



Architectural Review Board Staff Report

November 9, 2023

6:00 PM

Summary of Actions that can be taken on applications:

The following are the possibilities for a motion for Design Approval and issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness by the Architectural Review Board (all motions to be made in the positive):

1. To approve as submitted
2. To approve with conditions
3. To table the application
4. To continue the application to a date certain

The following are the possibilities for a recommendation to the Board of Zoning and Planning from ARB (1223.07 (c)). A Board member should make one of the following motions and there is no need for findings of fact.

1. To recommend to the BZAP for the approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness
2. To recommend to the BZAP for the approval Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions or modifications identified by the Board.
3. To recommend to the BZAP that a Certificate of Appropriateness not be issued. (Recommendations do not need to be in the positive)
4. To recommend to the BZAP a remand back to the ARB for final determination of Certificate of Appropriateness. (No approval or disapproval)

Other possibilities: Recommended that these should be avoided and that either scenario can be accommodated in one of the above 4 motions:

- To table the applicant only upon the applicants requests.
- No action taken (no recommendation) - application proceeds to BZAP

From the City of Bexley's codified ordinance 1223.04 (Changes To Existing Structures Not Involving Demolition: Ord. 29-16. Passed 11-15-16.)

(a)	The Board, in deciding whether to issue a certificate of appropriateness, shall determine that the proposed structure or modification would be compatible with existing structures within the portion of the District in which the subject property is located.
(b)	The Board may, as a condition of the certificate of appropriateness for the project, require a plan for the preservation (and replacement in the case of damage or destruction) of existing trees and other significant landscape features.
(c)	In conducting its review, the Board shall examine and consider, but not necessarily be limited to, the following elements:
	i. Architectural design, new or existing
	ii. Exterior materials, texture and color
	iii. Exterior details
	iv. Height and building mass
	v. Preservation of existing trees and significant landscape features.

Old Business:

- 1) Application Number: BZAP - 23-23
Address: 2200 E Main
Applicant: Ryan Pearson
Owner: Continental Real Estate Cos.

Request: The applicant is seeking review a recommendation to BZAP to allow demo and redevelopment of the vacant Trinity Lutheran apartment structures at 2160, 2188, & 2186 E Main Street (Parcel No.: 020-000836, 020-000217 & 020-000350), Also a Special Permit and Conditional Use for new 5-story building with housing alternatives and variance for a new 6-story mixed use building to provide additional housing, restaurant, retail and offices.

Process: This project is a very significant development and opportunity for the City of Bexley. It is the goal of the City to be open and transparent and encourage public comment and participation. That said, there is a process that the project is going through has been very deliberate in an effort to produce that best outcome for all. For the purposes of this specific process (the physical completion of the project), which includes site design, massing, variance, vehicular use, architecture.... the project will be before the Architecture Review Board and Tree and Public Garden Commission for recommendations to the Board of Zoning and Planning. The BZAP is the ultimate decision making body for the request(s) of the applicant. Issues such as tax abatements, TIFs, school impact are discussed and decided in other City bodies such as City Council, the CIC (Community Improvement Corporation) and the School Board.

Background:

This application is before the Architectural Review Board for the second time. It was heard at the September ARB meeting and tabled at the October meeting to allow the applicant more time for design refinement and, importantly, to allow time for a public workshop at which ARB members gave design feedback and suggestions. The first (City led) public presentation of this project was at the Board of Zoning and Planning on August 24th, 2023.

As background for this ARB hearing here is a summary which includes the timeline and discussion items :

08/24/2023 BZAP:

- This hearing was for preliminary review (no vote just review) and the first opportunity for comments and feedback from the BZAP and the public.
- BZAP discussion and purview includes site development, general massing, zoning code adherence, adherence to Main Street Design standards (different than the ARB Design Standards), a request for a Special Permit for 5 stories (they can have 3 stories by right), vehicular patterns and parking...
- What was not for discussion at BZAP was the architecture. Although inevitably the design and material choice, style, form, etc....did come up, design review is in the purview of the ARB.

09/14/2023 ARB:

- Design presented to ARB for the first time and opportunity for the neighbors to testify/comment on the design (second public hearing).
- Design critique revolved around mass of overall building, materials, and impact on the neighboring properties. It was suggested that the applicant look at a reigning in of the use of many materials and stick to just a few with a more traditional application.
- The applicant was encouraged to break down the massing in areas where the neighbors were affected - it was suggested that ARB would be open to a 6th floor in return for set backs on the edges.
- More public spaces, "pocket parks" and other types of outdoor amenities to encourage public use were encouraged.
- A major design discussion revolved around the front facade being carved out or broken down to prevent a "wall" along Main street. Doing so allows for outdoor uses as well.

10/17/2023 ARB Workshop:

- A public workshop was held at City Hall to allow the ARB members to have a design critique with the applicant. There was no public comment at this meeting.
- Many improvements based on the 9/14 ARB meeting were implemented and there was generally good feedback to the changes.
- The ARB indicated strong support for the 6th story at the front of the building to allow setbacks along the north, west and east sides.
- The use of materials have been streamlined and used in more traditional applications.
- The Board suggested that the applicant should consider further softening of the north facade and the east and west elevations that abuts neighboring properties.
- There was substantial focus on the southwest corner of the building and the public space outside and the applicant was encouraged to create an activated outdoor space for the public at that corner and was also asked to consider some additional restaurant or retail space.

11/09/2023 ARB (for discussion this evening):

- Changes that the Board requested have been made and/or addressed.
- The rooftops on the northwest and northeast corners are very nice and help soften the facades.
- The outdoor plaza at the southeast corner and its interactions with Main street and Bexley Square has been addressed in a way that will activate the space and create pedestrian scale.
- The West elevation has significantly less brick detail than all other facades - staff would recommend that the use of red brick be added to that facade.

Additional comments:

- A few elements of design will, by their nature, be discussed at all of 3 of the Boards and Commissions. These would include how the project interacts and activates public spaces and how it is interacts with all its neighboring properties. The BZAP

discussion included these issues from a site planning perspective. The ARB will discuss these issues with respect to the architecture and design of the building.

- This project will also be heard at the Tree and Public Garden Commission to look at public spaces in the context of the overall project.
- The applicant is seeking a variance to allow 6 stories.

Considerations:

This project will be a mixed use building that has residential and commercial/retail space. It is an exciting opportunity to provide additional housing, retail and development, and to activate the public space along Main street between Gateway and Bexley Square.

There are many aspects of this project are being evaluated and there are many decision points. As a reminder... For this meeting staff strongly encourages following these discussion guidelines to make the best use of our time this evening:

For discussion at ARB...

- the architecture/style/material choices in general
- how does the building address Main Street corridor with respect to it's architecture (code pushes the building to front through the Main street design standards)
- how does the building activate spaces around building
- how does the architecture and building design interface with adjacent properties
- discussion of materials and detailing of the building -

What we are not discussing in ARB:

- Parking and traffic patterns
- Tax abatements
- Use
- Site Design
- General massing

Staff Comments:

The applicant has been very receptive to changes that have been suggested and most of the suggestions show up in the latest revisions. The changes to date include a refinement of the south east entrance piece, a clearer definition of the public spaces, revision of the cornice line, a 6th story to allow softening of the mass in other areas without losing programming, better and more appropriate use of materials, and further development of the front facade and retail spaces.

Recommended Conditions (if Board moves to a vote to recommend to BZAP):

- The applicant return to ARB with refinement of any details or material samples that the Board wishes to see.
- The landscape plan shall be reviewed and approved by the Tree and Public Garden Commission.
- Final Design to be reviewed and approved by the city's Design Consultant

New Business:

- 2) Application Number: ARB - 23-36
Address: 217 N. Stanwood

Applicant: Anthony Pollina

Owner: Kate Qualmann and Patricio Andrade

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural Review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for a new front porch, a 3-season room, and slate roof modifications.

Background: This application is before the Board for the first time.

Considerations:

- Siting: The siting of this building is appropriate in relation to the existing homes on the street and the lot.
- Massing: The massing is appropriate and will fit into the existing streetscape.
- Compatibility: All material, elements, windows, etc... of the new structure should be compatible with the existing neighborhood.
- Adheres to Criteria of Architectural Appropriateness.

Staff Comments: Staff is comfortable with the Board conditioning the approval to work with staff on final design. The front entrance will be a good addition to the home. The pitch of the gable should match that of the other gables on the front. There are several design tweaks that would provide a nice cover to the entrance and still maintain the tudor proportions:



The rear addition/renovation seems fine in concept but needs study on the window proportions on the east and west elevations and a floor plan that clearly shows existing porch and what is to be added (including the trellis). The plans and elevations do not explain how the trellis will connect to the new porch addition.

Recommended Conditions (if Board moves to a vote):

- Final Design to be reviewed and approved by the city's Design Consultant

3) Application Number: ARB-37

Address: 2010 E Broad Street

Applicant: Brent Foley

Owner: Catholic Diocese of Columbus

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural Review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness and a recommendation to the BZAP for expansions to the old gym to add 2 stories and variance from the height limit, to allow the addition to exceed the 3-story or 45' height limit; in order to allow the addition to match the existing height.

Background: This application is before the Board for the first time, however, should be evaluated in the context of the overall master plan approval by the BZAP (see attached Zoning officer staff report).

Considerations:

- Siting: The siting of this building is appropriate in relation to the existing homes on the street and the lot.
- Massing: The massing is appropriate and will fit into the existing streetscape.
- Compatability: All material, elements, windows, etc... of the new structure should be compatible with the existing neighborhood.
- Adheres to Criteria of Architectural Appropriateness.

Staff Comments:

Staff comments from Zoning Officer (Kathy Rose):

The St. Charles Master Plan – was approved in Sept. 2021 – with the conditions (related to design and massing) as follows:

- Site modifications, design and materials will be in substantial conformance with the renderings and plans submitted at the Board of Zoning and Planning meeting unless otherwise modified in collaboration with the ARB and Staff Plans shared in 2021:



Current construction:



Construction aerial of St. Charles Black roof is the old gym

The applicant is seeking design review and a recommendation to the BZAP, as there is a variance from Bexley Code Section 1254.10 which limits the maximum height to 3 stories or 45 feet, to modify and build on the existing gym footprint, and allow the addition to match the height of the existing structure south of the old gym. (has an overall height of 49' – I believe)

The design of this new addition seems clear in its form, placement and program. The applicant will have an opportunity at the meeting to discuss and explain the materials and the differences between the rendering and the elevations - cornice arches, details, colors, etc...

Recommended Conditions (if Board moves to a vote):

- A recommendation to BZAP by the ARB can request a remand back to ARB for final design review.
- Final Design to be reviewed and approved by the city's Design Consultant

4) **CONSENT AGENDA ITEM**

Application Number: ARB- 23-38

Address: 358 N. Cassady

Applicant: Amy Lauerhass

Owner: Bruce and Michelle Carter

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural Review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for a front porch addition and modifications to the garage.

Background: This application is before the Board for the first time.

Considerations:

- Siting: The siting of this building is appropriate in relation to the existing homes on the street and the lot.
- Massing: The massing is appropriate and will fit into the existing streetscape.
- Compatability: All material, elements, windows, etc. . . of the new structure should be compatible with the existing neighborhood.
- Adheres to Criteria of Architectural Appropriateness.

Staff Comments: Staff recommends approving this application as a consent agenda item.

Recommended Conditions (if Board moves to a vote):

- Final Design to be reviewed and approved by the city's Design Consultant