



MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
WORTHINGTON ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
WORTHINGTON MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION
May 12, 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; James Sauer, Vice-Chair; Thomas Reis; Amy Lloyd; and David Foust. Also present were: Lee Brown, Director of Planning & Building; and Lynda Bitar, Planning Coordinator and Clerk of the Municipal Planning Commission. Scott Myers, Worthington City Council Representative to the Municipal Planning Commission was absent. Board members Kathy Holcombe Secretary; and Edwin Hofmann were absent.

A. Call to Order – 7:00 p.m.

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

Mr. Sauer moved to approve the minutes and Mr. Reis seconded the motion. All Board members voted, "Aye." The minutes were approved.

4. Affirmation/swearing in of witnesses – Members of the audience were sworn in by Mrs. Bitar.

Mr. Coulter said the application for 643 High St. & 41 E. New England Ave. will be moved to the end of the ARB agenda.

B. Architectural Review Board

1. Unfinished

- a. Signage – **6600 N. High St.** (Fastsigns/FC Bank) **AR 45-16**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

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. In February of 2016 amendments to the windows and roof screen, and a flagpole were approved. Throughout the process the applicant has shown signage, but details were never approved.

Project Details:

1. A freestanding sign, two wall signs, and illuminated drive-thru signs are included with this application. Variances would be needed for having a freestanding sign larger than is allowed, having more than one wall sign and for total sign area. Application has been made to the Board of Zoning Appeals.
2. The freestanding sign location was approved centered on the building and 10' from the right-of-way line as is allowed by Code. The sign was approved to be surrounded by Big Blue Lilyturf plants.
 1. Proposed is an 8' wide x 51" high cabinet faced with smooth cast stone, on an 8' wide x 2'8" high base with brick veneer to match the building. Cast stone caps are proposed for the top of the base and sign, and would extend slightly beyond the edges. Sign area would be approximately 55 square feet per side, including the base. If the base were no higher than 2', 16 square feet would be subtracted from that total.
 2. Dark green and gray painted aluminum reverse channel letters and logo are proposed to be mounted on the sign faces. White LED illumination would shine to the rear from inside the letters giving a halo effect. The depth of the characters is proposed to be 3.5" and the distance between the back of the letters and the sign face is proposed as 1.5".
3. A cast stone panel with the bank's logo raised 1/2" is proposed in the center of the front elevation. The raised panel was previously shown adjacent to the second floor windows, interrupting the soldier course, and adjacent to the lintels, being 9'4" wide x 4' 7 5/6" high. At the recommendation of the ARB, the applicant has reduced the size of the panel to 8' wide x 3'8" high (29.3 square feet in area). The cast stone logo appears to have the desired separation from the soldier course and lintels. There is an extra note on the detail pointing to a brick soldier course that is no longer applicable.
4. Five inch deep non-illuminated channel letters with the logo above are proposed at the edge of the canopy above the entrance. The proposed letters would be 75" wide x 20" high, and the logo would be 51" wide x 24" high. Sign area would be 75" x 44" or 22.9 square feet. The aluminum letters and logo are proposed to be green and gray.
5. Exposed LED signs are proposed above the drive-thru lanes on the canopy, with 2 identifying "OPEN/CLOSED" in green and red, and 1 identifying "ATM/NIGHT DEPOSIT" in an unidentified color. A non-illuminated "DO NOT ENTER" sign is proposed on the north side of the canopy, but the colors have not been identified.
6. A one way sign is shown and is likely to be located near the north drive for the site, which only allows exiting traffic. The post would be dark gray to match the proposed signage.

7. Other directional signage is not included with the application.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

While the regulations permit a certain maximum square footage of signs for a business, try to minimize the size and number of signs. Place only basic names and graphics on signs along the street so that drive-by traffic is not bombarded with too much information. Free-standing signs should be of the “monument” type; they should be as low as possible. Such signs should have an appropriate base such as a brick planting area with appropriate landscaping or no lighting. Colors for signs should be chosen for compatibility with the age, architecture and colors of the buildings they serve, whether placed on the ground or mounted on the building. Signs must be distinctive enough to be readily visible, but avoid incompatible modern colors such as “fluorescent orange” and similar colors. Bright color shades generally are discouraged in favor more subtle and toned-down shades.

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. While the freestanding sign is larger than Code allows, the graphic portion of the sign meets the requirement and the design is appropriate.
2. With space between the cast stone relief and nearby architectural features, the sign should be unobtrusive in its wall location.
3. The canopy sign is appropriately designed.
4. Exposed light sources, as in the drive-thru lane indicators, are not typical.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending *approval* of this application, based on the above items, except additional consideration should be given to enclosed signs for the drive-thru. Approval would be conditioned on variances being granted by the BZA.

Discussion:

Mr. Daniel Stutzman stated his address is 144 West 12th Street, Erie, PA, and said the only other signs would be the necessary handicap parking signs.

Mr. Coulter said he thinks the sign sizes are appropriate. Mr. Sauer questioned whether the brick base can be reduced by 8” to comply with the Code. Mr. Stutzman said the plant materials below it will mature to the two feet in a short matter of time. Mr. Sauer wondered again why the sign could not be brought into compliance with the standards. He said there are a variety of signs throughout the City with plant material, so the plant material selected does not seem to be a valid excuse for why the sign is that far off the ground.

Mr. Foust asked why one sample was glossy and the other had a matte finish. Mr. Stutzman said both would probably have a semi-gloss finish.

Mr. Sauer felt the one-way sign had a utilitarian look, and asked if it could be designed more in character with the other signs and the building. Mr. Stutzman said the one-way sign could be made to fit the building.

Mr. Coulter asked if anyone in the audience would like to speak for or against this application and no one came forward.

Mr. Sauer asked how many signs are on the building and Mrs. Bitar said there are 2 proposed, including the relief. Mr. Foust said reminded the Board of a similar treatment used for the Lutheran Church. He felt it was subtle and compliments the building.

Mr. Brown asked how the Board felt about the drive-thru signs. Mr. Foust said he would like to see alternatives presented, but would be willing to have review done by staff. Mr. Stutzman said they could propose a louvered style that is more old-school for the sign. Mr. Coulter asked they propose alternatives to staff.

Mr. Sauer asked again about lowering the sign base for the freestanding sign. Andy Dale, 3010 Greenville Drive, Columbus said he thinks they have already taken a nice feature and made it small. They have also changed the illumination to accommodate what the community wants, and are trying to find balance. Mr. Dale said the bank wants to be seen without being annoying. He does not know if 8" makes a big difference either way, but he does not want to do anything to reduce exposure. Mr. Dale feels the bank has made adjustments for the Board, and asking them to come back again would be troublesome.

Mr. Coulter thought the motion should reflect the signage as presented.

ARB Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY FASTSIGNS ON BEHALF OF FC BANK FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO ALLOW SIGNAGE AT 6600 N. HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 45-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 45-16, DATED MARCH 10, 2016, AND THAT THE APPLICANT REVIEW THE ONE-WAY AND OPEN/CLOSED SIGNS WITH STAFF, 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; Mr. Sauer, nay; Mr. Reis, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye; and Mr. Foust, aye. The motion was approved.

- b. Front Porch Roof & Satellite Dish – **653 Oxford St.** (RAS Construction, Inc./Lindholm) **AR 54-16**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This farmhouse was originally constructed in 1850, and has had minor modifications and additions over the years. The house is at the northwest corner of Oxford St. and W. New England Ave. This application was originally submitted for review at the April 14th meeting, but the homeowners asked the application to be tabled to allow detailing of the porch roof and exploration of alternate ways to deal with grade and drainage issues. The previous proposal included installation of a brick water table to correct issues with grade.

This application includes a redesigned porch roof and a request to retain an existing satellite dish. Storm drainage is now proposed to be handled with a barrier that would be mainly underground, with only a rowlock course of brick showing near the foundation. The brick would be at the same height as the front patio. Grading and connection of the downspout to the curb would also be part of the solution.

Project Details:

1. The cross-gabled roof form of this structure creates a natural area at the front door for the front porch. The owners would like to construct a roof over the porch area. The roof would slope from north to south, being below the second floor windows. Wood is proposed for the structure and columns, and standing seam metal is proposed for the roof. An ogee gutter is proposed on the south side of the roof structure. Colors for the wood, roof and gutter have not been identified.
2. A satellite dish was installed on the roof of the 1-story addition to the rear. The owners are concerned the roof would be damaged with removal, so would like approval to keep it in the current location.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

- From about 1915 on, porches generally were simplified and more integrated into the design of the house. Simple square or tapered columns were common. New porches (located where one is missing or there has not been a porch in the past) should be built in a simple design. Look at original porches on similar buildings -- height, materials, roof slope, and width -- and use these to develop a design. Avoid ornamentation such as spindles and scrollwork unless they were traditionally used on the porches of similar buildings. Design and materials should be traditional, and compatible with the existing structure.
- Historic wood siding should not be covered over or removed if it is repairable. Avoid removal of or damage to window and door surrounds, and avoid permanent blocking in of windows; the original window pattern of a house is part of its overall design.

- Satellite dish placement should be in a location that minimizes the visual impact as seen from the right-of-way.

Recommendations:

Staff is recommending *approval* of this application based on the following:

1. Assuming the porch is white, the design is appropriate.
2. The proposed solution for storm drainage is more architecturally appropriate than the previously approved brick water table.
3. The satellite dish is partially screened from view due to its location on the house and the trees that exist south of the house. Although removal would be ideal, approval could be granted in this location.

Discussion:

Mr. Sean Kocheran stated his address is 351 W. South Street. Mr. Sauer asked if the drainage structure will carry all the way around the house. Mr. Kocheran said the structure will be on the front elevation and the north elevations to the chimney, with the top being just above grade. Mr. Kocheran spoke of creating a masonry barrier to prevent further water damage to the foundation. Mr. Sauer asked if the brick would be painted white, feeling it should not be painted. Mr. Kocheran said the brick can stay unpainted, and would mostly be hidden with landscaping anyway.

Mr. Foust said the light fixture looks industrial and suggested looking for a globe style that matches the time period of the house and Mr. Coulter agreed. Mr. Kocheran said he will speak to the homeowner about selecting another light fixture.

Mrs. Lloyd asked if the porch roof would look similar to the screened porch roof on the south side and Mr. Kocheran said yes. Mrs. Lloyd asked Mr. Kocheran if the roof would be pitched in the same direction and he said yes, and the pitch will likely be a three and a half in twelve. Mr. Coulter said he should not go any shallower.

Mr. Coulter said he has walked by the house for years and has never noticed the satellite dish, and added there is not a better location for the dish. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application but no one came forward.

ARB Motion:

Mr. Sauer moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY RAS CONSTRUCTION, INC. FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO ADD A FRONT PORCH ROOF AND RETAIN THE SATELLITE DISH AT 653 OXFORD ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 54-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 54-16, DATED APRIL 1, 2016, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING WITH THE AMENDMENT THAT THE BRICK STAY IN THE NATURAL COLOR OF

RED AND THAT THE FIXTURE FOR THE FRONT PORCH BE REVIEWED BY CITY STAFF.

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

2. New

- a. Window Replacement – **821 Oxford St.** (Renewal by Andersen/Riley) **AR 63-16**

Findings of fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This Colonial Revival house was built in 1940 and is a contributing building in the Worthington Historic District. The house is located at the southwest corner of Oxford St. and W. Stafford Ave. Approval is requested to replace the existing wood windows, which are reportedly difficult to maintain and not energy efficient. The house has had aluminum storm windows for years.

Project Details:

1. The applicant is planning to replace the existing windows with windows in a composite material. The material is a combination of wood fibers and a thermoplastic polymer, developed and manufactured by Andersen. A sample of the window material has been submitted. The storm windows would be removed and not replaced.
2. The windows would be sized to fit in the existing openings, and would match the existing look. The first floor and rear windows are double hung with 6 over 6 lights or 8 over 8 lights; and the second floor windows on the front and side are divided into 3 sections, with 3 lights in each section. Although the second floor windows are double hung now, the proposed would be casement windows with 9 lights to allow for egress. The proposed windows would have muntins between the panes of glass.
3. An existing rear window above the kitchen sink is a newer casement window with 9 lights and would not be replaced.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Retention and repair of existing historic windows is always preferable to replacement. If energy efficiency is a concern, interior or exterior storm windows can greatly increase the insulating quality of windows. 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.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending *approval* of the application, as the proposed replacement windows appear to be a reasonably good match for the existing. Although the muntins would only be between the glasses the look would be an improvement over the existing storm windows.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Steve Armstrong stated his address is 4112 Mountview Road, Columbus, Ohio. He said the new windows will be a premium grade Anderson Windows and this is going to be a start to finish project. Mr. Armstrong said the way their business model is set up, they will make the window, take care of the installation and warranty all in one step. They could have almost the exact look that they have now. There will not be any maintenance in the future. Most of the windows right now do not open, the storm windows are even in a worse condition and egress is a consideration. Mr. Armstrong said his client does not want to do maintenance any longer.

Mr. Foust mentioned there are so many different shapes and sizes of windows on this house that he does not see a better solution, but he had a question and asked if the arrangement would stay similar to how the house is now. For example where there are six panes, will there be six panes in the new windows. Mr. Armstrong responded yes, exactly.

Mr. Sauer asked about the second floor windows on the front of the house. Mr. Armstrong responded the windows are cottage style, but the storm windows alter the look. Mr. Armstrong said he is not sure the interior could have been configured differently, but when the house was built they did not use air conditioning, and you actually pulled the double hung top sash down for air. The new window will be double hung also. Mrs. Lloyd asked if the slider window in the basement will be replaced and Mr. Armstrong said no, he is not replacing any basement windows.

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

ARB Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY RENEWAL BY ANDERSEN ON BEHALF OF EARL AND LINDA RILEY FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO REPLACE THE WINDOWS AT 821 OXFORD ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 63-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 63-16, DATED APRIL 22, 2016, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

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

- b. Sign – 137 E. Granville Rd. (DaNite Sign Company/Sharon Memorial Hall) AR 64-16

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This building was built as a residence in 1861, and used as such until 1946. After WWII, voters approved a War Memorial Levy and the building was purchased and dedicated as Sharon Memorial Hall in 1947. When zoning was established in 1971, the property was zoned R-10, Low Density Residence, which allows for single family dwellings and public and semi-public uses. Many community groups and organizations used the building until 1975, at which time the Sharon Township Trustees moved their offices and police department into the building. The Township moved its operations to E. Wilson Bridge Rd. in 2009 and the building was renovated. Attempts were made by the Sharon Memorial Board, the entity responsible for Sharon Memorial Hall, to find public and semi-public users for the building that would generate revenue, and allow maintenance of the building and site. After no users were found, the VM, Veterans Memorial zoning district was created in 2010, the property was rezoned from R-10 to VM, and the space was leased to small office users. Advertising for the users of the building was not discussed at the time.

This request is for approval to install a freestanding sign on the property that would identify the building and tenants. The VM zoning district does not have limitations on the size of signage, but any sign would be subject to the other provisions in the sign regulations.

Project Details:

1. Placement of the sign is proposed 15' from the E. Granville Rd. right-of-way and 40' from the Morning St. right-of-way. The sign would double-sided, sitting perpendicular to E. Granville Rd. in the grass area north and west of the building. The setback from E. Granville Rd. would be similar to the location of the cannon.
2. The sign would be non-illuminated.
3. Proposed are 22 ½ square foot sign faces inside a roughly 40 square foot structure with a pediment and columns. The cabinet and cap would be aluminum and the columns would be polyethylene. All elements would be painted white.
4. Burgundy vinyl graphics are proposed identifying the address in the pediment as "137 Dublin-Granville Rd.", and "Sharon Township Veterans Memorial Hall" at the top of the sign face. Both elements would be in the same font, but 3 different sizes are proposed. Below would be 3 tenant names in black vinyl, separate by burgundy lines. There appears to be 2 or 3 fonts and sizes being used for the 3 names. The text fonts and sizes are not identified on the drawing. A different logo is proposed for each tenant. The logos contain different designs and colors, but appear to be about the same size. With the logos, the total number of colors on the sign appear to be 7. A variance would be need for the number of styles, sizes and colors used on the sign.
5. A 20" high by 7'4" high base with brick veneer to match the building, and capped

with aluminum painted gray is proposed.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

While the regulations permit a certain maximum square footage of signs for a business, try to minimize the size and number of signs. Place only basic names and graphics on signs along the street so that drive-by traffic is not bombarded with too much information. Free-standing signs should be of the “monument” type; they should be as low as possible. Such signs should have an appropriate base such as a brick planting area with appropriate landscaping or no lighting. Colors for signs should be chosen for compatibility with the age, architecture and colors of the buildings they serve, whether placed on the ground or mounted on the building. Signs must be distinctive enough to be readily visible, but avoid incompatible modern colors such as “fluorescent orange” and similar colors. Bright color shades generally are discouraged in favor more subtle and toned-down shades.

Sign Code

Styles - Signs shall be comprised of not more than two styles of lettering plus one logo. A logo is an emblem, character, pictograph, trademark or symbol used alone to represent a business, organization, entity or product. There shall be not more than three sizes of all such lettering, including a logo.

Colors - Not more than four colors, including black and white, shall be used on any sign.

Staff Analysis:

1. While there is no regulation for sign size in the VM district, the sign should not be larger than is allowed in other parts of the City. The graphic portion of the sign is smaller than the commercial district allowance, so just the structure would be larger. The sign, being in a residential area, would not be in competition with other signs.
2. The design seems appropriate for the building.
3. More uniformity is needed with lettering styles and sizes to simplify the sign. Also, deletion of the logos may help.
4. The use of raised lettering for at least the building name would add some character to the sign. The font could match the lettering on the building.
5. The address would be more easily seen if just the number was placed in a larger size. The use of raised characters would also be appropriate.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending the sign graphics be simplified and modified per the above analysis.

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar mentioned letters of concern received, and spoke of the large sign in front of the building that acts as an identifier. Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Logan Dilts stated he was representing the DaNite Sign Company of 1640 Harmon Avenue, Columbus, OH 43223. Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Dilts if there was anything else he would like to add to Mrs. Bitar’s presentation.

Mr. Dilts said he talked to his clients and agrees the sign is pretty busy, with different font heights and such. This could be simplified and made of all one color. The issue with shrinking the sign is the columns, which are there to tie in with the building, and are only available in certain sizes. Forty-eight inches is the smallest available. The base could be reduced, or something could be done at the top. Mr. Dilts thought just putting the address numbers of 137 at the top instead of the whole address would help. The name could be simplified just to Sharon Memorial Hall, and also agreed with simplifying the name of the tenants to have everything on one line. Mr. Dilts definitely agreed the sign could be simplified and said his client is open to that.

Mr. Sauer said what was discussed by Mr. Dilts is all good, and if they could do that it would go a long way toward being approved. Mr. Sauer suggested the address numbers of 137 could be down on the brick. The simplifications mentioned seemed logical and appropriate and he thinks that would help.

Mr. Foust said he has some issues with the application. To start, he thinks the policy in the past has been to change or to not encourage directory signs. He does not think the building needs any sort of directory in the front, which has been a concept throughout the community. Mr. Foust had an issue with everything listed on the sign. The second thing is that E. Dublin-Granville Road is primarily residential in nature. While this building is an old house that fits in well with the community, if any signage is out there at all, the wording needs to be very refined and very small. Mr. Foust continued to say that because people know the building and know where it is, this sign does not do anything to enhance the area or the streetscape at all, and he does not see the necessity for the sign. He said someone is going to have to sell him on the need for the sign.

Mr. Coulter said he tends to agree with the comments made so far and that he would like to see other memorial halls that have signs of a similar nature to compare. Mr. Coulter said the proposed sign is very busy, and when driving by at 30 mph, the sign will not be readable. Mr. Coulter also said he is surprised that this location does not have size regulations.

Mr. Sauer said he believes everyone in the community knows the building, the building has a prominent location and has always been known as the Sharon Memorial Hall. He would agree he does not see the need for the sign.

Mr. Reis agreed with what was said, and said the sign is overkill. He said someone would have to come back with something to convince him that any sort of identification is needed at all.

Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and two people raised their hands.

Ms. Shelia Bagley of 5812 Olentangy Boulevard, Riverlea, Ohio said she is against the sign for all the reasons stated. She said the groups listed on the sign only meet occasionally, and there is only one business in the building. There is a concern that maybe in the future the sign would be illuminated. Ms. Bagley believes this is very inappropriate for the residential area and this is an “insidious commercial creep for that area” because the building is zoned as a Veteran’s Memorial.

Ms. Bagley said she is afraid this could be setting a precedent for turning the building into a more commercial type of venture. Another concern is the issue of what if the property was sold, there is nothing to preclude Sharon Township from selling the property, and once that sign is in place, the building could be commercial in the future.

Mrs. Bagley said the Sharon Memorial Board has been attempting to engage in providing an easement to others on their property which has been happening in a sort of secret executive session. Also, as some noted, the historical integrity of the building would be compromised by the huge plastic sign. The sign is going to be located in a large green space along State Route 161 and everyone likes the green space, so this is just a shame because the area is very park-like now. The current Sharon Memorial Board has really changed some the architectural and historical integrity of the building and this is just another change which is a concern to those of us who appreciate the history and integrity of the property. Mrs. Bagley said the other concern is she knows the area is zoned as Veteran's Memorial and there are no sign requirements in this particular zoning district, so she would like to know why they are looking at the commercial sign requirements as an alternative to maybe looking at residential home requirements for a home business. She believes only a small wall sign would be allowed. Mrs. Bagley asked why is the sign needed and said she is concerned this beautiful, historic building could degrade into just another commercial building in a lovely residential area.

Mr. Sauer had a question about the little white sign in the picture and asked if the sign moves around. Mrs. Bitar replied that staff has issued temporary use permits for different events in the building in the past, like when the Blue Star Moms put together their packages and need people from the community to volunteer. That may have been one of those signs for one of the times that those was allowed. The City has never issued a permit for a business in the building to have an advertising sign out temporarily. Mr. Sauer asked if those were all temporary signs that he is seeing. Mrs. Bitar said she is not saying that particular sign was approved, but there have been approval in the past.

Mr. Cal Taylor, PO Box 1284 Worthington, Ohio, stated he lived across the street for 40 years and he put his heart and soul into renovating the building for 4 years. He wrote the Veteran's Memorial Code since they did not have a zoning district fitting this unique building. This is the only building in the State of Ohio that is zoned as a Veteran's Memorial at the local level. It was zoned as residential until 1971, it had been inhabited until the 1960's. Mr. Taylor thanked Mrs. Bitar for some of the key points she brought up. Mr. Taylor said he is a retired Veteran, and the word Veteran has never been in the title of the building. This is a Veteran's Memorial, but the building has always been known as Sharon Memorial Hall. He said there really should be four listings on the sign, Sharon Township being one. The other names, two groups that meet once a month, one of them is a business in the building. The other businesses that are in the building do not have names on the sign.

Mr. Taylor said if at some point they wanted their names, then this would become a changeable sign, and he does not think they are allowed. Most of the tenants do not think that they need a sign, because they have a sign out front - a WW II gun. There are no other brick buildings on State

Route 161 with a gun out front. That gun was purchased from the American Legion for forty-eight dollars, which was the transportation cost. He has the checks and the original deed to prove that fact. He said the proposed sign is insensitive to the historic district. Mr. Taylor said when he wrote the zoning code, the neighbors were supportive of it. They did not envision this sign going up on the corner. He also would like to mention to Mr. Sauer the sign in the photograph was a BMW sign that was removed in 2009 because no one could come up with a permit for it, it was stuck out there. Others that have asked for signs have been directed to get temporary use permits.

Mr. Taylor said the name on the building is correctly called Sharon Memorial Hall. There are four business users, two churches, and two occasional users. The sign has two occasional users and one business are up there. Mr. Taylor wonders why one business is up there. He thinks there is more to it than that. He believes the sign is inappropriate and unneeded, future tenants cannot be added, and the gun has been a sign for the buildings for decade. No one asked for signage when he signed the original leases. Illumination could be an issue in the future. Mr. Taylor said that he does not want to see this building go back to being used commercially. He asked Mrs. Bitar why there was not a blue hearing sign on the property. Mrs. Bitar stated there should have been, but thought it might have fallen over or something might have happened to it. Mr. Taylor said again the building should stay with no new sign.

Mr. Coulter asked if there is anyone else in the audience that wanted to speak. No other speakers came forward.

Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Dilts to please come to the podium. He presented the option to table. Mr. Dilts requested to table this application.

Mr. Reis moved to table the application and Mr. Sauer seconded the motion. All Board members voted, "Aye" and the application was tabled.

- c. Fence – **72 E. Granville Rd. & 764 Hartford St.** (Ace Fence & Deck LLC/ Ventresca) **AR 65-16** (Amendment to AR 37-16)

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This house is not only a contributing building in the Worthington Historic District, but is also individually listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The original structure was built in the early 1800's, and additions were added at several points over the life of the house. There is an existing white wood fence with pickets that are straight across the top along the sides of the property, and a wire mesh fence exists toward the rear of the property. The wire fence is located between Beech trees that were planted 10 years ago to screen the addition constructed to the north.

The applicant received approval from the ARB in March to construct a new wood fence, matching the existing on the south side of the property, to replace the wire fence. The existing wood fence was designed as part of a competition and constructed using non-standard methods. The owners are committed to maintaining that fence, but would not like to replicate it due to the uniqueness of the design. The applicant is now asking for approval of a simpler version of the fence, rather than an exact match. The Board of Zoning Appeals approved a variance to allow new fencing in the proposed location.

Project Details:

1. Now proposed is a 4' high cedar fence with flat tops and no post toppers. The picket width and spacing would match the existing fence (1" x 4" with 2" spacing). The wood would be left in a natural state.
2. The purpose of the rear fence, which is south of the driveway to the freestanding garage, is to enclose the yard so the owners' pets cannot leave the property. Unfortunately, the existing rear wire fence is not substantial enough to accomplish that task.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Fencing should be open in style; constructed with traditional materials; 3' to 4' in height; in the back yard; and of simple design, appropriate for the house style. Design and materials should be compatible with the existing structure.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending approval of this application, as the proposed fence is complementary to the existing picket fence, but simpler in style which is appropriate for the location. The unpainted wood should more easily blend with the existing vegetation.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Rob Bruno of Ace Fence and Deck stated his name and address at 4459 Carrol Southern Road, Carrol Ohio. Mr. Coulter asked if there is anything else Mr. Bruno would care to add to Mrs. Bitar's presentation. Mr. Bruno said the fence will be constructed of cedar and they will use full thick 2" by 4" rails that would face the inside of the property. Mr. Sauer asked where Mr. Bruno gets his materials. Mr. Bruno responded that he makes his own materials. Mr. Sauer asked if that then means the fence is custom made, and Mr. Bruno responded yes. Mr. Sauer said then that means you could make something to match the fence that is already there. Mr. Bruno responded the way the fence is constructed in the picture, the 2" by 4"s are supported in between the 4" by 4" posts around the inside face of the post. Typical modern fence construction is to attach the 2" by 4" rail to the outside face of the post.

Mrs. Bitar stated the other difference is the caps which are individual pieces of wood put together in place. The property owner has maintained the fence for many years to stay like that but you can see that job is meticulous, and very difficult to have to maintain. Mr. Sauer said if you could leave off the caps and make it the same height, you would be moving in the right direction, but he still

does not understand why you could not have a fence that looks like that. Mr. Foust said he thinks he understands that this fence was not placed post first, then screw or nailed the entire fence structure to the outside of it. The individual fence structures connect into the sides of these posts, but he is perfectly fine with the outside posts, but the question remains, how does this fence compare to the other fence. Mr. Bruno stated it would be identical. Mr. Foust reiterated and asked if the fence would be the same picket width with the same width between. Mr. Bruno said yes, the fence is within a quarter of an inch with rough-cut lumber. Mr. Foust asked about the height. Mrs. Bitar said the fence was going to match the other exactly, at about 3 feet, but this is a request to go up to 4'.

Mr. Coulter asked Mrs. Bitar to bring up the photograph with the side yard. Mrs. Bitar said those are the pictures before the leaves, the recent pictures show that at this time of the year, the fence will not be visible. The fence will only be visible during the winter. Mr. Bruno clarified that the fence comes around and joins the existing fence. He said the last time they were before the Board, the issue was the vinyl and they were coming back with wood, and that is what they are doing here. The fence is screened very much from the road, which was the argument for the vinyl fence. The fence is not something that can really be maintained or stained because the location is between box trees. That was the argument with going for vinyl fence.

Mr. Foust said he is struggling with the issue that the ARB typically requires the opening between pickets to match the width of the pickets, which was waived in this case because the intent was to match the existing fence, especially in height and width and picket spacing. Now, the fence is not going to be the same color, the height is increasing; and the picket spacing would be kept closer like the existing.

Mr. Sauer said he was under the impression that this fence was going to be a continuation of the existing fence and wonders if this is still the case. Mr. Foust said the fence connects only at the back space. Mrs. Bitar clarified the fence encloses the yard. Mr. Bruno said that is the purpose, to enclose the yard.

Mr. Bruno pointed out the fence will essentially be comprised of two sections, and then the arch or angled turn will be made. Mr. Foust asked if the first couple sections to the tree would look like the existing fence or new fence. Mr. Bruno says it will look like the new fence. Mr. Foust said he thinks that whatever is along the streetscape needs to match, but along where it curves to the east it could be different. Mr. Coulter agreed with Mr. Foust that the fence along the streetscape needs to match as closely as possible to the existing fence, including painted white. But the rest could be a natural finish. Mr. Foust said he is not concerned about construction, with new construction, but it should be white for that section in line with the existing fence. Mrs. Bitar questioned whether the post tops should be the same. Mr. Foust said it could be without the post tops, but with matching height, so a person driving by will basically see the same fence.

Mr. Coulter asked if there is anyone in the audience that would like to speak for or against the application and no one came forward.

ARB Motion:

Mr. Foust moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY JIM & JORDY VENTRESCA TO AMEND CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS AR 37-16 BY CHANGING THE FENCE STYLE AT 72 E. GRANVILLE RD. AND 764 HARTFORD ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 65-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 65-16, DATED APRIL 27, 2016, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING WITH THE AMENDMENT TO SHOW THAT THE SECTION OF FENCE FACING HARTFORD STREET WILL BE THE SAME HEIGHT AND THE SAME PICKET SPACING AS THE EXISTING FENCE, THAT THE FENCE POSTS WILL EXTEND BEHIND THE FENCE TO THE SAME HEIGHT AS THE EXISTING FENCE SHOWS BUT WITHOUT THE EXISTING TRIM AND THE REST OF THE FENCE BE MADE AS PROPOSED, AND THE FENCE ALONG HARTFORD STREET WILL BE PAINTED WHITE.

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

d. Deck Replacement – **6452 Bellbrook Pl.** (Mark Davis) **AR 67-16**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This house is the second house north of W. Dublin-Granville Rd. on the east side of Bellbrook Pl., and is not easily seen from W. Dublin-Granville Rd. Approved by the ARB in 1989, the house is two-stories with a gabled roof, and finished with lap siding and brick accents. A 14' x 22' deck was approved and constructed on the east side (rear) of the house. The owner would now like to replace and enlarge the deck.

Project Details:

1. Originally the homeowners wanted to enlarge the deck 4' to the east, but decided against the idea due to the need for a variance and the timing of the project.
2. An adjustment is planned to the stepped down area on the south side to have it be level with the rest of the deck. An increase of 1'-2' of decking in that area is desired.
3. Construction is proposed with pine, and in a similar style as the existing deck with a 36" high rail.
4. There is no view of the deck from W. Dublin-Granville Rd. due to a fence installed in 2013.

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.

Discssion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Mark Davis stated his name and address at 6452 Bellbrook Place, Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Davis if he had anything more to add to Mrs. Bitar's presentation. Mr. Davis said no, he just wants to update the deck from builder-grade materials to something that is a little more aesthetically pleasing.

Mr. Coulter asked if there were any comments from the Board members. Mr. Foust said he liked the railing on this type of deck as compared to before. Mr. Davis says they also want to add a skirt to add to the look of the deck. Mr. Foust said again he liked this railing better. Mr. Sauer said he disagrees and likes the other but he guesses that is a matter of opinion.

Mr. asks if anyone in the audience would like to speak for or against this application, but no one came forward.

ARB Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY MARK DAVIS FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO REPLACE THE DECK AT 6452 BELLBROOK PL. AS PER CASE NO. AR 67-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 67-16, DATED APRIL 29, 2016, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

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

- e. Modifications to Front Elevation – **687 Evening St.** (Sean Kocheran/Stotzer) **AR 68-16**
(Amendment to AR 62-16)

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This ranch was constructed in 1958 and is on the west side of Evening St., south of W. Granville Rd. The house is not a contributing building in the Worthington Historic District. The property is 85' wide and an average of 158' deep. The owners were approved to make changes, including rear additions, at the last ARB meeting, but the front elevation was not approved. This application includes amendments to the proposed front elevation.

Project Details:

(Previously approved details that are not changing are italicized. **Proposed amendments are bolded.**)

1. *The existing house is stucco, with brick on parts of the front façade. The stucco is white; the brick is multi-colored with brown tones; and the roof is brown. Proposed for the existing house and addition are the following: the stucco would be painted light gray; the brick would be dark gray; and the roof is proposed as blended charcoal.*
2. *All of the existing windows are proposed for replacement with Pella aluminum clad wood casement windows, and any new windows would be the same.*
3. *A new mahogany front door is proposed.*
4. *Expansion of the front stoop into a porch that would extend to the garage and include a roof is proposed. The roof would have a forward facing gable to match the house gable to the north. **The porch is now proposed to be 1' back from the front of the house.** Square cedar columns with brackets at the top and a brick water table are proposed. ~~The gable would be gray Hardie board and batten siding, with standing seam metal at the base.~~ **The gable is now proposed as a flat panel and standing seam metal would not be used.** ~~Board and batten is also proposed to replace the stucco above the water table on the existing house wall below the gable.~~ **The existing brick would remain on the wall under the porch.** Existing shutters would be removed.*
5. *On the brick wall north of the entrance, ~~two new bay windows with seats inside are proposed. The windows are proposed with standing seam metal gables, stucco surrounds and brackets below.~~ **two double casement windows are proposed.***
6. **The garage door windows have been revised with rectangular rather than curved windows at the corners.**

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.

Recommendations:

Staff is recommending approval of this application, as the modifications are appropriate for this structure.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Sean Kocheran stated his address is 351 W. South St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Kocheran said the original brick will be left behind the columns instead of using board-and-batten. Mrs. Lloyd said she likes what is being proposed, feeling it looks much cleaner. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application but no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY THE SEAN KOCHERAN ON BEHALF OF JOE AND SHELLY STOTZER TO AMEND CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS NO. AR 62-16 WITH A REVISED FRONT ELEVATION TO RENOVATE AND ADD ON TO THE HOUSE AT 687 EVENING ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 68-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 68-16, DATED APRIL 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; Mr. Sauer, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye and Mr. Foust, aye. The motion was approved.

f. Front Porch Removal – **187 E. Granville Rd.** (James & Julia Miller) **AR 69-16**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This two-story house was constructed in 1951 and is on the south side of E. Granville Rd. west of Plymouth St. Improvements have been made over the years, including a two-story rear addition in 2008 and a deck in 2009. When the addition was approved in 2008, it was approved to have Hardie lap siding. Also mentioned was the future need to replace the deteriorating wood siding on the house. The homeowner is now undertaking that project by replacing the existing siding with Hardie siding in the same style. As that work is done, removal of the front porch roof structure is proposed.

Project Details:

1. There was a metal concave awning above the front porch. At some point in the 2000’s, the bottom part of the awning was removed and replaced with a box structure supported by narrow columns.
2. The entire structure is proposed for removal, leaving only a stoop. With the siding project there would not be any evidence of the awning or porch roof.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

From about 1915 on, porches generally were simplified and more integrated into the design of the house. Simple square or tapered columns were common. New porches (located where one is missing or there has not been a porch in the past) should be built in a simple design. Avoid ornamentation such as spindles and scrollwork unless they were traditionally used on the porches of similar buildings.

Recommendations:

Staff is recommending *approval* of this application, as neither the metal awning nor the current porch structure are appropriate for the house, or typical for the District.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Jim Miller stated his address is 187 E. Granville Rd., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application but no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Foust moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY JAMES AND JULIA MILLER FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO REMOVE THE FRONT PORCH ROOF AT 187 E. GRANVILLE RD. AS PER CASE NO. AR 69-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 69-16, DATED MAY 2, 2016, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

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

- g. Modifications to Multi-Family Dwellings – **634 High St. & 41 E. New England Ave.** (Worthington Lodge LLC) **AR 66-16** (Amendment to AR 50-14)

Findings of fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

In January of 2015, the City Council approved rezoning the Masonic Lodge property for use as multi-family housing. The PUD zoning also allowed for all C-5 Zoning District uses. The Architectural Review Board and Municipal Planning Commission approved final plans for the project in March of 2015. Since that time, the property owners have undertaken the approval process to be eligible for state and federal Historic Preservation Tax Credits. Modifications were needed to meet the interior and exterior standards for that program, and are before the ARB now for approval. Also part of this application are changes requested by the owner.

Project Details:

(Previously approved details that are not changing are italicized. Proposed amendments are bolded.)

1. Allowable Uses:

All C-5 District Uses are permitted on the property without a modification to the zoning except for the area east of the access drive that was zoned R-10 (Low Density Residential).

The proposal now includes the following uses:

- **First floor of the 1820 building would be 2 commercial spaces**
- **Second floor of the 1820 building would be a museum**
- **First floor of the 1955 building was modified from 3 residential units to 2**
- **Second floor of the 1955 building was modified from 2 residential units to 1**
- **Basement of 1955 building was to be a common area for the residential, but will now also include an office**

2. Design Regulations:

a. Character.

The project makes use of the historic lodge buildings, provides infill development along E. New England Ave., maintains and formalizes the access drive entrance to the Worthington United Methodist Church parking lot, and adds a 5' wide pedestrian walkway and lighting from the lot to E. New England Ave.

- b. Site layout: *Parking for the Lodge residential units is proposed in garages in place of the current Lodge parking. The access drive to the parking lot would remain in the same location, and a sidewalk with lighting is proposed on the west side of the drive. The units west of the drive are proposed 13' from the E. New England Ave. right-of-way line.*

c. Existing Buildings:

Existing windows, doors and stone panels are proposed to be retained.

- **West Elevation – The existing windows were always to remain, but now storm windows in “Café Cream” are proposed to be added. The addition of a door at the north end of the connector between the buildings was originally proposed, but now the existing window would be retained. Reconstruction with existing brick is proposed for the low wall in front of the connector. The metal gutter and downspout on the 1955 building are proposed for replacement. A lantern style light fixture is proposed north of the connector door. As shown in the enclosed photograph, the fixture would have scrolls on the top and bottom.**
- **South Elevation – New second floor windows are proposed in the rear part of the building that would align with existing first floor windows, and match the style of the second floor windows in the front of the building. Removal of the 2 existing second floor windows is proposed; recessed brick would fill the**

holes. New windows would have a brick rowlock for a sill; existing and replacement windows have a stone sill. At the rear, the open balcony area with exterior stairs is now proposed with everything enclosed. A four-season room would be created above the existing first floor of the building, and the stairs would be interior. Hardieplank Siding in “Woodstock Brown” is proposed on the first floor, windows would be on the second floor, and a “Weathered Zinc” standing seam metal roof is proposed.

- East Elevation – New arched windows, designed differently from the existing windows on the front, are proposed for the connector. New small dormers are proposed on the rear part of the roof. The existing stairs on the 1920 building would now be retained and painted rather than replaced.
- North Elevation – Two new entry doors are now proposed on the north side. Simple roof structures with columns would surround the doors. New windows are now proposed under the existing second floor glass block windows, which would remain. Other new and replacement windows are proposed on both floors.
- New fireplace flues are proposed at several locations on the roof. Matching light fixtures without the scrolls are proposed for the residential entrances. All new and replacement windows would be aluminum clad wood windows.

d. Garages:

Parking for the units in the lodge would be behind the 1955 building in 2 garages. The footprint of each building would be roughly 65’ x 25’ with about 28’ between the structures. Trash can pads are proposed east of the buildings.

Previously the garages were designed to accommodate 12 parking spaces, but with the reduction in dwelling units, part of the space would now be for storage rather than parking. Brick walls would now extend between the garages on the east side to an access gate, which appears to be metal.

The garages continue to be proposed as all brick. Garage doors are now proposed to look like more of a carriage door. Windows have been added and the cupolas have been redesigned to look like a lantern, having a hipped roof. Lantern style light fixtures with a top scroll only are also proposed for the structures.

e. Proposed Buildings:

West of the access drive from E. New England Ave. to the parking lot, a two-story structure with 2 townhomes is proposed. The units would each have a two-car garage with access from the access drive to the parking lot. The northern unit, ML #1 would have its entrance facing New England Ave.; the southern unit, ML #2, would have its entrance facing east. Both townhomes would have a private patio area on the west side of the structure. The new structure is proposed as a two-story structure finished

with a cultured stone veneer on the main living units and 6” Hardieplank lap siding between the units.

- **The building height in the townhomes was increased by 2’2” to allow for higher ceiling heights.**
- **A choice of Weathered Zinc standing seam metal or “Antique Slate” asphalt shingles is now proposed for the roofing.**
- **The entrances are proposed to be similar to the new lodge residential entrances. The same lantern style light fixtures without the scrolls are proposed for the residential entrances.**
- **The windows would be aluminum clad wood windows rather than all vinyl.**
- **The garage doors would be the same style as proposed for the lodge garages. Gooseneck lamps are proposed above the doors.**

No changes are proposed for the new structure east of the access drive.

- f. Landscaping: *A mixture of landscape and hardscape elements is proposed between and around the buildings including: ornamental and shade trees; shrubs; perennials; sidewalk and patio surfaces of brick, concrete and stone; a pergola; privacy fencing and gates; and a raised planter wall.*

The patio areas on the lodge site have been modified. For the townhomes, the condensing units are now proposed outside of the fenced area. A plan for screen the units is needed. Electric meters are shown on the east side of the townhomes near the front, so would be very visible from the front. A screening plan should be presented.

- g. Lighting: *Ten bollard lights are proposed along the new sidewalk west of the access drive.*

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Infill sites should be developed in a way that is complementary to their neighborhoods and that integrates well with surrounding building designs and land uses. Compatibility with the neighborhood should be the primary consideration. New structures should complement the form, massing and scale of existing nearby structures. Also, building placement and orientation are important design considerations. Most main entrances should face the street and garages should avoid facing the street.

Roof: Roof shapes for new buildings should be appropriate to the style or design of the building. If a new building does not follow a particular style but is instead a vernacular design, then roof shapes and heights similar to those in the neighborhood or nearby would be most appropriate.

Materials: Contemporary materials that simulate traditional ones are appropriate, but the preferred option is to use true traditional materials such as wood siding. Incompatible contemporary materials should be avoided. Brick has long been a traditional material in Worthington. Prepare a sample board for review by the Architectural Review Board.

Windows: For new buildings, multiple-paned windows generally are not appropriate. The exception is a building being built in a particular style -- such as Federal, Greek Revival or Colonial Revival -- that would have employed this window type. When in doubt, simple 1 over 1 double-hung sash windows are usually the simplest, least expensive and most appropriate choice. Using the excellent precedents of Worthington's many historic structures, carefully design the pattern of window openings; window sizes and proportions (they must be appropriate for the size and proportions of the wall in which they are placed); pattern of window panes and muntins; and trim around the windows. Good quality wood windows are readily available and more affordable than in the past. True wood windows are always the first preference. Aluminum- or vinyl-clad windows can be appropriate, but primarily on secondary facades and less conspicuous locations. All-aluminum or vinyl windows are not prohibited but are not encouraged. Avoid blank walls.

Entries: As with other design considerations, study Worthington's rich collection of 19th and 20th century architecture for design ideas for entrances and doors. For newly-built buildings, simpler designs usually look better than more ornate ones. Avoid heavy ornamentation on doors and entrances. Observe entry placement on existing buildings. Whether located symmetrically or asymmetrically, entries usually are aligned with a window on the second floor so that a regular rhythm of openings is maintained on both floors. Entries should be located so they are easily visible, and they should be oriented toward the street.

Color: In general, avoid bright colors not typical in Worthington neighborhoods, such as various shades of purple or orange. For infill buildings being placed in an existing streetscape, select colors compatible with those already used along the streetscape. Many buildings follow a pattern of light colors for the building body and darker colors for the trim. Following this pattern is encouraged. In Worthington, the use of white or cream-colored trim also is common and would be appropriate for new construction. Avoid using too many colors. Usually one body color and one trim color are sufficient.

Landscaping: Worthington's mature shade trees are the primary landscaping feature throughout the community. They are a major contributor to its character and help define its neighborhoods as stable, desirable places to live. In general, lawns are generous but not overly large, which contributes to the sense of human scale that is one of Worthington's important attributes. Other landscaping elements tend to be properly scaled and well-tended, which also tends to enhance neighborhood character. Maintain and nurture mature trees to prolong their lives. Plant and maintain street trees in planting areas between the street and sidewalk. Paving can sometimes reduce water absorption of the soil so much that trees do not get the moisture they require.

The standards of review in the Architectural District ordinance are:

1. Height;
2. Building massing, which shall include the relationship of the building width to its height and depth, and its relationship to the viewer's and pedestrian's visual perspective;
3. Window treatment, which shall include the size, shape and materials of the individual window units and the overall harmonious relationship of window openings;
4. Exterior detail and relationships, which shall include all projecting and receding elements of the exterior, including but not limited to, porches and overhangs and the horizontal or vertical expression which is conveyed by these elements;
5. Roof shape, which shall include type, form and materials;
6. Materials, texture and color, which shall include a consideration of material compatibility among various elements of the structure;
7. Compatibility of design and materials, which shall include the appropriateness of the use of exterior design details;
8. Landscape design and plant materials, which shall include, in addition to requirements of this Zoning Code, lighting and the use of landscape details to highlight architectural features or screen or soften undesirable views;
9. Pedestrian environment, which shall include the provision of features which enhance pedestrian movement and environment and which relate to the pedestrian's visual perspective;
10. Signage, which shall include, in addition to requirements of Chapter 1170, the appropriateness of signage to the building;
11. Sustainable Features, which shall include environmentally friendly details and conservation practices.

Worthington Comprehensive Plan

Village centers like Old Worthington are logical places to add residential density in and behind the main corridor. Such residential development adds more pedestrian activity, increases the market base for the retail stores, and can be designed as a product that is attractive to young professionals and empty nesters. In Worthington, redeveloping residential lots within the first High Street block requires expertise to prevent it from tearing into the historic fabric of the City. Such development must be evaluated on a case-by-case basis, but it would be critical to be appropriate for the site in scale and design while at the same time creating a continuous street front. One of the most effective methods for adding residential units in this area is to rediscover and recapture the upper floor spaces in existing and new development along the corridor.

The pedestrian-friendly, mixed-use nature of Old Worthington is historically appropriate. Its success indicates that there are significant land use lessons to be applied to redevelopment efforts in Worthington. It appears there may be new opportunities for mixed-use development in appropriate locations. The history of the High Street corridor indicates long-term success for a linear commercial development approach.

Worthington Area 360° Community Strategic Plan

With an historic community at its core, Worthington offers 21st century opportunities and global ties. Neighbors work together, support each other, appreciate diverse opinions and connect across

all ages, cultures and beliefs. Strong public institutions foster and invest in infrastructure, technology, economic development and public services that unite our community.

Vision 360:

- Housing – Worthington needs to develop a broad range of quality housing that meets the needs of all people, of all ages, with a diversity of incomes.
 - Strong neighborhoods with a variety of housing options
 - Implement higher density housing downtown
 - Density can be positive when handled correctly
 - Develop walkable, dense, mixed-use housing
 - Create different residential choices
 - Create opportunities for infill development
 - Address aging housing stock

- Downtown – Reflects Worthington’s values and becomes a place where people connect to live, learn, have fun, worship, dine, shop, visit and enjoy a distinctive Worthington experience.
 - Pedestrian friendly
 - Hub of activity
 - Higher density, without impacting the feel
 - Mix of uses (residential, retail and office)
 - Sense of place
 - Heart of the community

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending approval of this application, as the proposed changes would enhance the project.

Discussion:

Mr. Chris Peterson stated his address is 649 High St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Peterson said there is a State Historic Preservation Office which reviews the applications for National Park Service so ultimately their application will be decided by that office. The first cut is at the State Historic Preservation applications. Mr. Peterson clarified that copper will go over the door in the 1820’s building, and there is an existing goose neck lamp over the existing entrance now on High Street and that lamp will be replaced. The other goose neck lamps will be located above the garage doors. Mrs. Bitar explained the gutters and downspouts are going to be replaced on both buildings and she would have the applicant explain that in more detail.

Mr. Kevin Rohyans stated his address is 634 High St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Rohyans explained that the CT cabinet, which is the main incoming electrical line, will be located on the east end of the north garage. The cabinet will be wall mounted. Mr. Coulter explained that is something the Board would like to see visually screened with some type of soft landscaping. Mr. Rohyans thought he had given Mrs. Bitar an electrical drawing but she did not have any different electrical drawings in her presentation. She said that mechanical equipment will need to be

screened from the view of other properties and the right-of-ways. Mrs. Bitar asked Mr. Rohyans if the light above the garage was originally there and Mr. Rohyans said no, but he has looked at a few different photographs from the Historical Society and there was a light there at different times of the building's life. Mrs. Bitar said she wanted to mention that all of the other elements of these buildings will remain as part of this proposal, including all of the signs and symbols.

Mr. Coulter said before Mr. Peterson made his presentation he wanted to say how excited he was about the changes and what he has already seen. He believes the changes are a definite improvement over what was previously approved. Mr. Coulter said he realizes that Mr. Peterson has gone through the National Park Service to make some of the changes and he believes those changes will make the building more historically accurate and some of that is reflective of what is going on with the interior of the building. Mr. Coulter said he is very appreciative of the effort Mr. Peterson has made. Mr. Peterson said, "Thank you."

Mr. Sauer made reference to Mr. Peterson having to take a lot of flak from the community in the beginning of this project, and he hopes the community realizes what a nice job they have done. He said Mr. Peterson should take a lot of pride in what he has accomplished because this will be a very nice asset for the community. Mr. Peterson said, "Thank you."

Mr. Peterson said he had representatives from the architectural firm of Schooley Caldwell with him. The firm was formerly named Sims, Cornelius & Schooley, and designed the 1955 addition for the Masonic Lodge. He said there are historic features that will be preserved in the interior of the buildings that were not originally planned to stay. The building's historic value goes all the way up to 1955, which is part of the reason you see some of the weirdness going on with the recessed brick for windows they are infilling, the rowlock sills for the new openings they are creating, and keeping the glass block windows. Mr. Peterson said he will be available to answer questions but would like to turn over the discussion to the representatives from Schooley Caldwell so they can begin their presentation.

Mr. Brian Polaski stated he is representing Schooley Caldwell, 300 Marconi Blvd., Columbus, Ohio. Mr. Polaski showed the Board members, on the overhead projection screen, one of the original renderings that was produced by their firm in 1955. The President of the architectural firm, Mr. Robert Loversidge, Jr., was also present at the meeting. Mr. Polaski reviewed the photographs of the site and said while working with the preservation office they assigned zones/priority areas based on sensitivity, such as high, moderate and low. He showed an overview of the property, discussing the location of the lodge condominiums, the garages and where the townhomes will be. There will not be any residential units in the 1820's building, just commercial units on the first floor and a museum on the second floor.

Mr. Polaski said the existing windows on the rear of the south side of the building are made out of aluminum. The plan is to replace the windows with aluminum clad wood windows, and add windows, creating a continuous pattern on the second floor. Recessed brick will be used to fill in place of windows to be removed to tell the story that windows used to be there.

Mr. Polaski said the 1971 records vault was outside of the period of significance, and outside of the historical character of the building, so they will be creating a cementitious four season room on the second floor. There will be two residential units on the first floor, and one residential unit on the second floor. Each of the units will have an entrance into the courtyard area, and each of the entrances will have the look that fits in with Worthington's style. People will be able to see through the bay windows into the courtyard area. The mechanical room in the 1820's building which was built in 1945 will be re-clad with fibrous cement siding to match the four season room on the second floor. On the second floor of the 1955 building there was a large lodge room that will be kept and turned into a great residential unit. The vaulted ceiling will remain. The unit will also have living and dining rooms. The former stage will be turned into a kitchen. The museum will have minor touch ups such as painting. Mr. Polaski showed renderings of the interior space.

Mr. Polaski said the garage doors will become more carriage like, the lantern style light fixtures are a little bit nicer with more detail, and there will be new windows and doors on the back elevation of the garages. Instead of just a plain garage look they will now have more of a carriage house style. The townhomes will have roof tops with an asphalt shingle style which looks much nicer than standing seam metal roof. The standing seam metal roof will remain above the garage portion.

Mr. Reis said if he was a professor he would give Mr. Polaski an A+. He believes this is a vast improvement and he feels their firm did a very good job.

Mr. Sauer asked about the property on the other side of the driveway. Mr. Peterson asked if Mr. Sauer was referring to the free standing condominium, and Mr. Sauer said yes. Mr. Peterson said that condominium is very close to being under contract with a buyer and the construction company is close to submitting for a permit to build the condominium in the style that was originally approved. Mr. Coulter asked if the project was going forward with the design that was originally approved and Mr. Peterson said yes, nothing will be changed in regard to the PUD approvals.

Mr. Reis whether the surrounds on the exterior storm windows will fit within the framework of the existing windows so they will not look like they are applied storm windows and Mr. Peterson said yes. Mr. Peterson said the idea with the storm windows was to find the lowest profile they could to minimize the impact of the look of the windows. The color of the surrounds will match the trim of the windows. They chose the color of the trim based on what was available for the storm windows. Mr. Reis asked if the windows will be fixed and Mr. Peterson said some of the storm windows will be operable and some will not, as noted on the elevations. Most of the windows will be operable.

Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Polaski what type of material the gutters and downspouts will be. Mr. Peterson explained that has not been decided yet, but likely will be either copper or faux copper to match. Mrs. Bitar asked if the downspouts had always been dark and Mr. Peterson said downspouts had not been discussed with the preservation office, they were more concerned with

other elements of the project, so some new downspouts are planned. Mr. Sauer asked if that means that some of the downspouts will not be replaced and Mr. Peterson said that is correct. Mr. Reis asked if the existing shutters will remain and Mr. Peterson said yes. Mr. Peterson said the only thing they will be doing to the 1820's building is painting, sprucing things up, and adding storm windows. Mr. Foust asked about the light fixture and Mr. Peterson said there was a light there at one point in time, but that could go away depending on what is approved by the preservation office.

Mr. Sauer said the work that has been done so far represents care and expertise and he has confidence that whatever Mr. Peterson decides will be well done. Mr. Coulter said he would like to add one caveat to that. If anything on the exterior will be changing to please give Mrs. Bitar or Mr. Brown a call first and let them know before such change would occur.

Mr. Foust said he feels standing seam metal roof tops are becoming so common now. He asked Mr. Peterson if he would consider using stone or faux stone for the chimney area to represent the time period. Mr. Coulter clarified that what Mr. Foust is referring to is similar to what has been done to his neighbor's house in regard to preserving the chimney. Mr. Peterson said that will not be a problem in regards to the new construction, but the National Park Service takes a close look at things like that and would be difficult to change what is already there on the older buildings.

Mr. Reis said he feels the improvements will make a lot of people happy. Mr. Peterson said that he was very fortunate to have Schooley Caldwell on board with the plans because they are good record keepers and they have the actual plans and specifications from 1955. Mr. Peterson distributed the material samples to the Board members.

Mrs. Bitar asked Mr. Peterson about screening the condensing units. Mr. Peterson said screening has not been shown on the plans yet, but the intention is to screen the northwest corner for townhome number one. Mr. Coulter said he would appreciate screening the unit so it will not be seen from the street. The patio has changed to allow for a larger outdoor area. Mr. Sauer asked if the condensing unit would be close to the fenced in area. Mr. Peterson said he believes the original plan called for the condensing unit to be contained within the fenced in area, but it is now shown toward the front of the building.

Mr. Foust said he was not on the Board at the time of the original approval, but after listening to discussions about fences over the last couple of months, he asked Mr. Peterson if the fence would be wood instead of vinyl and Mr. Peterson said that is correct.

Mr. Peterson said in reference to the meters on the east elevation of the north townhome he was told they can only come off the pole from across the street because a leader feed would be expensive to install and the whole thing would need to be trenched out. He explained that is their preference to keep the meters where they are now. Mr. Peterson said he would like to explore from a Code perspective to see how high those meters need to go and then be able to screen them. He said he is only talking about a bank of two meters, and if they can be lowered he would like to screen the meters with landscaping. Mr. Coulter said once that matter is resolved with AEP,

Mr. Peterson can discuss the landscaping with city staff and if they have any concerns they can bring it up with the Board. Mr. Sauer asked if the meters would be fed overhead and Mr. Peterson said no. Mr. Peterson explained there is an existing pole on the east elevation of the 1971 addition and they will be dropping that because that is where the transformers are currently located. They are putting the transformers on the pole which is at the south end and east side of the access drive and going underground to the CT cabinet across the access drive.

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 WORTHINGTON LODGE LLC TO AMEND CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS AR 50-14 WITH AMENDMENTS TO THE APPROVED DRAWING FOR 634 HIGH ST. AND 41 E. NEW ENGLAND AVE., AS PER CASE NO. AR 66-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 66-16, DATED APRIL 29, 2016, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING WITH THE FOLLOWING AMENDMENTS:

- That the chimney flues on the new structures will be enclosed with a stone similar to that shown on the elevations;
- That screening be required for any mechanical or electrical units which are exposed to the public eye;

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

C. Municipal Planning Commission

1. Amendment to Development Plan

- a. Modifications to Freestanding Sign – **100 Old Wilson Bridge Rd.** (Pick of the Letter Signs & Graphics) **ADP 03-16**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This property is located on the north side of Old Wilson Bridge Rd. in the C-2 Zoning District, and has an approved Final Development Plan. Application must be made when the property owner wishes to change, adjust or rearrange buildings, parking areas, entrances, heights or yards,

following approval of a Final Development Plan. When variance requests are included, the modification must be approved by City Council.

The multi-tenanted office building is located on a parcel just over 2 acres in size, with other office buildings to the west; the Piano Conservatory to the east; the Shops at Worthington Place to the south; and the I-270 right-of-way to the north.

Last year, when Worthington Industries moved employees into this building, wall signs were added for the business facing both rights-of-way. Variances were granted to allow more than 1 wall sign and sign area greater than allowed.

There are 2 existing freestanding signs on the property: one near the west end identifying the property as Corporate Hill; and one near the east end by the drive entrance that was refaced for American Health Holdings in 2003. This is a proposal to restore and renovate the sign to the east.

Project Details:

1. The applicant is proposing to wrap the existing sign cabinet with an HDU foam wrap material and add a stucco finish. A sample has been provided. The sign would end up 8” wider and 3.5” taller than the existing, for 75.5” x 53.5” or 28 square feet in area per side.
2. Three PVC tenant panels are proposed on each side, each having black 4” graphics and the same font. Worthington Industries would not be named on the sign, so total sign area for the business would not be a concern with this application.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Sign Code:

Each business is permitted a maximum of 100 square feet of signage. The Code allows for a 2’ high x 8’ wide sign base that is not counted toward area. For properties larger than 2 acres in the I-1 Zoning District, 2 freestanding signs are allowed per development. Joint identification signs can display up to 3 business names.

Wilson Bridge Road Corridor

Exterior lighting fixtures are the preferred source of illumination.

(1) Freestanding Signs

- A. There shall be no more than one freestanding sign on parcels less than 2 acres in size, and no more than two freestanding signs on parcels 2 acres in size or greater.
- B. Freestanding signs shall be monument style and no part of any freestanding sign shall exceed an above-grade height of 10’. Sign area shall not exceed 50 square feet per side, excluding the sign base. The sign base shall be integral to the overall sign design and complement the design of the building and landscape.
- C. Freestanding signs may include the names of up to eight tenants of that parcel.
- D. Light sources shall be screened from motorist view.

Worthington Comprehensive Plan

The 2005 Worthington Comprehensive Plan stresses the importance of local business as a means to support municipal services provided to residents. The plan points to the success of the freeway commercial area as being critical to the health of the City.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending *approval* of the application, as it meets the current Code and adopted (but not yet effective) Wilson Bridge Corridor zoning requirements, and is complementary to the building.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked for the applicant and Mr. Scott McMannis stated he is representing Pick of the Letter Signs and Graphics. Mr. McMannis said Mrs. Bitar did a great job on the presentation and she mentioned everything in the request. He said the sign will represent the businesses in the building other than Worthington Industries. The sign would be wrapped in foam HDU. Mrs. Bitar presented the sample material to the Board members. 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 PICK OF THE LETTER SIGNS AND GRAPHICS ON BEHALF OF THE DONALD R. KENNEY COMPANY FOR APPROVAL OF AN AMENDMENT TO DEVELOPMENT PLAN TO MODIFY THE FREESTANDING SIGN AT 100 OLD WILSON BRIDGE RD. AS PER CASE NO. ADP 03-16, DRAWINGS NO. ADP 03-16, DATED APRIL 29, 2016, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

Mr. Sauer seconded the motion. Mrs. Bitar called the roll. Mr. Coulter, aye; Mr. Sauer, aye and Mr. Reis, aye. The motion was approved.

D. Other

Mrs. Bitar mentioned the e-mail sent to Board members regarding the house at 690 Evening St. The original owner went through the process and the only claim about color was that the garage would match the house. Staff's believed that meant the garage would be white like the house. The new owner thought he could go ahead and paint without approval because that is what the original owner told him. Mrs. Bitar said she had mentioned to the original owner that color is not always part of the approval process but a lot of times when there is a major renovation, big addition or new house the Board will approved the color and then any change would need to go back before the Board for further discussion.

Mrs. Bitar said what she needed from the Board is whether the change of the color of the house is something that they would like to discuss, or not. The homeowners have already spent a couple

of thousand dollars painting the garage the new yellow color. Mrs. Bitar said the homeowner has attached in his supporting statement that he has confirmed with the neighbors that they are all okay with the color change.

Mrs. Bitar asked the Board members if they felt this color change should come before them for approval. She said that typically if someone calls and asks if they need the Board to approve the color they are painting the house her answer is no, but advises the home owner to take a look at the design guidelines and historic palettes and what would be appropriate for the age of the house. Mrs. Bitar said Mr. Kiner submitted a palette for tonight's meeting.

Mr. Sauer said he cannot remember telling an applicant he did not like their color choice. He said the Board typically just asks for information about the color.

Mrs. Lloyd said she immediately thought about the recent project on Farrington Drive and how the project was approved but different materials and colors were used. She felt the Board is saying two different things if this house color is not considered. Mrs. Bitar said the only thing that she feels is different is the Farrington applicant clearly specified what color the house would be, and with the project on Evening Street, the Board has never discussed color, other than the garage was supposed to match the house.

Mr. Foust said he believed that reserving that option to discuss color especially with re-development is important. He said one of the statements in the Architectural Review Board guidelines is whatever is done to the house should be compatible with the surrounding homes. He continued to say there is a house on Morning Street that is bright purple. Mr. Foust said two of his neighbors that walk a lot stopped by and said they felt the Evening St. garage stood out and the color was inappropriate.

Mr. Coulter said he has seen the house at different times of day and the color looks different depending on the time of day and angle of the sun. Mr. Coulter said Mr. Kiner talked with the neighbors and made sure he was aware of their opinions. Also, he drove around the historic district and looked at all of the other homes that are of the same vintage. Mr. Coulter said the new owner lives in the Worthington Estates area and has lived there for a number of years and he has three children ages four, five and thirteen, and this is a relatively young family. Mr. Kiner asked his interior designer to come back out to the house to take a look at the color choice to see if he had made a mistake, and the designer said no, she is supportive of their original decision. The palette that Mr. Kiner found is from the 1920's, the same era as the home.

Mrs. Bitar said the way the guidelines describe colors for that era of home is lighter and cooler creams, grays and whites.

Mr. Sauer said he does not remember the discussion about the house being a specific color. He does remember the conversation about the garage being the same color as the house. Since the house was white does that mean both were supposed to be white, or does that have to be the case?

The house needs to be painted, but does it need to be the same color? Mr. Sauer continued to say he does not like the idea of telling people what color they can or cannot paint their house.

Mr. Foust said the Board already does because of the design guidelines stating the home should be the color that reflects the time period of the house.

Mrs. Bitar said she needs a decision from the Board because the home owner would like to move forward with painting. If people call to complain she needs to be able to explain the Board has no control over the color of the home. Mr. Reis said he feels a homeowner should not have to come before the Board to have the color approved.

Mrs. Bitar asked how many Board members feel the homeowner should not have to come before the Board to have the color of their home approved. Mr. Coulter, Mr. Sauer and Mr. Reis were in favor of the homeowner not coming to the Board to have the color of their home approved and Mrs. Lloyd and Mr. Foust disagreed. Mr. Coulter said he agreed with Mr. Foust that the color reference is in the Design Guidelines language. Mrs. Bitar confirmed the majority of the Board members present feel the homeowner does not need to come before the Board to have the color of their home approved.

E. Adjournment

Mr. Reis moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:50 p.m. and Mr. Foust seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned.