



**Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes
September 14, 2023
6:00 PM**

1) Call to Order

The meeting was Called to Order by Chairperson Toney.

2) Roll Call of Members

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

3) Approval of Minutes

Motion to approve July, 2023 Meeting Minutes with suggested edits from Board Members by Ms. Strasser, second by Mr. Heyer; roll call: Hall – Yes, Heyer – Yes, Strasser – Yes, Scott – Yes, Toney – Yes.

Motion to approve August, 2023 Meeting Minutes with suggested edits from Board Members by Mr. Heyer, second by Ms. Strasser; roll call: Strasser – Yes, Scott – Yes, Heyer – Yes, Hall – Yes, Toney – Yes.

4) Public Comment

There were no public comments.

5) Old Business

1. CONSENT AGENDA ITEM

Application Number: BZAP-23-8

Address: 2691 E Main Street

Applicant: Sarah Montague

Owner: Matt Davis

Request: The applicant is seeking (per remand of the Board of Zoning and Planning) Architectural review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for a 2 story addition to the front facade and building and site modifications.

Motion to approve Consent Agenda Items (BZAP-23-8, ARB-23-27, ARB-23-28, ARB-23-29, ARB-23-30, and BZAP-23-30) by Ms. Strasser, second by Mr. Scott; roll call: Strasser–Yes, Scott–Yes, Heyer–Yes, Hall–Yes, Toney–Yes.

2) TABLED TO THE OCTOBER 12, 2023 ARB MEETING

Application Number: ARB- 23-21

Address: 316 N Columbia

Applicant: Barry Tullos/Lidia Danjell

Owner: Rick and Cheryl Golden Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for room, porch and deck additions at the rear of the home.

6) New Business:

3) Application Number: ARB- 23- 26

Address: 2711 Brentwood

Applicant: Andrew Rosenthal

Owner: Marlee and Rick Snowdon

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of an existing structure and design for a new home.

Ms. Bokor explained this application is for the demolition of a corner lot, mid-century modern house that is a great house from a distance but has a lot of deferred maintenance. She stated this is a significant project and also that the Code stipulates a demolition ordinance, which, among other things, states that what is replaced must be better than the home being demolished. She clarified that adherence to criteria for design approval and Certificate of Appropriateness needs to be followed through and that the architectural design of the new building is keeping with the character of the neighborhood. She said that as staff she supports the demolition of this existing structure, highlighted that the footprint and massing of the new structure is similar to that of the existing home, indicated she feels the proposed structure keeps with the character of the street and neighborhood, and mentioned that is accomplished by the style of the new home.

Ms. Strasser requested that the demolition requirements be discussed; Ms. Bokor stated this will be discussed throughout the presentation.

Ms. Rose clarified that the proposed home meets setback requirements and Zoning Codes excluding that of the driveway, which will be a separate BZAP application.

Andrew Rosenthal was sworn in.

Mr. Rosenthal stated this home sits on two parcels. He explained that some of the home's history has been established and there is outside opinion that it is not a contributing structure to the neighborhood or City and that the home does not warrant any degree of conservancy. By virtue of the Code, nothing "important" happened in the home. Additionally, he stated the home might not have been designed for the parcel, mentioning the west end of the home sits beyond the allowable setback and the garage is under it. Furthermore, he explained some issues which would make it difficult to age in place in the home, which is the desire of the homeowner. Furthermore, he indicated the garage is tight for contemporary vehicles and suggested that solely reconfiguring the west end of the home would be challenging and it is therefore in his opinion to rebuild. He explained the current home's layout and that it did not feel like the right architectural language for the new owners.

Mr. Rosenthal showcased the home's footprint.

Ms. Strasser stated she has mixed feelings and that she is concerned that there are not a lot of homes in Bexley from this era; she is not convinced this is not architecturally significant due to the uniqueness of this home.

Mr. Heyer asked if there are structural issues with the home; Mr. Rosenthal stated there is no evidence of structural deficiencies. Mr. Heyer asked if the current home is on one lot, to which Ms. Rose clarified that as per the Code, the two lots are viewed as one.

Mr. Rosenthal stated they are trying to reinforce the public space; the current house has a strange idea about private space and the gesture of the house is an L shape. Massing diagrams were shown and Mr. Rosenthal said there is much variety with the nearby homes. An image was displayed showing what is proposed versus what is allowable, buildable volume.

The proposed tree to be removed was discussed.

The main volume of the proposed home was explained as were the ways the spaces will be designated.

Mr. Rosenthal detailed the results of the sun studies conducted.

Mr. Rosenthal explained various aspects of the proposed home including architectural shutters, a porch, and brick. He mentioned the tapered installed and interior drains will deal with roof water and softening the mass of the garage. Brick, cedar, and stucco will be the three primary exterior materials.

Mr. Scott commended Mr. Rosenthal for the packet he put together and stated the existing home is part of the 5% of unique Bexley homes. He said the determining factor for him regarding the demolition is the evaluation of what is being proposed. Mr. Scott said he feels the new home is a similar architectural style to the current home but done in a modern way. Because of what is being proposed, he stated he does not have reservations with the demolition of the existing home. In saying that and in looking at the design of the house, Mr. Scott explained he appreciates that new home is in a similar style to the original home. Mr. Scott stated he is worried that the proposed front porch is uninviting to sit on and the scale is uncharacteristic of a Bexley porch. He mentioned the architectural element of a lower roof, stated he was surprised that it wasn't pulled in and mentioned he does not feel the two story roof will do much. He stated he was curious of the sloped roof on the owners' suite.

Mr. Rosenthal explained the roof started off as flat but was changed by taking a cue from the existing home and also a way to make the owners' suite unique.

Mr. Scott stated this area sticks out as an anomaly but is not very well exposed.

Mr. Heyer explained this project is difficult for him because the project comes down to details and materials. For him to say that this is better than what was there before, he would like to see different materials or colors, such as the black brick. He mentioned the barn doors not revealing anything. He asked for a detail and discussed the human scale which is missing but for which there is an opportunity. He said most of the homes on this street and nearby do not do double height; he would like to see some kind of moderation to the monumental double height space.

Many of the spaces that are facing the street are service spaces with high windows. He said the central portico section takes away from the quality that he feels would be nice to accentuate more. He would like to see more human scale details at least at the front entryway.

Mr. Hall commended the presentation and agreed with what had been said thus far regarding the demolition of the existing home. He said he does not think it is a good mid century modern house, although there are some nice elements. He mentioned the door and black brick, vertical siding, heaviness of the stucco on the Roosevelt elevation, and the sloped roof on the master suite. He stated he is not sure that this new home is better yet but feels it will be easy to make better.

Ms. Strasser agreed with what had been said about the front door and porch and stated she is concerned about tearing down the existing home.

Chairperson Toney stated that addressing the corner and knowing that it is a dining room which will likely have a light on will be nice; she explained she appreciates the black brick and thinks it goes better with wood. She said she likes the quality of materials and feels the front door can be addressed with elements to give it more of a human scale. Furthermore, she said she feels this is nicer than the current home and appreciated why it didn't work for them to renovate it.

Mr. Rosenthal explained the brick is an iron brick which is almost iridescent and that the clients have thoroughly scouted materials. He said the detailing of the current house is generally very bad. He mentioned human scale and the windows on the current home. Finally, he said he thinks the proposed home is very well detailed and discussed the door.

Ms. Toney offered the idea of a hanging light above the door. Mr. Heyer clarified that his comment about human scale was not in reference to the original house.

Mr. Heyer mentioned the Design Guidelines and suggested Mr. Rosenthal reference them. Mr. Heyer reiterated the aspects of the design he would like to see addressed including color and human scale elements.

Mr. Rosenthal said it would be preferable to review additional details as the process moves forward.

Mr. Heyer shared his opinion that he would like it to come back to the Board. Chairperson Toney suggested if this is the case, to bring material samples. Mr. Rosenthal requested the application be tabled.

Motion to Table by Mr. Hall, second by Mr. Scott; roll call: Strasser–Yes, Scott–Yes, Hall–Yes, Heyer–Yes, Toney–Yes.

4) CONSENT AGENDA ITEM
Application Number: ARB- 23-27
Address: 250 S Parkview
Applicant: Derrick Layer Custom Homes & Remodeling

Owner: Ronald and Michael Negron Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness to convert an attached garage to study and laundry room.

Motion to approve Consent Agenda Items (BZAP-23-8, ARB-23-27, ARB-23-28, ARB-23-29, ARB-23-30, and BZAP-23-30) by Ms. Strasser, second by Mr. Scott; roll call: Straser–Yes, Scott–Yes, Heyer–Yes, Hall–Yes, Toney–Yes.

5) CONSENT AGENDA ITEM

Application Number: ARB- 23-28

Address: 2684 Fair

Applicant: Amy Lauerhass

Owner: Sara Tervo

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 (BZAP-23-8, ARB-23-27, ARB-23-28, ARB-23-29, ARB-23-30, and BZAP-23-30) by Ms. Strasser, second by Mr. Scott; roll call: Straser–Yes, Scott–Yes, Heyer–Yes, Hall–Yes, Toney–Yes.

6) CONSENT AGENDA ITEM

Application Number: ARB- 23-29

Address: 240 N Cassingham

Applicant: Amy Lauerhass

Owner: Ryan and Elizabeth Smith

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for a one-story addition.

Motion to approve Consent Agenda Items (BZAP-23-8, ARB-23-27, ARB-23-28, ARB-23-29, ARB-23-30, and BZAP-23-30) by Ms. Strasser, second by Mr. Scott; roll call: Straser–Yes, Scott–Yes, Heyer–Yes, Hall–Yes, Toney–Yes.

7) CONSENT AGENDA ITEM Application Number: ARB- 23-30

Address: 446 S Columbia

Applicant: Amy Lauerhass

Owner: Vincent and Jennifer DiMascio

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for a one-story addition.

Motion to approve Consent Agenda Items (BZAP-23-8, ARB-23-27, ARB-23-28, ARB-23-29, ARB-23-30, and BZAP-23-30) by Ms. Strasser, second by Mr. Scott; roll call: Straser–Yes, Scott–Yes, Heyer–Yes, Hall–Yes, Toney–Yes.

8) Application Number: BZAP - 23-19

Address: 733 Vernon

Applicant: K Bryon Wernicke

Owner: Barbara Wernicke

Request: The applicant is seeking a recommendation to BZAP for Architectural review and approval, a Certificate of Appropriateness and a variance to allow a screened garden house 1.5' from the north property line.

This case was heard after the approval of the Consent Agenda.

Bryon Wernicke was sworn in.

Chairperson Toney suggested that this application be approved by the BZAP prior to being heard by the ARB.

Ms. Rose explained the critical portion of this case is the variance and Ms. Bokor suggested the Board move this to the BZAP without a recommendation, and if the zoning is approved, that it be remanded back to the ARB for review.

Motion to send this application to BZAP without a recommendation for or against by Mr. Heyer, second by Ms. Strasser; roll call: Strasser–Yes, Scott–Yes, Hall–Yes, Heyer–Yes, Toney–Yes.

9) Application Number: BZAP - 23-23

Address: 2200 E Main

Applicant: Ryan Pearson

Owner: Continental Real Estate Cos.

Request: The applicant is seeking preliminary review to allow demo and redevelopment of the vacant Trinity Lutheran apartment structures at 2160, 2188, & 2186 E Main Street (Parcel No.: 020-000836, 020-000217 & 020-000350), Also a Special Permit and Conditional Use for new 5-story building with housing alternatives and variance for a new 6-story mixed use building to provide additional housing, restaurant, retail and offices.

Ms. Bokor stated this project is a significant process and that public participation is Encouraged through the established process. She explained this project will be before the ARB, Board of Zoning and Planning, and Tree and Public Garden Commission. Furthermore, the BZAP is the ultimate decision making body for the request(s) of the applicant. Issues such as tax abatements, TIFs, school impact are discussed and decided in other City bodies such as City Council, the CIC (Community Improvement Corporation) and the School Board. Ms. Bokor gave a history of this application and what will be presented to various city boards, stated special considerations for the application, and presented Staff Comments detailing the work put in by the applicant thus far with City Staff.

Scott Deisler and Ryan Pearson were sworn in.

Mr. Pearson stated the existing conditions map had been submitted and will go before the Tree and Public Gardens Commission and that the site relates to neighboring properties. He explained that the Gateway and Alexander sit lower than this site, and there are trees nearby. He explained the vegetation out front cannot be saved and many of the trees are currently above the sidewalk level. He showed visuals regarding the proximity of some of the parking to the Alexander and setback and proposed greenspace and explained that the property line almost follows one of the retaining walls and showed other photos of the property lines. A change to remove the trash

compactor out of the north west corner has been made and Mr. Pearson explained parking lot logistics still need to be finalized. Additionally, Mr. Person detailed traffic controls in the southwest corner and grade differences, displayed basement level drawings and explained the dimensions and traffic pattern, and mentioned the uses of various spaces. Mr. Pearson explained he will discuss the fate of two trees with the Tree and Public Gardens Commission and also detailed the various structural levels and where parking will take place. Mr. Pearson also displayed images from various angles and potential retaining walls. Mr. Pearson said the clubhouse on the proposed project is over the entrance to the garage, over the lobby space, and he described the plant material on the first floor parking level.

Mr. Deisler said the project proposes 218 multifamily housing units, 11,000 square feet of retail space, 12,000 square feet of office space, and a 265 space parking garage. He explained the layout of the plan was driven by site density and mentioned there is individual character in each of the retail establishments. Mr. Deisler indicated the proposed scheme is the one the team was most drawn to, that they have received feedback, and that he believes there will be further conversation. He explained the elements were divided into smaller building components, discussed the parking garage located in the basement, and stated the primary building materials in the retail/office portion being brick and aluminum with multiple brick colors. Where there are to be multifamily units there will be brick, vertical fiber cement siding and trim, fiber cement panels and trim, and vinyl windows in all of the apartments.

Images were shown displaying the relative height of this building to the Bexley Gateway, and it was mentioned that there will be an outdoor restaurant setting with an emphasis on the east corner of the building anchored by the pedestrian plaza.

Renderings were displayed and it was explained that the trash collection had been moved to the interior of the building, with trash chutes and a separate trash collection area adjacent to the restaurant to be used by other retail and office spaces.

Ms. Bokor explained trash collection came up as an important point at the BZAP meeting.

Residents in opposition to the project were sworn in:

Cathy Spolnick, 500 S. Parkview unit 207—stated she is not against the development, but is against losing sunshine in her unit, having an access road built under her unit, and the garage doors by her bedroom window, and said she thinks there are ways these can be altered so she doesn't need to move.

Rol Van Broisen, 530 S. Parkview—said one of his main issues is the scale of the proposed development, as it will overshadow his home and sunlight will be reduced because of the height of the development and the lack of setbacks. He said this will reduce the value of his home, quality of life, and quantity of light.

Oded Shenkar, 475 Columbia Place—stated his opinion that business is about opportunity and threat and that the opportunity here is also a threat to him. He said he can speak to what happens when density is changed to the extent it is being discussed at the meeting and mentioned there are assumptions being made that are unsubstantiated. He said that if the alleyway that borders Bryden becomes a highway, it will kill the value of his property and make his home uninhabitable.

He said he is not against development and that there are health consequences that he's happy to share in the next hearing.

Jane Blank, 500 S. Parkview unit 302—explained everyone understands that this is going to be developed and she does not believe that is anyone's argument, and it looks like there is more brick. Ms. Black asked about the look of the brick and said she feels density is the issue as this will tower over everything and she doesn't understand why this is architecturally acceptable on a small lot, and this should be kept in mind. She said this building will be massive and she thinks the actual architecture is not the argument, it is the size.

James Davis, 2188 Bryden—said he believes Bexley was founded as estates and low density residential areas and that this is high density with traffic which is similar to what is found near OSU. He stated there is nothing distinctive about the design in the neighborhood and while he has no problem with the commercial development, he doesn't see a benefit to the current residents. Additionally, he stated his thoughts that this proposed project is far too large for the residential neighborhood and is not keeping with the spirit of the neighborhood.

Jennifer Hirsch, 2265 Bryden—stated she feels the proposed development is a blight on the community and there are many factors of this design that are inconsistent with Bexley. She listed a variety of concerns and said Bexley residents are asking for new buildings that are compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. She stated her opinion that the new building has no definable character, that the contemporary facade is ugly and that the building looks like it belongs elsewhere. Ms. Hirsch asked why Bexley needs to settle for a design and listed a variety of architectural types in the City while also indicating a new building in Bexley should be equally classy. She said many people purchased homes in Bexley for its low density, beauty, schools, and safety.

Steve Diamond, 500 S. Parkview unit 202—said he thinks credit should be given to Mr. Kass and Continental for removing the trash compactors. He would also like to say he has no issues with the architecture per se but that the applicants need to do their due diligence; he indicated he himself has looked at similar buildings. He asked the Board to consider that the building has the look and feel of the City of Bexley.

Allison Steiner, 485 Columbia Place—explained that the way the building is currently proposed gives no hope to direct the flow of traffic onto Main Street and the impact of the height will impact her as a resident, as will the density. She stated the density that comes along with this development will change the neighborhood in which she just purchased a home.

John Rousch, 500 S. Parkview unit 303—referenced the aerial renderings and said they speak well to the fact that the project doesn't fit the context of the surrounding buildings.

Stephen Rosenthal, 500 S. Parkview unit 208—asked if the underground parking counts as a story; this was explained.

Edward Orenstein, 500 S. Parkview unit 305—explained that from his point of view, this proposed building looks so massive and that it looks like a prison in the middle of Bexley.

Angela Yock, 2240 Bryden—asked about those in attendance and made statements regarding removing trees, discussed a building similar to this in Upper Arlington, explained her reason for moving to this community prior to having children to feel like living in a city yet in a suburb, mentioned the traffic created by the density of this project that cannot be absorbed by Bryden Road, and referenced a traffic study which did not take into account Bryden Road or Capital University. She stated Bexley residents own the city and have made their voices heard.

Egle Weiland, 471 South Drexel—said she believes this proposed project is out of scale and constructing the building as presented will set a precedent and destroy Bexley.

Alejandro Deiz, 281 S. Parkview—reiterated the purpose of the Board, and said he wants to live in a place that looks like Bexley, and as a veteran who was serving the country away from home, longed for home as is.

The Board took a short recess.

Mr. Kass stated the traffic study results came in on the day of the BZAP meeting and indicated that at peak traffic, there were 3 cars going to Bryden, so the applicant is happy to close Bryden to be pedestrian traffic only. Mr. Kass explained his belief that this project doesn't look similar to the building on Broad and Hamilton and he also took time to describe other central Ohio buildings that look similar. He explained he feels Bexley has many looks and is unsure of the aesthetic for which he is to aim. He said there needs to be a tallest building in the City and mentioned that this project is important to Capital University. Mr. Kass said that everyone who comes to Bexley decides where they want to and can afford to live and that living within one block of a commercial district puts one in jeopardy of having new construction of which you are not in favor.

Ms. Strasser asked Mr. Kass to keep his comments focused on the architecture.

Mr. Kass stated Bexley doesn't have nice apartments for young, working people and the scale of this building is such that 23-33 years old can be in the City and then be potential buyers for Bexley homes, which will raise property values. He explained this building will have rooftop amenities, outdoor activities, and a park atmosphere. He said he feels the proposed building fits in from an architectural standpoint and admits that it is large. He noted another large Bexley apartment building that does not offer the walkability that this site will have. He said Lane Ave. is a thoroughfare and Main Street is a thoroughfare; that this is urban living and urban architecture. Mr. Kass mentioned he has been working with Staff on alternative looks for the building and is listening to feedback. He discussed the price of the property and indicated he is amenable and is trying to focus on what people want, but cannot change the size. He mentioned the local schools have indicated a desire to utilize some of the space and that there may be 4-5 kids in the Bexley schools because of the selection of 1-2 bedroom units, with a few 3 bedroom units.

Mr. Hall indicated he does not feel anyone is stating that this needs to be traditional architecture, he is saying that this project should be quality architecture that is unique to Bexley and he does not feel like the proposed is unique to Bexley. Mr. Hall suggested the applicant view urban infill buildings to see how those buildings fit into their surroundings. He stated there is no relief in the elevations and that there is only a play in materials. Mr. Hall wondered if the interior courtyard space can be flipped to the outside and have an impact with massing. Finally, he stated his opinion that this needs to be uniquely Bexley, and this current iteration is not.

Mr. Heyer asked Mr. Kass why nothing can be done to shrink the building; Mr. Kass explained there must be a certain density of units to justify the purchase price from Capital. Mr. Heyer stated his opinion that the financial cost has to be balanced with the density and the character of Bexley, and the question is whether or not this density is healthy for Bex. He said because the space is being filled out to the extent it has, there has been a loss of character. Mr. Heyer gave examples of recognizable scale, and asked why this building could not be more of a traditional u-court with the other amenities mentioned. While they might lose some space, Mr. Heyer stated he thinks this makes more sense. He gave alternatives to the roof and said he finds it odd that that southeast corner is the entry point, as it is not the entry of Bexley. He stated this is not really a public space and he doesn't see anything park-like. He also said he feels the scale of the corner is jarring and that it doesn't make sense. Mr. Heyer discussed the traffic pattern. He stated this seems to be a mid-block building, not one that should have a monumental corner; that it seems out of place. Mr. Heyer stated his opinion that making this more of a u-court would make the apartments more pleasant. Mr. Heyer stated it is inhuman to have people have to walk 50-60 feet before a more public space or light source. Mr. Heyer encouraged the applicant to look at this in terms of shrinking and making sure it works for Bexley and ways it can be done. He mentioned some quality in the design and that what is good for Bexley is quality materials, proportion, human scale, light, comfort, and green space.

Mr. Scott stated he agreed with many of Mr. Heyer's comments. He said there multiple things going on and he is trying to understand the kind of design approach to how the building was being materialized and ordered from the base, middle to the top, the massing, and he finds there are few attempts to modify the massing of the building to relate to the context of the surrounding neighborhood. He suggested the stepping that happens to the north tries to address concerns, but noted that there is a 5 story facade in the back of homes, and while it's zoned that way, he feels the facade feels busy, non hierarchical, and there are too many materials for his comfort. He suggested the project architect look at how the materials are being used and how they define base and middle and capping the building. He appreciated the articulation to the parapet and breaking down the massing overall. Mr. Scott said he agrees with the corner articulation comments and previously, and found the southeast corner to be confusing what was trying to be hierarchical. He said he would love to see one of the courtyards facing the street and that he appreciates some of the landscaping he has seen. Mr. Scott finished by saying he would like to see the quality of materials at the restaurant side of the building be repeated. Overall, he Mr. Scott said he thinks it feels busy and referenced other buildings in central Ohio.

Ms. Strasser said she generally agrees with the comments made. She stated her opinion that one of the key pieces of a successful addition to this corridor will be appropriate materials. She referenced the east and west elevations and stated she doesn't believe that hanging the materials and moving the wall back will change the mass, and that she does not believe the mass is appropriate. She explained she sees many colors and discussed Mr. Heyer's suggestions about taking advantage of the courtyards outside and opening up park space outside. She said she does not think tweaking the facade will result in a successful project for that location.

Chairperson Toney said she generally agrees with other Board member comments. She explained that when the proposed project on Cassady Ave. came before the Board, there was discussion about designing the first two floors to feel as though it was a building that had been there for many years. She commented there are things to build that are subtly beautiful and gave her opinion that

something like this, in order to be believable and fit in, would need to be chopped up to look like many individual buildings.

Mr. Kass said the comments redefine what they're doing. He said that to create the kind of density that the present price dictates, this density is needed. He stated that if the collective group wants less building on the property, he wanted to know if they have the opportunity to look at this and have some portions of the building a little higher. Additionally, he said fewer apartments will not allow him to do the project, and then Capital will find another buyer.

Ms. Strasser said the price he paid is probably a problem, but he can't make that a community problem. She explained there has to be an excellent building on this site, but the cart cannot drive the horse, and that it would be a shame if this didn't come to fruition, but cannot compromise to this extent. Mr. Kass said that for this to happen, some constraints have to be lifted.

Mr. Heyer asked how the Board can be publicly involved with the back and forth and discussed public workshops. Ms. Bokor said the applicant has been a pleasure to work with and the Board's comments at the meetings were productive and she thinks special meets can be scheduled

Ms. Rose said the Board will take no action at this meeting and she will send out another notice, mentioning this is a continuing discussion and will be on the agenda for the October meeting.

Mr. Kass confirmed that it was okay with Mr. Kass that a vote was not taken at the meeting.

Ms. Cunningham said a meeting will be opened to the public, noticed, and take place at City Hall.

Chairperson Toney said this Board will make a recommendation to BZAP, and it is their choice. Ms. Bokor explained the Tree & Public Gardens Commission will also make a recommendation.

Ms. Rose said the next ARB meeting will take place on October 12 and a notice will be posted at the Alexander Building.

It was explained that a working session with the ARB would be public and would be posted and noticed.

Mr. Kass stated his preference is to have no public work sessions. Ms. Bokor explained that she can blind carbon copy members and they can send her feedback without sharing it with other board members.

Mr. Heyer said the Board has seen resolutions happen at working sessions on previous projects.

Ms. Cunningham explained a work session as a work session that does not require public comment but does require allowing the public to attend. She said it is a work session between members of the Board in public, and no final decisions can be made until the public meeting when the Board is together and can take public comment. Ms. Cunningham gave additional information about the process.

Ms. Bokor indicated there is a lot of communication and a Record of Decision and verbal report will be given to the BZAP.

10) CONSENT AGENDA ITEM

Application Number: BZAP - 23-30

Address: 202 S Columbia

Applicant: Nathan Sampson

Owner: Bexley Next LLC Request: The applicant is seeking a recommendation to BZAP for Architectural review and approval, a Certificate of Appropriateness and a variance for a closed courtyard and a therapeutic bath inside the courtyard.

Motion to approve Consent Agenda Items (BZAP-23-8, ARB-23-27, ARB-23-28, ARB-23-29, ARB-23-30, and BZAP-23-30) by Ms. Strasser, second by Mr. Scott; roll call: Straser–Yes, Scott–Yes, Heyer–Yes, Hall–Yes, Toney–Yes.

7) Other Business

8) Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned.