



MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING  
WORTHINGTON ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD  
WORTHINGTON MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION  
February 11, 2016

The regular meeting of the Worthington Architectural Review Board and the Worthington Municipal Planning Commission was called to order at 7:30 p.m. with the following members present: Michael Coulter, Chair; Kathy Holcombe, Secretary (arrived at 7:32 p.m.); Thomas Reis; Edwin Hofmann; Amy Lloyd and David Foust. Also present were: Scott Myers, Worthington City Council Representative to the Municipal Planning Commission; Lee Brown, Director of Planning & Building; Lynda Bitar, Planning Coordinator and Clerk of the Municipal Planning Commission; and Melissa Cohan, Paralegal. Board member James Sauer, Vice Chair was absent.

**A. Call to Order – 7:30 p.m.**

1. Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Approval of minutes of the January 28, 2016 meeting

Mr. Hofmann moved to approve the January 28, 2016 minutes, and Mrs. Lloyd seconded the motion. The minutes were approved.

4. Affirmation/swearing in of witnesses

**B. Architectural Review Board**

**1. New**

- a. Deck Replacement – **6441 Bellbrook Pl.** (Cynthia Evans) **AR 16-16**

**Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

**Background & Request:**

This house at the northwest corner of W. Dublin-Granville Rd. and Bellbrook Pl. was approved by the ARB in 1991. The house is two-stories with a gabled roof, and finished with lap siding and

brick accents. In 1992, a 10' x 10' deck was approved and constructed on the west side (rear) of the house. The owner would now like to replace and enlarge the deck.

**Project Details:**

1. The new deck would be built in the same location, but be 12' x 14'.
2. Construction is proposed with wood, and in the same style as the existing deck with a 36" high rail.
3. Existing vegetation partially screens the deck from the W. Dublin-Granville Rd. right-of-way.

**Land Use Plans:**

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

There are recommendations in the Worthington Design Guidelines for additions and decks to be located as far to the rear as possible. Design and materials should be traditional, and compatible with the existing structure.

**Recommendations:**

Staff is recommending approval of the application. The proposed deck is compatible with the house and appropriately located.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Ms. Cynthia Evans stated her address is 6441 Bellbrook Pl., Worthington, Ohio. Board members did not have any questions or concerns. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

**Motion:**

Mrs. Holcombe moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY CYNTHIA EVANS FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO REPLACE THE DECK AT 6441 BELLBROOK PL. AS PER CASE NO. AR 16-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 16-16, DATED JANUARY 26, 2016, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.**

Mr. Reis seconded the motion. Mrs. Bitar called the roll. Mr. Coulter, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; Mr. Hofmann, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye and Mr. Foust, aye. The motion was approved.

- b. Amendments to Roof Equipment Screen & Windows; Flag Pole – **6600 N. High St.** (Carney Ranker Architects/FC Bank) **AR 17-16** (Amendment to AR 48-15)

**Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Page 2 of 11

ARB/MPC Meeting February 11, 2016

Minutes

**Background & Request:**

Approval was granted on May 14, 2015 for demolition of the 3 buildings on the site, and construction of a new two story office building to serve as the corporate office and a bank branch with drive-thru for FC Bank. On June 25, 2015 lighting, landscaping and window details were approved. A permit was issued in October of 2015 to begin construction on the site, and at this point the footers and foundation are more than 50% complete.

This application is a request for approval to enlarge the roof equipment screen; change the windows; and add a flag pole to the site.

**Project Details:**

## 1. Roof Equipment Screen:

- Almond colored PVC fencing was approved to screen the rooftop equipment and elevator. The fence is proposed to be 6' high, with 3" pickets spaced at 2 15/16" intervals, support posts every 6'. Previously, a generator was to be located on the ground near the northeast corner of the building. Now the applicant is proposing placement of the generator on the roof, and would like to expand the fenced-in area to include the mechanicals and roof drains.
- The approved fenced-in area was centered on the front elevation, but at the back half of the roof. Now proposed is a screened area that is 2 panels wider in each direction. The west and east elevations would still be centered on the front of the building. The north and south elevations were originally located in the back half of the roof. With the extra width, the fencing would extend onto the front half of the roof.

## 2. Windows:

- The proposed aluminum-clad wood casement windows have clear glass, external muntins, and are almond in color. The framing is a composite material. Details show the keystones projecting 1 1/2" out from the face of the brick and lintels projecting 3/4" from the face of the brick.
- With this application, the number of lights in each window is shown as 12, rather than the previously approved 18. The applicant felt the pattern would emulate a 6 over 6 double hung window and be more traditional.

## 3. Flag Pole:

- A 45' tall brushed aluminum flag pole is proposed near the entrance at the southwest corner of the building. The pole would be surrounded by pavement and landscaping.
- A ground mounted LED light is proposed to illuminate the 12' x 8' flag.

## 4. Signs:

- The raised panel on the wall is shown adjacent to the second floor windows and in place of the soldier course on the elevations. On the rendering it is shown below the soldier course.
- The sign on the canopy is identified as internally lit letters.
- Variances are needed for having 2 wall signs and a freestanding sign greater than 30 square feet per side.

**Land Use Plans:**Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Use traditional sizes, proportions and spacing for windows. Fences may be helpful for screening transformers, gas meters, and communication equipment.

Worthington Comprehensive Plan

The 2005 Worthington Comprehensive Plan promotes a high quality physical environment, encouraging the City to continue to emphasize strong physical and aesthetic design, and high-quality development.

**Staff Analysis:**

1. Although the roof screen may be more visible because it is wider and further forward on the roof, it is in character with the previous approval. Placement of the generator on the roof is preferable.
2. The change to the windows is appropriate.
3. Placement of the raised panel sign on the building disrupting the brick soldier course seems awkward. Reduction in size may be warranted.
4. The flag pole and flag seem too large for the site. Something more in scale with the building, site and area would be appropriate.
5. Although the signs are not being reviewed as part of this application, the canopy sign is identified as internally illuminated, which is not desirable in this location.

**Recommendations:**

Staff is recommending approval of this application after the Board is satisfied with the details.

**Discussion:**

Mrs. Bitar explained the proposed flag pole is forty-five feet in height and the building is approximately thirty-three feet in height. The flag pole next door to this site at City Hall is approximately twenty-five feet in height. Staff feels the size of the flag pole is out of character with what is typical in the Architectural Review District and should be a lower version with a smaller flag. There is a light proposed that will illuminate the flag.

Mrs. Bitar said although signage is not being considered this evening, she expressed concern with the size of the relief panel on the building and wanted to make sure the applicant knows that type of signage would not be approved at this location. She also discussed the need for variances due to having two wall signs and a freestanding sign that is larger than allowed. Mr. Coulter asked about the relief in the middle of the rendering and if that is considered signage. Mrs. Bitar said she considers that to be signage but the Architect thought that was already approved. She said size and placement is critical for that piece. Mr. Reis asked if that wall sign was on the rendering that was approved at the prior meeting and Mrs. Bitar said yes, but the rendering did not show the soldier course being cut into or being so close to the windows.

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Ms. Jennifer Carney stated her address is 5925 Wilcox Pl., Suite E, Dublin, Ohio 43016. Mrs. Bitar said she had one more comment. Flag poles

have always been considered a structure and because the flag pole is within the required one hundred foot setback, a variance would be needed from the Board of Zoning Appeals.

Mr. Reis said he did not have a problem with the windows and the muntins being changed, and he does not have a problem with an American Flag being proposed anywhere, but he agreed with Mrs. Bitar that the height of the flag pole may need to be adjusted to be more in scale with the building. He said as far as the signs he understands that the signage is not part of the application that is being discussed this evening but Ms. Carney needs to be careful to make sure she addresses the sign code and to discuss that with City staff.

Ms. Carney asked if Mr. Reis was referring to the sign over the canopy and Mr. Reis said he was referring to all of the signs. He said there are requirements for size and the number of signs. Mr. Reis said the bank appears to have four signs. Mrs. Bitar explained there are two wall signs and one freestanding sign proposed.

Mrs. Holcombe asked about the sign in regards to the soldier course and if the soldier course will go through it and Ms. Carney said yes. She said they are developing their drawings and working with block coursing which is cast stone. She did not have enough room to get the soldier course all the way through without interfering with the lintels below so she has taken the soldier course at that relief to a row lock all the way around the four sides. Mr. Hoffman asked if that was represented correctly and Ms. Carney said she did not know if the current rendering represents that, but the elevation has the details.

Mr. Foust asked if the panel could be made smaller to fit into the existing space. Ms. Carney said she would be getting to odd sized pieces for the other materials if she did that and the area would look off kilter. Mr. Foust asked if the stone panels were a pre-set size, and Ms. Carney said yes, the stone panels are 12" by 24" and the same size of stone would be used for the water table. Mr. Foust suggested having the stone panels cut to make them fit without interrupting the soldier course, feeling the panel should fit in the space without interruption. Mrs. Holcombe said she agreed. Mr. Coulter said he wanted to clarify regardless of what is decided for the panel that it is considered signage and will need to be approved along with the rest of the sign package when it is presented. The panel would not be approved tonight because it is not considered part of the building, the panel is considered signage. Ms. Carney said she thought the panel was originally approved at the previous meeting as part of the building. Mr. Coulter said it is considered signage, not part of the architecture.

Mr. Hofmann said the windows are a great improvement and the building now looks more proportional. He likes fewer lights in each window. He said the fence is fine because he would much rather have the generator on the roof instead of the ground. Mr. Hofmann said he would like to see the flag pole a little lower. Mr. Foust said he would not want to see a giant flag pole like what you see at automotive dealers because you can see the flags from miles away. He felt that since the new building will be similar in scale to City Hall he believes the flag and pole should be the same size as in front of City Hall, and no larger. Ms. Carney said she is not proposing to use one of the 50' flags that you would see at an automotive dealership. The bank has flags at all of

their banks and it is very important to them, and they would like to have the flag as large as the zoning district will allow. Mr. Coulter said there is also a flag at the fire station behind City Hall and he believes both of those flag poles are 25'. Ms. Carney said she thought the pole at City Hall was higher than 25 feet. Mrs. Holcombe said the flag pole at the bank should be equal in height to the pole at City Hall.

Mr. Foust said there are two other things to take note of in regards to the signage package. The ancillary signs for entrance and exit will also need to be part of the package, and the amount of color and signage at the drive-thru. Mr. Coulter said if for whatever reason, that there needs to be changes during the construction phase to the exterior of the building, to please call City staff before making any changes. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

**Motion:**

Mr. Reis moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY CARNERY RANKER ARCHITECTS FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO MODIFY THE EQUIPMENT SCREEN AND WINDOWS, AND INSTALL A FLAG POLE, NOT TO EXCEED THE SIZE OF THE FLAG OR POLE LOCATED AT CITY HALL AT 6600 N. HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 17-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 17-16, DATED JANUARY 28, 2016, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.**

Mr. Foust seconded the motion. Mrs. Bitar called the roll. Mr. Coulter, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; Mr. Hofmann, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye and Mr. Foust, aye. The motion was approved.

c. Rear Addition – **685 Morning St.** (MB Construction/Ross) **AR 18-16**

**Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

**Background & Request:**

A contributing property to the Worthington Historic District, the original part of this house was built in 1900 in the farmhouse style. Many additions have been constructed over the years, with the most recent being a rear second floor in 2012 that was construct above part of an existing one-story addition. This application is a request for approval to construct a new room and covered porch at the rear of the structure.

**Project Details:**

1. Addition:

- A roughly 27' x 32' crafts room is proposed at the rear of the garage. Access to the room would be through the garage, and from a new covered porch on the south side of

- the house. The 38' 1" x 7' porch is also proposed with doors to the garage and rear of the house.
- A gabled roof with a 9:12 pitch is the main element for the room addition. The pitch is steeper than the other rear elements, but similar to the front gable on the original house. A shed dormer with a 3:12 pitch is proposed on the south side of the gable. A gable with a 4:12 pitch is proposed to connect the existing garage roof to the room addition, and forms a covered porch on the south side and an overhang on the north side. Asphalt shingles to match the existing are proposed for all roof surfaces.
  - The walls are proposed to be Hardie board siding with trim pieces for a board and batten look as was used on the previous addition further east on the house. Windows are proposed on the west and south sides of the addition. The main style would be square or rectangular divided into 4 lights, with materials and trim matching the windows on the house. On the south side a double door would open to the porch, and a single door would provide access from the garage to the porch. The porch is proposed with a gravel base, and would have brick on top.
  - On the north side, support brackets would be installed under the overhang, and kayak racks are proposed to be mounted on the wall.
  - Light fixture locations and styles have been requested.
2. Two double doors are proposed on the existing house: one would provide access to the porch; the other is west facing but further south, would replace a window, and steps would be added.

### **Land Use Plans:**

#### Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Residential additions are recommended to maintain similar roof forms; be constructed as far to the rear and sides of the existing residence as possible; be subordinate; and have walls set back from the corners of the main house. Design and materials should be traditional, and compatible with the existing structure.

### **Recommendation:**

Staff is recommending *approval* of this application. The addition is appropriately sized and to the rear, and the materials are complementary.

### **Discussion:**

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mrs. Laura Ross stated her address is 685 Morning St., Worthington, Ohio; Mr. Brendan Ross stated his address is 685 Morning St., Worthington, Ohio; and Mr. Mark Fitzharris of MB Construction stated his address is 283 N. Liberty St., Delaware, Ohio. Mrs. Holcombe said she liked the colors, but was concerned with the placement of the kayaks on the northern side of the home and asked if there was going to be any screening. Mrs. Ross stated the neighbors' shed and junipers will screen the area where her kayaks will be located. Mr. Coulter asked if all three mechanical units were for the new addition. Mr. Fitzharris said two of the units are being relocated because of the addition. The third mechanical is for the new space. Mrs. Bitar stated the mechanicals will need to be screened on the side. Mr. Fitzharris asked if vegetation screening is acceptable and Mr. Coulter said, yes, vegetation is preferred. Mr.

Coulter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

**Motion:**

Mr. Hofmann moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY MB CONSTRUCTION ON BEHALD OF BRENDAN AND LAURA ROSS FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO CONSTRUCT AN ADDITION AT 685 MORNING ST. AND AS PER CASE NO. AR 18-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 18-16, DATED JANUARY 29, 2016, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING WITH THE OPTION OF THE SIDING BEING A DARKER GRAY COLOR WITH WHITE WINDOW TRIM, AND THAT THE MECHANICALS BE SCREENED WITH VEGETATION.**

Mrs. Holcombe seconded the motion. Mrs. Bitar called the roll. Mr. Coulter, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; Mr. Hofmann, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye and Mr. Foust, aye. The motion was approved.

d. Condensing Unit – **571 Evening St.** (Sean Kocheran/Moore) **AR 19-16**

**Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

**Background & Request:**

This house was constructed in 1954, and is a contributing property to the Worthington Historic District. Total renovation, including an addition, was approved for this house last year. This application would allow for installation of a second condensing unit.

**Project Details:**

1. The existing condensing unit is behind the house near the northern wall.
2. A second unit is proposed just west of the existing, and would be similarly sized.
3. Vegetation would be added to screen the unit.

**Land Use Plans:**

**Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance**

Keep functional items such as trash containers and mechanical equipment well screened with fences or plantings.

**Recommendation:**

Staff is recommending *approval* of the application. With additional screening on the north side, the location behind the house is appropriate.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Sean Kocheran stated he is the contractor for the applicant and his address is 351 W. South St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Coulter said that he had spoken with the neighbor, Mrs. Rodgers, and she told him that someone had already asked for her permission to relocate the unit, and she is fine with the relocation as long as the unit will be screened. Board members did not have any other questions. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

**Motion:**

Mr. Reis moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY ADAM AND GARY MOORE FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO ADD A CONDENSING UNIT AT 571 EVENING ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 19-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 19-16, DATED JANUARY 29, 2016, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.**

Mrs. Holcombe seconded the motion. Mrs. Bitar called the roll. Mr. Coulter, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; Mr. Hofmann, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye and Mr. Foust, aye. The motion was approved.

e. Window Replacement – **46 W. North St. (Matt Boone) AR 20-16**

**Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

**Background & Request:**

This house was built in 1951 and the style is Colonial Revival Influence. The house is just over 1200 square feet in area. The owner recently replaced most of the windows and is now asking for approval of the new windows.

**Project Details:**

1. The existing windows appeared to be wood and were mainly double hung. Mullions divided the upper window sashes only, mainly into 6 lights except a smaller window near the fireplace on the east side had 4 lights at the top. The windows were reportedly in poor condition.
2. Installed were vinyl windows with mullions in the upper and lower portion of the windows. Two windows have 8 over 8 lights; the others have 6 over 6 lights; with the east side smaller window having 4 over 4.
3. A box style bay window in the front and a casement to the rear appear not to have been changed.

**Land Use Plans:**

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

The Worthington Design Guidelines recommend if historic windows are too deteriorated to repair cost-effectively and replacement is justified, the preferred option is an in-kind replacement in the same material and design. New windows made of substitute materials such as clad wood can be acceptable if they provide a reasonably good match for the windows being replaced. Be sure that window designs are appropriate for the style or time period of the house. Avoid use of inappropriate window designs. Avoid enlarging or downsizing window openings to accommodate stock sizes of replacements. Also avoid permanent blocking in of windows.

Compatibility of design and materials, exterior detail and relationships, and window treatment are standards of review in the Architectural District ordinance.

**Recommendation:**

Staff is recommending *denial* of this application. When windows are replaced, keeping the style of the existing is recommended. The sashes appear to be thicker and the number of lights is different. Clad wood is preferred, but all vinyl windows have been approved elsewhere in the District for this period of house.

**Discussion:**

Mrs. Bitar said the window sashes still need to be trimmed, so that would provide an opportunity to make them look similar to the previous windows. Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Matt Boone stated his address is 46 W. North St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Boone said he purchased the home in December of 2015 with twenty percent of the payment down. He said his mortgage company told him that he had to have the windows replaced within 30 days because the sills had disintegrated. He said the siding is also rotten and there is a lot of other repair work that needs to be done. Mr. Boone said he has not purchased many homes in the past and did not realize this was within the Architectural Review District until he applied for the permit. At that point in time, the special windows were already ordered and his father, who is a contractor from Kentucky, was on his way to help with the installation that following weekend. Mr. Boone said he thought this was more of a maintenance issue since his mortgage company demanded the windows be repaired within 30 days, but now realizes the changes warrant review. He said he will be coming back to the Board for approval of the window trim, siding and roofing soon. Mr. Coulter asked if the owner would be living there, and Mr. Boone said yes, he already was living there and renting before he purchases. He spoke of replacement of the other windows and a possible bump out addition on the front.

Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

**Motion:**

Mr. Reis moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY MATT BOONE FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO REPLACE WINDOWS AT 46 W. NORTH ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 20-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 20-16, DATED JANUARY 29, 2016, BE APPROVED**

**BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.**

Mrs. Lloyd seconded the motion. Mrs. Bitar called the roll. Mr. Coulter, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; Mr. Hofmann, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye and Mr. Foust, aye. The motion was approved.

**D. Other**

Mrs. Bitar said the homeowner (Mr. Bryan Rood) from 701 Farrington Dr., Worthington, Ohio, is planning to ask approval to install cedar shingles in about the same location as originally approved. Mr. Hofmann and Mr. Reis said they felt comfortable with the change. Mr. Coulter asked about the retaining wall and Mrs. Bitar said he intends to move the wall out of the right-of-way, but it would still needs to be moved.

Mr. Brown said starting in May, the ARB-MPC meetings will begin at 7:00 p.m. He also stated that Board members need to start using their city email addresses for all day to day correspondence. Mr. Brown mentioned a meeting will be scheduled at the City Council committee of the whole meeting on May 9, 2016, or June 13, 2016, for the Council, boards and commission to train with the Ohio Attorney General's office and the Ohio Ethics Commission. Mr. Brown also said more money had been budgeted to allow board and commission members to attend local meetings and training if they are interested.

**E. Adjournment**

Mr. Hofmann moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:45 p.m. and Mr. Reis seconded the motion. All Board members voted, "Aye." The meeting was adjourned.