



Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes  
Thursday, March 9, 2023 6:00 PM

**1) Call to Order**

The meeting was Called to Order.

**2) Roll Call of Members**

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

**3) Public Comments**

There were no Public Comments.

**4) Approval of Minutes**

**Motion to approve the Minutes from the February 9, 2023 meeting by Ms. Krosky, second by Mr. Scott; all in favor.**

**5) Old Business**

**Motion to Table the BZAP-22-42 and ARB-22-58 applications to the April 13, 2023 meeting by Ms. Strasser, second by Ms. Kosky; Strasser – Yes, Scott – Yes, Krosky – Yes, Steele – Yes, Toney – Yes.**

**Motion to approve Consent Agenda Items (ARB 22-65, BZAP-22-3, BZAP 23-4) by Mr. Scott, second by Ms. Krosky; Krosky – Yes, Scott – Yes, Steele – Yes, Strasser – Yes, Toney – Yes**

1) Tabled by the Applicant to the April 13, 2023 ARB Meeting

Application Number: BZAP-22-42

Address: 2834 Powell Ave

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 for a new detached garage with a 2nd floor space and deck.

**Motion to Table the BZAP-22-42 and ARB-22-58 applications to the April 13, 2023 meeting by Ms. Strasser, second by Ms. Kosky; Strasser – Yes, Scott – Yes, Krosky – Yes, Steele – Yes, Toney – Yes**

2) Application Number: ARB-22-53

Address: 2010 E Broad

Applicant: Brent Foley

Owner: Catholic Diocese of Columbus

Request: The applicant is requesting Architectural review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for a renovation to the exterior and the interior of the building.

Ms. Bokor stated this project got to this point in November because there had been issues during construction. In January, the Board suggested a node at the corner would be helpful, and the applicant came with another solution which was conditioned that it would be further reviewed by Board members individually via email. In the meantime, St. Charles did not feel comfortable with a lack of proper entrance to the Learning Center and decided this would be a great opportunity to use this corner as a more proper entrance. The Board didn't receive the information to review via email, and now the applicant is here before the Board.

Mr. Negron and Mr. Foley were sworn in.

Mr. Negron gave historic context from St. Charles' perspective and stated this will be one of the last developments on campus. St. Charles' wanted to publicly acknowledge the City and Board for their assistance.

Mr. Foley echoed Mr. Negron's comments and pointed out the various buildings on the property, including moving the proposed parking and Convocation Center. He also discussed the grotto and colonnade, as well as the new entrance to the Learning Resource Center. The new entrance will be accessible and allow for primary access. Mr. Foley described new elements of the architecture with revised elevations. The proposed new entrance is a mix of historic and new architecture. New renderings with two options were displayed and Mr. Foley stated St. Charles prefers the glass option.

Ms. Bokor recapped that Staff Report and stated she thinks this is the right solution; she explained she is neutral between the brick and glass options, but would like to see a change in the gable. She would support a conceptual approval with the condition that the Board would need to see a full set of drawings. She explained that the Plaza would need further review.

Mr. Foley explained the rationale for the gable.

Mr. Scott stated he is partial to the added brick and indicated there may be scale issues on the gable. He described other ways to amend the space and discussed the hierarchy. He said he is supportive of the direction in which this project is moving and is interested in seeing the curved ramp. The columns were discussed; they are not being built now due to budgetary constraints.

Ms. Krosky stated she is in agreement that the brick version is a more elegant solution.

Ms. Strasser said she also supports the brick entrance, and thanked the members for listening to the Board's comments.

Mr. Steele further agreed with the brick entrance.

Ms. Toney stated she feels the design still needs a lot of work, and that the applicant is trying to transform a mistake into a focal point. She said she understands they want an entrance in this location, but the differing rooflines will be obvious; she would like them to be symmetrical. She questioned if the design wouldn't be better by rotating the element and letting it be part of one colonnade, even if one arch may be lost to accomplish this. Once it is turned, she feels it would be normal for the rooflines to come in at different heights.

Mr. Foley explained the original option presented was a gabled arch aligned with a colonnade, but the feedback was not positive. Ms. Toney stated she thinks the size was the issue at this time. She indicated that she likes the glass option. Mr. Foley explained Code compliance with the vestibule. Ms. Toney stated she feels the design can be better than what is shown. The gable roof was discussed. Ms. Bokor expressed she does not feel the pitch of the gable needs to be matched.

Mr. Scott stated many issues are being addressed. It can be rotated but does not think that the current plan can be successful. He is looking for the best solution given the current conditions and multiple factors. He would be interested in changing the roof left of the current entry. He stated he is supportive of the second option as it addresses many of the complexities.

Various drawings were viewed to compare consistency.

Ms. Krosky explained this entrance will make a statement, but she doesn't feel like the hardscape plan supports that. Mr. Foley detailed the reasoning for this layout, noting this is a complicated design challenge.

Ms. Strasser stated this application has her support.

Next steps were discussed.

The findings and decisions of the Board for application number ARB -22-53 for the property located at 2010 E Broad: That the Architectural Review Board issues a Certificate of Appropriateness for modifications to the previously approved Convocation Center with the following conditions:

- The applicant return to the Architectural Review Board with final design details.
- Landscape plan modifications to the plaza return to the Tree and Public Garden Commission.

Motion to approve Finding of Fact by Ms. Strasser, second by Ms. Krosky; **Scott – Yes, Krosky – Yes, Strasser – Yes, Steele – Yes, Toney – Yes**

The next application reviewed was ARB 23-5.

3) Tabled by the Applicant to the April 13, 2023 ARB Meeting

Application Number: ARB-22-58

Address: 21 S Parkview

Applicant: Neal Hauschild/ Cheryl Ware/Nth Degree

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

**Motion to Table the BZAP-22-42 and ARB-22-58 applications to the April 13, 2023 meeting by Ms. Strasser, second by Ms. Kosky; Strasser – Yes, Scott – Yes, Krosky – Yes, Steele – Yes, Toney – Yes**

4) 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.

**Motion to approve Consent Agenda Items (ARB 22-65, BZAP-23-3, BZAP 23-4) by Mr. Scott, second by Ms. Krosky; Krosky – Yes, Scott – Yes, Steele – Yes, Strasser – Yes, Toney – Yes**

**6) New Business**

5) Application Number: ARB-23-2

Address: 145 S Merkle

Applicant: Clearwater Group

Owner: Eric and Melissa Hoy

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for a terrace addition over a patio in the rear yard.

Ms. Bokor stated this is an extensive application. Ms. Rose said this is something typically Staff would sign off on. It was originally put on the agenda because it looked like an addition, but based on certain conditions, it does meet the criteria to be reviewed by Staff. Ms. Bokor stated this project looks to be close to the garage and she mentioned the wall.

Regarding the cover, Ms. Bokor explained she doesn't have any issue with it but that the drawings differed among documents. Ms. Bokor said something like this had been previously approved.

Eric Hoy and Craig Hipner were sworn in.

The correct drawings were determined.

The structure is 24' x 20' and 10' tall, with 12' between the posts on one side. The material will be aluminum. This is being brought to the Board because it read like an addition.

The types of comments that would be given were discussed.

Mr. Scott discussed the drawings and the construction of the wall. He said he feels no ornamentation is appropriate and stated the pool fence must comply with Code.

Mr. Steel stated he believes there are more details to be worked out and suggested a different seating arrangement be explored.

Ms. Strasser said it would be in their best interest to Table the application until there is a more thorough plan.

Mr. Scott suggested bringing this to the Design Consultant.

Ms. Krosky said the more scaled back view seemed to be more appropriate.

Ms. Bokor said she is comfortable with this going to Staff.

Ms. Toney believed it important to mention how far this is from the lot line and asked for a view from the neighbors. Ms. Toney said they may want more screening between the neighbors' property.

The findings and decisions of the Board for application number ARB -23-2 for the property located at 145 S Merkle: That the Architectural Review Board issues a Certificate of Appropriateness subject to Design Consultant review of a terrace addition over a patio in the rear yard for the drawings dated March 9, 2023.

**Motion to approve Finding of Fact by Mr. Steele, second by Mr. Scott; Strasser – Yes, Scott – Yes, Steele – Yes, Krosky – Yes, Toney – Yes**

6) Application Number: ARB-23-4

Address: 47 S Ardmore

Applicant: Charlie Scheiderer

Owner: Kyle Nave

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for a dormer addition on the front of the house.

Charlie Scheider and Kyle Nave were sworn in.

Ms. Bokor said this is an application to add a dormer for the building of a bathroom and a set of drawings had been submitted. She would like to see a drawn application.

Mr. Scheiderer stated the bathroom will come about 3' out to accommodate a tub/shower combination. The new dormer will be wider and taller but the design will be matched to the dormer on the other side of the home. The roof material will be the same shingle.

Ms. Krosky explained this is a clever architectural solution and indicated the window is not bothersome to her.

Mr. Scott said the details matter and that an elevation will help.

Ms. Bokor clarified her comment regarding viewing elevations and her desire to see this for staff review; she would like to see a straight on elevation.

Mr. Steele discussed proximity to the wall and how it will work with the chimney. He would like to see the details match and Mr. Scott indicated that it will be important for the roof to be maintained.

The left side of the dormer will be aligned with the exterior wall of the gable end.

Ms. Toney discussed how the side of the dormer will hit the end wall and still have the same amount of detail; she thinks it may need to be made thinner, and that drawings will be helpful in determining how things will interplay.

The findings and decisions of the Board for application number ARB -23-4 for the property located at 47 S Ardmore: That the Architectural Review Board issues a Certificate of Appropriateness for a dormer addition on the second floor on the front of the house, with the condition that an elevation drawing be submitted as part of the structural drawings, subject to final review and approval by the Design Consultant.

The applicant understood the Finding of Fact.

**Motion to approve Finding of Fact by Mr. Scott, second by Ms. Krosky; Krosky – Yes, Scott – Yes, Steele – Yes, Strasser – Yes, Toney – Yes**

7) Application Number: ARB-23-5

Address: 348 S Cassingham

Applicant: John Eikenberry

Owner: Bexley City School District Board of Education

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for wind screens for the tennis courts and sign replacements.

This was reviewed as part of Old Business.

Harley Williams was sworn in. He explained the school has been upgrading athletic facilities in recent years and how they are looking to hang temporary wind screens on the tennis court to provide a premier facility for student athletes and others using the courts. These screens will block wind and block activity and distraction from track and athletic fields. Mr. Williams detailed the history of the planning process, including various delays with vendors and outreach to and meetings with neighbors. Blue screens were used initially. Mr. Williams shared various photos of the tennis courts with and without screens.

Jeffrey Park has black windscreens, and the school's proposed new screens will be black with the same opacity to those at Jeffrey. Dr. Williams showed representations of aluminum signs they would like to hang on the courts. Signs would be mounted on the inside of the fence with the wind screens mounted on the outside. Additional images and signs were viewed, and Mr. Williams gave an overview of proposed locations and stated that many of the windscreens were reduced in size since they were conceptualized. Between the court and the track, the screen will be only the length of the court, not the entire space. Perpendicular screens go all the way across, and there are no screens along the road. Mock ups were displayed.

The opaqueness of the screens was discussed.

Ms. Rose stated she can verify opaqueness with the Recreation Director.

Dr. Williams stated they have clips which can be used to affix the screens to the fence, but were impressed with the ropes used at Jeffrey Mansion, and is therefore unsure how they will go about doing this.

The fence along the track is the same height throughout, and the screen will go top to bottom due to the support post.

Dr. Williams described the plaques that will be affixed to the fences, and stated that he believes that this is a compromise among the various parties.

Shannon and Fred Nelson, 310 S. Stanwood, were sworn in. Mr. Nelson recounted history of communication and discussions with the school beginning in July and stated he only received communications via email in February, which he left as an exhibit. He explained a visit to his home but didn't have an opportunity to discuss various aspects of the plan. He stated the school building provides a substantial windscreen and he believes the tennis players are well enough equipt to concentrate without windscreens. He stated Jeffrey Park doesn't have side

windscreens; he has no issue with windscreens on the back. He doesn't feel like there is a need for the side screen. Furthermore he displayed photographs and described how the installation of screens would change the view.

Samuel Nutis, 350 S. Stanwood, was sworn in. He discussed the windscreens at Jeffrey Park, and how there are no front doors viewing these. Additionally, he stated some of the fences are 16' tall because the fences are at an angle. Residents looking at these every day will be looking at a "black wall" indefinitely, and he didn't feel there was an opportunity to create a compromise with the school.

Bruce Grossman, 366 S. Stanwood, was sworn in. He played tennis for Bexley and doesn't feel the windscreens are necessary. The screens block light to his ranch house.

Chris Millard, 104 S. Stanwood, wished to speak but did not have standing and was unable to do so.

Ms. Rose read a notarized letter from Howard Schnitz 330 S. Stanwood. He stated the school is not being a good neighbor and discussed the history of this case and didn't feel there was collaboration.

Eli Goldberg was sworn in.

Ms. Strasser explained she is sympathetic to the frustration of the neighbors and stated this is more of a school Board/District, as the ARB is tasked with the design aesthetic and visual impact. She clarified that she suggested collaboration at the last meeting because it would likely come to a better end, but the ARB can't base its decision on whether the neighbors feel they were treated fairly or properly consulted. She said she grew up by the school and explained there are many situations where things change. She confirmed the months that the screens would be up and also stated the bleachers do not seem visually appealing. It would be a side benefit from her purview that the screens would be installed. She stated this screening material would be far superior to what was previously selected. She said a need to justify the screens is not up for consideration for this Board, as it is subjective and doesn't impact the aesthetics; the reasoning for the screens is a School Board issue.

Mr. Scott agreed with Ms. Strasser and reiterated the ARB is looking at an aesthetic issue and are needing to balance that with those who need to see this. It was confirmed that this will only be up during the playing season. Measurements were discussed, as were various height options.

Because the ball flies over 6', a wind screen higher than that makes the wind less of an obstacle. Regarding the screens at Jeffrey Mansion, the screens are both sides for the full length of the fence.

Mr. Scott said this project is analogous to a black wall, but there is also likely a need and this will assist the players. This is seen as something that will provide the best facility to the student athletes. Mr. Scott said there is a challenge with the location. He explained he is fully supportive of the signage.

Mr. Steele explained he is in agreement with Mr. Scott's comments and wondered if shortening the screens would be counter intuitive.

Ms. Krosky asked if the screen can come with less of an opacity and stated the opacity needed to be provided. It was stated that the opacity of the screen is as much as they can get that would effectively block the wind. She said she understands the screens between the courts but struggles with the ones along the track. The activity on the field was described as being distracting whilst playing.

Ms. Toney acknowledged the compromise, said she appreciates the black, and explained that most courts have windscreens. She reiterated that these won't be running along the street, and these are only blocking the building. She did state perhaps more could be done with the signage.

Ms. Rose stated there isn't a line of trees along with west side of Stanwood and said she discussed this with the City Arborist; Ms. Toney said there are small trees.

FOF 2:03:15

The findings and decisions of the Board for application number ARB -23-5 for the property located at 348 S Cassingham: That based on the modifications to the previously reviewed application, the applicant has provided a plan that has been modified and reduced from the original plan, the Architectural Review Board issues a Certificate of Appropriateness for wind screens for the tennis courts and sign replacements with the following conditions:

- The opacity of the screens be verified and confirmed to match the sample at the ARB meeting (to match those on the Jeffrey Park Tennis Courts).
- The screens will be up from August through October (the applicant noted that the bleachers are also up August through October) and from March to May. Screens are to be removed outside of those timelines.

**Motion to approve Finding of Fact by Ms. Strasser, second by Mr. Steele; Krosky – Yes, Steele – Yes, Scott – No, Strasser – Yes, Toney – Yes**

8) Application Number: BZAP-23-1

Address: 934 Grandon

Applicant: Valerie Halas

Owner: Todd Burger

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 2-story addition at the rear of the house.

Valerie Halas was sworn in.

Ms. Bokor stated Ms. Halas is gaining rapport in Bexley and is a pleasure to work with. She also said that had some of the details of this project been worked through ahead of time, she would have felt comfortable having this on the consent agenda.

She said that the drawings indicate large dormers which are not the case and detailed ideas she discussed with Ms. Halas.

The back porch is currently a concrete slab.



The family is looking to expand their home and they enter the home primarily through the front door. They would like to add a powder room and a front sitting room which can double as a guest room.

Ms. Strasser indicated she feels the massing and style are fine; she has no objections.

Mr. Scott said the charm is in this home's simplicity. He said the shutters give character. Putting massing on the back of the building makes sense. He did say the back porch is small and asked if there is a cost savings in changing it. Design-wise he is comfortable with the home but not the deck. He would recommend not doing it all concrete.

Ms. Krosky said she thinks this looks really cute and thinks this is great.

Mr. Steele loves that they're using stucco and discussed the patio.

Ms. Toney would remove the shutters and would paint the gutters the same color as the roof.

The findings and decisions of the Board for application number BZAP-23-1 for the property located at 934 Grandon: That the Architectural Review Board recommends a Certificate of Appropriateness to the Board of Zoning and Planning for a 2-story addition at the rear of the house, with the conditions that the applicant may consider modifications to the back stoop to possibly turn it into a deck and that the version of the cover over the back stoop is the version that is being recommended.

The applicant understood the Finding of Fact.

**Motion to approve by Finding of Fact by Ms. Krosky, second by Ms. Strasser; Strasser – Yes, Scott – Yes, Steele – Yes, Krosky – Yes, Toney – Yes**

9) Application Number: BZAP-23-3

Address: 273 S Dawson

Applicant: Amy Lauerhass

Owner: Natalie Cohen

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 an addition to connect the house to the garage.

**Motion to approve Consent Agenda Items (ARB 22-65, BZAP-22-3, BZAP 23-4) by Mr. Scott, second by Mr. Krosky; Krosky – Yes, Scott – Yes, Steele – Yes, Strasser – Yes, Toney – Yes**

10) Application Number: BZAP-23-4

Address: 181 Ashbourne

Applicant: Amy Lauerhass

Owner: Debora Ortega-Carr

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 porch addition to the house.

**Motion to approve Consent Agenda Items (ARB 22-65, BZAP-22-3, BZAP 23-4) by Mr. Scott, second by Mr. Krosky; Krosky – Yes, Scott – Yes, Steele – Yes, Strasser – Yes, Toney – Yes**

**8) Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned.