

Brett Smith represented the applicant. He said that the sign was revised to be more of a rectangle shape.

Mr. Clark said that the sign approved at the last meeting was not installed as approved. This board wanted the red changed to orange, yet it was put up with the red color. Mr. Clark asked Mr. Smith when that would be corrected, and Mr. Smith replied that it would be changed the following week.

MOTION: To approve the wall sign.

Mr. Clark moved for approval; Ms. Broderick seconded, and the motion carried, 5-0, on a roll call vote.

Yeas: Mr. Clark, Ms. Broderick, Mr. Liang, Mr. Riedel, Mr. Holecek

Nays: None

PULTE HOMES

690 MADISON AVENUE

HOUSE

MOTION: To remove this item from the table.

Mr. Clark moved for approval; Mr. Laing seconded, and the motion carried, 5-0, on a roll call vote.

Yeas: Mr. Clark, Mr. Laing, Ms. Broderick, Mr. Riedel, Mr. Holecek

Nays: None

Keith Filipkowski represented the applicant. He said that there was a discussion on this design at the last meeting. They tried to tie in all of the suggestions made by this board and developed two separate options for the elevations. Mr. Filipkowski explained option A to the members and the changes made to it from the original design. He then reviewed option B with the board and explained the revisions from the original design.

Mr. Wehrenberg confirmed that there were no problems with the similarity rules for the new options. There was a conversation on the fill under the driveway and its location on the lot.

Mr. Holecek asked the members for input on the different options. Overall, the members liked both options, but the applicant preferred option A, so the members agreed to use option A. Mr. Filipkowski reminded them of the colors and materials that were approved at the previous meeting.

Mr. Filipkowski stated that the new elevation drawings will be done and submitted to the building department. Mr. Holecek informed the applicant that the drawings must be submitted to the city before any approval is final, and Mr. Filipkowski agreed.

MOTION: To approve option A based on the colors and materials approved at the previous meeting.

Ms. Broderick moved for approval; Mr. Liang seconded, and the motion carried, 5-0, on a roll call vote.

Yeas: Ms. Broderick, Mr. Liang, Mr. Clark, Mr. Riedel, Mr. Holecek

Nays: None

NEW BUSINESS:

DREES HOMES S CHILLICOTHE & LEXINGTON MONUMENT SIGN

Lee Allen represented the applicant. They plan to replace the sign for Yorkshire Estates with the proposed sign. They want to advertise that they are now building in that development.

MOTION: To approve the plan for the monument sign.

Mr. Riedel moved for approval; Ms. Broderick seconded, and the motion carried, 5-0, on a roll call vote.

Yeas: Mr. Riedel, Ms. Broderick, Mr. Clark, Mr. Liang, Mr. Holecek

Nays: None

REEBOK (Aur. Prem. Out.) 549 S CHILLICOTHE UNDER CANOPY SIGN

Erin Rosado represented the applicant. She said that they will be temporary signs displayed for about 12 months.

MOTION: To approve the plan for the under canopy sign.

Mr. Clark moved for approval; Mr. Liang seconded, and the motion carried, 5-0, on a roll call vote.

Yeas: Mr. Clark, Mr. Liang, Ms. Broderick, Mr. Riedel, Mr. Holecek

Nays: None

REEBOK (Aur. Prem. Out.) 549 S CHILLICOTHE FRONT WALL SIGN

Ms. Rosado said that this sign will be put right next to the sign for Rockport on the front wall so that they look like one large sign.

MOTION: To approve the plan for the front wall sign.

Mr. Clark moved for approval; Mr. Liang seconded, and the motion carried, 5-0, on a roll call vote.

Yeas: Mr. Clark, Mr. Liang, Ms. Broderick, Mr. Riedel, Mr. Holecek

Nays: None

ROCKPORT(Aur. Prem. Out.) 549 S CHILLICOTHE FRONT WALL SIGN

MOTION: To approve the plan for the front wall sign.

Mr. Liang moved for approval; Ms. Broderick seconded, and the motion carried, 5-0, on a roll call vote.

Yeas: Mr. Liang, Ms. Broderick, Mr. Clark, Mr. Riedel, Mr. Holecek

Nays: None

WALDEN BISSELL RD & WALDEN DR SOUTH ENTRANCE SIGN

Mr. Wehrenberg explained that a sign for the north entrance must have a variance from the Board of Zoning Appeals, so the applicant asked for this sign to be tabled until both signs could appear on the agenda together.

MOTION: To table this item.

Mr. Liang moved for approval; Mr. Riedel seconded, and the motion carried, 5-0, on a roll call vote.

Yeas: Mr. Liang, Mr. Riedel, Ms. Broderick, Mr. Clark, Mr. Holecek

Nays: None

UNIVERSITY HOSPITAL 55 N CHILLICOTHE ELEVATIONS ONLY

Andrew Campagne of Town Center Construction represented the applicant. He explained that there is one less window than the preliminary plan. He then reviewed the entire design and answered the members' questions.

MOTION: To approve the elevations only.

Mr. Clark moved for approval; Mr. Riedel seconded, and the motion carried, 5-0, on a roll call vote.

Yeas: Mr. Clark, Mr. Riedel, Ms. Broderick, Mr. Liang, Mr. Holecek

Nays: None

CALVIN BROWN 995 CASCADES DR ACCESSORY BLDG

Charlene Freeman, Mr. Brown's mother, represented him since he was out of town. She said the building cannot be seen from the road. After some discussion on the plan, Mr. Wehrenberg explained that the topography raises substantially in the back, so it would probably not be seen from the road.

According to Ms. Freeman, the exterior materials will match the existing house.

MOTION: To approve the plan for an accessory building.

Ms. Broderick moved for approval; Mr. Liang seconded, and the motion carried, 5-0, on a roll call vote.

Yeas: Ms. Broderick, Mr. Liang, Mr. Clark, Mr. Riedel, Mr. Holecek

Nays: None

KEITH HUSTON

720 ROCK CREEK

GABLE

Ken LaBella represented the applicant. He presented the exterior materials and colors to be used for the project. The owner plans to add shutters to the front and side elevations. There was a conversation on how the shutters would be installed, and Mr. LaBella explained some of the changes to be made and how they would help with the shutter installation.

Mr. LaBella then gave the order in which items would be done and how the project would be completed. Mr. Holecek mentioned that if there are any issues with the project and something has to be changed, the applicant would have to revisit this board with those changes. Mr. LaBella said he would return if necessary. He noted that they already have a permit for the front entry roof, and only need the approval of the gable plan.

MOTION: To approve the plan for a gable.

Mr. Liang moved for approval; Ms. Broderick seconded, and the motion carried, 4-1, on a roll call vote.

Yeas: Mr. Liang, Ms. Broderick, Mr. Clark, Mr. Holecek

Nays: Mr. Riedel

SUSAN CHORLEY

325 EAST PIONEER TR

EXTERIOR ALTERATION

Dan Hurst, of Hurst Design Building and Remodeling, represented the homeowner. He said they are just renovating a three season room. The existing patio doors will be removed and the windows will also be changed. There is a total of six patio doors, and four will be changed to windows and two will be changed to full view doors to match the existing on the rear of the house. They will be updating some of the interior finishes.

Mr. Hurst said the homeowner just recently requested a change to the plan, which is for arched windows on the rear instead of the square windows. He asked if the board would consider that revision to the plan.

MOTION: To approve the plan with the addition of the arched windows.

Ms. Broderick moved for approval; Mr. Riedel seconded, and the motion carried, 5-0, on a roll call vote.

Yeas: Ms. Broderick, Mr. Riedel, Mr. Clark, Mr. Liang, Mr. Holecek

Nays: None

JIM MARTIN50 CHADWICK DRGABLE ROOF OVER DECK

Mark Mazzurco represented the applicant. There will be an open air patio cover over the top of the deck. A brief review and conversation followed.

MOTION: To approve the plan for a gable roof over a deck.

Mr. Clark moved for approval; Mr. Riedel seconded, and the motion carried, 5-0, on a roll call vote.

Yeas: Mr. Clark; Mr. Riedel, Ms. Broderick, Mr. Liang, Mr. Holecek

Nays: None

JOSEPH NICOLOSI889 BROOKFIELDGAZEBO & HOT TUB

Joe Nicolosi Jr. represented his parents. He explained the plan to the members and answered questions about the plan and the grade of the site.

MOTION: To approve the plan for a gazebo and hot tub.

Mr. Clark moved for approval; Mr. Liang seconded, and the motion carried, 4-1, on a roll call vote.

Yeas: Mr. Clark, Mr. Liang, Ms. Broderick, Mr. Riedel

Nays: Mr. Holecek

DOMINIC ANTONUCCI709 BISSELL ROADADDITION

Skip Bohrer represented the homeowner. He said that currently it is a glass room and is falling apart. The owners want to have a room with three skylights and two or three large windows with everything to match the existing house. He received the architect's review notes earlier in the day and started a brief conversation on the insulation noted.

Mr. Bohrer stated that there may be a change in the windows shown on the plan and explained what might be revised. However, the plan before the board is the one that they are submitting for approval. If the owner decides to change it, a revision will then be submitted for review. There was a discussion regarding the skylights and Mr. Bohrer explained how they will be hidden and unseen from the road.

MOTION: To approve the plan for an addition.

Mr. Riedel moved for approval; Mr. Liang seconded, and the motion carried, 5-0, on a roll call vote.

Yeas: Mr. Riedel, Mr. Liang, Ms. Broderick, Mr. Clark, Mr. Holecek

Nays: None

SCOTT WOLF156 ELDRIDGE ROAD2ND FLOOR ADDITION

Scott Wolf explained that construction drawings were not yet submitted. They want to wait until the elevations are approved so they are aware of what can be done. He offered to have it tabled if the board prefers. He said they are adding four bedrooms and three bathrooms to the second floor.

Mr. Wolf reiterated that he doesn't want the expense of drawing final plans unless he can be sure the elevations will be approved. There was additional discussion regarding the structural information, windows, the power supply, shutters and other topics. He presented photographs of another house in the city as an example of how his house will look when completed.

There was a discussion on the size of the dormers and the board members felt that they should be larger. It was agreed to table this plan so that revised drawings could be done.

MOTION: To table this item. (see additional motion at end of plan reviews)

Mr. Liang moved for approval; Ms. Broderick seconded, and the motion carried, 5-0, on a roll call vote.

Yeas: Mr. Liang, Ms. Broderick, Mr. Clark, Mr. Riedel, Mr. Holecek

Nays: None

DAVID GIAMBRONE220 SOUTHWICK LANECARRIAGE HOUSE

Mr. Wolf represented the applicant. He stated that dormers were added to the front as well as a porch. The elevation was approved over a year ago, but they made those changes and then flipped the design and are now here for a new review.

Mr. Wehrenberg said that he spoke to the architect who explained that elevations only were submitted to make sure they would be approved before a full construction set is drawn up.

Mr. Wolf told the members that the two lots that the owner had have been consolidated into one large lot. Mr. Wehrenberg stated that the proposed carriage house is considered an accessory building.

MOTION: To approve the plan for a carriage house.

Mr. Broderick moved for approval; Mr. Liang seconded, and the motion carried, 5-0, on a roll call vote.

Yeas: Ms. Broderick, Mr. Liang, Mr. Clark, Mr. Riedel, Mr. Holecek

Nays: None

MISCELLANEOUS:**AMENDMENT TO GUIDELINES REGARDING GARAGES**

Mr. Holecek referred to the revised guidelines in their packets. Mr. Riedel suggested changing the text to read "A garage should not face a public thoroughfare" rather than cannot, so it is up to this board's discretion. Mr. Holecek noted that there is still discretion embedded in the rule.

Mr. Holecek said that he preferred using the word cannot. There was a conversation on corner lots and how it would affect them. It was pointed out that they can be considered a hardship. Additional conversation followed on the language to be used in the rule, and it was decided to change the third sentence in that section to read "The Architectural Board may approve garage doors facing a public thoroughfare for hardship reasons".

MOTION: To revise the guidelines regarding garages to read as follows: 1) second sentence to read "A garage cannot face a public thoroughfare"; and 2) third sentence to read "The Architectural Board may approve garage doors facing a public thoroughfare for hardship reasons".

Mr. Clark moved for approval; Mr. Liang seconded, and the motion carried, 5-0, on a roll call vote.

Yeas: Mr. Clark, Mr. Liang, Ms. Broderick, Mr. Riedel, Mr. Holecek

Nays: None

DISCUSSION OF HOUSE DESIGNS & SIMILARITY RULES FOR TREAT RD. DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Wehrenberg referred to the site plan he had included in the packets. He said it is a concept site plan accompanying a Conditional Zoning Certificate.

A discussion began with Pulte Homes representatives regarding hardships and garage placements.

Mr. Wehrenberg said that the site plan for the development will be going to City Council for approval. If approved, there would be 60 foot wide lots approximately 140 feet deep. The house area, after setbacks, would be about 40 feet by 60-65 feet. He said the homes could be as much as 4,000 square feet.

Mr. Holecek raised the subject of front facing garages on those lots, and Mr. Wehrenberg responded that it depends if the sites qualify as narrow lots under the guidelines with regard to hardships. Mr. Holecek wondered if it is a hardship since the developer knew the restrictions available but still proposed lots of that width. He commented that they can't create their own hardship.

Mr. Clark asked why the driveways couldn't go back to the rear yard. Mr. Wehrenberg replied that they have only ten feet for side yards. Additional discussion followed. Mr. Wehrenberg gave some background on the development and its appearance before the Board of Zoning Appeals and the Planning Commission, and then explained conservation developments.

Mr. Wehrenberg addressed the proposed styles of homes to be built by Ryan Homes. He reviewed some of the designs for model homes relative to the similarity rules listed in the code.

He said that with the code's 150 foot rule and lots that are only 60 feet wide, it's going to be very challenging dealing with similarities. Much more discussion followed regarding the development's issues.

SCOTT WOLF

156 ELDRIDGE ROAD

2ND FLOOR ADDITION

Second review:

Mr. Wolf asked the board to consider taking action on his plan since they acted on Giambrone's plan and that applicant had only elevations as well. The members agreed to take a vote.

MOTION: To remove the plan from the table.

Ms. Broderick moved for approval; Mr. Liang seconded; and the motion carried, 5-0, on a roll call vote.

Yeas: Ms. Broderick, Mr. Liang, Mr. Clark, Mr. Riedel, Mr. Holecek

Nays: None

MOTION: To approve subject to increased dormer size to make room for shutters, and the color of the shutters and other materials will be consistent with the existing house; and subject to the submission of the construction plans and the corrected elevations.

Mr. Riedel moved for approval; Mr. Liang seconded, and the motion carried, 5-0, on a roll call vote.

Yeas: Mr. Riedel, Mr. Liang, Ms. Broderick, Mr. Clark, Mr. Holecek

Nays: None

Mr. Wehrenberg raised the subject of the development at Treat Rd. and N. Chillicothe and said that the developer had some questions. He said they wanted to know whether the board would consider the proposed lots as narrow lots that would fall under the exception to allow front facing garages.

Secondly, the developer wanted to know if this board would apply the similarity rules because of the 150 foot distance, especially since the proposed lots are only about 60 feet wide. Mr. Holecek said that it is part of the code so this board cannot change anything relative to the similarity rules. He suggested the developer reconsider the width of the lots because they may have problems down the road. Mr. Holecek then mentioned that if the developer does not want to make changes and wants to have front facing garages, he can then make the roads private roads since the rule for front facing garages applies to public thoroughfares. Additional conversation ensued.

Per an inquiry by Mr. Holecek, Mr. Wehrenberg stated that he put \$50,000 in the budget to have someone rewrite the guidelines. A long discussion on the guidelines followed.

ADJOURNMENT:

Mr. Liang moved to adjourn at 9:15 p.m.; Mr. Holecek seconded, and the motion carried, 5-0, on a voice vote.

Chris Holecek - Chairman

Susan Dombeck - Secretary
AUDIO TAPE ON FILE