

Findings of Fact

Meeting date: 5-9-24

Speakers: _____

*John B. Yoaz Secor
Kyle Katz
271 N. Columbia*

Architectural Review Board Approval
 Architectural Review Board Recommendation to BZAP

*THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND DECISION OF THE BOARD for

Application No. ARB-24-9 for property located at: 236 N. Columbia

The Board finds that a Certificate of Appropriateness should be issued
 The Board Recommends Design to be approved by the Board of Zoning and Planning subject to zoning approval

noting that the: proposed improvement; Addition; Other:

is architecturally compatible with the existing structure (as submitted)
 with the following condition / modification (s): _____

Motion #1 Arch Significant + Historically Significant - worthy of pres.

① Scott ② Hall motion that it is - all vote yes

*→ of substantial Hardship have been met
has been met*

All major changes required by the conditions for this approval are subject to further review and approval by

The Design Consultant
 The Architectural Review Board
 Tabled

Motion: 1st) _____
2nd) _____

#1 Deter all No failed

All minor changes to the, are subject to approval by the Design Consultant.

1) Haye 2) Hall
Mr. Scott 1 Mr. Hall 1 Mr. Heyer 1 Ms. Jones _____ Madam Toney 1

yes for all

ARCHITECTURALLY SIGNIFICANT

Mr. Heyer - NO
Not enough evidence needed
all 1, 2, 3, more evidence

Mr. Scott - NO
- NO redcut,
- min. maint. cut
short or long term submitt.
Cost of renovation is unclear
as compare to main. Doctod. com
\$0.10 support ec. Hallship

Mr. Hall - NO
- evidence to show redcut
unreasonable maint. cost
- cost presented to restore not same
none does fit compare.

Mrs. Tracy - NO
Not show redcut of value
maint. 1, 2, 3,

Failed

Demolition or Removal of Existing Structures Process Flow Chart

- Documentation:
1. Statement of Support of Demolition
 2. Existing site plan
 3. Plan and assessment for reuse

Determination for evaluation of Preservation Significance:
(1) Historically **OR** Architecturally Significance
AND (2) Worthy of Preservation
by the Architecture Review Board

- Criteria to Determine Preservation Significance:
1. Age and Condition
 2. Quality of Design
 3. Importance to the Neighborhood
 4. Significance of Structure to Development
 5. Impact on Property tax

*Evaluation based on the above criteria
by Architectural Review Board Determines:*

IF ONLY (1) or (2)

Structure **IS NOT**
Historically or Architecturally
Significant and Worthy of
Preservation

Structure **IS**
Historically or Architecturally
Significant and Worthy of
Preservation

*Bill
no. 10
Additional Criteria
1 motions*

Additional Criteria to Determine Cause for Demolition

Evaluation of Substantial Economic Hardship:

1. Reduction of property value
2. Unreasonable maintenance cost
3. Restoration/preservation imposes unreasonable costs

OR

Evaluation of Unusual and Compelling Circumstances:

1. Structurally not feasible
2. Replacement plan is superior to existing structure
3. Replacement plan more contextually compatible
4. Existing structure has adverse effect on neighbors

Applicant requests
Architectural Review and
Certificate of Appropriateness for
Proposed Replacement from
ARB

YES

Application Approved

Application Denied

#2 ^{motion} Bill + Hall ②

Bill - Evaluated Unusu has been met

Mr. Meyer - No 1, 2, 3, 4

criteria not corroborated

criteria for superior for minor adverse affect on neighbors but uncorroborated not substantial criteria for passing

Mr. Scott - No

etc 1, 4, No independent engineer

replacement plan not strong enough for unique structure

3, size or design is subjective

4 - No evidence, new structure would support.

Mr. Hall - NO ① - sufficient evidence

independent report to justify report

② subjective

4, adverse affect on neighbors

Modan Toney - No

1, 2nd opinion report

2, Not a Novice Mason

3, Not a true stonemason

4, no proof to support

Failed