



**City of Bexley  
Architectural Review Board  
November 10, 2022**

**1) Call to Order**

The Meeting was Called to Order by Chairperson Toney.

**2) Roll Call of Members**

Members Present: Mr. Scott, Mr. Steele, Ms. Krosky, Chairperson Toney

**3) Public Comments**

Howard Grant inquired about the order of the agenda.

**4) Approval of Minutes**

**Motion to approve the Meeting Minutes from the September 9, 2022 ARB Meeting by Mr. Scott, second by Ms. Krosky; all in favor.**

**Motion to approve the Meeting Minutes from the October 13, 2022 ARB Meeting by Mr. Scott, second by Ms. Krosky; all in favor.**

**5) Staff Report**

**Motion to approve the Consent Agenda (ARB-22-55 at 115 S Columbia, ARB-22-60 at 2731 Sherwood, ARB-22-61 at 216 N Roosevelt, BZAP-22-44 at 2364 Brentwood, ARB-22-62 at 202 N Stanwood) by Ms. Krosky, second by Mr. Steele; Ms. Krosky – yes, Mr. Steele – yes, Mr. Scott – yes, Chairperson Toney – yes.**

**6) Old Business**

*A. 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.*

Ms. Bokor stated this application had previously been before the Board and she reminded the Board that this vote is purely for architectural review. She indicated the architect and applicant have worked together to refine the design and stated the colors and roofline have been

modified. Ms. Bokor asked the Board to consider the various perspectives posted online. She shared a critique and asked the Board to approve certain aspects like massing, roof height, materials, color choices, and refined details to be determined when the first floor occupant has been confirmed.

Nicole Knight with The Community Builders gave a brief overview of the project, shared considerations, and discussed the reason for the bump outs which cannot be removed due to size regulations. She stated a portion of the ground floor will be utilized by the Community Builders and there is not an agreed upon end user for the remaining space on the ground floor.

Howard Murray was sworn in; Mr. Murray said he doesn't feel this project fits in with the community and is instead reminiscent of the west side. He further indicated other communities of note wouldn't consider this building and there will be parking challenges. He finds this project wrong.

Marilyn Levinson was sworn in; Ms. Levinson indicated the design concerns her and she would like to see the project be warmer to be more in tune. She asked how many car spaces will be on site; Ms. Rose stated that number was approved as part of the zoning review, that there will be on street parking, and that there will not be 30 parking spaces. Ms. Levinson asked how waste will be managed and space for children and pets. Chairperson Toney explained many of these questions are part of the zoning approval and Ms. Levinson said she'd like to see the building be warmer and softer.

Don Lewis, 663 Euclaire; Mr. Lewis explained he is in agreement with the aforementioned speakers and he doesn't see the parking spaces shown. It was confirmed that there are 17 spaces in the design.

Kevin Dryfuss-Wells was sworn in.

Mr. Steele questioned whether or not to soften the current design or to add details. Chairperson Toney clarified that Board members can share their opinions on the design for the applicant to take into consideration.

Mr. Scott appreciated the perspective renderings and the earlier comments regarding cleaning up the building mass. He stated he likes elevating the brick at portions of the building. Overall, he shared he has questions about the placement of details, such as the blade sign which he believes feels out of place, the brick details as they pertain to the scale mimicking the third floor window trim, and the window wrap at the first floor, which he believes is out of scale. Furthermore, he suggested panelizing the windows more. Overall, he said he feels this is a great leap forward. In the continued development of the details, Mr. Scott said he thinks they can be of a higher quality. He suggested continuing to look at precedent within the community in a modern way.

Ms. Rose stated the signage can be Staff approved if it meets Code. Mr. Dryfuss-Wells clarified that the sign in the drawings is a placeholder.

Ms. Krosky appreciated that this came back to be reviewed, as well as the colors and materials, but stated she believes the details need refinement, including the west elevation. She suggested aligning and finding out what the details need to be. She also encouraged refinement of the brick detailing, appreciated the step down, and complimented the landscaping. She stated she agrees with Mr. Scott about the windows and said she is not in favor of the lap siding with the windows; she also agrees with Mr. Scott's comments regarding the signage.

Mr. Scott suggested adding weight through details at the top of the building. Ms. Rose said she wants to ensure mechanical equipment is hidden. Mr. Scott discussed sightlines and height.

Mr. Steele said many of his thoughts have been discussed and suggested adding detail to the top of the brick.

Chairperson Toney stated her opinion that the building presented doesn't correlate with the qualities of the reference buildings shown. Mr. Dryfuss-Wells said TCB doesn't intend to replicate historic buildings but they are looking to replicate scale and similar brick details. Chairperson Toney said she doesn't see how the building fits into the street and she doesn't see it as traditional or contemporary. She was looking for a full fledged, new design and doesn't feel this building is Bexley.

Ms. Bokor reviewed the progress that has been made in materials and colors. She shared her thought that an approval can be made on massing and roof height. Ms. Rose clarified three-story is appropriate for this zoning district. Ms. Toney said this is an important building that must be charming, elegant, and/or otherwise good.

Ms. Knight indicated she is looking for an idea of how TCB can potentially move forward and some information about getting prices for contractors. Mr. Scott discussed becoming comfortable with simplicity and utilizing the feedback in a way that makes sense with the available funds.

There was discussion about how to proceed regarding a vote or Table.

Ms. Krosky said she would like to revisit the screening of the mechanical units at the next meeting.

**Motion to Table to the January 12, 2023 meeting by Ms. Krosky, second by Mr. Scott; Mr. Steele – yes, Mr. Scott – yes, Ms. Krosky – yes, Chairperson Toney – yes.**

*B. Application Number: BZAP-22-35*

*Address: 545 N Drexel*

*Applicant: Zahra Elkassabgi*

*Owner: Mohamed El-Sayed*

*Request: The applicant is requesting a recommendation to the Board of Zoning and Planning for Architectural review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for a pergola, a deck and a hot tub which requires a variance from the north side lot line.*

Mr. El-Sayed was sworn in.

Ms. Bokor explained this had previously been before the Board, and Ms. Rose shared it had also been in front of the Zoning Board, whose members encouraged the applicant to see what can be done to resolve encroachment issues. Ms. Rose said the applicant has pulled the deck back so it meets setback requirements and pulled back the arbor that is on the deck; at this time, they are only looking at a variance for the hot tub. Ms. Bokor said it looks nice from the curb but she is concerned about the architectural integrity. She noted she personally doesn't feel the hot tub will be an imposition on the neighbor's property, so long as the deck is cut as it is proposed. The structure of the deck and pergola design worries her; the applicant has hired a structural engineer to do the drawing. She shared she is comfortable with approval despite coming to the Board after the fact, but is concerned about the structural integrity. She stated the workmanship is clean and nicely done.

Mr. El-Sayed mentioned that the structural integrity is of concern and there are several things that must be corrected, but the structural engineer did not have safety concerns. He said everything will be compliant to Code. As soon as he has the finished structural drawings, he will submit them, and when they are approved, he will have someone fix the structure based on the recommendations of the Board and structural engineer. Today he is looking for a recommendation for the BZAP to issue a Certificate of Approval for design.

Ms. Krosky said based on the pictures, and knowing that a portion of the setback has been addressed, she finds this appropriate. Furthermore, she said she appreciates that there is a structural engineer and the structure will be amended to be compliant. Mr. El-Sayed said structural issues will need to be addressed. Ms. Krosky noted she is fine remanding this to Staff.

Mr. Scott said the overall scope is nice and indicated he wanted to include the following conditions: the posts that stick up behind the beams in the trellis need to be flush to be cut with the top of the beams, the beam extension will be cut back to no more than a foot, the deck needs a skirt board, for and trellis on the right, the top should be removed so there is not a double trellis.

Mr. Steele shared his opinion that meeting his conditions and the setback are key. Mr. El-Sayed said that the post near the neighbors will stay as in.

Chairperson Toney did not have anything else to add.

1:14:00 The Findings of Fact and Decision of the Board for ...

The applicant understood the Findings of Fact.

**Motion to approve by Mr. Steele, second by Ms. Krosky; Mr. Scott – yes, Ms. Krosky – yes, Mr. Steele – yes, Chairperson Toney – yes.**

*C. Application Number: ARB-22-49/BZAP-22-39*

*Address: 2735 Alleghany*

*Applicant: Curtis and Megan Allman*

*Owner: Curtis and Megan Allman*

*Request: The applicant is requesting Architectural review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for an addition to the rear of principle structure.*

Ms. Rose said there's a modification to the plans, which now meet Code. Therefore, this is for full approval of the design.

Ms. Bokor commended the applicant in his work to improve the design.

Mr. Allman was sworn in.

Ms. Bokor said she is in full support of approving this with conditions to refine details. Mr. Allman thanked Ms. Bokor and Ms. Rose for their assistance and said several aspects had been changed. Ms. Rose stated the loophole that was found which allows this to meet Code.

Mr. Scott said the mass at the back of the house is appropriate but he has concerns with the details, such as box capitals. Furthermore, he said the windows will need trim. He explained his belief that the floorplan is better and gave a suggestion depending on how the backroom will be used.

Mr. Steel was in agreement with Mr. Scott. He said he hopes to see the home resided in the future and the inclusion of additional details.

Ms. Krosky was also in agreement and said she believes this will be very nice. She is fine with the details being worked out with Staff.

Chairperson Toney said the home is still not symmetrical and asked if a pergola can be included to make this seem intentional. Various options were discussed.

Mr. Allman said all of the windows have been increased to meet the egress requirements.

#### **Findings of Fact 1:33:30**

The applicant understood the Findings of Fact.

**Motion to approve by Ms. Krosky, second by Mr. Scott; Ms. Krosky – yes, Mr. Scott – yes, Mr. Steele – yes, Chairperson Toney – yes.**

*D. Application Number: ARB-22-54*

*Address: 2504 Bexford Place*

*Applicant: Yvonne Riggie*

*Owner: Matt & Linsey Van Meter*

*Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for a two-story addition and renovation, front porch addition, new siding, and new roofing.*

Ms. Bokor said the design has been improved and the applicant has proposed three potential designs. The detail that was trying to be preserved doesn't exist in actuality.

Yvonne Riggie was sworn in. She discussed the roof and presented various options. She said the return discussed at the last meeting is not actually present. Regarding the rear elevation, the roof skirt, when pulled out on the addition, wasn't well received by the Board; it was the Board's preference to have that removed. While it is the applicant's and client's preference to build the house as presented, a compromise has been preserved.

Mr. Scott stated he is in agreement that he likes the preferred versions.

Ms. Krosky and Mr. Steele also agreed with the preferred versions. It was mentioned that the stairs need a railing and the roof was discussed.

Chairperson Toney's comment was that the two back doors should be at the same back landing; an option was discussed.

#### **Findings of Fact 1:49:00**

The applicant understood the Findings of Fact.

**Motion to approve by Ms. Krosky, second by Mr. Steele; Mr. Scott – yes, Mr. Steele – yes, Ms. Krosky – yes, Chairperson Toney – yes.**

The Board took a brief recess.

#### **7) New Business**

*A. Application Number: ARB-22-57*

*Address: 115 S Columbia*

*Applicant: Pete Foster*

*Owner: Patricia Gianakopoulos*

*Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for a new attached covered first floor sitting pavilion to the west of the existing two-story residence.*

*B. Application Number: ARB-22-58*

*Address: 21 S Parkview*

*Applicant: Neal Hauschild/ Nth Degree*

*Owner: Russ Klein*

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

Neal Hauschild was sworn in.

Ms. Bokor gave an overview of the case, explained that the driveway is somewhat unusual, and shared she requested specific information from the applicant.

Mr. Hauschild said the owners preferred to have a covered porch off of their Great Room, whereas they currently have a large patio and would like an outdoor fireplace. The home orientation was discussed and Ms. Bokor said there was a large tree line.

Mr. Hauschild indicated the new covered porch would mimic an existing covered porch.

Mr. Steele asked how the roof would tie in; the slope will hang over the parapet. Additionally, there will be one step down from the Great Room to the patio.

Mr. Scott commented on the wall and grade change and stated he would be in favor if the addition matches the existing structure. Furthermore, he commented on the roof. Mr. Scott said he is unable to approve what is presented given the current level of details; he would like to see real drawings.

Ms. Krosky agreed with Mr. Scott regarding the drawings; she feels the concept is appropriate and would like to see different drawings and elevations showing materials.

Chairperson Toney said she would like to see real drawings, but feels the concept is great.

The applicant would like to be Tabled to the January 12, 2023 meeting.

**Motion to Table by Ms. Krosky, second by Mr. Scott; Ms. Krosky – yes, Mr. Steele – yes, Mr. Scott – yes, Chairperson Toney – yes.**

*C. Application Number: ARB-22-59*

*Address: 380 S Merkle*

*Applicant: Jack Metzger*

*Owner: Debbie Vinocur*

*Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness to add a porch roof to the patio on the Northeast side of the family room.*

Ms. Bokor stated this is an addition of a cannibal membrane roof over a pre-existing stamped concrete patio. Ms. Bokor is fine with this application being approved under the condition that she work with the applicant, if necessary.

Mr. Metzger was sworn in and said the roof will tie in above the triple window and discussed other locations where it will be tied in.

Ms. Krosky said this seems appropriate and agrees that the details should be worked out with Ms. Bokor. Mr. Metzger clarified where the patio will end.

Mr. Scott reviewed the ways this roof will be tied in and said he was concerned. Various options were discussed. Mr. Scott said he supports the intent but stated he believes there is a large challenge in getting this to work.

Ms. Bokor said she is comfortable having this remanded to staff and Chairperson Toney suggested a roof plan. Mr. Metzger said the overhang will still be there and gave further information. The garage soffit will be cut off. Ms. Bokor indicated that she understands the plans.

Mr. Scott said he does not like the plans for the post and recommended elevating the post and putting it on an anchor.

Mr. Metzger indicated he is not interested in a detached structure and the shingles were discussed, as were other details, with Mr. Scott.

Ms. Bokor said she is comfortable with this.

**FOF 2:35:00**

The applicant understood the Finding of Facts.

**Motion to approve by Ms. Krosky, second by Mr. Steele; Mr. Steele – yes, Mr. Scott – yes, Ms. Krosky – yes, Chairperson Toney – yes.**

*D. Application Number: ARB-22-60*

*Address: 2731 Sherwood*

*Applicant: Amy Lauerhass*

*Owner: Elizabeth & Brian Murphy*

*Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for an addition of a screened porch to the west side of the house and addition of a mudroom to the south of the house.*

**Motion to approve the Consent Agenda (ARB-22-55 at 115 S Columbia, ARB-22-60 at 2731 Sherwood, ARB-22-61 at 216 N Roosevelt, BZAP-22-44 at 2364 Brentwood, ARB-22-62 at**



**202 N Stanwood) by Ms. Krosky, second by Mr. Steele; Ms. Krosky – yes, Mr. Steele – yes, Mr. Scott – yes, Chairperson Toney – yes.**

*E. Application Number: ARB-22-61*

*Address: 216 N Roosevelt*

*Applicant: Amy Lauerhass*

*Owner: Alida Smith & Greg Conant*

*Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for a small second story addition over the existing one-story section of the house.*

**Motion to approve the Consent Agenda (ARB-22-55 at 115 S Columbia, ARB-22-60 at 2731 Sherwood, ARB-22-61 at 216 N Roosevelt, BZAP-22-44 at 2364 Brentwood, ARB-22-62 at 202 N Stanwood) by Ms. Krosky, second by Mr. Steele; Ms. Krosky – yes, Mr. Steele – yes, Mr. Scott – yes, Chairperson Toney – yes.**

*F. Application Number: BZAP-22-42*

*Address: 2834 Powell*

*Applicant: Joey Brunetto*

*Owner: Joey Brunetto*

*Request: The applicant is seeking a recommendation to the Board of Zoning and Planning for Architectural review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish an existing 2 car garage and construct a new 4 car garage.*

Ms. Bokor clarified that the applicant is asking for a recommendation to the BZAP because this will need a variance. She stated concern about what is in the garage, however, it was clarified that the drawings have been modified to no longer reflect a dwelling unit. Ms. Bokor explained this is before the Board to review the architecture. This is a large lot without an alley and Ms. Rose said there is a grade change.

Mr. Brunetto was sworn in.

Ms. Bokor displayed various photos and Mr. Brunetto said the new proposed garage is shorter than the current garage. Ms. Bokor said she feels the lot has space for an oversized garage, but she is unsure this is in the spirit of the new garage code. She is not okay with the new deck.

Mr. Brunetto indicated he would like an oversized garage because there is a lot of space and neighbors at different locations; this garage will help address privacy concerns. He is not married to the idea of the deck. He would like to have the space to park three vehicles inside and also house bikes and toys. Because of the lot size and the vehicles that currently sit out, he would like to place the vehicles inside the structure. He indicated a willingness to work on the concept.

Mr. Brunetto said the most impacted neighbor is in favor of this and that other neighbors have large garages. There are no structures behind the home but there are many trees.

Ms. Rose said this lot size is almost twice the width as the standard size, but that the proposed garage is 240 square feet larger than what is allowed for this lot size, excluding the deck.

Mr. Brunetto said there is currently a challenge with ceiling height. Ms. Bokor said it would be great to see some of the details from the house in the garage design. Mr. Brunetto said some details have been approved but are not shown on the drawings. The home has a slate roof but the garage will not.

Ms. Krosky said it would be helpful to have the current height of the existing garage in comparison. She said it feels like another house is being built, due to the scale. She does not feel like the deck is appropriate and agreed that the detailing of materials and to think of what is happening at the lower level. She suggested including more vertical lines on the garage. She said the pictures don't reflect what will actually happen and can't say whether or not she feels the design is appropriate.

Mr. Scott confirmed that there is a current project that will change the existing home. He asked why details are being matched to the current, not future home. Mr. Scott said he agrees with Ms. Krosky that the proposed garage is approved.

Mr. Brunetto said there have been production issues and the shake project has been delayed.

Mr. Scott suggested breaking up the lower and upper half of the project, as he feels the proposed project is too big. Mr. Scott pointed out the dormers, which will drop lower than what is seen, but this detail is not coming from the main house. The 16 x 9' is not a recommendation for approval because it seems to be size for size's sake. He is not sold that the design matches the home; Mr. Brunetto said he is happy to revisit details. Visibility was discussed. Mr. Scott said the deck is large.

Mr. Steele said it is large and pulling the stairs inside would be helpful; various options were discussed. Mr. Steele suggested windows on the first floor.

Mr. Scott would like to see details explored.

Chairperson Toney said variances exist for a reason and to be approved, parameters must be met; she asked for additional drawings. She said the Board is trying to be more protective of the types of drawings and also discussed windows with the applicant.

The applicant would like this to be Tabled to the January 12, 2023 meeting.

**Motion to Table by Ms. Krosky, second by Mr. Steele; Mr. Scott – yes, Mr. Steele – yes, Ms. Krosky – yes, Chairperson Toney – yes.**

*G. Application Number: BZAP-22-43*

*Address: 157 N Ardmore*

*Applicant: Amy Lauerhass*

*Owner: Kyle & Allie Upchurch*

*Request: The applicant is seeking a recommendation to BZAP for Architectural review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness to convert a section of house from 1-story to 1-1/2 story; expansion of front porch; change of rear shed roof.*

Ms. Bokor stated in this case, the front door is at the side yard. Ms. Bokor stated her concern for the project is how the new and old roof lines will tie together and expanding the front porch could help make this smoother.

Amy Lauerhass was sworn in and gave information about the home and project. She suggested various improvements to make the home look more cohesive and discussed the materials.

Mr. Scott said the massing strategy seems balanced, but he is having difficulty with the connection. He and Ms. Lauerhass discussed various roofing options, including overhangs. He recommended dropping the roof and wants to ensure there is a balance from the front porch. He said the proportions of the dormers on the main roof do not feel proportional. Ms. Lauerhass discussed the other options she considered and she said she would consider a shed roof.

Mr. Steele agreed that a shed roof would be beneficial. He complimented going an extra step with the foundation details.

Ms. Krosky is excited for this project. She is in agreement and feels a shed dormer may be helpful. Ms. Lauerhass explained that some of the details were not carried throughout due to cost; Ms. Krosky encouraged her to rethink this. Ms. Lauerhass also said she will be matching details to the current home. Ms. Lauerhass described the refinements she believes will improve the home.

Chairperson Toney said making the dormers long and low would be beneficial, and suggested widening the porch, trying to accentuate the length of the porch, and reducing the number of columns. She also suggested raising the stone to improve the proportions.

Ms. Bokor suggested not to Table this application due to the timeline with the BZAP meetings.

**FOF 3:29:27**

**Motion to approve Ms. Krosky, second by Mr. Streele; Mr. Steele – yes, Mr. Scott – yes, Ms. Krosky – yes, Chairperson Toney – yes.**

*H. Application Number: BZAP-22-44*

*Address: 2364 Brentwood*

*Applicant: Amy Lauerhass*

*Owner: Geoffrey and Tiffany Winchell*

*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 the demolition of an existing garage, and construction of a new garage and the addition of a pool.*

**Motion to approve the Consent Agenda (ARB-22-55 at 115 S Columbia, ARB-22-60 at 2731 Sherwood, ARB-22-61 at 216 N Roosevelt, BZAP-22-44 at 2364 Brentwood, ARB-22-62 at 202 N Stanwood) by Ms. Krosky, second by Mr. Steele; Ms. Krosky – yes, Mr. Steele – yes, Mr. Scott – yes, Chairperson Toney – yes.**

*I. Application Number: ARB-22-62*

*Address: 202 N Stanwood*

*Applicant: Pete Foster*

*Owner: John Roll*

*Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for a two story addition to the east of the existing two-story residence.*

**Motion to approve the Consent Agenda (ARB-22-55 at 115 S Columbia, ARB-22-60 at 2731 Sherwood, ARB-22-61 at 216 N Roosevelt, BZAP-22-44 at 2364 Brentwood, ARB-22-62 at 202 N Stanwood) by Ms. Krosky, second by Mr. Steele; Ms. Krosky – yes, Mr. Steele – yes, Mr. Scott – yes, Chairperson Toney – yes.**

## **8) Other Business**

*A. Application Number: ARB-22-53*

*Address: 2010 East Broad Applicant: Brent Foley/Rachael Hill Owner: Catholic Diocese of Columbus*

*Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for a change to the original approved design.*

Ms. Bokor said there was a change during the construction process to an already approved design; the original colonnade was to seamlessly turn into the new, but due to grade issues, the old and new are on two different levels.

Mr. Foley was sworn in and apologized for miscommunication. One revision to the design was a lowering of the building height; as that happened, arches were lowered bringing the entire thing down. It was shown in revisions but the 3D images were not included and Mr. Foley gave additional information. He explained there is an intent for a sister courtyard and said he wanted to extend the colonnade, and some modifications that have been made. He said they have taken the language from the front of the building and have placed it where the two interact, to mimic it, with a cricket roof.

Ms. Bokor said Staff have met with the applicant and discussed. She said the biggest problem she sees with the current solution is that she doesn't see how the roofs will cleanly come together. Mr. Foley further explained the colonnades. Ms. Bokor stated Mr. Heyer is not comfortable with this solution and suggested looking at a parapet in front of the arches with a fake glass arch. Mr. Foley explained the difficulties with this option.

Mr. Scott asked if the colonnade could be rotated or changed to address the corner; Mr. Foley said they attempted to narrow the arch but it didn't work proportionally.

Everyone is on board for a change, but there is uncertainty about what the change will be, and various options were discussed. Ms. Bokor suggested an object transition piece, and Mr. Foley said they are trying to balance cost and time.

The applicant will report to Ms. Bokor, who will forward information to the Board to provide individual feedback. An update will be made during the January meeting. Mr. Foley said some simplification may be possible.

**FOF 3:52:20**

Jim Lower was sworn in and asked about the timeline; Ms. Bokor indicated this will be fast-tracked.

**Motion to approve by Mr. Steele, second by Ms. Krosky; Mr. Steele – yes, Ms. Krosky – yes, Mr. Scott – yes, Chairperson Toney – yes.**

#### *B. Design Guidelines*

Ms. Bokor requested a vote to recommend the adoption of the Design Guidelines by this board to City Council. The approval does not mean that it will no longer be worked on.

**Moved by Scott, second by Krosky; Mr. Steele – yes, Mr. Scott – yes, Ms. Krosky – yes, Chairperson Toney – yes.**

Ms. Bokor suggested representation during the discussion, as well as a public forum.

Chairperson Toney and Ms. Bokor discussed the solar panel ordinance.

#### *C. Commonwealth Follies*

This discussion will take place at a subsequent meeting.

### **9) Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned.