



Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes

August 10, 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. Heyer, Mr. Scott, Ms. Krosky, Ms. Strasser, Chairperson Toney.

3) Approval of Minutes

Motioned to Table the Approval of Minutes to allow for review by the Board members by Ms. Strasser, second by Ms. Krosky; roll call: Heyer – Yes, Scott – Yes, Krosky – Yes, Strasser – Yes, Chairperson Toney – Yes.

4) Public Comments

There were no Public Comments.

5) Old Business

1) 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.

Ms. Rose explained this applicant requested the application be Tabled to the September 14, 2023 ARB meeting.

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

Motion to approve the Consent Agenda (application numbers ARB-23-23 and BZAP-23-24) by Ms. Krosky, second by Mr. Heyer; roll call: Heyer – Yes, Krosky – Yes, Scott – Yes, Strasser – Yes, Chairperson Toney – Yes. Ms. Rose clarified that the

approval of application BZAP-23-24 for 2553 Dale is a recommendation on the design to the Board of Zoning and Planning.

2) Application Number: ARB- 23-18

Address: 346 S Drexel

Applicant: Brad Date

Owner: Robert Schwab

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace a Cedar Shake roof with asphalt shingles.

Chairperson Toney recused herself for this application. Ms. Rose distributed a document regarding materials at this site; this had been previously shared with the applicant and attorney.

Ms. Rosin and Mr. Cannon were sworn in.

Ms. Rosin explained the City connected the applicant with the contractor who had installed the roof in 2017; this contractor confirmed the roof which had been removed was cedar shingle. She brought cedar shingle samples which had been taken from the subject property. Ms. Rosin recalled that during the previous month's ARB Meeting, Mr. Cannon gave testimony stating a cedar shake is thicker than cedar shingle and that his business practice is to not install cedar shingle. She indicated they had consulted with Jose Gonzago who had been subcontracted to do the roof installation; he was unable to join the meeting. Ms. Rosin indicated he stated to her that he has never installed a cedar shingle roof and that the durability of the product is slightly longer than what Mr. Cannon testified at 15-20 years. They identified another property that is almost identical to the subject property in terms of style, character, and color, and has a gray asphalt shingle. A photograph of this property was submitted; Ms. Rosin indicated this is precedent for asphalt shingle. She stated the homeowner is willing to modify the color of the asphalt roof to dark gray or black and the contractor has agreed to reroof the garage to match the main property. A sample of the asphalt shingle was passed around to Board members and Mr. Cannon explained this product is a higher end True Definition shingle and explained the product specifications.

Ms. Rose explained she recently received the information from Ms. Rosin but had not yet been able to pass along the information to Board members.

Ms. Rosin stated that Brad Day, the gentleman who submitted the application, is no longer with the company with which he was previously employed and Ms. Rosin now has access to the online portal to submit photos.

Mr. Cannon stated the home at 442 S. Drexel is only seven homes south of the subject home; she described that on February 16, 2017 the home on Drexel had a slate roof on the main house and detached garage, but by July 22 of last year, shingle was approved for the home.

Ms. Rose explained the Drexel project was a different application and that the applicant attended a meeting before the Board to prove the deterioration of the slate and make the case that it was appropriate for it to be removed.

Ms. Rosin explained that the failing of the roof was what facilitated the necessity of hiring Mr. Cannon to replace the cedar shingle.

Mr. Cannon said the previous permit application was for a cedar shake but a cedar shingle was installed.

Ms. Rose explained that the photos shared were of the garage roof, which was installed in 1998, compared to the roof on the house which was installed in 2017. She referenced the City's file which had a letter stating the material was class C cedar shake shingle.

Ms. Rosin stated that the subject roof was a shingle and mentioned Mr. Cannon's testimony of deterioration and rot due to improper installation and resulting lack of air circulation, short lifespan, and decision by the homeowner to replace the roofs on the garage and home to match.

Mr. Heyer asked for clarification that the original material was cedar and it was replaced in 1998; it was a new garage in 1998 with a cedar shake roof. Ms. Rose explained the house underwent an addition and a new roof was put on the garage; the roof had been there for 23 years before being replaced and when the garage roof was replaced, it had been 24 years.

Ms. Strasser asked if the garage was approximately 20 years old and Ms. Rose confirmed this was true and Ms. Rose displayed a photo from 2017 of the house. Ms. Strasser asked if there was confirmation of leaks or other issues with the roof that would have been of detriment to the home itself; Ms. Rosin said that in talking to the homeowner, there were no leaks but the exterior appearance was deteriorating and it looked like there would be similar problems to what they were seeing on the garage. He indicated that when the contractor was asked about the lifespan of the roof and replied with approximate years, the homeowner decided to replace both roofs.

Ms. Rosin stated the installer stated that the life of a shingle roof, depending on various factors, if it is well maintained and correctly installed could be 15-20 years.

Mr. Cannon answered Ms. Strasser's question about his previous experience overseeing the installation of a shingle shingles; he said he doesn't install cedar shingle roofs but does install cedar shake roofs and he listed locations where his business had recently installed this product. He clarified that he acted as project manager on those jobs. He explained the homeowner originally contacted him to replace the garage roof and Mr. Cannon provided pricing information for shingle and heavy medium cedar shake and asphalt, and the owner chose asphalt based on the price. Mr. Cannon stated that after the garage

installation the homeowner asked that asphalt be installed on the home's roof because he liked the look. Mr. Cannon explained he did a change order and stated that the estimates only have options for medium and heavy shake. In this material, he explained the shingles are thin and wear down quickly. He further stated that any type of cedar product has a recommendation to be cleaned and preserved every 5-7 years which is expensive and challenging on a steep roof. He further reiterated he has never sold any cedar shingle.

In answering Ms. Strasser's question, Mr. Cannon explained his company maintains all types of roofs and that a shingle is thin and only as good as the underlay. Mr. Cannon stated cedar shingles cannot currently be purchased at Menard's.

Mr. Heyer reiterated that the homeowner requested the garage roof be replaced, this was completed and now there is an asphalt shingle. Mr. Cannon stated there was not a permit for that project because the supervisor left the company. Mr. Heyer clarified that following the roof replacement, the homeowner requested the main roof be replaced with the same material; Mr. Cannon stated he assumed the new superintendent had pulled a permit for that project, but he had not.

Ms. Rosin wanted to share with the Board that the Board that the homeowner regretted that the permit was not pulled and accepts responsibility for that, but that it would be unfair and improper for the homeowner to be forced to install something that is inferior. Ms. Rosin believes the applicant proposed a reasonable solution of replacing the roof with an asphalt color that the Board approves on both the home and garage. He stated there would be a 6-9 month wait on a cedar product. Ms. Rosin explained that if the project was done properly the Board might have made a different decision but she is making this request due to the practical consideration to install the asphalt.

Mr. Cannon said that pending the decision of the Board, he will not charge the homeowner to replace the asphalt.

Ms. Rose stated John Lyndon, the contractor who installed the removed cedar roof, is present; Mr. Fishel explained Mr. Lyndon didn't have standing but can provide information to the Board that might be relevant in their determination, including information of historical nature but not in support of or against the application.

Lyndon Jones was sworn in. He explained he is present at the request of Ms. Rose to provide information and answer Board questions and stated he installed a cedar shingle roof on the property. Mr. Jones further clarified the shingle roof was Certigrade by the Cedar Shake and Shingle Bureau and that this product is half an inch thick and is made for roofs. He confirmed that what was presented to the Board looked thin and he said he wasn't sure where they received it. He explained that he installed a treated product on the roof and the sample shown to the Board looked treated. His recollection of what was installed would have been thicker than what is presented. He explained it is industry standard to install cedar shingle on roofs at this Certigrade level or higher and detailed the difference between shake and shingle. He stated the cedar shingle was installed on the

house in 2017 and while a warranty wasn't offered, the product will last 20-25 years. Mr. Jones stated the product will last longer with space underneath to breath, and he explained Cedar Breather as a woven plastic that is about half an inch thick and placed as part of the material under the roof. He said he thinks that product was installed on this house but stated that some customers don't want that.

Ms. Rose explained that Ms. Rose provided a photo of the shingles as they were being taken off of this home; he couldn't tell whether or not cedar breather was part of this.

In his estimation, Mr. Jones stated the roof would have has 18-19 years of remaining life and explained other homes that were installed and also that it is his observation that cedar will last 60 years if it is properly breathing.

When asked if cedar material is unavailable at this time or on a 6-9 month delays, Mr. Jones said he was not aware of any delays and that he installed a cedar shingle roof about 6 weeks ago; the product was in stock at that time and there was no waiting time.

Mr. Heyer stated the request is the applicant is seeking architectural review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace a cedar shingle roof with the presented asphalt shingle roof.

Ms. Rosin said Mr. Cannon spent time with supplies to source cedar; that is where he received the estimated timeframe. She also stated the cost of the product is higher than it was prior to the COVID-19 pandemic. Ms. Rose noted Mr. Cannon had technical differences with the size differential of various products.

Mr. Cannon said medium shake is $\frac{1}{2}$ inch thick and heavy shake is $\frac{3}{4}$ inch, where shingles are $\frac{1}{4}$ - $\frac{1}{3}$ of an inch; he stated he has never seen the shingle product as $\frac{1}{2}$ inch. Ms. Rosin explained she wanted to remind the Board that the Board approved the original application for a shake roof in 2017, but an inferior shingle was installed.

Ms. Rosin admitted the application is in a situation of their own making and asked that the homeowner not be required to absorb the cost associated with a cedar roof and instead, install a roof that is keeping with the character and will exceed the lifespan of cedar.

Mr. Heyer reiterated that the homeowner requested that the roof be replaced on the home and garage. And even though an application wasn't filed with the City, it was the homeowner's intention to replace the roof. Ms. Rosin stated the homeowner received estimates for both products and selected asphalt for cost and aesthetics. She said he made an error by not going before the Board.

Mr. Heyer asked if the homeowner was made aware of Bexley's policies regarding cedar, shake, and shingle roofs; Ms. Rosin said she did not ask the homeowner that question but explained he became aware very quickly when Ms. Rose came by and the stop work order was issued.

Mr. Heyer said that even though the Board is voting on removing a cedar roof and installing an asphalt shingle as the primary focus of this application, it may be that Board members may aesthetically prefer to see a different material. Mr. Jones said the only other material would be slate shingles.

Mr. Heyer clarified that the vote will be for the particular product replacing what has already been removed from the roof of the house and stated that if anyone thinks another material should be looked at, it should be stated and a reason given, as a courtesy to the applicant. He said next steps could be discussed with City Staff in the event of a 'no' vote, but that would not be necessary for a 'yes' vote unless the applicant and homeowner would like to use a product other than asphalt.

Ms. Rosin asked that if it was a 'no' vote, that City Staff be given the authority to evaluate and approve administratively a cedar product so that the homeowner does not need to undergo further delay.

Mr. Fishel said he understood why Ms. Rosin was making this request but stated the codified ordinances mandate going before the Board except in the cases of a like for like replacement.

Mr. Fishel explained that if there is a majority 'no' vote on the application—that asphalt is not acceptable for this roof—the door would be open for the applicant to come back with another option after working with staff. Mr. Fishel said this would be a new application because the current application would be closed subject to an appeal to BZAP, which could be done simultaneously with a new application.

Mr. Fishel said it is not a requirement for Board members to explain why they voted in favor of or against this application, but anyone can offer any information they'd like.

Mr. Scott discussed precedent for the future.

Ms. Rose stated she believes this is an unfortunate situation for the Board and that had it been brought in with the roof still intact, the homeowner might still have the roof which the homeowner would be required to maintain.

Findings of Fact and Decision of the Board for Application No. ARB-23-18 for property located at 346 S. Drexel: The Architecture Review Board finds that the proposed cedar roof should be replaced with the proposed asphalt shingle.

Ms. Rosin requested that this go to a vote.

The applicant understood the Findings of Fact.

Motion to approve the Findings of Fact by Krosky, second by Strasser; Strasser – No, Krosky – No, Scott – No, Heyer – No, based on the information provided by the applicant and other evidence and testimony.

6) New Business:

3) Application Number: ARB- 23-21

Address: 316 N Columbia

Applicant: Barry Tullos

Owner: Rick and Cheryl Golden

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for porch and deck additions at the rear of the home.

Ms. Toney stated that there were no staff reports but Ms. Rose explained she passed out the criteria that Ms. Bokor uses to make her make staff reports.

Lidia Danjel, Richard Golden, and Barry Tullos were sworn in.

Ms. Danjel explained that she designed this and Mr. Tullos did the construction details. She explained that the house is a 1938 home and a true American colonial. The front is a beautiful stone and the applicant wants to achieve the feeling of the front of the home in the back so it has charm. The homeowner still has the original stone from the garage and in the one area, that unit will be an elevator. It will be 40 square feet. There will be a metal roof because the designer didn't want to introduce another material; the metal gives a little interest and the homeowner won't worry about sun fading and matching. The applicants expanded the dining room 3-5 feet and there will be a gathering place to sit. Additionally, they will create a master closet above the dinette. It was noted that the shutter details are fake. Ms. Danjel displayed the materials and described them, and explained that they will be painting the metal siding and working with what they have. The other built area that will come out 12 feet beyond the dinette is a health unit/spa. What is existing and what is proposed to be a new addition was discussed. Materials and details were discussed by the applicant and Board members. Parex will be attached to the building. There was additional conversation about brick, stone, small pebbles, and a large lantern. Ms. Danjel explained details of the drawings for the Board members.

Ms. Strasser said she doesn't feel like she saw all of the required drawings; they are included in the updated packet.

Mr. Heyer thanked Ms. Danjel for the presentation and said there is wonderful material expression. He said he thinks the concept is fine and doesn't have any issues with the massing but feels there is a little too much. Would like to see more clarification on some of the eaves, gutters, and downspouts, particularly on the larger extension that comes out. The applicants clarified that there will be a membrane roof and the planters will be decorative. Mr. Heyer said the Board doesn't encourage entablatures to project beyond the column capitals because it is not part of the language, where the columns have a

beam-like element cantilevering beyond them and explained alternatives and suggested reviewing the Design Guidelines. Ms. Danjel explained the reason for the Parex in lieu of the real thing is because this guarantees the preferred color and texture.

Mr. Heyer said those can be achieved with real stucco; he described the type of system that can be used and Ms. Danjel said she didn't think this would be a problem.

Mr. Heyer said the only photo they have of the home shows it is aluminum sided and the materials may feel out of place. It was determined that the front of the house is all stone. Mr. Heyer said he thinks the details need to be refined and encouraged the applicants to study the veneer system.

Ms. Krosky said the concept, massing and scale, and metal roof are fine, but she feels there are too many materials.

Ms. Strasser said she agreed with what had been said and said she doesn't understand the shutter look, that the pillars feel out of proportion, that the configuration of the elevator and windows doesn't work with the house, and there are too many textures. She complimented the creativity and said the massing and roof comes together nicely.

Mr. Scott said there is a lot going on and this is an ambitious project. He said he rarely sees this many details in the drawings and would like to see notes. Ms. Scott and Ms. Danjel discussed details and Mr. Scott said this addition will be very different from the rest of the home if constructed as is.

The homeowner said that the back of the home currently has no character; they are trying to do something nicer.

The shutters on the home were discussed; there are shutters on the front of the house but other shutters have fallen off. The home's garage doors are new.

Mr. Scott suggested trying to unify the angle of the slats.

The applicant and Board members discussed painting the siding and also the shutters.

Chairperson Toney stated she seems to be hearing from the Board that that the applicant should return next month with additional details and refinement.

The applicant requested that the application be Tabled.

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

Chairperson Toney said the application may be on the Consent Agenda for next month and Ms. Rose clarified that the application was tabled to the September 14, 2023 meeting.

4) Application Number: ARB- 23-22

Address: 199 S Ardmore

Applicant: Mitch Fries

Owner: Mitch Fries

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for a 2nd and 3rd floor addition to the rear of the home.

This application was heard after BZAP-23-22.

Mr. Fries said the addition was redone around the turn of the 21st century and plans were drawn up at that time that were not implemented. However, now plans have been redesigned to install an owner's suite and a dormer with a restroom on the 3rd floor. They would match the current house materials.

Ms. Krosky provided compliments.

Mr. Heyer stated the drawings were beautiful but said the windows at the master bedroom are close to the corner, making the walls look unsteady.

The applicant said he doesn't see any issue pulling the two windows in.

Ms. Strasser said she loves it.

Mr. Scott had the applicant clarify that the highest point is the new gable ridgeline. He said his concern is that the additions in the back of homes have taller, more prominent roofs. The applicant said it lines up proportionally with the dormer and ridge.

Mr. Heyer pointed out that the chimney will pair with the gable.

Ms. Rose said the height at the back of the home will be 2.5 stories, and the neighbor's home was discussed.

Mr. Heyer suggested hiping the gable and the roof slope would not be changed. Mr. Scott said he feels this will help.

The Findings of Fact and Decision of the Board for Application No. ARB-23-22 for property located at 199 S. Ardmore: The Architecture Review Board finds that the proposed second and third story additions to the rear of the house are architecturally compatible with the existing structure and further moves to approve a Certificate of Appropriateness with the following conditions: the second floor windows in the bedroom and closet are refined to push away from the corners and to add a hip the north elevation above the window.

The applicant understood the Findings of Fact.

Motion to approve findings of Fact by Ms. Krosky, second by Mr. Heyer; roll call: Heyer – Yes, Krosky – Yes, Strasser – Yes, Scott – Yes, Toney – Yes.

5) Application Number: BZAP - 23-22

Address: 199 S Ardmore

Applicant: Dennis Meacham

Owner: Mitch Fries

Request: The applicant is seeking a recommendation to BZAP for Architectural review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for a Special Permit for functional dormer in a new detached garage.

This application was reviewed prior to ARB-23-22.

Dennis Meacham and Mitch Fries were sworn in.

The applicant explained the old and existing garage is in peril, and that they are proposing a garage with both a front and back entrance which will increase the footprint and will require regrading.

Ms. Rose stated this is going to the BZAP because a garage with a functional dormer requires a special permit on some lot sizes.

The location of the dormer was discussed, and the garage will be larger going towards the home. Ms. Rose stated the distance from the property line meets the requirements.

The dormer faces the home, which Ms. Rose stated is proper.

The siding will match the house with a soft shingle.

The home is cedar shingle and with a slate roof. The dormer and the roof of the garage will be metal.

Ms. Rose stated the height is 18 feet, which meets Code.

The applicant stated the eave details will match the home.

Mr. Heyer asked if there is anything they can do to change the box eave; suggestions and ideas were discussed.

Chairperson Toney asked about heights and distances from the lot line and expressed concern about this project towering over the neighbor's yard; she said she would like to see it come further from the neighbor's yard. Ms. Rose stated the BZAP can review this. The applicant said the existing driveway somewhat dictated the proposed location.

There will be an internal landing. Mr. Heyer and the applicant discussed the eave height.

Ms. Rose showed a site plan compared to the neighbors.

Ms. Krosky asked about an existing tree. The applicant stated that to build both the addition and the garage, the tree will need to be removed, and that the tree's roots are destroying below ground infrastructure. He noted a new tree will replace the existing.

The Findings of Fact and Decision of the Board for Application No. BZAP-23-22 for property located at 199 S. Ardmore: The Architecture Review Board recommends to the Board of Zoning and Planning a Certificate of Appropriateness for a new garage with a functional dormer with the condition that the Board consider the location of this garage to the north side property line and the review of eave details with the Design Consultant.

Motion to approve findings of Fact by Mr. Heyer, second by Ms. Krosky; roll call: Scott – Yes, Strasser – Yes, Krosky – Yes, Heyer – Yes, Toney – Yes.

6) Application Number: ARB- 23-23

Address: 261 N Drexel

Applicant: David Stock

Owner: Jamie and Margo Lewis

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for a new attached garage, addition, auto court and 40" stone columns.

Motion to approve the Consent Agenda (application numbers ARB-23-23 and BZAP-23-24) by Ms. Krosky, second by Mr. Heyer; roll call: Heyer – Yes, Krosky – Yes, Scott – Yes, Strasser – Yes, Chairperson Toney – Yes. Ms. Rose clarified that the approval of application BZAP-23-24 for 2553 Dale is a recommendation on the design to the Board of Zoning and Planning.

7) Application Number: ARB- 23-24

Address: 2428 Bryden

Applicant: Amy Lauerhass

Owner: Steven & Kelly Schmidt

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness to expand the rear shed dormer, new dormer, window and door modifications.

Ms. Lauerhass was sworn in and stated that most of this job is interior but there are a couple of window/door changes. The items for the Board are the expansion of the rear shed dormer and addition of a small hipped roof front dormer.

Ms. Krosky said she likes the design and has no comments and was considering this to be a consent agenda item.

Mr. Heyer said he can't see the dormer without something there. Ms. Lauerhass stated the chimney and front doors have strong detailing and the dormer is high up and back, but she can add some small details. Mr. Heyer suggested adding a recess on the rear dormer and said there is precedent for higher elements. Various options were discussed.

The chimney is engaged with the structure.

Mr. Scott suggested something "quirky."

The Findings of Fact and Decision of the Board for Application No. ARB-23-24 for property located at 2428 Bryden: The Architecture Review Board finds that the expansion of the rear dormer and a new front dormer are architecturally compatible with the existing structure and further moves to approve a Certificate of Appropriateness with the following conditions: that there be design relief on the rear dormer.

The applicant understood the Findings of Fact.

Motion to approve the Findings of Fact by Mr. Scott, second by Ms. Strasser; roll call: Strasser – Yes, Scott – Yes, Heyer – Yes, Krosky – Yes, Toney – Yes.

8) Application Number: ARB- 23-25

Address: 316 N Stanwood

Applicant: Frederick Long

Owner: Frederick Long

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for a porch roof addition at the rear of the house over the patio area.

9) Application Number: BZAP - 23-24

Address: 2753 Dale

Applicant: Patrick Manley

Owner: Bryan M and Jessica L Olsheski

Request: The applicant is seeking a recommendation to BZAP for Architectural review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for a garage modification and dormer addition.

Mr. Long was sworn in.

Mr. Long said the home has a boring backyard and dysfunctional patio; he explained he wants to put a basic roof over it with 3 support posts following the roofing line where it changes.

The pitch was explained to be between 3 and 12 and 4 and 12. He said that when this is done, the house will be reroofed. Mr. Heyer suggested he get his warranty and this was discussed by Mr. Scott.

The beams will be LVL beams painted white.

Mr. Heyer said the details will be important and there is an issue at the corner with a little wall that comes down the pitch, as there's an opening to the structural column. Utilizing brackets was discussed.

Ms. Krosky said she has no problem with the concept of this and agrees that the details can be reviewed.

Ms. Strasser said she is comfortable remanding this to the Design Consultant.

Mr. Scott mentioned a window in a previous addition and supported the idea of the applicant working with the Design Consultant. He further stated that there will probably be a beam running across the posts, and the overhang will be important. Mr. Long said there will be footers. Mr. Scott indicated he is not a fan of the vertical wall and the existing rakes are basically flat; Mr. Long said there were other customizations

Ms. Toney agreed to have the applicant work with the Design Consultant. The Findings of Fact and Decision of the Board for Application No. ARB-23-25 for property located at 316 N Stanwood: The Architecture Review Board finds that the porch roof over the existing patio is architecturally compatible with the existing structure and further moves to approve a certificate of appropriateness with the following condition: that the applicant work with the Design Consultant on final column eave details and gutters, and if the roof pitch is too low, it is further subject to approval by the Design Consultant of appropriate roof material.

The applicant understood the Findings of Fact.

Motion to approve the Findings of Fact by Ms. Krosky, second by Mr. Scott; roll call: Krosky – Yes, Heyer – Yes, Strasser – Yes, Scott – Yes, Toney – Yes.

Motion to approve the Consent Agenda (application numbers ARB-23-23 and BZAP-23-24) by Ms. Krosky, second by Mr. Heyer; roll call: Heyer – Yes, Krosky – Yes, Scott – Yes, Strasser – Yes, Chairperson Toney – Yes. Ms. Rose clarified that the approval of application BZAP-23-24 for 2553 Dale is a recommendation on the design to the Board of Zoning and Planning.

7) Other Business

8) Adjourn Page

The meeting was adjourned.