



Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes

Thursday, September 9, 2021

6:00 PM

1) **Call to Order**

2) **Roll Call of Members**

Present: Strasser, Helman, Scott, Toney

3) **Public Comments**

There was no public comment.

4) **Approval of Minutes**

A) Approval of August 12, 2021 Meeting Minutes

5) **Staff Report**

A) Staff Report

Consent Agenda items included the following applications: ARB 21-59, ARB 21-61, and BZAP 21-37.

Motion to approve the Consent Agenda made by Helman; seconded by Strasser.

Vote: Scott, Helman, Strasser, Toney

6) **Old Business**

A) Application Number: ARB 21-58

Address: 221 Ashbourne

Applicant: Karrick Sherrill

Owner: Alex Marsh

Request: The applicant is requesting Architectural review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of existing, fire damaged home and the construction of new single family home.

Bokor summarized her staff report and this application's history in front of the ARB. She stated the architect has redesigned the proposal and Bokor believes this is a much better exterior design than what was submitted previously, but is not sufficiently detailed. She noted that additional demolition documents are posted online.

Shannon was sworn in and explained he was present at the last ARB meeting, but did not participate on behalf of this applicant. He indicated a desire to refine, incorporate comments from the Board, and call attention to the staff report. Shannon referenced the structural engineering report and the criteria for the historic nature of architecture in Bexley. He explained that the applicant's structural engineer believes the home's condition is in such a state that it is economically more viable to demolish it and create a replacement structure. Furthermore, he stated he believes Mr. Berardi's report addresses the criteria for removing an existing building and architectural significance; Shannon would like this report, and Mr. Lewis' report, to be incorporated into the record. He stated he believes the current task is to meet the criteria for demolition and the perceived value of the replacement project.

Sherrill was sworn in. He explained the design has changed to be more compatible with the neighborhood; he indicated they are still in a conceptual stage. They have tied the interior floor plan with the exterior and shared they do not expect the interior to result in any substantial changes to the exterior.

Scott explained he expects the vague details to be resolved, expressed appreciation for the engineer's report, discussed a cost-estimate with the applicant and representation, and shared his opinion of the proximity of this home to the street, coherence of design throughout the home, and columns.

Helman shared that demolition criteria must be met, as well as design criteria for the new build. He indicated he would like to learn more about the extent of the fire damage and height of the proposed new home. Sherrill explained the proposed new home is 32' 8" from grade to ridge.

Strasser indicated she is comfortable with the demolition report and feels this would be a substantial economic hardship to repair the home, assuming the replacement design can be worked through. She is convinced that a demolition and rebuild is an appropriate course of action.

Helman would like to know what fire damage means as it relates to the framing.

Sherrill explained the nuance in the building code that a cavity must be brought up to code.

Strasser shared that while it might be helpful to have more details about the fire damage and cost, she questioned whether or not this is necessary.

Rose explained that she shared engineer's letter and estimates with the City's Chief Building Official; he explained that based on the year the home was built and the exterior structural walls, additional expenses may be incurred, which would not occur when building a new home.

Helman explained the Board does not prefer demolition, but realizes there is a place for it; documented support for this demolition can be of assistance to the Board.

Strasser explained one report swayed her to believe this building is not historically or architecturally significant.

Helman understands the home is not historically significant, but is unsure it is architecturally insignificant.

Toney shared her criteria for a demolition and stated her opinion that the quality of the proposal is not up to par with quality of the home the applicant is wanting to tear down. She also discussed the porch, the amount of design work she still believes needs to be done, the home's style, and architectural materials.

There was discussion between Board members and the applicant about a holistic design.

Shannon stated Mr. Marsh has become aware of neighbors in opposition to this project.

The following residents made statements:

Jamie Rupp, 180 Ashbourne Rd. -- stated he moved in to a house similar to the home under consideration; he gutted and remolded his home and is offended by the thought of tearing down this home. He shared that according to the Lewis report, the homes in this area would not be structurally sound.

Melissa Lacroix, 254 Ashbourne Pl. -- stated she has renovated her home and asked for the integrity of the neighborhood to be maintained. She discussed proximity to the street, remodeling instead of demolishing, the height of the new build in relation to the current home, the home's footprint, and the neighbors' opinions.

Bryan McDermott, 275 Ashbourne Pl. -- shared he and his wife remodeled their home and that reports without bids or contracts may not be accurate.

Rupp, 180 Ashbourne Rd. -- asked if the home was on the market; it is being presented as a distressed sale.

Jeffrey Walker, 2725 Brentwood Rd. -- asked that the process be respectful and based on facts. He shared the applicant is committed to Bexley and that this is not a flip for profit.

James Jeffers, 207 Ashbourne Rd. -- discussed his concern regarding the height and footprint encroaching towards his home.

Shannon asked for the application to be tabled.

Motion to table made by Helman; seconded by Scott.

VOTE: Scott, Helman, Strasser, Toney

B) Application Number: ARB 21-59
Address: 99 S Roosevelt
Applicant: Benjamin Babeaux
Owner: PropertyPaths.com, LLC

Request: The applicant is requesting Architectural review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for a new front porch and conversion of the attached garage to living space.

A motion to approve this application as part of the consent agenda made by Helman; seconded

by Strasser.

Vote: Scott, Helman, Strasser, Toney

7) New Business

A) Application Number: BZAP-21-61
Address: 269 N Cassingham
Applicant: Brian Zingleman
Owner: Julie & Matt Stanley

Request: The applicant is requesting review and approval of a 2 story addition to rear of existing 2 story house, a first floor mud room and family room, a second floor mastersuite a new covered back porch, and new patio from the addition to existing garage.

A motion to approve this application as part of the consent agenda made by Helman;
seconded by Strasser.

Vote: Scott, Helman, Strasser, Toney

B) Application Number: ARB 21-62
Address: 2795 Bellwood
Applicant: Bryan Law
Owner: Bill Adams

Request: The applicant is requesting a certificate of Appropriateness for the installation of solar panels on the front face of the existing structure.

Bokor said that although the requested solar panels will be visible from the front of the house, it is not a front-facing roof.

All board members indicated they are comfortable with staff review and approval for this application and there was discussion about this case.

Antwan Smith -- asked Mr. Helman to further explain his color preferences and clarified that the panels are black in their entirety.

The Findings of Fact and Decision of the Board for Application No. ARB-21-62 for property located at 2795 Bellwood: The Architecture Review Board finds it appropriate to approve a Certificate of Appropriateness as submitted for solar panels which are architecturally compatible with the existing structure as proposed: black panels with black trim.

Motion by Strasser to approve the Findings of Fact and Decision; second by Helman.

Vote: Strasser, Helman, Scott, Toney

C) Application Number: ARB 21-63
Address: 261 S Columbia
Applicant: Nathan Sampson
Owner: 261 S Columbia LLC

Request: The applicant is requesting Architectural review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of existing home and the construction of new single family home.

Bokor said this application is before the Board for the first time to request an approval to demolish the current home and rebuild a new single-family home. She indicated that she has included information in the Staff Report.

Nathan Sampson and Joe Miller were sworn in and shared a presentation pertaining to why this structure meets the criteria for demolition, including: the structure's age and condition, quality of the architectural design, detail, use of materials, construction, scale, quality, character and quality of the neighborhood, significance of structure, impact on the City's property tax base of

restoration versus replacement/removal. Additionally, there was discussion between Strasser, Helman, and the applicant regarding prevalence of the architectural style in the city.

Wilcox was sworn in, shared her background, and explained her position regarding the house.

Miller read a statement from someone not in attendance.

Sampson shared a site survey and the proposed design.

Helman said he may challenge the presumption that demolition is the rule, not the exception, and read from Bexley Code 1223.01: "Residential property values have been maintained, in significant part, due to the City's unique physical attributes such as high quality homes built primarily in the early and mid 20th century and reflecting the diverse architectural styles and sizes of that period, distinctive established neighborhoods, and plentiful mature trees and landscaping on both public and private property. The demolition of existing residential structures, which frequently also results in the destruction or removal of mature trees and significant landscape features, may constitute an irreplaceable loss to the quality and character of a neighborhood and the City.

(b) 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 commercial and housing stock, the Architectural Review Board (ARB) is hereby established to maintain the quality of residential neighborhoods and commercial corridors in the City; to promote, preserve and enhance the existing character of various residential neighborhoods in the City by encouraging the retention of buildings which have historic, architectural or cultural value or which are otherwise worthy of preservation, maintaining lot size and building scale appropriate to each neighborhood, and minimizing or avoiding the adverse potential impacts of vacant lots within fully developed neighborhoods; to promote and improve the quality of neighborhoods and commercial corridors by permitting the demolition and replacement of existing residential buildings when they are not worthy of preservation or cannot be economically maintained or restored or when there are other compelling reasons to do so; to protect and preserve property values and the City's tax base; and to promote the general welfare by regulating the demolition or removal of existing structures, the exterior characteristics of new structures and the modification of existing structures throughout the City... encouraging the retention of buildings which have historic, architectural or cultural value or which are otherwise worthy of preservation, maintaining lot size and building scale appropriate to each neighborhood... permitting the demolition and replacement of existing residential buildings when they are not worthy of preservation or cannot be economically maintained or restored or when there are other compelling reasons to do so..." He then discussed the architectural character, economic factors, the home's history, renovation and economic hardship, and superiority; to which Miller responded.

Strasser appreciated the quality of design, plans, attention to detail, and stated concern about preserving, but not increasing, the tax base.

The applicants and Helman discussed the tax base and the qualifications of a demolition as stated in the code, expertise, counsel, and other approved demolitions.

Scott indicated he appreciates the efforts and shared that the core essence of the original home is unique to Bexley. He further shared he believes the design of the new home is fantastic, but asks what, if any, investigations have been done regarding renovating the home and its additions.

Strasser and Helman shared their opinions regarding the home's additions.

Toney discussed why the structure might warrant demolition and asked if they have spoken to the neighbors.

Board members discussed the code, the use of the term "superior," and what new homes cannot do; the applicant asked the Board to look at the application in totality.

Gilli Zofa, 209 S. Columbia -- gave a history of his time before the Board, read the listing from the home's posting from David Powers, gave a history of the home, and indicated that a demolition of this would be a demolition of a piece of Bexley history.

Miller and Zofa engaged in discussion regarding outreach to the neighbors.

Toney indicated the Board members need more time to consider the application.

Motion to table this application until the October 14th meeting made by Strasser; seconded by Scott.

VOTE: Strasser, Scott, Helman, Toney

D) Application Number: BZAP 21-37
Address: 809 S Cassingham
Applicant: Brenda Parker
Owner: Zach & Lara Kobee

Request: The applicant is requesting recommendation for a Certificate of Appropriateness to the Board of Zoning and Planning for a new screen porch, a new roof on sleeping porch and a new window reconfiguration

A motion to approve this application as part of the consent agenda made by Helman; seconded by Strasser.

Vote: Scott, Helman, Strasser, Toney

8) Other Business

Bokor asked for feedback on the Staff Report.

9) Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned.