



**Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes  
November 9, 2023  
6:00 PM**

**1) Call to Order**

The meeting was Called to Order by Chairperson Toney.

**2) Roll Call of Members**

Members present: Mr. Steele, Mr. Hall, Mr. Heyer, Mr. Scott, Chairperson Toney.

**3) Approval of Minutes**

**Motion to approve minutes from the October, 2023 meeting and October, 2023 workshop by Mr. Scott, second by Mr. Steele; roll call: Heyer–Yes, Scott–Yes, Hall–Yes, Steele–Yes, Toney–Yes.**

**4) Public Comments**

There were no Public Comments.

**Motion to approve ARB-23-28 as a Consent Agenda item by Heyer, second by Scott; roll call: Scott–Yes, Heyer–Yes, Hall–Yes, Heyer–Yes, Steele–Yes, Toney–Yes.**

**5) Old Business**

1. Application Number: BZAP - 23-23

Address: 2200 E Main

Applicant: Ryan Pearson

Owner: Continental Real Estate Cos.

Request: The applicant is seeking a recommendation to the Board of Zoning and Planning for a Certificate of Appropriateness 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 5-story mixed use building to provide additional housing, restaurant, retail and offices.

Ms. Bokor indicated she had uploaded a Staff Report to the City's website. She stated this project went before the BZAP for a preliminary review and since that time, has added a sixth story which will need a variance; this was encouraged by the ARB during the workshop. She stated this application was Tabled at the last ARB meeting but there was a productive workshop and mentioned this application won't be heard by the BZAP until the ARB provides a recommendation. She stated she is pleased with the changes

that have come in and gave an overview of the changes made during the workshop: relief in the massing which was accomplished by adding the sixth story in the front of the building, adding more undulations to the building, creating pocket parks, and developing the entrance and southeast corner to activate Main Street.

She stated the Board is present to talk about architecture, material choices, and style, how it addresses the Main Street corridor and activates spaces around the building, and how it interfaces with adjacent buildings and pedestrians. She explained this meeting is not to discuss parking and traffic patterns—this is being worked on separately: tax abatements, use, overall site design, and general massing. She said the applicant has been receptive to changes.

Jason Hockstock of Continental Real Estate thanked the Board for their work on this and indicated that Mr. Kass was unable to attend the meeting.

Ms. Bokor gave a staff recommendation to recommend this to BZAP and asked the Board to think about what types of things they want remanded back.

Brad Pauling, Studio Director at PH7, spoke through some of the changes as they were different from what was presented at the last ARB meeting. He displayed a Nolli plan to represent building masses and pointed out the pattern from Parkview to Drexel which was attempted to be replicated by a two-story facade at the front of the building. He said there was an endeavor to simplify the massing with two-story facades along Main which create a pedestrian scale; this includes an entry sequence for multiple locations, simplification of the masses, and a rooftop patio.

Various images were displayed to showcase activation and hierarchy. He said that by carving out some units, they have included a partial sixth floor. He said the cornice was flipped and explained more uniform vertical portions of the building. He also stated how there would be more transparency through the corner.

Members of the public wanting to give public comments were sworn in.

Chairperson Toney indicated everyone will be given three minutes to speak and she asked that comments not be repeated.

Lynn Jeffrey, 500 S. Parkview—spoke to the compatibility of the building with the neighborhood and that the ARB cannot adequately determine compatibility with incomplete information; she stated that the proposed building is not compatible. She said there is not a special permit or variance code to allow for a structure with a partial sixth story on this parcel of land. She said she is not against development but rather is against this particular project.

Marsha Hirsch, 500 S. Parkview—stated she has learned that the ARB has a responsibility to protect real estate from impairment of value; she said she believes this project will devalue her property and others', and mentioned how she believes this will happen and that this project will alter the character and value of other properties. She asked the Board not to approve this project.

Maria Rosenthal, 500 S. Parview—explained that her property abuts the Trinity parcel and she has only received one elevation of the west side of the building. She said this is a massive project that will block sunlight to her unit which will affect her quality of life; this is included in the Main Street Guidelines. She requested adjustments to protect welfare and asked questions about the property.

John Raush, 500 S. Parkview—stated that the proposed development does not preserve the character of Main Street, which is a historical small town environment. With external modifications, he said this will be a large building. He said he does not believe Continental has shown consideration for the historical preservation of Main Street. He spoke to current buildings as contemporary versions of existing buildings. He said he has spoken to Bexley residents who have indicated they are opposed to both the buildings and expressing their feelings. He encouraged people to learn more about 5 over 1 construction.

Roel Van Spronsen, 530 S. Parkview—discussed the skyline and how his view and his neighbor's view will be affected by this project.

James Gross, 500 S. Parkview—explained his history with the City of Bexley and stated that renderings provided the day of the meeting sends a bad message to Bexley residents.

Brittany Fortin, 2201 Bryden—shared her belief that this structure will change the view of people who live on Bryden. She said trees won't block this project and her privacy will be impacted. She said the Main Street Guidelines indicate a building 3-4 stories in height is ideal. She stated she is greatly concerned about the parking. She recommended this be a 3-4 story building or greenspace.

Jennifer and Modi Hirsh, 2265 Bryden—said she feels the contemporary facade is out of character, that there is no attempt to preserve the large trees, and that an inadequate attempt to replace the greenery. She said the Board can require a plan for the preservation of existing trees and other significant landscape features. Modi said he spoke for the trees and asked that they not be torn down. Ms. Hirsh ended by explaining her concerns.

Angela Yock, 2240 Bryden—Stated she has started a west Bexley coalition to ensure voices are heard and said that she believes that without that, this project would have been pushed through. She said that she was willing to take on speaking against this project because it is the right thing to do and asked if there was a representative from Capital University. She said there has been emphasis on how the City needs to help Capital, and asked if the university or the City's residents were most important. She asked why this project is so important. She said she has not been approached by the City government and discussed funds. She asked Board members if they would want to live near this structure and discussed how her home is her investment. She encouraged residents to "vote smartly." She suggested a community center in lieu of this project.

A neighbor stated that renderings were missing from a PDF; Ms. Bokor stated that the renderings were not deleted but are housed online in a different location.

The applicant stated they are not trying to hide anything in the elevation and that the images were submitted by the deadline. He showed the northeast corner and stated they have done the same thing on the opposite corner; it is a mirror but the image is not in the deck. He explained that the grade changes. Next, he displayed other elevations and discussed materiality and topographical changes.

A photograph rendering from the parking lot at the Alexander was displayed, which shows a one-story retaining element because of the topography. There was an explanation of the way the building will sit on the site and that there is currently a building on the proposed site, albeit the proposed building will fill the space more.

Ryan Pearson of the Edge Group spoke to a shadow study that was still in development and explained how the building would shade the Alexander at various times of day and throughout the year. He said information is going out as promptly as possible. Mr. Pearson explained the plant material won't be mature for about 25-30 years and on a commercial property there is an attempt to plant denser. He said the Alexander is similar in architectural style and massing to this proposed project. Combined with the Gateway, he said they can be viewed as a development.

Mr. Pearson discussed the grade and trees. He stated the easternmost portion of the Alexander is within five feet of the lot line and there is about 10 feet of greenspace before the drive aisle and discussed plans for the grade and trees.

Ms. Bokor explained that a part of the process is that a landscape plan will go to the Tree & Public Garden Commission.

John Raush discussed the building material and the difference between the proposed project and the Alexander.

Mr. Heyer stated he appreciated the comments and said he does not feel the renderings show what they are looking at in that the five story roof line is almost the same as the Alexander; he said the renderings don't make it look that way. He stated there is not a cornice line and the perception of the height. He said this goes up two floors higher than what is there currently and if there is a cornice, it will be like it only goes up one floor. Mr. Heyer explained that they want the perception and shadow line to be as low as possible and said he is hoping that the facade could be set back more. He said there is still a lot of height and asked if the top floor could be more commensurate with the Alexander by having a partial cornice line or otherwise breaking things up. There was discussion about a tapered mound at the Gateway and the grade. Mr. Heyer discussed material change and asked if there is a way to break down the west elevation even more. He said there is a sense that this is not broken down and that contributes to a problem. He noted that the sixth story section is directly east of the Gateway and the Alexander is elsewhere. Mr. Heyer said the Main Street elevation has come a long way and fits into the Main Street guidelines, but feels there is work to be done on the residential-facing side. Regarding the southwest corner elevation, he stated that he hoped the cornice line would mask more of the fifth floor but the sixth floor is downplayed by the deeper cornice which reads like a taller sixth floor. He said he appreciated the public space and said he does not feel the spandrels are helpful. He indicated he feels it is an urban success on Main Street.

Don Marshner, 2250 Bryden—asked if the previous submittal could be compared to the north and west elevations; he said the applicant has done a great job focusing on Main Street but has not focused on the residential side. He said additional units are being added from what was there before and the massing has gotten worse because of the additions. Mr. Heyer said he disagreed and they are asking for improvements to other sides and indicated that there are ways to step back the building so the perception from the ground is a better scale. There was a discussion about the number of units and parking. Mr. Heyer said they are asking for improvements to other sides and cornice line changes. He indicated the Board is sensitive to the pedestrian view. The path on Bryden was mentioned.

Mr. Hall stated the Main Street elevations have come a long way but there is work to be done on the other sides. He mentioned the facade facing City Hall, the Main Street elevation, access to the patios, the restaurant space, and the building entrance and elevator.

Mr. Steele shared comments about the west side, courtyard space, grade, and more.

Mr. Scott said he agreed with some of the comments regarding the last minute submittals. He indicated he appreciated the efforts made to listen to feedback so the architecture is relative to the context of the surrounding neighborhood, but there are challenges because based on Zoning, any developer can come in to build their project. He said the Board tries to push for what they feel is a quality project that addresses 360 degrees around the building, and they have seen progress on some aspects of this. He stated the sixth story is big but it is south of the Gateway and is not at the Alexander where people are living. He said the Board has pushed to be more reactive towards the north side and that what he feels what the designers have brought has gone a long way to break down the corner. He said there are ways to change the facade to influence the scale of the building and he would like more clear images and more attention paid to the west facade. He said that when looking, this is a five story building next to a five story building, and there are similarities. He mentioned conversations with the designers which resulted in the sixth story. Mr. Scott noted that nearby properties also cast shadows and some of, but not all, of the Alexander will be shadowed. He said the distance between the proposed property and the single family homes is three times that of the Alexander and the single family homes. He said the developer is trying to make gestures and the Board is working to help bring quality and change the scale. He would like to develop the west facade. He said the efforts to develop the public spaces in the southeast corner have been successful and he appreciated the incorporation of the comments. He said he agrees with the large bay windows but the bands are too dark; he suggested making these more similar in color. He stated the massing and approach is successful, as well as how the building meets the grade and parking lot, which is softened by the landscape.

Mr. Heyer asked for renderings that see the neighborhood in context, including Bryden.

Chairperson Toney stated Mr. Scott's comments reflect her thoughts. She said she originally wanted the cutout on the front of the building to be on the side. She said the face of the building on Main Street is similar in size to the Gateway. She said her concern is breaks along the side; she said the east side will be seen and similar to that of the Alexander. She said the Alexander and Gateway are two buildings but one

project. Chairperson Toney said she would like this to feel more broken down. She stated she was worried that enhancements on the Main Street side would force them to give up changes on the east and west sides and that she would like to see more bricks on the west side. She explained she feels they have made a lot of progress and understands that many people in the audience are not happy with the building being built at all. She stated the Board did not bring the project and did not decide what will happen on this site; they are only to react to what is presented and that what is built is the best project that can be built. She explained that this is a strange project because people are working every day to update drawings and bring updated information, but waiting to share them may be too late. She said this Board deals with last minute submissions on every project; despite it not being ideal, it helps others projects. She said the Board works with the community and does the best they can for everyone involved. She said she hopes people understand this and gives them courtesy as they work through the process that they are trying to make the project the best it can be.

The applicant thanked the Board and stated they are trying to address and react to the comments. He explained the deadlines associated with Capital. He said that they feel they are very close and they are trying to fit in and address concerns and they will get to a point where there is a project that is moving forward, and there is an upcoming closing date. He proposed another meeting to address concerns and recognized some of the information that came in today was intended to improve communication. He said the renderings are what should be reacted to and that those were in the packet.

The complexities of the calendar were mentioned; other options were offered. Ms. Cunningham stated typically there is a recommendation to BZAP and she stated various possibilities.

There was a recess.

The applicant asked for a remand back to allow this project to go to BZAP for the November 30, 2023 meeting and then request a special meeting in December. Ms. Cunningham discussed what is allowable by Code, including a recommendation to BZAP but remanded back to the ARB. Ms. Cunningham said informal review by the BZAP would not be a benefit to the applicant and explained why. Various options were discussed, and Mr. Heyer discussed a potential outcome and public perception, and Ms. Cunningham provided additional explanation. Chairperson Toney stated they want to send an excellent proposal to the BZAP. Mr. Scott shared his opinions. Ms. Cunningham explained the legalities. Mr. Heyer said this project is too important for a remand and conditions. The applicant stated he intends to bring this back to the ARB. Chairperson Toney stated the Board will be willing to do another workshop but bringing this to the BZAP would be important. Mr. Heyer stated he is uncomfortable being pressured by a closing date. A special meeting was tentatively scheduled for December 6, 2023 and a confirmed date will be publicized.

Ms. Bokor stated she is nervous about doing more design work without going to the BZAP; Chairperson Toney said they could possibly lose control if this goes to the BZAP. Mr. Heyer stated the decisions made are for a lifetime. Additional thoughts and possibilities were discussed. Ms. Cunningham said that the control of whether or not it stays here is the decision of the applicant, because it is the original BZAP jurisdiction. The applicant stated they want to work with the ARB so remanding it is the best thing to

do. There were discussions about next steps. Ms. Toney said the applicant can decide what they would like and the Board will vote appropriately; she also shared her opinions. Chairperson Toney said a date for a special meeting can be determined later and then made public. Ms. Bokor shared other potential dates. The Board will attempt to host another meeting on November 29, 2023.

The applicant requested a Table to November 29, 2023.

**Motion to Table to November 29, 2023 at 6 pm by Mr. Heyer, second by Mr. Hall; Heyer–Yes, Scott–Yes, Hall–Yes, Steele–Yes, Toney–Yes.**

## **6) New Business**

2. Application Number: ARB - 23-36  
Address: 217 N. Stanwood  
Applicant: Anthony Pollina  
Owner: Kate Qualmann and Patricio Andrade  
Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural Review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for a new front porch, a 3-season room, and slate roof modifications.

Gerard Martin, a representative of the customer, was sworn in.

Ms. Bokor explained she understands the intent and it is good, but she would like to see the pitch of the entrance portico changed; Mr. Martin said it was extended for the porch and reveal at the top. In terms of the back, she did not feel the drawings were clear as to how the trellis connects and she questioned the window choices.

Mr. Martin said the customer made the decision about the windows for the purpose of the sun exposure and they would like smaller windows to minimize the amount of sunlight.

Mr. Scott spoke to the roof intersecting with the second floor extension; Mr. Martin stated that while it looks like that in the drawings, it will not be in actuality and will be cut off. He said he feels it is a little large but does not think downsizing slightly will hide the keystone. He said he does not think that the details aren't being well represented in the drawings. He said he would have liked to see more details on the back. Mr. Martin discussed how they will be removing the front posts closest to the home and spreading three of them across the front at the back of the property and the house side will all tie in. Mr. Scott discussed details.

Mr. Heyer stated it should be painted black. He mentioned character and details. He said if the front is going to be commensurate with the details of the house, there must be more sensitivity; he stated this addition is not to the same level as the rest of the house. There was discussion about the portico. Mr. Martin stated the customer was interested in shifting the porch off center but it can be revisited. Mr. Heyer stated his belief that this was the wrong solution and stated there must be another way to approach this. Mr. Martin explained the previous renditions of this and ways to make changes. Mr. Heyer stated there could be a shed resting

on brackets. Mr. Martin said there is not a lot of space between the end of the house and the door. Mr. Heyer expressed concern that what they're doing isn't in character. Mr. Scott stated the details they're looking to preserve aren't typically found under a porch. Mr. Heyer suggested a flat.

Mr. Hall shared comments.

Mr. Steele gave his opinions.

Mr. Martin discussed coverage; Mr. Heyer and Mr. Scott discussed options with the applicant.

Ms. Toney asked why the windows on the porch on the back will be removed; she suggested more windows like what is there currently with shades. Mr. Martin stated he can go back to the customer with this note.

Ms. Toney asked for the applicant to request a Table.

**Motion to Table this applicant to the January 11, 2023 meeting by Mr. Steele, second by Mr. Hall; roll call: Heyer–Yes, Scott–Yes, Hall–Yes, Steele–Yes, Toney–Yes.**

3. Application Number: ARB-37  
Address: 2010 E Broad Street  
Applicant: Brent Foley  
Owner: Catholic Diocese of Columbus  
Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural Review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for expansions to the old gym to add 2 stories and variance from the height limit, to allow the addition to match the height of the existing building.

Mr. Foley was sworn in.

Ms. Bokor indicated there is a corresponding BZAP application and there will be a recommendation to the BZAP. She said the design is pretty straightforward but the issue is the height and gave a Staff Report. Ms. Bokor explained why this is going to the ARB, that she has no issues, but feels there needs to be additional clarification.

Mr. Foley said they did receive approval for this project, came before the back due to an issue, corrected the issue, and submitted the application because there are some changes that were submitted and approved back then. He said what is intended is what is in the elevations. He explained the changes regarding the stair, the ramp, and entrance.

Mr. Scott said he loved the new ramp and said the arches are appropriate. The glass window was discussed.



Mr. Heyer said there should be clarification on what is really going on in terms of matching; he suggested cast stone instead of brick and details were discussed.

Mr. Hall shared his thoughts.

Chairperson Toney had nothing to add.

**3:21:22** The Findings are the top goes to cast stone, that there is a stone casing, the line up the coursing so the stone is at the spring point of the arch, and \_\_\_\_.

**Motion to approve the Findings of Fact by Mr. Scott, second by Mr. Heyer; Scott–Yes, Heyer–Yes, Hall–Yes, Steele–Yes, Toney–Yes.**

4. Application Number: ARB- 23-38  
Address: 358 N. Cassady  
Applicant: Amy Lauerhass  
Owner: Bruce and Michelle Carter  
Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural Review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for a front porch addition and modifications to the garage.

**Motion to approve ARB-23-28 as a Consent Agenda item by Heyer, second by Scott; roll call: Scott–Yes, Heyer–Yes, Hall–Yes, Steele–Yes, Toney–Yes.**

## **7) Other Business**

## **8) Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned.