

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
WORTHINGTON ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
WORTHINGTON MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION
VIRTUAL MEETING
June 11, 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; 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. Thomas Reis, Vice-Chair, was absent.

A. Call to Order - 7:00 pm

1. Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Approval of minutes of the May 28, 2020 meeting

Mr. Foust moved to approve the minutes, and Mr. Hofmann seconded the motion. All Board members voted, "Aye," and the minutes were approved.

B. Architecture Review Board

1. Addition & Garage – **159 E. Dublin-Granville Rd.** (Sean Kocheran/Rekos) **AR 27-2020**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This brick Prairie style duplex was built in 1921 and is in the R-10 Zoning District. Because the structure houses two dwelling units it is non-conforming and would therefore need approval from the Board of Zoning Appeals to extend the use by constructing an addition. The property is reportedly in contract to transfer to new owners and the applicant is requesting approval to construct an addition and new garage and modify the existing garage.

Project Details:

1. The proposed ~34' wide by 18' deep two-story addition would be attached at the rear of the house in place of existing covered rear porches. Exterior basement steps would also be removed as part of this plan. The walls are proposed to be set in approximately 1.5' from the walls of the existing house. New stairs would lead to doors on both sides of the addition. Because the landings and steps extend beyond the existing house walls, proximity of the east side stairs to the property line would need to be at least 8'. That dimension is needed.

2. A gable roof with a 4:12 pitch is proposed to extend to the rear from the existing gable on the house. The peak would be lower than the main house gable. Asphalt shingles are proposed for the roof that would probably match the roofing on the existing house. A catalogue cut or description is needed. White aluminum gutters and downspouts are proposed.
3. The new walls would be finished with white 7" wide horizontal lap LP siding. The foundation is shown as concrete block but a description and cut sheet are not included. Brick to match the existing house would face the new steps and landings, and limestone caps are proposed for the treads and landings.
4. Four over one white Pella clad wood windows with simulated divided lights are proposed on the sides and rear of the house to compliment the windows on the existing house. The windows on the rear are shown in four sets of two windows each. On both sides toward the rear, horizontally oriented windows with vertical lights are proposed that are similar to existing side windows. All windows would be trimmed in a white LP material.
5. The side doors would have windows in the top half and 2 raised panels at the bottom. A coach lamp is proposed beside each door. Catalogue cuts are needed.
6. There is an existing 19'3 1/2" x 21'3" garage to the rear of the house. With the addition the structure would be about 15' from the rear of the house. The garage door faces east on the brick structure and there is a man door and window on the north side. The applicant is proposing to replace the roof; added gutters and downspouts; install LP siding over the existing brick; install a new man door that is wider than the existing; install a new double garage door; and install three new coach lamps. Information regarding proposed materials is needed.
7. A second garage is proposed south and east of the existing garage. The new structure would be 19'4" wide by 21'4" deep with a double garage door on the north side. A man door and window are proposed on the west side. LP siding is proposed for this structure and the other details would be as proposed for the existing garage. As with the other structures, more detail of the materials is needed.

Land Use Plan:

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. Be sure that window designs are appropriate for the style or time period of the house. Avoid use of inappropriate window designs. Design and materials should be traditional, and compatible with the existing structure.

The Guidelines call for outbuildings to be compatible in appearance to the house they accompany.

Recommendation:

The placement and massing of the addition mostly meets the Design Guidelines. The new stairs and landings would extend out further than the house but be partially blocked by bay windows in the front of the house. Although it is a shame to lose the character of the rear of the house, the proposed simplifications for the addition seem to be acceptable. Please review the following considerations:

- Materials should be verified and suitable.

- The brick garage should not be covered with siding.
- Garage doors should be appropriate.
- Although not shown in the proposal, the applicant has expressed some interest in painting the brick. Per the Design Guidelines unpainted masonry should not be painted.

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar swore in the applicant, Mr. Sean Kocheran, 351 W. South St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Kocheran said he wanted to discuss the garage. He said they really did not want to cover up the brick garage with siding but after doing a structural inspection, the back wall was in very bad condition. Mr. Kocheran said he was planning to frame the structure on the outside of the brick and then tie it together with structural sheathing to keep the garage from falling so that was the purpose of covering the garage, for structural integrity. The windows will have mullions on both the inside and outside of the windows, and the homeowners would like to paint the house to give it a more uniform look but would understand if not allowed to paint.

Mr. Hofmann asked to see the site plan which would show the addition in relationship to the garage. He asked how close the addition would be to the garage. Mr. Kocheran did not have a scaled drawing in front of him at the time of the meeting because he was out of town. He said there was a large Pin Oak tree and they were trying to keep the structure as far away from the tree as possible, but he believed the garage would be approximately fifteen feet away from the addition. They plan to have green space between the garage and the addition.

Mr. Foust said he wanted to know the other Board member's thoughts about City Staff's concerns for keeping the original brick for the garage. Mr. Coulter said he did not like the idea of covering up the natural brick, but he did not have a problem with putting a door on the garage and he would like to see what is proposed for the garage door. He said he understood the issue that the brick wall is beginning to lean, but he was not sure framing around the brick was the best solution. Mr. Coulter said he would rather see the back wall torn down and rebuilt using the same brick, and then maybe some columns inside the garage to tie it back together. He would prefer the brick on the house not be painted, and he felt windows could be added to the second floor rather easily. Mr. Coulter said he did not have an issue with the siding material that was chosen. He liked the matching windows with matching mullions, and he did not have a problem with the stairs.

Mr. Schuster said he was not comfortable with painting the brick. He said the Board encountered a similar situation a while ago, and unfortunately the job was done without approval. He said he would like to see the brick on the garage maintained, but construction was not his area of expertise, so he would leave that decision up to those individuals who knew more about construction. Mr. Schuster said he was comfortable with the roofing as long as both garages match, and he was fine with the stairs because the bay window would hide most of that as well.

Mr. Brown said there were no emails, or other callers, but there was someone in the lobby of the Municipal Building.

Motion:

Mr. Foust moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY SEAN KOCHERAN ON BEHALF OF GREG & JEN REKOS AND THE ESTATE OF CECELIA WEISENBERGER FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO CONSTRUCT A REAR ADDITION AND GARAGE AT 159-161 E. GRANVILLE RD. AS PER CASE NO. AR 27-2020, DRAWINGS NO. AR 27-2020, DATED MAY 15, 2020, 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 WINDOW WILL HAVE MULLIONS ON BOTH THE INSIDE AND THE OUTSIDE AS PER STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS;**
- **THAT THE GARAGE BRICK WILL BE RETAINED, RESTORED AND LEFT EXPOSED;**
- **THAT THE BRICK ON THE HOUSE WILL BE LEFT NATURAL AND NOT PAINTED;**
- **THAT CITY STAFF WOULD REVIEWED ANY RELOCATION OR MODIFICATION OF THE WINDOWS ON THE REAR ADDITION;**
- **THAT CITY STAFF WOULD REVIEW THE GARAGE DOOR DETAILS, AND ONLY COME BACK TO THE BOARD IF NECESSARY.**

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

2. Sign – 7140 N. High St. (Tracey Diehl/Park National Bank) AR 29-2020

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This two-story brick building was constructed in 2005 for Park National Bank and was designed in the Federal/Adam styles. Initial signage approval included a freestanding sign and 3 directional signs. Shortly after installation of the freestanding sign the owners submitted a new application for a sign that was larger and they felt more complimentary to the building and area. A variance was granted for the new sign to be 8’ high x 6’ wide with a 2’ high x 8’ wide base and is the externally illuminated sign that is still in place. This request is to modify all the signage to reflect new branding.

Project Details:

1. The proposed freestanding sign would be in the same location about 10’ from the right-of-way line and use the same stone base. The new sign would be a 9’ high x 4’3” wide (38.25 square feet in area per side) aluminum cabinet with internally illuminated push through acrylic letters and logo. The depth of the rectangular sign box would be 2’. A dark blue is proposed for the background of the sign; illuminated light blue stripes are proposed on both sides; the bottom ~2.4’ feet would be two shades of gray; lettering is shown as white; and the dimensional looking “P” logo would be two shades of blue and a yellow-green color. A variance would be needed for this sign as shown due to having more than 4 colors.

2. Page 7 of the application shows vinyl signage for the glass door that would not need ARB approval or a variance if applied to the inside of the door.
3. There is a small stone sign to the right of the door. This proposal includes a 7.5” high x 1’4” wide vinyl covering for the stone.
4. The three freestanding directional signs are proposed for replacement in the same locations with post and panel type signs. The panels would be 30” high x 15” wide x 3 3/16” deep aluminum boxes in dark blue with a light blue stripe down the sides and mounted on gray poles. The bottom of the signs would be 18” above the ground. Each sign is shown divided into three sections with light blue and yellow-green stripes, and would have text in white vinyl stick-on graphics.
 - Sign at N. High St. Entrance: Top – Enter; Middle – Parking; and bottom Drive-thru and all with arrows. Shown as double sided although there are no left turns allowed when heading south on N. High St. so the north side of the sign could only say exit.
 - The other two signs are located at the E. Wilson Bridge Rd. drive and currently say enter to the west and exit to the east. The replacement east sign would say exit at the top. (Mocked up photo incorrectly places the sign on N. High St.) The entrance sign is proposed with the name and logo at the top and enter in the middle panel.Variations would be needed for the size and height of all three signs, and too many colors on the entrance sign with the logo.
5. Additional directional signs were added at some point to the fence and dumpster enclosure. Both 1.5 square foot signs are proposed for replacement using the light blue and dark blue color scheme with white letters. A directional sign was also added to the north side of the building pointing to the drive-thru and lobby that would be replaced. A handicapped parking sign is proposed near the front entrance in the same colors. There are also existing illuminated directional signs on the drive-thru canopy for the lanes which would stay, and a sign is proposed in the same color for the clearance height. A variance would be necessary for total directional sign area of 27.25 square feet.

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. 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.

The Architectural District Ordinance calls for design and materials to be compatible.

Recommendations:

- The proposed freestanding sign is not in character with the classic looking architecture of the building. Although the colors are not totally objectionable, the shape of the sign and

the illuminated side panels are not appropriate.

- The stone wall sign should not be covered.
- All vinyl cling door signage should be mounted on the interior.
- The freestanding directional signs are larger and taller than is needed. Also, the applicant must clarify the messaging. Some dimensional lettering rather than stick on flat vinyl would be preferable.
- Building and fence mounted directional signs were added without approval but at least did not stand out due to the colors used. With the proposed colors the signs would be more noticeable. Because the bank has now been at this location for 15 years and is on a relatively compact site, customers should not need these additional directional signs. The exceptions might be the sign on the dumpster indicating access to travel south on N. High St. and the handicapped parking sign. Fine information is required to be included with the parking sign.

Staff recommended tabling the application after discussion to allow modifications to the proposal.

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar swore in the applicant, Ms. Tracey Diehl, 6487 Hilliard Dr., Canal Winchester, Ohio, representing Park National Bank. Ms. Diehl apologized to City Staff for not responding sooner because she was traveling for a variance hearing on another matter and did not get to the email until the last minute. The light blue strip will be removed from the side of the sign. She said the winter photograph was displayed, but the summer photographs would show a substantial amount of beautiful landscaping. The majority of the base is covered by landscaping, and is made of a stone material, which will be hidden by boxwood. Ms. Diehl said the changes were necessary because Park National Bank has changed their branding all over, and all of the sister banks will be changing over to the Park National name. She said the sign was somewhat similar to the signs across the street and were minimalistic, and her client is hoping for ARB approval, because this is their new branding across the region. The vinyl insert would be applied on the inside of the window and the existing stone would remain as is. The height of the directional signage will be reduced to be in compliance with what the Code allows, and the graphics will be dimensional instead of flat. Ms. Diehl reiterated the blue strip on the side would be removed. The blue graphics in the drive-thru will be left in place and not replaced. Ms. Diehl said the handicapped sign is a bit faded and probably needed to be replaced, but the bank wrote her a note and said they plan to keep the sign as it is. She said they plan to add a clearance sign with the same colors because there is currently no clearance sign. Due to Covid-19, more people are staying in their vehicles and not going inside the lobby, and they are not familiar with the height of the canopy, so the clearance sign is necessary for safety purposes. Mrs. Bitar clarified that the directional signage can be no larger than two by two.

Mr. Coulter felt there were a number of changes and would be best for the applicant to table the application until they can see exactly what they are voting on. Mr. Hofmann said he agreed with Mr. Coulter, and he would like to see a sign package that shows exactly what is expected. He said he also agreed with Mrs. Bitar, and that this site is small, and he would prefer seeing the bare number of directional signs. He said they would like to keep the corridor as stately as they can because signage tends to degrade that. Mr. Hofmann said he agreed the clearance sign was important, but he would rather have the clearance sign in place of three or four of the other

directional signs. Mr. Foust said he noticed the letters for the directional signage are supposed to be two inches in height, but he felt that was small lettering, and might be difficult for drivers to view. He felt a two and a half or three-inch letter would be more visible and easier to read. Mr. Foust asked the other Board members if they felt the top of the front sign should be more ornate to be more in character with what goes with the building. Mr. Coulter suggested a simple band around the top. Mr. Schuster said he agreed with Mr. Coulter. Mr. Foust said he would be okay with somewhat of an overhang, something that looked more like a cap. Ms. Diehl said she would like the Board members to clarify what the monument sign is allowed to look like and Mr. Coulter said they would give an overview after checking to see if there were any emails or outside callers wanting to make comments. Mr. Brown said there were no emails or outside callers.

Ms. Diehl asked the Board members to table the application so she can come back with a revised sign package, and she asked the Board members to clarify the sign specifications. Mr. Foust reviewed the list of revisions the Board members would like to see:

- Remove the lighted stripes from the sides of the monument sign;
- Possibly a cap for the top of the monument sign;
- Lowering the number of directional signs, and reducing the height of the directional signs to 36” to meet City standards;
- Letting the stone tablet on the outside of the building remain visible;
- Make sure all vinyl door signage is applied to the inside;
- That the handicap sign would remain as is.

Mr. Schuster seconded the motion to table the meeting. All Board members voted, “Aye,” and the application was tabled.

3. Fence – **590 Hartford St.** (Marlene and Warren Orloff) **AR 31-2020**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This property is 51.85’ wide and 240.12’ deep with a two-story vernacular house constructed in 1910 which is a contributing building in the Worthington Historic District. Fencing is proposed at the rear of the property.

Project Details:

1. The property owners are proposing a 6’ high solid Cedar fence along the rear 60’ of the north property line and along the full width of the rear property line.
2. There is a sanitary sewer approximately 3’ from the rear property line in a 25’ easement, 12.5’ of which is on this property. Placement of a fence would be allowed but should access be needed to the sewer, removal and replacement of the fence would be at the property owners expense.

Land Use Plans:

Page 7 of 14

ARB/MPC June 11, 2020

Minutes

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Fences have long been used to mark property boundaries, to restrict access to properties by people and animals and for decorative purposes. They serve these traditional purposes in Worthington and can add to the character of a neighborhood when they are well executed and properly cared for. 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.

Consider using natural plant materials instead of fences. Various bushes and shrubs can be used to mark property lines or to set off private areas such as rear patios. Some of these may be evergreens; some may lose their leaves in the fall. Get good advice from a nursery or professional arborist about plant size, shape, rate of growth and care before choosing a natural fencing material.

Whether natural or man-made, all fencing materials require maintenance. Do not let plants get overgrown or full of litter; keep wood fences painted or coated with opaque stain; keep metal fences from rusting; and watch for mortar loss and other deterioration in masonry walls.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended denial of this application as presented, as the proposed fence did not meet the recommendations found in the Design Guidelines. Any fence should be no higher than 4' and open in style.

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar swore in the applicants, Mr. Warren and Mrs. Marlene Orloff, 590 Hartford St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Orloff said a privacy fence on the north side of the property would be beneficial to both parties. He said his neighbors have created an extensive play area for their children, and the fence would make both areas a little more private and quieter. Mrs. Orloff said she spoke with her neighbors and wanted to make sure they knew she was not trying to exclude them from her yard, she was planning to make the back area open so children would still be able to run through the back yard to other neighborhood houses. She said she has talked with neighbors personally on both sides of her property. Mrs. Orloff said she did not think a fence lower than 6' would give them the same privacy as a lower fence, but they are open to different styles of fencing. She said her neighbor at 608 Hartford St. has a six-foot fence near the front of the driveway in between their house and their neighbors. Mr. Orloff said if the fence would need to be modified, he would like to hear what the ARB Board members have to say.

Mr. Foust said in the past, the Board members have knowingly allowed six-foot high solid fences between residential homes that border commercial property where there is a lot of noise or headlights shining. Typically, the Board approves of fences that have 50% open space. Mr. Foust said they recently approved of a fence on Oxford Street that included the use of pines to act as screening. He thought maybe there could be some other wooden features, such as some separated sections that are combined with additional plantings. Mr. Foust said he would have trouble supporting a six-foot privacy fence because he believed there are other options.

Mr. Hofmann said he agreed with Mr. Foust and thought maybe the fence could be more typical and add more features such as a trellis and additional plantings. If the play area is bothersome, maybe there is another way to screen it. He said they are all good stewards of the land, and people

move on, but fences tend to stick around for decades. He would like to see a more traditional fence with additional plantings to help hide the features they do not want to see in the neighbor's yard. Mr. Schuster said he had a similar situation with his back yard, and they resolved the issue by planting large pine trees. Mr. Coulter said he agreed with the other Board members comments and he would also like to see a combination of fencing and landscaping with the plantings. He said he would need to take a look at the neighbor's fence which was approved because he did not remember what it looked like. Mr. Coulter said he could not tell from the photograph if the neighbor's were trying to create a composting pile, or if possibly this could be a property maintenance code issue. He agreed the view of the brush pile was unsightly.

Mr. Orloff shared photographs of what the neighbor's fence looked like. Mrs. Orloff said their fence would not be visible from Hartford Street. Mr. Foust said he remembered the fence. The driveway had a row of arborvitae down the middle that kept falling over and the only conclusion to fix the issue was the fence, but the fence was not without controversy. Mrs. Bitar said she remembered, and the shrubs were also scratching the vehicles. They could not keep a landscape separation between the drives. Mrs. Orloff said she is a gardener, and did try planting arborvitae, and she tried to take care of them, but the arborvitae died. Mr. Brown said City Staff would check into the property to the east.

Mr. Foust suggested the applicant should table the application and take some time to look at the options. Mr. Brown said there were a couple of callers on the line, and he did receive an email from Mr. Brent Watson, who said there were multiple recently approved six-foot fences near 590 Hartford Street, not touching the United Methodist parking lot. Mr. Watson said he approved of six-foot fences that were tastefully done and improved the aesthetics of the property.

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

4. Garage & Condensing Unit – **570 Evening St.** (Todd Bradham) **AR 32-2020** (Extension & Amendment to AR 27-2016)

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This house is a 1940 Colonial Revival style with a one-car attached garage on an 88' wide lot. The house is a contributing building in the Worthington Historic District. The homeowner was approved to add a detached two-car garage to the south of the house in 2016. Now the owner would like to extend the previous approval with minor modifications and add a condensing unit.

Project Details:

1. The proposed garage is 24' wide x 28' deep, and would be located 8' east of the front of the house; 4' south of the house; and 8' from the south property line. Construction of a new drive and entrance is proposed. Previously the garage was reduced to 21' in width to fit it in with existing trees.

2. The proposed garage would be 1 ½ stories with two single carriage style doors with arched windows at the top. With the last approval the ARB also allowed the use of a double door as an option. A catalogue cut of the garage door is needed. Proposed is lap siding, either wood or fiber cement, painted to match the house, and asphalt shingles to match the house. Trim elements would be complementary to the trim on the house. On the front gable, cedar or fiber cement shakes were previously proposed but not approved.
3. A variance for total accessory building area will be needed due to usable space on the second floor of the new garage, and the presence of a shed.
4. A new condensing unit is proposed on the south side of the house in the middle. The drawing indicates the unit would be screened with vegetation. It is not clear how the spacing between the house and garage would be impacted with placement of the unit and its screening. An accurate site plan is needed.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

The Guidelines call for outbuildings to be compatible in appearance to the house they accompany. Keep functional items such as trash containers and mechanical equipment well screened with fences or plantings.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of this application if all details are presented and acceptable.

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar swore in the applicant, Mr. Todd Bradham, 507 Evening St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Bradham said he would be removing a Redbud tree where the garage would sit. He did not think he would have to move the condensing unit, but if necessary, he could move the unit somewhere else. Mr. Coulter asked if the other driveway would be removed, and Mr. Bradham said yes, he would be removing the other driveway.

Motion:

Mr. Foust moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY TODD BRADHAM TO EXTEND AND AMEND CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS NO. 27-2016 TO CONSTRUCT A NEW GARAGE AND FOR APPROVAL TO INSTALL A CONDENSING UNIT AT 570 EVENING ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 32-2020, DRAWINGS NO. AR 32-2020, DATED MAY 22, 2020, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING WITH THE CONDITION OF THE REMOVAL OF THE NORTH DRIVEWAY.

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

5. Condensing Unit – **6555 Worthington Galena Rd.** (Michael Anderson/Worthington Police Headquarters) **AR 33-2020**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

The police building was originally constructed in 1979 but was purchased for use as Police Headquarters in 2001. At that time, the parcel was combined with the City Hall and Division of Fire parcels and became part of the Architectural Review District. This project involves remodeling the building lobby to create a separate vestibule and secure entrance. The only visible change to the outside would be placement of a condensing unit.

Project Details:

1. A condensing unit is proposed to the right of the entrance.
2. The unit would be partially screened with existing shrubs, a boulder and a yew.
3. A black bollard is proposed in the middle of the sidewalk in front of the door.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

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

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of this application, as placement of the condensing unit would be acceptable with the proposed screening.

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar swore in the applicant, Michael Anderson, 4420 Cooper Rd., Suite 220, Cincinnati, Ohio 45242. Mr. Brown explained the mini-split system is part of the safety improvements that are being made to the front of the Worthington Police Department. Mr. Foust said he wanted to go on record stating the unit would not be near any residential houses, and not typical of any other location in the Architectural Review District, which makes this okay. There were no emails or outside callers.

Motion:

Mr. Foust moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY MICHAEL ANDERSON ON BEHALF OF THE CITY OF WORTHINGTON FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO ADD A CONDENSING UNIT 6555 WORTHINGTON-GALENA RD., AS PER CASE NO. AR 33-2020, DRAWINGS NO. AR 33-2020, DATED MAY 29, 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. Brown called the roll. Mr. Schuster, aye; Ms. Hinz, aye; Mr. Hofmann, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Foust, aye; and Mr. Coulter, aye. The motion was approved.

6. Hot Tub – 817 Oxford St. (Todd and Jessica Boucher) AR 34-2020

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This house is the second house south of W. Stafford Ave. on west side of Oxford St. Constructed in 1928, the house is of Colonial Revival Influence and is a contributing building in the Worthington Historic District. The property is 80' wide and 153.64' deep and drops off quickly to the west with a walkout lower level and decking above. This is a proposal to add a hot tub.

Project Details:

1. The 7' x 7' x 3' high hot tub is proposed below the rear deck on the north side.
2. The Nordic Encore SE would have a mahogany exterior and brown 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 applicants Mrs. Jessica and Mr. Todd Boucher, 817 Oxford St., Worthington, Ohio. Board members did not have questions or concerns. Mr. Brown said there were no emails or outside callers.

Motion:

Mrs. Holcombe moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY TODD AND JESSICA BOUCHER FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO ADD A HOT TUB AT 817 OXFORD ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 34-2020, DRAWINGS NO. AR 34-2020, DATED JUNE 11, 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; Mr. Hofmann, aye; Mr. Schuster, aye; Mr. Foust, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, and Mr. Coulter, aye. The motion was approved.

7. Modifications to Previous Approval – **569 Oxford St.** (Michael Siroskey) **AR 35-2020**
(Amendment to AR 25-19)

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

The house at 569 Oxford St. is an American Foursquare that was built in 1915 and is a contributing building in the Worthington Historic District. A rear addition was constructed in the early 1980's. The owner gained approval in 2019 to renovate the house, modifying the windows and rear door, and add skylights. Now the owner is proposing a couple of changes to the previous approval.

Project Details:

1. The original plan was to match the aluminum siding on the original part of the house, but the same siding is not available. The applicant is instead proposing to use Hardi plank painted medium to dark blue with cream color trim for the rear addition and reuse the removed rear siding to patch around window changes for the original house. The house would then be painted to match the addition sometime in the next year.
2. An additional window is proposed for the north side of the original house. It would be the same style as the others that were approved - Reliabil 460 Double Hung Vinyl Window in Almond Color 29 1/2" W x 35 1/2" H.
3. Movement of a rear second floor window is proposed.
4. Two slider windows on the south side of the house are proposed for replacement with Reliabil 755 Awning Windows in Almond.

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 the application as the modifications would not change the character of the house.

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar swore in the applicant, Mr. Michael Siroskey, 569 Oxford St., Worthington, Ohio. Board members did not have any questions or concerns. Mr. Brown said there were no emails or outside callers.

Motion:

Mr. Foust moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY MICHAEL SIROSKEY FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO MODIFY THE PREVIOUS APPROVAL AT 569 OXFORD ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 35-2020, DRAWINGS NO. AR 35-2020, DATED MAY 29, 2020, BE APPROVED BASED ON 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. Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Schuster, aye; Ms. Hinz, aye; Mr. Hofmann, aye; Mr. Foust, aye; and Mr. Coulter, aye. The motion was approved.

C. Municipal Planning Commission

There was no business to discuss.

D. Other

There was no other business to discuss.

E. Adjournment

Mr. Schuster moved to adjourn the meeting, and Mr. Hofmann seconded the motion. All Board members voted, "Aye," and the meeting adjourned at 8:55 p.m.