



Architectural Review Board Staff Report

April 11, 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 - 23-36
Address: 217 N. Stanwood
Applicant: Anthony Pollina
Owner: Kate Qualmann and Patricio Andrade

Application Number: BZAP-24-3
Address: 690 Vernon
Applicant: Ryan Brothers' Landscaping- Ryan
Owner: Sharon Stanley

Application Number: BZAP-24-4
Address: 2498 Fair
Applicant: Amy Lauerhass
Owner: Kyle Barger

Application Number: BZAP-24-5
Address: 2700 E. Main
Applicant: Greg Margulies
Owner: 2700 Partnership LLC

Application Number: ARB-24- 5
Address: 125 Ashbourne
Applicant: David Marshall
Owner: Danielle Demko

Application Number: ARB-24- 6
Address: 481 N Parkview
Applicant: Jamie Parish
Owner: Billy Cory and Dr. Bridget Hermann

Application Number: ARB-24-10
Address: 155 S Drexel
Applicant: Amy Lauerhass
Owner: The Whislers

Tabled Items:

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

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

Old Business

- 1) ***Tabled to the the May 9, 2024 ARB***
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.

- 2) ***Consent Agenda Item***
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. This application was tabled by the applicant at the January and February ARB meeting.
Background: This application was before the Board at the January 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.
 - Compatability: All material, elements, windows, etc. . . of the new structure should be 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. Applicant has agreed to redesign the front gable at the same slope as the existing gables.

- 3) ***Consent Agenda Item***
Application Number: BZAP-24-3
Address: 690 Vernon
Applicant: Ryan Brothers' Landscaping- Ryan
Owner: Sharon Stanley
Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural Review and a Certificate of Appropriateness for a new front porch and garage addition. This application was

approved for the variance by BZAP and remanded back to ARB for final design approval.

Background: This application is before the Board for the second time and was approved at BZAP with a remand back to ARB for approval of design changes.

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 should be 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. Applicant redesigned front porch as requested by ARB and has agreed to work with design consultant on final details.

4) ***Tabled to the the May 9, 2024 ARB***

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. ***This applicant was before the Board for a conceptual review in March.***

5) ***Consent Agenda Item***

Application Number: BZAP-24-4

Address: 2498 Fair

Applicant: Amy Lauerhass

Owner: Kyle Barger

Request: The applicant is a seeking Design review and a Certificate of Appropriateness for a new detached garage and a special permit for functional dormer. This application was approved for variances by the BZAP and remanded back to ARB for final design approval.

Background: This application is before the Board for the second time and was approved at BZAP with a remand back to ARB for approval of design changes..

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 should be 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

redesigned the new garage structure per the recommendations of ARB at the March 2024 meeting and was approved at BZAP.

6) **Consent Agenda Item**

Application Number: BZAP-24-5

Address: 2700 E. Main

Applicant: Greg Margulies

Owner: 2700 Partnership LLC

Request: This application is a recommendation to the Board of Zoning and Planning for a Certificate of Appropriateness to change the color of the building.

Background: This application was tabled by the applicant at the March 2024 ARB and was not heard.

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 should be compatible with the existing structure..
- Adheres to Criteria of Architectural Appropriateness.

Staff Comments: The applicant is required to have paint color approval by the BZAP. Staff has requested a recommendation by ARB as follows:

1. The entire building can be a uniform color with accents
2. Color choice(s) to be samples on the building for staff review after BZAP approval.

6) **New Business:**

7) **Consent Agenda Item**

Application Number: ARB-24- 5

Address: 125 Ashbourne

Applicant: David Marshall

Owner: Danielle Demko

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural Review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for 1st and 2nd floor additions to the principal structure by turning the balcony on the rear of the house into finished space on the second floor, and expanding the footprint of the pool house which is just below the existing balcony.

8) **Consent Agenda Item**

Application Number: ARB-24- 6

Address: 481 N Parkview

Applicant: Jamie Parish

Owner: Billy Cory and Dr. Bridget Hermann

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural Review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for the addition of 3 dormers and a new window to an existing house.

- 9) Application Number: ARB-24-7
Address: 2688 E Broad
Applicant: Bennett Tepper
Owner: Bennett and Martha Tepper
Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural Review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace a slate roof with asphalt shingles.
Background: This application is before the Board for the first time.

City of Bexley Slate Roof Repair and Replacement Guidelines:

Roofing materials are important contributing visual elements to the integrity of the built environment.

Slate is one of the most aesthetically pleasing and durable of all roofing materials.

(Below is taken from the National Park Service)

It is indicative at once of the awesome powers of nature which have formed it and the expertise and skill of the craftsman in handshaping and laying it on the roof. Installed properly, slate roofs require relatively little maintenance and will last 60 to 125 years or longer depending on the type of slate employed, roof configuration, and the geographical location of the property. Some slates have been known to last over 200 years. Found on virtually every class of structure, slate roofs are perhaps most often associated with institutional, ecclesiastical, and government buildings, where longevity is an especially important consideration in material choices. In the slate quarrying regions of the country, where supply is abundant, slate was often used on farm and agricultural buildings as well.

Because the pattern, detailing, and craftsmanship of slate roofs are important design elements of historic buildings, they should be repaired rather than replaced whenever possible. The purpose of this Preservation Brief is to assist property owners, architects, preservationists, and building managers in understanding the causes of slate roof failures and undertaking the repair and replacement of slate roofs. Details contributing to the character of historic slate roofs are described and guidance is offered on maintenance and the degree of intervention required at various levels of deterioration.

The relatively large percentage of historic buildings roofed with slate during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries means that many slate roofs, and the 60 to 125 year life span of the slates most commonly used, may be nearing the end of their serviceable lives at the end of the twentieth century. Too often, these roofs are being improperly repaired or replaced with alternative roofing materials, to the detriment of the historic integrity and appearance of the structure. Increased knowledge of the characteristics of slate and its detailing and installation on the roof can lead to more sensitive interventions in which original material is preserved and the building's historic character maintained. Every effort should be

made to replace deteriorated slate roofs with new slate and to develop an effective maintenance and repair program for slate roofs that can be retained. Although slate replacement roofs are expensive, the superiority of materials and craftsmanship will give years of continued service. If amortized over the life of the roof, the replacement cost can be very reasonable.

SLATE ROOF REPAIR AND REPLACEMENT:

The following must be submitted as part of the application process:

- Any/all proposed repairs to existing roofs require Staff/Administrative or Board approval.
- Any/all missing, damaged, and deteriorated slate on all main and ancillary roofs should be repaired with new or used slate of same color and profile as existing, in accordance with the Architectural Review Board Design Guidelines and all applicable City Codes and industry standards.
- Approval by the Architectural Review Board and the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness for a roof replacement are required prior to the removal of a slate roof.
- Pictures showing all roof surfaces and street views should be included in the submission.
- History of the roof maintenance should be submitted.
- Applicants should provide written estimates for slate repair as well as both replacement of the roof with slate and replacement with proposed new replacement material.
- Applicants should address a) the remaining life of the existing slate roof, b) the estimated future life of the roof repaired and remaining slate, and c) the estimated life expectancy of a non slate replacement roof. It important to understand the life cycle value/cost of a roof repair/ replacement vs simply present cost.
- Applicant should provide a written statement of the architectural importance of the existing slate roof (its prominence on the street, its significance to the architecture/architectural style of the home, etc...)
- Applicants are to work with the Design Consultant to determine the additional level of documentation necessary for consideration of a slate roof removal.
- The applicant should submit a minimum of one written slate roof assessment by a slate roofing contractor, licensed in the City of Bexley, regarding the existing condition of the slate roof, and documenting, to the commission's satisfaction, that the slate is beyond its serviceable life.
- In addition to a written description of the existing condition of the slate, all slate roof assessments should provide the type and style of slate.
- When slate removal has been determined to be appropriate/ necessary, the maintenance and repair of the slate on the primary elevation(s) will be considered in conjunction with replacing the deteriorated slate on secondary elevations.

Staff Comments: The applicant has submitted letters and documentation to address the Roof replacement guidelines and will be giving testimony for any additional questions/concerns. This does appear to be a thin slate and expert testimony is important in deterring whether it can be serviced or needs replacing.

- 10) 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 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.
- Compatibility: All material, elements, windows, etc... of the new structure should be compatible with the existing structure. The news proposed additions are appropriate in placement but, given the simplicity of the existing home, is very fussy and overly detailed for the original structure. For example, the gable dormers in the front could be simplified to a shed dormer and the double columns could just be single columns.

Staff Comments: Staff recommends that the applicant ask to be tabled and return with design modifications. .

- 11) 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 is before the Board for the first time. Below is the Bexley demolition ordinance for reference. All materials addressing the criteria have been submitted by the applicant and are included in the packet. Additional testimony will be given at the ARB Meeting.

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.)

Considerations of proposed demolition:

- There are several criteria of the demolition ordinance that should be a focus at the ARB. These criteria are italicized above.

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.

Staff Comments: The applicant has made it possible to see the interior of the structure for the Board members and staff. If the applicant requests a table of this application staff would advise any Board members to go to the site before the May meeting. This is a complicated case and deserves careful consideration of the factors in the demolition ordinance.

12) **Consent Agenda Item**

Application Number: ARB-24-10

Address: 155 S Drexel

Applicant: Amy Lauerhass

Owner: The Whislers

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural Review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for the removal of an existing screened porch and an addition of new screened porch, half bath & pool storage.

13)

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 is before the Board for the second time and was approved at BZAP with a remand back to ARB for approval of design changes..

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 should be compatible with the existing structure. The proposed addition is at odds with the bungalow style and significantly changes the horizontal nature of the home. The 3rd floor addition may be problematic and the second floor should be perceptually still horizontal (perhaps using a hip roof?). Additionally, the tower in the front in the proposed addition is out of scale and proportion with the original home.

Staff Comments: Staff recommends that the applicant ask to be tabled and return with design modifications.

7) **Other Business**

- 14) *Update*
Application Number: F-24-1/ARB-24-4
Address: 2829 Columbus
Applicant: Andrew Frankhouser
Owner: Andrew Frankhouser

8) **Adjourn**