



Architectural Review Board Staff Report

May 09, 2024

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.

Consent Agenda Items:

Application Number: ARB-24-2
Address: 148 S. Ardmore
Applicant: Seth Hanft
Owner: Seth Hanft

Application Number: ARB-24- 8
Address: 505 N Drexel
Applicant: Brenda Parker
Owner: John & Abby Mally

Application Number: ARB-24-13
Address: 176 S Stanwood
Applicant: Amy Lauerhass
Owner: Ed & Sheila Straub

Application Number: ARB-24-16
Address: 2557 East Broad
Applicant: Stephanie Hayward
Owner: Kelly Gebert

Application Number: BZAP-24-12
Address: 319 S Columbia
Applicant: Amy Lauerhass
Owner: Debbie & Mike Nickoli

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 design review and a recommendation to the Board of Zoning and Planning for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the redevelopment of the vacant Trinity Lutheran apartment structures at 2160, 2188, & 2186 E Main Street (Parcel No.: 020-000836, 020-000217 & 020-000350). This application was approved with conditions at the December 18, 2024 Board of Zoning and Planning Special Meeting. A condition of approval was the return of the applicant to the ARB to review changes that address the ARB conditions for the building design.

Background: This applicant was before the ARB in January at a special meeting to review the conditions of approval listed below. While some conditions were met not all were completed. The applicant will be before the Board at this meeting to present material boards and samples and developed elevations.

The following is the list of ARB conditions that required approval in order to return to BZAP for final approval:

2. **The applicant modifies the architecture to be in accordance with the Architectural Review Board recommendations #1 - #8 in the ARB Decision and Record of Action 11/29/23. Those conditions are:**
 - ARB-1. **The applicant returns to the ARB with material boards and samples.**
 - ARB-2. **Headlight screening be added to the parking lots where needed.**
 - ARB-3. **The west drive on the site be redesigned to enhance the green space and allow substantial tree planting.**
 - ARB-4. **The north and west elevations of the proposed building be reworked to lessen the massing, create better connection to the ground, screen the garage, and use more consistent materials.**
 - ARB-5. **The height on the west and north elevations toward the rear of the site be reduced.**
 - ARB-6. **The west elevation have more variation in the plane of the facade and the height.**
 - ARB-7. **The ARB supports the addition of the sixth story architecturally to allow flexibility in lessening the overall massing of the building.**
 - ARB-8. **Outdoor dining adjustments be reviewed by the ARB when a tenant is secured.**

Staff Comments: The applicant has will be presenting materials which would fulfill ARB-1 of the conditions. ARB-2 and ARB 4-7 have been addressed with consensus that they have been satisfied at the ARB Special Meeting for this project held on January 31st, 2024. ARB-3 includes as a critical component the opinion of TPGC and ARB- 8 is a condition that cannot be met until a tenant is secured. IF ARB-1 is satisfied and the Board confirms that ARB 2-8 are either satisfied or have enough information to move forward with conditions that the applicant brings updates to the ARB as the project progresses (ie a tenant is secured) then staff is comfortable moving this application back to BZAP for final approval. (Minutes from Januarys special meeting have been attached to the application on the City's website)

- 2) ***Consent Agenda Item***
Application Number: ARB-24-2
Address: 148 S. Ardmore
Applicant: Seth Hanft
Owner: Seth Hanft

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural Review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for 2nd story addition at the rear of the principal structure.

Background: This applicant was before the Board for a conceptual review in March. The Board recommended design changes and these are reflected in the new design.

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.
- Compatibility: All material, elements, windows, etc... of the new structure are compatible with the existing structure.
- Adheres to Criteria of Architectural Appropriateness.

Staff Comments: The applicant has hired a designer and made changes as conditioned by the Board. Staff is comfortable with approval as a consent agenda item.

3) ***Consent Agenda Item***

Application Number: ARB-24- 8

Address: 505 N Drexel

Applicant: Brenda Parker

Owner: John & Abby Mally

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural Review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of a new second floor dormer at the front & rear of the house to add a third bedroom, bath, & laundry and a new front porch, an office addition to the south, and a mudroom addition at the north.

Background: This application was before the Board at the April meeting. The Board recommended design changes and these are reflected in the new design.

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.
- Compatibility: All material, elements, windows, etc... of the new structure are compatible with the existing structure.
- Adheres to Criteria of Architectural Appropriateness.

Staff Comments: The applicant has made changes as conditioned by the Board. Staff is comfortable with approval as a consent agenda item.

4) Application Number: BZAP-24- 9

Address: 129 S Cassingham

Applicant: Brenda Parker

Owner: John & Stacey Barnard

Request: The applicant is seeking a recommendation to BZAP for a Certificate of Appropriateness to allow second & third floor additions as well as single-story addition at the south.

Background: This application was before the Board at the April meeting. The Board recommended design changes and some of these are reflected in the new design.

Considerations:

- Siting: The siting of this building is appropriate in relation to the existing homes on the street and the lot.
- Massing: The addition still seems tall for the style.
- Compatability: All material, elements, windows, etc... of the new structure are compatible with the existing structure - the windows on the 2nd story addition may be more appropriate as dormers with a lower roof.
- Adheres to Criteria of Architectural Appropriateness but needs design refinement.

Staff Comments: The applicant has made changes as conditioned by the Board. However, the proportions of the roof still feel out of character with the style of the original home. Staff has spoken with the applicant and suggested that lowering the hip and using dormers would be more in character with the Arts and crafts language of the existing structure.

- 5) Application Number: ARB-24- 9
Address: 236 N Columbia
Applicant: John Behal
Owner: Yoaz Saar

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural Review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish an existing home and replace with a new home.

Background: This application was before the Board at the April meeting. The applicant asked to be tabled to the May meeting.

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.
- Compatability: All material, elements, windows, etc... of the new structure are compatible with the existing structure.
- Adheres to Criteria of Architectural Appropriateness.

Staff Comments: Additional information has been added to the application. These include an opinion letter from an architect hired by the City and a Structural engineering report submitted by the applicant. Below is the demolition ordinance for the Boards reference. As a reminder of the process for demolition or removal of existing structures, it is the Boards responsibility to determine (1) is the structure historically or architecturally significant AND (2) is it worthy of preservation. The proposed new design should then be discussed if the structure is determined not worthy of preservation and the decision to allow the demolition is dependent on the evaluation of the new design.

New items for Consideration of proposed demolition

1. Letter from Joe Kuspan
2. Evaluation from Structural Engineer

3. All Board members and professional experts have been given the opportunity to tour the property and structure.

Considerations of proposed new building:

- 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.
- Compatibility: All material, elements, windows, etc... of the new structure should be compatible with the existing structure..
- Adheres to Criteria of Architectural Appropriateness.

Demolition Ordinance:

1223.05 DEMOLITION OR REMOVAL OF EXISTING STRUCTURES.

Recognizing the need to balance the benefits of preserving the City's existing quality and character against the benefits of responsible renewal and redevelopment of the City's aging housing stock, the Architectural Review Board is charged with reviewing all applications for Certificates of Appropriateness where any demolition, complete or partial, is requested within the R-1, R-2, R-3, R-6, R-12, or residential-only structures in PUD districts.

(a) No primary building or structure or significant accessory structure such as a carriage house shall be demolished, partially demolished or removed until an application with respect to such demolition or removal has been submitted to and reviewed by the Board, and the Board has issued a Certificate of Appropriateness, except when demolition is determined by the Building Department to be required to abate a nuisance or eliminate an unsafe building as defined in Section [1476.01](#) of the Building and Housing Code.

(b) Application for Demolition. The application shall include the following:

(1) A statement as to whether such structure is, or is not, historically or architecturally significant and worthy of preservation, together with relevant supporting information;

i. In the case of a structure which is historically or architecturally significant and worthy of preservation, the reasons for the proposed demolition, including proof of substantial economic hardship or unusual and compelling circumstances.

(2) A site plan showing existing structures, driveways, and all existing trees and shrubs.

(3) A definite plan for reuse of the site, including proposed replacement structures, landscaping, a time schedule for the replacement project, and an assessment of the effect of the demolition and proposed replacement project on the subject property and the neighborhood.

(c) Process for Review. The Board, in deciding whether to issue a certificate of appropriateness approving the demolition or removal of an existing building or structure, shall determine the following:

(1) That the structure to be demolished or removed is not historically or architecturally significant and worthy of preservation or;

(2) If it is historically or architecturally significant and worthy of preservation, that denial of a certificate of appropriateness would cause:

- i. A substantial economic hardship, or;
- ii. That demolition is justified by the existence of unusual and compelling circumstances.

(3) The Board may request and consider, among other evidence, a report concerning the proposed demolition and existing structure from a registered architect, historical conservator or other person with appropriate preservation experience.

(4) The Board shall also apply the criteria in this section in determining whether it shall recommend, pursuant to Chapter [1256](#) of the Zoning Code, approval of a development plan or an amendment to a development plan for a Planned Unit District, which contemplates the demolition or removal of existing.

(d) Criteria to Determine Preservation Significance. The following criteria shall be used by the Board in determining whether a structure is historically or culturally significant and worthy of preservation:

- (1) The age and condition of the structure.
- (2) The quality of the structure's architectural design, detail, use of materials or construction.
- (3) The importance of the structure to the character and quality of the neighborhood.
- (4) The significance of the design or style of the structure to the historical, architectural or cultural development of the City, central Ohio, the State or nation; or
- (5) The impact on the City's real property tax base of restoration versus replacement and/or removal.

(e) Criteria to Determine Substantial Economic Hardship. The following criteria shall be used by the Board in determining whether denial of a certificate of appropriateness would cause a substantial economic hardship:

- (1) Denial of a certificate will result in a substantial reduction in the economic value of the property.
- (2) Denial of a certificate will result in a substantial economic burden because the structure cannot be maintained in its current form at a reasonable cost.
- (3) Denial of a certificate will result in a substantial economic burden because the cost of preserving or restoring the structure will impose an unreasonable financial burden.

(f) Criteria to Determine Unusual and Compelling Circumstances: The following criteria shall be used by the Board in determining whether the certificate is justified by the existence of unusual or compelling circumstances:

- (1) The preservation or restoration of the structure is not structurally feasible.
- (2) The proposed replacement plan is superior to retention of the existing structure.
- (3) The proposed replacement plan is more compatible than the existing structure with existing structures and uses within the portion of the District in which the subject property is located.

(4) Demolition is required to eliminate a condition which has a materially adverse effect on adjoining properties or the neighborhood, and demolition is consistent with the purposes of this chapter.
(Ord. 29-16. Passed 11-15-16; Ord. 08-20. Passed 7-14-20.)

6) **New Business:**

- 6) Application Number: ARB-24-12
Address: 2172 E Livingston
Applicant: Eric Jenison
Owner: Robert Dean Huffman
Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural Review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for an addition to the front, modifications and a variance form the required front setback.
Staff report to be given by Planning Consultant, Jason Sudy
- 7) **Consent Agenda Item**
Application Number: ARB-24-13
Address: 176 S Stanwood
Applicant: Amy Lauerhass
Owner: Ed & Sheila Straub
Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural Review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for a one story addition to the rear of the principal structure and a garage addition.
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.
 - Compatability: All material, elements, windows, etc... of the new structure are compatible with the existing structure.
 - Adheres to Criteria of Architectural Appropriateness.
- Staff Comments:** The applicant has made changes as conditioned by the Board. Staff is comfortable with approval as a consent agenda item. The applicant has agreed to make changes as recommended.
- 8) Application Number: ARB-24-14
Address: 2357 Bexley Park
Applicant: Guy Allison
Owner: Meara Alexa Simon
Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural Review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish deteriorated garage structure and existing wood deck and replace with attached garage addition and covered patio.
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 of the new addition seems awkward - especially the east elevation.
- Compatability: All material, elements, windows, etc... of the new structure are compatible with the existing structure.
- Adheres to Criteria of Architectural Appropriateness.

Staff Comments: The concept of this garage demolition and addition to the primary structure seems fine. However, the details and massing need to be refined and connections to the original structure should be more elegant and seamless. In particular the east elevation seems long and disproportional to the style of the original home. Staff suggests the applicant table the application for design refinement and development.

- 9) Application Number: ARB-24-15
 Address: 1004 Vernon
 Applicant: Cory Smith
 Owner: Cory Smith

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural Review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for a two story addition to the rear of the principal structure.

Background: This applications 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 but need some refinement on the roof slope and windows including those in the dormer.
- Compatability: All material, elements, windows, etc... of the new structure are compatible with the existing structure.
- Adheres to Criteria of Architectural Appropriateness.

Staff Comments: The concept of this addition seems fine. However, the roof of the addition seems low and looking at a greater pitch may create better proportions. Also a study of the windows looking at shape, placements and divides should be done. Staff recommends the applicant table this application to the June ARB meeting.

- 10) *Consent Agenda Item*
 Application Number: ARB-24-16
 Address: 2557 East Broad
 Applicant: Stephanie Hayward
 Owner: Kelly Gebert

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural Review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for a sunroom addition to the rear of the principal structure.

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.
- Compatability: All material, elements, windows, etc... of the new structure are compatible with the existing structure.
- Adheres to Criteria of Architectural Appropriateness.

Staff Comments: The applicant has made changes as conditioned by the Board. Staff is comfortable with approval as a consent agenda item and to work with the applicant on Board recommendations.

11) **Consent Agenda Item**

Application Number: BZAP-24-12

Address: 319 S Columbia

Applicant: Amy Lauerhass

Owner: Debbie & Mike Nickoli

Request: The applicant is seeking a recommendation to the Board of Zoning and Planning for a Certificate of Appropriateness for an addition to the home and a variance for the replacement garage to include a 2nd floor.

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.
- Compatability: All material, elements, windows, etc... of the new structure are compatible with the existing structure.
- Adheres to Criteria of Architectural Appropriateness.

Staff Comments: The applicant has made changes as conditioned by the Board. Staff is comfortable with approval as a consent agenda item.

7) **Other Business**

Discussion: Murals on Main Street, Megan Meyer, Development Director

8) **Adjourn**