



## Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes

Thursday, October 14, 2021

6:00 PM

---

**1) Call to Order**

**2) Roll Call of Members**

Present: Heyer, Helman, Scott, Strasser, Toney

**3) Public Comments**

**4) Approval of Minutes**

A) Minutes for September 9, 2021 ARB

Motion to approve the September 9, 2021 meeting minutes made by Scott; seconded by Strasser. All in favor.

**5) Staff Report**

A) Staff Report 10/14/2021

Bokor gave an overview of the staff report, which included the following Consent Agenda applications: ARB-21-64, ARB-21-65, ARB-21-66, ARB-21-67, BZAP-21-41, and BZAP-21-43. Applicants had asked to withdraw the following applications: ARB-21-68 and ARB-21-40.

Motion to approve the Consent Agenda made by Helman, seconded by Scott. All in favor.

B) 1223.05 Demolition Ordinance

**6) Old Business ( Two cases - both to be heard under Demolitions and New Builds)**

**7) New Business**

A) Application Number: ARB 21-64

Address: 442 S Drexel  
Applicant: William Andrews  
Owner: John & Alexandria Fisher

**Request:** The applicant is requesting architectural review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for an addition and remodel to the rear of the existing home.

This application was approved as part of the Consent Agenda.

Motion to approve the Consent Agenda made by Helman, seconded by Scott. All in favor.

B) Application Number: ARB 21-65  
Address: 30 N Drexel  
Applicant: Robert Raskin  
Owner: Mike and Marta Foster

**Request:** The applicant is seeking Architectural review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for the addition of a covered pavillion.

This application was approved as part of the Consent Agenda.

Motion to approve the Consent Agenda made by Helman, seconded by Scott. All in favor.

C) Application Number: ARB 21-66  
Address: 479 N Columbia  
Applicant: Amy Lauerhass  
Owner: Skylar & Chris Blannin

**Request:** The applicant is requesting Arhcitectural review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for the addition of a new front porch, rear porch, and side pergola and new exterior siding.

This application was approved as part of the Consent Agenda.

Motion to approve the Consent Agenda made by Helman, seconded by Scott. All in favor.

D) Application Number: ARB 21-67  
Address: 70 S Parkview  
Applicant: Amy Lauerhass  
Owner: Mike Agriesti

**Request:** The applicant is requesting Architectural Review and Approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace an existing front entry porch with a new porch; addition of a covered porch/balcony to the south side of the house.

This application was approved as part of the Consent Agenda.

Motion to approve the Consent Agenda made by Helman, seconded by Scott. All in favor.

E) Application Number: ARB 21-68  
Address: 121 N Remington  
Applicant: Christine McMillian  
Owner: Chris Murray

**Request:** The applicant is requesting Architectural Review and Approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness to install solar panels that can be viewed from the front of the home.

This application was withdrawn by the applicant.

F) Application Number: BZAP-21-40  
Address: 2592 Bexley Park  
Applicant: Jaime Swartzwelder  
Owner: Jaime Swartzwelder

**Request:** The applicant is requesting a recommendation to the Board of Zoning and Planning for Architectural Review and Approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for the installation of a patio and hardscape.

This application was withdrawn by the applicant.

G) Application Number: BZAP-21-41  
Address: 934 Euclaire  
Applicant: Amy Lauerhass  
Owner: Jennifer and Nicholas Geruntino

**Request:** The applicant is requesting a recommendation to the Board of Zoning and Planning for Architectural Review and Approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for the addition of a new front porch to replace an awning and an addition of a 1-1/2 story structure over an existing flat-roof garage.

This application was approved as part of the Consent Agenda.

Motion to approve the Consent Agenda made by Helman, seconded by Scott. All in favor.

- H) Application Number: BZAP-21-42  
Address: 276 S Stanwood  
Applicant: Joseph Carifa  
Owner: Katherine Moss and Simon Doolittle  
**Request:** The applicant is requesting a recommendation to the Board of Zoning and Planning for Architectural Review and Approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness to install a new deck and replace an existing elevated patio.

Carifa was sworn in.

The applicant and Board discussed this project.

The Findings of Fact and Decision of the Board for Application No. BZAP-21-49 for property located at 276 S. Stanwood: The Board recommends Design to be approved by the Board of Zoning and Planning subject to zoning approval with the condition that it includes a 6' fence along the east rear property line and to be constructed simultaneously.

The following public comment was made:

George -- raised concern about screening the raised deck from his property.

Motion by approve by Helman; seconded by Scott. All in favor.

- I) Application Number: BZAP-21-43  
Address: 2371 Bryden  
Applicant: Amy Lauerhass  
Owner: Christopher and Emily Johns  
**Request:** The applicant is requesting a recommendation to the Board of Zoning and Planning for Architectural Review and Approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for the addition of windows to an existing screened porch, to enclose it to create finished space.

The Board discussed this application.

The Findings of Fact and Decision of the Board for Application No. BZAP-21-43 for property located at 2371 Bryden Road: The Board finds that a Certificate of Appropriateness should be issued. All were in favor.

This application was approved as part of the Consent Agenda.

Motion to approve the Consent Agenda made by Helman, seconded by Scott. All in favor.

## 8) Demolitions and New Builds

- A) Application Number: ARB 21-51  
Address: 2010 East Broad  
Applicant: Brent Foley  
Owner: Catholic Diocese of Columbus  
**Request:** The applicant is requesting Architectural review and approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for the addition of a Convocation Center and the renovation of the lobby area attached to the existing building.

Motion to table to the November 11, 2021 meeting made by Heyer; seconded by Scott. All in favor.

- B) Application Number: ARB 21-58  
Address: 221 Ashbourne  
Applicant: Karrick Sherrill  
Owner: Alex Marsh and Katie Walker Marsh

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

Bokor displayed a new, recently submitted rendering.

Sherrill was sworn in.

Shannon said he maintained the belief of sufficient demonstration that the current home is not historically or architecturally significant, but if the Board determined the current home is structurally significant or otherwise worthy of preservation, it can be demonstrated that rehabilitating the building would present an economic hardship vis a vis demolishing and rebuilding. Shannon referenced reports from a structural engineer and Mr. Berardi, stated costs of renovations, a replacement project, and the prices per square foot at which nearby homes were sold.

Marsh was sworn in.

Shannon and Marsh answered Strasser's questions pertaining to the cost estimates of a renovation.

Sherrill gave an overview of the new proposed structure and updates including elevations, alignment of interior and exterior in relation to the windows, cooper and window detailing, and massing.

Shannon read a petition signed by current Ashbourne residents indicating support for this project. The document was drafted by the applicant and circulated by Dunn for residents to sign. Not all signees have standing.

Heyer stated the existing house has character and that details are important to the character of the neighborhood; the loss of the current home will remove character from the street. In a new design, he is looking for an equal or better quality of character. Important design qualities to retain or improve character include: a similar eave height to other homes in the neighborhood, a grade similar to the current structure, two steps to the main entry, ridge height, and details. He asked that the first floor grade be lowered and he requested more details and information, or better quality, on the eave height and floor plate, weathering and water details, band board, dormers and crowns, and materials. He would accept this proposal if all of the conditions are met and he sees the upgraded and improved project.

Strasser shared her belief that the applicant has demonstrated the house does not have historical or architectural significance and that a renovation would provide an economic hardship. However, she does not believe the proposed project is ready for approval. With the proper plan that demonstrates the quality and character would be maintained, she believes the preservation issue has been dealt with and the information provided about undue hardship is satisfied. However, she would personally rather see the house renovated, but does not believe her personal opinion is relevant.

Helman explained his opinion that the large scale of the initial proposal has been remediated. He is concerned with both the demolition and new build and would like the Board to be careful regarding setting a precedence. He referenced the newly built home behind this location and its

similarity to this lot. He said all three criteria categories are continuous and indicated this house has merit but he has come to the realization that nothing exists inside the current house. He stated he will probably vote on this property, but detailing makes the cost. He feels this is progressing.

Scott commented that he agrees with other Board members and indicated a belief that the exterior of the current house has significance. The reports and economic information show how this is an economic hardship. He wants to continue looking at the eave height and lower it to be more in compliance with neighboring homes, interior floor plans, and massing of the dormers, brick detailing, banding, and trees surviving the demolition.

Bokor indicated there should be a preservation plan that will be reviewed by the Tree & Public Garden Commission.

Toney said it is important for the applicant to demonstrate a superior replacement aspect; she particularly points out the roof, gutters, and details.

Sherrill said details and materials have been considered, despite not being shown in the plans. He also shared the home is 2' from grade and there won't be an increase in grade. Furthermore, Sherrill explained the location of the home in comparison to the landscape that is being kept, the driveway, and the sequence of construction of the new home. He explained not all details can all be represented in this state of the drawings, but they have been considered. Regarding the height, Sherrill said the eave height is within a few inches of 19' 6" off of grade and the front eave height is 8" taller. The building is deeper, so the ridge height is higher; he is unsure of comparison to the other homes, but feels like this is a good average. Sherrill asked if the Colonial detailing is important, or if there can be more contemporary detailing, to which Board members said there are no restrictions on a contemporary style, but that many traditional details are time-honored, and that materials need to be high-caliber and in relation to the architectural type.

Public Comments were as follows:

Jamie Rupp, 180 Ashbourne Rd. -- believed the house is one of the most historically intact in the City. He discussed economic hardship, the applicant owning the property, how this new build will diminish the value of his home, and his anticipation of the home's square footage.

Shannon said that at least three Board members indicated there is an economic hardship and all Board members are motivated to see a replacement project be of such quality that they can approve; he wondered if the Board would approve the demolition. Toney said that is not typically how they proceed; Strasser said she does not believe they ready to do this.

There was discussion between Shannon and the members regarding approval for demolition. Shannon made a request to table this application to the November 11, 2021 meeting. Motion made by Helman; seconded by Strasser.

Roll call: Strasser, Heyer, Scott, Helman, 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 shared that there had been changes to the proposed exterior materials.

Sampson and Bell were sworn in.

Sampson indicated he spoke with the home's prior occupants and did not hear of anything indicating the home is historically significant. He explained there are many revival-style homes within Bexley and that this home is not a uniquely detailed example of this type of architecture, therefore it does not meet the criteria of architectural significance.

Loversidge was sworn in. He explained the current house was built in the 1920s and is old, large, and insignificant, and does not translate to a 21st century house. He indicated the condition is okay, but it is not fitting for South Columbia. He said the proposed home has a similar footprint than the current home. He shared that the City's demolition ordinance states that a replacement structure must be better than the demolished home, and this project would be an improvement to the city. Loversidge said he does not believe the current home is advancing the community. When asked, he stated a belief that homes should be considered for demolition on a case-by-case basis.

Sampon said they've worked to develop a proposed home that fits in and has character for the neighborhood; he explained the level of detail in the plans. He shared they have changed the building material to stucco and discussed the site plan, set back, circular driveway variance request, tree removal, lot coverage, footprint, height and width, detailing, and the evolution of the city's architectural landscape.

Miller said this residence is without significance and is unworthy of preservation. He explained there is support from certain neighbors, and iterated the superiority of the proposed plan to the current home.

Strasser asked that a submitted letter dated August 12, 2021 be signed by a principal architect.

Scott complimented the design but discussed the integrity of the current house and additions which can be added or removed. He does not see the economic hardship as being met.

Miller indicated Bexley's building Code should be considered in totality and Sampson said the economic hardship did not apply to this project; what is presented as a replacement home will cost more than rehabilitating the current home.

Strasser disagreed with the assertion that if the building is architecturally significant, that under unusual or compelling circumstances, the superior proposed replacement building must be approved. She said the compelling circumstance is a combination of factors and discussed the reports that were provided regarding significance. She would like to hear from Board members who may be experts in this area.

Heyer said that should the existing house be demolished, the street would lose character. He explained he believes that the design of the new build is generally more compatible than the current home and also discussed measurements, grade and character.

Sampson explained the drawings contain many details, although some need to be adjusted. He shared he is in agreement regarding lowering the first floor to help the overall proportions and believes Heyer's conditions can be met.

Helman expressed concern about the demolition and discussed the sale price and this being the litmus case for future demolitions.

Toney said it feels like her judgement should be used as to whether or not a demolition and rebuild is justified; in her mind it is only justified if it is replaced with something superior. She is currently leaning towards approving the demolition and she discussed eave height.

The applicant indicated this deliberation needs to be a careful process.

Residents made the following comments:

Amy Conley, 2226 Bryden Road -- stated she is in favor of the project and feels the completed project can look established and that the materials and scales are key in keeping the neighborhood looking consistent.

Gilli Zofan, 209 S. Columbia -- expressed concern about setting a residence.

The applicant indicated a desire for the Board to vote; Heyer said he would like to see conditions met before voting and for this application to be tabled. Strasser suggested checking the application for the replacement project and Heyer said this would be an opportunity to make adjustments to the application. The applicant decided to table until the November 11, 2021 meeting. There were no concerns from the Board regarding the circular drive. Motion by Strasser to table this application to the November 11, 2021 meeting; seconded by Scott. Vote: Helman, Heyer, Strasser, Scott, Toney.

**9) Other Business**

A poll will be sent to Board members to coordinate a time for the next ARB workshop.

**10) Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned.