

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
WORTHINGTON ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
WORTHINGTON MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION
VIRTUAL MEETING
May 28, 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. Deck/Picnic Shelter – **1900 W. Dublin-Granville Rd.** (Jack Rosen/Perez) **AR 23-2020**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This property is roughly 1.6 acres with a two-story house that was constructed in 1963. A portion of the rear yard is fenced in, and outside of the fence the property drops off to the ravine below. The applicant is proposing construction of a picnic shelter with a deck in the rear yard.

Project Details:

1. The proposed 18’ x 14’ structure would be northeast of the house near the edge of the slope to the ravine and about 16’5” from the east side property line. It would be angled toward the house.
2. The wood structure is proposed with a 5:12 pitch open gable roof that would be stained to match Timbertech “Tigerwood” flooring. Dimensional asphalt shingles would be used to match the house roof. A 3’ x 3’ landing and steps are proposed for access.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

New outbuildings should use design cues from older nearby structures, including form, massing, roof shape, roof pitch and height, materials, window and door types and detailing. Try to create a new building compatible in appearance with the house it accompanies.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of this application. The proposed structure is appropriate in this location.

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar swore in the applicant, Mr. J.J. Perez, 1900 W. Dublin-Granville Rd., Worthington, Ohio, did not have any additional comments to staff's presentation. Mr. Foust said he felt the structure would be far enough back from the road and would not impact the Architectural Review District. Board members had no other comments or concerns. There was one email submitted by the neighbors who were in support of the project. The neighbors were Mr. & Mrs. Brown, 1940 W. Dublin-Granville Rd., Worthington, Ohio.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY JACK ROSEN ON BEHALF OF JUAN JOSE PEREZ FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO ADD A DECK/PICNIC SHELTER AT 1900 W. DUBLIN-GRANVILLE RD., AS PER CASE NO. AR 23-2020, DRAWINGS NO. AR 23-2020, DATED MAY 7, 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. Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Foust, aye; Ms. Hinz, aye; Mr. Schuster, aye; Mr. Hofmann, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; and Mr. Coulter, aye. The motion was approved.

2. Fence Modifications – 541 Oxford St. (1150 Alum Creek LLC) AR 24-2020

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This Cottage style house was built in 1921 and is a contributing property in the Worthington Historic District. The property is at the northwest corner of Oxford and South Streets. The house was purchased and renovated last year and is about to be sold to a new owner. Included with the renovations were repairs to the existing fence that was originally approved in 1991. Those repairs resulted in a change to the look of the fence.

Project Details:

1. The original fence was a 42” high wood fence with 4” wide dog-eared pickets and equal spacing between pickets. The fence was approved by the ARB, and the Board of Zoning Appeals approved a variance for placement in the side yard setback.

2. Repair of the fence involved installation of new pickets that appear wider, mainly on the inside of the fence.
3. There is heavy vegetation along the south side of the fence.

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:

The previously approved and installed fence met the Design Guidelines. The new pickets that are possibly wider and placed closer together create a more solid look to the fence and gates. Although much of the fence is screened with an existing hedge, a future property owner could remove that vegetation at any time. Staff is recommending the fence be modified to reflect the previous approval more closely with pickets on one side and larger openings between pickets. Another alternative might be to line up the pickets on both sides of the rails.

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar swore in the applicant, the homeowner, Mr. Matthew Pasternak, 541 Oxford St., Worthington, Ohio, and he thanked the Board members and staff for the work they do because that was the primary reason for relocating to Worthington. Mr. Pasternak said he has lived in Worthington for six days and purchased the home with the fence in its current condition. He said he planned to keep the hedges in place for as long as he owns the home. Mr. Reis asked who the previous homeowner was and if that homeowner was aware of the requirements within the Architectural Review District for fencing. Mr. Pasternak said he had the information for the previous homeowner's LLC but he was not sure about his knowledge about the area. Mr. Coulter said as he looked at the photographs, he believed the previous homeowner was Mr. Joel Mazza, and Mr. Mazza is aware of the requirements of the Architectural Review Board (ARB). Mr. Reis said Mr. Mazza has been in front of the ARB before, and Mr. Mazza is aware of the Design Guidelines and he should have come to the Board before doing anything. Mr. Foust explained the only place there is privacy style fencing is along properties that border commercial property and the privacy fencing is needed to screen out headlights. The fence is now different than what was originally approved, the original fence had open style pickets. Mr. Foust asked if most of the fence had been replaced on both sides. Mr. Pasternak said after speaking with the previous owner, he was told the entire fence was updated with cedar planking on the inside of the fence. He said from his observation it matches the picket width of the neighboring fence. Mr. Foust said approval would be needed because the fence should have 50% open pickets. He said he was a little perplexed by what he was seeing. Mr. Coulter said he did not want to punish the new homeowner since he was unaware of what happened to the fence. He asked the other Board members what they thought if the homeowner took off the interior panels of the fence to make the fence open style picket again. Mr. Reis said he would be willing to compromise with Mr. Coulter's suggestion, but he would also like to reach out to the previous homeowner and explain the Board would no longer tolerate this way of doing things in the Review District. Mr. Reis said leaving the panels open would be in line with the Design Guidelines. Mr. Schuster asked when the homeowner received information about the fence. Mr. Pasternak said he received information

from his realtor before closing on the house last week. His realtor informed him that he would be responsible for any remedy. Mr. Pasternak said he was sorry, but he was unaware of what was going on with the fence. Mr. Coulter asked for clarification of where the new fence was, and Mrs. Bitar explained the new panels were placed on the interior of the existing fence to create a shadowbox style of fencing, and the corners of the house have all new fencing. The rest of the fence has the old fence on the outside and the new fence on the inside. Mr. Reis asked if the interior panels were added for stability of the fence and Mrs. Bitar said, yes, that is what was expressed by the previous owner when she asked him. The change was never approved. Mrs. Holcombe said the fence should reflect what is appropriate for the district.

Mrs. Bitar swore in Mr. Joel Mazza. Mr. Coulter said Mr. Mazza has been before the Board several times before and asked him to explain why he did what he did. Mr. Mazza said when he began to rebuild the fence, the fence was in very bad condition. He used all of the existing posts except for one. He added the panels for structural support. The fence is behind shrubbery. Mr. Mazza said when he spoke with the neighbor to the north, his fence was a little different than the fencing on the outside of the hedges, so he matched the fencing that was between the two properties. He said he re-built the gates and shadow boxed them.

Mr. Schuster said Mr. Mazza knew he should have come before the Board and he chose not to do so, and he knew the risk he was running. He said he was very disappointed that Mr. Mazza chose not to talk with the Board before making the changes. Mr. Schuster said he felt bad for the new homeowner, but Mr. Mazza took a risk and that risk did not pay off. He said he agreed with Mrs. Holcombe and that the fence should reflect what is appropriate for the area, and within the Design Guidelines. Mr. Brown said there were no additional comments from email or outside callers, other than the email mentioned by Mrs. Bitar earlier from Mr. Ribic, which was already emailed to the Board members, and the neighbors were in support of the fence.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY 1150 ALUM CREEK LLC FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO LEAVE FENCE MODIFICATIONS INTACT AT 541 OXFORD ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 24-2020, DRAWINGS NO. AR 24-2020, DATED MAY 4, 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. Mr. Schuster, nay; Mrs. Holcombe, nay, because the fence needs to be modified to reflect the spacing requirements for the district; Mr. Hofmann, nay; Ms. Hinz, nay; Mr. Foust, nay; Mr. Reis, nay, and the homeowner should take up the issue with the previous owner to make the fence reflect what is required by the Design Guidelines; and Mr. Coulter, nay, because the fence needs to reflect what is appropriate for the Design Guidelines. The motion failed.

3. Sign – 7176 N. High St. (Amanda Hanna/Starbucks) AR 25-2020

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This commercial building was constructed in 2002, and the last original tenant, COSI, closed in 2016. The current tenants are Starbucks, Immediadent, Jimmy John's, SportClips and Blaze Pizza. At the time of development, the building owner agreed to a unified theme for signage and awnings which included similar sizes, coordinated colors, and internally illuminated channel letters. Text styles were allowed to be different. As tenants have changed over the years, the basic premise of the sign package has been followed, except a larger variety of colors has been allowed. Currently, the signs are red, blue, green, white, black and orange. The awnings across the front of the building were all changed to black when Blaze Pizza was approved in 2017.

Starbucks was not one of the original tenants of the building but has been operating at this location since 2006. This is a request to change the wall sign.

Project Details:

1. The existing wall sign consists of 12" high green internally illuminated channel letters spelling "STARBUCKS COFFEE" and 8" high internally illuminated channel letters spelling "DRIVE-THRU".
2. Proposed is replacement of the "STARBUCKS" letters with 14" channel letters in white with black returns mounted further down in the sign panel. The "COFFEE" letters would be removed and "DRIVE-THRU" would be moved up a bit.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

The Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance recommend signs be efficient and compatible with the age and architecture of the building. 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. Exposed raceways or wiring are not desirable. The Architectural District Ordinance calls for design and materials to be compatible.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of this application. The proposed changes to the wall sign are appropriate for this development.

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar swore in the applicant, Ms. Amanda Hanna, 7176 N. High St., Worthington, Ohio. Board members had no questions or concerns. Mr. Brown said there were no emails or calls regarding this application. Mr. Coulter asked Mrs. Bitar if there were any issues regarding the size of the sign and she said no.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY AMANDA HANNA OF ADAMS SIGNS ON BEHALF OF STARBUCKS FOR APPROVAL OF A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO CHANGE THE WALL SIGN AT 7176 N. HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 25-2020, DRAWINGS NO. AR 25-2020, DATED MAY 1, 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. Hofmann, aye; Mr. Foust, aye; Mr. Schuster, aye; Ms. Hinz, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; and Mr. Coulter, aye. The motion was approved.

4. Sign – 890 High St., Suite A. (Clarkson Eyecare) AR 26-2020

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This two-story brick building was constructed in 2018. COPC Worthington Pediatrics is on the second floor, and Porch Growler occupies the southern space on the first floor. Papillion Day Spa is located in the center of the first floor. This is a request by Clarkson Eyecare for a wall sign at northernmost suite of the first floor.

Project Details:

1. The proposed sign would consist of ½” thick individually mounted PVC letters painted satin white spelling “Clarkson Eyecare” spanning ~10.5’. The capital letters would be 10½” high.
2. A 16” x 16” teal and white logo is proposed next to the lettering.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

The Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance recommend signs be efficient and compatible with the age and architecture of the building. Use of traditional sign materials such as painted wood, or material that looks like painted wood, is the most appropriate material for projecting and wall signs. 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.

Recommendation:

The proposed sign was appropriately designed for this building; however, the logo would be better if it was routed to give the look of texture.

Discussion:

The applicant did not show up for the virtual meeting. Mr. Coulter said he would like to proceed with the Agenda item if no one objected. Mr. Reis referred to Mrs. Bitar's suggestion of routing the logo and said he did not have a problem with what was submitted. He said he was not sure of the rationale for routing the logo. Mrs. Bitar said the neighboring business has a raised logo. She said the sign was not required to be routed, it could also be formed and painted so it has a bit of texture. Mr. Coulter asked Mrs. Bitar if raising the logo by ¼" to 3/8" was acceptable and she said yes. Mrs. Holcombe said if the Board approves the Motion without the applicant being present, they could amend the Motion and allow staff to grant the final approval of the sign. There were no other emails or outside callers.

Motion:

Mr. Foust moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY CLARKSON EYECARE FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL A WALL SIGN AT 890 HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 25-2020, DRAWINGS NO. AR 25-2020, DATED MAY 14, 2020, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING AND MODIFIED TO SHOW SOME DEGREE OF TEXTURE FOR THE LOGO SIMILAR TO WHAT HAS BEEN DONE ELSEWHERE ON THE FRONT OF THE BUILDING AND TO BE REVIEWED BY STAFF FOR FINAL APPROVAL.

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

5. Remove and Replace Porch – 594 Hartford St. (RAS Construction/Huffman) AR 28-2020

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

The house on this 100' wide x 253' deep property was constructed in the early 1900's. In 2007, aluminum siding was removed and the original clapboard siding was restored. Also, a front porch was added which was similar to the front porch originally constructed with the house and removed in the early 1970's. In 2012 the windows were replaced with simulated divided light vinyl clad wood windows.

An addition and garage were approved for this Dutch colonial house in 2014, as was the removal of the barn. There were 2 phases of construction planned: Phase 1 allowed construction of a 26' x 26' two-story addition to the rear of the home; Phase 2 involved construction of a two-story garage attached to the addition. Construction of a carriage house was also approved.

The applicant is now requesting approval to replace the front porch.

Project Details:

1. The existing porch has a flat roof with antique detail work as the trim. The applicant reports the existing porch has severe rot and is deteriorated.
2. Proposed is a porch in the same footprint but with a hipped roof that extends to the second story window and stops short of the front bay window. The roof would be finished with standing seam copper and be supported by the existing columns if possible. Otherwise, fiber cement materials would be used. The skirting would also be fiber cement.
3. The decking would be replaced with the same composite material used on the rear of the house.

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.

Older outbuildings, sheds, and garages should be retained and repaired. They add variety and visual interest to the streetscape and are part of Worthington's character. New outbuildings should use design cues from older nearby structures, including form, massing, roof shape, roof pitch and height, materials, window and door types and detailing. Try to create a new building compatible in appearance with the house it accompanies.

Recommendation:

The proposed porch roof awkwardly extends over the trim between the first and second floors, and stops abruptly at the bay window. No part of the trim lines up with the roof on the bay window. Adjustments should be made so the proposed structure relates better to this historic house.

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar swore in the homeowner, Mr. Rob Huffman, 594 Hartford St., Worthington, Ohio, and his contractor, Mr. Sean Kocheran. Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Huffman why he tore the porch off. Mr. Huffman said they purchased the home in 2011 and have put a lot of work into the home because the home had issues. He said they put a lot of life back into the home so the home should last for several more generations. Mr. Huffman said the proposed drawings reflected the Dutch Colonial look of the home. In addition to the copper roof, they have added copper gutters. He said the porch was probably a DIY project in 2007 and whoever did the job cut corners because the roof began rotting and leaking, and the steps were also rotting. Their children started tripping over the hazardous stairs, so they removed the porch because it was a safety hazard. He said there have been several proposals and they have compromised quite a bit to get to the point they are at now. Mr. Hofmann said he would prefer to see taller columns. He said he did not have a problem with the roofing material, and felt the material was durable to adequately shed water and he also felt the slope could be less and allow the porch to be taller and more proportional. Mr. Reis asked Mr. Hofmann if the header would align better with the bay window and Mr. Hofmann said yes, the top of the header would be respectful of the beltline of the second floor. Mr. Foust said he had a discussion with the contractor earlier in the day and expressed his concerns about the exposed copper standing seam roof of this style because he thinks the style is out of character for the house.

He said in newer subdivisions they are using the same narrow style of standing seam rooftops. He felt a flatter rooftop that was not metal would be more appropriate. Mr. Foust said the way the house is currently painted, the trim strip below the second floor, should not be changed. He felt the roofing should disappear into the house and not draw attention to the roof. The rooftop needs to be flatter. Mr. Reis said he agreed with Mr. Foust. Mr. Schuster said he would like to hear from the homeowner about the Board members suggestions. He said he also agreed with Mr. Foust's comments. Mr. Huffman said he was okay with modifications to a slanted rooftop, but he would not want to have a completely flat rooftop because he does not want the same thing to happen again. There is a large elm tree to the right of porch that sheds a lot of leaves and causes problems and a flat roof just becomes a leaf trap. Mr. Schuster asked Mr. Huffman how he felt about using a different material than copper. Mr. Huffman suggested using copper on the bay window so it would match the porch. Mrs. Holcombe said she agrees with the homeowner, that the roof needs to be sloped because a flat roof would create problems down the road. Mrs. Holcombe asked if the roof would be copper and the contractor, Mr. Sean Kocheran, said the roof would be real copper standing seam. Mr. Foust said he wanted to go on record for saying the porch should not have been removed before coming to the hearing. Mr. Kocheran said he called the City's Chief Building Official, Mr. Don Phillips, prior to removing the porch, and discussed the condition with Mr. Phillips and that the porch had become a safety hazard. He said he was granted permission to tear off the hazardous porch if he turned in a building permit application which he did. Mr. Kocheran said he did not do what Mr. Mazza did, nor did he try to do something underhanded. Mr. Kocheran said he followed proper procedure. Mr. Foust thanked Mr. Kocheran for the clarification. Mr. Brown said there were no emails or outside callers.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY SEAN KOCHERAN ON BEHALF OF ROB & TERA HUFFMAN FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO REMOVE AND REPLACE THE FRONT PORCH AT 594 HARTFORD ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 28-2020, DRAWINGS NO. AR 28-2020, DATED MAY 15, 2020, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING AND THAT WE FOLLOW THE THIRD DESIGN AS PRESENTED IN GENERAL AND THAT THE ROOF LINE BE SHALLOWER AND TO ALIGN WITH THE HEADER OF THE BAY WINDOW AND THAT THE METAL ROOF HAVE A WIDER SEAM, AND THE FINAL APPROVAL TO BE REVIEWED BY CITY STAFF PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION AND THAT THE BELTLINE OF THE SECOND FLOOR WILL BE RESPECTED AND THAT THE BOARD IS OKAY WITH THE AUTHENTIC COPPER MATERIAL AS IT WILL WEATHER AND WILL NOT BE AS PROMINENT GIVEN THAT THE SLOPE WILL BE MUCH LESS.

Mr. Hofmann offered a friendly amendment to the motion made by Mr. Reis. The amendment was that the beltline of the second floor be respected and that the Board is okay with the authentic copper material as it will weather and will not be as prominent given that the slope will be much less. The friendly amendment was accepted.

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

6. Pool, Fence, Siding – 184 E. Granville Rd. (Bloch) AR 30-2020

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This house was originally built in 1930 and is two-stories with a gabled roof and a one-story addition to the rear. In June of 2015, approval was granted to construct a 9' x 9' addition with a deck at the northeast corner of the house, and amendments were approved later that year and in March of 2016. In September of 2018 the Board approved a planter on the eastern edge of the deck, and string lighting for the deck. In 2019 a shed was approved in July; retaining walls in the front, a patio to the rear, and painting were approved in September; and a railing for the front porch was approved in October. The painting project led to replacement of the siding. In December a proposed rear yard fence was denied. Not all of the approved projects were constructed and the house was recently sold.

The new owner is proposing the addition of a pool and fence in the rear yard and changing the color of the siding.

Project Details:

1. A 24' diameter pool that would be partially above ground (26" above grade and 26" below grade) is proposed. The pool would be located north of the garage and shed. The exposed wall of the pool would be finished with stone or block and there would be steps or a ladder to get into the pool. Details of the area around the pool would return to the ARB if approval is granted.
2. A fence to enclose the rear yard is proposed that would extend to the 30' rear setback. The preferred style is a 48" black metal picket fence. A wood picket fence is proposed as an alternative. A 48" high fence would be required to guard the pool.
3. The previous owners planned to paint the house gray to match the garage. Prior to selling the property, the owners instead painted the new siding white. This owner would like to leave the house white and paint the garage to match.

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.

After about 1900, architectural design entered a period of reaction to the heavy, ornate compositions of the late 19th century. Architects used simpler, plainer designs and turned to the classical forms and ornamentation of the past. In the Colonial Revival and other styles of this

period, colors tended to be lighter and cooler, including creams, yellows, grays, and white. This trend generally continues today. People often prefer lighter rather than darker colors for both body and trim. Indeed, the brighter colors sometimes used in the past often do not seem “right” for today’s tastes. Even on older buildings that might have used brighter colors in the past, lighter color schemes can be appropriate.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of this application. The proposed pool could appear like a hardscape feature and would be partially blocked by the garages of the adjacent properties. Black metal fences can generally disappear into the background so that style may be appropriate in this area which has retained a very open feel over the years. If the house and garage match, white or gray would be appropriate colors.

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar swore in the applicant Ms. Ellen Bloch, 184 E. Granville Rd., Worthington, Ohio. Ms. Bloch thanked the Board members and City Staff for their help in this process. She said she was excited to be a new homeowner, and she has seen all the hard work the previous owner has done to improve the exterior of the house. Ms. Bloch said she was already familiar with the Architectural Review District, and she did her homework before she purchased the home. She said she looked at the Permits that had been requested, she reviewed the City’s Ordinances and Design Guidelines, and based upon those guidelines she felt confident that the vision she had for the backyard would fall into compliance. She said she was probably going to hold off on the pool until she addresses the drainage issue on the property. Ms. Bloch said she has been working with landscapers to be able to retain the rainwater rather than divert it. She said she would be planting rain gardens and obtaining rain barrels to collect and absorb the water that is currently pooling in the yard. She is also researching ways to regrade the yard that would not negatively impact the neighbors. She said she is only seeking approval for the fence at this time. Ms. Bloch said since she purchased the home she said she became aware of the neighbors’ protests about the fence, as well as being very critical about the property. She said she faces a long list of issues and concerns that neighbors’ feel her property requires.

Mr. Schuster asked for clarification as to what Ms. Bloch is asking for at this time. Ms. Bloch said she is requesting to install the fence from the front of the garage to 30’ from the rear property line. There is an alley way in the back which requires a 30’ setback. Mr. Reis asked if the fence would be black metal picket style and Ms. Bloch said yes, and she felt the look was Colonial Revival style. She said there were concerns is a wood fence would be sustainable concerning the amount of standing water on the property, and the black metal fence would be more visually appealing. Mr. Foust asked City Staff if there was an Ordinance which required a pool to be fenced in, and if the fence should be a specific height to make sure the neighbors cannot climb in. Mrs. Bitar said yes, the fence is required to be forty-eight inches tall. Mr. Coulter said there were several emails sent into City Staff regarding this Agenda item. Mr. Brown reviewed the emails that were sent in to City Staff.

Email from Mr. Jeremy Rumpf, 172 E. Granville Rd., Worthington, Ohio, felt the open area creates a strong sense of community, togetherness and pride amongst the members that live there. He said he understood Ms. Bloch would like to have a fence around her property is counter to the ideal

that people share this area off of East Granville Road, and for that reason he disapproves of a fence for her property.

Email from Mr. & Mrs. Zadnik, 183 Franklin Ave., Worthington, Ohio, who live behind this property. They said they can see this property from their kitchen window and they have asked the Board to deny the applicant's request. Mrs. Zadnick said the Board members will probably also hear the same request to deny the application by the other neighbors, such as, Mr. & Mrs. Konecny, 196 E. Granville Rd.; Mr. & Mrs. Arthmire, 189 Franklin Ave., and Mr. & Mrs. Hartwick, 178 E. Granville Rd. Mrs. Zadnik said one of the reasons they purchased their home was because of the park like backyard that they share with their neighbors. Twenty-four years later it is still wonderful to be able to go outside on their back deck and not see fences in the neighborhood. In regard to the safety of children, the neighbors at 178 E. Granville Rd. were able to raise their children from toddlers to teenagers without the need of fence. Mrs. Zadnik said 184 E. Granville Rd. has always flooded with any significant amount of rain, and they do not see how putting a pool in that area would be feasible.

Mr. Brown read the following emails into record:

Email from Mr. & Mrs. Hartwick, 178 E. Granville Rd., Worthington, Ohio. They read the proposal for a pool and a fence, but they treasure the open area surrounding their properties with its rural atmosphere. They felt adding a pool and a fence would alter the current feel of the neighborhood in both aesthetics and noise. They believe the open space in their backyards enhances the value of their property and is a key selling feature. They also respect the boundary lines and would not enter others yards without permission, and have voiced their opinions about fences at previous ARB meetings. In January 2020, the previous property owner had their application for a fence denied and they still prefer not having any fencing adjacent to their yard.

Email from Ms. Jill Welch, 181 E. Granville Rd., Worthington, Ohio, said she has lived in her Worthington home since June of 1988. She said when they purchased the home with a one-year old child, her parents were very skeptical about living on such a busy street. As they met with the neighbors they began understanding the sense of community and they consider the backyard as an oasis for children. She was not in favor of the applicant's proposal and urged the newer Board members, who were not familiar with the area, to consider their wishes to not have fencing in this part of Worthington.

Email from Mr. & Mrs. Konecny, 196 E. Granville Rd., Worthington, Ohio. Ms. Konecny said although the black metal fence may seem less intrusive than a privacy fence, the fence still acts as a barrier. They do not want to see the character of the neighborhood begin to shift. She also felt the noise from a pool would impact the quality of life on her back patio and suggested a smaller pool with an alternative location on the property. Please refer to the attached emailed letters.

Each caller was sworn in before speaking.

Ms. Julie Miller, 187 E. Granville Rd., Worthington, Ohio, said she has lived in the neighborhood for seventeen years. She said she met Ms. Bloch and understands she only wants to do what is best for the community. Ms. Bloch represents young families that want to move into the

neighborhood. Ms. Miller said she is pro fence and supports the applicant's proposal. She said she is supportive of making the area hipper, more desirable, and her neighbor's do not want change, nor do they want their community to grow into something amazing. Ms. Miller said they are all very lucky to be able to live inside of Interstate Route 270 in a town that is taken care of. She said her neighbors continue to scare away new people over a fence. Ms. Miller said Dublin-Granville Road is one of the most dangerously busy streets to live on, with a high amount of traffic from cars and semi-trucks. Why would anyone choose grass over the safety of people? Ms. Miller said Ms. Bloch just wants to keep her family safe, and the neighbors are lucky that their children have not been killed along this busy road. Ms. Miller said she approved of the fence 150%, and whatever Ms. Bloch wants to do inside the fence 150%. Ms. Bloch is going to make the neighborhood more desirable and increase the property values.

Mrs. Carla Zadnik, 183 Franklin Ave., Worthington, Ohio, said she wanted to make a correction to a statement made earlier by City Staff that the back area did not feel that open. Mrs. Zadnick said she disagreed with the statement, and that she and her neighbors that live in the area feel it is more like a park setting. She said she does not think a fence is hip, nor are they resistant to change. They really appreciate the uniqueness of the area that they have and how rare it is. There were no other callers.

Mr. Reis said he would like to apologize to the previous owner for voting no on the fence the last time. He feels that Ms. Bloch has all the right intentions and has a right to have a fence for her yard, and a black metal fence that is 48" high falls within the Guidelines and follows Code requirements if she decides to build a pool. Mr. Reis said he will be voting in favor of this project.

Mrs. Holcombe said the new homeowner has done a good job with research for the property. She felt the black metal fence would be better than the picket fence. Mrs. Holcombe said Ms. Bloch said she would stay thirty feet back from the end of the property which is what the Board members asked of the previous homeowner, and they also asked if they could just partially fence. Mrs. Holcombe said she would not be in favor of the pool but felt the rain gardens would be a really good idea. Mrs. Holcombe said she was in favor of the fence.

Mr. Hofmann asked for clarification to where the pool would be located, and Mrs. Bitar explained where it was proposed. Mr. Hofmann said people should have the right to some extent to do what they want with their property. He felt Ms. Bloch has shown a ton of compromise and options. He said he appreciated all the viewpoints. Mr. Hofmann suggested a fence maybe 70 or 80 feet off of the back area which would still give room for the pool if she chose to do that, but the pool would be for discussion at another time.

Mr. Foust said what may be appropriate for one property may not be appropriate for a different property. He said often times, people see something that a neighbor has done, and they believe that they should be able to do that also. The neighbors feel this is a unique area and he said he has a strong record over the past several years of standing up for neighbors because when you move into a neighborhood, you are taking to some degree the neighborhood the way it is, and you are also accepting to some degree, what the neighbors have done with their yards. He said he is a strong believer that you should be respectful of what the neighborhood community is like while balancing that with someone's personal property rights. When he looks at the area, he said he

tends to see the neighbor's point of view, and he might be okay with something that did not go too much further than the north end of the neighboring garage to the east. Mr. Reis felt that the applicant should be able to build the fence that is within the Guidelines and the requirements of the City. He felt making the applicant put the fence in line with the neighbor's garage would not fit her needs.

Mr. Schuster said he was still struggling with this, trying to balance personal property rights with the neighborhood. He referred to the City of Worthington's Codified Ordinances, Section 1177.05, which discusses the standards for review in the Architectural District. Mr. Schuster said he would be more comfortable approving a fence as suggested by Mr. Hofmann, and Mr. Foust, therefore leaving a good amount of open space in the back, but also respecting the homeowner's desire to have a fence. Ms. Bloch explained there is a shed on the property which is not shown on the aerial photograph. The entrance to the shed faces the rear of the property. Mr. Coulter agreed with Mr. Hofmann's suggestion for the fence line, and that they would discuss the pool at a future meeting. Ms. Hinz said she also agreed with Mr. Hofmann's suggestion for the fence line and she hoped the neighbors understood the compromise because raising children along State Route 161 is not the same as it was twenty years ago.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY ELLEN BLOCH FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL A BLACK METAL FENCE AS SHOWN IN THE APPLICATION, AT 48 INCHES IN HEIGHT AND THAT THE FENCE WILL EXTEND TO THE NORTH AND ALIGN WITH THE NORTH MOST PORTION OF THE NEIGHBORS SPLIT RAIL FENCE, WHOSE PROPERTY IS LOCATED TO THE EAST AND CHANGE THE GARAGE COLOR TO MATCH THE HOUSE AT 184 E. GRANVILLE RD. AS PER CASE NO. AR 30-2020, DRAWINGS NO. AR 30-2020, DATED MAY 15, 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. Ms. Hinz, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Hofmann, aye; Mr. Foust, nay; Mr. Schuster, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; and Mr. Coulter, aye. The motion was approved.

B. Municipal Planning Commission

1. Amendment to Development Plan

a. Wall Signs – 535 Lakeview Plaza Blvd. (Play: CBUS) ADP 02-2020

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

Lakeview Plaza was platted in 1985 and developed as a light industrial/warehouse and office development. The property in question was constructed in 1995 and consisted of 60,000 sq. ft. of office and warehouse. An additional 26,128 sq. ft. was added to the south end of the building in 2007. The building has been used over time as warehouse space and for recreational purposes. In 2002 Ohio Sports Plus had a Conditional Use Permit to utilize approximately 35,000 sq. ft. of the southern end of the original building. SuperGames was approved as a Conditional Use in 2003 to operate as an adventure education/sports facility in the northern ~25,000 sq. ft. of the building, and was located there until last year. Road Runner Sports took over occupancy of the Ohio Sports Plus space in 2007, expanded the warehouse to the south by 26,128 sq. ft. and added a retail store to the site by a Conditional Use Permit approved in 2007. Road Runner Sports vacated the site in 2018 however they continue to have a small 7,890 sq. ft. retail facility at the site.

Play:CBUS, received approval in July of 2019 to utilize ~52,260 sq. ft. for an indoor adventure park with an associated restaurant and bar for its patrons. Play: CBUS is renovating the building for use and is receiving money from the Façade Assistance and Corridor Enhancement Program for exterior improvements. As the major tenant of the building, Play: CBUS would like to add signage that is visible from I-270.

Project Details:

1. Previously variances were granted for RoadRunner Sports to have a total of 900 square feet of signage on this building: 600 sf on the south side and 300 sf on the east side. Both signs are still on the building.
2. Play: CBUS would like to replace the sign on the south façade with a ~54' x ~11' sign for about 596 sf in area. The sign would consist of internally illuminated channel letters in gray and orange. On the east side a new "Play: CBUS" sign is proposed that would be ~31' x 6' for approximately 199 square feet of sign area. Apparently the 300 square foot roadrunner sign on the east side would remain due to the retention of the retail store in that location.
3. A painted gray and orange stripe is proposed from the east sign to the south sign.
4. Windows are proposed on the south side and a double door would be added.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Development Plan Regulations

Location and Character of Development: The following regulations, conditions and procedures shall apply to the development of institutional, office or industrial developments in "C- 3" or "I-1" Districts:

The proposed institutional, office or industrial development or combination thereof shall be located so that reasonably direct traffic access is supplied from major thoroughfares and where congestion will not likely be created by the proposed development; or where such congestion shall be alleviated by presently projected improvements of access thoroughfares, by properly arranged traffic and parking facilities and landscaping which shall be an attractive development and which shall fit harmoniously into and shall have no adverse effects upon the adjoining or surrounding development.

A request for the change, adjustment, or rearrangement of buildings, parking areas, entrances, heights, or yards may require approval of the Municipal Planning Commission. The Commission can approve or disapprove the proposed amendment with no further review by Council if the amendment substantially conforms to the standards established by the final development plan and it complies with the Planning and Zoning Code. Otherwise, the request would be heard by Council.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of this application as the proposed signs were appropriate for this location.

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar swore in the applicant, Mr. Greg Carlin, 535 Lakeview Plaza Blvd., Worthington, Ohio, said the square footage for signage would be under 800 square feet. Mr. Foust said he had a historic comment, and he was not sure how many of the other Board members were present when the Road Runner sign was approved, but the discussion at the time was that sign was much larger than anything they had ever approved in Worthington. The discussion also included the fact that this in a unique location, and certainly not located on High Street. This is a freeway viewed building, and the signed was deemed to be appropriate for a building of this size. Mr. Foust said he voted for the previous sign, and he felt that the Play: Cbus signage is comparable to what the Board has already approved for that building. Mr. Hofmann said he liked the new sign and felt this was a good improvement. Mr. Coulter said he agreed, this is a huge improvement for the building. Mr. Brown explained the signage would need to be approved by City Council since it required a variance for signage at the City Council meeting on June 15th, 2020, meeting. There were no other callers or emails.

Amendment to Development Plan Motion:

Mr. Foust moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY PLAY: CBUS TO AMEND THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR 535 LAKEVIEW PLAZA BLVD., BY ADDING SIGNS AS PER CASE NO. ADP 02-2020, DRAWINGS NO. ADP 02-2020, DATED APRIL 9, 2020, BE RECOMMENDED TO CITY COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL BASED ON THE PLANNING GOALS OF THE CITY, AS REFERENCED IN THE LAND USE PLANS AND THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

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

Other

There was no other business to discuss.

Adjournment

Mr. Schuster moved to adjourn the meeting, and Mr. Hofmann seconded the motion. All Board members voted, "Aye," and the meeting adjourned at 9:41 p.m.