



**Board of Zoning and Planning Meeting Minutes**  
**March 28, 2024**  
**6:00 PM**

**1) Call to Order**

The meeting was Called to Order by Chairperson Behal.

**2) Roll Call of Members**

Members present: Mr. Levine, Mr. Turner, Mr. Eshelbrenner, Mr. Marsh, Chairperson Behal

**3) Approval of Minutes**

**Motion to approve the Meeting Minutes from the February Meeting by Mr. Marsh, second by Mr. Eshelbrenner; all in favor: Behal; Turner-Abstain, Levine-Abstain, Marsh-Abstain.**

**Motion to Table this to the next meeting.**

**4) Public Comments**

There were no Public Comments.

**5) Old Business**

There was no Old Business.

**6) New Business**

- 1) Application Number: BZAP-24-4

Address: 2498 Fair

Applicant: Amy Lauerhass

Owner: Kyle Barger

Request: The applicant is seeking a Certificate of Appropriateness and approval of a special permit for a functional dormer from the Board of Zoning and Planning for a new detached garage and a special permit for functional dormer.

Ms. Lauerhass was sworn in.

Ms. Rose gave a Staff Report which included dimensions and lot coverage, stating that the structures are designed to meet Code as it relates to size, but the request of a functional dormer requires a special permit. She explained that the ARB questioned the overall design and gave

suggestions. Updated plans have been submitted to appease the ARB, but in doing so triggered variances.

Ms. Bokor explained the history of the design as it was created by Ms. Lauerhass and the ARB's comments. She showed a photo of the current garages and explained the proposal and request from the ARB.

Ms. Lauerhass explained the proposed structure would reduce the overall development coverage and increase green space. She said the only aspect of the new design that requires a variance is the dormer. She said the existing garage will become an outdoor living space.

Chairperson Behal questioned the number of buildings that are permissible on a lot; Ms. Rose said there is a lot coverage limit and expansion along the property line limit. Ms. Rose mentioned the arbor and explained she thinks it should be addressed and stated that the two structures separately don't exceed the 60% or lot coverage maximums. She said that as long as they are accommodating the two off street parking spaces, they can utilize the space for something else. She referenced a similar case.

It was determined that if these were one structure, it would be too large to be approved.

Ms. Lauerhass stated her understanding that a trellis is a garden feature so it doesn't add to the development cover or accessory structure cover; Ms. Rose indicated it could be conditioned not to be covered. Ms. Lauerhass explained that the use of the second floor of the original garage is storage.

The accessory structure total width limits were discussed as was the arbor. There was discussion about having multiple accessory structures. The designed was explained to accommodate the vehicles. There will not be living space above the garage.

The ARB's involvement and suggestions were discussed. Ms. Lauerhass stated her opinion that for the lot, this is a more elegant solution. It was explained that this project is not requiring large variances but is a much better design.

It was asked whether or not two garages was allowed; Ms. Rose indicated that they are.

Chairperson Behal stated the concept requires BZAP approval, and the Board can say they don't want to grant variances but could grant a special permit, or the Board could approve the first design. Since the ARB prefers the second design, Chairperson Behal wants to look at the variance requests for the second design to see if the Board agrees that they are reasonable variances that should be granted.

Ms. Lauerhass explained the variances that pertain to the dormer width, area of second floor, and dormer roof.

Ms. Rose suggested making the dormer less wide and Ms. Bokor stated her opinion that that is minor compared to the gables in the same direction.

Various vantage points were discussed. Chairperson Behal discussed the importance of the variances.

The arbor was discussed in terms of approval, connectedness to the garages, square footage, etc.

The Findings of Fact and Decision of the Board for Application Number BZAP-24-4 for property located at 2498 Fair: Upon consideration of the application, proposed variance and testimony before it, the the Board finds the Applicant has proven that the criteria to grant an area variance for Bexley code Section 1226.11(c) have been met and a variance from Bexley code Section 1252.15(a) to allow a second floor space to exceed the 50% limit of the first floor space and Special Permit for a functional dormer, a variance from 1252.15(b)(2) to allow an arbor between the existing and proposed garage with the condition that it have 4 posts separate from the garages, 1252.15(d)(1)(3), to allow the dormer to be connected at the ridge; to match the existing accessory structure. And that the detached garage shall be developed in substantial conformance with the renderings and plans reviewed at the March 28, 2024 meeting.

The Board of Zoning and Planning further finds after review of the plans and consideration of the application, evidence and testimony given, and the recommendation of the Architectural Review Board, that a Certificate of Appropriateness should be issued for Plan "B".

The applicant understood the Findings of Fact.

**Motion to approve the Findings of Fact by Mr. Turner, second by Mr. Eshelbrenner; roll call: Marsh–Yes, Eshelbrenner–Yes, Turner–Yes, Levine–Yes, Behal–Yes.**

- 2) Application Number: BZAP-24-6  
Address: 2529 E. Broad  
Applicant: Amy Lauerhass  
Owner: Marcel Bischoff and Melissa Salguero Rottier  
Request: The applicant is seeking a Certificate of Appropriateness and approval of a variance for an addition to the east side of the principal structure.

Ms. Lauerhass was sworn in.

Ms. Rose stated the applicant is requesting a variance for an addition to the east side of the principal structure. She discussed the various setbacks and angles for the lot and existing structure.

Ms. Bokor stated that the ARB approved this as a Consent Agenda item.

The plan was discussed, and it was determined how the property is angled and much is nonconforming. Ms. Lauerhass shared that the homeowners received approval for a fence and there will be some landscaping.

The Findings of Fact and Decision of the Board for Application Number BZAP-24-6 for property located at 2529 E. Broad: Upon consideration of the application, proposed variance and evidence and testimony before it, the Board finds the Applicant has proven that the criteria to grant an area variance in Bexley code Section 1226.11(c) have been met and a 2' 3" variance from Bexley code Section 1252.09, to allow an addition to the east side of the principal structure; shall be granted as submitted being it is a small portion of the addition and pales in comparison to the existing attached garage that encroaches 20' into the rear yard setback.

The Board of Zoning and Planning further finds after review of the plans and consideration of the application, evidence and testimony given, and the recommendation of the Architectural Review Board, that a Certificate of Appropriateness should be issued for the proposed addition as submitted.

The applicant understood the Findings of Fact.

**Motion to approve the Findings of Fact by Mr. Turner, second by Mr. Levine; roll call: Levine–Yes, Marsh–Yes, Eshelbrenner–Yes, Turner–Yes, Behal–Yes.**

- 3) Application Number: BZAP-24-7  
Address: 394 S Columbia  
Applicant: Karen McCoy  
Owner: Michael Glimcher  
Request: The applicant is seeking a variance from the Board of Zoning and Planning to allow 36" columns at the driveway entrance.

Ms. McCoy was sworn in.

Chairperson Behal recused himself.

Ms. Rose gave a Staff Report explaining the case pertaining to a hold harmless agreement and location in relation to an existing oak tree.

Chairperson Behal decided to return to the case but will abstain from voting.

Ms. Bokor explained that the ARB had not reviewed this case.

Ms. McCoy said the homeowner purchased this home while it was under construction and began to customize it. The previously approved Landscape Plan did not include columns but the current

owner would like to include columns, as close to the sidewalk as possible, two feet off the drive and two feet from the sidewalk.

Ms. Rose explained the reasoning for keeping structures away from the sidewalk.

Other columns on the same street were discussed, as was the Hold Harmless agreement.

The Findings of Fact and Decision of the Board for Application Number BZAP-24-7 for property located at 394 S. Columbia: Upon consideration of the application, proposed evidence and testimony before it, the Board finds the applicant has proven that the criteria to grant an area variance in Bexley code Section 1226.11(c) have been met and a special permit in accordance with 1264.02(c) to allow three 36" columns with 4" limestone caps, as proposed, subject to the following conditions: 1) the column should be located 2' off the driveway and sidewalk; 2) that is subject to City council approval of a hold harmless agreement; and 3) subject to a landscape plan approved by the Tree & Public Gardens Commission.

The applicant understood the finding of Fact.

**Motion by Mr. Eshelbrenner, second by Mr. Turner; roll call: Turner–Yes, Eshelbrenner–Yes, Levine–Yes, Behal–Abstain, Acting Chairperson Marsh–Yes.**

## **7) Other Business**

Chairperson Behal stated that members of the Tree and Public Gardens Commission have asked them to consider getting an approval from them when anything will be built into the Right of Way. Chairperson Behal explained they understand Council has to approve; but would like their take on the matter to be made known to the BZAP before the Board votes on variances.

The logistics of this was discussed and Ms. Rose gave insight to this request.

Ms. Rose explained what typically goes before the Tree and Public Gardens Commission and the Landscape Consultant. Ms. Bokor also indicated some items should go before the Architecture Review Board. The Tree and Public Gardens Commission's jurisdiction was discussed.

Chairperson Behal explained his understanding of the Tree Commission's reasoning for this request.

Ms. Rose explained the current procedure.

## **8) Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned.