



Architectural Review Board Staff Report

September 14, 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.

From the City of Bexley's codified ordinance 1223.05 (Demolition or Removal of Existing Structure (Ord. 29-16. Passed 11-15-16; ; Ord. 08-20. Passed 7-14-20.)

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 from the applicant 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 definite plan for reuse of the site, including proposed replacement structures, 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.	

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:

(c) Process for Review by the Architecture Review Board

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.	

(c) Process for Review by the Architecture Review Board

- | | | |
|----------|---|--|
| 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. | |
|----------|---|--|

The following criteria shall be used by the Board in determining whether a structure is historically or culturally significant and worthy of preservation:

(d) Criteria to Determine Preservation Significance

- | | | |
|----------|---|--|
| 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. | |

The following criteria shall be used by the Board in determining whether denial of a certificate of appropriateness would cause a substantial economic hardship:

(e) Criteria to Determine 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. | |

The following criteria shall be used by the Board in determining whether the certificate is justified by the existence of unusual or compelling circumstances:

(e) Criteria to Determine Unusual and 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 that 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. | |

Old Business:

1) **CONSENT AGENDA ITEM**

Application Number: BZAP-23-8

Address: 2691 E Main Street

Applicant: Sarah Montague

Owner: Matt Davis

Request: The applicant is seeking final review and approval for material choices and construction details for the front facade material. This application was approved with this condition at the June, 2023 ARB.

Background: This application was approved by Board of Zoning and Planning with a remand back to ARB for final design review and approval. The applicant was approved at the June, 2023 ARB meeting with the condition that the applicant return with details of the facade materials.

Staff Comments: The extra effort in analysis of the facade materials was extremely helpful and appreciated by the Board. The information is sufficient to approve as a Consent Agenda item.

2) **TABLED TO OCTOBER 12, 2023**

Application Number: ARB- 23-21

Address: 316 N Columbia

Applicant: Barry Tullos/Lidia Danjell

Owner: Rick and Cheryl Golden

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for room, porch and deck additions at the rear of the home.

Background: This application was tabled at the August, 2023 meeting.

Staff Comments: Staff is working with the applicant to correct and clarify the drawings and expects this to be back before the Board at the October 12th, 2023 meeting.

New Business:

3) Application Number: ARB- 23- 26

Address: 2711 Brentwood

Applicant: Andrew Rosenthal

Owner: Marlee and Rick Snowdon

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of an existing structure and design for a new home.

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

Considerations:*(All documents referenced are published on the City's website.)*

• **Adherence to Criteria of Architectural Appropriateness and Demolition (City of Bexley's codified ordinance 1223.05):**

- Supporting material for the merits of demolition has been submitted by an architect, an inspection company and a structural engineer. (1223.05 (b)1)
- A new plan for the reuse of the site has been submitted. (1223.05 (b)2)

- The preservation criteria have been addressed in submitted materials from Acock Associates Architects and GRAD Architects (1223.05(d))
- No substantial economic hardship has been determined although economic benefit of a replacement structure. The economics of rehabilitation vs. replacement may, in fact, be similar due to the significant deferred maintenance of the existing structure both on the interior and exterior of the building. (1223.05(e))
- **Adherence to Criteria For a Design Approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness (City of Bexley's codified ordinance 1223.04):**
 - Consideration of elements of design (1223.04(c)):
 - i) Architectural Design - the new design is in keeping with the character of the neighborhood and pays homage to the original structure by the use of a modernized, mid-century modern vocabulary.
 - ii) Exterior Materials are appropriate (material selections have been provided)
 - iii) Exterior Details - the roof line, window placement and size, massing, are all consistent with the neighboring properties and existing structure.
 - iv) Height and Building Mass - the height and building mass are appropriate for the streetscape. The footprint is also appropriate given that the site is a double lot.
 - v) Preservation plans for existing trees and significant landscape features - and a full landscape plan will be a condition of approval as well as review by the Tree and Public Gardens Commission.

Staff Comments: Staff supports approving the demolition of the existing home and the approval of the new home to be built in its place. The applicant has demonstrated the appropriateness of this with a very thorough and clear packet of materials. Some important highlights of the proposed new structure to consider:

- The footprint and massing of the new structure remains similar to the existing home and does not change the character of the street and neighborhood.
- The style of the new home pays homage to and, in the opinion of staff, is an improvement to the original mid century modern design.

Recommended Conditions (if Board moves to a vote):

- Final Design to be reviewed and approved by the city's Design Consultant.
- All permits must be issued before demolition can begin
- The landscape plan be reviewed by the tree and public garden commission.

4) **CONSENT AGENDA ITEM**

Application Number: ARB- 23-27

Address: 250 S Parkview

Applicant: Derrick Layer Custom Homes & Remodeling

Owner: Ronald and Michael Negron

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness to convert an attached garage to study and laundry room.

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 in with the existing home.
- Compatibility: All materials, elements, windows, etc... of the new structure are compatible with the existing structure.
- Adheres to Criteria of Architectural Appropriateness (see chart above).

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

Recommended Conditions (if Board moves to a vote):

- Suggested changes to the submitted plans are to put a stoop out the door (not just immediately arrive at steps).
- Final Design to be reviewed and approved by the city's Design Consultant.

5) **CONSENT AGENDA ITEM**

Application Number: ARB- 23-28

Address: 2684 Fair

Applicant: Amy Lauerhass

Owner: Sara Tervo

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for a covered porch 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 and will fit into the existing streetscape.
- Compatibility: All materials, elements, windows, etc... of the new structure are compatible with the existing home.
- Adheres to Criteria of Architectural Appropriateness (see chart above).

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

Recommended Conditions (if Board moves to a vote):

- Clarify brick wall - plan shows a step in to provide detail and scale, elevation does not.
- Final Design to be reviewed and approved by the city's Design Consultant.

6) **CONSENT AGENDA ITEM**

Application Number: ARB- 23-29

Address: 240 N Cassingham

Applicant: Amy Lauerhass

Owner: Ryan and Elizabeth Smith

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for a one-story 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 and will fit into the existing streetscape.

- Compatibility: All materials, elements, windows, etc... of the new structure are compatible with the existing home.
- Adheres to Criteria of Architectural Appropriateness (see chart above).

Staff Comments: Staff supports 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.

7) **CONSENT AGENDA ITEM**

Application Number: ARB- 23-30

Address: 446 S Columbia

Applicant: Amy Lauerhass

Owner: Vincent and Jennifer DiMascio

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for a one-story 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 home.
- Massing: The massing is appropriate and will fit into the existing streetscape.
- Compatibility: All materials, elements, windows, etc... of the new structure are compatible with the existing neighborhood.
- Adheres to Criteria of Architectural Appropriateness (see chart above).

Staff Comments: Staff supports 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.

8) Application Number: BZAP - 23-19

Address: 733 Vernon

Applicant: K Bryon Wernicke

Owner: Barbara Wernicke

Request: The applicant is seeking a recommendation to BZAP for Architectural review and approval, a Certificate of Appropriateness and a variance to allow a screened garden house 1.5' from the north property line.

Background: This application is before the Board for the first time. This was built without approvals during construction.

Considerations:

- Siting: The siting of this building does not adhere to the zoning code. The structure is too close to the street.
- Massing: The massing is not appropriate and will not fit into the existing streetscape. There are no other accessory structures so close to the lot line and so long.
- Compatibility: All materials, elements, windows, etc... of the new structure should be compatible with the existing neighborhood. There is not enough information to understand the structure and its materials.
- Adheres to Criteria of Architectural Appropriateness (see chart above).

Staff Comments: The application is missing critical information to determine the appropriateness of materials, massing, etc... There are no drawings to understand the

completed project. Additionally this will need a significant variance from BZAP. Staff's recommendation is that no recommendation be given and that the application be forwarded to BZAP for evaluation of the variance with a remand back to ARB if the variance is granted.

9) Application Number: BZAP - 23-23

Address: 2200 E Main

Applicant: Ryan Pearson

Owner: Continental Real Estate Cos.

Request: The applicant is seeking preliminary review and 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 will go through what has been very deliberately thought through 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 first time. 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 discussion items at BZAP:

- This hearing was for preliminary review and the first opportunity for comments and feedback from the Board 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.
- 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 Special permit to allow 5 stories. While this is the decision of BZAP, there are items in 1254.14 (MAIN STREET DISTRICT SPECIAL PERMITS) that will weigh heavily on the recommendation of the ARB. For reference below - the considerations that are important for ARB are in bold:

1254.14 MAIN STREET DISTRICT SPECIAL PERMITS.

Special permits to allow the maximum height of a structure as provided in Section [1254.10](#) of up to 5 stories or up to 7 stories west of Sheridan Avenue and south of Main Street, may be granted based upon any of the following considerations:

(a) The extent to which the proposed property and site design conform to the intent of the Main Street Design Guidelines.

(b) The extent to which the proposed development represents exceptional architectural and site design.

(c) The extent to which the design helps to mitigate a substantial impact upon adjacent single family residential uses.

(d) Compatibility of architecture and site design to the surrounding uses and structures.

(e) The extent to which the development creates meaningful pedestrian and public amenity spaces.

(f) The extent to which the development provides public parking.

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 that will undergo evaluation and discussion and many decision points. 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:

Staff has met with the applicant over the past few weeks and offered general feedback on the architecture for the project such as the character of the proposed structure and its relationship to the neighboring properties in terms of materials, style and design. The applicant has been guided to reevaluate the quality of design and materials and lesson the amount of different colors and materials. Many changes that have been suggested show up in the latest revisions but there are still many design studies that need to be done. 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, and many other changes and studies are occurring simultaneous to this meeting. Generally the applicants have been asked to study the design and understand and interpret it as an urban infill rather than the design characteristics of a suburban apartment building.

This ARB meeting is an opportunity for the Board and public to comment about the architecture and staff will carry forward the appropriate suggestions and continue to work with the applicant to create the best design for the city.

10) **CONSENT AGENDA ITEM**

Application Number: BZAP - 23-30

Address: 202 S Columbia

Applicant: Nathan Sampson

Owner: Bexley Next LLC

Request: The applicant is seeking a recommendation to BZAP for Architectural review and approval, a Certificate of Appropriateness and a variance for a closed courtyard and a therapeutic bath inside the courtyard.

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 - the applicant will be bringing sample products to the June ARB.
- Adheres to Criteria of Architectural Appropriateness (see chart above).

Staff Comments: Staff supports 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.