



Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes

April 11, 2024

6:00 PM

1) Call to Order

The meeting was Called to Order by Chairperson Toney.

2) Roll Call of Members

Members present: Ms. Jones, Mr. Scott, Chairperson Toney.

Chairperson Toney indicated that a positive vote by two of the three members is required in order to get approval during this meeting.

3) Approval of Minutes

Minutes from the last meeting will be discussed at the next meeting.

4) Public Comment

There were no public comments.

5) 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.

Applications BZAP-23-23 and ARB 24-2 will be Tabled to the May 9, 2024 meeting.

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.

Motion to approve Applications ARB-23-36, BZAP-24-3, BZAP-24-4, BZAP-24-5, ARB-24-5, ARB-24-6, ARB-24-10 as Consent Agenda items by Ms. Jones, second by Mr. Scott; roll call: Scott–Yes, Jones–Yes, Toney–Yes.

Ms. Bokor stated all of the Board members' individual suggestions were accepted by the applicants.

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 remanded back to ARB for final design approval.

Motion to approve Applications ARB-23-36, BZAP-24-3, BZAP-24-4, BZAP-24-5, ARB-24-5, ARB-24-6, ARB-24-10 as Consent Agenda items by Ms. Jones, second by Mr. Scott; roll call: Scott–Yes, Jones–Yes, Toney–Yes.

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 recommendation to the Board of Zoning and Planning for a Certificate of Appropriateness for a new detached garage and a special permit for functional dormer. This application was remanded back to ARB for final design approval.

Motion to approve Applications ARB-23-36, BZAP-24-3, BZAP-24-4, BZAP-24-5, ARB-24-5, ARB-24-6, ARB-24-10 as Consent Agenda items by Ms. Jones, second by Mr. Scott; roll call: Scott–Yes, Jones–Yes, Toney–Yes.

6) Consent Agenda Item

Application Number: BZAP-24-5

Address: 2700 E. Main

Applicant: Greg Margulies

Owner: 2700 Partnership LLC

Request: The applicant is a recommendation to the Board of Zoning and Planning for a Certificate of Appropriateness to change the color of the building. This application was tabled at the March meeting.

Motion to approve Applications ARB-23-36, BZAP-24-3, BZAP-24-4, BZAP-24-5, ARB-24-5, ARB-24-6, ARB-24-10 as Consent Agenda items by Ms. Jones, second by Mr. Scott; roll call: Scott–Yes, Jones–Yes, Toney–Yes.

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.

Motion to approve Applications ARB-23-36, BZAP-24-3, BZAP-24-4, BZAP-24-5, ARB-24-5, ARB-24-6, ARB-24-10 as Consent Agenda items by Ms. Jones, second by Mr. Scott; roll call: Scott–Yes, Jones–Yes, Toney–Yes.

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.

Motion to approve Applications ARB-23-36, BZAP-24-3, BZAP-24-4, BZAP-24-5, ARB-24-5, ARB-24-6, ARB-24-10 as Consent Agenda items by Ms. Jones, second by Mr. Scott; roll call: Scott–Yes, Jones–Yes, Toney–Yes.

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.

Ms. Bokor explained that slate removal cannot be approved by Staff and must be approved by this Board. She indicated there is a list in the Staff Report of items that are requested be addressed. She said that if the Board votes to allow this to be replaced, that details should be meticulously carried out.

Martha and Ben Tepper were sworn in.

Mr. Tepper explained that last summer, the home's insurance was canceled due to the age of the roof, which is original to the house. This process was concerning and they had reached out to roofers who indicated the slate portion of the roof was at the end of the usable life, and would cost \$160,000 to replace just the slate. The whole roof replaced with shingles would be something they can afford.

Chairperson Toney stated that this Board is trying to preserve some of the old architecture and slate roofs.

Mr. Bokor explained that she does not see anything missing from the submittal process, but the maintenance can be discussed.

Mr. Tepper discussed the process of attempting to get the home insured and that Durable Roof indicated the roof was at the end of its useful life. He said Durable Roof attends to the roof annually and replaces the pieces in the worst shape. Mr. Tepper said the home's addition has an asphalt roof which needs to be replaced as well.

The roof's previous issues were discussed.

Mr. Scott noted that the roof seems to be in fairly bad shape and discussed pricing differences.

There was a discussion about the replacement shingle.

Ms. Jones stated she understands the applicant's position and would like to make sure the color corresponds with the home and other houses on the street.

Mr. Scott said that he would trust Staff to work on the color selection and also thinks that the hardship of the price difference between the two is extreme. He also stated that the longevity of the shingle could be easily questioned because of the shape that it is in. He noted that the slate is a strong characteristic of this home.

Ms. Bokor listed the type of details she would like to work with the homeowners on.

Findings of Fact and Decision of the Board for Application Number AR-24-7 for property located at 2688 E Broad Street: The proposed improvements to replace slate with asphalt based on the fact that the Pennsylvania Slate has reached its end of life, the Board finds it appropriate to allow the replacement with the condition that the applicant work with the Staff Design Consultant on a final color and any details she recommends.

The applicants understood the Findings of Fact.

Motion to approve the Findings of Fact by Mr. Scott, second by Ms. Jones; Jones–Yes, Scott–Yes, Toney–Yes.

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.

There was no one present to represent the application; Chairperson Toney stated it would be Tabled until the end of the meeting.

This applicant was heard when Ms. Parker arrived.

Ms. Bokor stated this application is before the Board for the first time and expressed her concern based on the simplicity of the existing house; she thinks some of the elements of the additions are too complex for the house.

Ms. Parker was sworn in.

Ms. Parker explained that the project is for the purpose of gaining space. She explained modifications to the designs but did not have enough time to make additional drawings.

Mr. Scott stated he agreed with Staff and thinks the overall content is fine but that some parts seem too busy for the simple existing home. He discussed variations that could be made to the roof and said it should be made sure that the design is hierarchical in design concepts.

Mr. Scott explained he did not have a problem with the guardrail but said it has to be done right and the applicant should work with Staff on details. Ms. Bokor said it would be good to do a detail on a couple of rails. Mr. Scott said that regarding the scale, there are too many columns. He also mentioned the change between the porch and the grade seems like it might be approaching the Code limits.

Ms. Jones said she agrees with Mr. Scott on the number of columns, has no problem with the railing, and that it would be helpful to define the details a bit further.

Chairperson Toney agreed with other Board members and listed ways to bring additional charm, such as flower boxes. She suggested keeping modifications simple.

Motion to Table this application to the May 9, 2024 meeting by Mr. Scott, second by Ms. Jones; roll call: Scott–Yes, Jones–Yes, Toney–Yes.

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.

Initially, there was no one present to represent the application; the case was heard about 45 minutes after the meeting began.

Ms. Bokor stated that she has gone through the demolition ordinance and noted what sections are most pertinent to this particular project.

Ms. and Mr. Warner, Mr. Behal, and Mr. Saar were sworn in.

Mr. Behal rhetorically asked why there is a demolition ordinance and stated that neighbors are affected by what is done. He said this particular house doesn't contribute to the neighborhood and shared they have spoken to all neighbors on the block who agreed that demolition of the current house and construction of the proposed house would enhance their neighborhood. He said that if he had brought the current house before the Board to be constructed, it would not be approved. He explained the existing home is virtually invisible from the street and stated it is much shorter than surrounding

homes and off center to the lot. He said the Code reads that for the Board to prohibit demolition, the home needs to be historically or architecturally significant, but as a resident of the neighborhood the current home is relatively insignificant.

He addressed the other criteria including the home's age and condition; quality of design and materials; the importance of the structure and character, and quality of the neighborhood; the significance to the historical or architecture culture; and the impact on the city's real estate base.

He said that Bexley is not a historic district and that the Code is written specifically to create a very difficult way for the City to deny a homeowner what they propose to do for their property.

He said that regarding the significance to Bexley, if the current house was demolished and the proposed house was constructed, few people would know the current house is gone.

Ms. Saar explained that she purchased this home before the interested clients and had visited this home as a child. She said the interior of the home is the same as it was when she was a child. She said it could be worked with, but feels the current home isn't appealing and that is why they reached out to the neighbors.

She said Yoaz has had a great experience working in Bexley and is excited about this project. She said she purchased the house wanting to see what would happen. They have been in contract over the past 3 months and closed 10 days ago. She said the house never officially went on the market.

Ronald Kauffman, 200 N Columbia, was sworn in. He said that they're very excited about having a neighbor with stature and also have the proposed house. He said he knew Mrs. Lazarus and her home hadn't been kept up .

John Wirchanski, 2010 Industrial Parkway in Plain City, indicated he is in contract for the home next door. He said he agrees with the scale of the new project and appropriateness of it for the neighborhood.

There was discussion about the new proposed design. He said the new home will face the street which aligns more with the streetscape. He noted they will maintain one curb cut and add a second on the south side, and that they would like to take the height up to 40 feet. He discussed the slope, materials, and grade.

Mr. Scott thanked Mr. Behal for inviting Board members to the home. He discussed the submitted statements and shared his own anecdotes and thoughts to Mr. Livesey's letter, including bathrooms, ceiling heights, subjective design beliefs, the home's orientation to the street, the unique style of architecture, and benefit to the City on a tax

basis. He said he feels the house is a major contributor to the architectural character and the heritage of Bexley, although it is a different contributing factor to what is typically seen in this neighborhood. He found no significant structural concerns or indication of financial hardship.

Regarding the letter from Mr. Behal's office, Mr. Scott stated the determination to demolish an existing building should not be based on the design success of a project compared to other work that that architect has performed. He discussed the true intent of the design, agreed that the entry is modest but that it is part of the charm, and said that things can easily be improved. He also spoke to the low ceilings, poorly constructed addition, undesirable enclosure, scale in comparison to the neighboring homes, ability to remodel the kitchen, prominence of the home's original owner, lack of interesting details, consideration of tax values, cost for renovation, home size, street view, and proposed design. He said he feels this would be an excellent design on an empty lot. He said the conditions of the existing house are poor but the bones are intact. He mentioned other aspects of the letter that he agrees with but that can be addressed.

He asked Mr. Behal to explain the comment stating "a renovation project that corrects the inherent problems of the existing house would almost certainly require demolition of a few architectural elements to give the existing house its character." Mr. Behal said he and Mr. Saar felt the grade was so low and impossible to lower the grade around the house that to correct what they felt was the problem would require the impossible task of changing the way the house looked.

Mr. Behal stated there is a two tiered evaluation system based on the home's significance, but the potential to remodel the home isn't based on significance but is based on the second tier. He clarified that he does not feel the home is historically significant in the context of this particular block.

Mr. Behal spoke with Board members and spoke to the economic hardship; by the time it would be brought up to today's standards, one would have a hard time selling it for that price as the value is in the lot.

Mr. Scott noted that the home was featured in a book in 1976.

Ms. Jones agreed with Mr. Scott's points and said the conversation for her is a balance between preservation and neighborhood improvements; she said she thinks the decision would be more clear-cut coming from a lesser known architect. The decision is based on striking the balance. She discussed the other similar homes in the area and said she is personally leaning more towards the new design.

Ms. Bokor said the job of the Board is to first talk about the significance of the current home and all of the other things follow afterwards.

Chairperson Toney said that if there wasn't a well known architect's name associated with it, that they wouldn't be having this conversation. She said the Board tries to maintain homes and lack of maintenance should not be the reason for a demolition. She explained that the prairie style is unique to Bexley, many of the issues can be fixed, and is asking the applicant to not tear down the home. She stated she thought the home has really good bones and didn't see anything that couldn't be worked around. While noting that the proposed design is gorgeous, Chairperson Toney asked if they couldn't see if there's someone who wants to renovate the home to what the house deserves and she would like more time to think about it.

Mr. Behal asked for the application to be Tabled.

Mr. Scott said it may be difficult for the board to quantify historical significance.

Ms. Bokor said she thinks the home is a significant home, and therefore the Board needs to meticulously go through the other points. Chairperson Toney asked the neighbors if they had known that the house had been designed by a significant architect. None knew.

Holly Kastan, 225 N Columbia, was sworn in. She said she knew the history of the home and the other homes in the neighborhood and noted the home was significant at one time. She said she has seen the plans for the new home and does not think the home in its current or improved condition would be the best use for the property. She said she believes the Warners and their proposed home will be beautiful additions to the community.

Renee Kauffman, 200 N Columbia, was sworn in. She said she has watched the home rot for the last 30 years. She said it is strictly a local architect and there was discussion about Frank Lloyd Wright and that this is not a historical building. She said no one will put the work into the house; no one wants it.

Mr. Behal asked for a Table.

Motion to Table to the May 9, 2024 meeting by Ms. Jones, second by Mr. Scott; roll call: Scott–Yes, Jones–Yes, Toney–Yes.

12) Consent Agenda Item

Application Number: ARB-24-10

Address: 155 S Drexel

Applicant: Amy Lauerhass

Owner: The Whislars

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.

Motion to approve Applications ARB-23-36, BZAP-24-3, BZAP-24-4, BZAP-24-5, ARB-24-5, ARB-24-6, ARB-24-10 as Consent Agenda items by Ms. Jones, second by Mr. Scott; roll call: Scott–Yes, Jones–Yes, Toney–Yes.

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.

Initially, there was no one present to represent the application. This application was heard later in the meeting.

Ms. Bokor said that this project is very doable to have a second story but the bungalow style is strong and the proposed addition is anti-bungalow. She gave suggestions like a hip roof or spreading wide would be more appropriate.

Ms. Parker stated that the homeowners really want a second and third floor but they have agreed to give up the third floor which gives flexibility to bring the height down and the roof.

Mr. Scott said there is a variation of a third floor that would depend on how it is done. The bay at the front was extruded up and Ms. Parker is going to do studies to address this.

Ms. Jones said the massing of the addition is the biggest issue; omitting the tower and bringing down the overall height would go a long way.

Mr. Scott said he agreed with Ms. Jones and said the front has three strong competing elements and the rest of the house should be subservient to the porch. He suggested softening the roof and changing the tower.

Chairperson Toney didn't have anything else to add.

Mr. Scott asked to include notes in the elevations.

Ms. Parker asked about the variances and Ms. Bokor explained that the ARB will give a recommendation to BZAP, and that this project should go back to the ARB before the BZAP.

Ms. Rose said she gets the feeling the ARB would like to see this again before going to the BZAP.

Ms. Parker asked to have this application tabled to the May 9, 2024 meeting.

Motion to Table by Ms. Jones, second by Mr. Scott; Jones–Yes, Scott–Yes, Toney–Yes.

7) Other Business

14) Update

Application Number: F-24-1/ARB-24-4

Address: 2829 Columbus

Applicant: Andrew Frankhouser

8) Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned.