



MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
WORTHINGTON ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
WORTHINGTON MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION
May 13, 2021

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 were; Lee Brown, Director of Planning & Building; and Lynda Bitar, Development Coordinator. Worthington City Council Representative Scott Myers was absent.

A. Call to Order – 7:00 p.m.

1. Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Approval of the minutes of the April 8, 2021 meeting.

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

B. Architectural Review Board

Mr. Reis moved to take the following Agenda item off the table and Mr. Foust seconded the motion. All Board members voted, “Aye,” and the Agenda item was removed from the table.

1. Fencing – **1 Kenyon Brook Dr. (Robert Best) ARB 29-2021**

Mr. Brown reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This property is roughly 0.6 acres in area on the north side of Kenyon Brook Dr. and adjacent to N. High St. The 1 ½ story house was constructed in 1923 and was one of 3 original houses that were later part of the Kenyon Brook Dr. subdivision. The owners were previously approved by the Architectural Review Board and the Board of Zoning Appeals to construct a freestanding oversized 24’ x 28’ two-story two-car garage to the east of the house in November of 2018. In

April of 2019, the Architectural Review Board approved modifications to the previously approved garage and to replace the siding and roofing on the house.

In 2020 the property owner installed a white vinyl fence without a Fence Permit and Architectural Review Board approval. This application was the result of a Code Enforcement case concerning the installation of the fence without a Fence Permit and Architectural Review Board approval. The applicant made application once they were notified of the violation.

History:

On January 28, 2021 the Board approved the applicant's request to install a sauna, however, they did not approve the applicants request to legalize the placement of a white vinyl fence that was installed without a Fence Permit and Architectural Review Board approval. The Board asked the applicant to come back with revised materials on how the fence would be painted to match the color of the house and an updated landscape plan that reflected the change in elevation in the area in front of the fence. On February 25, 2021 the Board tabled the applicant's request.

Updated Project Details:

1. Installed four separate sections of white vinyl fence along the west side of the house to create a visual/sound barrier that is part of a proposed Japanese garden and outdoor sauna.
2. The sauna was approved by the Architectural Review Board on January 28, 2021 and the Board of Zoning Appeals approved the accessory structure area on March 4, 2021.
3. The fence sections are 96" wide and 72" high.
4. Barrette Privacy Vinyl Fence Kit – Full Privacy Fence
5. ~~Paint fence dark gray to match the house.~~ Proposing to leave the fence white.
 - a. The applicant stated that it was not recommended to paint the vinyl fence as it could warp.
6. Install stone retaining wall at the base of the fence to raise the elevation to mitigate the slope for the proposed plantings.
7. Landscaping proposed to reach full height to screen the fence within a year.
8. Proposed landscaping:
 - a. Doublefile Viburnum 'Shasta' – Mature height of 6'7'
 - b. Iris Siberica 'Caesar's Brother' – Mature height of 3'
 - c. Miscanthus 'Gracillimus' – Mature height of 5'6'
 - d. Arrowood Viburnum 'Chicago Lustre' – Mature height of 8'-10'

Land Use Plans:

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. Fences are not permitted in the front yard, with the goal of maintaining an open, friendly feel and avoiding barriers between neighbors. However, there are many other kinds of fences, both natural and man-made, that can be used to protect and enhance a property.

Fencing should be appropriate for the house's period and style and should be open in style (avoid

solid, opaque fences that block all views) and three to four feet in height. Consider using natural plant materials instead of fences.

Staff Analysis & Recommendation:

- The proposed fencing material does not meet the Design Guidelines for style, openness, and material for fencing.
- Staff was supportive of the February 25, 2021 proposal as the fence was to be painted to match the house, an addition of landscaped retaining walls were proposed to raise the ground and additional vegetation was to be installed that appeared to be follow the conversation the Board had at the January 28, 2021 meeting.
- The addition of more mature evergreen vegetation might be a more appropriate way to camouflage/screen the white vinyl fence year-round if the fence is to remain white.

Discussion:

Mr. Brown swore in the applicants, Mr. Robert and Mrs. Mary Best, 1 Kenyon Brook Dr., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Best said they spoke with their landscape architect about vegetation concerns to make sure that the vegetation would cover the fence. The purpose of the fence is for a sound barrier because of the location next to High Street. He said he also spoke with Mr. Foust who referred him to take a look at a house on Oxford Street that had done some nice work with vegetation. Mr. Best said he felt they were mitigating the view of the fence and when it is all said and done there should not be a problem. He said the fence currently does not have any vegetation, so the look is pretty stark. Mr. Best said they listened to Mr. Foust's suggestions about building out the base of the beds to ensure the vegetation would grow so they went back to the landscape architect and made those adjustments. He said they are helping their issue with the sound barrier while also mitigating the visual effect of the fence. Mrs. Best read the list of neighbors who were in support of their fence. Mr. Coulter asked Mrs. Bitar if there were any speakers who would like to comment about this Agenda item and Mrs. Bitar said there were a couple of people waiting to speak.

Mr. Brown swore in Mr. Joe Foust, 30 Kenyon Brook Dr., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Foust said he wanted to reiterate his support for the project.

Ms. Melissa Robol said she wrote a letter of support. She said the Best family were great neighbors and she was very appreciative of the work they have done, and what they added to their property values in the neighborhood. She added there was an existing fence between residential property in the neighborhood and St. Michael Church that was painted multiple colors, and the fence is used as a sound barrier for the children's playground.

Mr. David Foust said he spoke with the applicants about some work that was done by one of his neighbors and how they planted evergreens of a specific height that hid the fence. He said he appreciated the work they have done and that the property is gorgeous, but he felt there were some things that could have been done to eliminate the problem in the first place. Mr. Reis said he had felt from the beginning that he did not see these panels as a fence, he views the panels as a sound barrier. He felt the applicant has gone beyond the call of duty, and what they have proposed was fine, and he would like to be able to see this move forward. Mr. Hofmann said his position has not shifted since January, and the only way he would vote to approve the fence would be if the fence

was painted a dark color. Mrs. Best said she researched painting the vinyl and said she felt the paint would not hold up. Mr. Hofmann said the vinyl material should not have been used in the first place but they are trying to make a compromise, and maybe in five or eight years the fence may need some touch up paint. Mr. Best said he was fine with that and willing to paint the fence gray to match the house. Mr. Schuster said as he looked back at the original presentation, from the fence company, there was a clear mark that approval might be needed. He said if this fence had come before the Board before being installed it would never have been approved, and he remained uncomfortable approving a vinyl fence. Mrs. Hinz said she would echo Mr. Foust's comments and felt some evergreen trees should be planted. She also had some concerns with the vegetative plants that are on the invasive species list. She said she could possibly vote for the fence if painted darker in color and had densely planted evergreens for coverage. Mrs. Hinz reiterated that the fence would never have been approved if it had come to the Board in the first place. Mr. Coulter said he agreed with Mr. Hofmann. He said he has seen a number of properties with vinyl that have been successful with painting when they used the proper products. The vinyl will need to be pretreated and he recommended using a professional painter to apply the paint correctly. He said the white starkness was bothersome to him, but he could get behind painting it if painted the same color as the house. Mr. Coulter said he also agreed with Mrs. Hinz and he would be more inclined to vote favorably if they were to plant more coniferous trees or taller plantings that would grow a bit quicker. Mr. Best said he would like to move forward with the project and was willing to take a second look at the plantings and have a professional painter take care of the fence. There were no additional speakers.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY ROBERT & MARY BEST FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL FENCING AT 1 KENYON BROOK DR., AS PER CASE NO. ARB 29-2021, DRAWINGS NO. ARB 29-2021, DATED APRIL 23, 2021, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- **THAT THE FENCE BE PAINTED THE SAME COLOR AS THE HOUSE;**
- **THAT THE APPLICANT REVIEW THE LANDSCAPING PLAN WITH CITY STAFF WITHOUT COMING BACK TO THE BOARD AND THAT CONIFEROUS TREES BE ADDED TO THE LANDSCAPING PLAN;**

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

Mr. Reis moved to take the following Agenda item off the table. Mr. Foust seconded the motion. All Board members voted, "Aye," and the item was removed from the table.

2. Wall Sign – 7141 N. High St. (Morrison Sign/Duchess) ARB 41-2021

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

The current BP building was constructed in 2004, with signage for the convenience store changing a few times over the years. Before now, the most recent version of the sign was installed in 2011. A request to replace the wall sign was heard by the ARB at its March 25, 2021 meeting and tabled. Reduction of area was needed in order to avoid a variance. Also, the submitted rendering did not seem to accurately represent the proposed size. Since that meeting, a new sign of undetermined size has been installed, and a new sign drawing was submitted for ARB review.

Project Details:

1. The previous wall sign was 5'6 ½" wide by 4' high (22.2 square feet in area) and said "Duchess Shoppe" with a crown above. The freestanding sign is 30 square feet per side in area or 60 square feet total.
2. Proposed at the March 25, 2021 meeting was an internally illuminated yellow crown with internally illuminated red lettering below reading "Duchess". The sign was 4'2" high x 9'10" wide or 41 square feet in area. Due to the Code allowance of no more than 100 square feet of total sign area per business, reduction of the sign area by at least 1 square foot was requested.
3. Now the proposal includes a 32 square foot version (8'7 ¾" side x 3'8" high) of the sign. The sign would meet the Code sign area requirements.

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.

Worthington Section 1170.05

Commercial and Industrial District Requirements

(a) **Sign area.** Allowable permanent sign area for any single business shall be limited according to the widths of the building or part of the building occupied by such enterprise. For the purposes of this section, width shall be measured along the building face nearest parallel to the street line. In the case of a corner lot, either frontage may be used in determining maximum area for signage. The area of all permanent signs for any single business shall be equivalent to one and one-half square feet of sign area for each lineal foot of width of the building or part of the building, but shall not exceed a maximum area of 100 square feet per business.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of this application as the 32 square foot sign was appropriately sized for this building.

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar swore in the applicant, Ms. Abby Freese, on behalf of 7141 N. High St., Worthington, Ohio. Ms. Freese apologized for installing the sign before being approved. She said there was a miscommunication. The sign is larger than the previous sign so they would like to apply for a variance. Mr. Coulter asked how big the sign was and Ms. Freese said 41 square feet. Board members did not have any comments or concerns. Mr. Coulter asked if there were any emails or callers and Mrs. Bitar said no.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY MORRISON SIGN ON BEHALF OF WORTHINGTON DUCHESS LLC FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL A NEW WALL SIGN AT 7141 N. HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. ARB 41-2021, DRAWINGS NO. ARB 41-2021, DATED APRIL 6, 2021, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING WITH THE CONDITION THE SIGN IS APPROVED BY THE BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS.

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

C. Architectural Review Board – New

1. Fence – 653 Oxford St. (Outdoor FX/Kruse) ARB 43-2021

Mr. Brown reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This farmhouse was originally constructed in 1850 and has had minor modifications and additions over the years. The house is at the northwest corner of Oxford St. and W. New England Ave. In 2016 approval was granted for a new porch roof to be constructed, and brick was to be installed at grade to help with storm water issues.

In 2008, the previous owners installed a fence to enclose a portion of the rear yard, which is also adjacent to W. New England Ave. A variance was granted to allow the fence in the required side yard adjacent to the right-of-way. In 2011, the previous owners extended the fencing north and east to connect to the house, and on the south side between the garage and house. In 2016, the previous owners extended the fence to the western property line. The Architectural Review Board and the Board of Zoning Appeals approved the original style and location of the fence in the setback along W. New England Ave.

The applicant would like to replace the existing wood fence with an aluminum fence that is maintenance free.

Project Details:

1. Black aluminum fence – Harbor Series
2. 4-feet in height
3. Two swing gates for access to the yard.
4. Updated Information:
 - a. The applicant has stated that the fence will be constructed in the same location as the existing wood fence along W. New England Ave. The fence is currently 2.1-feet from the public right-of-way.
 - b. The applicant has also stated that the fence will now be 8-feet off the western property line.
 - i. Clarification is needed, the submitted materials do not match with the updated information provided by the applicant.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

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

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of this application. Replacing the current white picket fence was a visual loss, however the proposed fence complied with the Design Guidelines.

Discussion:

Mr. Brown swore in the applicant, Mrs. Wren Kruse, 653 Oxford St., Worthington, Ohio. Mrs. Kruse said the original application should have stated that the fence would be eight feet off of the western property line between the garage and the far end of the yard. They would like to have the fence sit six feet from the sidewalk so there would be more of a buffer between the sidewalk and dogs inside the fence because right now there is no buffer. Board members did not have any questions or concerns. Mr. Coulter asked if there were any emails or callers and Mrs. Bitar said no.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY OUTDOOR-FX ON BEHALF OF WREN KRUSE FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL FENCING AT 653 OXFORD ST. AS PER CASE NO. ARB 43-2021, DRAWINGS NO. ARB 43-2021, DATED MARCH 24, 2021, 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. Hinz, aye; Mr. Foust, aye; Mr. Hofmann, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Schuster, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; and Mr. Coulter, aye. The motion was approved.

2. Fence – **777 Morning St. (Elevated Fence LLC/Szabo) ARB 48-2021**

Mr. Brown reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

The property is 99-feet wide and 126-feet deep and backs to the Village of Seventeen. The house was originally a double farmhouse built in 1917 that was converted to a single-family home in 2007 by the current owners. The applicant would like to install an aluminum fence.

Project Details:

1. Black aluminum fence
2. 4-feet in height
3. Two gates for access to the yard, a 4’ gate and an 8’ gate on the north and south side of the house.
4. Aluminum fence will be installed approximately 3-feet from the northern property line and along the rear of the house.
5. There is an existing chain-link fence across the rear of the property and a wood privacy fence along the southern portion of the property that are to remain.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

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

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of this application. The proposed fence complied with the Design Guidelines.

Discussion:

The applicants were not available for discussion; however, the Board members did not have any questions or concerns. Mr. Coulter asked if there were any emails or callers and Mrs. Bitar said no.

Motion:

Mr. Foust moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY ELEVATED FENCE LLC ON BEHALF OF JAMES & JULIE SZABO FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL A FENCE AT 777 MORNING ST. AS PER CASE NO. ARB 48-2021, DRAWINGS NO. ARB 48-2021,

DATED APRIL 21, 2021, 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. Hofmann, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; Mrs. Hinz, aye; Mr. Schuster, aye; Mr. Foust, aye; and Mr. Coulter, aye. The motion was approved.

3. Shed – 129 E. South St. (Jack Conrath) ARB 49-2021

Mr. Brown reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This house was built in the early 1950s and is a contributing building in the Worthington Historic District. The house is described as being of Colonial Revival Influence and sits on 2 parcels that are 100' wide in the front and 75' wide in the rear. The eastern 75' of the property is 128' deep and the western 25' is 86' deep. In 2017 the driveway was relocated to the east side of the property, being moved from adjacent to the house. In 2018 the Board approved a one-story addition to the east side of the house.

This request is for approval for the installation of a shed at the rear of the lot.

Project Details:

1. 8'x8' (63 sq. ft.) shed with 3 windows and a single man door for access.
2. Rear setback of 5-feet
 - a. City Code permits a minimum of 5-feet
3. Side setback of 17-feet
4. Setback from the public right-of-way by approximately 114-feet.
5. 3-feet between the garage and shed
6. Vertical Cedar siding and roofing to match existing 2-car garage.
7. Painted white to match the existing house.
8. Average height of 8-feet.
9. Existing 2-car garage is approximately 518 sq. ft. in size.
 - a. Total square footage with the 64 sq. ft. shed will be 582 sq. ft., well below the permitted 850 sq. ft. permitted in the R-10 District.

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 the application as it met the intent of the Design Guidelines.

Discussion:

Mr. Brown swore in the applicant, Dr. Melissa Conrath, 129 E. South St., Worthington, Ohio. Board members did not have any questions or concerns. Mr. Coulter asked Mrs. Bitar if there were any emails regarding this application and Mrs. Bitar said yes, one email was received from the Crowleys who live to the north of the property and they were in support of the project. There were no other emails or callers.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY JACK CONRATH FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL A SHED AT 129 E. SOUTH ST. AS PER CASE NO. ARB 49-2021, DRAWINGS NO. ARB 49-2021, DATED MAY 13, 2021, 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. Hofmann, aye; Mr. Schuster, aye; Mr. Foust, aye; Mrs. Hinz, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; and Mr. Coulter, aye. The motion was approved.

4. Replace Windows – **881 High St.** (Mary Jo Marraffa DC) **ARB 50-2021**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This circa 1870’s building was likely constructed as a farmhouse but has been used as office space for many years. It is a contributing building in the Worthington Historic District. The applicant is requesting approval to replace most of the windows in the structure.

Project Details:

1. Twenty-seven of the twenty-nine windows are proposed for replacement. The two dormer windows with a gothic arch would not be replaced.
2. The existing windows are wood and are deteriorated and cannot be opened. The majority of the windows are a double-hung one over one design except the first floor windows overlooking the porch at the southeast corner of the building are 6 over 6.
3. Replacement windows would be Plygem Simonton double-hung windows in a one over one pattern. The windows are proposed to be the same sizes as the existing. Two windows that are currently fixed on the north side would remain as fixed.
4. The shutters on the front of the building would be replaced with new wood shutters painted white as part of this project.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

The Worthington Design Guidelines recommend if historic windows are too deteriorated to repair cost-effectively and replacement is justified, the preferred option is an in-kind replacement in the same material and design. New windows made of substitute materials such as clad wood can be acceptable if they provide a reasonably good match for the windows being replaced. Be sure that window designs are appropriate for the style or time period of the house. Avoid use of inappropriate window designs. Avoid enlarging or downsizing window openings to accommodate stock sizes of replacements.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of this application, as the proposed windows should be a reasonably good match for the existing wood windows. The one over one pattern is appropriate for the structure.

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar swore in the applicant, Dr. Mary Jo Maraffa, 881 High St., Worthington, Ohio. Board members did not have any questions or concerns. Mr. Coulter asked Mrs. Bitar if there were any emails or callers and Mrs. Bitar said no. Mr. Foust said he was willing to approve the windows as they were presented. He said the defining features on the building were the two little gothic windows which fortunately are staying in place. Those types of windows were popular from the mid 1840's to the 1870's. He said he was guessing that the building did not have one over one windows at that time period, but instead long narrow windows that would have been two over two or possibly four over four. Mr. Foust said Dr. Maraffa could talk with her window supplier and see if that was something she would consider.

Motion:

Mr. Schuster moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY MARY JO MARAFFA DC FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO REPLACE THE WINDOWS AT 881 HIGH ST. AS PER CASE NO. ARB 50-2021, DRAWINGS NO. ARB 50-2021, DATED APRIL 23, 2021, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING WITH THE FRIENDLY AMENDMENT TO SEE IF THE OWNERS WOULD CONSIDER WINDOWS WHICH WERE APPROPRIATE FOR THE TIME PERIOD.

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

5. Addition Revisions – 41 W. South St. (JS Brown & Co./Yang) ARB 51-2021

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This two-story Vernacular style house was constructed in 1923 and remodeled in 1955. The structure and detached garage are contributing buildings in the Worthington Historic District. The house has a front-facing gable with a cross gable about 12' back that extends about 12' out on both sides of the house. A sunroom was added to the rear in 1994. The front door is on eastern part of the cross gable and was approved to be replaced at the January 24, 2019 ARB meeting. Also at that meeting, the porch was approved to be reconstructed with the steps heading to the front. The lot is 71' wide and ~209' deep.

In 2019 an application was approved to demolish the freestanding garage and sunroom addition and construct an addition for the kitchen and a new garage that was to be attached to the house by way of a deck. The current application is a change to those last approved plans and in some cases an extension of that approval.

Project Details:

1. Demolition of the existing two-car detached garage is proposed.
2. Rather than a deck connecting the house and garage, the applicant would now like to construct an office addition. The foundation would match the recently renovated front porch. A smaller deck would be constructed adjacent to the west of the office and is proposed to be constructed with TimberTech materials. A black metal railing to match the railing approved for the front porch is proposed.
3. A new two-car garage is planned to the rear, being 28'8" wide and 22'8" deep. The request to locate the garage 6'2" from the east property line is slightly further away than the variance granted by the Board of Zoning Appeals. The garage is proposed to have roofing to match the house, which is Biscayne Blue GAF Timberline asphalt shingles. Siding would also match the house, being a horizontal vinyl or aluminum product in white. A double door is proposed for the garage, with 6 horizontally oriented windows above 6 vertically oriented panels. A different garage door style was approved previously.
4. A new asphalt driveway with turnaround is proposed west and south of the house.
5. Sliding glass doors on the rear addition are proposed to allow access to the deck.
6. New windows are proposed to match the existing in the room at the southeast corner of the house in style and material, which are 6 over 1 and all vinyl.
7. The existing shed roof over the rear door would now remain.
8. Light fixtures to match the existing on the front of the house are proposed by the rear sliding doors and the garage door. Also, floodlights are shown on the north and south sides of the garage.
9. Removal of the two chimneys on the house is not proposed with this application.
10. A condensing unit is shown on the west side of the house south of an existing room that extends to the west.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

- A decision on whether a particular demolition is appropriate must be made in light of several factors, including whether the demolition is full or partial; the age of the structure; the level of integrity of the structure being demolished (has it been extensively altered?); the impact of the demolition on Worthington's character; and plans for the site following demolition (is the proposed replacement appropriate for Worthington? Does it follow the design guidelines for

new structures?) Generally, demolition of pre-1950s buildings should be avoided. These tend to contribute the most to a community's character. However, it may be desirable to avoid demolishing a newer building, depending on what is proposed to replace it.

- Roof: Roof shapes for new buildings should be appropriate to the style or design of the building. If a new building does not follow a particular style but is instead a vernacular design, then roof shapes and heights similar to those in the neighborhood or nearby would be most appropriate.
- Materials: Contemporary materials that simulate traditional ones are appropriate, but the preferred option is to use true traditional materials such as wood siding. Incompatible contemporary materials should be avoided. Brick has long been a traditional material in Worthington. Prepare a sample board for review by the Architectural Review Board.
- Windows: For new buildings, multiple-paned windows generally are not appropriate. The exception is a building being built in a particular style -- such as Federal, Greek Revival or Colonial Revival -- that would have employed this window type. When in doubt, simple 1 over 1 double-hung sash windows are usually the simplest, least expensive and most appropriate choice. Using the excellent precedents of Worthington's many historic structures, carefully design the pattern of window openings; window sizes and proportions (they must be appropriate for the size and proportions of the wall in which they are placed); pattern of window panes and muntins; and trim around the windows. Good quality wood windows are readily available and more affordable than in the past. True wood windows are always the first preference. Aluminum- or vinyl-clad windows can be appropriate, but primarily on secondary facades and less conspicuous locations. All-aluminum or vinyl windows are not prohibited but are not encouraged. Avoid blank walls.
- Entries: For newly-built buildings, simpler designs usually look better than more ornate ones. Avoid heavy ornamentation on doors and entrances. Observe entry placement on existing buildings. Whether located symmetrically or asymmetrically, entries usually are aligned with a window on the second floor so that a regular rhythm of openings is maintained on both floors. Entries should be located so they are easily visible, and they should be oriented toward the street.
- Chimneys are a defining feature of a building and should be repaired and maintained.
- Landscaping: Worthington's mature shade trees are the primary landscaping feature throughout the community. They are a major contributor to its character and help define its neighborhoods as stable, desirable places to live. In general, lawns are generous but not overly large, which contributes to the sense of human scale that is one of Worthington's important attributes. Other landscaping elements tend to be properly scaled and well-tended, which also tends to enhance neighborhood character. Maintain and nurture mature trees to prolong their lives. Plant and maintain street trees in planting areas between the street and sidewalk. Paving can sometimes reduce water absorption of the soil so much that trees do not get the moisture they require.

Staff Analysis:

- Demolition of the existing garage would be necessary with the proposed plan. The condition and age are unknown.
- Landscaping on the east side may help soften the new garage, which is closer to the east property line than the house. More information about landscaping is generally needed, including plans for removal of significant trees and any proposed planting.

- The applicant is planning to match the siding on the house, which does not appear to be original. Clarification of the material is needed.
- Vinyl windows are not preferred over original wood windows.
- The proposed garage door should have vertically oriented windows to match the house windows. Additional windows should be considered for blank garage walls.
- Although the condensing unit is shown behind the front part of the house, screening would still be needed on the side.
- Painting the noticeable vents and screening existing glass block windows is desirable.

Recommendation:

The issues in the staff analysis should be addressed before using the following motion.

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar swore in the applicants, Mrs. Rosanne Yang and Mr. Bill Yang, 41 W. South St., Worthington, Ohio, and Ms. Monica Lewis, representing J.S. Brown & Company. Mr. Yang said they received their original approval in January of 2019 but unfortunately his mother became extremely ill as they were completing the front porch project, and then passed away in early 2020. He said the first death of Covid was the day his mother died, so they have been dealing with unusual circumstances which has drawn the project out. Mrs. Yang said she is now working from home permanently and that is what has caused the change in the plans. Mr. Coulter asked if they wanted to discuss the removal of the chimneys and Mrs. Yang referred the discussion to Ms. Lewis. Ms. Lewis said she picked up the project from a J.S. Brown employee that is no longer with the company. She said she understood there is a past history of problems with the chimneys, and she also had a discussion with Mrs. Bitar about the historical significance of the chimneys. Ms. Lewis said their primary concern is trying to keep water from infiltrating the homeowner's house. She said several attempts have been made to try and fix the problem and they would prefer to remove the chimneys as they are not serving any purpose. Ms. Lewis said if removal of the chimneys was not acceptable, they had an alternative plan for correcting the problem which would keep the look of the chimneys but separating them from the house with a barrier. Mr. Coulter said he felt the alternative suggestion would be acceptable. He said he understood the issue because he also has a leaking chimney on his house. Mr. Coulter asked if the other Board members had any thoughts about the chimneys which will come back on a separate application. Mr. Reis said he was okay with the chimneys being removed and a barrier added along with the false chimney. The brick would need to be similar in color and texture with the non-existent penetration at the top and maintain the character of the chimneys as part of the historic value of the home. Mr. Coulter asked Mrs. Bitar if there were any emails or callers waiting to speak regarding this application and Mrs. Bitar said no.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY J.S. BROWN & COMPANY ON BEHALF OF THE WILLIAM AND ROSANNE YANG FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO CONSTRUCT AN ADDITION AT 41 W. SOUTH ST. AS PER CASE NO. ARB 51-2021, DRAWINGS NO. ARB 51-2021, DATED APRIL 23, 2021, 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. Foust, aye; Mr. Hofmann, aye; Mrs. Hinz, aye; Mr. Schuster, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; and Mr. Coulter, aye. The motion was approved.

6. Lighting in Rear Yard – 120 E. South St. (Sean & Kim Crowley) ARB 52-2021

Mr. Brown reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This house was built in 1972 and is described as being of Colonial Revival Influence and sits on a lot that is 80-feet wide by 140-feet deep. In 2018 the Board approved the installation of a shed in the rear yard. In 2020 the applicant constructed a 30'x40' basketball court in the rear yard. In early 2021 the applicant installed temporary lighting on a post to illuminate the basketball court.

The applicant would like to install permanent lighting associated with the basketball court.

Project Details:

1. Replaces a temporary lighting solution that is 400 watts/40,000 lumens and is mounted on a pole directing light directly to the north and northeast.
2. Proposed lighting attaches to the existing basketball hoops and directs lighting downward to the playing surface.
3. Each LED light is 30 watts/2,250 lumens for a total wattage of 120 watts/9,000 lumens.
4. Lights are proposed to be directed downward.
5. Lighting can be turned on and off manually and has an option for a timer to automatically turn the lights on and off at a certain time.
6. Goalrilla basketball hoops have an adjustable height from 7.5-feet to 10-feet.
7. Proposed lighting would attach to the top of the basketball hoop and raise the lights another 5 to 6-feet in height.
8. The basketball court is approximately 4-feet to 5-feet from the rear property line and abuts an unimproved alleyway that is 15-feet in width.
9. Since the basketball court is at-grade, the applicant did not need Board approval prior to the installation of the court.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

In selecting new light fixtures, simple designs are usually the best. Avoid overly ornate fixtures and ones that are out of scale with the building or property. Use as few fixtures as are necessary to provide adequate light for walks, yards and driveways. Avoid overly bright lights. Locate and orient fixtures to minimize light “spill” onto adjacent properties.

Keep lighting at a pedestrian scale along the streetscape. Avoid lighting fixtures mounted high above the ground. Avoid excessive brightness. In recent years great care has been taken by the ARB to assure newly installed lighting fixtures are not overly bright and that the light source is not visible from the right of way.

Staff Analysis & Recommendation:

- The proposed lighting is an improvement over the current temporary lighting; however, the Board's policy has been that they do not wish to see the light source from the neighboring residential properties. This lighting issue is typically associated with the lights for commercial parking lots bothering neighboring residential properties.
- The Guidelines recommend avoid using overly bright lights and avoid lighting fixtures mounted high above the ground.
- An agreed time limitation on the lights might be an appropriate compromise.

Discussion:

Mr. Brown swore in the applicant, Mr. Sean Crowley, 120 E. South St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Crowley said the temporary lighting solution was just that, just temporary. The sports court came about because of Covid and their kids not being able to play sports. The kids were going to be home a lot and they needed activity so once they found out they were allowed to have it, Mr. Crowley told his kids they had to install it. He said they worked hard last fall to complete the project but by the time the kids were able to use the court, the sun was setting at 5:00 p.m. Mr. Crowley said the temporary lighting has more lumens than necessary to light up the court. He said after talking with Mr. Brown he understands the light should not spill over into the neighboring property and the lighting should be directed downward and not outward. Mr. Crowley said the Goalrilla lighting he found was a bit pricy but seemed to be the best solution for permanent lighting. Mr. Coulter asked if the new light was an LED and if the fixture had baffles so the light would not bleed into the neighbor's yard. Mr. Crowley said the fixture was an LED, but he was not sure about baffles. He said the light fixture would only be lighting up the court and not spilling over. Mr. Foust said basketball can be a noisy sport. He said if the sports court was going to be used at night he would like it to be clear on the time frame the court could be used so it would not interfere with the neighboring properties. Mr. Hofmann said for Mr. Crowley to make sure he speaks with all of his neighbors to make sure they were okay with his plans. Mr. Crowley asked if there were certain Ordinances in regards to the noise and lighting. Mr. Brown explained that noise would not be handled through the Planning and Zoning Code, noise would be more of a Police matter. He suggested a good neighbor Agreement as to the hours of lighting and play.

One of the neighbors asked to speak. Mr. Brown swore in Mr. John Conrath, 129 E. South St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Conrath said when they first moved to Worthington from the German Village area in 2006, there were probably no more than ten young people living on their street, and now there are probably twenty-five. He said they view that as a really positive thing and enjoy watching the kids go down the street and being active and they see this as a positive aspect of the Worthington community. Mr. Conrath said talking with the neighbors would be the best solution. He said the Crowley's have been great neighbors and they like all of their neighbors living on South Street. He felt they would all be able to resolve this with open communication so these young people can have an opportunity to play close to home.

Mr. Brown swore in Mr. Brent and Mrs. Suzanne Gipson. He said they are all trying to do everything thing they can to support their families. He said they greatly support the children being able to play and exercise and they have been supported many neighborhood sports activities in their own back yard since moving in six years ago. They are also supportive of the sports court next door despite the noise of the basketballs and kids yelling. He said their properties are connected perpendicularly and their first-floor master bedroom, and second story bedroom for their four-year-old is located about twenty feet from the edge of the sport court. Mr. Gipson said the temporary lighting situation caused problems for them and they were unable to enjoy living peacefully in their home. Mr. Gipson said even with the curtains closed, their bedroom was still lit up, and so was the bedroom of their daughter even with privacy blinds pulled closed. He said a private group meeting in his back yard became blinded when the lights were turned on, and they politely asked their neighbors to turn off the lights, but their requests were unanswered. Mr. Gipson said they have looked at ways to resolve this issue with the neighbors and they have tried to work with them on a curfew which they agreed to 9:00 p.m. but unfortunately that was never followed. He said they hired a professional landscaper to help determine a way to block the light and the noise. Mr. Gipson said with the height of the proposed lights, it would take decades of growth for trees to be able to block the light. He said they also came up with a few reasons the lights were not architecturally appropriate for the historic district. The LED lights are super cold and between 4000-5000k, by contrast a soft white bulb is 2700. Mr. Gipson said while walking through old Worthington he has not seen the use of cold white bulbs, not even streetlights. The lights do not have a historic look. The lights are long arching lights that are suspended from poles and they are hoodless. While the new lights would be shining downward which is positive, the light would still be visible from all sides as was with the case with the temporary lights. He said they live in a great neighborhood, and they love living in old Worthington. Mr. Gipson said he feared approval of the bright lights would eventually cause a burden to the taxpayers because they would have to call upon the public services to intervene and address the resulting nuisance. Mr. Gipson said finally he would like to address the concept of property values. Who would want to move in next to professional sports court that stays brightly lit until late hours of the night. These bright lights would negatively affect property values. The Gipsons believe there is a light solution. He said this does not have to be a professional court but he was certain there is a light solution so the kids can enjoy their yards and get out and have fun. He said they ask the Board to preserve the historical appeal and value of the community and homes.

Mr. Brown swore in Mr. Brian Russell, 550 Hartford St., Worthington, Ohio, said he would like to see a curfew limit on the time.

Mr. Coulter said he agreed with the comment about the temperature of the LED lights. When LED's first came out there was only one temperature available and that was how bright could they be made. The lights have since been toned down and warmer LED's are now available and should be available for that type of fixture. Mr. Foust said there were so many questions that needed to be answered, the type of light, the height of the light, the location of the light, the type of bulb, whether or not the lights can be screened, and because this is a residential neighborhood, all of those things can be agreed to but he would still be uncomfortable approving something like this. Mr. Reis said he was sympathetic to the neighbor who spoke about his family and child. He said he has a basketball court outside of his house and when his kids played a lot he knows the sounds that come from there. They also had lighting, but they did not have any neighbors that complained. Mr. Reis

said in the summer the sun does not set until about 9:30 p.m. He said he understood the neighbors concerns about the noise and lighting and suggested letting the kids use the sports court while the sun is up. Mr. Hofmann said he was also uncomfortable approving anything at this point. Mrs. Hinz said she commended Mr. Crowley in having his kids build the court. She said this has been a tough year for everybody and she sympathized with the neighbors with small children. She said she was not totally against lighting the court in some capacity but sixteen feet above grade is a lot. Mrs. Hinz said she has driven past basketball courts that only have the hoop lit up at night. She felt the court could be lit up in some way so the neighbors would not be affected.

Mr. Crowley said the lights have not been on for a least a month. He said he was not particularly married to that design. He thought that was a design which would only show lighting just on the court. He is fully open to other options and asked the Board for suggestions as to what level of lumens would be acceptable and appropriate. Mr. Coulter said city staff could give him guidance on the temperature of recommended lighting in the historical district, and he could get behind approving the lighting if it was done in the right way. He also said positioning the lamps is key and critical and to make sure the lights do not shine in your neighbor's back yard or windows. The lights could also be lowered which also might make a difference because they are only lighting up the court's surface. Mr. Coulter said the Board would not be involved with making the recommended curfew time, instead Mr. Crowley would need to discuss that with his neighbors.

Mr. Crowley asked for the application to be tabled. Mr. Reis moved to table the application and Mrs. Hinz seconded the motion. All Board members voted, "Aye," and the application was tabled.

7. Replace Siding – 849 Oxford St. (Feazel Inc./Gentile & McGarry) ARB 53-2021

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This Colonial Revival style house was originally built in 1938 and went through an addition and renovation project from 2011 – 2013 that considerably modified the look of the house and property. Replacement of the siding on the original part of the house is proposed with this application.

Project Details:

1. The existing siding on the original front part of the house is 6" lap wood siding.
2. Installation of 6" Hardie lap siding painted Dream Black Diamond is proposed that would match the siding on the addition.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Wood siding is preferred, and should be used in one of its traditional forms: shingle, board-and-batten, shiplap or beveled siding. New siding should match the thickness and width of the old as closely as possible. Design and materials should be traditional, and compatible with the existing structure.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of this application. Although wood siding is preferred, the proposed Hardie plank should provide a good match for the existing.

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar swore in the applicant, Mr. Brian McGarry, 849 Oxford St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. McGarry said they are having problems with woodpeckers on the north side of the home, so they need to replace the siding. Everything will look the same. Board members did not have any questions or concerns. Mr. Coulter asked if there were any emails or callers regarding this application and she said no.

Motion:

Mrs. Holcombe moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY FEAZEL INC. ON BEHALF OF BRIAN MCGARRY & ALLISON GENTILE TO REPLACE SIDING AT 849 OXFORD ST. AS PER CASE NO. ARB 53-2021, DRAWINGS NO. ARB 53-2021, DATED APRIL 26, 2021, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

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

8. Landscaping with Walls & Lighting – 886 Oxford St. (Damien & Kellie Healy) ARB 54-2021

Mr. Brown reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This structure is a one and ½ story Cap Code influenced home constructed in 1940 with a front porch added in 2004 and a two-story addition added above the garage in 2007. In December 2020 the Board approved the homeowners request to replace the existing roof and install a new shed for storage behind the existing garage.

The applicant would now like to install new landscaping, retaining walls and accent lighting to the property.

Project Details:

- 1. Install two stone retaining walls on each side of the entrance to the home to create terraced planting beds that will complement the grade change from the house towards Oxford St.
 - a. Stone walls will be built using natural limestone slabs that are dry-stacked.
 - i. Please see application materials for details.

2. The existing paver sidewalk and steps are to remain; however, they will access a 2.4' by 24' apron along the side of the driveway to allow for additional room for those entering or exiting their car.
 - a. Courtship pavers to match the existing sidewalk and compliment the limestone slabs.
3. Lighting:
 - a. Low voltage accent lighting is proposed along the retaining walls that are cast the light downward and up lighting of landscaping.
 - i. Please see application materials for details.
4. Installing new landscaping along the northern, southern, and western elevation of the home.
 - a. Please see the landscape plan in the application materials for details.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

In selecting new light fixtures, simple designs are usually the best. Avoid overly ornate fixtures and ones that are out of scale with the building or property. Use as few fixtures as are necessary to provide adequate light for walks, yards and driveways. Avoid overly bright lights. Locate and orient fixtures to minimize light “spill” onto adjacent properties. Keep functional items such as mechanical equipment well screened with fences or plantings.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of this application, as the proposed landscaping, retaining walls and lighting were compatible with the Design Guidelines.

Discussion:

Mr. Brown swore in the applicant, Mr. Damien Healy, 886 Oxford St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Coulter said this was a really nice plan. Board members did not have any questions or concerns. Mr. Coulter asked if there were any emails or callers regarding this application and Mrs. Bitar said no.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY DAMIAN & KELLIE HEALY FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL LANDSCAPING WITH WALLS AND LIGHTING AT 886 OXFORD ST. AS PER CASE NO. ARB 54-2020, DRAWINGS NO. ARB 54-2020, DATED APRIL 27, 2021, 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. Foust, aye; Mr. Hofmann, aye; Mrs. Hinz, aye; Mr. Schuster, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; and Mr. Coulter, aye. The motion was approved.

9. Condensing Unit Relocation – **711 High St.** (Amanda Sexton & Andrew Graf) **ARB 55-2021**

Mr. Brown reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This house was constructed in 1925 in the American Foursquare style and was added onto over the years. Both the house and garage are listed as contributing properties to the Worthington Historic District. In 2017 the Board approved the addition of gas light fixtures to the house and garage.

The homeowner would now like to relocate the condensing unit to the north side of the home.

Project Details:

1. The applicant is in the process of purchasing new HVAC equipment for the home and would like to install the condensing unit on the north side of the home.
2. The northern side yard is approximately 6.1-feet.
3. The existing condensing unit is located to the rear of the home in the location of a future screened porch.
4. Screening:
 - a. The property owner plans to keep a large tree for screening while removing an existing honeysuckle bush for the placement of the unit on a bluestone or concrete pad.
 - b. Boxwood shrubs will also be added to screen the condensing unit.

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

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

Worthington Planning & Zoning Code

Section 1173.10 requires air-conditional equipment to be located to the rear of the dwelling unit, however it does give the option to place the equipment at the side of the dwelling provided that the equipment be effectively screened on the front and sides by an evergreen hedge or dense planting of shrubs not less than the height of the equipment, or by a fence or wall of similar height

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of this application, as the proposal met the requirements found in the Planning & Zoning Code and met with the intention of the Design Guidelines.

Discussion:

Mr. Brown swore in the applicant, Mr. Andrew Graf, 711 High St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Graf said in the future they are planning to add a screened porch to the back of the house. He said he did not want to have to move the AC unit twice, and the ideal location is on the north side of the property. Board members did not have any questions or concerns. Mr. Coulter asked Mrs. Bitar if there were any callers that would like to speak.

Mrs. Ursula O'Brien Schroeder, 721 High St., Worthington, Ohio. She said she found out about the issue last Friday and wanted to make sure the Board members had a chance to read the letter she wrote. A letter was emailed to the Board prior to the meeting. Mr. Coulter and Mr. Foust both stated they read the letter. Mrs. Schroeder said the outdoor placement of this device would be inappropriate for the noise it generates and the noise that will be reverberated from its position. She said the previous owners of the property did an addition and during that time they relocated the condenser to the south side of the home. She said that is the same location that the applications are proposing. Mrs. Schroeder said they applied for a variance from the Board of Zoning Appeals and their request was denied because it affected the enjoyment of their home. Mr. Schroeder said there was not a problem until the weather got warmer and the air conditioner started. He said the sound of the condenser wakes them up at night because it is so close to their house, and very intrusive. Mr. Schroeder said there is not much of a side yard next door. The little strip of land next where they want to place the condenser is next to their driveway and very close to the house. He said the neighbors had plenty of other options to place the condenser such as the back of their garage. Where they are proposing the placement of the condenser would affect their quality of life. Mr. Coulter explained the Code does allow for placement of mechanical units in the side yard, but it does come with some restrictions in what you have to do to visually block the view of the unit. Mr. Coulter asked what the distance was between the two homes and Mr. Graf said possibly fifty feet. Mr. Schroeder said he wanted to say the outdoors is part of their home. He said his wife spends several hours outside every day. Mr. Foust suggested tabling the application until they see the drawings for the addition and see where the placement of the unit makes sense after seeing the plans for the addition. Mr. Graf said his air conditioner is broken and he needs a new one. Mr. Foust suggested replacing the unit where it is currently located, then see what makes sense after the addition is planned. Mr. Graf said he did not want to have to pay to have the unit moved twice. Mrs. Hinz said she did not believe the condenser and the screening would both fit in the side yard. Mrs. Amanda Sexton said if one of the options is having a fence there would be adequate space for a fence if there was not enough room for a shrub to cover the condenser. The neighbors said the proposed placement would negatively affect the enjoyment of their home. Mr. Coulter asked if there were any other emails or callers and Mrs. Bitar said no. Mr. Schuster said he struggled with his decision. He suggested Mr. Graf do whatever is possible to deaden the sound of the condenser so it would not adversely affect his neighbor.

Motion:

Mr. Schuster moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY AMANDA SEXTON & ANDREW GRAF FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL A CONDENSING UNIT AT 711 HIGH ST. WITH THE PROVISION THAT THEY WORK WITH THEIR NEIGHBORS TO FIND SOMETHING THAT WILL DEADEN THE SOUND TO THE EXTENT POSSIBLE AS PER CASE NO. ARB 55-2020, DRAWINGS NO. ARB 55-2020, DATED APRIL 27, 2021, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

Mr. Reis seconded the motion. Mr. Brown called the roll. Mr. Hofmann, nay, because he believed there are other options on both sides; Mr. Foust, nay, because the new unit needs to be tied into the new addition; Mrs. Holcombe, nay, because of the new addition, and not enough room to

landscape in the proposed location; Mrs. Hinz, nay, for the same reasons as stated by Mrs. Holcombe; Mr. Reis, yea, because of all the reasons stated by the applicant; Mr. Schuster, yea, because the unit does meet Code requirements; Mr. Coulter, yea, for the same reasons as stated by Mr. Schuster. The motion was denied.

D. Municipal Planning Commission – No Business

E. Other

The application for Wings Over Columbus was left off of the Agenda and will be heard at the next meeting on Thursday, May 27th, 2021. Staff gave a quick overview of the proposed signage.

ARB & MPC Consent Agenda Discussion

F. Adjournment

Mr. Reis moved to adjourn the meeting and Mr. Schuster seconded the motion. All Board members voted, “Aye,” and the meeting adjourned at 10:08 p.m.