

CITY OF AURORA  
OHIO  
**Architectural Board of Review**  
Meeting Minutes  
February 25, 2021

The Architectural Board of Review met in a scheduled meeting on Thursday, February 25, 2021 via Zoom. Melissa Coleman called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

The meeting was facilitated by Zoom technology via the internet, in accordance with the emergency measures permitted by Governor DeWine and the Ohio General Assembly. This temporary measure amends the Ohio Open Meetings Act R.C. 121.22, during this period of the Covid-19 pandemic to allow meetings to be conducted in this manner (HB 197). The Aurora City Council, Resolution 2020-030, adopted this same emergency measure. All applicants and members were provided the link ahead of time. The link to the meeting was also made available to the public on the City of Aurora website.

**ROLL CALL:**

Present:	Melissa Coleman, Chairman Brad Duguay, Vice Chairman Ralph Ware
Absent:	Daisy Alford-Smith
Also Present:	Meredith Davis, Asst. Director of Planning, Zoning, & Building Division Christine Gruttadauria, Secretary

**AMENDMENTS TO AGENDA:**

None.

**OATH OF OFFICE:**

Ms. Coleman administered the oath to the applicants individually, before the presentation of each project.

Ms. Coleman explained to the applicants that with only three Board members present, a unanimous vote would be needed for a project to be approved.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

**MOTION: To adopt the minutes of January 28, 2021 meeting, as submitted**

Mr. Duguay moved; Ms. Coleman seconded and the motion carried, 3-0 on a roll call vote.

Yeas: Mr. Duguay, Ms. Coleman, Mr. Ware

Nays: None

**OLD BUSINESS:**

KEVIN NIETERT

800 DEEPWOODS DR.

METAL ROOF

Kevin Nietert, homeowner, attended the meeting to present the project and answer questions. Ms. Coleman swore in the applicant. The applicant was seeking approval to construct a 198 square foot pavilion with a metal roof to complete his pool area. He stated that there is an existing 10X16 foot concrete pad, that the proposed pavilion would sit on. He stated the pavilion will have 8 inch posts and would be finished with a Slate Gray metal roof. Ms. Coleman asked what color shingle was on the existing house roof as well as on the existing garage. Mr. Nietert explained that he was not sure of the color, but described the color as a reddish brown. He further stated that the reason for the Gray roof on the pavilion is to complement the finish materials in the pool area. Ms. Coleman asked if the pavilion would be in front of the existing pool, or behind it. Mr. Nietert explained the pavilion would be at the back of the pool area. Ms. Coleman asked if the slope of the roof would face the street. The answer was no. Mr. Nietert stated the open side of the pavilion would face the street, he further stated, that the roof would not be visible from the street. Mr. Duguay asked about an existing shed on the property. Mr. Nietert explained that the shed would be torn down in the near future. Ms. Coleman asked what color the posts of the pavilion would be stained. Mr. Nietert stated the posts would be stained Gray to complement the other finish materials of the pool area.

**MOTION: To approve the plans, as submitted.**

Ms. Duguay moved; Ms. Coleman seconded and the motion carried, 3-0, on a roll call vote.

Yeas: Mr. Duguay, Ms. Coleman, Mr. Ware

Nays: None

BRIAN PERGERT

600 NANCY DR.

REVISIONS

Brian Pergert, homeowner, attended the meeting to present the revisions and answer questions. Ms. Coleman swore in the applicant. Mr. Pergert asked to share his screen with the Board. He explained the changes and stated that the original plans called for a sloped roof on the addition. He stated that after further consideration, he and his wife felt the sloped roof would block the view. He submitted revised drawings showing a flat roof over the addition, with a decorative railing around the roof for detail. Mr. Pergert stated that all finish colors and materials would stay the same. Ms. Coleman asked what material would be used on the flat roof. Mr. Pergert explained he would use EPDM, rubber roof material and that the roof would be Black, and the decorative railing would be White vinyl. Mr. Ware asked if there would be access to the roof. Mr. Pergert explained there would be no access to the roof and that he planned to keep the windows as were originally presented. Mr. Duguay asked if there were any other houses in the Hawthorne Development that had a flat roof. Mr. Duguay stated he was concerned that architecturally, the flat roof would stand out from the rest of the

neighborhood. Mr. Duguay further stated that he was concerned that the flat roof would be highly visible when the road goes through. Mr. Pergert stated that he was told the road would never be extended. Mr. Duguay stated that the Developers master plan shows the road would be extended. He further stated that the flat roof was architecturally different from any other house in Hawthorne. Mr. Pergert did not agree. Ms. Coleman asked if Mr. Duguay was leaning towards voting no. Mr. Duguay explained that he was leaning towards voting no and stated that he did not think the flat roof fit the neighborhood. Ms. Coleman stated that she understood Mr. Duguays concerns, but had no issue with the flat roof. Ms. Coleman explained that the applicant could table his project until the March meeting, as he would need a unanimous vote for the project to be approved. Mr. Pergert stated that waiting until March would delay his project as the foundation work has already started. Mr. Ware stated that he lives in Hawthorne near the subject property. He stated that based on the location of the house, and the location of the flat roof on the house, approving the revisions would provide low risk for setting a precedent even if Nancy Drive were to be extended as the Master plan suggests. Ms. Coleman asked Mr. Duguay for his comments. Mr. Duguay stated that he did not think the flat roof fit with the neighborhood. He explained that in his opinion the design resembled a deck. He said it would be easy to change the windows to a door and provide easy access to the roof. Lastly, he stated that he just did not think the design fit in with the rest of the neighborhood.

Ms. Coleman explained that tabling the project until the March meeting was the best option for the applicant. Mr. Pergert asked what course of action he could take if the Board did not approve his revisions. Ms. Davis explained that the applicant could appeal to City Council. Mr. Pergert asked when the next Council meeting would be held. Mr. Duguay stated that he appreciates the arguments the applicant has made. He further stated that the renovations are a great thing for the house and realizes it is a big investment. Lastly he stated that his arguments were not personal, but he was trying to uphold the spirit of the Architectural Board of Review. Ms. Coleman confirmed that if the project were defeated, the applicant could not bring his project back in March. Ms. Davis confirmed and explained that the next Council meeting is March 8<sup>th</sup>, but the applicant had already missed the deadline and would have to go on a future agenda. She further explained that the first possible Council meeting the applicant could attend is March 22<sup>nd</sup>, and the Architectural Board next meets on March 25<sup>th</sup>.

**MOTION: To approve the revisions, as submitted.**

Ms. Coleman moved; Mr. Ware seconded and the motion was defeated, 2-1, on a roll call vote.

Yeas: Ms. Coleman, Mr. Ware

Nays: Mr. Duguay

CLASSIC HOMES

235 HAWKS NEST S/L 102

HOUSE

Ed Wurm of Classic Homes, attended the meeting to present the project and answer questions. Ms. Coleman swore in the applicant. Mr. Wurm was seeking approval to construct a 2,590 square foot ranch style home within the Homestead subdivision. The

home will feature a two-car side-load garage, a covered rear deck, and a fireplace in the great room. Finish colors and materials were reviewed and include Midnight Blue siding, Garrison Gray brick, and Prestige Weatherledge stone. The trim and soffit will be White. The front door will be Black, and the overhead garage doors will be White. Mr. Wurm was able to show the Board samples of the finish materials. Ms. Coleman asked if the fireplace would vent out the rear of the home. The answer was no. Mr. Wurm explained that the fireplace would vent through the roof. He stated that a stone clad chimney was added after the plans were submitted. Mr. Wurm noted that the rear covered deck, would have White columns and trim, with Black railings. Residential Guidelines were reviewed. No issues were noted. The home passed a similarity review. No issues were noted. Mr. Ware and Mr. Duguay did not have any additional questions.

**MOTION: To approve the plans, with the addition of a stone clad chimney.**

Mr. Duguay moved; Mr. Ware seconded and the motion carried, 3-0, on a roll call vote.

Yeas: Mr. Duguay, Mr. Ware, Ms. Coleman

Nays: None

**BECKER SIGNS**

**29 S. AURORA RD.**

**MONUMENT SIGN**

Brian Becker of Becker signs, attended the meeting to present the project and answer questions. Ms. Coleman swore in the applicant. The applicant did not have access to a camera, and joined the meeting using audio only. Mr. Becker explained the project and stated that the monument sign was previously presented to the Board. He stated the proposed sign was redesigned to resemble other signs in the area, specifically, the sign located directly across the street. He explained that he added fypon crosshead under the sign cabinet and around the top of the sign. He also made the skirt a solid color. Ms. Coleman stated the redesign was a nice improvement. She asked about the base of the sign. Mr. Becker explained that the base would be constructed using unilock or stone pavers. The base would be constructed as a planter bed, and have landscaping inside. He further explained the stone would match the existing building as close as possible. Ms. Coleman asked if the sign would be illuminated. The answer was yes, it would be illuminated from within. Ms. Coleman asked what color the base and cabinet would be. Mr. Becker explained that the cabinet and the base would be Gray, and the trim would be White. Mr. Duguay thanked the applicant for the thoughtful redesign.

**MOTION: To approve the plans, as submitted.**

Ms. Coleman moved; Mr. Duguay seconded and the motion carried, 3-0, on a roll call vote.

Yeas: Ms. Coleman, Mr. Duguay, Mr. Ware

Nays: None

**NEW BUSINESS:**

LAAD SIGNS 29 S. AURORA RD. WALL SIGN

Linda Nichols, of LAAD Signs joined the Zoom meeting to present the project and answer questions. The applicant did not have access to video and joined the call using audio only. Ms. Coleman swore in the applicant. Ms. Nichols was seeking approval to replace the existing sign at Gionino's Pizza. She explained that she is replacing what is there and adding the logo. The letters will be red. She noted that the landlord has given his approval. Ms. Coleman asked if the red letters would match the other wall signs that are existing. Ms. Nichols explained that in addition to replacing the letters, the LED bulbs would be replaced. She stated that for that reason the new sign would be brighter than the older existing signs and would not match exactly. Mr. Ware asked if the size of the letters would be consistent with the existing signs. The answer was yes. Mr. Duguay asked if the red vinyl is the standard color for all the Gionino's in the area. Ms. Nichols explained that she is contracted to do all of the signs for this client and she uses the same red vinyl consistently.

**MOTION: To approve the plans as submitted.**

Mr. Duguay moved; Mr. Ware seconded and the motion carried, 3-0, on a roll call vote.

Yeas: Mr. Duguay, Mr. Ware, Ms. Coleman

Nays: None

LAAD SIGNS 485 N. AURORA RD WALL SIGN

Linda Nichols, of LAAD Signs joined the Zoom meeting to present the project and answer questions. The applicant did not have access to video and joined the call using audio only. Ms. Nichols was seeking approval to replace the existing wall sign. She stated that the previous occupant retired and a new Dentist is moving in. Mr. Duguay asked if the Board was reviewing the monument sign, or just the wall signs. Ms. Davis explained that the monument sign did not need approval, and that technically the wall signs would be considered two separate signs as they are not connected. It was determined that the wall signs would be voted on together. The sign colors were reviewed. There were no concerns. Ms. Coleman asked if the wall signs would be illuminated. The answer was yes.

**MOTION: To approve the plans, for the wall sign and the logo wall sign, as submitted.**

Ms. Coleman moved; Mr. Duguay seconded and the motion carried, 3-0, on a roll call vote.

Yeas: Ms. Coleman, Mr. Duguay, Mr. Ware

Nays: None

LAAD SIGNS 485 N. AURORA RD. LOGO WALL SIGN

See the above minutes for details regarding the Logo Wall Sign project.

AURORA POLICE DEPT

100 S. AURORA RD

CARPORT

Eric Pros, of DS Architecture, attended the meeting to present the project and answer questions. Ms. Coleman swore in the applicant. Mr. Pros explained the project. He was seeking approval to construct a 2,457 square foot carport at the Police Station to protect the cruisers from the weather. He stated that the finish materials and colors would match the existing police station as close as possible. Specifically, the brick and shingles. Mr. Pros shared his screen with the Board. He showed the Board samples of the brick and the shingles. He further stated that when the carport is finished, it should look like the station and the carport were constructed at the same time. Ms. Coleman and Mr. Duguay asked where the carport would be located. Mr. Pros stated that the carport would be located directly behind the existing building. He further stated that the carport would be located in the area where the cruisers currently park. Mr. Ware asked if the Carport would take up the entire rear parking area. Mr. Pros stated that the carport would only cover twelve parking spaces. Ms. Coleman asked what color the columns of the carport would be painted. The answer was White.

**MOTION: To approve the plans, as submitted.**

Ms. Coleman moved; Mr. Ware seconded and the motion carried, 3-0, on a roll call vote.

Yeas: Ms. Coleman, Mr. Ware, Mr. Duguay

Nays: None

DREES HOMES

720 E. GARFIELD RD.

HOUSE

Alicia Verner and Amanda Bundy of Drees Homes, attended the meeting to present the project and answer questions. Ms. Coleman swore in the applicants. Ms. Verner was seeking approval to construct a 6,076 square foot home. The home will feature a fireplace in the Family Room as well as a 2-car side-load garage. In addition to the side load garage, the proposed home will have a carriage style garage. The overhead door of the carriage garage will face front. Ms. Coleman asked how many acres makes up the property. She also asked how far from the street the house would sit. Ms. Verner explained that the parcel was 15 acres and the house would be located about 440 feet from E. Garfield Road. Finish colors and material were discussed and include White siding, Moire Black shingles, and Cavalry Gray brick. The trim and soffit will be White, and the front door will be Tricorn Black. The overhead garage door will be White. Ms. Coleman asked if the applicant had a sample of the brick. Ms. Verner was able to show the Board the sample. Ms. Coleman asked about the decorative arches on the front elevation. Ms. Verner explained the arched would be White. Ms. Coleman also asked if the fireplace would vent out the back of the home. The answer was yes. The subject home passed a similarity review. No issues were noted. Mr. Ware noted that the house would be a good fit to the neighborhood. Mr. Duguay questioned the front facing carriage garage. Ms. Coleman asked if there was a reason that prevented the third garage bay from being located on the side. Ms. Verner stated that due to the curve in the driveway the carriage garage would not be prominent from the street and the front facing carriage garage fit the design of the house. Mr. Duguay asked if there were any similar styles in the City. Ms. Verner explained that Drees Homes has not built in the City in a few years and this home is a new model for them. Ms. Coleman stated that she

was aware of a similar design in The Highlands subdivision. Mr. Ware stated that there was also a home in the Hawthorne subdivision that resembles the proposed style. Mr. Duguay asked if there was anything in the code preventing the approval of a front facing garage. Ms. Davis explained that the approval of the garage location was per the Boards discretion. She also explained that there are wetlands on the subject property, and the buildable area may be defined by the location of the wetlands. She stated the property is quite large, but the buildable area may not reflect the size of the property. Ms. Coleman questioned the absence of 2-foot brick wraps on the plans. Ms. Verner stated that the wraps would be included, they were left off the plans as an oversight.

**MOTION: To approve the plans, with the addition of 2-foot brick or stone wraps on the right side elevation.**

Mr. Duguay moved; Ms. Coleman seconded and the motion carried, 3-0, on a roll call vote.

Yeas: Mr. Duguay, Ms. Coleman, Mr. Ware

Nays: None

RESIDENCE ARTISTS 507 RAVINE DR ADDITION

Matt Ross, attended the meeting to present the project and answer questions. Ms. Coleman swore in the applicant. Mr. Ross was seeking approval to construct a 300 square foot addition to an existing home in the Walden subdivision. The addition will be constructed at the Southwest corner of the existing home. Mr. Ross noted that the finish colors and materials will match the existing materials on the existing home. He further stated that he would use lattice around the bottom of the addition to match an existing deck. Mr. Ross noted that the project has received approval from the Walden HOA. Ms. Coleman asked for clarification regarding the use of the lattice. Mr. Ross explained that the addition is elevated and the lattice would be used to wrap the posts. He stated the lattice would not be stretched from post to post. Ms. Coleman questioned the fireplace chimney. Mr. Ross stated that the chimney would be painted to match the siding. Ms. Coleman asked Ms. Davis if the guidelines state that the chimney has to be clad in stone or brick. Ms. Davis explained that any chimney coming out of the home needs to be clad in stone or brick. She further stated that the stipulation was included in the local Building Code. Ms. Coleman asked if there were any existing chimneys on the house. The answer was no. The Residential Guidelines were reviewed and discussed in detail as they pertain to the chimney. The applicant agreed to wrap the chimney in brick to match the brick on the existing house. No other issues were noted.

**MOTION: To approve the plans, adding brick to the chimney.**

Ms. Coleman moved; Mr. Duguay seconded and the motion carried, 3-0, on a roll call vote.

Yeas: Ms. Coleman, Mr. Duguay, Mr. Ware

Nays: None

DUTCH LEGACY HOMES 1123 RILEY RD HOUSE

Merle Troyer, of Dutch Legacy Homes, attended the meeting to present the project and answer questions. Ms. Coleman swore in the applicant. Mr. Troyer was seeking approval to construct a 3,272 square foot, ranch style home. The home will feature a 2-

car side-load garage and a fireplace in the Great Room. Finish materials and colors were discussed and include Storm siding, Quail Grey Ledgestone, and Williamsburg Slate shingles. The trim and soffit will be White, and the front door will be Bordeaux. The overhead garage door will be White. Residential Guidelines were reviewed. Ms. Coleman asked about the lack of windows on both of the side elevations. Window placement was discussed and the applicant agreed to add two windows to each side elevation. The applicant noted that after the plans were submitted, the client opted to remove the shutters and replace them with 4 inch window wraps. Mr. Duguay asked to see samples of the finish materials. The applicant was able to share his screen to show the Board his samples. The subject home passed a similarity review. No issues were noted. Mr. Ware asked if the area mostly consisted of ranch style homes. Mr. Troyer stated that there was a mix of colonials and ranch homes. Ms. Coleman asked about the lack of brick or stone to grade on the side and rear elevations. Ms. Davis explained the guidelines, and stated that it was up to the discretion of the Board to require it. Ms. Coleman stated that for the sake of consistency, she would recommend stone or brick to grade on all elevations. The applicant agreed to implement the suggestion. Ms. Coleman asked if the stone on the chimney would be Quail Gray Ledgestone to match the other stone components. The answer was yes.

**MOTION: To approve the plans, with the addition of 2 windows on each side elevation, as well as the removal of shutters from the front elevation, and the addition of 4 inch wraps on all windows. Also, the addition of stone to grade on all sides of the home.**

Ms. Coleman moved; Mr. Duguay seconded and the motion carried, 3-0, on a roll call vote.

Yeas: Ms. Coleman, Mr. Duguay, Mr. Ware

Nays: None

YELLOW LITE

485 CLUB DRIVE

SOLAR PANELS

Paul Gable, of Yellow Lite joined the Zoom call to present the project and answer questions. Mr. Gable was sworn in by Ms. Coleman. The applicant did not have access to video, and joined the meeting using audio only. The applicant was seeking approval to install solar panels on an existing home in the Barrington subdivision. He stated that the majority of the panels would be installed on the Southwest side of the home. He stated that some panels would be installed on the Southeast side of the home. Lastly, he stated that he did not believe the solar panels would be visible from the street. Mr. Duguay asked what color the existing roof was. The answer was a mix of Black and Gray. Ms. Coleman stated that she visited the property and thought that the panels on roof 1 and roof 2 would be visible from the street. Mr. Ware stated that he thought the panels look like they would be low profile. Ms. Coleman explained the guidelines and stated that the solar panels are typically not allowed on the front of homes. Ms. Davis directed the Board to the last two pages of the information packet. She stated that she included the new codified ordinances regarding solar panels. Ms. Coleman stated that she thought the panels on roof 1 and roof 2 would be visible from the street. The Board thoroughly reviewed the submission to ensure they knew where the panel locations were being proposed. Mr. Duguay asked if there was any option to move the panels. Ms. Coleman asked if any of the panels could be relocated to the back of the garage.

The applicant explained that the garage would not be an option as it faces the Northwest. Ms. Coleman stated that she had an issue with the panels being visible from the street and was inclined to vote no. Mr. Duguay stated that the Board has been consistent when approving solar panels. He stated that if the panels are visible from the street, then typically, the Board votes no. Ms. Coleman explained the options to the applicant as there are only three members and the project would require a unanimous vote to pass. The applicant decided to postpone the submitted project until the next meeting.

**MOTION: To postpone the item until the next meeting.**

Ms. Coleman moved; Mr. Duguay seconded and the motion carried, 3-0, on a roll call vote.

Yeas: Ms. Coleman, Mr. Duguay, Mr. Ware

Nays: None

**PULTE HOMES**

**697 SCARLETT LANE S/L 64**

**HOUSE**

Gabe Kirksey, of Pulte Homes attended the meeting to present the project and answer questions. Ms. Coleman swore in the applicant. The applicant was seeking approval to construct a 5,658 square foot Castleton model home, within the Beljon Farms subdivision. The home will feature a 3-car side-load garage and a fireplace in the gathering room. Finish colors and materials were reviewed and include Marine Blue siding, Weathered Wood shingles, and Clay shutters. The trim and soffit will be Extra White and the front door will be Cyberspace. The overhead garage door will be Balanced Beige and the shake siding will be Marine Blue. Breakwater LedgeStone will be used for the stone component. Residential Guidelines were reviewed. Mr. Kirksey explained the lack of windows on the left elevation. He stated that there is a storage room and closets on that side of the home. Ms. Coleman asked if a window could be placed in the storage area. Mr. Duguay and Mr. Ware did not have an issue with the lack of windows on the left elevation. Ms. Coleman asked if windows had been added to this particular model in the past. Mr. Kirksey did not have that information readily available. Mr. Duguay pointed out that the subject home would be located at the end of a cul-de-sac and the side elevations would not be very visible. The subject home passed a similarity comparison. No issues were noted.

**MOTION: To approve the plans as submitted.**

Ms. Coleman moved; Mr. Duguay seconded and the motion carried, 3-0, on a roll call vote.

Yeas: Ms. Coleman, Mr. Duguay, Mr. Ware

Nays: None

**PULTE HOMES**

**615 BELJON LANE S/L 46.**

**HOUSE**

Gabe Kirksey, of Pulte Homes attended the meeting to present the project and answer questions. The applicant was seeking approval to construct a 6,390 square foot Deer Valley model home within the Beljon Farms subdivision. The home will feature a 3-car side-load garage and a fireplace in the Gathering Room. Finish materials and colors were discussed and include Ironstone siding, Black shutters, and a Moire Black roof. The trim and soffit will be Extra White, the front door will be Domino, and the overhead



Yeas: Mr. Duguay, Ms. Coleman, Mr. Ware  
Nays: None

**MISCELLANEOUS:**

None.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Mr. Duguay moved; Ms. Coleman seconded, and the meeting adjourned at 6:40 p.m. on a unanimous voice vote.

---

Melissa Coleman, Chairman

---

Christine Gruttadauria, Secretary