



## Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes

Thursday, May 13, 2021

6:00 PM

---

**1) Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 pm. To view a recording of the meeting click here: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KhaxhZrxpic>

**2) Roll Call of Members**

Jocelyn Krosky, Pete Scott, Peter Bardwell, Suzanne Toney

**3) Public Comments**

There were no public comments.

**4) Approval of Minutes**

Motion made to Approve the April 8<sup>th</sup>, 2021 Minutes: Peter Bardwell, seconded by Pete Scott  
Vote: Jocelyn Krosky, Pete Scott, Peter Bardwell, Suzanne Toney

Motion made to Approve the Consent Agenda: Jocelyn Krosky, seconded by Peter Bardwell  
Vote: Pete Scott, Jocelyn Krosky, 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.

**Consent Agenda Item**

B) Application Number: ARB 21-47  
Address: 821 Grandon Avenue

Applicant: Taylor Pfefennberger

Owner: Jerry and Lisa Haas

Request: The applicant is seeking architectural review and a Certificate of Appropriateness for the addition of an unenclosed, covered front porch addition, house and trim painting and one window replacement.

Consent Agenda Item

## 7) New Business

- A) Application Number: ARB 21-33  
Address: 912 Chelsea  
Applicant: Pete Foster  
Owner: Cynthia Weckbacher  
Request: The applicant is seeking architectural review and a Certificate of Appropriateness for an addition of a new front porch to the west elevation of the existing home and the addition of a new first floor one story kitchen expansion to the east of the existing home.

Consent Agenda Item

- B) Application Number: ARB 21-34  
Address: 307 N Parkview  
Applicant: Pete Foster  
Owner: Matt & Annette Vaughan  
Request: The applicant is seeking architectural review and a Certificate of Appropriateness for the expansion of an existing first floor screen porch to the east of the existing residence, the expansion of a new first floor covered exterior cooking area to the north of the existing screen porch and the design of a new uncovered sitting terrace and fireplace.

Consent Agenda Item

- C) Application Number: ARB 21-35  
Address: 206 S Dawson  
Applicant: Dean Wenz  
Owner: Graham and Emily Williams  
Request: The applicant is seeking architectural review and a Certificate of Appropriateness for a one story addition to the principal structure for use in expanding the kitchen and adding a new family room.

Consent Agenda Item

- D) Application Number: ARB 21-36  
Address: 331 S Parkview  
Applicant: Sullivan Builders  
Owner: Thomas Vetter  
Request: The applicant is seeking architectural review and a Certificate of Appropriateness an addition of screened porch to existing single family residence.

Bokor reviewed staff comments with the Board, which were as follows: The applicant is adding on a screened porch to the side and front of the home. The drawings are hard to understand, and she wanted the Board to take a look at the photographs and the elevation side-by-side. Staff does not have a problem with a porch being added to the side but thinks it is a mistake to have it on the same plane on the front elevation.

Matt Sullivan was sworn in and provided background information to the Board, which is as follows: the addition is across the façade. It is laid out in a way that allows a double door from the existing patio with the house. They are proposing to leave it in the current location because they have an existing patio already there. That patio is not covered. He added that it should not be an issue to recess it back and still keep it accessible. The front of the screened porch is at the same level as the front of the patio.

Bardwell said he is not in favor of the Board designing the project during the course of the meeting. He added that one option is to have the converse of what is proposed, pushing the addition backward. Another consideration would be to pull it forward so there is still a distinction between the new and existing planes. He does not want to design this on the fly but is saying that there are other options.

Scott said that the house is beautiful and that this type of addition can be challenging. The idea of a large screened in porch is not typically found on this type of home. He likes it inline with the existing half wall of the front porch, the form and massing, and thinks that mimicking the roof works well. His concerns are that the stonework that exists looks like it has been repaired a lot and it would be difficult to match the mortar. Regarding the screened in porch openings, he thinks the existing windows are nicely detailed and would like to see more details in the screened in porch details on the front of the home. The applicant said that they have a large amount of stone they can salvage and they designed it with that in mind. The finish is not overly precise so the project was designed to look rustic. There is an opportunity for a natural breakpoint where it hits the stairs in the main entrance. Scott said he does not have a problem where it is, likes the front steps, doesn't feel the porch is competing with the home, and likes that it is aligned with the existing half wall.

Bardwell added that he is not advocating for pulling it out to be in alignment with the current projection for the reasons he previously mentioned. He recommended that the plane not be a simple extension and said that a house of this nature in this city thrives on changes in plane, shade, and shadow. A simple extrusion does not do it justice. He said it appears flat, which it is not. He suggested for the applicant to show how this is represented in three dimensions. He also suggested framing whatever the protrusion is with a corresponding vertical element.

Krosky suggested to watch the screen size. She has a screened in porch with large screens in it and advised the applicant to make sure the screen panels are not too large. She also said on the side elevation there is a missed opportunity. She suggested carrying the stone pier to the left-hand side and meeting two larger screens and then turning the corner on the part of the rear elevation.

Toney thinks it is nice but would like to see some kind of detail to carry on what is going on with the windows. She said it might help to not have massive areas of the screen unsupported, especially on the front and the side. Bokor suggested a transom screen. Toney said that fits the character of the house much better.

The applicant asked to Table the application and to return with revisions based on the comments from the Board.

Motion made to Table the application: Jocelyn Krosky, seconded by Pete Scott

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

- E) Application Number: ARB 21-38  
Address: 160 N Stanwood  
Applicant: Samuel Rosenthal  
Owner: Samuel Rosenthal  
Request: The applicant is seeking architectural review and a Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of a new 2-story addition, porch and trellis.

Bokor reviewed staff comments with the Board, which were as follows: This application is for an addition to the rear of the primary structure with a porch and trellis. Staff's concern are the two gable roofs. There is an interesting bay window on the third floor. Staff would like to have the applicant discuss the double gable roof structure which is not in keeping with the front of the house.

Samuel Rosenthal was sworn in and provided design information for this application with the Board, which is as follows: The impetus for creating a double gable is that they are trying to preserve the bay window on the primary massing while not obstructing the view. Part of the addition is to create interior space and other variations were considered before deciding on this option. Walking around the home the volumes are set back. An existing chimney that is out of service will be removed. Multiple angles were shown to see it from all sides of the house. Adjustments can be made to the height of the peak but in prior renderings it looked forced.

Krosky asked if the Captain's Nest on the back is going to remain. She does not like the other options included as much and said that having the renderings helped explain the project better. The rendering from the neighbor's perspective shows that the roof is not flat.

Toney said she had a problem with too many different ideas between what is going on in the front and the Captain's Nest in the back. She felt that they are conflicting and then including the addition is one more element in the mix. She does not think they all work together. She understands why he is working around the third-floor window, but the proposed roof is not doing it any justice. She asked why the addition could not be in an L-shape and simplify the plan, and asked the applicant to draw the house in a three-dimensional rendering to see how all of the gabled roof lines worked together.

Scott said he agreed with Toney. The front has so much character and is the first impression people see. He does not like the valley created with the double gable in terms of aesthetics as well as maintenance with elemental factors like rain. He sees the potential for leaks and patch-ups over time. He suggested to include something that would slope water away. He also said the 4x4 posts for the first-floor deck are not doing the house any justice, and that the columns and how they are detailed will what make it look complete. He suggested the applicant continue to explore other options and is interested in seeing how the transitions will look.

Bardwell said he echoed the comments of other members and wanted to emphasize that he thinks the applicant will regret the extrusion on the north elevation from the front to the back will be on one plane, as well as aligning old and new materials. He suggested the applicant consider factors like shade and shadow. He said that this project is a real challenge and would urge the applicant to have a change in plane. He agreed with Scott that there are issues with the proposed columns and the way they look spindly and like stilts in the renderings. He said it is okay to have a mass under an enclosed area, but this has too much of a beach feel and is not appropriate to the character of Bexley, and they would need to appear substantially more supported.

Scott added that he is not convinced of the full project and would like to see options of alternate materials. He suggested a different material might create a nice visual break from the main house and balance the scale. Toney said she agreed and also suggested including a change of

color. Bardwell agreed and said that his concluding point would be for the roof over the new portion of the proposal and added that it is the least of the issues for the project. From what he heard from the members of the Board, there are issues related to the extension of planes, the materiality, and the nature of the projection of the second floor over an open area.

The applicant said the comments were fair and explained that the open portion was initially designed to be part of the home but was revised. Bardwell said that everything is solvable, but that the open space needs to appear better enclosed and better supported. Scott said he likes this mass over the columns but thinks there is a better way to connect it to the ground.

Bokor said it could look like two different houses and to look for clues how to reportion the columns. Krosky offered that stone piers on the front elevation could be included on that portion in the back to achieve that. Bardwell agreed and said cues could be taken from other examples. Scott suggested a simple piece of trim included in the detailing of the column could be examined.

The applicant said that he had looked at a version with trim at the corners, but the existing house does not have those features. He agreed with the feedback and asked to Table the application and come back next month with revisions.

Motion made to Table the application: Peter Bardwell, seconded by Jocelyn Krosky

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

- F) Application Number: ARB 21-39  
Address: 168 S Cassingham  
Applicant: Megan Dixon  
Owner: Christopher Phommas  
Request: The applicant is seeking architectural review and a Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of a new 2-story addition to an existing single-family residence.

#### Consent Agenda Item

- G) Application Number: ARB 21-40  
Address: 155 S Roosevelt  
Applicant: Brian Marzich  
Owner: David Ornstein  
Request: The applicant is seeking architectural review and a Certificate of Appropriateness for a one story addition to the northwest corner of the exiting structure.

Rose reviewed background information for this application, which was as follows: This application was originally submitted for architectural review but also includes a variance request and will also need to go before the Board of Zoning and Planning. Notification was sent and for tonight, this application is seeking a recommendation to BZAP for the one-story addition that is 5'11" from the side yard property line.

Bokor said that staff does not have a problem with the addition. The proposal went from a porch addition and kitchen renovation to a wraparound porch addition that connects in the kitchen. Included in the discussion there needs to be a recommendation to BZAP with any conditions included this Board sees fit.

Brian Marzich, David Ornstein, and Michelle Ornstein were sworn in. The applicant reviewed design details for this application with the Board. Currently there is a narrow kitchen and the owners are wanting to expand it and add a mudroom area on the interior and a covered porch on the exterior. The application evolved and turned into what is being presented tonight. From

the interior perspective, it was optimal to push to the north side and then they realized once they did that they were encroaching into the setback. The house is already nonconforming. The addition is minimal and there is still plenty of room between this house and the neighbor's property, who approve of this project. He added that part of the intent of the project is not to just gain a kitchen but to gain more backyard space as well.

Scott asked if the whole roof would be standing seam metal and worries that the detailing of it might be a challenge. The roof would have to have roof flashing that would need to fit under a little window space and he is concerned that there is not enough room. He suggested to lower the roof line. He also asked how the gabled roof intersects with the roof of the addition. He said the design of the project is nice and thinks the floorplan is a great solution. He has no problems with the massing but is concerned about the roof transitions.

Bardwell said he echoed what Scott said. The design is fine but placing a roof pitch under a window is unforgiving. He urged the applicant to work on those details in advance of construction.

Toney said she is worried about the details. A standing seam roof does not line up with the edge of the gable, and a few things feel off. She would like to see this come back and have the details figured out more.

The applicant said what where the roof lands was dictated by the interior walls lining up and can be addressed.

There were no public comments.

The Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law for Application No. ARB-21-40 for the property located at 155 S. Roosevelt Avenue: For a proposed one-story addition, the Board recommends to the Board of Zoning and Planning approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness with a condition that the applicant work with the Design Consultant on refinements.

The applicants understood the Findings of Fact.

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

H) Application Number: ARB 21-44  
Address: 309 N Parkview  
Applicant: Todd Parker  
Owner: Jane Robinson  
Request: The applicant is seeking architectural review and a Certificate of Appropriateness for a screen porch.

Consent Agenda Item

## 8) Other Business

A) 53 South Ardmore - Cedar shake roof replacement

Bokor said that she was not sure what to. The current cedar shake roof has a lot of damage. Slate roofs always come to the Board for approval. Currently they do not have in place a good orientation program yet. There is no definition whether Bokor does them or the Board does.

Typically requests like this have been approved to be changed because of the weather being difficult on them. They provided a good material that was chosen to replace the cedar shake and the applicant sent a lot of pictures so the Board could see the damage.

Toney said she did not get the information ahead of time.

Bardwell said that before they proceed he wanted to know what the ask is on this. Bokor said she is asking permission from the Board to give her permission to allow the owners to find a new roof to replace what is currently there.

Rose said that they are proposing asphalt shingles because they are having difficult time finding cedar shake. Damage was done to the roof. If the Board feels comfortable with it, Bokor could work with the applicants to help them find an asphalt shingle to replace the cedar shake. Bardwell asked if this would not return to the Board and seeking concurrence this is remanded to Bokor. Rose said the Board could weigh in on what is proposed. Bokor said this is for an informal discussion and feedback. She is asking for reaffirmation to let the Design Consultant do this. Bardwell said he did not know if they need the applicant before them to speak on this. He knows the issues associated with an aging roof of this nature. They do not have all of the information other than to suggest this is remanded to staff and if she feels uncomfortable then it will come back to the Board. Scott said that this was his position as well.

Toney said that her only comment is that she hopes it is replaced with something that has dimension to it and keeping the character and the color is important too. She said that wood roofs are a lot of maintenance.

Bokor said she wanted to reaffirm that the Board is comfortable with her working with the applicant to find a good replacement asphalt dimensional shingle.

**9) Adjourn**

The meeting Adjourned at 7:14 pm.