


BEHAL SAMPSON DIETZ
990 WEST THIRD AVE.
COLUMBUS, OHIO 43212




SCHEMATIC DRAWINGS FOR THE
WARNER RESIDENCE


236 NORTH COLUMBIA AVE
BEXLEY, OHIO

03.14.24

SITE PLAN




BEHAL SAMPSON DIETZ
990 WEST THIRD AVE.
COLUMBUS, OHIO 43212



FIRST FLOOR PLAN

SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"




SCHEMATIC DRAWINGS FOR THE
WARNER RESIDENCE

236 NORTH COLUMBIA AVE
BEXLEY, OHIO


03.14.24

BEHAL SAMPSON DIETZ
990 WEST THIRD AVE.
COLUMBUS, OHIO 43212



SECOND FLOOR PLAN

SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"



SCHEMATIC DRAWINGS FOR THE
WARNER RESIDENCE

236 NORTH COLUMBIA AVE
BEXLEY, OHIO

03.14.24

BEHAL SAMPSON DIETZ
990 WEST THIRD AVE.
COLUMBUS, OHIO 43212



WEST EXTERIOR ELEVATION

SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"

SCHEMATIC DRAWINGS FOR THE
WARNER RESIDENCE

236 NORTH COLUMBIA AVE
BEXLEY, OHIO

03.14.24

BEHAL SAMPSON DIETZ
990 WEST THIRD AVE.
COLUMBUS, OHIO 43212



NORTH EXTERIOR ELEVATION


SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"

SCHEMATIC DRAWINGS FOR THE
WARNER RESIDENCE

236 NORTH COLUMBIA AVE
BEXLEY, OHIO

03.14.24

BEHAL SAMPSON DIETZ
990 WEST THIRD AVE.
COLUMBUS, OHIO 43212



EAST EXTERIOR ELEVATION


SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"

SCHEMATIC DRAWINGS FOR THE
WARNER RESIDENCE

236 NORTH COLUMBIA AVE
BEXLEY, OHIO

03.14.24

BEHAL SAMPSON DIETZ
990 WEST THIRD AVE.
COLUMBUS, OHIO 43212



SOUTH EXTERIOR ELEVATION

SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"

SCHEMATIC DRAWINGS FOR THE
WARNER RESIDENCE

236 NORTH COLUMBIA AVE
BEXLEY, OHIO

03.14.24

Structural Letter

Kooi LLC

900 Foxcreek Road
Sunbury, OH 43074



Yoaz Saar

Date
5.07.2024

Yore Fine Builders
367 North Columbia Avenue
Columbus, OH 43209

236 North Columbia Avenue
Columbus, OH 43209

Yoaz,

At your request, I performed a visual structural assessment of the residential structure at the above stated address on Thursday May 2, 2024. The structural assessment was requested to review the overall structural integrity of the existing structure. Existing documents were provided for my review. The existing two-story structure was constructed in 1953 and is comprised of conventional wood framing. The roof framing members are wood rafters supported on interior and exterior walls. The floor framing members are 2x10 @ 16"o.c. supported by exterior walls and interior beams and walls. The basement is comprised of CMU foundation walls. There have been several additions added to the original footprint of the structure. The front entrance is located on the north side of the structure and will be the main point of reference.

Observations:

- Exterior framing and grade:

- The difference between first floor framing and top of grade varies through the perimeter, however at most of the first floor framing the top of grade is above the bottom of the sill plate and partially into the rim board height.
- The brick façade is brought down below grade.
- All except for (1) window well have been closed.
- Signs of water saturation and water infiltration were prevalent around the perimeter of the structure. Certain areas showed signs of water saturation and efflorescence for several courses above grade.



Exterior grade at south side



Exterior grade at west side



Exterior grade at east side



Exterior framing at north low roof



Exterior grade at south side



Exterior framing at south low roof



Gutter downspout at south side



Exterior framing and downspout at west

- **Roof framing:**

- Gutters were not present at all roof eaves and water management appeared to be consolidated into one area on the South side of the structure. The downspouts were not checked for proper working order.
- Roof flashing did not appear to be working properly as water infiltration was present at exterior wood siding components.
- Certain areas of the ceiling along exterior windows appear to have been patched in the past.
- Water infiltration was observed at the north side low roof by the western stair wall framing adjacent to the low roof.
- No visible roof sag or major shifts were observed along the roof line or inside the structure at the ceiling level.



Ceiling patching



Water infiltration at north side wall / low roof

- **Floor framing:**

- There was visible water infiltration at the perimeter of the first-floor framing. The locations include the ends of the floor joist and rim board.
- There were signs of water mitigation towards the center of the first-floor framing.
- The first-floor framing had visible, perceived, and measurable deflections in several rooms.
- The second-floor framing did not have visible or perceived deflections or movements at the floor level. There were no observed plaster and/or drywall cracked at the floors or ceiling.

	
<p>Rim board water infiltration</p>	<p>Beam water infiltration at end</p>
	
<p>Rim board water infiltration at corner</p>	<p>Rim board discoloration</p>
	
<p>Rim board water infiltration</p>	<p>Rim board water infiltration at corner</p>



Rim board water infiltration at corner



Rim board water infiltration at corner

- **Basement:**

- Certain corners of the CMU foundation walls had signs of water infiltration and efflorescence.
- Exterior window well wall openings have been framed closed with CMU block.
- A sump pump was installed after the original construction was completed as parts of the concrete slab on grade were cut out and replaced.
- The crawl spaces that had a concrete mud slab installed showed signs of movement and potential heaving.



Water infiltration at CMU wall corner



Window well infill and water mitigation framing




Window well infill and water mitigation framing



Concrete lintel cracks due to internal corrosion

Comments and recommendations:

- Based on the existing construction documents, the grade is above the bottom sole plate of the wood framing as shown in the image below:



Based on my observations, this condition is prevalent around most of the perimeter of the structure. Without proper water management and precautionary measures, this detail will compromise the wood structure over time due to water infiltration. The photos that were taken are from the visible interior portion of the perimeter, however no access was available to inspect the brick to framing cavity. Water at grade would saturate the brick façade and the wood framing would absorb the moisture over time. The moisture will deteriorate the wood components and compromise the structural integrity of the exterior wall load bearing system. Without intervention, the structural integrity will be compromised, and the risk of failure would increase.


- Common practice and current building codes require the wood framed structure to be fully above the adjacent grade with an additional buffer to avoid any moisture infiltration via the sole plate or rim board.
- Proper water management will ensure longevity of the structure and minimize the opportunity for water infiltration into the structure. These measures include installing gutters and downspouts as this will lessen the water saturation around the perimeter of the structure at grade.
- Below are several ways to address the water damaged structural components:
 1. Raise the entire structure to be above current grade and in compliance with building codes and replace all water damaged wood framing. This method would require every load bearing component and brick façade to be shored and jacked simultaneously. There is no guarantee that any of the brick façade would remain in place and the likelihood of the brick being compromised would be high. In my experience, rectangular houses have been raised off the foundation. This house contains many intricacies due to geometry and brick locations including a centrally located full height chimney. This option would require a very specialized contractor who is willing to accept the high risks associated with this work.
 2. Lower the grade around the entire structure and throughout the property and replace all water damaged wood framing. This option to lower the grade may not be feasible due to adjacent lots that are at similar elevations. If the grade is lower surrounding the structure, then negative drainage may occur therefore bringing more water from surrounding areas, including adjacent lots, to this structure's basement and foundation. If proper drainage is achievable, the next topic to review would be the surrounding vegetation and trees. By lowering the grade, it will likely adversely impact the tree root system. Further consultations by a civil engineer for drainage and grading, and an arborist for tree and vegetation management would be required to further explore this option.
 3. Selective replacement the water damaged wood framing. This would require partial temporary shoring of the exterior wall and replacing the wood components. This would not be a permanent fix as it will not address water infiltration, however it would decrease the likelihood of a structural failure. This is a temporary solution and not recommended for long term usage.

4. Complete removal of the structure and replacement with a new code compliant structure that has proper water management measures in place.

My structural assessment was limited to the area stated in the image and described in this document. If further items are of concern, please bring them to my attention and I can help assess each situation.


If you have any questions or comments, please contact me.

Sincerely,



Bernardus Kooi, PE, SE, LEED AP

Structural Engineer | Owner



PLANT LIST

QUANTITY	PLANT NAME	SIZE
GROVE TREES		
4	Kousa Dogwood	CORNUS 'Kousa' 1.5"-2" caliper
6	Eastern Red Bud	CERCIS canadensis 6' Multi-stem
TREES		
2	COLUMNAR EUROPEAN HORNBEAM	CARPINUS BETULUS 'Franz Fontaine' 2.5"
3	MALUS	MALUS 'Raspberry Spear' 1.5" caliper
1	PAPERBARK MAPLE	ACER GRISEUM 2.5"
2	MAGNOLIA	MAGNOLIA x 'Jane' LITTLE GIRL 7-8'
1	UPRIGHT JUNIPERS	JUNIPERUS chinensis 'Trautman' 6'-7'
4	SERVICEBERRY	AMELANCHIER canadensis 'Glenn Form' RAINBOW PILLAR 2" caliper
2	JAPANESE MAPLE	ACER palmatum 'Bloodgood' 7'-8'
8	ARBORVITAE	THUJA plicata x standishii 'Green Giant' 8'-10'
15	ARBORVITAE	THUJA occidentalis 'Smaragd' 7'-8'
1	Kousa Dogwood	CORNUS 'Kousa' 1.5"-2" caliper
2	UPRIGHT JUNIPERS	JUNIPERUS CHINENSIS 'TAYLOR' #7 (4')
2	UPRIGHT JUNIPERS	JUNIPERUS CHINENSIS 'TAYLOR' #7 (4')
SHRUBS		
6	FLOWERING VIBURNUM	VIBURNUM carlesii 'Cayuga' 24" B&B
11	FLOWERING VIBURNUM	VIBURNUM SPECIES 3'
3	WITCHHAZEL	HAMAMELIS VERNALIS 4'
14	YEW	TAXUS 'Densiformis' 18-24"
13	HYDRANGEA	HYDRANGEA paniculata 'ILVOBO' Bobo #5
8	HYDRANGEA	HYDRANGEA paniculata 'Little Quick Fire' #5
41	GREEN VELVET BOXWOOD	BUXUS X 'GREEN VELVET' 15-18"
5	GREEN MOUNTAIN BOXWOOD	BUXUS X 'GREEN MOUNTAIN' 48"
9	LILAC	SYRINGA PATULA 'Dwarf Korean' 24-30"
11	DWARF BARBERRY	BERBERIS 'CRIMSON PYGMY' #3
8	SUMMERSWEET	CLETHRЯ 'Hummingbird' #3
10	JUNIPER	JUNIPERUS procumbens 'Nana' 15-18"
10	Dwarf Norway Spruce	PICEA abies 'Pumilla' #5
16	DENSE YEW	TAXUS M. DENSIFORMIS 18"
7	EUONYMUS	EUONYMUS 'Emerald Gaiety' 18"
PERENNIALS & GRASSES		
7	CRANESBILL	GERANIUM sanguineum 'Max Frei' #1
12	HOSTA	HOSTA SPECIES #1
43	CORALBELLS	HEUCHERA SPECIES #1
18	FALSE SPIREA	ASTILBE species #1
6	VERONICA	Veronica spicata 'Purpleicious' PP1763 #1
18	LILYTURF	Liriope muscari 'Variegata' #3

236 N. Columbia Appeal

On May 9, 2024, the Architectural Review Board (the “ARB”) denied Appellant’s application for architectural review and approval of a certificate of appropriateness to demolish an existing home and replace with a new home (the “Decision”) at 236 North Columbia (the “Property”). In doing so, the ARB incorrectly determined that: (a) the existing home on the Property is historically and architecturally significant; (b) the denial of the certificate of appropriateness will not cause substantial and economic hardship; and (c) there are no unusual or compelling circumstances that justify the approval of the certificate of appropriateness. In making the Decision, the ARB failed to follow the Bexley Code and precedent. The ARB also failed to follow Ohio law. The Decision violates Appellant’s private property rights under the Ohio and United States Constitutions. Through counsel, Appellant intends to present argument and evidence establishing that the Board of Zoning and Planning (“BZAP”) must reverse the Decision and approve Appellant’s application for a certificate of appropriateness.

BEFORE THE BEXLEY BOARD OF ZONING AND PLANNING

In re: Application for Demolition of :
236 N. Columbia Avenue : Application No. ARB-24-9
: :
Applicant: John Behal : Appeal to BZAP-24-14
Property Owner: Yore Fine Homes, LLC :
(Yoaz Saar) : :

INDEX OF RECORD

<u>Page Nos.</u>	<u>Description of Document</u>	<u>Date Provided</u>
001-035	Demolition Application <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Architectural Details Drawings• Landscape Plan w/existing trees• Photos of Current House and Existing Conditions• Site Plan / Survey of 1.100 Acres <i>[dated 1.15.23]</i>• Site Plan <i>[dated March 14, 2023]</i>• Architectural Consultant letter <i>[Livesey; dated 3.1.24]</i>• Architect's Criteria for Replacement <i>[Behal Sampson Dietz letter dated 3.13.24]</i>• Existing and Proposed Streetscape	March 14, 2024
036-037	Public Meeting Notice - Architectural Review Board	March 28, 2024
038	Boundary and Topographical Survey	April 1, 2024
039-042	Agenda - Architectural Review Board meeting	April 11, 2024
043-053	Staff Report	April 11, 2024
054	Video of Bexley Architectural Review Board meeting [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YoGTP3GUVQo] from 27:14 through 27:44 and 47:25 through 2:06:40]	April 11, 2024
055-065	Minutes - Board of Zoning and Planning meeting	April 11, 2024
066-067	Public Meeting Notice - Architectural Review Board	April 26, 2024
068-069	Detailed Landscape Plan and Plant List	May 6, 2024
070	Photo of Crack in Carport	May 8, 2024
071-073	Agenda - Architectural Review Board meeting	May 9, 2024
074-083	Staff Report	May 9, 2024
084-090	Kooi LLC structural assessment letter <i>[dated May 7, 2024]</i>	May 9, 2024
091-092	Chapter 4 Foundations from 2019 Residential Code of Ohio	May 9, 2024

093	Original Wall Section with notes	May 9, 2024
094-096	Probable Costs of Construction	May 9, 2024
097-098	Statement from Joseph Kuspan, Architect	May 9, 2024
099	Video of Bexley Architectural Review Board meeting <i>[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SOffl4oQTLA from 1:52:30 through 3:48:05]</i>	May 9, 2024
100-104	Decision and Record of Action	May 9, 2024
105-122	Appeal of ARB Decision to BZAP <i>[filed by Yoaz Saar]</i>	May 16, 2024
123	Statement of Appeal <i>[filed by Elizabeth Alexander]</i>	May 31, 2024
124-125	Public Meeting Notice - Board of Zoning and Planning	June 27, 2024

**ARB-24-9**

*Demolition Request to
ARB (for principal
structures or garages)

Status: Active

Submitted On: 3/14/2024

Primary Location

236 N COLUMBIA AV
Bexley, OH 43209

Owner

Yoaz Saar (Dr. and Mrs. John
Warner in contract)
South Virginialee Road 123
Columbus, Ohio 43209

Applicant

John Behal
 614-496-1444
 jrbehal@gmail.com
 2546 Bexley Park Road
Columbus, OHIO 43209

A.1: Project Information

Brief Project Description

Demolition of existing house and replacement with new home

Architecture Review**Demolition****Planned Unit Dev****Special Permit**

A.1: Attorney / Agent Information

Agent Name**Agent Address****Agent Email****Agent Phone**

A.2: Fee Worksheet

Estimated Valuation of Project

2000000

Minor Architectural Review**Major Architectural Review****Variance Review****Zoning****Zoning Review Type**

—

Sign Review and Architectural Review for Commercial Projects**Review Type**

—

Appeal of ARB decision to BZAP**Appeal of BZAP decision to City Council**

B: Project Worksheet: Property Information

Occupancy Type

Residential

Zoning District

R2

Use Classification 

R-2 (25% Building and 50% Overall)

B: Project Worksheet: Lot Info

Width (ft)	Depth (ft)
191.47	250.25
Total Area (SF)	
47915	

B: Project Worksheet: Primary Structure Info

Existing Footprint (SF)	Proposed Addition (SF)
3457	—
Removing (SF)	Type of Structure
3457	residence
Proposed New Primary Structure or Residence (SF)	Total Square Footage
6595	6595

B: Project Worksheet: Garage and/or Accessory Structure Info (Incl. Decks, Pergolas, Etc)

Existing Footprint (SF)	Proposed Addition (SF)
—	—
New Structure Type	Ridge Height

Proposed New Structure (SF)	Is there a 2nd Floor
—	—
Total of all garage and accessory structures (SF)	Total building lot coverage (SF)
0	—
Total building lot coverage (% of lot)	Is this replacing an existing garage and/or accessory structure?
—	—

B: Project Worksheet: Hardscape

Existing Driveway (SF)	Existing Patio (SF)
3358	400
Existing Private Sidewalk (SF)	Proposed Additional Hardscape (SF)
93.5	0
<hr/>	
Total Hardscape (SF)	
9952	

B: Project Worksheet: Total Coverage

Total overall lot coverage (SF)	Total overall lot coverage (% of lot)
13792	29
<hr/>	

C.1 Architectural Review Worksheet: Roofing

Roofing

Structure

House or Principal Structure

Existing Roof Type

Std. 3-tab Asphalt Shingle

New Roof Type

Arch. Dimensional Shingles

New Single Manufacturer

Certainteed

New Roof Style and Color

slate grey

C.1 Architectural Review Worksheet: Windows

Windows

Structure

House or Principal Structure

Existing Window Type

Casement

Existing Window Materials

Wood

New Window Manufacturer

Pella

New Window Style/Mat./Color

black aluminum clad wood casements

C.1 Architectural Review Worksheet: Doors

Doors

Structure

House or Principal Structure

Existing Entrance Door Type	Existing Garage Door Type
Wood	—
Door Finish	Proposed Door Type
Stained	carriage house style
Proposed Door Style	Proposed Door Color
wood paneled	match trim

C.1 Architectural Review Worksheet: Exterior Trim

Exterior Trim	Existing Door Trim
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Std. Lumber Profile
Proposed New Door Trim	Existing Window Trim
Hardi board or PVC	Redwood
Proposed New Window Trim	Trim Color(s)
Hardi board or PVC	brown

Do the proposed changes affect the overhangs?

Yes

C.2 Architectural Review Worksheet: Exterior Wall Finishes

Exterior Wall Finishes	Existing Finishes
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Brick

Existing Finishes Manufacturer, Style, Color	Proposed Finishes
brick and wood siding	Natural Stone

Proposed Finishes Manufacturer, Style, Color
North Shore Buff

D: Tree & Public Gardens Commission Worksheet

Type of Landscape Project	Landscape Architect/Designer
Commercial Landscape	Oakland Nursery
Architect/Designer Phone	Architect/Designer E-mail
John Doone	doone@oaklandnursery.com

Project Description

see site plan

I have read and understand the above criteria



D: (Staff Only) Tree & Public Gardens Commission Worksheet

Design plan with elevations (electronic copy as specified in instructions plus 1 hard copy)



Design Specifications as required in item 3 in "Review Guidelines and List of Criteria" above



❑ Applicant has been advised that Landscape Designer/Architect must be present at meeting

G. Demolition Worksheet

Is your property historically significant? Please attached supporting documentation. Recommended sources include ownership records, a letter from the Bexley Historical Society, etc.

No

Is your property architecturally significant? Please attached supporting documentation. Recommended sources include a letter of opinion from an architect or expert with historical preservation expertise.

No

If you answered "yes" to either of the above two questions, please describe any economic hardship that results from being unable to demolish the primary residence, and attach any supporting evidence.

If you answered "yes" to either of the above two questions, please describe any other unusual or compelling circumstances that require the demolition of the primary residence, and attach any supporting evidence.

I will provide a definite plan for reuse of the site, including proposed replacement structures, by completing Worksheets B & C and any other pertinent worksheets, along with required exhibits.

Provide a narrative time schedule for the replacement project

demo when approval is finalized, new home completed in 2025

Please provide a narrative of what impact the proposed replacement project will have on the subject property and the neighborhood.

see attachment

H: Rezoning Worksheet

Existing Zoning

R2


Proposed Zoning

R2

Reason for rezoning request

Project description

Attachments




Architectural Details

warner.pdf

Uploaded by John Behal on Mar 14, 2024 at 10:15 AM

REQUIRED




Landscape Plan and existing site trees

warner sp.pdf

Uploaded by John Behal on Mar 14, 2024 at 10:18 AM

REQUIRED




Photographs

Warner Extg Photos.pdf

Uploaded by John Behal on Mar 13, 2024 at 2:58 PM

REQUIRED

**Site Plan**


236 n columbia survey.pdf

Uploaded by John Behal on Mar 13, 2024 at 3:26 PM

**Architectural Consultant letter**


livesey letter.pdf

Uploaded by John Behal on Mar 13, 2024 at 11:15 AM

**Architect's Criteria for Replacement**


Architect's Criteria for Replacement.pdf

Uploaded by John Behal on Mar 13, 2024 at 3:59 PM

**Existing & Proposed Streetscape**


warnerstv.pdf

Uploaded by John Behal on Mar 14, 2024 at 10:56 AM

**236 North Columbia survey.pdf**


236 North Columbia survey.pdf

Uploaded by John Behal on Apr 1, 2024 at 1:46 PM

**detailed landscape plan.pdf**


detailed landscape plan.pdf

Uploaded by John Behal on May 6, 2024 at 2:35 PM

**plant list.pdf**


plant list.pdf

Uploaded by John Behal on May 6, 2024 at 2:35 PM

**236 N. Columbia crack in carport.pdf**


236 N. Columbia crack in carport.pdf

Uploaded by Kathy Rose on May 8, 2024 at 12:46 PM

**structural engineering report.pdf**

structural engineering report.pdf

Uploaded by John Behal on May 9, 2024 at 10:15 AM

**relevant code sections.pdf**

relevant code sections.pdf

Uploaded by John Behal on May 9, 2024 at 10:15 AM

**original wall section with notes.pdf**

original wall section with notes.pdf

Uploaded by John Behal on May 9, 2024 at 10:15 AM

**probable cost of renovation-addition existing house.pdf**

probable cost of renovation-addition existing house.pdf

Uploaded by John Behal on May 9, 2024 at 10:15 AM

**bexley architectural consultant letter.pdf**

bexley architectural consultant letter.pdf

Uploaded by John Behal on May 9, 2024 at 10:16 AM

History


Date	Activity
3/14/2024, 11:01:41 AM	completed payment step Payment on Record ARB-24-9
3/14/2024, 10:56:56 AM	approval step Zoning Officer was assigned to Kathy Rose on Record ARB-24-9
3/14/2024, 10:56:55 AM	John Behal submitted Record ARB-24-9
3/12/2024, 2:20:17 PM	John Behal altered Record ARB-24-9, changed ownerPhoneNo from "" to "6143487895"
3/12/2024, 2:20:17 PM	John Behal altered Record ARB-24-9, changed ownerPostalCode from "" to "43209"
3/12/2024, 2:20:17 PM	John Behal altered Record ARB-24-9, changed ownerState from "" to "Ohio"
3/12/2024, 2:20:17 PM	John Behal altered Record ARB-24-9, changed ownerStreetName from "" to "South Virginialee Road"
3/12/2024, 2:20:17 PM	John Behal altered Record ARB-24-9, changed ownerStreetNo from "" to "123"
3/12/2024, 2:20:17 PM	John Behal altered Record ARB-24-9, changed ownerCity from "" to "Columbus"
3/12/2024, 2:20:17 PM	John Behal altered Record ARB-24-9, changed ownerEmail from "" to "yfh121@outlook.com"
3/12/2024, 2:20:17 PM	John Behal altered Record ARB-24-9, changed ownerName from "" to "Yoaz Saar (Dr. and Mrs. John Warner in contract)"

Date	Activity
3/12/2024, 9:46:07 AM	John Behal started a draft of Record ARB-24-9

Timeline


Label	Activated	Completed	Assignee	Due Date	Status
\$ Payment	3/14/2024, 10:56:55 AM	3/14/2024, 11:01:41 AM	John Behal	-	Completed
✓ Zoning Officer	3/14/2024, 10:56:55 AM	-	Kathy Rose	-	Active
✓ Design Planning Consultant	-	-	-	-	Inactive
✓ Architectural Review Board	-	-	-	-	Inactive
✓ Board of Zoning and Planning	-	-	-	-	Inactive
✓ City Council	-	-	-	-	Inactive
✓ Tree Commission	-	-	-	-	Inactive
✓ Arborist	-	-	-	-	Inactive

BEHAL SAMPSON DIETZ
990 WEST THIRD AVE.
COLUMBUS, OHIO 43212



FIRST FLOOR PLAN

SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"




SCHEMATIC DRAWINGS FOR THE
WARNER RESIDENCE

236 NORTH COLUMBIA AVE
BEXLEY, OHIO


03.14.24

BEHAL SAMPSON DIETZ
990 WEST THIRD AVE.
COLUMBUS, OHIO 43212



SECOND FLOOR PLAN

SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"



SCHEMATIC DRAWINGS FOR THE
WARNER RESIDENCE

236 NORTH COLUMBIA AVE
BEXLEY, OHIO

03.14.24

BEHAL SAMPSON DIETZ
990 WEST THIRD AVE.
COLUMBUS, OHIO 43212



WEST EXTERIOR ELEVATION

SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"

SCHEMATIC DRAWINGS FOR THE
WARNER RESIDENCE

236 NORTH COLUMBIA AVE
BEXLEY, OHIO

03.14.24

BEHAL SAMPSON DIETZ
990 WEST THIRD AVE.
COLUMBUS, OHIO 43212



NORTH EXTERIOR ELEVATION


SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"

SCHEMATIC DRAWINGS FOR THE
WARNER RESIDENCE

236 NORTH COLUMBIA AVE
BEXLEY, OHIO

03.14.24

BEHAL SAMPSON DIETZ
990 WEST THIRD AVE.
COLUMBUS, OHIO 43212



EAST EXTERIOR ELEVATION


SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"

SCHEMATIC DRAWINGS FOR THE
WARNER RESIDENCE

236 NORTH COLUMBIA AVE
BEXLEY, OHIO

03.14.24

BEHAL SAMPSON DIETZ
990 WEST THIRD AVE.
COLUMBUS, OHIO 43212



SOUTH EXTERIOR ELEVATION


SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"

SCHEMATIC DRAWINGS FOR THE
WARNER RESIDENCE

236 NORTH COLUMBIA AVE
BEXLEY, OHIO

03.14.24

BEHAL SAMPSON DIETZ
990 WEST THIRD AVE.
COLUMBUS, OHIO 43212




SCHEMATIC DRAWINGS FOR THE
WARNER RESIDENCE

236 NORTH COLUMBIA AVE
BEXLEY, OHIO

03.14.24


SITE PLAN
SCALE: 1" = 20'



NORTH COLUMBIA AVENUE



Exterior Views



Exterior Details



Interior Views



Interior Views



Main Stairwell and Hall






Bathrooms




Head Height Problems



Basement



DRAWN BY: DJH



SURVEY OF
1.100 ACRES

LYING IN

BLOCK 10

LOTS 7, 11 & PART OF LOT 12
AMENDED PLAT OF BULLITT PARK
PLAT BOOK 5, PAGE 138
CITY OF BEXLEY, COUNTY OF FRANKLIN
STATE OF OHIO

LEGEND

● IPF IRON PIN FOUND
○ RBF REBAR FOUND
○ RBS REBAR SET

BASIS OF BEARINGS:

THE BEARINGS ARE BASED ON THE OHIO STATE PLANE COORDINATE SYSTEM, SOUTH ZONE, NAD83 (CORS). SAID BEARINGS ORIGINATED FROM A FIELD TRAVERSE WHICH WAS REFERENCED TO SAID COORDINATE SYSTEM BY GPS OBSERVATIONS AND OBSERVATIONS OF SELECTED STATIONS IN THE OHIO DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION RFAI -TIME -NETWORK

NOTE.

THIS SURVEY DOES NOT REPRESENT ANY EASEMENTS THAT
MAY AFFECT THIS TRACT AND DOES NOT REPRESENT ANY
UNDERGROUND UTILITIES THAT MAY AFFECT THIS TRACT. ALL
REBAR SET ARE 5/8" DIA. 30" LONG, W/ RED PLASTIC CAP
STAMPED, "LANDMARK SURVEY".

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS SURVEY WAS PREPARED FROM AN ON THE GROUND SURVEY IN JANUARY OF 2024 MADE UNDER MY SUPERVISION AND THAT IT AND THE INFORMATION, COURSES AND DISTANCES AS SHOWN ARE CORRECT TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE.

SCOTT D. GRUNDEI, P.S.
REGISTERED SURVEYOR NO 8047

DATE

DATE: 1/15/24 FILE NO. YEH1-10B03-MISC



1 March 2024

Ms Kathy Rose
Director of Zoning and Building
City of Bexley
2242 East Main Street
Bexley, OH 43209

Re: Review of 236 North Columbia Avenue

Dear Ms Rose:

As a licensed architect in the State of Ohio who has done contextual additions in Bexley and as a teacher of architecture, I have been asked to comment on the character and quality of the structure at 236 North Columbia Avenue.

I have examined the building and reviewed the City of Bexley Zoning Ordinance Criteria to determine preservation significance. I will organize my comments relative to the list of criteria:

1. *The age and the condition of the structure:* The building is definitely in need of updating. Unfortunately, the requirements for a home in 1953 were significantly different than the expectations would be in 2024. Any attempt to rehabilitate the house would require an extreme intervention, and some things would just not be possible. Two issues would be the low ceiling heights and the tiny bathrooms. Obviously, nothing can be done about the ceilings, and to make the bathrooms more accommodative, not to mention accessible, would require imposing upon the adjacent living spaces which in turn would make them less habitable.
2. *The quality of the structure's architectural design, detail, use of materials or construction:* The architect of the house, Noverre Musson, was a good friend and a great architect. Unfortunately, we all have better and lesser designs, and this is not one of Noverre's better projects. If one compares this house to the Miller house or indeed his own house, both in Bexley, it does not measure up. Noverre studied with Frank Lloyd Wright and, dare I say, brought the Prairie Style to Columbus. But the characteristics of the Style are low, sleek and simple with lots of spatial extensions. There are some spatial extensions/overlaps with the wrap-around windows in the living room, dining room, library, and garden porch spaces, but the rest of the house is just jammed in. Not to be rude, but in defense of Noverre, there might have been too much value engineering, or someone might have miscalculated on the size of the spaces. Although FLW was famous for making low spaces because he was short, they tended to work. The fact that one must duck to get up or down the main staircase in this house is just not acceptable.

3. *The importance of the structure to the character and quality of the neighborhood:* For me, this is one of the major detriments of the house. The house is sited to have its main façade face the driveway vs the street. Already low relative to the majority of the houses on the street, it faces the street with a narrow side elevation. This has three important impacts on the neighborhood. First, the house lacks a presence in the neighborhood; second the siting leaves a big gap between this house and the neighboring house to the south; and third it lacks the scale of the other houses on the street. The property is actually two lots, and while many of the other houses on the street are more than one lot, they fill their combined lots. Put simply, there is a pattern to the development of the houses on the street and this house breaks the pattern.
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:* As I have mentioned, Noverre was the first person to bring Prairie Style Architecture to Central Ohio. The good news is that he was a prolific architect and there are many much better examples of his work. Therefore, given both the house's lesser architectural quality and general disrepair, I would offer that this house does not qualify as a significant structure.
5. *The impact on the City's real property tax base of restoration versus replacement and/or removal:* I have not seen the design for the replacement house, but I understand that its primary façade will face the street, which in itself would be a big improvement. In addition, given the state of the existing house and the increased size of the proposed house, it cannot help but improve on Bexley's property tax base.

It is for these reasons that I would recommend that the Bexley Architectural Review Board allow the demolition of 236 North Columbia Avenue. If you would like further elaboration or clarification, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,


Robert S. Livesey FAIA FAAR
Professor and Director Emeritus



BEHAL [SAMPSON] DIETZ
A R C H I T E C T U R E & C O N S T R U C T I O N

March 13, 2024

Ms. Kathy Rose
Director of Zoning and Building
City of Bexley
2242 East Main Street
Bexley, Ohio 43209

Re: Application for Demolition of Existing House at 236 North Columbia Avenue

Dear Ms. Rose,

We request approval for demolition of the existing house at 236 North Columbia Avenue and replacement with a larger home that more appropriately addresses the Columbia Avenue frontage and is compatible in scale with other surrounding homes. Behal Sampson Dietz has established a long history of high-quality renovation and new home designs in Bexley, and our proposal for this project will be an enhancement to the block and the community.

The relevant issues to support demolition and new construction per the Bexley Zoning Ordinance are outlined as follows:

Is the existing structure historically or architecturally significant?

We do not feel this home is historically or architecturally significant for the following reasons, based on the criteria in Bexley Code 1223.05 d:

- Although this home is designed by Tibbals Crumley Musson in 1953 with the addition designed in 1986 by Noverre Musson, this is not one of the best examples of their work. Other better examples of their work exist in Bexley. In addition, the building has had few updates and is in poor condition.
- The home was constructed without some important details the architect intended. Designed with heavy clay tiles, the flat asphalt shingles greatly diminish the character of the house. The entrance trellis was not built and, therefore, the stair landing projection appears visually unsupported and awkward. In addition, the main entrance lacks the importance that the trellis covering would have given it.

- The interior of the main entrance, as well as the stairwell, feel awkward and very modest for this type of home.
- Low ceilings throughout the first floor, as well as lack of vertical clearance at the stairwell and some door openings are problematic.
- The 1986 addition diminished the front enclosed patio and garden area to a point which makes the remaining space undesirable.
- Unfortunately, a brick-pierced wall is the main visible street façade. This looks more like a trash enclosure than the main façade of the home on North Columbia.
- As is evidenced by the street view of the block, the home is grossly out of scale with the very large adjoining properties.
- The kitchen was renovated in 1976 in a 70's style that is not in keeping with the original architecture.
- Although the house was built for Charles Lazarus, a prominent Columbus businessman, many, many Bexley homes were built for prominent business people. This, therefore, does not lend any particular historical significance.
- The home lacks many interesting features/details that distinguish high quality mid-century homes.
- The more than one-acre site near Commonwealth Park can support a more valuable home which would generate more property tax revenue for the City than the current home.

Based on these factors, we feel the Board should determine a lack of historical or architectural significance and allow the demolition.

If the Board does not agree with this conclusion, we further submit that there is economic hardship and there are unusual and compelling circumstances, per Bexley Code Sections 1223.05 e and f, that allow for its demolition, as noted in the following lists:

Is there Economic Hardship if demolition is not approved?

- If renovation is attempted, the cost of bringing the home up to current standards, in addition to the purchase price, would far exceed the value of the completed project. In contrast, a larger home, more in scale with other homes on this block of North Columbia, would be economically feasible.

- The cost of renovation of the existing structure, due to its inherent limitations, could easily equal the cost of the new home with much less resultant value.

Are there Unusual and Compelling Circumstances to support demolition and replacement?

- The larger proposed new home is more in scale with other adjacent homes.
- The proposed new home presents a far more appropriate street view which complements and enhances the value of adjoining properties.
- The condition of the existing home is poor. No updates are apparent since the 1986 addition.
- The kitchen does not meet current standards, especially since the laundry is combined with the kitchen.
- All bathrooms are dated and in need of renovation.
- Closet space does not meet current standards.
- Windows and sliding doors are original, in poor condition and do not meet energy standards. These would require complete replacement.
- The basement is exceedingly low, small and awkward.
- A renovation project that corrects the inherent problems in the existing house would almost certainly require demolition of the few architectural elements that give the existing house its character.
- The home is sited very low to the grade and an added perimeter drainage system in the basement indicates water infiltration issues. This is an issue that is practically impossible to correct without demolition.


We submit that the conditions of economic hardship and unusual and compelling circumstances allow for the demolition of the existing house and construction of a more appropriate and valuable home on this property.

Sincerely yours,



John Behal







**PUBLIC MEETING NOTICE
CITY OF BEXLEY
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
BOARD OF ZONING & PLANNING
TREE & PUBLIC GARDEN COMMISSION**

The following meetings will be held in City Council Chambers, Bexley City Hall, 2242 E. Main Street, Bexley.

The Bexley Architectural Review Board (ARB) will hold a Public Meeting on the following case on **Thursday, April 11, 2024, at 6:00 PM.** *Those cases receiving a "recommendation to the Board of Zoning and Planning" by the ARB will then move on to the Board of Zoning and Planning meeting.

The Bexley Board of Zoning and Planning (BZAP) will hold a Public Hearing on the following case on **Thursday, April 25, 2024, at 6:00 PM.**

The Bexley Tree and Public Garden Commission (TPGC) will hold a Public Meeting on **Wednesday, April 17, 2024, at 4:00 PM** for cases recommended by ARB or BZAP to receive landscape review or requests to landscape in the City right-of-way.

You are receiving this notice because of your proximity to one of the following ARB, BZAP or TPGC cases. The completed applications are on file and available for public inspection at the Bexley City Hall Monday through Friday or on the City's website at www.bexley.org one week prior to the meeting. These proceedings are open to the public. All interested persons are invited to attend.

The APPLICANT or REPRESENTATIVE must be present at the Public Hearing. The Board may dismiss, without hearing, an application if the applicant or authorized representative is not in attendance. The Board may move to consider the application in those circumstances where dismissal without hearing would constitute a hardship on the adjoining property owners or other interested persons.

The following applications are seeking design approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness from the Architectural Review Board on April 11, 2024, at 6 PM:

Application No. Property Address Brief Description of Project

BZAP-24-3	690 Vernon	New Front porch, garage addition (remand back to ARB)
ARB-23-36	217 N. Stanwood	New front porch 3-season room, slate roof modification & arbor
ARB-24-2	148 S. Ardmore	2 nd story addition at the rear of the principal structure
ARB-24-5	125 Ashbourne	1 st and 2 nd floor additions to principal structure
ARB-24-6	481 N. Parkview	2 nd floor dormers
ARB-24-7	2688 E. Broad	Request to replace slate roof with asphalt shingles

ARB-24-8	505 N. Drexel	2 nd floor dormers, addition to side and new front porch
ARB-24-9	236 N. Columbia	Demolish existing house and replace with new house
ARB-24-10	155 S. Drexel	Screen porch expansion and remodel

The following applications are seeking a Certificate of Appropriateness and variance request from the Board of Zoning and Planning (BZAP), and will therefore be heard at both the **April 11, 2024, ARB meeting** for a design recommendation, as well as the **April 25, 2024, BZAP meeting** for approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness and variance request:

<u>Application No.</u>	<u>Property Address</u>	<u>Brief Description of Project</u>
BZAP-24-4	2498 Fair	New detached garage – special permit for functional dormer
BZAP-24-5	2700 E. Main	Architectural Review and approval to change the color of the building
BZAP-24-9	129 S. Cassingham	variance to allow 2 nd and 3 rd floor addition at non-conforming setback

The following applications are seeking a variance request from the Board of Zoning and Planning (BZAP), and will therefore be heard at the **April 25, 2024, BZAP meeting** for a variance request:

BZAP-24-7	394 S. Columbia	variance to allow 36" columns at the driveway entrance
BZAP-24-8	2711 Brentwood	variance to allow Driveway expansion to 20' in width on west side of property
BZAP-24-10	2829 Columbus	variance to allow a 48" high fence in a portion of the front yard
BZAP-24-11	543 S. Drexel	seeking a Conditional Use approval to allow a Day& after school Camp


The following applications are seeking landscape review and approval, from the Tree and Public Garden Commission and will therefore be heard at the **April 17, 2024 TPGC meeting at 4 PM**:

F-23-120	261 N. Drexel	Landscape review of north side yard area
BZAP-24-7	394 S. Columbia	Landscape plan for columns at driveway entrance

A copy of the application will be available on our website 1 week prior to the meeting.

Any questions regarding an application should be emailed to Kathy Rose at: krose@bexley.org and write **ARB** or **BZAP** in the subject line and the address in question, to prioritize it make sure that it is addressed prior to the day of the meeting. Any other questions please call the Bexley Building Department at (614)559-4240.

Mailed: March 28, 2024



LEGEND

- IPF IRON PIN FOUND
- RBF REBAR FOUND
- RBS REBAR SET
- UTILITY POLE
- GUY WIRE ANCHOR
- FIRE HYDRANT
- WATER TAP
- GAS METER
- GAS VALVE
- DECIDUOUS TREE
- XXX EXISTING CONTOUR LINE
- B/C BACK OF CURB

DEED REFERENCE:
 DAVID K. LOWE,
 SUCCESSOR TRUSTEE
 I.N. 202310120107093
 P.I.D. 020-004484

BASIS OF BEARINGS:

THE BEARINGS ARE BASED ON THE OHIO STATE PLANE COORDINATE SYSTEM, SOUTH ZONE, NAD83 (CORS). SAID BEARINGS ORIGINATED FROM A FIELD TRAVERSE WHICH WAS REFERENCED TO SAID COORDINATE SYSTEM BY GPS OBSERVATIONS AND OBSERVATIONS OF SELECTED STATIONS IN THE OHIO DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION REAL-TIME-NETWORK.


NOTE:

THIS SURVEY DOES NOT REPRESENT ANY EASEMENTS THAT MAY AFFECT THIS TRACT AND DOES NOT REPRESENT ANY UNDERGROUND UTILITIES THAT MAY AFFECT THIS TRACT. ALL REBAR SET ARE 5/8" DIA. 30" LONG, W/ RED PLASTIC CAP STAMPED "LANDMARK SURVEY"

SOURCE BENCHMARK:

FRANKLIN COUNTY ENGINEER MONUMENT "BEXLEY"
 BEING A BRASS PLAQUE ON THE TOP OF A ONE FOOT SQUARE CONCRETE MONUMENT AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF EAST BROAD STREET AND WESTLAND AVENUE, 6.5 FEET SOUTH OF THE CURB FACE OF EAST BROAD STREET, 18 FEET WEST OF THE CENTERLINE OF WESTLAND AVENUE, 12 INCHES ABOVE THE GROUND.
 ELEV.=780.08 NAVD 88 DATUM

GRAPHIC SCALE



BOUNDARY & TOPOGRAPHIC SURVEY OF
1.100 ACRES
 LYING IN
 BLOCK 10
 LOTS 7, 11 & PART OF LOT 12
 AMENDED PLAT OF BULLITT PARK
 PLAT BOOK 5, PAGE 138
 CITY OF BEXLEY, COUNTY OF FRANKLIN
 STATE OF OHIO

FLOOD NOTE:

THE SUBJECT PROPERTY LIES IN ZONE X (AREA DETERMINED TO BE OUTSIDE THE 500 YEAR FLOODPLAIN), AS DETERMINED BY GRAPHIC INTERPOLATION FROM THE FLOOD INSURANCE RATE MAP NUMBER 39049C0327K, WITH AN EFFECTIVE DATE OF 6/17/2008, PUBLISHED BY THE FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY.

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS SURVEY WAS PREPARED FROM AN ON THE GROUND SURVEY IN JANUARY OF 2024 AND MARCH OF 2024 MADE UNDER MY SUPERVISION AND THAT IT AND THE INFORMATION, COURSES AND DISTANCES AS SHOWN ARE CORRECT TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE.

Scott D. Grunlei 3/27/24
 SCOTT D. GRUNLEI, P.S.
 REGISTERED SURVEYOR NO. 8047



LANDMARK
 SURVEY GROUP
 690 LAKEVIEW PLAZA BLVD. SUITE A
 WORthington OH, 43085
 PHONE: (614) 485-9000
 WWW.LANDMARKSURVEY.COM
 DATE: 1/15/24
 REV: 3/27/24
 FILE NO. YFH1-JOB02-MISC



Architectural Review Board Meeting Agenda

April 11, 2024

6:00 PM

- 1) Call to Order
- 2) Roll Call of Members
- 3) Approval of Minutes
- 4) Public Comments
- 5) Old Business

- 1) ***Tabled to 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.***

- 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.*

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.*

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.*

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.

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.

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.

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.

7) Other Business

14) *Update*

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

Address: 2829 Columbus

Applicant: Andrew Frankhouser

8) Adjourn



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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">i. Architectural design, new or existingii. Exterior materials, texture and coloriii. Exterior detailsiv. Height and building massv. 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 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.
- 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 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 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 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 is 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.
- Compatability: 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

**Video of Bexley Architectural Review Board Meeting
on April 11, 2024**

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YoGTP3GUQo>
from 27:14 through 27:44 AND 47:25 through 2:06:40



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 Wirsanski, 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 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.

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.



**PUBLIC MEETING NOTICE
CITY OF BEXLEY
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
BOARD OF ZONING & PLANNING
TREE & PUBLIC GARDEN COMMISSION**

The following meetings will be held in City Council Chambers, Bexley City Hall, 2242 E. Main Street, Bexley.

The Bexley Architectural Review Board (ARB) will hold a Public Meeting on the following case on **Thursday, May 9, 2024, at 6:00 PM.** *Those cases receiving a "recommendation to the Board of Zoning and Planning" by the ARB will then move on to the Board of Zoning and Planning meeting.

The Bexley Board of Zoning and Planning (BZAP) will hold a Public Hearing on the following case on **Thursday, May 23, 2024, at 6:00 PM.**

The Bexley Tree and Public Garden Commission (TPGC) will hold a Public Meeting on **Wednesday, May 15, 2024, at 4:00 PM** for cases recommended by ARB or BZAP to receive landscape review or requests to landscape in the City right-of-way.

You are receiving this notice because of your proximity to one of the following ARB, BZAP or TPGC cases. The completed applications are on file and available for public inspection at the Bexley City Hall Monday through Friday or on the City's website at www.bexley.org one week prior to the meeting. These proceedings are open to the public. All interested persons are invited to attend.

The APPLICANT or REPRESENTATIVE must be present at the Public Hearing. The Board may dismiss, without hearing, an application if the applicant or authorized representative is not in attendance. The Board may move to consider the application in those circumstances where dismissal without hearing would constitute a hardship on the adjoining property owners or other interested persons.

The following applications are seeking design approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness from the Architectural Review Board on **May 9, 2024, at 6 PM:**

<u>Application No.</u>	<u>Property Address</u>	<u>Brief Description of Project</u>
ARB-24-2	148 S. Ardmore	2 nd story addition at the rear of the principal structure
ARB-24-13	176 S. Stanwood	One story additions to rear of principal structure & Garage addition
ARB-24-14	2357 Bexley Park	Attached garage, detached garage and covered patio
ARB-24-15	1004 Vernon	Two story addition to rear of principal structure
ARB-24-16	2557 E. Broad	Sunroom addition to rear of principal structure
ARB-24-8	505 N. Drexel	2 nd floor dormers, addition to side, new front porch Tabled April 11

ARB-24-9 236 N. Columbia Demolish existing house and replace with new house

The following applications are seeking a Certificate of Appropriateness and variance request from the Board of Zoning and Planning (BZAP), and will therefore be heard at both the **May 9, 2024, ARB meeting** for a design recommendation, as well as the **May 23, 2024, BZAP meeting** for approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness and variance request:

<u>Application No.</u>	<u>Property Address</u>	<u>Brief Description of Project</u>
ARB-24-12	2172 E. Livingston	Addition to front, modifications and variance from required front setback
BZAP-24-12	319 S. Columbia	Addition to house – Variance for Replacement garage with a 2 nd Floor
BZAP-24-9	129 S. Cassingham	variance to allow 2 nd and 3 rd floor addition - tabled on April 11 th
BZAP-23-23	2200 E. Main	Update on Conditions of Approval


The following applications are seeking landscape review and approval, from the Tree and Public Garden Commission and will therefore be heard at the **May 15, 2024 TPGC meeting at 4 PM**:

BZAP-23-23	2200 E. Main	Update on Conditions of Approval
BZAP-24-7	394 S. Columbia	Landscape plan for columns at driveway entrance

A copy of the application will be available on our website 1 week prior to the meeting.

Any questions regarding an application should be emailed to Kathy Rose at: krose@bexley.org and write **ARB** or **BZAP** in the subject line and the address in question, to prioritize it make sure that it is addressed prior to the day of the meeting. Any other questions please call the Bexley Building Department at (614)559-4240.

Mailed: April 26, 2024



PLANT LIST

QUANTITY	PLANT NAME	SIZE
GROVE TREES		
4	Kousa Dogwood	CORNUS 'Kousa' 1.5"-2" caliper
6	Eastern Red Bud	CERCIS canadensis 6' Multi-stem
TREES		
2	COLUMNAR EUROPEAN HORNBEAM	CARPINUS BETULUS 'Franz Fontaine' 2.5"
3	MALUS	MALUS 'Raspberry Spear' 1.5" caliper
1	PAPERBARK MAPLE	ACER GRISEUM 2.5"
2	MAGNOLIA	MAGNOLIA x 'Jane' LITTLE GIRL 7-8'
1	UPRIGHT JUNIPERS	JUNIPERUS chinensis 'Trautman' 6'-7'
4	SERVICEBERRY	AMELANCHIER canadensis 'Glenn Form' RAINBOW PILLAR 2" caliper
2	JAPANESE MAPLE	ACER palmatum 'Bloodgood' 7'-8'
8	ARBORVITAE	THUJA plicata x standishii 'Green Giant' 8'-10'
15	ARBORVITAE	THUJA occidentalis 'Smaragd' 7'-8'
1	Kousa Dogwood	CORNUS 'Kousa' 1.5"-2" caliper
2	UPRIGHT JUNIPERS	JUNIPERUS CHINENSIS 'TAYLOR' #7 (4')
2	UPRIGHT JUNIPERS	JUNIPERUS CHINENSIS 'TAYLOR' #7 (4')
SHRUBS		
6	FLOWERING VIBURNUM	VIBURNUM carlesii 'Cayuga' 24" B&B
11	FLOWERING VIBURNUM	VIBURNUM SPECIES 3'
3	WITCHHAZEL	HAMAMELIS VERNALIS 4'
14	YEW	TAXUS 'Densiformis' 18-24"
13	HYDRANGEA	HYDRANGEA paniculata 'ILVOBO' Bobo #5
8	HYDRANGEA	HYDRANGEA paniculata 'Little Quick Fire' #5
41	GREEN VELVET BOXWOOD	BUXUS X 'GREEN VELVET' 15-18"
5	GREEN MOUNTAIN BOXWOOD	BUXUS X 'GREEN MOUNTAIN' 48"
9	LILAC	SYRINGA PATULA 'Dwarf Korean' 24-30"
11	DWARF BARBERRY	BERBERIS 'CRIMSON PYGMY' #3
8	SUMMERSWEET	CLETHRЯ 'Hummingbird' #3
10	JUNIPER	JUNIPERUS procumbens 'Nana' 15-18"
10	Dwarf Norway Spruce	PICEA abies 'Pumilla' #5
16	DENSE YEW	TAXUS M. DENSIFORMIS 18"
7	EUONYMUS	EUONYMUS 'Emerald Gaiety' 18"
PERENNIALS & GRASSES		
7	CRANESBILL	GERANIUM sanguineum 'Max Frei' #1
12	HOSTA	HOSTA SPECIES #1
43	CORALBELLS	HEUCHERA SPECIES #1
18	FALSE SPIREA	ASTILBE species #1
6	VERONICA	Veronica spicata 'Purplelicious' PP1763 #1
18	LILYTURF	Liriope muscari 'Variegata' #3



070



Architectural Review Board Meeting Agenda

May 9, 2024

6:00 PM

1) Call to Order

2) Roll Call of Members

3) Approval of Minutes

4) Public Comments

5) Old Business

1) 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.

The applicant will be giving the Board an update on progress and conditions of approval.

2) 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.*

3) 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.

- 4) 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.
- 5) 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.

6) **New Business:**

- 6) Application Number: ARB-24-12
Address: 2172 E Livingston
Applicant: Eric Jenison
Owner: Robert Dean Huffman
Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural Review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for an addition to the front, modifications and a variance from the required front setback.
- 7) Application Number: ARB-24-13
Address: 176 S Stanwood
Applicant: Amy Lauerhass
Owner: Ed & Sheila Straub
Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural Review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for a one story addition to the rear of the principal structure and a garage addition.
- 8) Application Number: ARB-24-14
Address: 2357 Bexley Park
Applicant: Guy Allison
Owner: Meara Alexa Simon

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural Review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish deteriorated garage structure and existing wood deck and replace with attached garage addition and covered patio.

9) Application Number: ARB-24-15
Address: 1004 Vernon
Applicant: Cory Smith
Owner: Cory Smith
Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural Review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for a two story addition to the rear of the principal structure.

10) Application Number: ARB-24-16
Address: 2557 East Broad
Applicant: Stephanie Hayward
Owner: Kelly Gebert
Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural Review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for a sunroom addition to the rear of the principal structure.

11) Application Number: BZAP-24-12
Address: 319 S Columbia
Applicant: Amy Lauerhass
Owner: Debbie & Mike Nickoli
Request: The applicant is seeking a recommendation to the Board of Zoning and Planning for a Certificate of Appropriateness for an addition to the home and a variance for the replacement garage to include a 2nd floor.

7) Other Business

8) Adjourn



Architectural Review Board Staff Report

May 09, 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">i. Architectural design, new or existingii. Exterior materials, texture and coloriii. Exterior detailsiv. Height and building massv. Preservation of existing trees and significant landscape features.

Consent Agenda Items:

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

Application Number: ARB-24- 8
Address: 505 N Drexel
Applicant: Brenda Parker
Owner: John & Abby Mally

Application Number: ARB-24-13
Address: 176 S Stanwood
Applicant: Amy Lauerhass
Owner: Ed & Sheila Straub

Application Number: ARB-24-16
Address: 2557 East Broad
Applicant: Stephanie Hayward
Owner: Kelly Gebert

Application Number: BZAP-24-12
Address: 319 S Columbia
Applicant: Amy Lauerhass
Owner: Debbie & Mike Nickoli

Old Business

- 1) 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.

Background: This applicant was before the ARB in January at a special meeting to review the conditions of approval listed below. While some conditions were met not all were completed. The applicant will be before the Board at this meeting to present material boards and samples and developed elevations.

The following is the list of ARB conditions that required approval in order to return to BZAP for final approval:

2. The applicant modifies the architecture to be in accordance with the Architectural Review Board recommendations #1 - #8 in the ARB Decision and Record of Action 11/29/23. Those conditions are:
 - ARB-1. The applicant returns to the ARB with material boards and samples.
 - ARB-2. Headlight screening be added to the parking lots where needed.
 - ARB-3. The west drive on the site be redesigned to enhance the green space and allow substantial tree planting.
 - ARB-4. The north and west elevations of the proposed building be reworked to lessen the massing, create better connection to the ground, screen the garage, and use more consistent materials.
 - ARB-5. The height on the west and north elevations toward the rear of the site be reduced.
 - ARB-6. The west elevation have more variation in the plane of the facade and the height.
 - ARB-7. The ARB supports the addition of the sixth story architecturally to allow flexibility in lessening the overall massing of the building.
 - ARB-8. Outdoor dining adjustments be reviewed by the ARB when a tenant is secured.

Staff Comments: The applicant has will be presenting materials which would fulfill ARB-1 of the conditions. ARB-2 and ARB 4-7 have been addressed with consensus that they have been satisfied at the ARB Special Meeting for this project held on January 31st, 2024. ARB-3 includes as a critical component the opinion of TPGC and ARB- 8 is a condition that cannot be met until a tenant is secured. IF ARB-1 is satisfied and the Board confirms that ARB 2-8 are either satisfied or have enough information to move forward with conditions that the applicant brings updates to the ARB as the project progresses (ie a tenant is secured) then staff is comfortable moving this application back to BZAP for final approval. (Minutes from Januarys special meeting have been attached to the application on the City's website)

2) ***Consent Agenda Item***

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.

Background: This applicant was before the Board for a conceptual review in March. 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 are compatible with the existing structure.
- Adheres to Criteria of Architectural Appropriateness.

Staff Comments: The applicant has hired a designer and made changes as conditioned by the Board. Staff is comfortable with approval as a consent agenda item.

3) **Consent Agenda Item**

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 was before the Board at the April 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 are 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.

4) 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 was before the Board at the April meeting. The Board recommended design changes and some of 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 addition still seems tall for the style.
- Compatibility: All material, elements, windows, etc... of the new structure are compatible with the existing structure - the windows on the 2nd story addition may be more appropriate as dormers with a lower roof.
- Adheres to Criteria of Architectural Appropriateness but needs design refinement.

Staff Comments: The applicant has made changes as conditioned by the Board. However, the proportions of the roof still feel out of character with the style of the original home. Staff has spoken with the applicant and suggested that lowering the hip and using dormers would be more in character with the Arts and crafts language of the existing structure.

5) 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 was before the Board at the April meeting. The applicant asked to be tabled to the May meeting.

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

Staff Comments: Additional information has been added to the application.

These include an opinion letter from an architect hired by the City and a Structural engineering report submitted by the applicant. Below is the demolition ordinance for the Boards reference. As a reminder of the process for demolition or removal of existing structures, it is the Boards responsibility to determine (1) is the structure historically or architecturally significant AND (2) is it worthy of preservation. The proposed new design should then be discussed if the structure is determined not worthy of preservation and the decision to allow the demolition is dependent on the evaluation of the new design.

New items for Consideration of proposed demolition

1. Letter from Joe Kuspan
2. Evaluation from Structural Engineer

3. All Board members and professional experts have been given the opportunity to tour the property and structure.

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.

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.)

6) **New Business:**

6) Application Number: ARB-24-12

Address: 2172 E Livingston

Applicant: Eric Jenison

Owner: Robert Dean Huffman

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural Review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for an addition to the front, modifications and a variance from the required front setback.

Staff report to be given by Planning Consultant, Jason Sudy

7) **Consent Agenda Item**

Application Number: ARB-24-13

Address: 176 S Stanwood

Applicant: Amy Lauerhass

Owner: Ed & Sheila Straub

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural Review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for a one story addition to the rear of the principal structure and a garage 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.
- 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 applicant has made changes as conditioned by the Board. Staff is comfortable with approval as a consent agenda item. The applicant has agreed to make changes as recommended.

8) Application Number: ARB-24-14

Address: 2357 Bexley Park

Applicant: Guy Allison

Owner: Meara Alexa Simon

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural Review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish deteriorated garage structure and existing wood deck and replace with attached garage addition and covered patio.

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 of the new addition seems awkward - especially the east elevation.
- Compatability: All material, elements, windows, etc... of the new structure are compatible with the existing structure.
- Adheres to Criteria of Architectural Appropriateness.

Staff Comments: The concept of this garage demolition and addition to the primary structure seems fine. However, the details and massing need to be refined and connections to the original structure should be more elegant and seamless. In particular the east elevation seems long and disproportional to the style of the original home. Staff suggests the applicant table the application for design refinement and development.

9) Application Number: ARB-24-15

Address: 1004 Vernon

Applicant: Cory Smith

Owner: Cory Smith

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural Review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for a two story addition to the rear of the principal structure.

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 but need some refinement on the roof slope and windows including those in the dormer.
- Compatability: All material, elements, windows, etc... of the new structure are compatible with the existing structure.
- Adheres to Criteria of Architectural Appropriateness.

Staff Comments: The concept of this addition seems fine. However, the roof of the addition seems low and looking at a greater pitch may create better proportions. Also a study of the windows looking at shape, placements and divides should be done. Staff recommends the applicant table this application to the June ARB meeting.

10) **Consent Agenda Item**

Application Number: ARB-24-16

Address: 2557 East Broad

Applicant: Stephanie Hayward

Owner: Kelly Gebert

Request: The applicant is seeking Architectural Review and approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness for a sunroom addition to the rear of the principal structure.

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 are 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 and to work with the applicant on Board recommendations.

11) ***Consent Agenda Item***

Application Number: BZAP-24-12

Address: 319 S Columbia

Applicant: Amy Lauerhass

Owner: Debbie & Mike Nickoli

Request: The applicant is seeking a recommendation to the Board of Zoning and Planning for a Certificate of Appropriateness for an addition to the home and a variance for the replacement garage to include a 2nd floor.

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 are 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.

7) **Other Business**

Discussion: Murals on Main Street, Megan Meyer, Development Director

8) **Adjourn**

Kooi LLC

900 Foxcreek Road
Sunbury, OH 43074



Yoaz Saar

Date
5.07.2024

Yore Fine Builders
367 North Columbia Avenue
Columbus, OH 43209

236 North Columbia Avenue
Columbus, OH 43209

Yoaz,

At your request, I performed a visual structural assessment of the residential structure at the above stated address on Thursday May 2, 2024. The structural assessment was requested to review the overall structural integrity of the existing structure. Existing documents were provided for my review. The existing two-story structure was constructed in 1953 and is comprised of conventional wood framing. The roof framing members are wood rafters supported on interior and exterior walls. The floor framing members are 2x10 @ 16"o.c. supported by exterior walls and interior beams and walls. The basement is comprised of CMU foundation walls. There have been several additions added to the original footprint of the structure. The front entrance is located on the north side of the structure and will be the main point of reference.

Observations:

- Exterior framing and grade:

- The difference between first floor framing and top of grade varies through the perimeter, however at most of the first floor framing the top of grade is above the bottom of the sill plate and partially into the rim board height.
- The brick façade is brought down below grade.
- All except for (1) window well have been closed.
- Signs of water saturation and water infiltration were prevalent around the perimeter of the structure. Certain areas showed signs of water saturation and efflorescence for several courses above grade.



Exterior grade at south side



Exterior grade at west side



Exterior grade at east side



Exterior framing at north low roof



Exterior grade at south side



Exterior framing at south low roof



Gutter downspout at south side



Exterior framing and downspout at west

- **Roof framing:**

- Gutters were not present at all roof eaves and water management appeared to be consolidated into one area on the South side of the structure. The downspouts were not checked for proper working order.
- Roof flashing did not appear to be working properly as water infiltration was present at exterior wood siding components.
- Certain areas of the ceiling along exterior windows appear to have been patched in the past.
- Water infiltration was observed at the north side low roof by the western stair wall framing adjacent to the low roof.
- No visible roof sag or major shifts were observed along the roof line or inside the structure at the ceiling level.



Ceiling patching



Water infiltration at north side wall / low roof

- **Floor framing:**

- There was visible water infiltration at the perimeter of the first-floor framing. The locations include the ends of the floor joist and rim board.
- There were signs of water mitigation towards the center of the first-floor framing.
- The first-floor framing had visible, perceived, and measurable deflections in several rooms.
- The second-floor framing did not have visible or perceived deflections or movements at the floor level. There were no observed plaster and/or drywall cracked at the floors or ceiling.

	
<p>Rim board water infiltration</p>	<p>Beam water infiltration at end</p>
	
<p>Rim board water infiltration at corner</p>	<p>Rim board discoloration</p>
	
<p>Rim board water infiltration</p>	<p>Rim board water infiltration at corner</p>



Rim board water infiltration at corner



Rim board water infiltration at corner

- **Basement:**

- Certain corners of the CMU foundation walls had signs of water infiltration and efflorescence.
- Exterior window well wall openings have been framed closed with CMU block.
- A sump pump was installed after the original construction was completed as parts of the concrete slab on grade were cut out and replaced.
- The crawl spaces that had a concrete mud slab installed showed signs of movement and potential heaving.



Water infiltration at CMU wall corner



Window well infill and water mitigation framing




Window well infill and water mitigation framing



Concrete lintel cracks due to internal corrosion

Comments and recommendations:

- Based on the existing construction documents, the grade is above the bottom sole plate of the wood framing as shown in the image below:



Based on my observations, this condition is prevalent around most of the perimeter of the structure. Without proper water management and precautionary measures, this detail will compromise the wood structure over time due to water infiltration. The photos that were taken are from the visible interior portion of the perimeter, however no access was available to inspect the brick to framing cavity. Water at grade would saturate the brick façade and the wood framing would absorb the moisture over time. The moisture will deteriorate the wood components and compromise the structural integrity of the exterior wall load bearing system. Without intervention, the structural integrity will be compromised, and the risk of failure would increase.


- Common practice and current building codes require the wood framed structure to be fully above the adjacent grade with an additional buffer to avoid any moisture infiltration via the sole plate or rim board.
- Proper water management will ensure longevity of the structure and minimize the opportunity for water infiltration into the structure. These measures include installing gutters and downspouts as this will lessen the water saturation around the perimeter of the structure at grade.
- Below are several ways to address the water damaged structural components:
 1. Raise the entire structure to be above current grade and in compliance with building codes and replace all water damaged wood framing. This method would require every load bearing component and brick façade to be shored and jacked simultaneously. There is no guarantee that any of the brick façade would remain in place and the likelihood of the brick being compromised would be high. In my experience, rectangular houses have been raised off the foundation. This house contains many intricacies due to geometry and brick locations including a centrally located full height chimney. This option would require a very specialized contractor who is willing to accept the high risks associated with this work.
 2. Lower the grade around the entire structure and throughout the property and replace all water damaged wood framing. This option to lower the grade may not be feasible due to adjacent lots that are at similar elevations. If the grade is lower surrounding the structure, then negative drainage may occur therefore bringing more water from surrounding areas, including adjacent lots, to this structure's basement and foundation. If proper drainage is achievable, the next topic to review would be the surrounding vegetation and trees. By lowering the grade, it will likely adversely impact the tree root system. Further consultations by a civil engineer for drainage and grading, and an arborist for tree and vegetation management would be required to further explore this option.
 3. Selective replacement the water damaged wood framing. This would require partial temporary shoring of the exterior wall and replacing the wood components. This would not be a permanent fix as it will not address water infiltration, however it would decrease the likelihood of a structural failure. This is a temporary solution and not recommended for long term usage.

4. Complete removal of the structure and replacement with a new code compliant structure that has proper water management measures in place.

My structural assessment was limited to the area stated in the image and described in this document. If further items are of concern, please bring them to my attention and I can help assess each situation.

If you have any questions or comments, please contact me.

Sincerely,



Bernardus Kooi, PE, SE, LEED AP

Structural Engineer | Owner

CHAPTER 4

FOUNDATIONS

SECTION 401

GENERAL

401.1 Application. The provisions of this chapter shall control the design and construction of the foundation and foundation spaces for buildings. In addition to the provisions of this chapter, the design and construction of foundations in flood hazard areas as established by Table 301.2(1) shall meet the provisions of Section 322. Wood foundations shall be designed and installed in accordance with AWC PWF.

Exception: The provisions of this chapter shall be permitted to be used for wood foundations only in the following situations:

1. In buildings that have not more than two floors and a roof.
2. Where interior basement and foundation walls are constructed at intervals not exceeding 50 feet (1524 mm).

401.2 Requirements. Foundation construction shall be capable of accommodating all loads in accordance with Section 301 and of transmitting the resulting loads to the supporting soil. Fill soils that support footings and foundations shall be designed, installed and tested in accordance with accepted engineering practice.

401.3 Drainage. Surface drainage shall be diverted to a storm sewer conveyance or other approved point of collection that does not create a hazard. Lots shall be graded to drain surface water away from foundation walls. The grade shall fall not fewer than 6 inches (152 mm) within the first 10 feet (3048 mm).

Exception: Where lot lines, walls, slopes or other physical barriers prohibit 6 inches (152 mm) of fall within 10 feet (3048 mm), drains or swales shall be constructed to ensure drainage away from the structure. Impervious surfaces within 10 feet (3048 mm) of the building foundation shall be sloped not less than 2 percent away from the building.

401.4 Soil tests. Where quantifiable data created by accepted soil science methodologies indicate expansive soils, compressible soils, shifting soils or other questionable soil char-

acteristics are likely to be present, the building official *may* determine whether to require a soil test to determine the soil's characteristics at a particular location. This test shall be done by an approved agency using an approved method.

401.4.1 Geotechnical evaluation. In lieu of a complete geotechnical evaluation, the load-bearing values in Table 401.4.1 shall be assumed.

401.4.2 Controlled low-strength material (CLSM). Where footings will bear on controlled low-strength material (CLSM), the CLSM shall comply with the provisions of an approved report. The report shall contain the following:

1. *Specifications for the preparation of the site prior to placement of CLSM.*
2. *Specifications for the CLSM.*
3. *Laboratory or field test method(s) to be used to determine the compressive strength or bearing capacity of the CLSM.*
4. *Test methods for determining the acceptance of the CLSM in the field.*
5. *Number and frequency of field tests required to determine compliance with Item 4.*

401.4.3 Compressible or shifting soil. Instead of a complete geotechnical evaluation, where top or subsoils are compressible or shifting, they shall be removed to a depth and width sufficient to ensure stable moisture content in each active zone and shall not be used as fill or stabilized within each active zone by chemical, dewatering or presaturation.

SECTION 402

MATERIALS

402.1 Wood foundations. Wood foundation systems shall be designed and installed in accordance with the provisions of this code.

402.1.1 Fasteners. Fasteners used below grade to attach plywood to the exterior side of exterior basement or crawl-

TABLE 401.4.1
PRESUMPTIVE LOAD-BEARING VALUES OF FOUNDATION MATERIALS ^a

CLASS OF MATERIAL	LOAD-BEARING PRESSURE (pounds per square foot)
Crystalline bedrock	12,000
Sedimentary and foliated rock	4,000
Sandy gravel and/or gravel (GW and GP)	3,000
Sand, silty sand, clayey sand, silty gravel and clayey gravel (SW, SP, SM, SC, GM and GC)	2,000
Clay, sandy, silty clay, clayey silt, silt and sandy siltclay (CL, ML, MH and CH)	1,500 ^b

For SI: 1 pound per square foot = 0.0479 kPa.

a. Where soil tests are required by Section 401.4, the allowable bearing capacities of the soil shall be part of the recommendations.

b. Where the building official determines that in-place soils with an allowable bearing capacity of less than 1,500 psf are likely to be present at the site, the allowable bearing capacity shall be determined by a soils investigation.

ment and No. 4 bars described in this section does not exceed 24 inches (610 mm).

404.1.3.3.8 Exterior wall coverings. Requirements for installation of masonry veneer, stucco and other wall coverings on the exterior of concrete walls and other construction details not covered in this section shall comply with the requirements of this code.

404.1.3.4 Requirements for Seismic Design Category C. Concrete foundation walls supporting above-grade concrete walls in *dwellings with four or more dwelling units* assigned to Seismic Design Category C shall comply with ACI 318, ACI 332 or PCA 100 (see Section 404.1.3).

404.1.4 Seismic Design Category D₀, D₁ or D₂, Deleted.

404.1.4.1 Masonry foundation walls. *Deleted.*

404.1.4.2 Concrete foundation walls. *Deleted.*

404.1.5 Foundation wall thickness based on walls supported. The thickness of masonry or concrete foundation walls shall be not less than that required by Section 404.1.5.1 or 404.1.5.2, respectively.

404.1.5.1 Masonry wall thickness. Masonry foundation walls shall be not less than the thickness of the wall supported, except that masonry foundation walls of not less than 8-inch (203 mm) nominal thickness shall be permitted under brick veneered frame walls and under 10-inch-wide (254 mm) cavity walls where the total height of the wall supported, including gables, is not more than 20 feet (6096 mm), provided that the requirements of Section 404.1.1 are met.

404.1.5.2 Concrete wall thickness. The thickness of concrete foundation walls shall be equal to or greater than the thickness of the wall in the story above. Concrete foundation walls with corbels, brackets or other projections built into the wall for support of masonry veneer or other purposes are not within the scope of the tables in this section.

Where a concrete foundation wall is reduced in thickness to provide a shelf for the support of masonry veneer, the reduced thickness shall be equal to or greater than the thickness of the wall in the story above. Vertical reinforcement for the foundation wall shall be based on Table 404.1.2(8) and located in the wall as required by Section 404.1.3.3.7.2 where that table is used. Vertical reinforcement shall be based on the thickness of the thinner portion of the wall.

Exception: Where the height of the reduced thickness portion measured to the underside of the floor assembly or sill plate above is less than or equal to 24 inches (610 mm) and the reduction in thickness does not exceed 4 inches (102 mm), the vertical reinforcement is permitted to be based on the thicker portion of the wall.

404.1.5.3 Pier and curtain wall foundations. Use of pier and curtain wall foundations shall be permitted to support light-frame construction not more than two sto-

ries in height, provided that the following requirements are met:

1. All load-bearing walls shall be placed on continuous concrete footings placed integrally with the exterior wall footings.
2. The minimum actual thickness of a load-bearing masonry wall shall be not less than 4 inches (102 mm) nominal or $3\frac{3}{8}$ inches (92 mm) actual thickness, and shall be bonded integrally with piers spaced in accordance with Section 606.6.4.
3. Piers shall be constructed in accordance with Sections 606.7 and 606.7.1, and shall be bonded into the load-bearing masonry wall in accordance with Section 606.13.1 or 606.13.1.1.
4. The maximum height of a 4-inch (102 mm) load-bearing masonry foundation wall supporting wood-frame walls and floors shall be not more than 4 feet (1219 mm).
5. Anchorage shall be in accordance with Section 403.1.6, Figure 404.1.5(1), or as specified by engineered design accepted by the building official.
6. The unbalanced fill for 4-inch (102 mm) foundation walls shall not exceed 24 inches (610 mm) for solid masonry or 12 inches (305 mm) for hollow masonry.
7. *Deleted.*


404.1.6 Height above finished grade. Concrete and masonry foundation walls shall extend above the finished grade adjacent to the foundation at all points not less than 4 inches (102 mm) where masonry veneer is used and not less than 6 inches (152 mm) elsewhere.

404.1.7 Backfill placement. Backfill shall not be placed against the wall until the wall has sufficient strength and has been anchored to the floor above, or has been sufficiently braced to prevent damage by the backfill.

Exception: Bracing is not required for walls supporting less than 4 feet (1219 mm) of unbalanced backfill.

404.1.8 Rubble stone masonry. Rubble stone masonry foundation walls shall have a minimum thickness of 16 inches (406 mm), shall not support an unbalanced backfill exceeding 8 feet (2438 mm) in height and shall not support a soil pressure greater than 30 pounds per square foot per foot (4.71 kPa/m), and shall not be constructed for *dwellings with four or more dwelling units* in Seismic Design Category C, as established in Figure 301.2(2).

404.1.9 Isolated masonry piers. Isolated masonry piers shall be constructed in accordance with this section and the general masonry construction requirements of Section 606. Hollow masonry piers shall have a minimum nominal thickness of 8 inches (203 mm), with a nominal height not exceeding four times the nominal thickness and a nominal length not exceeding three times the nominal thickness. Where hollow masonry units are solidly filled with concrete or grout, piers shall be permitted to have a nominal



PROBABLE COST OF CONSTRUCTION FOR RENOVATION & ADDITION PROJECT

236 N. Columbia Ave.
Bexley, Ohio 43209

This cost breakdown shows the probable cost of renovation of the existing house at 236 N. Columbia Ave. plus an Addition to create a total project comparable to the proposed new home.

House Square Footage Breakdown:

* Existing Structure, finished first and second floor	4,500 SQFT
* New Addition	2,500 SQFT
* New Addition finished basement	1,000 SQFT

NOTE: These costs do not include costs to raise the existing house or to repair structurally compromised main floor construction, as noted in the engineer's report.

Renovation Work

1. Site Work and Demolition	\$250,000	\$270,000
○ Demolition for new work connecting new structure to existing at south side		
○ Demolition of existing front porch and steps		
○ Demolition of existing carport to allow for basement walls repair		
○ Removal of all drywall to studs		
○ Demolition of master bathroom suite and second first floor bathroom		
○ Demolition of all other bathrooms		
○ Demolition of existing kitchen		
○ Repair and abatement of asbestos duct work		
○ Removal of all rotten and decayed exterior wood trim		
2. Shell at Existing Structure	1,125,000	1,250,000
○ Concrete and block bracing and waterproofing		
○ Tuckpointing of brick where settled		
○ Wall framing where studs needs to be replaced		
○ Roof framing where connects to Addition		
○ All new electric - up to code and upgraded to new requirements		
○ HVAC to run new ductwork where asbestos exists		
○ Repair and run new plumbing to new plumbing fixtures		

- All new windows and door package
- Exterior painting
- New insulation and drywall
- Exterior finishes, replace exterior trim where needed
- Rebuild existing carport as a 2 car full garage

3. Finishes for Existing Structure 700,000 725,000

- Interior trim detailing
- Interior doors and interior door hardware
- Cabinetry and closet systems
- Hardwood flooring
- Tile flooring and walls in all 6 baths
- New countertops
- Painting and finishing of all woodwork, walls and windows
- Specialties including bath accessories, master shower enclosure and mirrors
- Appliances
- Plumbing fixtures

Addition

1. Shell for new structure 625,000 635,000

- New foundation to include new entry way and foyer, new half bath, new kitchen and living room, new master bedroom and bathroom, new stairs
- New 1000 SQFT finished basement to include family room and bathroom
- New stairs to second floor and to new basement
- New plumbing
- New HVAC
- Exterior finishes, new boral, new brick
- New windows and doors
- Insulation and drywall

2. Finishes 500,000 515,000

- Interior trim detailing
- Interior doors and hardware
- New fireplace and mantle
- New stairs and balcony railings
- All new cabinets and closet systems
- Hardwood flooring on the first and second floors

- Laminate flooring at lower level
- Tile flooring and shower walls at master bath, tile at new kitchen backsplash
- Countertops and backsplashes
- Decorative wood beams in living room
- Painting and finishing of all woodwork, walls and windows
- Specialties including bath accessories, shower enclosures and mirrors
- Appliances package
- Plumbing fixtures

Total Home Budget Summary with Finished Lower Level

\$3,200,000 \$3,395,000

Line Item Costs Include:

- Project Management and Site Supervision
- Permit fees
- Testing and Consultants as required
- General conditions including general labor, progressive cleaning, trash hauling, final cleaning, and temporary facilities
- Expendables and reimbursable expenses
- Protection measures
- Overhead and profit

Items By Owner - Contracted directly by Owner:

- Landscaping/Irrigation softscapes and hardscapes, driveway, sidewalks, fencing
- Architectural services
- Window treatment, carpeting, draperies, wall coverings, window film, faux finishes, motorized drapery systems
- Decorative electric surface mounted fixtures
- Security system, safe
- Audio/Visual system, electronic control systems
- Interior design services
- Items not planned in Design: central vac system, steam shower, elevator, wine room or rack system, plaster

Joseph Kuspan, Architect

So that I may introduce myself to the members of the board who don't know me, I was a member of the BZA/ARB for ten years and a member of the Main Street Commission for two years. As an architect I would not call myself a historic preservationist nor a residential designer, but I have restored/renovated five houses over the past 43 years, acting as owner, architect, general contractor and many building trades from carpenter to ditch digger and everything in between! My particular area of expertise here is that I have lived in two houses designed by Noverre Musson, one of which was his own house on Clifton Avenue, which I restored and renovated over a fifteen year timespan. In addition, I presently live in a 1940 house that has an addition and renovation by Noverre from 1949. I also assisted restaurateurs Kent and Tasi Rigsby when they bought a Noverre Musson house in Upper Arlington about 25 years ago.

My wife and I are quite courageous fixer uppers, and we have had three of our house projects published in local publications, were Persons of the Year in 2017 for the restoration of our present (and last!) house, which had been on Columbus Landmark's endangered buildings list for many years. The house also won an award from the State Historic Preservation Office in 2018. It required significant reconstruction that included about half of the roof structure to be rebuilt, as well as numerous other significant issues that were addressed. In other words - a money pit. It's a delight to live here!

My primary criterion regarding all these projects was that the things you don't see, especially the foundation, is most critical. Before making an offer on our present house, I had a structural engineer assure me that it wasn't going to slide down into the creek. That was in 2013 and so far it hasn't! Everything else in wood frame construction is repairable and replaceable. Mediocre design can be transformed, and that is certainly a possibility with this house. I know there are issues with the elevation of the first floor framing relative to grade. It certainly wouldn't meet code today. Mid-century architects were pushing the envelope on technical aspects as well as aesthetic. Noverre's own house had many unusual and innovative structural, mechanical and electrical systems. I personally did not see any obvious damage in this house while in the basement, but this is most definitely not my wheelhouse.

I agree with the statements made by Rob Livesey, so I will not belabor the point. This house doesn't remotely compare in quality with his own house, nor is it comparable stylistically. The Rigsby's former house is also stylistically different from the others I know of as well. It does not appear that he had a signature style that this house is exemplary of, although it does bear resemblance to other Bexley houses of his. None of his houses that I am familiar with show a strong influence of Frank Lloyd Wright to me, other than being modernist in approach. Even with my present house, which was done by three Wright apprentices and was totally influenced by Wright's Usonian houses, he chose to use different materials and fenestration for his renovation and addition project, which we chose to modify somewhat for the sake of unity.

While I am generally opposed to demolition and the loss of our architectural heritage and the waste of resources, I am certainly not opposed in every case. Noverre's Drake Union at Ohio State was recently demolished, as it prevented the execution of a flood barrier to protect the medical center campus. Like the house in question, it was not a stellar example of his work. The fact that the house's wood framed first floor structure is situated below grade is definitely a concern. Raising the house or lowering the grade to the tune of two feet or so both seem like daunting tasks to say the least. I would not personally purchase this house and restore it, were I in the market to do so. I am not advocating for it to be either saved nor demolished, given the nuanced decisions and complexities. My assumption is that the structural analysis was done to make a case for demolition, and maybe an independent review would be in order?

I have no concerns regarding the quality of the replacement, given the reputation of those involved and the quality the surrounding context.

**Video of Bexley Architectural Review Board Meeting
on May 9, 2024**

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=S0Ffl4oQTlA>
from 1:52:30 through 3:48:05



Architectural Review Board

Decision and Record of Action - May 9, 2024, Meeting

The City of Bexley's Architectural Review Board took the following action at this meeting:

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.

During the hearing, the Board requested that the Applicant agree to the hearing being continued to permit ARB to request and consider an independent report concerning the proposed demolition from a structural engineer as permitted by Bexley City Code. The Applicant requested that the ARB vote on the application as presented.

MOTION #1: The following motion to designate the existing structure as historically or architecturally significant considering Bexley City Code Section 1223.05 (d) (1),(2), (3), (4) and (5) was made by Mr. Scott and seconded by Mr. Hall.

The findings and decisions of the Board for application number ARB- 24-9 for the property located at 236 N Columbia as stated by Kathy Rose: That the Architectural Review Board determines the existing structure is historically and architecturally significant and finds the following criteria from Bexley City Code Section 1223.05 (d) criteria to determine preservation significance have been met:

Criteria (2): The building is a unique midcentury modern home.

Criteria (4): The architect, Noverre Musson, was a contributing and significant local designer and the home was commissioned and occupied by the Lazarus family, a prominent and longtime Bexley family.

The applicant, John Behal, agreed to the findings of fact.

VOTE: All members voted in favor as follows: Mr. Hall, Mr. Heyer, Mr. Scott,

Chairperson Toney, (4) voting yes, (0) voting no, motion passed.

RESULT: The existing structure was designated a historically and architecturally significant structure.

MOTION #2: The following motion to determine whether the existing structure, designated as historically and architecturally significant, can be demolished considering the criteria from Bexley City Code Section 1223.05 (e) (1), (2) and (3), Criteria to Determine Substantial Economic Hardship, was made by Mr. Heyer and seconded by Mr. Hall:

The findings and decisions of the Board for application number ARB-24-9 for the property located at 236 N Columbia as stated by Kathy Rose: That the Architectural Review Board finds that the existing structure located at 236 N Columbia and designated historically and architecturally significant is not worthy of preservation and can be demolished using the following criteria for the evaluation of substantial and economic hardship to determine cause for demolition:

- (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 applicant, John Behal, agreed to the findings of fact.

VOTE: Mr. Heyer, Mr. Scott, Mr. Hall, Chairperson Toney, (0) voting yes, (4) voting no, motion fails.

The Board members stated the following reasons for their conclusions in evaluating the criteria for the evaluation of substantial and economic hardship:

Mr. Heyer: There is not enough evidence or substantiation to support a finding that the applicant proved any of the criteria of the Bexley City Code for substantial economic hardship.

Mr. Scott: The applicant did not provide sufficient evidence that there would be a substantial reduction of the economic value of the property, no maintenance costs for the existing structure short term or long term

were submitted and the comparable cost of preservation and rehabilitation of the existing structure vs. the cost of new construction is unclear and not sufficient to meet the third criteria. The evidence presented by the applicant was not sufficient to prove the criteria for substantial economic hardship that would permit demolition were met. Mr. Hall: There was not enough evidence presented to determine criteria (1) (2), and criteria (3) does not have enough evidence for a conclusive comparison. There was not enough evidence presented to prove there is a reduction in the property value. There was insufficient evidence presented to prove that there were unreasonable maintenance costs of the existing property. There was some evidence presented by the applicant/architect on the costs of restoration of the existing structure and construction of an addition, but there were no costs presented on the proposed new house (replacement structure), no ability to compare the costs of restoration vs. new construction, and there is insufficient evidence to find criteria for substantial economic hardship necessary to permit demolition.

Chairperson Toney: The applicant has not shown enough evidence to support criteria (1) and (2) and there is not enough information to determine criteria (3). The applicant failed to prove denial of demolition would result in reduction in the value of the property; the applicant did not prove the preservation of the existing residence imposes unreasonable maintenance costs or that the restoration and preservation of the residence imposes unreasonable costs.

RESULT:

The existing structure was denied a certificate for demolition under the evaluation of criteria from Bexley City Code Section 1223.05 (e) (1), (2) and (3), Criteria to Determine Substantial Economic Hardship.

MOTION #3:

The following motion to determine whether the existing structure, designated as historically and architecturally significant, can be demolished considering the criteria from Bexley City Code Section 1223.05 (f) (1), (2), (3), and (4), Criteria to Determine Unusual and Compelling Circumstances, was made by Mr. Heyer and seconded by Mr. Hall:

The findings and decisions of the Board for application number ARB-24-9 for the property located at 236 N Columbia as stated by Kathy Rose: That the Architectural Review Board finds that the existing structure located at 236 N Columbia and designated historically and architecturally significant is not worthy of preservation and can be

demolished using the following Bexley City Code criteria to determine unusual and compelling circumstances to determine cause for demolition:

- (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.

The applicant, John Behal, agreed to the findings of fact.

VOTE: Mr. Heyer, Mr. Scott, Mr. Hall, Chairperson Toney, (0) voting yes, (4) voting no, motion fails.

The Board members stated the following reasons for their conclusions in evaluating the criteria to determine unusual and compelling circumstances:

Mr. Heyer: (1) The structural feasibility criteria is not corroborated. (2) The replacement plan is not superior to existing structure. Superior has not been defined. (3) Contextual Compatibility of replacement plan has not been defined. (4) There was some evidence that the existing structure has an adverse effect on neighbors, but it was insufficient to support the overall criteria for demolition. Unusual and compelling circumstances were not proven by the applicant and the request for demolition fails.

Mr. Scott: (1) The letter of the structural engineer only looks toward future conditions, not the adverse existing conditions and their resolution and has not been corroborated by an independent structural engineer. (2) The replacement plan is not superior to the uniqueness of the existing site and arguably better contextually with the neighboring properties. (3) from a design perspective the replacement property does fit in with the existing community and housing but the existing house does not negatively impact the neighborhood (4) there was insufficient credible evidence that the existing structure has an adverse effect on neighbors though the proposed new structure on the property may increase the value of the neighboring properties, but there was no evidence to support that conclusion.

Mr. Hall: (1) There is not enough sufficient evidence that structurally preservation of the existing structure is not feasible and in fact there were several suggestions that made it feasible and the letter from the applicant's engineer was not corroborated; an independent report should be obtained; (2) and (3) There was not enough study or evidence to evaluate the textual compatibility of the existing structure and what the existing property could be. (4) There was no evidence presented that the existing structure as an adverse effect on neighbors.

Chairperson Toney: (1) there is not sufficient evidence that the existing house is structurally not feasible, and the Board should obtain an independent report . (2) This is one of only 3 Noverre Musson homes in the City of Bexley and the replacement plan is not superior to the existing home. (3) The application did not prove the replacement plan is more contextually compatible than the existing residence. (4) There is not sufficient evidence to show the existing structure had an adverse effect on any neighbors.

RESULT:

The existing structure was denied a certificate for demolition. under the evaluation criteria of Bexley City Code Section 1223.05 (f) (1), (2), (3), and (4), Criteria to Determine Unusual and Compelling Circumstances.

Staff Certification: Recorded from the ARB meeting on the 21st day of May, 2024.



Kathy Rose

Kathy Rose, Zoning Officer



Karen Bokor

Karen Bokor, Design Consultant

cc: Applicant, File Copy

**BZAP-24-14**

*(BZAP)Board of Zoning
& Planning Application -
Review of Variance
requests for Residential
and Commercial
Development

Status: Active

Submitted On: 5/16/2024

Primary Location

236 N COLUMBIA AV
Bexley, OH 43209

Owner

Yoaz Saar
S Virgininalee road 123
columbus, ohio 43209

Applicant

Yoaz Saar
 614-348-7895
 yfh121@outlook.com
 123 S Virginialee Rd
Columbus, OH 43209

A.1: Project Information

Brief Project Description - ALSO PROVIDE 2 HARD COPIES OF PLANS TO THE BUILDING DEPARTMENT.

Request a Demolition of existing structure and build a new home

Architecture Review**Conditional Use**

Demolition - *You must provide criteria in
accordance with Bexley Code Section 1223.05



Planned Unit Dev

Rezoning**Variance or Special Permit****What requires Major Architectural Review**

What requires Minor Architectural Review ?**Major Architectural Review****Minor Architectural Review****Appeal of ARB or Staff Decision to BZAP****State the specific nature of the Appeal.**

Need a demolition permit due to economical hardship and house not being historical

Upcoming ARB Hearing Date ---(Hearings held the 2nd Thursday of the month. Application must be submitted 4 weeks prior to the upcoming meeting date)

—

Upcoming BZAP hearing --- (Hearings held the 4th Thursday of the month. Application must be submitted 4 weeks prior to the upcoming meeting date)*

07/25/2024

All BZAP (Board of Zoning & Planning) applications that also require ARB (Architectural Review Board) design review must go to the ARB hearing PRIOR to being heard by BZAP

A.1: Attorney / Agent Information**Agent Name***

Joseph R. Miller

Agent Address

52 East Gay Street P.O. Box 1008
Columbus, Ohio 43216

Agent Email*

jrmiller@vorys.com

Agent Phone*

614-464-6233

Property Owner Name*

Yoaz Saar

Property Owner Email

yfh121@outlook.com

Property Owner Address123 S Virginialee road Columbus oh
43209**Property Owner Phone number**

6143487895

A.2: Fee Worksheet

Estimated Valuation of Project

40000

Minor Architectural Review**Major Architectural Review****Variance Review****Zoning****Zoning Review Type**

—

**Sign Review and Architectural Review for
Commercial Projects****Review Type**

—

Appeal of ARB decision to BZAP**Appeal of BZAP decision to City Council**

Conditional Use - Explain type of Use if being requested and fill out Conditional Use Criteria**Appeal of Zoning Officer determination to BZAP****Detailed explanation of appeal**

We are appealing the decision that the house is architecturally significant. We provided the ARB with expert opinions regarding the property including letters from highly regarded OSU Architectural School Professor Robert Livesey describing house as not an important or even fine example worthy of preservation in representing a historical prarie home. He stated there are many, finer examples of this type. Additionally the city brought Joe Kuspan, who himself agreed with Robert Livesy and Mr. Kuspan states it does not remotely compare in quality to other homes by same architect. He said the home is not exemplary and is without strong influence of Frank Loyd Wright who the committee continually referenced.

Additionally when pushed to provide economic hardship and compelling circumstance, we brought forth a registered structural engineer letter/report, signed, identifying major issues in the house showing poor elevation & structurally deficient and buried support, suffering from water intrusion and structural weakness at the bandboard/ringboard level. It is most cetrainly not up to current code, and most difficult is that it is below grade.

The engineer made 4 recommendations, 3 of which are untenable or impossible practically speaking!

The committee proces was exceptionally frustrating. The committee itself upon numerous occasions doubted their own process, questioned openly the validity of their own process they took us through, wondered out loud why there isn't a list of historical homes, and they had to be reminded on numerous occasions to focus on the matter at hand. The committee mebers also stated they are not equipped to make these decisions (please see youtube ARC meetings/or minutes available to view). The committee asked inappropriate questions regarding the way the home was purchaesd and the nature and goals of the buyer, which was insulting and crude. One committee member stated that it was lucky for us that there was not a historical plaque on this home. It was a poor process.

B: Project Worksheet: Property Information**Occupancy Type**

Residential

Zoning District

Use Classification 

R-2 (25% Building and 50% Overall)

B: Project Worksheet: Lot Info

Width (ft)	Depth (ft)
191	250

Total Area (SF)

47750

B: Project Worksheet: Primary Structure Info

Existing Footprint (SF)	Proposed Addition (SF)
4500	—

Removing (SF)	Type of Structure
4500	new house

Proposed New Primary Structure or Residence (SF)	Total (footprint) square foot of all structures combined
6075	6075

B: Project Worksheet: Garage and/or Accessory Structure Info (Incl. Decks, Pergolas, Etc)

Existing Footprint (SF)	Proposed Addition (SF)
400	—

New Structure Type	Ridge Height
garage	39'11"
Proposed New Structure (SF)	Is there a 2nd Floor
1112	Yes
2nd Floor SF and total volume	Total of all garage and accessory structures (SF)
1790	1112
Total building lot coverage (SF)	Total building lot coverage (% of lot)
5689	0.11
Is this replacing an existing garage and/or accessory structure?	
Yes	

B: Project Worksheet: Hardscape

Existing Driveway (SF)	Existing Patio (SF)
3000	400
Existing Private Sidewalk (SF)	Proposed Additional Hardscape (SF)
200	4000
Total Hardscape (SF)	
3600	

B: Project Worksheet: Total Coverage

Total overall lot coverage (SF)	Total overall lot coverage (% of lot)
13289	0.27

C.1 Architectural Review Worksheet: Roofing

Roofing	Structure
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	House or Principal Structure
Existing Roof Type	New Roof Type
Std. 3-tab Asphalt Shingle	Arch. Dimensional Shingles
New Single Manufacturer	New Roof Style and Color
	Gray slate

C.1 Architectural Review Worksheet: Windows

Windows	Structure
<input type="checkbox"/>	House or Principal Structure
Existing Window Type	Existing Window Materials
Casement	Wood
New Window Manufacturer	New Window Style/Mat./Color
Pella	Casement aluminum clad wood black

C.1 Architectural Review Worksheet: Doors

Doors



Structure

House or Principal Structure

Existing Entrance Door Type

Wood

Existing Garage Door Type

—

Door Finish

Painted

Proposed Door Type

insulated metal

Proposed Door Style

2 panel

Proposed Door Color

trim color

C.1 Architectural Review Worksheet: Exterior Trim

Exterior Trim



Existing Door Trim

Redwood

Proposed New Door Trim

Painted wood

Existing Window Trim

Redwood

Proposed New Window Trim

limestone and wood

Trim Color(s)

earth tone

Do the proposed changes affect the overhangs?

No

C.2 Architectural Review Worksheet: Exterior Wall Finishes

Exterior Wall Finishes**Existing Finishes**

—

Existing Finishes Manufacturer, Style, Color

wood

Proposed Finishes

Natural Stone

Proposed Finishes Manufacturer, Style, Color

natural

By checking the following box I agree (as the applicant of record) to monitor this application and respond to any additional information requested by the Zoning Officer, Design Consultant, and Bldg. Dept Staff, through the email in this application, in order to allow a notice to be written and sent out 2 weeks prior to the next scheduled meeting and to be placed on the Agenda. This includes the ARB meeting when Design Recommendation is needed prior to Board of Zoning and Planning Review. I understand that incomplete applications may be withheld from the agenda or only offered informal review.*

D: Tree & Public Gardens Commission Worksheet

Type of Landscape Project

—

Landscape Architect/Designer

Lori Botkins

Architect/Designer Phone

614-402-1775

Architect/Designer E-mail

lbotkins@oaklandnursery.com

Project Description

Landscape of new house

I have read and understand the above criteria



D: (Staff Only) Tree & Public Gardens Commission Worksheet

Design plan with elevations (electronic copy as specified in instructions plus 1 hard copy)



Design Specifications as required in item 3 in "Review Guidelines and List of Criteria" above



Applicant has been advised that Landscape Designer/Architect must be present at meeting



E.1 Variance Worksheet

Description of the Proposed Variance. Please provide a thorough description of the variance being sought and the reason why.

1. Does the property in question require a variance in order to yield a reasonable return? Can there be any beneficial use of the property without the variance? Please describe.

2. Is the variance substantial? Please describe.

3. Would the essential character of the neighborhood be substantially altered or would adjoining properties suffer a substantial detriment as a result of the variance? Please describe.

E.2 Variance Worksheet

4. Would the variance adversely affect the delivery of governmental services (e.g. water, sewer, garbage)? Please describe.

5. Did the property owner purchase the property with the knowledge of zoning restriction? Please describe.

6. Can the property owner's predicament feasibly be obviated through some method other than a variance? Please describe.

7. Is the spirit and intent behind the zoning requirement observed and is substantial justice done by granting the variance? Please describe.

F.1 Fence Variance Worksheet

Lot Type

—

Narrative description of how you plan to meet the pertinent outlined variance criteria

F.1-F.2 Fence Variance Worksheet: Side and Rear Yard Restrictions for Corner Lots

1. Compatibility: Describe how the proposed side yard fence or wall exceeding forty-eight inches in height and on the street side of a corner lot compatible with other properties in the neighborhood?

2. Height: Please verify that the maximum height of such fence or wall shall not exceed seventy-two inches as measured from the average grade, as defined in Section 1230.06. Artificially raising the height of the lot line by the use of mounding, retaining walls or similar means shall be included within the seventy-two inch maximum height.

3. Transparency: Fences exceeding forty-eight inches in height should include transparency in the upper 12" to 18" of the fence through the use of latticework, pickets, or other appropriate design elements. Describe how you have satisfied this requirement.

4. Screening: A landscaping plan must be filed with the application for a special permit, indicating how such fencing or wall is to be screened from the street side elevation. The landscape plan should be designed in such a way as to mitigate the impact of a solid fence or wall as it relates to the street and other properties. Describe how the landscape plan addresses these items.

5. Visibility and Safety: The installation of such fence or wall shall not create a visibility or safety concern for vehicular and/or pedestrian movement. Please describe any visibility/safety concerns with your design.

6. Material Compatibility: No chain link, wire mesh or other similar material shall be installed on lot lines adjacent to public rights-of-way. Please verify that your design complies with this requirement.

7. Finished Side: Any fence or wall erected on a lot located at the intersection of two or more streets must have the finished and not the structural side facing the adjacent property, alley or street. Please verify that your design complies with this requirement.

F.3 Fence Variance Worksheet

Front Yard Restrictions

Fences Adjacent to Commercial Districts

Require Commercial Fences Adjacent to Residential Districts

F.3 Fence Variance Worksheet: Front Yard Restrictions

The proposed decorative landscape wall or fence is compatible with other properties in the neighborhood.

—

The height of the fence or wall does not exceed the size permitted as above when measured from the average grade of the yard where the fence or wall is to be installed. Artificially raising the height of the lot line by the use of mounding, retaining walls or similar means shall be included in the maximum height.

—

Posts, columns and finials may extend up to 6" above the maximum allowed height of the fence panels. CHAPTER 1264. FENCES AND WALLS City of Bexley Zoning Ordinance

—

A landscaping plan shall be filed with the application indicating how such fencing and/ or wall is to be integrated with existing front yard landscaping.

—

The installation of such fence and/or wall shall not create a visibility or safety concern for vehicular and/or pedestrian movement.

—

No chain link, wire mesh, concrete block or other similar type material shall be installed as a decorative landscape wall or fence.

—

The fence and/or wall shall have a minimum of 50% transparency.

—

That the lot exhibits unique characteristics that support the increase in fence height.

—

G. Demolition Worksheet

Is your property historically significant? Please attach supporting documentation. Recommended sources include ownership records, a letter from the Bexley Historical Society, etc.

No

Is your property architecturally significant? Please attach supporting documentation. Recommended sources include a letter of opinion from an architect or expert with historical preservation expertise.

No

If you answered "yes" to either of the above two questions, please describe any economic hardship that results from being unable to demolish the primary residence, and attach any supporting evidence.

We provided a report from a structural engineer detailing the economical hardship, the structure has been subject to water intrusion, damaging structural wood members due to house foundation being too low and buried too deep in the ground, making the structure unsafe, and not up to existing code. Because of the condition of this house, we can not sell this house to a prospective buyer, nor can we fix it without investing extremely substantial amounts of resources.

If you answered "yes" to either of the above two questions, please describe any other unusual or compelling circumstances that require the demolition of the primary residence, and attach any supporting evidence.

This house was not ever designated as historical. Additionally when we purchased it we looked at remodeling it first, but the costs to repair the structural issues and additionally do a remodel to bring it up to current standards where it would be safe and comfortably liveable are extremely high/not feasible.

I will provide a definite plan for reuse of the site, including proposed replacement structures, by completing Worksheets B & C and any other pertinent worksheets, along with required exhibits.




Provide a narrative time schedule for the replacement project

Start construction as soon as we get demolition permit

Please provide a narrative of what impact the proposed replacement project will have on the subject property and the neighborhood.

The proposed new house will undoubtedly enhance the neighborhood. We have connected with all the surrounding neighbors who are supporting the new house proposal, and supporting the demolition of the existing house. The houses to either side are mansions; the current home is out of scale with surrounding homes and has been neglected in terms of garden and landscape and street presence/attention to property maintenance.


Attachments



Architectural Plan

236 full scale drawings behal.pdf

Uploaded by Yoaz Saar on May 16, 2024 at 12:57 PM



Landscape Plan

236 landscape.pdf

Uploaded by Yoaz Saar on May 16, 2024 at 1:01 PM



Photographs

236 front photo.jpg

Uploaded by Yoaz Saar on May 16, 2024 at 1:07 PM




Site Plan and Vicinity Map of immediate surrounding lots

REQUIRED

236 survey.pdf


Uploaded by Yoaz Saar on May 16, 2024 at 12:55 PM



Appeal supporting information and documents

236 Kooi engineering letter and report.pdf


Uploaded by Yoaz Saar on May 16, 2024 at 1:13 PM



236 plant list.pdf

236 plant list.pdf

Uploaded by Yoaz Saar on May 16, 2024 at 1:11 PM



Appeal.pdf

Appeal.pdf

Uploaded by Elizabeth Alexander on May 31, 2024 at 5:10 PM

History

Date	Activity
7/18/2024, 9:20:15 AM	Kathy Rose assigned approval step Zoning Officer to Kathy Rose on Record BZAP-24-14

Date	Activity
7/18/2024, 9:18:32 AM	Matt Klingler changed the deadline to Jul 25, 2024 on approval step Zoning Officer on Record BZAP-24-14
7/18/2024, 9:08:39 AM	Matt Klingler added Upcoming BZAP hearing --- (Hearings held the 4th Thursday of the month. Application must be submitted 4 weeks prior to the upcoming meeting date) to Record BZAP-24-14
7/18/2024, 9:08:39 AM	Matt Klingler added Upcoming ARB Hearing Date ---(Hearings held the 2nd Thursday of the month. Application must be submitted 4 weeks prior to the upcoming meeting date) to Record BZAP-24-14
7/18/2024, 9:01:48 AM	Kathy Rose assigned approval step Zoning Officer to Matt Klingler on Record BZAP-24-14
7/18/2024, 9:01:27 AM	altered payment step Payment, changed sequence from "1" to "0" on Record BZAP-24-14
7/18/2024, 9:01:27 AM	Kathy Rose assigned approval step Design Planning Consultant to Karen Bokor on Record BZAP-24-14
5/28/2024, 3:17:13 PM	completed payment step Payment on Record BZAP-24-14
5/17/2024, 11:25:57 AM	Kathy Rose added a guest: esalexander@vorys.com to Record BZAP-24-14
5/17/2024, 11:25:30 AM	Kathy Rose added a guest: jrmiller@vorys.com to Record BZAP-24-14
5/16/2024, 4:54:59 PM	Yoaz Saar added a guest: esalexander@vorys.com to Record BZAP-24-14
5/16/2024, 1:21:01 PM	approval step Zoning Officer was assigned to Kathy Rose on Record BZAP-24-14
5/16/2024, 1:21:00 PM	Yoaz Saar submitted Record BZAP-24-14
5/16/2024, 10:36:46 AM	Yoaz Saar altered Record BZAP-24-14, changed ownerPhoneNo from "" to "614-348-7895"
5/16/2024, 10:36:46 AM	Yoaz Saar altered Record BZAP-24-14, changed ownerPostalCode from "" to "43209"
5/16/2024, 10:36:46 AM	Yoaz Saar altered Record BZAP-24-14, changed ownerState from "" to "ohio"
5/16/2024, 10:36:46 AM	Yoaz Saar altered Record BZAP-24-14, changed ownerStreetName from "" to "S Virgininalee road"
5/16/2024, 10:36:46 AM	Yoaz Saar altered Record BZAP-24-14, changed ownerStreetNo from "" to "123"
5/16/2024, 10:36:46 AM	Yoaz Saar altered Record BZAP-24-14, changed ownerCity from "" to "columbus"

Date	Activity
5/16/2024, 10:36:46 AM	Yoaz Saar altered Record BZAP-24-14, changed ownerEmail from "" to "yfh121@outlook.com"
5/16/2024, 10:36:46 AM	Yoaz Saar altered Record BZAP-24-14, changed ownerName from "" to "Yoaz Saar"
5/16/2024, 10:34:57 AM	Yoaz Saar started a draft of Record BZAP-24-14

Timeline

Label	Activated	Completed	Assignee	Due Date	Status
⌚ Payment	5/16/2024, 1:21:00 PM	5/28/2024, 3:17:13 PM	Yoaz Saar	-	Completed
✓ Zoning Officer	5/16/2024, 1:21:00 PM	-	Kathy Rose	7/25/2024	Active
✓ Design Planning Consultant	-	-	Karen Bokor	-	Inactive
✓ Architectural Review Board	-	-	-	-	Inactive
✓ Board of Zoning and Planning	-	-	-	-	Inactive

236 N. Columbia Appeal

On May 9, 2024, the Architectural Review Board (the “ARB”) denied Appellant’s application for architectural review and approval of a certificate of appropriateness to demolish an existing home and replace with a new home (the “Decision”) at 236 North Columbia (the “Property”). In doing so, the ARB incorrectly determined that: (a) the existing home on the Property is historically and architecturally significant; (b) the denial of the certificate of appropriateness will not cause substantial and economic hardship; and (c) there are no unusual or compelling circumstances that justify the approval of the certificate of appropriateness. In making the Decision, the ARB failed to follow the Bexley Code and precedent. The ARB also failed to follow Ohio law. The Decision violates Appellant’s private property rights under the Ohio and United States Constitutions. Through counsel, Appellant intends to present argument and evidence establishing that the Board of Zoning and Planning (“BZAP”) must reverse the Decision and approve Appellant’s application for a certificate of appropriateness.



**PUBLIC MEETING NOTICE
CITY OF BEXLEY
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
BOARD OF ZONING & PLANNING**

The following meetings will be held in City Council Chambers, Bexley City Hall, 2242 E. Main Street, Bexley.

The Bexley Architectural Review Board (ARB) will hold a Public Meeting on the following case on **Thursday, July 11, 2024, at 6:00 PM.** *Those cases receiving a "recommendation to the Board of Zoning and Planning" by the ARB will then move on to the Board of Zoning and Planning meeting.

The Bexley Board of Zoning and Planning (BZAP) will hold a Public Hearing on the following case on **Thursday, July 25, 2024, at 6:00 PM.**

You are receiving this notice because of your proximity to one of the following ARB or BZAP cases. The completed applications are on file and available for public inspection at the Bexley City Hall Monday through Friday or on the City's website at www.bexley.org one week prior to the meeting. These proceedings are open to the public. All interested persons are invited to attend.

The APPLICANT or REPRESENTATIVE must be present at the Public Hearing. The Board may dismiss, without hearing, an application if the applicant or authorized representative is not in attendance. The Board may move to consider the application in those circumstances where dismissal without hearing would constitute a hardship on the adjoining property owners or other interested persons.

The following applications are seeking design approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness from the Architectural Review Board at the **July 11, 2024 meeting, at 6 PM:**

Application No. **Property Address** **Brief Description of Project**

ARB-24-21	2607 Sherwood	2-story addition to the rear of principal structure
ARB-24-22	837 Grandon	2 story & 2 nd story additions to the rear of the principal structure.
ARB-24-23	167 S. Columbia	partial demo and 2-story and 1 ½ story addition to rear of house

The following applications are seeking a Certificate of Appropriateness and variance request from the Board of Zoning and Planning (BZAP), and will therefore be heard at both the **July 11, 2024, ARB meeting for a**

design recommendation, as well as the **July 25, 2024, BZAP meeting** for approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness and variance request:

<u>Application No.</u>	<u>Property Address</u>	<u>Brief Description of Project</u>
BZAP-24-9	129 S. Cassingham	variance to allow 2 nd and 3 rd floor addition - tabled (April & June)
ARB-24-24	2554 E. Livingston	12' by 12' enclosed porch (variance for steps)
BZAP-24-19	261 N. Stanwood	1 st and 2 nd floor additions to house – variance from side setbacks

The following applications are seeking a variance request from the Board of Zoning and Planning (BZAP), and will therefore be heard at the **July 25, 2024, BZAP meeting** for a variance request:

BZAP-24-20	2505 E. Main	Food Truck to be located at the rear of the building, subject to approval
BZAP-24-14	236 N. Columbia	Appeal to BZAP of the Record of Decision from the ARB
BZAP-24-21	114 N. Merkle	Variance to allow a 6' fence along the south side yard property line

A copy of the application will be available on our website 1 week prior to the meeting.

Any questions regarding an application should be emailed to Kathy Rose at: krose@bexley.org and write **ARB** or **BZAP** in the subject line and the address in question, to prioritize it make sure that it is addressed prior to the day of the meeting. Any other questions please call the Bexley Building Department at (614)559-4240.

Mailed: June 27, 2024

Appeal
Application No. BZAP-24-14


236 North Columbia

City of Bexley, Ohio Board of Zoning and Planning

July 25, 2024

236 North Columbia

- Parcel: 020-004484-00
- Total acreage: 1.10 acres
- The existing house is oriented to the north with a side elevation facing toward the street
- Currently vacant
- Overgrown tennis court and garden



The Requested Certificate of Appropriateness

1. Demolish existing structure




2. Construct new home



Existing Structure – Exterior



Existing Structure - Interior



The Proposed Home



The Standards in the Zoning Resolution for Approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness Are Satisfied



1. The structure is not historically or architecturally significant
2. Denial of the certificate will cause substantial economic hardship
3. Unusual and compelling circumstances justify the demolition

The Standards in the Zoning Resolution for Approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness Are Satisfied



1. **The structure is not historically or architecturally significant**
2. Denial of the certificate will cause substantial economic hardship
3. Unusual and compelling circumstances justify the demolition


The Existing Structure Is Not Historically or Architecturally Significant

Each factor in Section 1223.05(d) establishes that the structure is not historically or architecturally significant:

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 Structure Is 71 Years Old and in Poor Condition

- The building was constructed in 1953 when the building code requirements were drastically different than today.
- Rehabilitation of the home would require extreme intervention.
- Two essential aspects of the home cannot feasibly be remedied:
 - Low ceiling height; and
 - Small and inaccessible bathrooms



The House Lacks Presence and Is Uninviting



- The entrance is small and uninviting as compared to other homes in the neighborhood.
- The small and narrow drive is out of place in the neighborhood.

The Structure Is Not Representative of Noverre Musson's Best Work



Noverre Musson House
2115 Clifton Avenue



The Miller House
385 North Parkview Avenue

The House Detracts from the Neighborhood

The main façade of the home faces the driveway, rather than the street, resulting in a narrow side elevation and creating three issues:

1. The house lacks a presence in the neighborhood;
2. The siting leaves a large gap between this house and the neighboring house to the south; and
3. The other homes on the street fill their lot or combined lots, while this structure breaks that pattern.

The Design Is Not Significant to the City, Central Ohio, the State, or Nation



The Noverre Musson House





The A.F. Miller Residence



Ohio School for the Deaf

The Design Is Not Significant to the City, Central Ohio, the State, or Nation



Joseph Kuspan's Letter to the Architectural Review Board Supports Demolition

My primary criterion regarding all these projects was that the things you don't see, especially the foundation, is most critical. Before making an offer on our present house,


I agree with the statements made by Rob Livesey, so I will not belabor the point. This house doesn't remotely compare in quality with his own house, nor is it comparable stylistically. The Rigsby's former house is also stylistically different from the others I

stellar example of his work. The fact that the house's wood framed first floor structure is situated below grade is definitely a concern. Raising the house or lowering the grade to the tune of two feet or so both seem like daunting tasks to say the least. I would not personally purchase this house and restore it, were I in the market to do so. I am not

I have no concerns regarding the quality of the replacement, given the reputation of those involved and the quality the surrounding context.

The Structure Should Not Be Considered a "Historic Lazarus Home"

The historic Lazarus Home on East Town Street was built in 1879 by Fred Lazarus Sr.



- Several generations removed from the founders, Charles Lazarus was raised on Bryden Road in the Franklin Park neighborhood
- The family then moved to Bexley in 1922 to South Columbia Avenue
- Charles Lazarus lived in this home later in life.

The New Home Will Improve Bexley's Tax Base

- In 2023, the property was valued at \$1,254,000 with a taxable value of \$438,900.
- However, the valuation likely did not take into consideration the poor condition of the structure.
- The new home will be a substantial improvement to the property's value.
- The demolition of the existing home and construction of new home will also increase the value of surrounding properties.

The Standards in the Zoning Resolution for Approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness Are Satisfied



1. The structure is not historically or architecturally significant
2. **Denial of the certificate will cause substantial economic hardship**
3. Unusual and compelling circumstances justify the demolition

Denial of the Certificate Will Cause Substantial Economic Hardship


Each factor in Section 1223.05(e) establishes that the owner will suffer 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.

There Is Substantial Damage to the Structure That Requires Restoration



- Signs of water saturation and water infiltration were prevalent around the perimeter of the structure, in the exterior siding, floor framing, and basement.
- Without intervention, the structural integrity will be compromised and the risk of failure will increase.





Restoration, if Feasible, Will Require Lifting the Structure or Lowering the Grade

Lifting the Structure:

- May not be feasible, as it would require expert contractor willing to lift home of irregular shape
- A specialized contractor would raise the entire structure to be above current grade and in compliance with building codes and then replace all water damaged wood framing
- This would require every load bearing component and brick façade to be shored and jacked simultaneously.

Lowering the Grade:

- May not be feasible due to adjacent lots at similar elevations.
- Lower the grade around the entire structure and throughout the property and replace all water damaged wood framing.
- Could also adversely impact the surrounding tree root system.

The Restoration Is Not Economically Feasible

Lifting the Structure:

- Involves a wide range of tasks, including but not limited to:
 - Removing landscaping and other exterior fixtures, basement ceiling, and stairs;
 - Lifting house;
 - Constructing new concrete block wall and reinforcing same;
 - Replacing all damaged structure and lowering house; and
 - Reconnecting and rebuilding house.
- **Total cost: \$893,343 - \$1,235,531**

Lowering the Grade:

- Involves a wide range of tasks:
 - Civil engineering and architectural design and drawings;
 - Remove driveway, front porch, patio, tennis court, landscaping, and large trees;
 - Underpin foundations that would then too close to grade;
 - Replace all damaged structure and design and implement a solution to newly exposed concrete block, changing the architectural integrity of the home;
 - Rebuild house.
- **Total cost: \$738,100 - \$1,048,465**

Denial of the Certificate Will Result in a Substantial Reduction in the Economic Value of the Property

- The property requires an investment of approximately \$893,343-\$1,235,531 to lift the structure or \$738,100-\$1,048,465 to lower the grade just to make it habitable.
- The property cannot absorb the cost of repair to the current structure.

The Standards in the Zoning Resolution for Approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness Are Satisfied



1. The structure is not historically or architecturally significant
2. Denial of the certificate will cause substantial economic hardship
3. **Unusual and compelling circumstances justify the demolition**



Even If the Structure Is Historically or Architecturally Significant, the Demolition Should Be Approved Due to Unique and Compelling Circumstances

Each factor in Section 1223.05(f) establishes that unique and compelling circumstances exist:

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.

The Restoration Options May Not Be Feasible

- Lifting the structure would require a highly specialized contractor and would likely result in severe damage to the brick façade because of every load bearing component being shored and jacked simultaneously.
- Lowering the grade would expose new concrete that would alter the architectural integrity of the home, disturb the drainage pattern – negatively affecting neighboring homes at a similar elevation, and potentially damage the tree root systems.

The Replacement Plan Is Superior to the Existing Structure



The Replacement Plan Is More Compatible with the Neighborhood



279 N. Columbia Ave.



316 N. Columbia Ave.




301 N. Columbia



225 N. Columbia Ave.

The Replacement Plan Is More Compatible with the Neighborhood



Demolition Is Necessary to Eliminate a Condition with a Materially Adverse Effect on the Neighborhood

- Both lifting the structure and lowering the grade will adversely affect the neighborhood:
 - Tearing down landscaping and trees that are a fixture of the neighborhood
 - Negatively impacting drainage which will affect neighboring properties
 - Disturbing tree root systems

Ohio Law Strongly Disfavors Government Intervention Into the Free Use of Property

- “There can be no doubt that the bundle of venerable rights associated with property is strongly protected in the Ohio Constitution and must be trod upon lightly, **no matter how great the weight of other forces.**” *City of Norwood v. Horney*, 2006-Ohio-3799, ¶ 38.
- “The Ohio Supreme Court has stated that **zoning resolutions are ordinarily construed in favor of the property owner.**” *Vill. of Bale Kenyon LLC v. Orange Twp. Bd. of Trustees*, Delaware C.P. No. 12CVF050482 (Jan. 18, 2013) (reversing Orange Twp. Trustees’ decision).
- “Restrictions on the use of real property by ordinance, resolution or statute must be **strictly construed**, and the scope of the restrictions **cannot be extended to include limitations not clearly prescribed.**” *Terry v. Sperry*, 130 Ohio St. 3d 125, 2011-Ohio-3364, 956 N.E.2d 276, ¶ 19.
- “All doubt is to be resolved **in favor of the free use of land by the landowner.**” *DeRosa v. Parker*, 198 Ohio App. 3d 332, 2011-Ohio-6024, ¶ 62 (7th Dist.).

Denial of the Certificate Would Subject the City to Unnecessary Liability for Damages and Attorneys' Fees

- An improper denial would violate the Zoning Code, Ohio law, and the applicant's rights protected by the United States and Ohio Constitutions, including:
 1. Deprivation of right to due process;
 2. Regulatory taking; and
 3. Failure to provide equal protection under the law.
- Constitutional violations expose the City and its officers to unnecessary liability for delay damages and attorney's fees.