



Architectural Review Board Meeting Staff Report

November 14, 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-24-43
Address: 1043 Chelsea
Applicant: Brenda Parker
Owner: Glenna Halligan

Application Number: ARB-24-44
Address: 244 S Ardmore
Applicant: Cobie Cribbs
Owner: Gary Wren

Application Number: ARB-24-47
Address: 44 Meadow Park
Applicant: Peter Krajnak
Owner: Clint and Lauren Stahler

Application Number: ARB-24-48
Address: 290 Ashbourne
Applicant: Brian Zingelmann
Owner: Matt Brenner

Application Number: BZAP-24-40
Address: 2075 Fair
Applicant: Gary Alexander
Owner: William Bundy

Application Number: ARB-24-49
Address: 2361 Clifton
Applicant: Dan Morgan - Behal Sampson Dietz
Owner: 2361 Clifton LLC

TABLED TO JANUARY 9, 2025:

Application Number: BZAP-24-37
Address: 2775 Powell
Applicant: Brian Shepard
Owner: Brian and Katie Shepard

New Business

- 1) Application Number: MA-24-188
Address: 258 N Parkview
Applicant: Muth & Company, Roofing- Michaela Upchurch
Owner: Matthew Birkhold

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural Review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace a shake roof with asphalt.

Background: The applicant is before the Board for the first time. Staff does not have the delegated authority to approve wood shake replacements with asphalt.

Considerations:

- Siting: N/A
- Massing: The use of asphalt shingles does not provide the dimensionality that wood shakes do, however, the applicant has chosen a top of the line architectural dimensional shingles and will still provide an appropriate profile.
- Compatibility: Wood shingles are a beautiful but difficult material to maintain in our climate. When the home is highly shaded it adds an additional difficulty.
- Adheres to Criteria of Architectural Appropriateness - must be reviewed by the ARB for appropriateness.

Staff Comments: This applications is before the Board as staff does not have designated authority to approve certain types of roofs. A wood shake roof is one of these roof types. Wood shake roofs can be beautiful and are appropriate where there are not dense trees and shade. High humidity and precipitation can shorten the lifespan of a wood shake roof. The general life expectancy of a wood shake roof is approximately 50 years.

An additional look at the existing roof was done by Trevor Fisher of Precision Slate and Tile on behalf of the City. His observations have been added to the file.

2) **CONSENT AGENDA ITEM**

Application Number: ARB-24-43

Address: 1043 Chelsea

Applicant: Brenda Parker

Owner: Glenna Halligan

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural Review and approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for new single-story addition at the rear of house.

Background: The applicant 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 of this building is in scale with the neighboring structures and the homes surrounding this home.
- Compatibility: All material, elements, windows, etc... of the new structure are compatible with the existing structure.
- Adheres to Criteria of Architectural Appropriateness.

Staff Comments: This proposed addition matches the existing home.

Recommendation: Staff supports approving this application with any conditions the Board may have.

3) **CONSENT AGENDA ITEM**

Application Number: ARB-24-44

Address: 244 S Ardmore

Applicant: Cobie Cribbs

Owner: Gary Wren

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural Review and approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness to frame and install walls on existing front porch/screen room and installing windows and siding.

Background: The applicant 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 of this building is in scale with the neighboring structures and the homes surrounding this home.
- Compatibility: All material, elements, windows, etc... of the new structure are compatible with the existing structure.
- Adheres to Criteria of Architectural Appropriateness.

Staff Comments: The change from screens to windows will not substantially change the look of this home. The knee wall siding will match the trim of the existing home.

Recommendation: Staff supports approving this application with any conditions the Board may have.

4) **CONSENT AGENDA ITEM**

Application Number: ARB-24-47

Address: 44 Meadow Park

Applicant: Peter Krajnak

Owner: Clint and Lauren Stahler

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural Review and approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for the addition of four new dormers on the existing house. The materials of the new dormers are to match the existing dormers, including slate roof and painted trim.

Background: The applicant 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 of this building is in scale with the neighboring structures and the homes surrounding this home.
- Compatibility: All material, elements, windows, etc... of the new structure are compatible with the existing structure.
- Adheres to Criteria of Architectural Appropriateness.

Staff Comments: This dormer additions are appropriate for and match the existing home.

Recommendation: Staff supports approving this application with any conditions the Board may have.

5) **CONSENT AGENDA ITEM**

Application Number: ARB-24-48

Address: 290 Ashbourne

Applicant: Brian Zingelmann

Owner: Matt Brenner

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural Review and approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness to remodel existing porch and patio.

Background: The applicant 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 of this building is in scale with the neighboring structures and the homes surrounding this home.
- Compatibility: All material, elements, windows, etc... of the new structure are compatible with the existing structure.
- Adheres to Criteria of Architectural Appropriateness.

Staff Comments: Staff has worked with the applicant to rework the window sizes and grid proportions to match the existing home.

Recommendation: Staff supports approving this application with any conditions the Board may have.

6) **CONSENT AGENDA ITEM**

Application Number: ARB-24-49

Address: 2361 Clifton

Applicant: Dan Morgan - Behal Sampson Dietz

Owner: 2361 Clifton LLC

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural Review and approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for a refuse enclosure and the replacement of the existing standing-seam metal roof covered porch with a screened-in pergola enclosure.

Background: The applicant 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 of this building is in scale with the neighboring structures and the homes surrounding this home.
- Compatibility: All material, elements, windows, etc... of the new structure are compatible with the existing structure.
- Adheres to Criteria of Architectural Appropriateness.

Staff Comments: This type of pergola has been approved a few times by this Board. We typically see this type of structure approved when the original home is very plain - without much detail.

Recommendation: Staff supports approving this application with any conditions the Board may have.

7) Application Number: BZAP-24-35

Address: 470 S Parkview

Applicant: Santiago Alvarez

Owner: Jana Clarke

Request: The applicant is seeking a recommendation to the Board of Zoning and Planning for the approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for a garage and in-law suite addition and eliminate current curb cut and move to the other side of the property.

Background: The applicant is before the Board for the first time..

Considerations:

- Siting: The siting of this building is not consistent with the neighboring properties in its placement of the addition. The neighboring properties maintain the traditional green space between the home and the detached garages.
- Massing: The massing of this building is not in scale with the neighboring structures and the homes surrounding this home which have more prominence to the front of the lot. This large and modern addition will take up the voided green space between the home and accessory structures. While this is not prohibited in Bexley, it should be done in a more sensitive and site specific way. The massing of this proposed addition is too large and has no architectural connection with the existing structure.
- Compatibility: Materials, elements, windows, etc... of the new structure are not compatible with the existing structure. The extensive use of brick should be carried in some way in to the addition - architectural shapes and styles should blend with the existing home. The way this addition is designed looks as though 2 very different structures have been placed side by side without an overlying architectural connection.
- Does not adhere to the Criteria of Architectural Appropriateness.

Staff Comments: This application is for a recommendation to BZAP. If the applicant would like to move to a recommendation on this application staff cannot support this design and therefore would only support a negative recommendation to BZAP. If the applicant does request a vote staff would request that the condition of any BZAP approval be a remand back to ARB for design review.

Recommendation: Staff recommends that the applicant rework the design of this addition to better blend with the existing architecture and reconsider the size, height, and other elements that are out of scale with the original structure.

8) **CONSENT AGENDA ITEM**

Application Number: BZAP-24-40

Address: 2075 Fair

Applicant: Gary Alexander

Owner: William Bundy

Request: The applicant is seeking a recommendation to the Board of Zoning and Planning for a Certificate of Appropriateness for a fence variance and mudroom addition in rear yard setback.

Background: The applicant 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 of this building is in scale with the neighboring structures and the homes surrounding this home.
- Compatibility: All material, elements, windows, etc... of the new structure are compatible with the existing structure.
- Adheres to Criteria of Architectural Appropriateness.

Staff Comments: The proposed addition is appropriate and matches the existing structure. The Board of zoning and planning will evaluate the fence variance.

Recommendation: Staff supports recommending this application to BZAP with any conditions the Board may have.

- 9) Application Number: BZAP-24-41
 Address: 2111 Park Hill
 Applicant: Steven Schwope
 Owner: Patrick King

Request: The applicant is seeking a recommendation to the Board of Zoning and Planning for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the removal of existing cmu masonry piers and actuated vehicular gate. New attached single-bay Garage Addition (364 SF) and new side-door metal awning replacement. Modified landscaping and hardscaping.

Background: The applicant 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 of this building is in scale with the neighboring structures and the homes surrounding this home.
- Compatibility: All material, elements, windows, etc... of the new structure are compatible with the existing structure.
- Adheres to Criteria of Architectural Appropriateness.

Staff Comments: This is a very nice and beautifully designed structure. There are some concerns about that much mass - despite its appropriate design - being so close to the street from an architectural/design aesthetic. Staff would still support a recommendation to the BZAP for a Certificate of Appropriateness but believes the case merits discussion.

Recommendation: Staff supports recommending this application to the BZAP with any conditions the Board may have.

Tabled Applications:

- 10) Application Number: ARB-24-39
 Address: 806 Francis
 Applicant: David Greene
 Owner: David Greene

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural Review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for a conversion of rear porch to an enclosed kitchen.

Background: The applicant 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 of this building is in scale with the neighboring structures and the homes surrounding this home.
- Compatibility: All material, elements, windows, etc... of the new structure are compatible with the existing structure.
- Adheres to Criteria of Architectural Appropriateness.

Staff Comments: This case was tabled at the October ARB as the Board did not feel the drawings were adequate to discuss. The applicant has added more photos and elevations.

Recommendation: Staff supports approving this application with any conditions the Board may have.

11) ***TABLED TO JANUARY 9, 2025***

Application Number: BZAP-24-37

Address: 2775 Powell

Applicant: Brian Shepard

Owner: Brian and Katie Shepard

Request: The applicant is seeking a recommendation to the Board of Zoning and Planning for a Certificate of Appropriateness to add a new garage constructed 3 feet off backyard property line.