



Architectural Review Board Meeting

Agenda February 9, 2023
6:00 PM

- 1) Call to Order
The meeting was Called to Order by Chairperson Toney.
- 2) Roll Call of Members
Members present: Ms. Krosky, Mr. Heyer, Mr. Scott, Chairperson Toney
- 3) Approval of Minutes
Motion to approve Minutes from the January 12, 2023 meeting by Mr. Scott, second by Ms. Krosky; Mr. Heyer – abstain, Ms. Krosky – Yes, Mr. Scott – Yes, Chairperson Toney – Yes.
- 4) Public Comments
There were no Public Comments.
- 5) Old Business

1) 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 gave a Staff Report stating that last month's meeting included robust discussion about the architecture of this project, and that Board members had differing opinions as did community members. However, the general consensus was that the presented design was not a good fit for the area. The applicant asked for a Table, and in the interim, worked with Ms. Bokor to revise the design. The updated design includes a footprint consistent with the original design, but the elevations, materials, windows, and brick work, were reconsidered to make this "look like Bexley," and maintain character. The revised drawings are available online for community members to view.

Ms. Bokor indicated there was an emphasis on adding brick to the building to maintain a more traditional window pattern and look, removing bump outs, and using awnings and a water table. Ms. Bokor wanted to get a sense that this project was approvable, either outright or with conditions so the project can know that it is going forward in a positive way and that funding can be secured. She said there was a good momentum and stated there had been feedback from individual Board members and an intense work process.

Nicole Knight was sworn in, thanked the Board members and Ms. Bokor for their work, and said she hoped this design was well received. The applicant indicated a willingness to a Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law with conditions so the project can collaboratively move forward.

Ms. Bokor stated she has researched how architecture and design can further enhance affordable living and economic opportunities in well resourced neighborhoods.

Kevin Dryfuss-Wells was sworn in.

Ms. Knight spoke to the changes and discussed that the funding guidelines include minimum unit sizes and amenities and features; the applicant is trying to balance this with funding costs. They achieved minimum unit sizes while removing the bump outs to have a more calm facade along Cassady. The units are a little bit larger from what they were in the original design; on the ground floor, the additional square footage is in amenities for residents, not in commercial square footage. However, the building is still in compliance with the BZAP requirements for commercial space.

Mr. Dryfuss-Wells explained some of the design changes, including flattening out the facade, a consistent window size, extended brick, and metal panels.

Ms. Knight proposed the condition of a mock up of materials and Board members would be invited to review them; Ms. Bokor was in support of this.

Larry Golden of Ruhl and Stanbery was sworn in. Mr. Golden asked the Board members to think about how this building will impact the people nearby who saved for a deposit, in contrast to the people living here who will be getting grants or subsidies. He questioned how this building will change the value of the neighbor's homes and asked if Board members would allow this structure next to their homes? He further stated Bexley wouldn't allow retirement housing and he doesn't think this architecture fits in this area. He stated there is a difference between owner-occupied housing and apartments, and that historically, over time, apartments go downhill.

Ruthellen Weaver, 400 Stanbery with law office at 542 S. Drexel, was sworn in. She stated that a major part of net worth is tied in her home and indicated she would like to see the neighborhood preserved. Furthermore, she does not think this building looks like what the Cassady corridor should look like and asked the Board to think about the impact of people who frequent the area, as well as parking. Finally, she urged the Board to reconsider architecture. It was determined that Ms. Weaver does not have standing.

Chairperson Toney explained that the BZAP had already looked at the building's parking.

Mr. Heyer discussed details, such as the quality of the masonry; he would like to have a historic, long standing regional mason to complete this work. He asked that the mortar be a historic buff-color, suggested soldier courses over the windows, and requested that they're not projected. He explained he is looking for quality materials, mason, and designer, and clean, simple traditional details. He would like to see the soldier course be continuous above the windows and asked if it was possible to make complete over the windows with a band to sit over it. Mr. Heyer said this is an example of a good, community fabric building; this fits the bill of the Land Use Strategy. He would like to see the awnings gain more character as well as equal length metal panels across the roof.

Chairperson Toney said that they wanted to see a mock up of the brick and mortar: Ms. Knight said that can be done.

Mr. Scott said he thinks is a great move forward, and he considered the overall influencers of this project and understands who the building is being built for as well as the financial models. He stated it feels like the applicant has gone through great strides to invest in material for the exterior facade and developed an overall design that fits into the community. Mr. Scott explained he likes the stone base but does have a concern with the details; the soldier course is interrupted by the windows, the soldier course stops in the renderings (it was determined that this was an error), and the vertical brick detail. Mr. Dryfuss-Wells discussed this as well as a small stone detail. Referring to the east elevation, Mr. Scott made comments about the siding, metal panels, and other details.

Ms. Krosky said she thinks this design looks better; including the brick and metals panels. Further, she explained it would be nice to alternate to fiber cement and stated she is in agreement with previous comments.

Mr. Heyer said there's one soldier course that defines the pedestrian experience and the applicant may want to add an additional course to have a double projection defining the pedestrian zone with everything above it being private. Furthermore, he would like to make sure the architecture endures.

Chairperson Toney stated she was relieved that this design is a much simpler building. She would like there to be a focus on the brick and she mentioned a recessed line, and explained this might be nice in order to create gentle patterns in the brick to give detail and sophistication. She explained she struggles with the white line going across the windows and would like another course of brick under that. Furthermore, she stated that the south elevation looks to have double windows but single windows are in the plan. She explained that previously there was a window in the stairwell, and she would like to see that come back on all floors, as well as more brick details across the south elevation.

Ms. Knight said they'll need to clean up the drawings and work with engineers. TCB encourages windows in the stairwell and she explained the double windows are correct. Ms. Knight discussed moving forward and Mr. Dreyfuss-Wells talked about materials. There was discussion about details and materials between Board members regarding the band and soldier course.

Ms. Bokor read through the conditions.

The findings and decisions of the Board for application number BZAP-20-52 for the property located at 420 N. Cassady Ave. as stated by Kathy Rose: That the Architectural Review Board issues a Certificate of Appropriateness for a 3- story structure with commercial on the first floor and residential on the 2nd and 3rd floors with the following conditions:

- Demolition cannot occur until a building plan approval is obtained in conjunction with any needed environmental remediation.
- Landscape plan to be review and approval by the Tree and Public Garden Commission.
- No trees should be removed without an approved landscape plan.
- Material samples of brick and the mortar during construction at the site should be made available to the Architectural Review Board for review and comments.
- The brick lintels/brick course over the windows should not project.
- One soldier course should be removed from the 3rd floor.

- Applicant must return to the Architectural Review Board for review and approval of final details in the elevations, specifically the brickwork, window details and metal work.

The applicant understood the Findings of Fact.

Motion to approve by Ms. Krosky, second by Mr. Scott; Mr. Scott – Yes, Mr. Heyer – Yes, Ms. Krosky – Yes, Chairperson Toney – Yes.

2) TABLED BY THE APPLICANT TO MARCH 9, 2023

ARB 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.

3) 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.

Ms. Bokor stated this application had previously been before the Board and the applicant didn't have the full set of drawings. From her perspective the intent is clear but the drawings may need to be more refined for building permits.

Cheryl Ware was sworn in. She explained this project is a covered course built above an existing patio, attached to the existing structure and with a fireplace. She explained they would be matching all stone and roofing with the house and this project will include electrical work.

Mr. Scott asked how the project engages the adjacent roof, explaining it feels like there are two roofs colliding. He explained there needs to be trust that the addition will match the existing home, but that it is hard to understand the overall scale and proportion of the project to the whole house. Finally, he mentioned many aspects of the design were appropriate.

Ms. Bokor stated the drawing are not traditional and are improving.

Ms. Rose asked if the addition needs to be attached to the home; Ms. Ware said it does need to attach to the doors in order to step down to the patio. The home owners want to be able to walk out and not have any space.

Brittany Fortin was sworn in and stated this addition will mimic a porch that is original to the house and on the other side; she explained there is a door that opens to the outdoor porch.

Ms. Bokor reiterated her intent to get constructible, approvable drawings.

Ms. Fortin described where this addition will be built on the house.

Ms. Krosky asked that the drawings be improved to allow for an understanding as to how the addition is connecting to the flat roof area. She explained she does not have an issue with this addition and discussed the differences in the brickwork and how the stone and stucco will integrate. She would like to see elevations.

Mr. Heyer asked why the applicant wants to put a stone addition on the stucco side of the house; he indicated he feels the stone will not look natural and that it would make more sense to do stucco because there won't be arches, as stucco is a clean and natural putty material. He suggested hiring someone to do a beautiful rendering and bring this to the Board, stating it is important for the Board to have a record of the real thing. Therefore, he stated there needs to be a drawing that more accurately shows what will happen.

Chairperson Toney stated doesn't see how the corner of the addition will meet the roof of the house; Ms. Ware explained that one roof is higher. Chairperson Toney said there will need to be drawings to further explain the design with exact measurements, how things will work with snow, etc.

Mr. Scott discussed the roof and Ms. Toney said that things might look right. There was discussion about the flat roof and alternative designs. It was stated that there is a desire to make this look like it is original to the home; Mr. Heyer, Board members, and the applicant discussed a connector and having the stone go around the pavilion. Mr. Heyer described this would be pulled off the stucco and build a connecting roof so they are separate structures; architecturally, this will separate that.

Motion to Table to the March 9, 2023 by Ms. Krosky, second by Mr. Heyer; Mr. Scott – Yes, Mr. Heyer – Yes, Ms. Krosky – Yes, Chairperson Toney – Yes.

4) TABLED BY THE APPLICANT TO MARCH 9, 2023

ARB 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.

5) 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 stated this application was tabled at the last meeting. She explained this project is split into two applications and the house does not need zoning approval but the applicant can move on to the BZAP for the garage, as this was approved with the condition it be remanded back to this board for design review. Ms. Rose explained that the easement issue has been resolved and Ms. Bokor said some of the higher end details have been redone. Ms. Halas and the owner do not want to step in one wall because it compromises the interior floor plan, although the entire home will be resided. The discussion about the front door has been addressed in the plan.

Ms. Halas said they've looked at detailing around the windows and have added details -- some of which have been carried around all facades -- as well as updated the front door area to have pilasters and an articulation with the crown, banding, and simplified materiality.

Mr. Heyer wanted to pay attention to the massing more than the details. He stated that redoing the windows would be ideal but not in the budget. He indicated support of the massing and details but would like to see real, enduring materials. Materials were discussed and Mr. Heyer said the chosen materials should be ones that the the builders can make look substantial and clean. Mr. Heyer stated is he fine with the flushness of the addition because the chimney breaks up the long run but indicated sadness because the materials will feel cheap.

Ms. Krosky said she feels this design is more cohesive. She indicated she does not like the board and batten but stated that is her opinion, not that of own the owner.

Ms. Bokor indicated she received sketches with cedar vinyl shakes and thought getting verticality would be best. She said cedar shake vinyl looks more fake than board and batten vinyl.

Mr. Scott stated the details in this project will be critical; he said he is not a fan of the white trim and would rather that be much closer to the color of the house, but there are other elements that can be lightened. He is okay with the board and batten but not the board and batten vinyl. He said the eave seems to be deep in the model; Ms. Halas said she believed it is the angle. Mr. Heyer wanted to make sure it isn't going past the other roofs on the property.

Ms. Heyer clarified that all of the windows will be on the same height.

Mr. Scott said the details at the base of the column should be simplified. He is not sold that the wall at the rear needs to be stone. Ms. Halas described the materials that are there now and that the stucco will be removed. Mr. Heyer further explained that the trim color should be changed.

Chairperson Toney stated she appreciated the details around the front door and porch, but struggles with the addition not being inset, and alternatives were stated to break up the wall. She would like to see the overhangs on the addition drawn more accurately.

Mr. Scott stated that the forms and massings in the presentations are appreciated.

There was discussion about how to proceed. Ms. Bokor stated she is comfortable working with the applicant and Mr. Heyer expressed a desire to see this application again.

Ms. Halas asked for a Table.

Motion to Table to the March 9, 2023 by Mr. Scott, second by Mr. Heyer; Mr. Heyer – Yes, Ms. Krosky – Yes, Mr. Scott – Yes, Chairperson Toney – Yes.

6) 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.

Mr. Heyer recused himself.

Ms. Bokor stated this applicant went to the BZAP, was approved, and remanded back to this Board for design review and Certificate of Appropriateness. Ms. Rose gave more detail and Ms. Bokor explained why this went to the BZAP first.

Mr. Scott complimented the proportions but said he liked the color suggestions, and discussed the board and batten and the reason why putting in a window doesn't make sense.

Ms. Krosky had no comments and Ms. Toney thanked them from pulling this structure off the lot lines.

Ms. Bokor added a condition.

The findings and decisions of the Board for application number BZAP-22-47 for the property located at 110 S Stanwood as stated by Kathy Rose: That the Architectural Review Board issues a Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish the existing garage and build a new garage with the condition that it match the final design to the new addition to the house.

The applicant understood the Findings of Fact.

Motion to approve by Ms. Krosky, second by Mr. Scott; Ms. Krosky – Yes, Mr. Scott – Yes, Chairperson Toney – Yes.

Application Number: BZAP 22-51

Address: 381 S. Drexel

Applicant: Valerie Halas

Owner: Sarah 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. This application was approved but the Board of Zoning and Planning and remanded back to ARB for final design approval.

Ms. Bokor stated this was an add on to the agenda and was approved at the last BZAP meeting with a remand for final design review, and did not need to be noticed. Ms. Bokor indicated the variance was not the issue at hand, as it was a design issue, but the structure has been moved from the lot line.

Mr. Scott complimented the design and is in support.

Ms. Halas explained the drawings.

Ms. Krosky indicated this looks fine.

Chairperson Toney asked about the windows in the elevation along the fence line. Ms. Halas shared the client would rather not include additional windows. The project will be made of cement board.

The findings and decisions of the Board for application number BZAP-22-51 for the property located at 381 S. Drexel as stated by Kathy Rose: That the Architectural Review Board issues a Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish the existing garage and build a new garage.

The findings and decisions of the Board for application number BZAP-22-51 for the property located at 381 S. Drexel as stated by Kathy Rose: That the Architectural Review Board issues a Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish the existing garage and build a new garage with the condition that it match the final design to the new addition to the house.

The applicant understood the Findings of Fact.

Motion to approve by Mr. Scott, second by Ms. Krosky; Mr. Scott – Yes, Ms. Krosky – Yes, Chairperson Toney – Yes.

7) 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.

Ms. Bokor explained this application was in front of the Board in January; there was complete consensus at that time about the demolition and the proposed new structure was well received with the request that some details were revisited.

Andrew Calhoun was sworn in and described the changes, including the roof shingle profile, small gable, color, switching to limestone from cultured stone, and copper gutters. Mr. Calhoun explained how the craftsman nature will be emphasized and indicated there was additional information in the packet explaining this.

Ms. Krosky said this feels like a craftsman and likes that they decided to go with the natural limestone.

Mr. Scott said it is great to see someone make an investment into this neighborhood, and it will be a unique style on Cassady. He appreciated the stone, palate, and copper ridge fence.

There was discussion about the grade. Mr. Calhoun stated this project started when the owner wanted to make this home accessible. There is an existing wheelchair lift; the intent is to lower the existing floor, as close to grade as Code will allow. There will not be a basement. The existing grade and relationship to the curb will be noted. Furthermore, the overall mass of this home is higher because the existing home is single-story.

Chairperson Toney explained she loved the copper gutters and likes the other changes but feels the kitchen is small. Mr. Calhoun stated the client is fine with it as is.

The findings and decisions of the Board for application number ARB-22-68 for the property located at 2425 Sherwood as stated by Kathy Rose: That the Architectural Review Board issues 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 with the following conditions:

- The first floor elevation is to be determined from existing grade and verified by staff.
- The landscape plan be reviewed and approved by the Public Tree and Commission.
- No trees are to be removed until the landscape plan is approved.
- No demolition can occur until there are approved construction documents.

The applicant understood the Findings of Fact.

Motion to approve by Ms. Krosky, second by Mr. Scott; Ms. Krosky – Yes, Mr. Scott – Yes, Chairperson Toney – Yes.

6) New Business

7) Other Business

8) Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned.