



Village of South Russell  
5205 Chillicothe Road  
South Russell, Ohio 44022  
440-338-6700

**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD**  
**Record of Proceedings**  
**February 4, 2020 5:30 P.M.**

(Editor's Note: These minutes are not actual verbatim transcript of the meeting but merely intended to be detailed synopsis of the discussion that took place during the meeting. It is the belief of the author of this document that all pertinent information has been included to represent an overview of the discussions and decisions reached.)

**Members Present:** Gary Neola, Chairman; Ryan Parsons & Denis Marino  
**Members Absent:**  
**Other Officials:** Bridey Matheney, Solicitor; Mayor Bill Koons; Nancy Grattino, Board Secretary  
**Visitors:** N/A

Chairman Gary Neola called meeting to order at 5:39 P.M.

Board Secretary Nancy Grattino conducted roll call.

Mr. Gary Neola made Motion to APPROVE the Minutes of November 5, 2019 with CORRECTIONS. Mr. Neola stated there were two places where when they were discussing 48 Daisy Lane that the recourse the homeowner had was to appeal to the BZA and he had incorrectly stated that it was part of the Ohio Revised Code in two locations in the minutes when it was really a Village Ordinance. **Mr. Neola again made a Motion to APPROVE the Minutes with CORRECTIONS. Seconded by Mr. Ryan Parsons. With Unanimous Vote, Motion Carried.**

**OLD BUSINESS:**

Mr. Neola stated the next item is that the BZA requested clarification on what was specifically denied on November 5, 2019 by the ABR for exterior modifications at 48 Daisy Lane. Mr. Neola stated they have a response to them and read the following (also in file):

**“Board of Zoning Appeals Remand to the Architectural Board of Review:**

**BZA Case # 20-BZA-01- 48 Daisy Lane Appeal**

In response to the BZA' request, the Architectural Review Board is submitting the following information to the BZA:

Below is a chronology of the ABR's review of 48 Daisy Lane's plans submitted to ABR and the findings of fact (highlighted) below that Gary has drafted. Please let me know if you have anything you would like to add (either to the chronology or the findings of fact).

- The ABR reviewed the 48 Daisy Lane initial submission at the 1-7-19 ABR meeting. The drawings presented plans indicate an addition to the existing structure at 48 Daisy Lane. The ABR requested that the drawings be revised to add dormers on the addition portion to enhance the elevations as the addition only extended the existing roof line 38 feet.
- At the 2-5-19 ABR meeting, the homeowner presented rendered views of 48 Daisy Lane which indicated adding four reverse shed dormers and standing seam metal roofing being used on both the roof and the exterior walls. The ABR did not approve using standing seam metal roofing on the walls and recommended a Hardie board and batten siding instead.
- Drawings were revised (dated 2-11-19) with the ABR's recommended change to use the Hardie board and batten siding. These drawings were submitted for ABR review at the 2-19-19 meeting and were approved.
- The ABR was presented an alternate set of sketches at the 4-16-19 ABR meeting which were marked up by the 48 Daisy Lane homeowner to indicate his intent to use a faux stone (per the homeowner, it is recycled plastic from China) on the west gable end of the home with small areas returned around the corner on adjacent facades, and T-111 (4'x8' cedar-faced plywood sheets with grooves at 8" on center in the 8' direction) on all other facades designated on the previously approved drawings (2-19-19) with Hardie board and batten siding. The homeowner stated that he was planning to burn the surface and apply an oil (linseed or tung) to seal it. A sample piece of T-111 was presented at this meeting. As the homeowner insisted he could not afford to pay an architect again to revise his drawings, the ABR, wanting to work with the homeowner, required the homeowner to prepare mockups and submit photos of how the window trim and corner boards would be detailed. Also, since T-111 is made in 4'x8' sheets, a mocked-up detail of a horizontal joint with a trim board to cover the plywood butt joint was requested. The homeowner was told that the faux stone would not be approved. A motion was voted in favor of 'revise and resubmit'. The homeowner left upset and stated he would see us in court.
- The homeowner came to the 11-5-19 ABR meeting with photos (taken by the former Board Secretary) for review. The photos indicated the home was completed with the T-111 siding and faux stone. A vote was taken to approve the completed project. It was unanimously voted 'nay' for the following reasons:
  - The homeowner ignored the ABR's 4-16-19 to revise and resubmit with mocked up details and without the faux stone.
  - The ABR had concerns about the use of the faux stone as it is not known how durable it would be exposed to the environmental conditions since there has not been any product or testing data (such as an ASTM test) and that it could diminish adjacent property values due to what its aesthetic appearance would be (Section 264.11(a)(1) of the Codified Ordinances).
  - The homeowner's submission on 4-16-19 did not comply with the 264.11(c) drawing requirements."

Mr. Neola stated this is what they want to present back to the Board of Zoning Appeals. Mr. Neola asked Ms. Matheney if they need to vote on this. Ms. Matheney stated that they can vote on the fact that these are their findings. But they are not changing, obviously the decision which was done in November. Just that you are all in agreement. Mr. Neola stated okay.

**Mr. Gary Neola made a Motion to APPROVE these as the facts that they found to back up their decision to NOT approve. Seconded by Mr. Parsons. With Unanimous Vote, Motion Carried.**

**Mr. Gary Neola ADJOURNED the meeting at 5:46 P.M.**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Gary Neola, Chairman

2-18-2020  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Nancy Grattino, Board Secretary

2-18-2020  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Prepared by: Nancy Grattino

**Board of Zoning Appeals Remand to the Architectural Board of Review:  
BZA Case # 20-BZA-01- 48 Daisy Lane Appeal**

In response to the BZA' request, the Architectural Review Board is submitting the following information to the BZA:

Below is a chronology of the ABR's review of 48 Daisy Lane's plans submitted to ABR and the findings of fact (highlighted) below that Gary has drafted. Please let me know if you have anything you would like to add (either to the chronology or the findings of fact).

- The ABR reviewed the 48 Daisy Lane initial submission at the 1-7-19 ABR meeting. The drawings presented plans indicate an addition to the existing structure at 48 Daisy Lane. The ABR requested that the drawings be revised to add dormers on the addition portion to enhance the elevations as the addition only extended the existing roof line 38 feet.
- At the 2-5-19 ABR meeting, the homeowner presented rendered views of 48 Daisy Lane which indicated adding four reverse shed dormers and standing seam metal roofing being used on both the roof and the exterior walls. The ABR did not approve using standing seam metal roofing on the walls and recommended a Hardie board and batten siding instead.
- Drawings were revised (dated 2-11-19) with the ABR's recommended change to use the Hardie board and batten siding. These drawings were submitted for ABR review at the 2-19-19 meeting and were approved.
- The ABR was presented an alternate set of sketches at the 4-16-19 ABR meeting which were marked up by the 48 Daisy Lane homeowner to indicate his intent to use a faux stone (per the homeowner, it is recycled plastic from China) on the west gable end of the home with small areas returned around the corner on adjacent facades, and T-111 (4'x8' cedar-faced plywood sheets with grooves at 8" on center in the 8' direction) on all other facades designated on the previously approved drawings (2-19-19) with Hardie board and batten siding. The homeowner stated that he was planning to burn the surface and apply an oil (linseed or tung) to seal it. A sample piece of T-111 was presented at this meeting. As the homeowner insisted he could not afford to pay an architect again to revise his drawings, the ABR, wanting to work with the homeowner, required the homeowner to prepare mockups and submit photos of how the window trim and corner boards would be detailed. Also, since T-111 is made in 4'x8' sheets, a mocked-up detail of a horizontal joint with a trim board to cover the plywood butt joint was requested. The homeowner was told that the faux stone would not be approved. A motion was voted in favor of 'revise and resubmit'. The homeowner left upset and stated he would see us in court.
- The homeowner came to the 11-5-19 ABR meeting with photos (taken by the former Board Secretary) for review. The photos indicated the home was completed with the T-111 siding and faux stone. A vote was taken to approve the completed project. It was unanimously voted 'nay' for the following reasons:
  - The homeowner ignored the ABR's 4-16-19 to revise and resubmit with mocked up details and without the faux stone.
  - The ABR had concerns about the use of the faux stone as it is not known how durable it would be exposed to the environmental conditions since there has not been any product or testing data (such as an ASTM test) and that it could diminish adjacent property values due to what its aesthetic appearance would be (Section 264.11(a)(1) of the Codified Ordinances).
  - The homeowner's submission on 4-16-19 did not comply with the 264.11(c) drawing requirements.