



**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
JANUARY 12, 2023**

1) Call to Order

The meeting was Called to Order.

2) Roll Call of Members

Members present: Mr. Heyer, Ms. Strasser, Mr. Scott, Ms. Krosky, Chairperson Toney

3) Public Comments

There were no Public Comments.

4) Approval of Minutes

Ms. Rose stated the minutes will be amended to to include an applicant's name which was previously missing.

Motion to approve with changes by Ms. Krosky, second by Mr. Scott; Heyer – Yes, Strasser – abstention, Scott – Yes, Krosky – Yes, Toney – Yes.

5) Old Business

Ms. Rose made remarks about the following applications: 295 S. Dawson was withdrawn, 692 Vernon was an incomplete application, 21 S. Parkview was tabled at the request of the applicant until February 9, 2023, and 2834 Powell was tabled at the request of the applicant until the February 9 ARB and February 23 BZAP meetings.

Regarding the Consent Agenda, Ms. Bokor explained all conditions set forth by the Board were presented to the applicants, who agreed to comply.

Motion to approve Consent Agenda Items (Application Number: ARB-22-72, Address: 2670 Sherwood; Application Number: ARB-22-63, Address: 80 S. Cassingham; Application Number: ARB-22-64, Address: 211 N. Cassingham; Application Number: ARB-22-66, Address: 178 Stanbery; Application Number: ARB-22-69, Address: 976 Grandon; Application Number: ARB-22-70, Address: 165 N. Columbia; Application Number: ARB-22-71, Address: 299 N. Parkview; Application Number: BZAP-22-49, Address: 2456 Fair Ave) **by Mr. Heyer, second by Ms. Krosky; Krosky –Yes, Scott – Yes, Strasser – Yes, Heyer – Yes, Toney – Yes.**

1. Application Number: BZAP-20-52
Address: 420 N. Cassady
Applicant: The Community Builders
Owner: Bexley CIC
Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural review and approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for a 3-story building. This application was approved by the Board of Zoning and Planning and has been remanded back to the ARB for final design approval.



**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
JANUARY 12, 2023**

Ms. Bokor reminded the Board to look only at architecture, such as details, as the general size, placement, and massing have been conceptually approved. This application had previously been before the Board and many changes were presented at that time while members presented various opinions. The applicant had submitted a new packet which addressed some of the issues previously discussed. Ms. Bokor was still concerned about some of the details and she indicated the goal of the Board is to help get the building through the process with a good design. Ms. Bokor suggested a tweak that can be worked out to allow the applicant to continue working on the details with encouragement to get to the finished design.

Nicole Knight was sworn in.

Ms. Rose stated the Minutes from the last meeting indicated this project was Tabled to be discussed at the January 12 meeting, and while typically notices aren't sent when applications are tabled to a specific date, notices were sent on December 29, 2022. Furthermore, a sign was posted on site the Monday prior to this meeting.

Ms. Knight said the application is scheduled to appear before the Tree Commission and the landscape will align with the City's goals for tree canopy and softness; what is shown in images will not be the final landscape.

The applicant has tried to simplify the materiality and make changes at the pedestrian level; the blade sign has been removed and will be reinstated after careful consideration and cooperation with the City at a later time, taller scoping has been added to assist with sight lines, lap siding was removed at the window bump outs, and the masonry was simplified. Ms. Knight indicated construction drawings were being developed and they will continue to work on details; she was hoping to get a vote of approval on design with the condition to work with Staff and Board members on details. The applicant was working on construction documents and going through this process is required to put the project in a position to move forward. Furthermore, they are going through a buster process to remove environmental contamination at the site.

Howard Verney was sworn in and asked why the Board would approve the design with conditions that would be met later instead of waiting for a final design to be approved. He said he doesn't love this design and doesn't feel it represents the city well.

Harold Long was sworn in and stated he is concerned about traffic; Chairperson Toney indicated that was approved by the BZAP. Mr. Long said this project doesn't really blend in with the surrounding area.

There were no public comments in support of the project.



**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
JANUARY 12, 2023**

Mr. Heyer shared he was not present at the previous meeting but listened to the recording and doesn't see much of a difference other than the taller coping. Ms. Knight stated her takeaway from the meeting was that the massing – in terms of the uniformity of the roofline and bump outs – were more in line with something that was a simpler design and follow up items were to further simplify the materiality and details around the windows and doors, particularly along the pedestrian level. She said they simplified the masonry openings, which previously were two bricks of running bond; now this is a simple opening at the ground level. At the windows, there was lap siding but now there is paneling. Around the banding, there is more substantial detailing, Mr. Kevin Dryfuss-Wells explained more.

Mr. Heyer stated his takeaway from listening to the November meeting was that the massing is fine but that the details would be more refined. He feels many of the details feel "cheap" as opposed to simple. Mr. Heyer indicated this building is all about flashing and Bexley's details for roofline and flashing are generally subtle. He shared that there should be consistency to meet character and suggested ideas to Mr. Dryfuss-Wells. Mr. Heyer said he wants the details to be quality both while looking directly at the building and while looking from a distance. He would like to reintroduce refinement into the brick work, particularly on the ground floor and make sure that the visual quality remains over time. Mr. Heyer stated the colors are great and the awnings should be more "Bexley-ish." He said the flashing can be reduced above the precast if the building had the framing projected over the cavity. Mr. Heyer indicated he was hoping to see more refinement of details.

Mr. Dryfuss-Wells said they can happily incorporate more brick details.

Mr. Heyer commented on the precast and stated he is worried about how it will keep up over time. Talked about proportions, materials that age well, human scale.

Ms. Strasser said she appreciates the effort being made and that she found the depth of information to be helpful. She is of the belief that the next step is to work out the details.

Mr. Scott appreciated the effort and felt the removal of the siding in the base was a bonus; he said he believes this design is a little more appropriate but he would like to see additional details. He shared that the cleaner roofline balances out the bumps in the facade and mentioned the joints on the third floor as well as modifying the second and third story windows. The cement board panels have a painted channel all the same color. Overall, he thinks the building sits well. He would like a high quality awning and to see further refinement of the details.

Ms. Krosky said she thinks they're getting closer and suggested the applicant take the comments they've heard about details and brick refinement to heart, and consider removing metal trim and fixing walls. She encouraged the applicant to think about the color of the awnings. She appreciated that they took the time to look at the mechanical units. There was a brief discussion about drainage.



**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
JANUARY 12, 2023**

Mr. Scott asked how the brick is meeting the ground; the vertical soldier courses is how this happens at some places. The banding was discussed.

Chairperson Toney said she still feels there are many ideas, such as multiple window designs. She is bothered by the bump outs and windows and clarified that her request for simplification was to simplify the overall building but detail it well. She mentioned bump outs, to which Ms. Knight explained the bump outs are more efficient than having a square building to comply with guidelines. Chairperson Toney said she feels the unit should be more graceful. Ms. Knight said the design serves the residents so that the units are functional and that the applicant can afford to build. Chairperson Toney to see previously built buildings.

Mr. Dryfuss-Wells said there's variety between the living room and bedroom windows to comply with zoning code and that they've concentrated the glazing in living areas. Chairperson Toney said it feels like the building is trying to be contemporary in window design but it is not a contemporary building.

Mr. Heyer gave additional suggestions about the windows; reinforcement was discussed and a rationale for the current design was given.

There was a discussion about a special meeting. Ms. Strasser was in favor of this. Ms. Knight said the applicant cannot proceed to move forward with other aspects of the project until this portion of the project moves forward. Ms. Knight said it is critical to also get grant funds early on.

It was decided that a date for the next hearing of this application would be discussed at the end of the meeting.

2) Application Number: BZAP-22-43

Address: 157 N. Ardmore

Applicant: Amy Lauerhass

Owner: Kyle & Allie Upchurch

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural review and approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness to expand a 1 story to 1 ½ story. This application was approved by the Board of Zoning and Planning and has been remanded back to the ARB for final design approval

Ms. Bokor said this case was recommended to the BZAP with the request that it be remanded back to the ARB. Ms. Lauerhass redid some details that received approval from BZAP with respect back to the ARB. Her comments, and feedback from board members, are to discuss dormers on the north elevation and not to connect them.



**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
JANUARY 12, 2023**

Amy Lauerhass was sworn in. She stated she made changes to present to the BZAP: added a new roof to the sunroom on the west elevation and lowered that roof, changed stone detailing, and changed the dormers to shed configuration.

Ms. Strasser asked if continuous dormers were considered on the north elevation; while this is workable, it is more expensive. Ms. Lauerhass said she can ask the client if they would be amenable to this, but she thinks, and Ms. Strasser agrees, it might be too heavy.

Ms. Krosky said she is fine with the changes.

Mr. Scott and Ms. Lauerhass discussed dropping the higher stone at a different location. He also said he feels the revised side elevation is appropriate but the scale may seem oversized; however, that is the nature of the width of the windows. He further stated he is not a fan of the two over three, but suggested relooking at the overhangs on the dormers.

Mr. Heyer said he likes the design and would like to see some special detail; Ms. Lauerhass said the porch that is there will be extended, as will the details that are currently there. He would like to see the beams reworked to make them nicer and would argue against having the stone so high, suggesting keeping it low up to the sill of the door; Mr. Scott said the flat facade is a challenge and Ms. Lauerhass said it would look odd to have it high and low on either side. Ms. Lauerhass indicated the socket is going to be flush to the bottom of the rake. Mr. Heyer suggested taking the opportunity to make it a nicer set of capitals.

Ms. Lauerhass described the desire to put in a window in the laundry room but there are challenges due to an electrical meter. Ms. Lauerhass said making the dormer span both windows requires a more complex budget.

Mr. Scott wanted to go on record to say that the Board is moving towards requiring notes on elevations.

Findings of Fact and Decision of the Board for Application No. BZAP-22-43 for property located at 157 N. Ardmore: The Architecture Review Board finds that the expanded 1 story to a 1 ½ story and porch expansion on the north elevation of the property located at 157 N. Ardmore is appropriate and would recommend a Certificate of Appropriateness with the following conditions: that the stone water table on the north elevation continue to the west end of the porch and that the applicant additionally work with the design consultant on design details.

Ms. Lauerhass understood the Findings of Facts.

Motion to approve Findings of Fact by Ms. Krosky, second by Ms. Strasser; Heyer – yes, Strasser – yes, Krosky – yes, Scott – yes, Toney – yes.



**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
JANUARY 12, 2023**

6) New Business

3) Consent Agenda Item Application Number: ARB-22-72

Address: 2670 Sherwood

Applicant: Amy Lauerhass

Owner: Heather Baas

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural review and approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for an addition of a front porch, dormer expansion, and window, door, and roof modifications.

Motion to approve Consent Agenda Items (Application Number: ARB-22-72, Address: 2670 Sherwood; Application Number: ARB-22-63, Address: 80 S. Cassingham; Application Number: ARB-22-64, Address: 211 N. Cassingham; Application Number: ARB-22-66, Address: 178 Stanbery; Application Number: ARB-22-69, Address: 976 Grandon; Application Number: ARB-22-70, Address: 165 N. Columbia; Application Number: ARB-22-71, Address: 299 N. Parkview; Application Number: BZAP-22-49, Address: 2456 Fair Ave) **by Mr. Heyer, second by Ms. Krosky; Krosky –Yes, Scott – Yes, Strasser – Yes, Heyer – Yes, Toney – Yes.**

4) Consent Agenda Item Application Number: ARB-22-63

Address: 80 S. Cassingham Applicant: Suncraft Corporation/James Knox

Owner: Rebecca Brisker

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural review and approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness to enclose the front terrace with a 14' x 9' screened porch.

Motion to approve Consent Agenda Items (Application Number: ARB-22-72, Address: 2670 Sherwood; Application Number: ARB-22-63, Address: 80 S. Cassingham; Application Number: ARB-22-64, Address: 211 N. Cassingham; Application Number: ARB-22-66, Address: 178 Stanbery; Application Number: ARB-22-69, Address: 976 Grandon; Application Number: ARB-22-70, Address: 165 N. Columbia; Application Number: ARB-22-71, Address: 299 N. Parkview; Application Number: BZAP-22-49, Address: 2456 Fair Ave) **by Mr. Heyer, second by Ms. Krosky; Krosky –Yes, Scott – Yes, Strasser – Yes, Heyer – Yes, Toney – Yes.**

5) Consent Agenda Item Application Number: ARB-22-64

Address: 211 N. Cassingham

Applicant: Matthew C Dehlendorf

Owner: Jennifer and Brian Kelly

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural review and approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for a covered porch addition at rear of house.

Motion to approve Consent Agenda Items (Application Number: ARB-22-72, Address: 2670 Sherwood; Application Number: ARB-22-63, Address: 80 S. Cassingham; Application Number: ARB-22-64, Address: 211 N. Cassingham; Application Number: ARB-22-66, Address: 178 Stanbery;



**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
JANUARY 12, 2023**

Application Number: ARB-22-69, Address: 976 Grandon; Application Number: ARB-22-70, Address: 165 N. Columbia; Application Number: ARB-22-71, Address: 299 N. Parkview; Application Number: BZAP-22-49, Address: 2456 Fair Ave) **by Mr. Heyer, second by Ms. Krosky; Krosky –Yes, Scott – Yes, Strasser – Yes, Heyer – Yes, Toney – Yes.**

6) Application Number: ARB-22-65

Address: 110 S. Stanwood

Applicant: Valerie Halas

Owner: Nathan Render and Tal Bendor

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural review and approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for a 2-story addition to the rear of the house.

Ms. Bokor indicated this is a completely new application with much to discuss; the applicant is asking for an addition with a new garage which is a separate application. She believed it will be important to talk about material choices and changes, including a slate roof request for replacement.

Ms. Halas was sworn in and gave an overview of the project, a two-story addition off the rear of the house with a proposed patio and two story garage. Square footage will be increased, because the project will include enlarging the kitchen as well as adding a mudroom, family room, and second floor master bathroom and master bedroom.

Ms. Strasser indicated she is overall really pleased but believes this will be a lot of vinyl siding.

Mr. Heyer was in agreement with Ms. Strasser. He did not believe the remaining aluminum eaves and rakes is an aesthetic that should be matched but thought it is important to uncover the original character of the house. He said the 3D renderings are shown differently than what is existing and asked if there is a way to create a nicer, cleaner profile, even with aluminum. Mr. Heyer wanted to know can character be increased. He expressed concern that the addition is flush with the original house; the Bexley way of doing an addition looks like it is attached to an existing house and the existing house is revealed. He asked that the details be stepped up and does not want to see wraparound frames on exterior windows on a traditional house.

Ms. Krosky said she likes the massing of the additions. She had concerns about the materials and applications of the materials and suggested looking holistically at the products that are being used. She suggested the stones need to wrap around and noted the exterior materials seem to be discombobulated.

Ms. Halas said they have gone through extensive pricing and have presented materials that are not cost-prohibitive. She suggested spending time on making the whole exterior look cohesive.



**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
JANUARY 12, 2023**

Ms. Strasser said the project should be right, and if need be, something must be scaled back to do so.

Ms. Halas confirmed the pediment detail at the front door and thin metal railing above the fly roof will be removed. Mr. Scott said he feels the new building has lost character. The door will be wider than what is shown in the images, but Mr. Scott indicated he agrees with what had been previously said and that he would like to see some specialness at the front door.

Chairperson Toney agreed with Mr. Scott; she said she believes the quality of materials is very important in clean and contemporary structures and suggested the applicant go back to the drawing board to add character and update the quality of materials.

Nathan Render was sworn in. He stated there is a sister house down the block with original siding, which he does not feel looks any more appealing than his house and is also not maintained. The design details of that house are similar to what is shown in the design. He would love to do a hardy board siding but would increase the project cost by \$35,000, and the project is already costing \$440,000; this is the difference between them doing and not doing the project. They are willing, but are trying to do their best and there is nowhere else to cut in order to do the project effectively. He doesn't feel the house is stripped of all character, and another option is to continue the white siding as is. He indicated they wouldn't be able to do the project with the additional cost of \$35,000.

Ms. Bokor said she felt many Board members are focusing on the vinyl because that is what they're seeing. She suggested details that could be made so the Board members see less vinyl and more details. She said she feels they can find creative solutions and the homeowners shouldn't be discouraged. Ms. Halas has looked at a variety of options. Ms. Bokor will work with the applicant between meetings to discuss options.

Mr. Scott stated he has no objections to the slate roof and other members agreed. Ms. Strasser said it was compelling to her that there has been an ongoing maintenance program.

**Motion to Table to the February 9, 2023 meeting by Ms. Krosky, second by Mr. Heyer;
Kroskey – yes, Strasser – yes, scott – yes, Heyer – yes, Scott – yes, Toney – yes.**

7) Application Number: BZAP-22-47

Address: 110 S. Stanwood

Applicant: Valerie Halas

Owner: Nathan Render and Tal Bendor

Request: The applicant is seeking a recommendation to the Board of Zoning and Planning for Architectural review and approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of the existing garage and a proposed new garage.



**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
JANUARY 12, 2023**

Options on how to proceed were discussed.

Motion to move to BZAP for approval for the variance with the remand back to the ARB for materials and details by Mr. Heyer, second by Ms. Strasser; **Heyer – Yes, Strasser – Yes, Scott – Yes, Kroskey – Yes, Toney – Yes.**

8) Application Number: BZAP-22-51

Address: 381 S. Drexel

Applicant: Valerie Halas

Owner: Sara Luck

Request: The applicant is seeking a recommendation to the Board of Zoning and Planning for Architectural review and approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish the existing garage and build a new garage.

Ms. Bokor said there is a need for a recommendation to go to BZAP for a new garage, which is closer to the lot line than allowable, which Ms. Bokor said she believes is an architectural issue. Ms. Rose indicated this will be further from the lot line than the existing garage. Ms. Bokor recommended that this be moved to BZAP for review and approval with a remand to the ARB.

Ms. Toney said she knows of some projects that have gone to BZAP, where Board members have looked at recommendations. She would like her opinion be noted that she does not feel this garage needs to be so close to the lot line. Ms. Bokor said she believes BZAP is more strict on this type of thing than ARB and will include concern about proximity to the lot line in her report. Ms. Rose said this is improving the zoning issue, but Ms. Bokor said it is an architectural issue and Ms. Strasser explained further.

Mr. Scott asked that windows be added, as well as notes to the elevations.

There was various discussion about how things will be viewed from the neighbor's yard, lot depth, and windows.

Motion for this application to go to BZAP with a remand back to the ARB for final design review by Ms. Strasser, second by Mr. Heyer; Heyer – Yes, Strasser – Yes, Scott – Yes, Kroskey – Yes, Toney – Yes.

9) Consent Agenda Item Application Number: ARB-22-66

Address: 178 Stanbery

Applicant: Gary J. Alexander

Owner: Michael and Shauna Lehman



**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
JANUARY 12, 2023**

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural review and approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for a 2nd story Addition to the rear of the existing structure.

Motion to approve Consent Agenda Items (Application Number: ARB-22-72, Address: 2670 Sherwood; Application Number: ARB-22-63, Address: 80 S. Cassingham; Application Number: ARB-22-64, Address: 211 N. Cassingham; Application Number: ARB-22-66, Address: 178 Stanbery; Application Number: ARB-22-69, Address: 976 Grandon; Application Number: ARB-22-70, Address: 165 N. Columbia; Application Number: ARB-22-71, Address: 299 N. Parkview; Application Number: BZAP-22-49, Address: 2456 Fair Ave) **by Mr. Heyer, second by Ms. Krosky; Krosky –Yes, Scott – Yes, Strasser – Yes, Heyer – Yes, Toney – Yes.**

10) Application Number: BZAP-22-46

Address: 2366 Bexley Park

Applicant: Gary Alexander

Owner: Laura S. Schick

Request: The applicant is seeking a recommendation to the Board of Zoning and Planning for Architectural review and approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for 2nd floor addition at the rear of the existing house.

Gary Alexander was sworn in.

Ms. Bokor said this application is an addition to the second story. Ms. Bokor said she feels like the massing of this project is out of character.

Mr. Alexander said they are intentionally not matching the existing home because the existing back of the house does not have a lot of character. He stated the owners need one additional reasonably sized bed and bathroom. The room below is only slightly over 11 feet, so they want a caneliever, which also reinforces that this is an addition. The low pitch of the roof also helps differentiate and doesn't overwhelm the height of the original roof. The applicant wants to use a board and batten with a thicker profile to assist with the differentiation. Mr. Alexander also said the double hung windows are original to the house and will be used in that context, the entire house will be painted white, the fascia is continued across the back, the bathroom could be shifted with one of the closets, but it is currently as is due to functional preferences, and that there is plumbing in the caneliever but it is not coming through the wall. He discussed the insulation that will be used and said the floor will be heated.

Mr. Heyer asked if the home would be painted white, the applicant agreed. Mr. Heyer said he does not have a problem with the caneliever. He does not feel the board and batten is contemporary, just a little different. He is wondering if there can be some design detail to the underside of the caneliever, such as having it accordion down.



**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
JANUARY 12, 2023**

Mr. Scott discussed structural support; he would like to see more articulation on the existing box below to give support, even if it is just some type of trim. He said he wants it to be something that is paid attention to. Regarding the way the roof fascias are lined up, he is interested in seeing a flat roof only or the slow sloped roof above for shingles, if the banned connection was not there. Mr. Alexander said part of his concern is the material and he described various options that were considered. Mr. Scott was trying to understand the horizontal band, which Mr. Alexander said was driven by materials.

Ms. Krosky discussed making the cantilever look more interesting; she is interested in seeing this again or having the applicant work with Ms. Bokor about whether or not the horizontal piece at the top is there or not. Mr. Alexander said there may be a way to make it weaker.

Mr. Alexander spoke to Ms. Krosky about breaking scale so the home seems to get smaller towards the back.

Chairperson Toney indicated she is not a proponent of this project based on how it looks in the rendering. Mr. Heyer said it is due to the proportions. Mr. Alexander said the windows will be clad to match the existing.

Ms. Bokor said she is comfortable working with Mr. Alexander on finalizing the details.

Findings of Fact and Decision of the Board for Application No. BZAP-22-46 for property located at 2366 Bexley Park: The Architecture Review Board finds that, regarding the second floor addition to the rear of the house, they move to recommend to the Board of Zoning and Planning for the approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness with the condition that the applicant work with the Design Consultant on final design details discussed in the meeting.

The applicant understood the Findings of Fact.

Motion to approve the Findings of Fact by Ms. Krosky, second by Mr. Scott; Strasser – Yes, Scott – Yes, Heyer – Yes, Krosky –Yes, Toney – No.

11) Application Number: ARB-22-68

Address: 2425 Sherwood

Applicant: Andrew Calhoun

Owner: Parker MacDonell

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural review and approval of a certificate of appropriateness for the Demolition of existing home and detached garage, construction of new home and attached garage in approximately the same footprint as existing.



**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
JANUARY 12, 2023**

Ms. Bokor stated there is no doubt that this merits a demolition, but the due diligence must be gone through. She indicated there is a complete packet with preliminary landscape plans that if approved, would be conditioned on going to the Tree & Public Garden Commission. She has received positive feedback from those who have looked at the plan. She explained to the applicant that it often takes multiple meetings to approve a demolition plan. Ms. Rose said that via email, they sent a plan of what they are considering which required variances, the applicant was asked to rethink those to meet the requirements of the zoning district, and he was able to do that. Therefore, the application has no variances.

Andrew Calhoun was sworn in. He stated this project started as the potential remodel of the existing home, and it became apparent that it is not in the best interest of the client's goals of having a connected garage and having an accessible home. This gave them the opportunity to think about what would be a better fit for the neighborhood and what would be a good fit for the client, that would work within the zoning requirements. Based on this, the applicant had come up with a craftsman style home with an attached garage. They considered how to successfully hold the corner lot; to do so, they wanted to introduce a strong gable and minimize the impact of the garage facade on the exposed faces. They like the classic craftsman style.

Jeff Beam was sworn in – he lives four houses away from the site and feels this project is a good neighbor with simple forms.

Ms. Strasser doesn't have an issue with the demolition, the applicant had brought the right materials, and she said it seems to her that they satisfy the requirements. She stated she thinks this will be an eye-catching design.

Mr. Scott said he loves the drawings and feels the process of the demolition has been satisfied. He indicated the side porch works well. He further stated this is different but he is a fan and would like to see the details worked out. He indicated a belief that the proportions are right and he was curious about the light roof.

Mr. Heyer said it is a beautiful design with great massing and heights. He indicated he struggled with the roof that showcases asphalt shingles. Mr. MacDonell explained that they wanted to come up with a texture that didn't have the cost and weight as slate. Mr. Heyer suggested other roof materials; he has the ability to make this plane of the roof, the texture will read differently because of size but questioned how to tie the eave in to make it a floating plane. He suggested painting the eaves the same color as the shingles to make it look like the plane has a thickness and also encouraged the applicant to look at a different asphalt shingle. Mr. Heyer explained the white trim takes away from other materials and he would like to see it to blend it in. Furthermore he indicated that if the gutters aren't designed, it won't feel natural. Mr. Heyer questioned the cultured stone and asked if Bexley's real stone could be included. Mr. MacDonell explained the actual window itself is dark bronze and the trim is ivory; Mr. Heyer said he feels this is too much contrast, noting that material quality in Bexley has decreased over time, and this is an opportunity to elevate.



**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
JANUARY 12, 2023**

Ms. Krosky said she has no issues with the demolition, drawings, and layout. She stated she doesn't see this as a craftsman home, due to the open beams, and other elements.

Mr. Heyer added that it is normal for the Board to nitpick on a replacement for a demolished house to ensure that the replacement home is better than what was there before.

Ms. Toney indicated that she likes this a lot and she loves that this is being torn down and given a fresh start. She said she feels there are still many details which can be worked out as they go through the process and explained she thinks copper gutters would be a great addition while also detailing the things that she loves.

There was discussion about how to proceed.

Mr. Heyer said he hopes that Mr. MacDonell can come back with a different roof proposal.

Motion to Table this to the February 9, 2023 meeting by Ms. Krosky, second by Mr. Scott; **Krosky – Yes, Strasser – Yes, Scott – Yes, Heyer – Yes, Toney – Yes.**

12) Consent Agenda Item Application Number: ARB-22-69

Address: 976 Grandon

Applicant: Pete Foster

Owner: Harry and Edna Wright

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural review and approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness of a new one story addition to the rear (east) of an existing two story resident.

Motion to approve Consent Agenda Items (Application Number: ARB-22-72, Address: 2670 Sherwood; Application Number: ARB-22-63, Address: 80 S. Cassingham; Application Number: ARB-22-64, Address: 211 N. Cassingham; Application Number: ARB-22-66, Address: 178 Stanbery; Application Number: ARB-22-69, Address: 976 Grandon; Application Number: ARB-22-70, Address: 165 N. Columbia; Application Number: ARB-22-71, Address: 299 N. Parkview; Application Number: BZAP-22-49, Address: 2456 Fair Ave) **by Mr. Heyer, second by Ms. Krosky; Krosky – Yes, Scott – Yes, Strasser – Yes, Heyer – Yes, Toney – Yes.**

13) Consent Agenda Item Application Number: ARB-22-70

Address: 165 N. Columbia

Applicant: City of Bexley

Owner: City of Bexley

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural review and approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for the Commonwealth Park Follies.



**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
JANUARY 12, 2023**

Motion to approve Consent Agenda Items (Application Number: ARB-22-72, Address: 2670 Sherwood; Application Number: ARB-22-63, Address: 80 S. Cassingham; Application Number: ARB-22-64, Address: 211 N. Cassingham; Application Number: ARB-22-66, Address: 178 Stanbery; Application Number: ARB-22-69, Address: 976 Grandon; Application Number: ARB-22-70, Address: 165 N. Columbia; Application Number: ARB-22-71, Address: 299 N. Parkview; Application Number: BZAP-22-49, Address: 2456 Fair Ave) **by Mr. Heyer, second by Ms. Krosky; Krosky –Yes, Scott – Yes, Strasser – Yes, Heyer – Yes, Toney – Yes.**

14) Consent Agenda Item Application Number: ARB-22-71
Address: 299 N. Parkview
Applicant: Michael Matrka
Owner: Dan & Christie Crane Page
Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural review and approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness screen porch addition to west side of house and an addition of a dormer.

Motion to approve Consent Agenda Items (Application Number: ARB-22-72, Address: 2670 Sherwood; Application Number: ARB-22-63, Address: 80 S. Cassingham; Application Number: ARB-22-64, Address: 211 N. Cassingham; Application Number: ARB-22-66, Address: 178 Stanbery; Application Number: ARB-22-69, Address: 976 Grandon; Application Number: ARB-22-70, Address: 165 N. Columbia; Application Number: ARB-22-71, Address: 299 N. Parkview; Application Number: BZAP-22-49, Address: 2456 Fair Ave) **by Mr. Heyer, second by Ms. Krosky; Krosky –Yes, Scott – Yes, Strasser – Yes, Heyer – Yes, Toney – Yes.**

15) Consent Agenda Item Application Number: BZAP-22-49
Address: 2456 Fair Ave
Applicant: Scott Baker Owner: Anthony & Veronica Bradley
Request: The applicant is seeking a recommendation to the Board of Zoning and Planning for Architectural review and approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for a covered porch at rear of house and a new garage.

Motion to approve Consent Agenda Items (Application Number: ARB-22-72, Address: 2670 Sherwood; Application Number: ARB-22-63, Address: 80 S. Cassingham; Application Number: ARB-22-64, Address: 211 N. Cassingham; Application Number: ARB-22-66, Address: 178 Stanbery; Application Number: ARB-22-69, Address: 976 Grandon; Application Number: ARB-22-70, Address: 165 N. Columbia; Application Number: ARB-22-71, Address: 299 N. Parkview; Application Number: BZAP-22-49, Address: 2456 Fair Ave) **by Mr. Heyer, second by Ms. Krosky; Krosky –Yes, Scott – Yes, Strasser – Yes, Heyer – Yes, Toney – Yes.**

7) Other Business

Regarding 420 N. Cassady, the applicant would like to be heard at the February 9, 2023 meeting. Ms. Bokor will share materials with Board members who can directly share comments with her but not with each other.



**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
JANUARY 12, 2023**

Motion to Table to the February 9, 2023 meeting by Mr. Heyer, second by Ms. Krosky; Strasser – yes, scott – yes, Kroskey – yes, Heyer – yes, Scott – yes, Toney – yes.

Chairperson Toney explained Board members each have their own opinion and hopefully the regular Board members will be in attendance at the next meeting.

Ms. Bokor said the Solar Panel Ordinance passed and ARB design guidelines have had one reading, with a tentative date of January 24, 2023 to do a presentation.

8) Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned.