



Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes

Thursday, August 11, 2022

6:00 PM

1) Call to Order

The meeting was Called to Order.

2) Roll Call of Members

Members present: Strasser, Scott, Heyer, Toney.

3) Public Comments

There were no Public Comments.

4) Approval of Minutes

A) June ARB Minutes

Motion to approve the June ARB Minutes by Mr. Heyer, second by Mr. Scott; all in favor.

B) July ARB Minutes

Motion to approve the July ARB Minutes by Mr. Heyer, second by Mr. Scott; all in favor.

C) July ARB Special Meeting Minutes

Motion to approve the Special July ARB Minutes by Mr. Heyer, second by Mr. Scott; Ms. Strasser - Abstain; Ms. Scott - Yes, Mr. Heyer - Yes, Mr. Toney - Yes

5) Staff Report

A) Staff report for 8/11/2022

There was discussion about the tabled applications.

6) Old Business

A) ***Tabled to September, 8, 2022 ARB***

Application Number: ARB-22-34

Address: 348 S Cassingham

Applicant: Bexley School District Board of Education

Owner: Bexley School District Board of Education

Request: The applicant is requesting Architectural review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness windscreens and plaques at our Shiff Family Tennis Complex behind Bexley High School.

B) ***Tabled to September 8, 2022 ARB***

Application Number: ARB-22-35

Address: 2456 Sherwood

Applicant: Shawn Snyder

Owner: Bill Litfin

Request: The applicant is requesting Architectural review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness to remove slate shingles and replace with "slate like" - Certainteed Belmont - Stonegate Grey shingles.

C) ***Tabled to September, 8, 2022 ARB***

Application No.: BZAP-20-52

Applicant: The Community Builders

Owner: 420 N. Cassady Ave. LLC

Location: 420 N. Cassady Ave.

Request: The applicant is seeking architectural review and approval for a 3- story structure with commercial on the first floor and residential on the 2nd and 3rd floors. This application was remanded to ARB final final design approval as a condition of the BZAP approval.

D) ***Tabled to September, 8, 2022 ARB***

Application No.: BZAP-20-48

Applicant: The Community Builders

Owner: Sally Woodyard

Location: 2300 E. Livingston Ave

Request: The applicant is seeking architectural review and approval for a 3- story structure with residential use on the first, 2nd and 3rd floors. This application was remanded to the ARB for final design approval as a condition of approval from BZAP

7) **New Business**

A) Application Number: ARB-22-42

Address: 2774 - 2776 E Main

Applicant: Edward Khodorkovsky

Owner: Edward Khodorkovsky

Request: The applicant is seeking a recommendation to the Board of Zoning and Planning for Architectural review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for wall art on the east facade of the building.

This application was discussed at the end of the meeting.

Ms. Bokor and Ms. Rose gave an overview and stated this application is before the Board for aesthetic review.

Mr. Khodorkovsky was sworn in.

The location of the building and whether or not work has begun was discussed.

Mr. Khodorkovsky explained this site will be an art gallery with plans to have the exhibit available to be viewed. Mr. Khodorkovsky shared the window art will not be permanent; he further explained there will be 4-5 pieces in the windows.

It was explained that this vote will be for a recommendation to the BZAP.

There was discussion about the type of art that will be displayed in the windows.

Ms. Toney suggested that unused panels will be painted and lit at night.

Mr. Heyer asked about the possibility of other art to be displayed in the future due to personal tastes.

Mr. Scott discussed the possibility for community engagement and rotating art.

The findings and decisions of the Board for application number ARB-22-42 for the property located at 2774 - 2776 E Main, as stated: That the Architectural Review Board recommends Architectural review and approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for rotating wall art on the east facade of the building with the condition that the unused spaces be painted to compliment the brick.

Motion to approve by Mr. Scott, second by Ms. Strasser; all in favor.

B) Application Number: ARB-22-43
Address: 86 North Cassady
Applicant: Amy Lauerhass
Owner: Neal and Aileen Raisman
Request: The applicant is requesting Architectural review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for a second story addition over the existing first floor.

Ms. Bokor shared an ongoing concern about incomplete or unlabeled elevation drawings and materials, in regards to this case and general precedence.

Ms. Lauerhass was sworn in and spoke to the drawings.

Mr. Heyer discussed adding additional leaders in the drawings.

Ms. Bokor and Ms. Rose spoke to posting additional personal information online.

Mr. Scott explained the details he would like to see in drawings.

There was discussion about a list of required information to be included in future drawings, including the capacity of the computer program to include dimensions.

Ms. Lauerhass answered Mr. Scott's questions about a cricket.

Mr. Scott explained he is comfortable with Ms. Lauerhass working with staff on this case but

would like to see an ongoing discussion about guidelines and submissions.

The findings and decisions of the Board for application number ARB-22-43 for the property located at 86 N Cassady: That the Architectural Review Board issues a certificate of appropriateness for a second story addition over the existing first floor with the condition that the final design be reviewed and approved but the city's design consultant.

Motion to approve by Ms. Strasser, second by Mr. Heyer; all in favor.

C) **Consent Agenda Item**

Application Number: ARB-22-44

Address: 107 S Ardmore

Applicant: Chelsea Dwyer

Owner: Michael and Delia Gold

Request: The applicant is requesting Architectural review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for a front porch expansion and house modifications.

Motion to approve Consent Agenda by Ms. Strasser, second by Mr. Heyer; all in favor.

D) Application Number: ARB-22-45

Address: 216 S Columbia

Applicant: Nate Sampson

Owner: Michael Glimcher

Request: The applicant is requesting Architectural review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for a new house on the north lot subject to the lot split.

Ms. Bokor explained that the lot split, upon which this application is contingent, is a separate application to be approved by the BZAP.

Nathan Sampson was sworn in.

Ms. Bokor stated this application is for a new home to be built in front of an already-existing poolhouse; currently the house is combined but the applicant is seeking a lot split. She stated this Board is focused on the design of the new home as if the lot split was granted, shared documents, and discussed conditions.

Mr. Green discussed the two parts of this application in terms of the lot split and extension of the carriage house. Regarding the carriage house, he said the addition is intended to match the additional carriage house with a slightly shorter roofline. Mr. Green explained the submitted drawings.

Mr. Green answered Mr. Heyer's question regarding the height of the proposed structure; they discussed dormer size.

Mr. Green indicated they are proposing a new single-family structure and discussed the proposed materials and heights, tree preservation, and a shared use agreement for the curb cuts and parcel configuration.

Erica McIntyre, 172 S Columbia -- Discussed the shared use driveway, the lowering of neighboring property values, and the use of this property as a compound.

Ms. Rose discussed that in-law suites and shared driveways are allowed in some districts within the City, shared who reviews this type of application, and spoke to easement agreements for future homeowners.

Ms. McIntyre asked the Board to think about what Columbia represents, for them to make a decision about which they'll be proud, and the movement of pool equipment near her home. She would not like these near her home.

Ms. Bokor, Ms. Rose, and Ms. Strasser discussed the green space and driveways with the applicant.

Mr. McIntyre, 172 S Columbia -- Said he has never met anyone wanting to purchase a home with a shared driveway and that this would fill a short-use case, as a future buyer may not be able to put in an additional driveway.

Gilli Zofan, 209 S Columbia -- Spoke to the shared driveway and this being a compound, as well as communication that this would never be built upon.

Mr. Sampson confirmed Mr. Heyer's suggestion that the main eave is lower than the adjacent houses and the main wall dormers are lower than the houses next door; the design is in scale and the eave heights are lower than the adjacent properties. Mr. Sampson explained that the parcel was surveyed to understand the grades and other parameters used to propose the lot split. These drawings are based off of the undisturbed, grade height as it exists currently; additional dimensions can be added in future drawings. There will be three steps before the threshold going in to the house; there are 24" from grade to the new first floor. The windows will be Marvin Modern Series or similar, expect for the front and back door, which may be Marvin Modern Product or Arcadia Thermal Aluminum in bronze. Mr. Heyer suggested rethinking the bronze. Furthermore, he asked if the mechanicals can be moved or screened; Mr. Sampson stated this can happen; these are proposed to be on the north side within the zoning guidelines -- the two condensers are within bounds and they must be screened. Mr. Heyer suggested the garage north wall could be a garden wall. Mr. Sampson said care must be taken to ensure airflow. Other units are also required to have screens. Wing walls were discussed. Mr. Heyer shared that if the lot is split, the onus will be on the southern property because the southern property would not have a driveway. Mr. Sampson discussed the sensitivity to how the lot is being treated; there would be room to put a second drive to the south of the proposed home.

Mr. Sampson described the proposed property line's current location as it relates to the Zoning Code.

Mr. Sampson shared that the pool equipment would run as loudly as a dishwasher; Ms. Toney indicated the problem is more so with the visual aspect than noise level. Mr. Sampson described where a generator would be housed; Mr. Scott discussed that these are usually boxed and run quieter than portable generators.

Mr. Sampson said a plunge pool is not included in this application but the proposed landscape wall looks to be stucco and if the concept moves forward that will be considered. Mr. Scott

discussed screening and the reason behind the location of the pool equipment.

Mr. Sampson said the equipment could be further south and the screen wall would be set back. Mr. Sampson said a 6' wall would be sufficient. Mr. Heyer acknowledged that people have seen the lot as it currently exists for so long, but as an architect, he looks at this and still sees Bexley.

Ms. Strasser explained it feels like something is missing on the streetscape and if it is to be filled, she would like to see an excellent piece of architecture. Mr. Sampson described the front facade windows proposed with horizontal monies but the north and south windows will be without them.

Mr. Scott agreed with the prior conversation about noise control and asked that it continue to be looked at. Regarding the driveway, he agreed that adding a driveway to the southern property would be difficult. He would want the driveway separation to be closer to the front, to alleviate the feeling of this being one property; he explained there is a precedence to this concept. Mr. Scott and Mr. Sampson discussed the decisions made regarding the window above the second floor entry and other details such as stucco.

Ms. Toney complimented the plans, materials, and heights and stated she is comfortable with the shared driveway. Mr. Sampson discussed the choices made regarding the window muntins. Mr. Sampson explained there are windows with and without muntins on the street.

Ms. Strasser questioned if the lack of window muntins on the sides of the home, particularly on the driveway side. Mr. Sampson explained there would be much screening and breathing room since the homes are set back.

Mr. Sampson confirmed Mr. Heyer's question regarding the location; Mr. Sampson said they did not want the lot split to trigger a contemporary variance, so they are proposing to move the lot line 3' up to get the sideyard setback required today for the existing house. While it could be moved further, this most closely represents the lot as it was divided previously and also balances lot coverage and other zoning conditions. In the future, the seller will recognize the current market value to putting in another drive; they are not trying to preserve and use what is there but to allow for future plans; this still requires BZAP approval.

Ms. Rose discussed the lot's previous variance and spoke to this lot split meeting the criteria.

Ms. Strasser asked if moving lot line so the driveway as proposed is on the existing house property, would impeded the footprint of the proposed new house. Mr. Sampson said it is close and the drive is wider than what is currently allowed. Ms. Strasser suggested alternate solutions and Mr. Sampson said this lies with the homeowner.

Ms. Rose said any driveway modifications that would effect city right of way plantings have to go to the Tree & Public Gardens Commission.

Mr. Heyer said this Board's concerns are noted for the BZAP to review.

There was discussion about how to proceed, including acknowledgement of the neighbor's

concerns.

The findings and decisions of the Board for application number ARB-22-45 for the property located at 216 S Columbia: That the Architectural Review Board issues a certificate of appropriateness for a new house on the north lot with the following conditions:

1. The application is subject to the lot split and decision of BZAP for the subject property.
2. First floor elevation to be 24”.
3. Wing wall to be added on east end to screen the generator.
4. Existing grade to be provided and maintained.
5. Final Design to be reviewed and approved by the city’s Design Consultant
6. Landscape plan to be reviewed by the Public Tree and Garden Commission.

The applicant understood the Findings of Fact.

Motion to approve by Ms. Strasser, second by Mr. Heyer; all in favor.

E) Application Number: ARB-22-46
Address: 698 S Cassingham
Applicant: Darryl Haas
Owner: Darryl and Paula Haas

Request: The applicant is seeking a recommendation to the Board of Zoning and Planning for Architectural review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for a variance for a one-story addition at the rear of the house.

Ms. Bokor stated the application is for a recommendation to BZAP; she has no issues with the application and shared an additional drawing. Ms. Bokor will work with the applicant on specifications. Ms. Rose stated there is a request for a variance for the garage.

Mr. Haas and Michael Lange were sworn in. Mr. Lange neighbor described the plan and stated the desire for feedback.

The space between the proposed garage and size of the shed dormer were discussed.

The applicant answered Mr. Scott's question that the garage dormer is to allow for the use of the second floor in the garage. He said he liked the drawings and there was discussed about the sun deck on the second floor. It was explained that there would be a little bit of greenspace. Mr. Scott said he liked the balcony but he would rather see a decorative railing, discussed the portions and stated that the windows feel large, spoke to leaded applied windows, and the scale of the screening along Mound St. and more. Mr. Scott encouraged the applicant to keep developing the window area.

There was discussion about how to move forward.

The applicant confirmed for Mr. Heyer that the old garage will be torn down and replaced, and may include a dormer. It was shared that 9' is for the addition and there was discussion about heights to be added to drawings.

Mr. Heyer indicated there is no need for a big fence because the sidewalk is low and he encourages a standard fence, discussed the character in the area, and asked the applicant to

bring back original details to the eaves and natural materials.

There is not enough information on the dormer to affirm or deny the dormer.

The findings and decisions of the Board for application number ARB-22-46 for the property located at 698 S Cassingham:

That the Architectural Review Board recommends architectural review and a certificate of appropriateness for a variance for a one-story addition at the rear of the house and a new detached garage with the condition that the final design be reviewed and approved with the request that the application remand back to the ARB for final design approval.

1. Details such as eaves, rakes, etc... to match existing structure.
2. Garage elevations be shown from all sides for the BZAP meeting.
3. The final design be reviewed and approved but the city's design consultant.

Motion to approve by Mr. Scott, second by Strasser; all in favor.

8) Other Business

9) Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned.