and how the garage would be seen from the street.

Rose added that staff understood about the concerns of a second-floor use but it is not an architectural issue, and wanted to note that should this application be approved, it is noted in the Building Permit no to approve the structure as a dwelling unit. Slight modifications were made to the roof, bringing the second-floor space under 10' in height so that variance did go away.

Bokor said that some updates were added within the last few days as well as renderings that were submitted Wednesday, April 7th, 2021 in an attempt to show what portion of the garage would be shown in the direct elevation for context. Helman said that in the last meeting they asked for a drawing that shows the rendering or relationship of the height to its side yard and neighboring fence, which he did not see in this. He said that the rendering from the front shows nothing from the right, and does not provide the relationship that would tell the Board what issues they may or may not have.

Marica McKeel, Gina Kim, and Jacob Garrett were sworn in. Mr. Garrett said that in the discussion in the March 8th, 2021 meeting was constructive and they attempted to honor that guidance while designing the aesthetic for the garage. They were careful to design within the parameters that would not require a variance. This was a major redesign and they do have the rendering with the wall and neighbor's house included. Windows were introduced to soften the feel of the wall and the mix of materials was simplified to come across less heavy than as proposed before. More of the aesthetic of the proposed addition was incorporated into the design of the garage. The fascia on the addition is aligned with the existing roof on the existing house. The roof connections were addressed and are more aligned.

Scott appreciates the efforts but thinks a lot of detail was stripped out and was made into a miniature massing of the main house. He is not comfortable with the glass wrap and the look of

roof, but is more comfortable with the massing and roofs to blend well together. He said that the overall front of the garage doors and massing seems like a lot of glass. He understands the modern aspect but thinks the balance might have gone too far. He would like to see more of a way in how the materials come together, and more detail on the transition from brick to glass. He also does not think the materials on the roof have to match the materials on the house.

Mr. Garrett said that part of the thought was to try to reuse the slate from the original garage, and both the house and the garage have slate roofs. It is in good shape and they would like to reuse it if possible. Scott said in normal protocol the Board would never argue that, but the rendering is not doing full justice of the materiality. Ms. McKeel said there is an intentional off-set between the brick and the windows, there will be a shelf and the windows will be set back. She added the same happens with the way the wood slats move around but is hard to see in the other rendering that they are also off-set. Scott said that the details are what will make this successful and he has confidence that it will be worked out, but it is important to get right.

Krosky said she agreed with Scott and would like to wit for the other rendering that documents what the height of the garage is consistent with. She likes the height of the brick around the garage and aligning it with the windows. She is concerned with the amount of glass proposed and wondered if it would feel like it would be too much on display. Mr. Garrett said he would be using it as an office and window treatments could be installed if it like privacy was a concern. He said people can see up into it but it was more difficult to look out and see down. He liked the idea of having natural light in there. Ms. McKeel said from an interior perspective, lower sitting furniture is introduced.

Helman said that he remains concerned about not having a drawing showing this from the rear. He said there are two renderings that show flooding in green space but does not show the alley in the back, and added that there is no true interpretation of what this building is going to have in because it 9' of building wall and 5' of roof loom over the fence. He likes the addition but thinks the garage will be a mistake. Mr. Garrett said he respects that, and that the existing house next to them looms over their backyard, and to a certain extent this is the nature of the lots in this area. They can all see into each other's backyards. Helman said this sets precedent as the ARB of changing the scale and rhythm of the alley and the lots. It changes the character and scale of the neighborhood, and balance and compatibility are concerns.

Mr. Garrett said that this will be the fourth or fifth garage in a two-block area in this area. Helman said that the vast majority have dormers coming out of a pitched roof, but not this one. Mr. Garrett and Helman discussed the possibility of including dormers on the garage and what the visual effect would be if they were to be included in the design. Ms. McKeel said the main house is simple and does not have a dormer. The initial design had a flat roof proposed but they understood that was not best for a Bexley garage. They did not want to introduce more elements and complicate the design. Helman said that the price paid was in its scale and that it was a massive scale to achieve the design objective. He said there were ways to do this differently and still be in vogue with the main house. The applicants stated that the owners wanted natural light in the space and that was the main reason for keeping the brick down and introducing the windows. The Garretts wanted to be able to use their backyard. The whole focus was for backyard use as a family.

Bardwell said that Helman articulately stated everything he would have said.

Mary Schleppe, resident at 277 S. Ardmore, was sworn in. Ms. Schleppe lives next door to this home, directly to the south. She said it is a traditional home, but she is excited about seeing the addition and garage on the property. Looking at the new layout, the windows soften it up and the garage plays off of the back of the addition and does not look like as much of a box. She said that any improvement done on this property is welcome. She understands in terms how the owner and his family want to use the space and she is okay with that. She feels this plays off the existing home and looks like good living space.

Krosky asked that in the current design for the garage is there any footprint change from the original. Ms. McKeel said it is about 3' longer. Krosky said looking at the whole block, she noticed every single garage is up to the alley, but this one is taller than most. The garage behind this one is huge compared to this one. She feels comfortable with the placement of the garage on this site and has no issue with it based on what she is seeing online.

Bokor said she thinks it is a good think it is a slate roof and a good tie-in. She thinks heavier black window frames would tie it in more and that it looks very thin from the street view. The applicant said the goal was to lighten it up. Bokor said making the trim board black would tie it in.

Toney said she thinks the design is amazing but is not 100 percent comfortable with the massing of it. She is concerned neighbors would sit in their backyards and feel like they are being watched and is worried about the windows proposed on that side of the garage. She asked if the applicants would consider taking the wood slats across the windows to give more privacy to the neighbors. The applicants said that they could do that, and that behind the slats they can make the glass translucent and not transparent.

Ms. Schleppe said that from her yard they will see mostly in the glass added an outdoor patio to their backyard so they had privacy. Their other living space is on the front porch and they are not offended by open glass. Toney said she was worried about the privacy of looking out into others backyards. Mr. Garrett said he spoke with other neighbors and offered to pick out window treatments. They have been supportive and are aware of their intent for the space. The applicants asked if there would be a separate vote on the house and on the garage. Rose said if the applicant wanted to file the same design for the garage next month they may want to withdraw it and submit it on its own application. If it would be voted down they would have to submit a new design, but they could not be separated for a vote. Bokor said the applicant could withdraw the garage and that would let them get started with the addition. Mr. Garrett said he would prefer to do construction all at once. He said they would be better off Tabling and resubmitting changes to the garage. Toney asked the applicants if they felt clear on what to show by the next meeting. The applicants said they did. They asked to Table the application.

The applicant asked to Table the application and no Motion was made by the Board.

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

- B) Application Number: ARB 21-18
Address: 394 South Columbia
Applicant: John Behal
Owner: Yoaz and Julie Saar

Request: The applicant is seeking architectural review and a Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish an existing structure and replace it with a new single family home.

Bokor reviewed staff comments with the Board, which are as follows: There were no huge objections to the demolition and replacement for this project, but there were several things asked for the applicant to produce to support the project.

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

Mr. Behal made a list of the five items the Board asked for in the March 8th, 2021 meeting. He addressed them with the Board. For the streetscape they used a laser scanner to do an accurate view of all of the houses and this new build is almost exactly the height at the peak of the house two doors down. They did not get the house two doors down to the north, but believe it is taller. This house would be 1' taller than the applicant thought, but a 1' buffer had been added into the renderings the applicant submitted and was accounted for. In terms of the survey, it is referenced from the grade shown in this meeting. There is a benchmark on the fire hydrant in front of the house which is what they used and can be verified before and after construction. For the site plan, they are asking for one more foot. They will leave the existing driveway and will not disturb the south side of the parcel. They started at that and the minimal slope up to the garage door and are setting the finished floor of the house from that grade. That brings the peak to 4' above the existing and asked a surveyor to get the peak of the existing house. Toney asked if the extra foot they were asking for is already represented in the original representation. The applicant said it was. He also said another thing to point out is the slope of this lot on the east side is somewhat level and this lot slopes to the northwest. Keeping the finish for it at this level is important so they can take the groundwater and not push it into the inside corner at the back of the house. For the landscape plan, they are keeping a lot of the existing trees and adding supplements in. The last item is for the exterior materials. They are proposing dimensional roof shingles, stone, and contemporary window series, and will be using hardy products for shingles on the side.

Helman asked if they are scheduled to go before the Tree and Public Garden Commission. Bokor said that it was a condition of approval.

Krosky said she had no issues with what was presented and it documents shows everything clearly.

Scott appreciated the three-dimensional scan and said that the building design is fantastic and the materials are inline with its area.

Bardwell asked if there was only one house between this and the new build under construction on the street. The applicant said no, there is one to the south, then another house, and then the other new build is next to that house. Bardwell said the he echoed comments from the other Board members.

Toney asked if slate roof was a consideration for this house. The applicant said it might not be a fair ask to consider.

Jodi and David Westin, and Carol and Alan Radnor, were sworn in.

The Westins live at 399 S Columbia, and they said that they wished this was in effect for the other new build on the same street. They appreciate the architectural design of the house and are looking forward to it coming to the neighborhood.

The Radnors live in the house to the south of this property and they support the plan, because the roof line is the same with the house next door and they are preserving the oak tree. They hope it is built to the plan and are comfortable and enthusiastic about the build.

The Findings of Fact and Decision of the Board for Application No. ARB-21-18 for the property located at 394 S. Columbia: The Board finds that a Certificate of Appropriateness should be issued, noting that the house is architecturally compatible with the neighborhood, with the following conditions: 1. That is approved in substantial conformance with the plans submitted and reviewed at the April 8th, 2021 Architectural Review Board meeting, 2. No trees can be removed until a landscape plan has been approved by the Tree and Public Garden Commission, and 3. Demolition cannot happen until the construction plans for the new home are approved.

The applicant understood the Findings of Fact.

Motion to Approve the Findings of Fact: Peter Bardwell, seconded by Larry Helman
Vote: Jocelyn Krosky, Larry Helman, Peter Bardwell, Pete Scott, Suzanne Toney

C) Application Number: ARB 21-22
Address: 2764 Dale
Applicant: Amy Lauerhass
Owner: Shu-Ping Lin

Request: The applicant is requesting architectural review and a Certificate of Appropriateness for a 2 story addition to the rear of the existing home.

Bokor reviewed staff comments with the Board, which are as follows: This application was before the Board in the March 8th, 2021 ARB meeting. Revisions were made by the applicant based on the feedback from that discussion with the Board.

Amy Lauerhass was sworn in. Ms. Lauerhass reviewed the revisions with the Board. The use of stone has changed and is now proposed to reflect a heavier stone at the base of the addition, which lines up with the change of materials on the front of the house. She stepped back in the plan the massing and patterning of the addition and raised the end-piece so it is inline with the main garage, so that the connector read lower. Changes were made to the way the front porch is detailed and instead of proposing panels of translucent material she is proposing that the whole thing is translucent, like a pergola-type of structure. The black connecting hardware and a simple beam would go across the front. She removed the columns at the back of the porch so it separates itself from the house and becomes its own feature. The connector piece and back piece would be stained cedar, and there would be a pattern of the stone and the stucco. The trim is proposed to be dark bronze, attempting to blend in with the existing stone and stucco that are in the earth-color range.

Scott said that this has improved, and he is interested to see how it turns out. He thinks the design moves on the garage will make more sense in the massing of the project.

Krosky said she was fine with what was shown.

Helman said his only concern was regarding the cross bar on the big window on the garage in the west elevation and asked if the side window side bars are higher.

Toney said she thinks there are too many different window ideas going on and there is nothing consistent with how the windows relate to the stone. She thinks it would look better if it were more consistent. The applicant said she was trying to keep the existing windows and tried to achieve a combination of shapes, all in similar proportion. Toney said she appreciated the rendering attempt but it did not give a feel for the colors proposed. She suggested the applicant remain in contact with Bokor for design details.

Bardwell said there was a challenge with this application, and they are taking a lot on faith because he cannot see the materials and colors clearly. He would like to have been able to see how this would be viewed in three dimensions.

There were no public comments.

The Findings of Fact and Decision of the Board for Application No. ARB-21-22 for the property located at 2764 Dale: The Board finds that a Certificate of Appropriateness should be issued, noting that the addition to the principal structure is architecturally compatible, with the following conditions: That the northern most section of the addition be lowered to meet the same ridge height of the connector piece, and that the stone be raised over the double garage door, and final design details are subject to further review and approval by the Design Consultant.

Motion to Approve the Findings of Fact: Jocelyn Krosky, seconded by Larry Helman
Vote: Pete Scott, Scott Krosky, Larry Helman, Peter Bardwell, Suzanne Toney

7) **New Business**

- A) Application Number: BZAP 21-11
Address: 254 Stanbery
Applicant: Dean Wenz
Owner: Philip and Lisa Kessler
Request: The applicant is seeking a recommendation to the BZAP for architectural review and a Certificate of Appropriateness for new rear entrance and porch.

Consent Agenda Item

- B) Application Number: ARB 21-28
Address: 2434 Fair Avenue
Applicant: Brian Zingleman
Owner: Phyllis Edelstein
Request: The applicant is requesting architectural review and a Certificate of Appropriateness for a covered front porch.

Consent Agenda Item

C) Application Number: ARB 21-29

Address: 2713 Bryden Road

Applicant: Amy Lauerhass

Owner: Steven and Danielle Dankof

Request: The applicant is requesting architectural review and a Certificate of Appropriateness for an addition to the primary structure and a new garage.

Consent Agenda Item

D) Application Number: ARB 21-30

Address: 2467 Sherwood Road

Applicant: Darryl Rogers

Owner: Chris and Kimberly Rankin

Request: The applicant is seeking architectural review and a Certificate of Appropriateness for a new detached garage.

Consent Agenda Item

E) Application Number: ARB 21-31

Address: 195 South Parkview

Applicant: Nathan Sampson

Owner: Nicolas and Yasmine Lacaillade

Request: The applicant is requesting architectural review and approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for sunroom addition.

Consent Agenda Item

8) **Other Business**

9) **Adjourn**

The meeting Adjourned at 7:53 pm.