

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
WORTHINGTON ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
WORTHINGTON MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION

June 24, 2010

The regular meeting of the Worthington Architectural Review Board and the Worthington Municipal Planning Commission was called to order at 7:30 p.m. with the following members present: R. Hunter, Chair; J. Sauer, Vice-Chair; K. Holcombe, Secretary; C. Hermann; M. Coulter; A. Lloyd; and J. Rodgers. Also present were Lynda Bitar, Development Coordinator and Clerk of the Municipal Planning Commission, and Melissa Cohan, Paralegal.

A. Call to Order – 7:30 p.m.

1. Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Approval of the Minutes of January 28, February 11, March 11, and June 10, 2010.

Mr. Coulter motioned to approve the minutes, A. Lloyd seconded the motion, and all members said aye to approve the minutes as submitted.

4. Affirmation/Swearing in of Witnesses

Mrs. Bitar swore in those who planned to speak.

B. Architectural Review Board

1. New

- a. Lighting – **937-1001 High St.** (The Grove at Worthington Condo Assoc.) **AR 38-10**

Facts:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application, explaining The Grove at Worthington Condo Association installed box spot lights on top of two buildings along High St. without applying for a permit, and the neighbors were very concerned about the brightness shining into their windows at night. The Condo Association had the spot lights disconnected while they proceeded to apply for a permit and seek the approval of the Board. She stated the Condo Board has suggested putting shields on the lights and changing the angle to face down further so less light would be visible across the property line.

Mr. Bret Hart, President of the Condo Association approached the microphone and apologized for not seeking a permit to install lighting on the top of two buildings. Mr. Hart explained the Board has looked for the past year to find a parking lot lighting solution because the area is not well lit and has been vandalized. Mr. Hart said he got a couple of estimates of what light poles would cost, but the estimates were outrageous.

Mr. Hermann said that he did not think that the box spot lights on the roofs were appropriate, and that it would be very difficult to reduce the glare. Mr. Hermann said that he could not support that type of lighting. Mr. Sauer agreed with Mr. Hermann and restated that it would not be possible to block the lighting that projects into the neighbor's window. Mr. Hunter explained that the particular area is very sensitive, and Mr. Hart should have come to the board first before buying light fixtures. Although Mr. Hunter sympathized with the vandalism situation, he could not support this type of lighting either. Mrs. Lloyd agreed and said that the light spill is too much and should not be projecting onto the neighbor's property. Mr. Hunter asked the audience if there was anyone in the room that would like to speak for or against the lighting.

Mr. Steve Harness, 287 Greenbrier Ct., Worthington, Ohio, came to the microphone to explain that he wanted to speak for the residents on his street. He said that the spot lights on top of the building are inappropriate, and cause too much light to spill over into the back of the residences. Mr. Harness feels that the lights are unwanted, unneeded and unacceptable. Also, he felt maintenance of the existing lights would solve the problem; and additional lighting of any kind was not necessary.

Conclusion:

1. The spot lights on top of the building were found to be inappropriate and spilled too much light on the abutting properties.

Mr. Sauer motioned:

THAT THE REQUEST BY THE GROVE AT WORTHINGTON CONDO ASSOCIATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO RETAIN LIGHTING AT 937-1001 HIGH ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 38-10, DRAWINGS NO. AR 38-10, DATED JUNE 4, 2010, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

Mr. Hermann seconded the motion. Mrs. Bitar called the roll. Mr. Hunter, nay, Mr. Sauer, nay, Mrs. Holcombe, nay, Mr. Hermann, Nay Mr. Coulter, nay, Mrs. Lloyd, nay; Mrs. Rodgers, nay. Mr. Hunter said the motion failed to pass.

- b. New Roof – **570 Morning St.** (Robert E. Roth) **AR 39-10**

Facts:

Mrs. Bitar showed the pictures of the new brown roof that was just installed on the house, and described the emergency nature of replacing the roof before ARB approval.

Mr. Robert Roth, 570 Morning St., came to the microphone and introduced himself and stated that he has been a resident of Worthington for 41 years. He said he went up on his roof and discovered a large hole through the shingles. Because of the rainy weather, he figured he had to act quickly to get it repaired. Mr. Roth called the Holly Roofing Company from Reynoldsburg, Ohio, to fix the hole in his roof, and it was taken care of before a permit could be issued. Mr. Roth said that the Worthington Engineering Department was made aware of the emergency, and Mr. Jerry Graves came by the property several times to inspect the roof. Mr. Roth replaced the entire roof. Rubber roofing was placed above the family room roof due to the low pitch.

Conclusions:

1. The proposed rubber roofing is appropriate for that portion of the roof.
2. Brown shingles look better on the house than the existing black.

Mrs. Rodgers motioned:

THAT THE REQUEST BY ROBERT E. ROTH FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO REPLACE THE ROOF AT 570 MORNING ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 39-10, DRAWINGS NO. AR 39-10, DATED JUNE 7, 2010, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

Mrs. Lloyd seconded the motion. Mrs. Bitar called the role. Mr. Hunter, aye; Mr. Sauer, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Hermann, aye; Mr. Coulter, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye; Mrs. Rodgers, aye. Mr. Hunter said it has been approved.

c. Skylights – **110 Kenyon Brook Dr.** (Dave Fox Remodeling/Thompson) **AR 40-10**

Facts:

Mrs. Bitar discussed the 2 Velux Sun Tunnel (low profile version) skylights that are proposed to provide additional lighting for the kitchen. One will be on the right side of the roof, and the other will be on the rear elevation. She showed photos of the relatively hidden locations for the skylights.

Mr. Thompson introduced himself as the contractor for the project. He stated the homeowners checked with the one neighbor with a view and got their approval of the skylights. Mr. Hunter stated it is a very green way to brighten the kitchen, and that low or high profile would be all right with him.

Conclusion:

1. Style and placement of the proposed skylights is appropriate. Visibility is limited.

Mrs. Holcombe motioned:

THAT THE REQUEST BY DAVE FOX REMODELING FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL SKYLIGHTS AT 110 KENYON BROOK DR. AS PER CASE NO. AR 40-10, DRAWINGS NO. AR 40-10, DATED JUNE 11, 2010, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

Mr. Hermann seconded the motion. Mrs. Bitar called the role. Mr. Hunter, aye; Mr. Sauer, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Hermann, aye; Mr. Coulter, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye; Mrs. Rogers, aye. Mr. Hunter said it has been approved.

d. Architectural Lighting – **777 Evening St.** (McConnell Arts Center) **AR 41-10**

Facts:

Mrs. Bitar showed photographs of the McConnell Arts Center banners on the south side of the building, and discussed the applicant's request to install lighting to illuminate the banners in the evening.

Mr. Jon Cook, Executive Director of the McConnell Arts Center stepped to the microphone with City Council member Mr. David Norstrom, a member of the MAC Board.

Mr. Sauer was concerned that if this type of banner and lighting were approved then another applicant might try to do the same thing and that the Board should carefully consider its decision. Mr. Hunter and others disagreed, feeling this building is different because of its use. Mrs. Holcombe stated that she is in favor of ground lighting because there are so many trees in that area it is difficult to see the banners without the lighting. Mr. Hunter suggested LED lights because it would add brightness, and a better spectrum of color. Mr. Coulter added LED would be more energy efficient. Mr. Hermann asked Mr. Cook if the art center plans to do any more landscaping and the answer was yes, depending on available funds.

Mr. Norstrom asked the ARB to reconsider its former decision to have the existing black trim painted to match the walls. ARB members were not willing to reverse the decision.

Conclusion:

1. The proposed lights are appropriate at this location.

Mr. Hermann motioned:

THAT THE REQUEST BY THE MCCONNELL ARTS CENTER FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL LIGHTING AT 777 EVENING ST., AND ACCEPTABLE TO USE LED LIGHTS. AS PER CASE NO. AR 41-10, DRAWINGS NO. AR 41-10, DATED JUNE 15, 2010, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

Mrs. Holcombe seconded the motion. Mrs. Bitar called the role. Mr. Hunter, aye; Mr. Sauer, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Hermann, aye; Mr. Coulter, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye; Mrs. Rogers, aye. Mr. Hunter said it has been approved.

C. Municipal Planning Commission

1. Amendment to Development Plan

a. Building Addition – 550 Schrock Rd. (The Waterworks) ADP 04-10

Facts:

Mrs. Bitar discussed the applicant's request to amend their development plan, which was last approved in 2007 to add a separate building to the northwest corner of the property. The company now seeks approval to add on to the north side of the existing building instead of building a second building, which would also eliminate loading docks. Mrs. Bitar stated that the applicant would need variances to place the addition as close as 15' to the north property line rather than the required 30', and possibly for the elimination of loading docks.

Mr. Jim Matthews, C.O.O. for the Waterworks Company, stepped forward as the applicant. Mr. Coulter asked the applicant if there were enough parking spaces at the location to support the addition to the building and the applicant confirmed that there are plenty of parking spaces.

Conclusion:

1. The proposed building addition is appropriate for this property.
2. The Board will recommend the variance requests to City Council.

Mr. Sauer motioned:

THAT THE REQUEST BY WATERWORKS TO CONSTRUCT A BUILDING ADDITION AT 550 SCHROCK RD. WITH A VARIANCE FOR SETBACK FROM THE NORTH PROPERTY LINE, PLUS A VARIANCE TO ELIMINATE THE REQUIREMENT OF NEEDING A LOADING DOCK, AS PER CASE NO. ADP 04-10, DRAWINGS NO. ADP 04-10 BE RECOMMENDED TO CITY COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

Mr. Coulter seconded the motion. Mrs. Bitar called the role. Mr. Hunter, aye; Mr. Sauer, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Hermann, aye; Mr. Coulter, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye; Mrs. Rogers, aye. Mr. Hunter said it has been approved.

D. Other

1. Discussion – Location of Christ Restoration Ministries at 740 Lakeview Plaza Blvd.

Mrs. Bitar stated the attorney that is representing this entity was not present at the meeting, and mentioned that she may have forgotten to mention to the attorney that this discussion would be on the agenda again tonight. The question to the Municipal Planning Commission is if it feels Christ Restoration Ministries could be determined to be of the same character as other uses in the I-1 Zoning District (112342 (a)), or if a request to rezone the property to C-3 should be submitted.

Mr. Hunter said this church does not fit in the I-1 District, and he would like to see the Board preserve the Industrial District. Mr. Coulter asked if the Board could come up with some restrictions; could they work something out with this entity. Mr. Sauer warned about setting a precedent with similar businesses. Mr. Norstrom asked if the issues had been discussed with the City's Law Director yet, and Mrs. Bitar confirmed it had.

Mr. Hermann asked if the MPC would have allowed this use in the Industrial District if questioned beforehand. Mr. Hunter summarized the Commission was not unanimous in response to that question. Mr. Hunter then asked the Commissions members if they felt that this tenant was in violation. Several members of the MPC felt that the tenant was in violation, and therefore could not determine the use to be of the same character as other uses in the I-1 Zoning District.

Mrs. Bitar stated with that interpretation, Christ Restoration Ministries should make an application to rezone the property to C-3, and see how the Board votes.

Mrs. Holcombe wondered if the landlord should be responsible, or if maybe the church misrepresented themselves to the landlord.

2. Mrs. Bitar announced a public meeting to discuss the Wilson Bridge Road Planning Project. Nearby residents, businesses and property owners have all been invited. She welcomed the Architectural Review Board and Municipal Planning Commission members to attend as well. The meeting will take place on Wednesday, June 30, 2010, at the Worthington Education Center, 200 E. Wilson Bridge Rd., Worthington, Ohio, 43085, at 7:30 p.m.

E. Adjournment

Mrs. Holcombe motioned to adjourn the meeting, and Mr. Coulter seconded the motion. All members said aye. The meeting adjourned at 9:02 p.m.