



MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING  
BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS  
VIRTUAL MEETING

March 4, 2021

**A. Call to Order – 7:00 p.m.**

1. Roll Call - the following members were present: Cynthia Crane, Chair; D.J. Falcoski, Vice-Chair; Brian Seitz, Secretary; Garrett Guillozet, member; and Michael Coulter, Representative from the MPC. Also present were Lee Brown, Director of Planning & Building; and Lynda Bitar, Planning Coordinator.
2. Approval of Minutes of the February 4, 2021 meeting

Mr. Coulter moved to approve the minutes, and Mr. Seitz seconded the motion. Mr. Seitz, aye; Mr. Coulter, aye; Ms. Crane, aye; and Mr. Guillozet, aye. The minutes were approved.

**B. Items of Public Hearing**

1. **Variance** – Traffic Visibility Across Corner Lots – Arborvitae – **59 W. Stanton Ave.** (Woodrow Walton) **VAR 07-2021**

Mr. Brown reviewed the following from the staff memo:

**Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

**Background:**

This property is in the R-10 (Low-Density Residential) Zoning District in the Davis Estates Neighborhood. The surrounding properties are zoned R-10. The elongated shaped 0.15-acre lot is situated on the corner of W. Stanton Ave. and Emerson Ave. The house is located approximately 13-feet from W. Stanton Ave. public right-of-way (23-feet from sidewalk) and 34-feet from the Emerson Ave. public right-of-way (44-feet from the sidewalk). The applicant would like to legitimize the placement of landscaping in the public right-of-way; however, the Board does not have the ability to approve the landscaping since it is located in the public right-of-way owned by the City. The Board's authority is only over private property. The public right-of-way is controlled by the City Engineer. If the applicant would like to move the vegetation to the edge of the public right-of-way on their private property, the Board would then have the ability to review the request.

**Worthington Codified Ordinances:**

Section 1149.09 TRAFFIC VISIBILITY ACROSS CORNER LOTS.

In any district on any corner lot, no fence, structure or planting shall be erected or maintained within ten feet of either the front or side yard right-of-way line at a height greater than two and one-half feet above street grade, nor shall any vehicle or other obstruction be located within fifteen feet of either the front or side yard right-of-way line so as to interfere with traffic visibility. Trees are permitted if trimmed so that no foliage is less than ten feet above street grade.

**Request:**

The applicant is seeking approval to legitimize the placement of landscaping in the public right-of-way. Again, the Board does not have the legal authority to permit the vegetation to stay in the public right-of-way, however the Board could approve the relocation of the vegetation to the edge of the public right-of-way. The variance would then be for 10-feet, where the requirement is for vegetation to be 10-feet back from the front and side yard right-of-way line.

**Conclusions:**

The City Engineer has stated that he will not approve the vegetation to remain in the public right-of-way.

If the applicant were to move the vegetation to the edge of the public right-of-way, the following discussion would be appropriate:

- There is a larger right-of-way on the corner of W. Stanton Ave. and Emerson Ave. that would negate the overall impact of the vegetation at the corner.
- There is an addition 20-feet at the intersection to the sidewalk that is considered public right-of-way.
- The essential character of the neighborhood should not be substantially altered.
- The delivery of government services should not be affected by the installation of the fence.

**Recommendation:**

The Board does not have the ability to approve the current location of the vegetation, however if the applicant were to move the vegetation back to the edge of the public right-of-way, staff would then recommend approval.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Brown swore in the applicant, Mr. Woodrow Walton, 59 W. Stanton Ave., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Walton said when they purchased the home last fall, they had intended to put up some sort of privacy fence. They are first time home buyers, and eventually realized there were a few obstacles for creating privacy. After speaking with Mr. Brown through emails, he understood that vegetation would be a better route to go then adding a fence, so he purchased 17 arborvitaes for about a thousand dollars and hired a contractor to plant the trees. He did not realize the trees were planted in the public right-of-way. Mr. Walton said he realized the trees could not remain in the public right-of-way and must be moved. He said he is not sure which side of the house he would like to move

the arborvitaes to so he asked the Board if they could approve either option, of moving the trees back out of the public right-of-way on the same side or moving the trees to the other side of the property. Ms. Crane asked if there were any emails or calls from the outside public and Mrs. Bitar said no.

**Motion:**

Mr. Guillozet moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY WOODROW WALTON FOR A VARIANCE FROM CODE REQUIREMENTS TO ALLOW THE INSTALLATION OF VEGETATION ON OR AT THE PROPERTY LINE, ON THE EAST OR WEST SIDE OF THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 59 W. STANTON AVE., AS PER CASE NO. VAR 07-2021, DRAWINGS NO. VAR 07-2021 DATED, DECEMBER 30, 2020, BE APPROVED, BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND/OR PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.**

Mr. Seitz seconded the motion. Mr. Brown called the roll. Mr. Coulter, aye; Mr. Falcoski, aye; Mr. Seitz, aye; Mr. Guillozet, aye; and Ms. Crane, aye. The motion was approved.

**2. Variance – Accessory Structure Area – Sauna – 1 Kenyon Brook Dr. (Robert Best) VAR 08-2021**

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. in the R-10 (Low-Density Residential) Zoning District. 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 January 2021, the Architectural Review 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 Architectural Review 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.

**Worthington Codified Ordinances:**

Section 1149.08(b) of the Worthington Codified Ordinances states, “In any “R” District, the total area for accessory buildings shall be limited to 850 square feet and must be compatible in materials and appearance to the other buildings in the area”.

**Request:**

The applicant is requesting the shed to be 80 sq. ft., a variance of 80 sq. ft. on top of the already approved 777 sq. ft. variance that was previously approved.

**Conclusions:**

The applicant is seeking approval to construct an 80 sq. ft. sauna that will be 8’x10’ in size. The sauna will be 17’ from the northern property line and 93’ from the western property line. The applicant is currently 777 sq. ft. over the permitted Accessory Building Area of 850 sq. ft. The Board of Zoning Appeals approved the addition of a two-story garage with 1,344 sq. ft. for a total square footage of 1,627 on the site. The additional 80 sq. ft. will bring the total accessory structure size to 1,707 sq. ft.

The sauna will not be highly visible from the public right-of-way as it located off a private drive and has existing vegetation on the site.

The essential character of the neighborhood should not be substantially altered. Sheds and/or detached garages are not uncommon in Worthington.

A Permit for electrical work will be required from the Division of Building Regulation along with a Certificate of Compliance if the sauna is approved by the Board of Zoning Appeals.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Brown swore in the applicants, Mr. Robert, and Mrs. Mary Best, 1 Kenyon Brook Dr., Worthington, Ohio. Board members did not have any questions or concerns. Ms. Crane asked if there were any emails or callers from the public and Mrs. Bitar said no.

**Motion:**

Mr. Seitz moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY ROBERT BEST FOR A VARIANCE FROM CODE REQUIREMENTS FOR ACCESSORY STRUCTURE SIZE TO INSTALL A SAUNA AT 1 KENYON BROOK DR. AS PER CASE NO. VAR 08-2020, DRAWINGS NO. VAR 08-2020, DATED JANUARY 26, 2021, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND/OR PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.**

Mr. Coulter seconded the motion. Mr. Brown called the roll. Mr. Guillozet, aye; Mr. Coulter, aye; Mr. Seitz, aye; Mr. Falcoski, aye; and Ms. Crane, aye. The motion was approved.

**3. Variance – Side & Rear Yard Setback – Swimming Pool – 130 E. South St.**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

### **Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

#### **Background:**

This two-story vernacular house was constructed in 1950 and is a contributing property in the Worthington Historic District. Various changes have been approved for the house over the years, including an addition and solar panels. The 50' wide property is 140' deep and adjacent to an unimproved alley to the rear.

#### **Worthington Codified Ordinances:**

1173.05 Portable and Nonportable Swimming Pools.

(c) Nonportable swimming pools may be allowed as an accessory use only in "R" and "AR" Districts provided that they comply with the following conditions and requirements:

- (1) The pool is intended and used solely for the enjoyment of the occupants of the principal use of the property on which it is located.
- (2) The pool may not be located, including any walks or paved areas or accessory structures adjacent thereto, closer than ten feet to any property line of the property on which it is located.
- (3) The swimming pool or the property as hereinafter defined on which it is located, shall have a barrier as required by Chapter [1305](#) to prevent uncontrolled access by children or other persons from the street or other adjacent properties.

#### **Request:**

This request is to install a swimming pool at the rear of the property closer than 10' from adjacent properties. The pool is shown 5'6" from the rear property line; 8'6" from the west side property line; and 15'6" from the east side property line. The concrete pool deck would be 2'6" from the rear property line and 3'6" from the side property lines. Variances would be needed for the west side to be 6'6" into the required yard and the rear to be 7'6" into the required yard.

#### **Project Details:**

1. A 10' x 20' inground fiberglass pool that is 4'11" deep is proposed that would have an automatic safety cover.
2. A low stone retaining wall is proposed on part of the north side and along the east side of the pool area.
3. A 4' tall metal picket fence is shown running from the garage to the west property line; along the west property line to the rear; and along the rear to connect to an existing fence at the east property line. Ornamental grasses would be planted between the pool deck and the fence.
4. Furniture is shown around the pool.
5. The Architectural Review Board approved this project at its February 11, 2021 meeting.

**Conclusions:**

Adjoining properties should not suffer a substantial detriment as a result of the variances. The pool would likely be an amenity at the rear of this property.

The delivery of governmental services should not be affected as the adjacent alley is unimproved.

**Discussion:**

Ms. Crane asked if the automatic pool cover was adequate safety protection and Mrs. Bitar said yes, the Building Code requires either a lock and cover, or a fence. Mrs. Bitar swore in the applicant, Mr. Jason Isaacson, 130 E. South St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Isaacson said he has spoken with all the neighbors who would be impacted by the variance, and all neighbors have submitted letters of approval for the pool and design. He said he also modified his plans to make sure the neighbors safety concerns were addressed. The original plans did not include a fence because of the lock and cover, but they decided to add the fence to address the safety concerns. Ms. Crane asked if there were any other emails or calls from the public and Mrs. Bitar said no.

**Motion:**

Mr. Seitz moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY BUILDERSCAPE|EASY LIVING POOLS ON BEHALF OF JASON & MEGAN ISAACSON FOR VARIANCES FROM CODE REQUIREMENTS TO INSTALL A SWIMMING POOL AT 130 E. SOUTH ST. AS PER CASE NO. VAR 09-2021, DRAWINGS NO. VAR 09-2021, DATED JANUARY 27, 2021, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.**

Mr. Falcoski seconded the motion. Mr. Brown called the roll. Mr. Guillozet, aye; Mr. Coulter, aye; Mr. Falcoski, aye; Mr. Seitz, aye; and Ms. Crane, aye. The motion was approved.

**4. Extension of Construction Completion Period – New House & Garage – 100 W. South St. (Neil Toepfer) EXCP 02-2021**

The applicant was not in attendance. Mrs. Crane moved the item to the end of the agenda to give staff the opportunity to get in touch with the applicant to attend the meeting.

**5. Temporary Use Permit – Covid Testing Modular Unit – 918 High St. (GLR, Inc.) TUP 01-2021**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

**Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

**Background:**

CVS is located at the southeast corner of North and High Streets on a 0.85 acre lot. There are entrances to the store at the northwest and northeast corners of the building, and parking is east of the building. A Covid testing trailer was placed east of the building in December of 2020 to allow additional testing capacity for the pharmacy.

**Worthington Codified Ordinances:**

Section 1129.05(b)(5) Temporary Use Permits - A temporary use permit may be granted where the temporary use of a structure or premises in any district where such temporary use shall be for a period of more than ninety days is proposed for a purpose or use that does not conform to the regulations prescribed elsewhere in this Zoning Ordinance for the district in which it is located, provided that such use be of a temporary nature and does not involve the erection of a substantial structure. A temporary use permit for such use shall be granted in the form of a temporary and revocable permit, for not more than a six-month period, subject to a six months' renewal and such conditions as will safeguard the public health, safety, convenience and general welfare.

**Request:**

A Temporary Use Permit is requested to allow the Covid testing trailer and accompanying signage to remain to the east of the building. The request is for 3-6 months.

**Project Details:**

1. The white trailer with red trim has been placed in the first parking space east of the entrance. The next 2 spaces are surrounded with yellow stanchions connected with yellow chains. Reserved parking is marked in the next 3 spaces with red and white plastic sandwich board signs and cones. Other temporary signs are laying on the ground.
2. An electrical connection was made from the top of the trailer to the building above and to the left of the entrance.

**Conclusions:**

Although the need for testing seems to have lessened, if the presence of the trailer is helping to provide a service during the pandemic retention should be acceptable. It would be nice if there was a way to block off the needed parking lot area in a less obtrusive way. The materials and colors used for the temporary signs and fencing draw attention and look a bit unkempt.

The loss of 6 parking spaces should not hinder the parking for the site, except those spaces are convenient and well used.

The trailer should be removed as soon as possible, and retained 6 months only if necessary for the general welfare of the public.

**Discussion:**

Mrs. Bitar swore in the applicant, Ms. Danlys Hernandez, Rhode Island, representing GLR,

Inc., for CVS, 918 High St., Worthington, Ohio. She said she was not exactly sure how long they would need the trailer and signage but asked for the full six-month extension of time. Ms. Crane asked how much use the trailer was getting because she did not see people waiting in line and Ms. Hernandez said that appointments are made to avoid having people waiting in line. Mr. Seitz said his family has used this service with CVS and it was a very easy process. Ms. Crane asked if there were any emails or calls from the public and Mrs. Bitar said no.

**Motion:**

Mr. Guillozet moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY GLR, INC. FOR A TEMPORARY USE PERMIT TO ALLOW A TRAILER AND SIGNAGE TO REMAIN FOR UP TO 6 MONTHS AT 918 HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. TUP 01-2021, DRAWINGS NO. TUP 01-2021 DATED FEBRUARY 3, 2021, BE APPROVED, BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND/OR PRESENTED AT THE MEETING AND THAT ALL SIGNS AND THE TEMPORARY USE FACILITY BE KEPT IN AN ORDERLY FASHION.**

Mr. Coulter seconded the motion. Mr. Brown called the roll. Mr. Seitz, aye; Mr. Falcoski, aye; Mr. Coulter, aye; Mr. Guillozet, aye; and Ms. Crane, aye. The motion was approved.

6. **Variance** – Side Yard Setback on Corner Lot – Fence – **215 Highgate Ave.** (Heidi Comstock/Stovell) **VAR 10-2021**

Mr. Brown reviewed the following from the staff memo:

**Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

**Background:**

This property is in the R-16 (Very Low-Density Residential) Zoning District in the Worthingway Neighborhood. The surrounding properties are a mix of R-10, R-16, and S-1 zoning. The irregularly shaped 0.59-acre lot is situated on the corner of Highgate Ave. and Evening St. The house is located 50-feet from Highgate Ave. and 40-feet from Evening St. rights-of-way. The applicant would like to install a new 5' high aluminum fence around the property, however the fence is proposed to encroach approximately 5-feet into the setback along Evening St.

**Worthington Codified Ordinances:**

Section 1149.08 (a): At corner lots, no accessory uses, accessory structures, structures, material or equipment storage shall be located in any required front yard. Side yards fronting on the adjacent street can be reduced to two-thirds of the required front setback from the right of way of the adjacent street. The required setback for this property along Hartford St. is 20'.

1180.02 "R" DISTRICTS (a): In any "R" District, no fence or wall shall be erected in the



area between the right of way line and the building setback line except for a wall necessary to accommodate differences in grade. No fence or wall in an "R" district shall exceed a height of six feet.

**Request:**

The applicant is seeking approval to construct a fence that would extend approximately 5-feet into the required setback along Evening St. A variance of 5-feet is requested, where 20-feet is required.

**Conclusions:**

The proposed fence is a 5' high aluminum open style fence.

Existing vegetational along the sidewalk along Evening St. helps screen the fence.

The essential character of the neighborhood should not be substantially altered.

The delivery of government services should not be affected by the installation of the fence.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Brown swore in the applicants, Ms. Heidi Comstock, 120 E. Market St., Baltimore, Ohio, and Mr. Sam Stovall and Mrs. Kristen Stovall, 215 Highgate Ave., Worthington, Ohio. Ms. Comstock said they are asking for a five-foot variance on Evening Street, but they technically only need 3.5 feet. There are mature trees in the way, and they do not want to cut the trees down. Then fence will be made out of black aluminum which has a thirty-year warranty. No maintenance will be required. Ms. Comstock said because of the trees, people will not know the fence exists, the trees will cover the fence. Ms. Crane asked if there were any emails or calls and Mrs. Bitar said no.

**Motion:**

Mr. Coulter moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY HEIDI COMSTOCK FOR A VARIANCE FROM CODE REQUIREMENTS TO ALLOW THE INSTALLATION OF A FENCE AT 215 HIGHGATE AVE., AS PER CASE NO. VAR 10-2021, DRAWINGS NO. VAR 10-2021 DATED, FEBRUARY 5, 2021, BE APPROVED, BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND/OR PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.**

Mr. Seitz seconded the motion. Mr. Brown called the roll. Mr. Guillozet, aye; Mr. Falcoski, aye; Mr. Seitz, aye; Mr. Coulter, aye; and Ms. Crane, aye. The motion was approved.

7. **Variance** –Rear Yard Setback – Deck Extension – **237 Greenbrier Ct.** (Nicholson Builders Inc./Shonk) **VAR 11-2021**

Mr. Brown reviewed the following from the staff memo:

### **Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

#### **Background:**

This property is in the R-10 (Low-Density Residential) Zoning District in an area know as The Settlement. The surrounding properties are a mix of R-10 and S-1 zoning. The lot is a 0.25-acre lot that is 112-feet wide and 95-feet deep. The property backs to Tucker Creek on the north side of the site. The Settlement (Greenbrier Hill) was platted in 1979 with building setbacks set at 30-feet for the front yard and 20-feet for the rear yard. In 2001 the Board approved a variance for the placement of a deck in the rear yard setback. The applicant would like to expand the deck further to the west for the installation of a hot tub.

#### **Worthington Codified Ordinances:**

Section 1149.06(c) permits uncovered floor areas such as patios, decks and similar structures accessory to a dwelling shall be permitted to within not less than fifteen feet of the rear lot line provided that the floor level of the structure shall be not more than three feet above the adjacent grade prior to construction of the structure, and provided that railings, screens, posts or other enclosures shall project not more than four feet above the floor surface of the structure.

#### **Request:**

The applicant is seeking approval to expand a deck to the west and will be approximately 9.6-feet from the rear property line and is 12-feet above grade. A variance of 5.5-feet is requested.

#### **Conclusions:**

The proposed deck expansion is on 76 sq. ft. in size and is the area of the existing deck.

Section 1149.01 requires a rear yard setback of 30-feet, however according to Section 1149.06(c) uncovered decks and patios are permitted to no closer than 15-feet to the rear lot line. The encroachment is only 4.5 feet and overall minimal in size.

The site is heavily wooded and slopes to the rear of the lot towards Tucker Creek which is entirely on the UMCH site. Usable flat area is minimal on the site, so the use of a deck is needed. The physical circumstances unique to this property are the shallow lot and that there is an existing deck in the same location make the strict conformity to the Code impractical.

The essential character of the neighborhood should not be substantially altered as many of the homes have rear decks and patios.

The delivery of government services should not be affected by the expansion of the deck.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Brown swore in the applicant, Mr. Britain Myers, representing Nicholson Builders, on behalf of Mr. Jason Shonk, 237 Greenbrier Ct., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Myers said the limitations of the lot are a little unusual. He said the property is steeply graded and it has been a challenge for his clients to use their backyard, so he is asking the Board members for a little extra living space. Board members did not have any questions or concerns. Ms. Crane asked if there were any emails or calls and Mrs. Bitar said no.

**Motion:**

Mr. Seitz moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY NICHOLSON BUILDERS INC. ON BEHALF OF JASON SHONK FOR A VARIANCE FROM CODE REQUIREMENTS TO ALLOW THE EXPANSION OF A DECK AT 237 GREENBRIER CT., AS PER CASE NO. VAR 11-2021, DRAWINGS NO. VAR 11-2021 DATED, FEBRUARY 8, 2021, BE APPROVED, BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND/OR PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.**

Mr. Guillozet seconded the motion. Mr. Brown called the roll. Mr. Falcoski, aye; Mr. Coulter, aye; Mr. Seitz, aye; Mr. Guillozet, aye; and Ms. Crane, aye. The motion was approved.

**8. Extension of Construction Completion Period – New House & Garage – 100 W. South St. (Neil Toepfer) EXCP 02-2021**

The applicant was not in attendance at the time of his agenda item and the item was moved to the end of the agenda.

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

**Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

**Background:**

This property is in the R-10 (Low Density Residential) Zoning District within the Architecture Review District in Old Worthington. In March of 2018, the property owner was approved by the Architecture Review Board to construct a new dwelling and garage on the property.

The permit for the house project was issued in August of 2018 and an extension was approved in the beginning of 2020 until the end of that year.

The owner sites the pandemic as a reason for the delay.

**Worthington Codified Ordinances:**

Section 1305.06(b) The permit authorizing the work as shown on the approved construction documents is invalid if the work is not completed, inspected, and approved within eighteen months of the issuance of the permit.

Section 1305.06(c) Before any work authorized by a permit may continue for which the permit is invalid, the owner shall make application to the Board of Zoning Appeals for an extension of time as required under Chapter [1129](#) of the Planning and Zoning Code. Failure to complete work within said eighteen-month period or additional time granted by the Board of Zoning Appeals shall constitute a violation of this code.

**Request:**

The applicant is requesting another extension until July 31, 2021 to complete the construction. Staff feels the end of the year may be a more appropriate time limit.

**Project Details:**

1. The house has progressed to the point of nearing completion on the outside, needing just finish materials. The owner feels that work will be done in 8-10 weeks. City services and mechanicals would also be installed in that time period.
2. After the outside has been finished, interior work could continue.
3. Landscaping would likely not be installed until the fall.

**Conclusions:**

Once the exterior coverings are installed, the house would have a more finished look. Accomplishing that task in the next 8-10 weeks would improve the look of the property.

Believing the exterior would look finished in the next months, staff feels the time extension to the end of the year for the rest of the work would be prudent.

**Discussion:**

Mrs. Bitar swore in the applicant, Mr. Neil Toepfer, 100 W. South St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Toepfer said the house is now a little further along, and the roof is on the house now. Board members had no questions or concerns. Mr. Coulter asked if there were any emails or calls from the public and Mrs. Bitar said no.

**Motion:**

Mr. Seitz moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY NEIL TOEPFER FOR AN EXTENSION OF THE CONSTRUCTION COMPLETION PERIOD UNTIL DECEMBER 31, 2021, AT 100 W. SOUTH ST. AS PER CASE NO. EXCP 02-2021, DRAWINGS NO. EXCP 02-2021 DATED FEBRUARY 1, 2021, BE APPROVED, BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND/OR PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.**

Mr. Falcoski seconded the motion. Mr. Brown called the roll. Mr. Guillozet, aye; Mr. Coulter (lost connection 8:20 p.m.); Mr. Falcoski, aye; Mr. Seitz, aye; and Ms. Crane, aye. The motion was approved.

**C. Other** – No other business to discuss.

**D. Adjournment**

Mr. Guillozet moved to adjourn the meeting, and Mr. Seitz seconded the motion. All Board members voted, “Aye,” and meeting adjourned at 8:23 p.m