



Architectural Review Board
April 13, 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. Strasser, Mr. Scott, Mr. Heyer, Chairperson Toney

3) Approval of Minutes

Motion to approve the Minutes from the March, 2023 meeting by Ms. Strasser, second by Mr. Scott;
Strasser – Yes, Scott – Yes, Heyer – Yes, Toney – Yes

4) Public Comments

There were no Public Comments.

5) Old Business

Motion to approve Consent Agenda items (ARB-22-58, ARB-23-8, ARB-23-9) by Mr. Scott, second by Ms. Strasser; Heyer – Yes, Strasser – Yes, Scott – Yes, Toney – Yes

1) Application Number: ARB-22-53

Address: 2010 E Broad

Applicant: Brent Foley

Owner: Catholic Diocese of Columbus

Request: This application was approved for Conceptual design with the condition that the applicant return to the Architecture Review Board with design details.

Mr. Foley was sworn in and explained there are three items in this update: the overall site plan, enlarged plaza drawing which had been submitted to the Tree & Public Gardens Commission, and the revised rendering submitted for the last meeting.

Mr. Foley described the vestibule and entry and showed the roof plan, overall elevation, and grade-level perspective. He stated the intent is to mimic the new entrance of the Convocation Center with brickwork and limestone, and other details. He mentioned a limestone band at the base of the colonnade.

Mr. Heyer asked if the brick shown in the rendering is projected from the face of the science wing; Mr. Foley stated that location is the current gymnasium wall that is being built on top. Mr. Foley mentioned glass across the science wing was discussed at the last meeting; Mr. Heyer stated he felt this was an improvement. The intent to match the brick details was clarified.

Ms. Strasser did not have any questions.

Mr. Scott asked about the brick details matching what is currently built; Mr. Foley confirmed this.

Chairperson Toney did not have additional comments.

Finding of Fact and Decision of the Board for Application No. ARB-22-53 for property located at 2010 Broad: The Board finds that the proposed modifications are compatible with the existing structure, noting that the gutters are to match the existing and brick details are to match the details of the Convocation Center.

The applicant understood the Finding of Facts.

Motion to approve Finding of Facts by Mr. Scott, second by Ms. Strasser; Heyer – Yes, Strasser – Yes, Scott – Yes, Toney – Yes

2) 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 approve Consent Agenda items (ARB-22-58, ARB-23-8, ARB-23-9) by Mr. Scott, second by Ms. Strasser; Heyer – Yes, Strasser – Yes, Scott – Yes, Toney – Yes

6) New Business

3) Application Number: BZAP-23-8

Address: 2691 E Main Street

Applicant: Sarah Montague

Owner: Matt Davis

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 to the front facade and building and site modifications.

This application was reviewed after the application of ARB-22-70.

Tim Lai and Eliza Hoe were sworn in.

Mr. Sudy indicated this is an existing building upon which the applicant is proposing to modify the front and add a two story addition that will bring the building out closer to the street; the addition will be more in conformance to the design guidelines with regards to siting but it will be removing limited open space in front of the building, although this is not a concern. Mr. Sudy stated that this seems to be in conformance with the codified guidelines. There are no variances required. They are currently providing 18 parking spaces and are only required to have 16; there may be interest from the Tree & Public Gardens Commission to soften the landscaping. There is one location that may be difficult to incorporate in the code; typically there is screening on Main

Street for parking areas. Currently, there may be some difficulties due to architecture. Other than that, there are no issues from the zoning perspective.

Mr. Heyer asked about allowing for a green roof terrace; Mr. Sudy said the code does not speak to this.

Ms. Bokor stated she has been meeting with the applicant to develop this project while maintaining homage to the building. She said that the applicant has provided interactive design opportunities and they're looking for a recommendation to BZAP.

Tim Lai stated this is a COHATCH project and will be the tenth COHATCH project in central Ohio. The original building was constructed in the 1960s and is bareboned. COHATCH takes pride in renovating and preserving existing buildings. Because the building is not big enough to be a COHATCH location, the applicants would like to create an addition, as they feel there is an opportunity to add square footage in the front. Mr. Lai described the current building and how the addition will enhance it. There is a desire to create a more transparent facade which will help preserve the old facade, and the existing windows in the side of the building will be used to open up the facade. Mr. Lai explained the ways the old building will be brought into the new addition. He described the modern use of limestone and various other design elements, and explained the addition will create depth to the building, the creation of a balcony, and a more engaging pedestrian experience.

Mr. Lai explained the desire to use steel with a clear coat or metallic paint color.

Ms. Hoe discussed ways to soften the site and that the building is situated right on the property line. Therefore, they are proposing a green wall on the east side because the doors and/or windows on that side cannot be opened. Specifically, the idea is for the greenery to grow in the shape of the COHATCH logo; Mr. Sudy suggested that the board give BZAP their comments on that, because it influences the interpretation of the Code. In further discussion; Mr. Scott sees this as a sign and would lean to not do this but would rather see it in another way. Ms. Strasser stated there is no guarantee that the CO will be there. Ms. Toney stated she loves the CO and feels it is sophisticated. Mr. Heyer indicated there can also be a natural mosaic of the existing limestone panels.

Mr. Heyer explained he is fine with the design of the building but has concerns about the longevity of the limestone veneer. He suggested a more durable composite or ceramic material and described the difficulties with using limestone; he suggested a material with a glazing. Furthermore, Mr. Heyer is worried about the rust that will develop over time. He would love to see a green balcony.

Mr. Scott discussed the parking on the east side and suggested building a step up.

The building height is within the parameters of what the Code recommends.

Mr. Scott recognized the applicant's attempt to balance design and renovate existing properties with longevity of materials. He is less concerned with steel than maintenance. Mr. Scott offered many compliments to the design. It was explained that the balcony will be at least 5' wide; there are plans to have more counter space and bar seating. He is confident there will be quality in

materials and details. A railing in the parking space will be removed and Mr. Scott suggested looking for additional opportunities for greenery.

Ms. Strasser asked about the longevity of the wire net. The applicant said they are 4.5" by 2.5" and they are stainless steel woven rope that will not rust to achieve a transparent look without glass; the same material will be used for the green wall.

Ms. Toney asked if the steel used on the front can be used in the back; the applicants indicated they anticipate many people will be using street parking and will be utilizing the front entrance, but they can look at adding something to the back. Mr. Heyer cautioned against blocking the sun.

Mr. Heyer suggested being careful with the window sills so there will not be deterioration.

Ms. Bokor indicated the applicant has been awesome to work with.

Finding of Fact and Decision of the Board Application No. BZAP-23-8 for property located at 2691 E Main Street: The Board recommends this application to the Board of Zoning and Planning with the condition that it be remanded back to the Architecture Review Board for final design review.

There was discussion of next steps.

Motion to approve Finding of Facts by Mr. Scott, second by Ms. Strasser; Strasser – Yes, Scott – Yes, Heyer – Yes, Toney – Yes

4) 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 and a Certificate of Appropriateness for arbors and hardscape along Commonwealth Park Plaza.

Mr. Jones was sworn in.

Mr. Jones stated this plan is focused on the central plaza piece and explained there are four smaller pavilions that keep an open relationship and allow for improvement of the streetscape with traffic calming and more. There is a desire to maintain the Bexley vocabulary with brick, signage, and curbs. He described bollards with chains, pavilions, and previously approved buildings. The existing street trees will be removed and replaced and there will be trees within the park that will be affected, some of which are in decline. However, things will be replaced like for like and/or with better material.

The limestone will be a stone mixture that has been recovered from older quarries and was previously used at a house on Parkview.

Mr. Heyer described the construction of the limestone stations at the entrances to the City; he and Mr. Jones discussed the limestone that will be used in this project. The limestone will be a buff color.

Mr. Jones mentioned a desire to match materials.

Mr. Jones and Mr. Heyer discussed the tree canopy at the medians. Ms. Strasser mentioned damage from roots in the future and Mr. Heyer suggested shrubbery as opposed to trees; Ms. Strasser agreed and this was discussed.

Mr. Scott asked about plan signage; Mr. Jones stated the bollards have signaled pedestrian warning devices. He indicated there is also consideration for the addition of stop signs and said there is a desire to retain signage reminiscent of the Bexley Park signage to repeat signage instead of inventing new.

Mr. Scott suggested anti-skateboard pegs in addition to the benches.

Mr. Jones stated a desire to express the steel connections and described copper details.

Electric and water hookups will be installed, and the lights were discussed.

Mr. Heyer asked about the metal details which support an urban feel; Mr. Jones said pegs can be hidden. Mr. Heyer indicated he liked the natural connections and Mr. Jones explained connections can be sliced into the timber. Various stone caps and foots were described.

Mr. Scott asked about discussions with and involvement of residents. Mr. Jones indicated that seasonally, some pieces may be removed for storage.

Ms. Strasser stated this is an inviting plaza, but indicated she is not a fan that the road material changes to plaza material, stating safety concerns. Mr. Heyer mentioned the coloration. Mr. Jones stated a stop sign is not required and shared the narrowing road widths and bollards will change the feel of the street and will be a traffic calming component. This was discussed further. Mr. Scott indicated it may be easier to control vehicular traffic than playing children. Mr. Jones explained the granite will be the same with a different finish.

Regarding the brick curb inside and out, Mr. Heyer stated he feels this will be more Bexley. Chairperson Toney described the landscaping for the purpose of vision. Mr. Jones indicated signage will be a large piece of this project.

There was a discussion about next steps and conditions.

Finding of Fact and Decision of the Board for Application No. BZAP-22-70 for Property Located at 165 N Columbia: The Board finds that the hardscape and arbors are appropriate with the condition that as the design development continues, natural conditions (connections and details) will be pursued throughout construction.

The applicant understood the Finding of Facts.

Motion to approve Finding of Facts by Mr. Heyer, second by Mr. Scott; Scott – Yes, Heyer – Yes, Strasser – Yes, Toney – Yes

5) Application Number: ARB-23-8

Address: 246 Ashbourne Place
Applicant: Amy Lauerhass
Owner: Adam & Eleanor Brandt
Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for an expansion of the screened porch at southeast corner of the house.

Motion to approve Consent Agenda items (ARB-22-58, ARB-23-8, ARB-23-9) by Mr. Scott, second by Ms. Strasser; Heyer – Yes, Strasser – Yes, Scott – Yes, Toney – Yes

6) Application Number: ARB-23-9
Address: 2471 Bryden
Applicant: Amy Lauerhass
Owner: Matthew and Jessika Klingler
Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for modification and 2nd story addition and new larger front porch.

Motion to approve Consent Agenda items (ARB-22-58, ARB-23-8, ARB-23-9) by Mr. Scott, second by Ms. Strasser; Heyer – Yes, Strasser – Yes, Scott – Yes, Toney – Yes

7) Application Number: BZAP-23-7
Address: 784 Chelsea Applicant: Suncraft/James Knox
Owner: Christy and Daniel Conway
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 1'3" variance to allow an open covered porch addition to the front of the house.

James Knox was sworn in.

Ms. Bokor stated this is a straightforward project and stated feedback for the applicant.

Mr. Knox stated that they are putting a front porch on the front facade, extending the roofline, and adding columns and a railing.

Mr. Heyer asked what will be holding up the railing and asked if they had considered three-sided steps. It was indicated that the flower bed on one side would need to be removed to include this and the existing steps will be removed. The requirement for a handrail was discussed. Mr. Heyer encouraged Mr. Knox to work with Ms. Bokor to match eave details. Mr. Scott and Mr. Heyer discussed additional roof details.

The existing shingles will be matched.

Ms. Strasser asked about the venting near the top window; this will be staying.

The porch lights will be remaining and there will be no new lights; Mr. Scott made suggestions.

Mr. Heyer mentioned differences in porch width and framing.

Finding of Fact and Decision of the Board for application No. BZAP-23-7 for property located at 785 Chelsea: The Board recommends this application to the Board of Zoning and Planning for review and approval for a Certificate of Appropriateness and to work with the Design Consultant on final design details.

The applicant understood the Finding of Facts.

Motion to approve Finding of Facts by Mr. Scott, second by Ms. Strasser; Scott – Yes, Strasser – Yes, Heyer – Yes, Toney – Yes

7) Other Business

8) Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned.