

Oakwood, Dayton, Ohio

August 10, 2006

The Zoning Board of Appeals met in session this date at 4:30 o'clock p.m., in the council chambers of the City of Oakwood, 30 Park Avenue, Dayton, Ohio-45419. The Chair, Mr. Jim Faulkner, presided and the Recording Secretary, Ms. Cathy Blum, recorded.

Upon call of the roll, the following members of the board responded to their names:

MR. JIM FAULKNER.....PRESENT  
MR. ROBERT CURRY.....PRESENT  
MR. KIP BOHACHEK.....PRESENT  
MRS. SHARON KILLWORTH....PRESENT  
MR. WILLIAM J. ROESS.....PRESENT

The following officers of the city were present:

Mr. Jay A. Weiskircher, Assistant City Manager

Mr. Dave Bunting, City Inspector

The following visitor was in attendance:

Linda Lantz, 519 Woodview, representing Mr. and Mrs. House

It was moved by Mr. Curry and seconded by Mr. Faulkner that the minutes of the meeting held July 13, 2006 be approved as submitted and the reading thereof be dispensed with at this hearing. Upon a viva voce vote on the question of the motion, the same passed unanimously and it was so ordered.

Application #06-4, the request by Dave and Barb House to vary the rear yard setback for an addition at 511 Woodview was reviewed. Mrs. Lantz explained she is the next door neighbor, project designer and representing Mr. and Mrs. House who are out of town. She noted, as is with most Oakwood homes, the kitchen is very small and since Mrs. House sells pampered chef, she wanted to improve the kitchen into a family/great room type function in the one-story addition. She indicated to the rear is a mudroom and paver patio, all of which will be removed, and the new structure will not cover any more surface than what exists. Mrs. Lantz indicated the owners met with the other neighbors and there were no objections.

Mr. Curry reviewed the north and south elevations. Mrs. Lantz explained the rear view is the noted east sketch. Mr. Faulkner noted the mudroom is much smaller than the addition and questioned the same coverage. Mrs. Lantz explained she meant the ground surface, including the patio. Mr. Curry questioned materials. Mrs. Lantz replied a stucco type material to match the front stucco appearance. Mr. Faulkner indicated if she plans to use the concrete type stucco material, it has obvious seams, so he would like more details. Discussion ensued in regard to the possible stucco type material. Mrs. Lantz explained she plans to mimic the front Tudor board style and use trim on the addition to match, however didn't draw those specific details on the plans. Mr. Curry asked about the solid wall to the south. Mrs. Lantz indicated due to the proximity of the neighbor and abutting fence, the owners didn't want a window; however, she will use trim to match. Mr. Curry noted the abutting property additions were of brick to match the house and blended in well.

Mr. Faulkner expressed concern with the roof line since nearby additions match the roof line and this one-level ranch addition doesn't. Mrs. Lantz indicated ten years ago, the previous owner had plans approved for an addition which included a shed roof, however, she didn't think that fit in well and is surprised with the concerns/objection over the appearance of what is being proposed. Mr. Faulkner noted they don't have details on the materials. Mr. Curry agreed, the materials and architectural style need to blend and he doesn't get that feel in this instance. Mrs. Lantz indicated she plans to use brick detail on the corner to match the house, she didn't feel a two-story addition would work on this house and felt the mudroom is not aesthetically pleasing. She noted she was in charge of having the front porch enclosed on this home and the materials, board and colors match.

Mr. Faulkner recommended, since he can't tell from the drawings, that this be tabled so more details can be submitted. Mrs. Lantz referenced a home project on Coolidge she was in charge of and utilization of a

synthetic stucco type material to match the house. She wondered if the board could add a restriction that there be no visible seams rather than losing a month by tabling the application. Mr. Bohachek indicated the Tudor style boards are usually 6" wide and asked if that will be used. Mrs. Lantz concurred. There being no other comments, Mr. Faulkner closed the public hearing.

Mr. Bohachek indicated the synthetic stucco is limited in size, corner seams are obvious however he has seen it used both well and poorly. Mr. Faulkner agreed, it's difficult to hide the nails and feels the addition needs to blend in well with the house, not look like an extension. He also expressed concern with the blank wall which will make this material stand out more. Mrs. Killworth noted the addition really isn't a Tudor style. Mr. Bohachek indicated the roof pitch is such so as to not interfere with the second story window, suggested a window be included in the blank wall area and would like to see another rendering with additional details. Mrs. Lantz indicated since she isn't the builder and hasn't yet bid out the project, but she is willing to have the board inform her what materials would be acceptable. She expressed concern with using brick on this large brick square box and would prefer to use another material, a mix to make it more attractive. Mr. Faulkner noted no brick has been shown on the drawings at all and reiterated his concern with the final materials. He indicated they don't have enough details to approve the request, there are too many questions. Mrs. Killworth questioned the 5 x 5 window noted on the drawing. Mrs. Lantz explained that will be a bump out, boxed window.

Mrs. Lantz indicated she has been before the board many times and never asked for so much detail so has learned a lesson. Mr. Curry indicated some times the plans are obvious that the addition will fit in architecturally and with materials, however, there are a lot of unknowns with this particular application. Mr. Faulkner referenced staff's suggestion that the variance be approved subject to several members of the board reviewing specific materials. However, he doesn't believe there is consensus amongst the members as to the use of stucco. Mr. Faulkner reiterated his concern with the stucco type material and a possible hodgepodge of wood.

Mrs. Lantz indicated she hasn't investigated the stucco materials so is open to changing the materials. She would like to help her client with the addition and rather than returning next month, asked if it could be approved with specific conditions. Mr. Faulkner reiterated concern with brick or stucco, architectural treatment, etc. Mr. Bohachek indicated he had no problem with an appropriate stucco product. Mr. Roess concurred as long as there is a seamless appearance. Mrs. Killworth expressed concern with the large blank wall. Mr. Faulkner understood time constraint concerns but felt too much was left open.

Therefore, it was moved by Mrs. Killworth and seconded by Mr. Curry that application #06-4, the request by Dave and Barb House to vary the rear yard setback for an addition at 511 Woodview Drive and known as lot #2520, be tabled pending submission of more detailed drawings and information. Upon a viva voce vote on the question of the motion, same passed unanimously and it was so ordered.

Mr. Weiskircher asked Mrs. Lantz if she has a "feel" for what the board needs. Mrs. Lantz reiterated she has been before the board many times, her work is attractive, she prefers a mixed blend of style and material and doesn't want to add brick to a big brick box. Mr. Faulkner indicated given the variance request and scale, the board needs additional information on what the addition will look like. Mr. Roess suggested she specify all the details since the board is struggling with the material and appearance. The Board of Zoning Appeals adjourned. The public meeting concluded at 5:17 p.m.

---

CHAIR

ATTEST:

---

RECORDING SECRETARY