

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
WORTHINGTON ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
WORTHINGTON MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION
VIRTUAL MEETING
May 14, 2020**

The regular meeting of the Worthington Architectural Review Board and the Worthington Municipal Planning Commission was called to order at 7:00 p.m. with the following members present: Mikel Coulter, Chair; Thomas Reis, Vice-Chair; Kathy Holcombe, Secretary; Edwin Hofmann; David Foust, Richard Schuster and Susan Hinz. Also present was Scott Myers, Worthington City Council Representative; Lee Brown, Director of Planning & Building; and Lynda Bitar, Planning Coordinator.

A. Call to Order - 7:00 pm

1. Roll Call
2. Approval of minutes of the May 14, 2020 meeting

Mr. Reis moved to approve the minutes, and Mr. Hofmann seconded the motion. All Board members voted, “Aye,” and the minutes were approved.

3. Affirmation/swearing in of witnesses at each application

B. Architecture Review Board

1. Addition and Renovations – **605 Evening St.** (David and Amy Yenkin) **AR 17-2020**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

The house on this property is an L-shaped one story with a walk out lower level to the rear. Constructed in 1958, the house is not a contributing property in the Worthington Historic District. In the late 1980’s a covered porch was added to the rear at the southern part of the house; and in 2015 approval was granted for the porch to be replaced with a deck. A fence was approved on the south side of the property last year.

This is a request to construct an addition and renovate the house.

Project Details:

1. On the existing house there is a front facing gable for the garage at the south end, and a cross gable to the north. The garage is faced with brick and the house walls have horizontal

white siding. A covered porch supported by columns extends across the front elevation north of the garage. Double hung windows with shutters are on the existing house.

2. The proposed ~550 square foot addition would be primarily on the north side of the house and would include a small gable to the east. A larger gable is proposed to add area to the west with that part of the addition supported above the downward sloping grade.
3. It is not clear if any siding is being replaced, or what material is proposed for the new siding. Dark gray is the proposed color for the covered patio siding and for trim on the house, and the rest would be white. On the new north gable, a brick water table is proposed.
4. Windows of different shapes and sizes are shown on all sides of the house. The window material and color have not been identified.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

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

Recommendation:

Staff recommended modifications be made to the proposed plans. The windows and trim proposed for the front façade and the addition are not traditional looking and change the look of the house. The location, form and massing of the addition appear to meet the Design Guidelines.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked the Board members if they had any questions or concerns. Mr. Reis said he agreed with Mrs. Bitar regarding the design of the windows. He said he was not sure how to fix the issues but maybe incorporate some of the double hung windows that are on the rest of the structure. He said as far as the external materials, the siding, the HardiPlank, he was okay with that. Mr. Reis said the scale of the addition was fine, but the windows could use some refinement. Mrs. Holcombe felt the windows made the look more contemporary, but she did not feel the look fit the neighborhood. She felt the materials being used were fine and the scale of the house was fine. Mrs. Holcombe said she would like to hear some of the other Board members comments about the windows.

Mr. Hofmann said he felt the massing was well done, and the rear addition will be nice. He said he had less concerns about the rear addition since it was off the street. Mr. Hofmann said he appreciated the comments about the front addition, and he recalled the street having some eclectic homes. He suggested maybe keeping within the eclectic bounds of what type of homes were already on the street now, but he could be okay with some contemporary because that is somewhat typical for that era. Mr. Hofmann said he would be okay with some adjustment for the front elevations. Mr. Foust said he agreed that the massing fits and he was not real concerned with the back addition because no one would see that. He said he would like to see the style of the windows on the house carried over to the new addition. Mr. Foust said one small window on the front addition, inside a walk-in closet, he was wondering if that could be moved around to the south side of that addition so if someone needs to turn a light on in the closet that would not be visible from the front. Mr. Shuster said he echoed the earlier comments, he would like to see the windows

retained and be consistent on the addition because he felt the current design on the home was great. He said looking at the front, he would like to see the current roofline maintained across the front versus the reverse gable he felt that would be more consistent with the neighborhood. Ms. Hinz said her comments echo everyone else's as far as the massing; the general addition and the windows. She said the garage looked as if there is additional brick work being added and the tiny triangles on the sides of the windows might need infilled. Mr. Myers did not have any comments.

Mrs. Bitar swore in the applicant, Mr. Pete Foster, who said he was representing the homeowners. Mr. Foster said the goal of his client was to give the house some newness. The low profile of the existing gabled roof on the garage sets a tone for the street, so in developing a plan, they had space to go to the north, and they had space to go to the east, so the smaller gabled piece over the master that comes towards the street began to give them a book end at each end of the porch so they were hoping would allow for some privacy, but also to allow for a different color within the porch area. The brick shown on the existing garage, other than the center section, and a small water table piece they were going to add to the front, to tie the old in with the new, but brick is hard to match. Mr. Foster believed if the bricks were cleaned up it would be easier to match. He may also have some plantings in the front as the landscape develops.

Mr. Foster said if you look at the existing house, the current garage window is the same proportion as the window being discussed but it would instead be a casement window which is a little more contemporary. He said he went with a transom above that because a window punched in with the brick gets a little lost within all of that brick so they it allowed them to add a little bit of verticality to the elevation, as well as some trim above. Mr. Foster said the important thing to notice on the porch was that there were two different sized windows. One of the windows is very thin, and when the put the addition on, that window would also be a casement window to add some consistency to the porch.

He said he did not mind the comment about moving the window around to the other side of the porch, from the master closet, although being that it is a higher window, it would allow for some privacy as well as some wall space beneath it in the closet, but he did not believe it would be the best location from a function standpoint on the interior. Mr. Foster said he was trying to create some balance with the new gable with the new window. The new windows that are being proposed in the addition and as the addition wraps around the rear of the house are the bedrooms. The windows in the bedrooms now are high and do not meet the requirement of egress windows. The larger windows that are occurring in the bedrooms have been kept high, but he could switch to double hung on the front and casements on the back, but he was not a big fan of that because he felt consistency was important. Now that they are creating bedrooms, they need different sized windows to meet life safety standards. The windows are now a little larger, but he kept them high, but that was the reason for the different scale of windows.

Mr. Foster said in regards to the family room space, they thought they would like to do a glass room that looks onto some fantastic trees that border the western property line and bring more of the outside in as people sit in that space. The HardiBoard they are proposing, at minimum, would be an 8" exposure, which is like what is already on the house.

Mrs. Bitar asked if the new siding would match what is already existing on the house and Mr. Foster said the house would be completely resided. Mrs. Bitar asked what the new siding material would be and Mr. Foster replied the material would be James HardiBoard. Mrs. Bitar asked what size of lap would be used and Mr. Foster reiterated the size would be 8", but they could use larger which is approximately 11 ¼". Mr. Coulter said he wanted to confirm that the siding would be all HardiBoard, and not a mixture of HardiBoard and vinyl, and Mr. Foster said, "Correct."

Mrs. Amy Yenkin, the homeowner, said the HardiBoard would be only on the front of the building, and the rest of the home would be replaced with vinyl siding, and Mr. Foster said he was not aware of that. Mrs. Yenkin said the change was made due to the budget numbers that came back.

Mr. Hofmann said the breakup of the materiality, either the siding or the brick, was creating some of the problem for him, the more he studied the plans. He suggested not breaking up the material on the front of the house, and he was mainly concerned with the east elevation. Mr. Hofmann said there was a choice to fill those back in and that would help him a bit, and then in regard to the closet, if he took Mr. Foust's recommendation and proportion the bedroom window, there could be a symmetrical casement window on the left and the right. Mr. Foster said he did not feel any of the suggestions made by the Board would be a game changer. Mr. Reis said he agreed with Mr. Hofmann's suggestions, and agreed he would like to see a narrower window on the left side and move the closet window. Mr. Foster asked if the Board if they would be okay with eliminating the closet window altogether and they said that would be fine. Mr. Foster said he would discuss the window with his clients.

Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Brown if there had been any comments from the public and Mr. Brown said he had not received any emails, but there was one speaker.

Mr. Tom Burns, 1006 Kilbourne Dr, Worthington, Ohio, wanted to clarify if the house was in the Architectural Review District and Mrs. Bitar explained the house is located within the Architectural Review District, but not the Historic District. Mr. Burns asked if the house met the Design Guidelines, and Mrs. Bitar said staff felt the house did not meet the Design Guidelines in every way because the windows and the trim on the front façade were not traditional looking and changed the look of the house. The Guidelines recommend keeping the basic look of the house as much as possible. Mr. Burns asked if there was a safety or construction problem with the addition as submitted, but it seemed like the answer to that was no. He said he assumed this was an interpretation of the Guidelines and asked if the Board disagreed with the larger safe windows, and Mrs. Bitar clarified that the Board members agreed the larger safer windows were fine. The Board members are only concerned with the front façade. Mr. Burns felt the design was fine, but he felt the level of detail they were getting into was a bit overly in depth for a private residence that has a good-looking addition being proposed for the house. He approved of the project.

Mr. Brown said he received an email from the neighbor, Ms. Karen Madden of 605 Evening St., Worthington, Ohio, and she was in favor of the project. There were no other speakers.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY DAVID & AMY YENKIN FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO CONSTRUCT AN ADDITION AND RENOVATE THE HOUSE AT 605 EVENING ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 17-2020 DRAWINGS NO. AR 17-2020, DATED MARCH 13, 2020, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING AND THAT THE EAST ELEVATION ADJUST THE MASTER BEDROOM WINDOW AND TO BE REVIEWED BY STAFF AND THAT THE SMALL WINDOW ON THE SAME ELEVATION MAY BE REMOVED OR RELOCATED TO THE SOUTH ELEVATION

Mrs. Holcombe seconded the motion. Mr. Brown called the roll. Mr. Schuster voted, “Nay,” because of the Board members concerns about the windows and the front design is a departure from that neighborhood. Mr. Foust voted, “Nay,” because of the same reasons Mr. Schuster expressed, but with some changes he would be okay with the project in the future. Mr. Hofmann, aye; Ms. Hinz, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Coulter, aye. The motion was approved.

2. Garage Modification – 100 W. South St. (Neil Toepfer) AR 18-2020

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This property in Old Worthington is 70.13’ wide and 150’ deep. The owners gained approval on March 22, 2018 to create a house with more living space and create space that is accessible. The project originally involved partial demolition of the existing house, construction of an addition and garage, and total renovation. The owners ended up demolishing the entire house and are in the process of building a new structure that matches the design of the previous approval. A new detached garage is nearly complete. An extension of the construction completion period to the end of this year was granted by the Board of Zoning Appeals on May 7, 2020.

This application is a request for approval to install a window instead of a vent in the main garage gable.

Project Details:

1. The new detached garage is at the northwest corner of the property and is roughly 33’ wide x 22’ deep. The structure was approved to be 3’ from the west property line and 10’ from the rear. Variances were granted for side yard setback and total accessory structure area, which includes a one-car attached garage at the northeast corner of the house.
2. On the street facing gable above the garage doors, a 16” x 32” attic vent was proposed. Now the owners would like to install a 24” x 36” double hung window with simulated divided light windows in a four over four pattern. The trim would match that on the garage and proposed for the house.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

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. Design and materials should be traditional, and compatible with the existing structure.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of this application, as the proposed window was appropriate in this location.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the Board members had any questions or concerns and Ms. Hinz asked if there were any other aesthetic changes since the vent was removed. Mrs. Bitar swore in the applicant Mr. Neil Toepfer, 100 E. South St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Toepfer said the reason for the change of the vent to a window was because the area above the garage will be conditioned so he could not have a vent in that place. The window going in place of the vent will be the same type window, same material that already exists on the garage and the house. The original make of the other windows went out of business in 2019 so he is looking at a few other companies that offer a similar window.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY NEIL TOEPFER FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL A WINDOW IN THE GARAGE GABLE AT 100 E. SOUTH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 18-2020, DRAWINGS NO. AR 18-2020, DATED APRIL 6, 2020, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

Mr. Foust seconded the motion. Mr. Brown called the roll. Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Hofmann, aye; Mr. Schuster, aye; Ms. Hinz, aye; Mr. Foust, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; and Mr. Coulter, aye. The motion was approved.

3. Deck Replacement – 615 Oxford St. (Lynn A. Bird) AR 19-2020

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This house is a single-story stucco ranch constructed in 1935. In 2002 the Board approved the construction of a 230 sq. ft. composite (TimberTech) deck on the rear of the home. The rear yard is heavily landscape and slopes to the west and was reworked as part of a major hardscape and landscape plan last year (approved drawings included). With this application replacement of the deck is proposed.

Project Details:

1. The existing deck is reportedly stained and the cedar railings are rotted.
2. The proposed deck would have roughly the same footprint as the existing deck.
3. Trex flooring in gray would replace the existing. The railings would be replaced with metal railings in black.

Land Use Plans:Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Decks and patios should be limited to the rear of buildings. Decks should be built of wood and kept low to the ground. Finishes should be either paint or an opaque stain to match the color of the building or its trim. Patios may be constructed of concrete, stone or brick. Consider the style of the house when designing decks and patios, since some styles and some designs are not compatible.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of this application, as the proposed deck was appropriate.

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar swore in the applicant, Ms. Lynn Bird, 615 Oxford St., Worthington, Ohio. Ms. Bird had no further comments to staff's presentation. All Board members felt the project was wonderful and no questions or concerns. Mr. Brown said there were no emails or outside callers.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY LYNN BIRD FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL A NEW DECK AT 615 OXFORD ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 19-2020, DRAWINGS NO. AR 19-2020, DATED APRIL 13, 2020, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

Mr. Schuster seconded the motion. Mr. Brown called the roll. Mr. Hofmann, aye; Mr. Foust, aye; Ms. Hinz, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Schuster, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; and Mr. Coulter, aye. The motion was approved.

4. Replace Fire Escape – **41 Short St.** (New England Construction) **AR 20-2020**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions**Background & Request:**

This building is a rare fourplex in Old Worthington that was constructed in 1935. On the front, the two-story brick building has patio space for the two units on the first floor and balconies for the two units on the second floor. There is a deteriorated metal fire escape on the rear that is proposed for replacement with this application.

Project Details:

1. The new structure would extend out 12'6" from the building with a flat roof, creating a roughly 9' x 9' area for each upstairs apartment, with steps leading to the ground level. The new structure would be above the existing exterior basement access for the first-floor apartments. As part of the project, existing concrete and railings at the ground level would be replaced.
2. Materials proposed for the fire escape include:
 - Timbertech composite material would be used for the decking (6" wide Vintage Mahogany) and railings (Impression Rail in black).
 - New columns would be fiberglass Perma Wrap that would look similar to those on the front of the building.
 - Boral composite fascia and soffit boards are proposed.
 - The ceiling would be tongue and groove Panlowia.
 - EPDM rubber roofing is proposed.

Land Use Plans:Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Original porch elements should be retained to the maximum extent possible and should be duplicated in the same design and materials if deteriorated or missing. Wrought or cast iron or aluminum supports and railings should not replace original elements unless the originals were made of these materials (this typically was true primarily of post-World War II houses). Porches tend to project from a house and are exposed to the weather. Watch for signs of deterioration caused by moisture such as streaking, staining, mildew, dry rot, moss growth and peeling paint

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of this application. Although the metal fire escape is likely original, replacement with a product that looks like wood is also appropriate.

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar swore in the applicant, Mr. Kevin Rohyans, representing New England Construction, 41 S. Short St., Worthington, Ohio, said the fire escape is very rusty, and an eye sore after years of neglect and there are some safety concerns. Mr. Hofmann asked if the concrete curbs and steps would be removed and Mr. Rohyans said the first step would be demolished and they would try to hide most of the staining. Mrs. Holcombe and Mr. Coulter felt this would be a wonderful change to the backside of this building. The stairs would be safer and more in line with the Design Guidelines. Mr. Brown explained there were no emails or outside callers.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY NEW ENGLAND CONSTRUCTION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO REPLACE THE FIRE ESCAPE AT 41 SHORT ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 20-2020, DRAWINGS NO. AR 20-2020, DATED APRIL 14, 2020, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

Mrs. Holcombe seconded the motion. Mr. Foust, aye; Mr. Schuster, aye; Ms. Hinz, aye; Mr. Hofmann, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; and Mr. Coulter, aye. The motion was approved.

5. Hot Tub – **6452 Bellbrook Pl.** (Mark & Ashley Davis) **AR 21-2020**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

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 in 1989 and replaced and enlarged in 2016. The owners would now like to install a hot tub in the rear yard.

Project Details:

1. The 7' x 7' x 3' high hot tub is proposed near the northeast of the deck. The rear yard is enclosed with a fence.
2. The Jacuzzi J-425 would have a brown exterior and cover.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

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

Recommendations:

Staff recommended approval of the application as the hot tub appeared it would be an attractive addition to rear yard.

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar swore in the applicant, Mrs. Ashley Davis, 6452 Bellbrook Pl., Worthington, Ohio. Mrs. Davis did not have any additional comments, nor did any of the Board members. Mr. Brown said there were no emails or outside callers.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY MARK & ASHLEY DAVIS FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO ADD A HOT TUB AT 6452 BELLBROOK PL. AS PER CASE NO. AR 21-2020, DRAWINGS NO. AR 21-2020, DATED APRIL 24, 2020, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

Mr. Hofmann moved. Mr. Brown called the roll. Mr. Schuster, aye; Ms. Hinz, aye; Mrs.

Holcombe, aye; Mr. Hoffman, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; and Mr. Coulter, aye. The motion was approved.

6. Front Porch – **661 Seabury Dr.** (Famiglia Homes/Piche) **AR 22-2020**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This two-story house at the southwest corner of W. Dublin-Granville Rd. and Seabury Dr. was constructed in 1962. The house has a combination of brick and vinyl siding. Approval is sought to construct a front porch.

Project Details:

1. A new 34' wide x 8' deep concrete porch with a roof is proposed to extend across the front of the house.
2. The shed roof structure would be supported by square columns. White board and batten vinyl siding is proposed in a small front gable and on the sides of the shed roof. Asphalt shingles would match the existing roof.
3. Variances for placement would be necessary due to the 50' setback requirement for W. Dublin-Granville Rd.

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. 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.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of this application, as the proposed porch was appropriate for this house.

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar swore in the applicant, Mrs. Alainna Greene, who was representing the homeowner of 661 Seabury Dr., Worthington, Ohio. Mrs. Greene said the house would not be painted, but both the posts and the peak would be white. Mr. Hofmann said the porch would make the house look good. Mr. Foust said he drove through the Kilbourne area and the proposed porch was very similar to other porches of the time period. He said the project was done very well. Mr. Coulter said he echoed Mr. Foust's comment. Mr. Brown said there were no emails or outside callers.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY FAMIGLIA HOMES ON BEHALF OF MICHAEL AND DANIELLE PICHE FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO ADD A FRONT

PORCH AT 661 SEABURY DR. AS PER CASE NO. AR 22-2020, DRAWINGS NO. AR 22-2020, DATED APRIL 30, 2020, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

Mr. Foust seconded the motion. Mr. Brown called the roll. Ms. Hinz, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Hofmann, aye; Mr. Schuster, aye; Mr. Foust, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; and Mr. Coulter, aye. The motion was approved.

C. Municipal Planning Commission

1. Conditional Use Permit

a. Recreational Facility in I-1 – 7086 Huntley Rd. (M Lab Ohio LLC) CU 03-2020

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This 1.37 acre property has a roughly 22,000 square foot building that was constructed in 1978. This request is to locate a Recreational Facility, Movement Lab Ohio, in the north half of the building. The business is a fitness center that is focused on providing professional training and entertainment for obstacle course racing and building active local communities. Classes, open gyms, team practices, camps, birthday parties, competitions, seminars, yoga classes, weightlifting, private training, and more will be offered mostly in the evening and on weekends.

Basic Standards and Review Elements: The following general elements are to be considered when hearing applications for Conditional Use Permits:

1. Effect on traffic pattern – Ample parking is available adjacent to the building and will mostly be used at times the other tenant is not in the building.
2. Effect on public facilities – No effect has been identified.
3. Effect on sewerage and drainage facilities – The effect would be minimal.
4. Utilities required – No new utilities would be required.
5. Safety and health considerations – None have been identified.
6. Noise, odors and other noxious elements, including hazardous substances and other environmental hazards – None have been identified.
7. Hours of use – Generally 4:00 am – 10:00 pm, but possibly some daytime hours also.
8. Shielding or screening considerations for neighbors – Not applicable.
9. Appearance and compatibility with the general neighborhood – Signage would need to meet Code requirements.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Conditional Use Permit Regulations

The following basic standards apply to conditional uses in any "C" or "I" District: the location, size, nature and intensity of the use, operations involved in or conducted in connection with it, its site layout and its relation to streets giving access to it, shall be such that both pedestrian and

vehicular traffic to and from it will not be hazardous, both at the time and as the same may be expected to increase with increasing development of the Municipality. The provisions for parking, screening, setback, lighting, loading and service areas and sign location and area shall also be specified by the applicant and considered by the Commission. Recreational Facilities are a conditionally permitted use in the I-1 Zoning District.

Recommendations:

Staff recommended approval of the application. There should be minimal effect on traffic patterns; public facilities; sewerage and drainage facilities; and utilities. No safety or health considerations or environmental hazards have been identified.

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar said there was an error in the memo about the operating hours. The hours of operation would be mainly after 4:00 p.m., not 4:00 a.m. Mrs. Bitar swore in the applicant Ms. Michelle Buurma, 7086 Huntley Rd., Worthington, Ohio. Board members had no questions or concerns. Mr. Brown said there was one email by Mr. Tom Burns, 1006 Kilbourne Dr., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Burns said small businesses were the lifeblood of the community and the City should do everything that they can for Movement Lab to do business in Worthington. There were no emails or outside callers.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY M LAB OHIO LLC FOR A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO OPERATE A RECREATIONAL FACILITY AT 7086 HUNTLEY RD. AS PER CASE NO. CU 03-2020 DRAWINGS NO. CU 03-2020, DATED APRIL 30, 2020, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE PLANNING GOALS OF THE CITY, AS REFERENCED IN THE LAND USE PLANS AND FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

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

D. Other

Mr. Brown discussed the Tree Caliper fee that was previously discussed on March 12th with the Board members. Mr. Brown said the Board members had originally approved of lowering the Caliper Fee from \$450.00 to \$150.00 but have now figured a truer cost would be \$250.00 per tree if you related it to the City's Street Tree Program. Mr. Brown wanted to clarify that after our March 12th meeting he realized that the City's contribution was discussed when we reference the Street Tree Program as a basis for the lowering of the fee. Mr. Brown gave an overview of the program and the true cost associated with the program and recommended adjusting the fee from the previously recommended \$150.00 per caliper inch to \$250.00 per caliper inch. Mr. Reis said he was okay with the \$250.00 fee, however asked for clarification on the fee structure. Mrs. Holcombe asked for clarification about the fee, if the fee would be for the one to one and a half inch tree but would that also be the same fee for replacing a four inch tree. Mr. Hofmann said if a

developer wanted to cut down 10 caliper inches on the site, that fee would be multiplied across those ten inches, say for example two five-inch trees. Then there is a cost for the City to replace two trees that are brand new. Mr. Brown said the caliper fee would not occur until the tree was at least six caliper inches. Mr. Foust said he was comfortable with anything between \$150.00 and \$250.00. The Board discussed the overall goal is to preserve mature trees if possible and felt that the \$150.00 per caliper inch fee brought in more money than just tying it back to the fee associated with the Street Tree Program since the fee was for every caliper inch over six inches in size. Mr. Myers thanked the Board members for the clarification and said while they want to encourage that trees remain there has to be a balance between the trees remaining and the Draconian cost. Mr. Coulter agreed and said a good example was the apartment project on East Wilson Bridge Road. There were so many trees that needed to be removed and the cost was so high the developer almost walked away from the project. He said he echoed Mr. Hofmann's comments and the cost needs to be reasonable. All Board members agreed to the caliper inch fee of \$150.00 per caliper inch for trees 6" or larger.

Mr. Foust moved that the City charge a fee of \$150.00 dollars per caliper inch for the removal of any tree over six inches. Mr. Reis seconded the motion. Mr. Brown called the roll. Mr. Hofmann, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; Mr. Foust, aye; and Mr. Coulter. The motion was approved. Mr. Coulter said it would be recommended to City Council that any tree over six inches or larger in caliper would be subject to the \$150.00 dollar fee per inch.

Mr. Brown thanked the Commission for the discussion and clarification related to amending the fee recommendation that would be sent to City Council for discussion. There were no emails or outside callers.

E. Adjournment

Mr. Foust moved to adjourn the meeting, and Mr. Reis seconded the motion. All Board members voted, "Aye," and the meeting adjourned at 8:42 p.m.