



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

November 13, 2014

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: Richard Hunter, Chair; James Sauer, Vice Chair; Kathy Holcombe, Secretary; Mikel Coulter; Thomas Reis; Amy Lloyd and Jo Rodgers. Also present were: Scott Myers, Worthington City Council Representative for the Municipal Planning Commission; Lee Brown, Director of Planning & Building; Lynda Bitar, Planning 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 minutes of the October 23, 2014 meeting

Mr. Coulter moved to approve the minutes, and Mr. Sauer seconded the motion. All members voted, "Aye".

4. Affirmation/swearing in of witnesses

B. Architectural Review Board

Mr. Hunter explained the Snow House and Lodge Condominiums will be discussed after "New Business", so the hearing will begin with item "c", for 138 W. Clearview Avenue, AR 61-14.

1. Unfinished

- c. New House & Garage – **138 W. Clearview Ave.** (Hal Lieberman) **AR 61-14**

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar said new information has not been received since last month's meeting. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Hal Lieberman approached the microphone and stated he is representing Fairfax Homes, and his address is 345 Forest St., Columbus, Ohio 43206. Mr.

Lieberman distributed new information to the Board members and City staff. Mr. Lieberman said he would like the Board's support for a variance to move the garage. Instead of the eight foot side yard, he would like to pursue a variance to move just the garage and have a four foot six or eight inch side yard. He would also like to add a front porch that would encroach into the front setback area. Mr. Lieberman said he would like to get the Board's blessing this evening to move forward with the architects based upon the massing. He said he has already taken care of the arborist's study that was requested earlier. The house will be twenty feet away from the large tree, and the house has a smaller footprint that will be in line with the percentages of the rest of the homes in the neighborhood.

Mr. Coulter said he liked the idea of the front porch and there are several homes in the area with front porches. He asked if the setback was thirty or forty feet. Mrs. Bitar said thirty feet is required by Code, but forty feet is the prevailing setback. She also stated a variance would probably not be needed for the front porch because the porch would not extend past the thirty foot mark.

Mr. Coulter said he appreciated the garage being moved forward, and noticed the house is now smaller, which was one of the Board's concerns at an earlier meeting. Mr. Coulter said he would still like to see the elevations and the architecture of the structure. Mr. Lieberman said he wanted to have this discussion with the Board members before going forward with the architectural plans. Mrs. Holcombe stated she also liked the idea of the porch. Mr. Sauer said he was glad to see some of the Board's concerns had been addressed, especially the issues about the tree and setback. He believes that Mr. Lieberman is on the right track.

Mr. Hunter said the Board has not received enough information for a vote, and Mr. Lieberman said he was not expecting a vote this evening; he was just continuing the discussion. Mr. Lieberman said he would like to table the application. Mrs. Rodgers said she believes the house is still too large for this parcel. The house appears to be smaller, but also taller, and that is still something she cannot support. Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak about this application and one person came forward. Ms. Peggy Barnum approached the microphone and stated her address is 120 W. Clearview Ave., Worthington, Ohio. She said her house is immediately to the east of the diagram on the right. She said she has lived in the area for approximately twenty-four years. Ms. Barnum believes that too many trees are being destroyed and the character of the proposed house does not fit in with the neighborhood. She said she opposed the lot split from the very beginning, and when the first for sale sign went up, she made an offer (the asking price) to the owner to buy the property, but her offer was refused. Ms. Barnum said all she wanted to do was purchase the property and leave the area as green space, pay the taxes, and wait for the homeowner to move and then try to purchase the home, and resell the property as a whole, as the property used to be. She said she understood the realtor got into a disagreement with the owner, and a new for sale sign went up, along with a price increase of \$15,000.00 dollars. Ms. Barnum said her sister prepared a study based upon the house square footages as compared with lot square footage in that quadrant. The percentages range from fourteen percent footprint to thirty-three percent footprint. She believes the house is out of character for the neighborhood. Ms. Barnum said that her neighbor, Christy Cane feels the same

way that she does, but Ms. Cane was not able to attend the meeting. There were no other speakers.

Mr. Coulter moved to table this application, and Mr. Reis seconded the motion. All members voted, "Aye". The motion was approved.

2. New

a. Windows – 617 Hartford St. (Jim & Lindsay Roop) AR 63-14

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Jim Roop approached the microphone and stated his address is 617 Hartford St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Roop said he had one correction to make. He is planning to have interior and exterior muntins on the windows, and keep the windows the way they originally were. Mr. Roop said some of the windows are broken, and some do not work anymore. He wants to replace the windows in his children's bedrooms and bathrooms. He explained these are the first windows of many that will need to be replaced because they are old and in disrepair. Mr. Sauer asked Mr. Roop if he would be replacing the attic windows also, and Mr. Roop said he will be eventually. Mr. Coulter suggested giving Mr. Roop a blanket approval to replace all the windows with the same style over an eighteen month period. Mr. Roop said as the funds are available they will replace windows. Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

The homeowners recently purchased this Homestead style home built in the early 1930's, and received approval to replace 9 basement windows with glass block at the last meeting. This request involves replacing nine second floor windows in the house.

Project Details:

1. There are 4 windows in the front; 2 on the north side; and 2 on the south side; and 1 on the west side that are slated for replacement. The existing windows are double-hung wood windows with the top sash being divided into 6 lights and the bottom being a single pane. The window frames and trim are white.
2. Proposed are white aluminum or fiberglass clad wood windows, in the same size and style as the existing. Exterior muntins are proposed. The exterior molding would be preserved.

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 aluminum, vinyl, or 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 enlarging or downsizing window openings to accommodate stock sizes of replacements.

Compatibility of design and materials, exterior detail and relationships, and window treatment are standards of review in the Architectural District ordinance.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending *approval* of this application. Although retention and repair of existing wood windows is preferred, replacement with a modern version of the same style and size window is acceptable.

Mr. Coulter moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY JIM AND LINDSAY ROOP FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO REPLACE SECOND FLOOR WINDOWS AT 617 HARTFORD ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 63-14, DRAWINGS NO. AR 63-14, DATED OCTOBER 27, 2014, AND THAT THE HOMEOWNER BE APPROVED TO CHANGE OTHER WINDOWS IN THE SAME STYLE AND MATERIAL AS SUBMITTED THIS EVENING FOR A PERIOD OF EIGHTEEN MONTHS, AND 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 roll. Mr. Hunter, aye; Mr. Sauer, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Coulter, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye and Mrs. Rodgers, aye. The motion was approved.

b. Addition and Garage – 594 Hartford St. (Dave Fox Remodeling/Huffman) AR 64-14

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Steve Dempsey said he is representing Dave Fox Builders and his address is 5623 Dumfries Ct., Dublin, Ohio. Mr. Dempsey said the addition to the house is the first phase of this project and the garage will be the second phase, but they are looking for approval of both projects. He said they will be using the same products that will match the current structure, from copper gutters to a slate roof. They will be using Pella Windows that have an aluminum clad exterior. The windows already on the house and previously approved were vinyl, but they are going with aluminum clad this time, and all of those windows will be in the back. They will have a SDL upper sash, muntins to match the current vertical bars on the windows. He said they will not be building a deck at this time, but they will be building stairs as seen on the elevation, using treated material and painting the stairs. He said the main addition is the main concern at this time.

Mr. Hunter asked if the out building could be saved. Mr. Dempsey said the out building is in poor condition, unstable and feels the building would be destroyed if moved. Mr. Hunter asked if the building is on a foundation and Mr. Dempsey said no. Mr. Sauer asked Mr. Dempsey if he is seeking approval for both the addition and the garage at this time. Mr. Dempsey yes, unless the Board felt there were major concerns he would like to address those concerns now. Mr. Sauer asked if Mr. Dempsey was going to be able to match the slate roof, and Mr. Dempsey said the slate will be newer, and they will have to clip the edges to match the style.

Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and one person came forward. Mr. Greg Hopkins approached the microphone and stated he is the next door neighbor to the north. He said he is very pleased that the Huffman family has decided not to move away, and are adding on to their home.

Mr. Myers asked for clarification and asked if the Board was approving the whole project this evening, the garage and the addition and Mr. Hunter said yes. Mr. Dempsey said if anything changes to the current plans, he would come back to the Board for approval. Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this project and no one else came forward.

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

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

With this application, the homeowners would like approval for 2 phases of construction: Phase 1 would allow construction of a two-story addition to the rear of the home; Phase 2 would allow construction of a two-story garage attached to the addition.

Project Details:

1. In Phase 1, the proposed addition would be 26' x 26' and would be rear of the house, with the new walls extending in line with the existing. A gambrel roof matching the three on the existing house is proposed for the rear at an elevation matching the front of the roof. Small dormers are proposed on the sides of the roof. Steps are proposed leading to a small porch in the rear, which would be in place until a future deck and patio are designed. The proposed materials would match the existing house including: clapboard siding, slate roof, Pella aluminum clad wood simulated divided light windows, and split faced and parged block for the foundation. Demolition of a small part of the rear of the existing house would be necessary to allow construction of this addition.
2. Phase 2 would involve demolition of the existing barn, and construction of a new roughly 26' x 26' garage with a room above attached to the south side of the Phase 1 addition.

Two separate carriage style garage doors would face south and allow for entry from an extension of the existing drive. A matching gambrel roof is proposed for the two story structure that would extend south with the peak being much lower than the roof of the house due to the downward slope of the property. In addition to the matching materials proposed for the house addition, this structure would have a cupola and a rear entry door.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Residential additions are recommended to maintain similar roof forms; be constructed as far to the rear and sides of the existing residence as possible; be subordinate; and have walls set back from the corners of the main house. Design and materials should be traditional, and compatible with the existing structure. Older outbuildings, sheds, and garages should be retained and repaired. They add variety and visual interest to the streetscape and are part of Worthington's character.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending *approval* of this application. Although the rear addition is not set back from the corners of the house, it follows the other guidelines being to the rear with a similar roof form. The addition is subordinate in that it does not overpower the existing house as viewed from the street. The garage addition is to the rear and at enough of a lower elevation to appear subordinate to the house. Retention of the existing barn would be nice, as it adds character to the community.

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY DAVE FOX REMODELING FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO CONSTRUCT ADDITIONS TO THE HOUSE AT 594 HARTFORD ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 64-14, DRAWINGS NO. AR 64-14, DATED OCTOBER 29, 2014, THE DECK SHOWN ON THE PLANS WILL NOT BE CONSTRUCTED, AND BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

Mr. Sauer seconded the motion. Mrs. Bitar called the roll. Mr. Hunter, aye; Mr. Sauer, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Coulter, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye and Mrs. Rodgers, aye. The motion was approved.

- c. Landscape Plan – **362 E. Granville Rd.** (Rodney Arcaro) **AR 65-14**
(Amendment to AR 84-11)

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Rodney Arcaro approached the microphone and stated his address is 362 E. Granville Rd., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Arcaro said he took great care in creating where the rain gardens will be located in the front which will help mitigate water from the first third of the

property, and the front of the house. The two rain gardens in the back of the property will mitigate the water from the last third of the roof and the rest of the property. The rain garden in the front is about one foot lower than the rest of the area, and the back rain garden is about two feet lower. He said the idea behind the set up of the garden is as the first rain garden fills up the rest of the water will spill over into the second rain garden. Mr. Arcaro said there is no storm sewer in the area so the only thing that will help mitigate the water are the rain gardens. He believes the rain gardens and the vegetation within them will slow down the water.

Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Arcaro to explain what a “no mow lawn is”. Mr. Arcaro said a no mow lawn has four different types of Fescue grass seeds and the grass will not grow as high as normal grass. Mr. Sauer asked Mr. Arcaro if he had a time frame as to when this project will be completed and Mr. Arcaro said he plans to have this project completed by next June. Mrs. Holcombe asked how high the stone walls would be. Mr. Arcaro said the stone walls will be minimum height, approximately eighteen inches high. Mr. Sauer how large the trellis is. He said from the plans the trellis appears to be as large as the garage is wide. Mr. Arcaro said trellis will be behind the trees, and will be eight feet wide. Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this project and one person came forward.

Mr. Frank Dean, of 431 Granville Sq., Worthington, Ohio approached the microphone and stated he is Mr. Arcaro’s neighbor to the north. He said this past spring when they experienced a monumental rain their backyard flooded enough to kayak in. Mr. Dean said he wanted to make sure the abatement of the water is adequate because all of the water coming from Mr. Arcaro’s property goes to the north, which is his property. Mr. Dean showed photographs of the flooding in his back yard. He said as long as the yard is mounded up enough to keep the water from flowing into his yard, the plan should not be a problem. Mrs. Holcombe asked Mr. Dean if this is the first year he has experienced that much water in his back yard and Mr. Dean said no, he heard the previous owner had back yard water issues as well, but with the change of the landscaping, there was more water than in previous years. There were no other speakers.

Mr. Sauer asked about the elevation of the back rain garden. Mr. Arcaro asked Mrs. Bitar if she still had previous photographs that were originally submitted and she did. While viewing the photographs, Mr. Arcaro explained that the elevation is actually a foot lower to the north, and should retain most of the water.

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This house was approved in 2012 by the Architectural Review Board with the requirement to have a landscape plan return to the Board for approval. Construction on the house was finished in 2013 and the homeowner is now seeking approval for the proposed landscaping. The house that was previously on this property burned down in the 2000’s.

Project Details:

1. The submitted landscape plan shows a variety of existing and proposed plant material including trees, grass, perennials and shrubs.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Maintain and nurture mature trees to prolong their lives. Lawns should be generous but not overly large to contribute to the sense of human scale that is one of Worthington’s important attributes. Other landscaping elements should be properly scaled and well-tended.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending approval of this application, with additional information that is acceptable to the Board. Continued maintenance of the existing mature trees and the new plant material would be expected.

Mr. Sauer moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY RODNEY ARCARO FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL LANDSCAPING FOR THE HOUSE AT 362 E. GRANVILLE RD., AS PER CASE NO. AR 65-14, DRAWINGS NO. AR 65-14, DATED OCTOBER 30, 2014, 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 roll. Mr. Hunter, aye; Mr. Sauer, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Coulter, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye and Mrs. Rodgers, aye. The motion was approved.

d. Fencing – 172 E. Granville Rd. (Cory Tressler) AR 66-14

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Cory Tressler approached the microphone and stated his address is 172 E. Granville Rd., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Tressler thanked Mrs. Bitar for her assistance. He said he and his wife recently purchased their home and were unaware they were living within the Architectural Review District and Mrs. Bitar has been very helpful with information. Mr. Tressler said they have two dogs and recently had a child and they have safety concerns since the property is next to a busy road. He said there are a number of strange dogs that run onto their property off leash, while his dogs are on a leash. Mr. Tressler said they purchased the property with the intention of building a fence from the very beginning. What he presented to the Board this evening was his original vision. Mr. Hunter asked if he had any conversations with the neighbors about his plans, and Mr. Tressler said he had a couple of discussions, including the neighbor to the west, who did not have a problem with the fence.

Mr. Hunter explained the Architectural Review District is well publicized and well thought of in the community. Mr. Tressler said he looked at the Worthington.org website and was confused because he thought the area was west of Morning Street, but said he may have confused that with “Old Worthington”. Mr. Tressler said real estate agents and homeowners of the review district area should be required to disclose that information to potential buyers.

Mrs. Rodgers explained one thing that residents have done in the past to meet the guidelines and address the safety issues, is to build an open style fence and then line the fence with chicken wire which would prevent anything from getting in or out of the enclosed area. Mr. Tressler thought that would be less visually appealing than what he proposed. He said the French gothic look was closer to the time period of when the house was built, but he understood what Mrs. Rodgers was saying. Mrs. Holcombe asked if Mr. Tressler would consider making the fenced in area smaller, and not fencing the entire yard. Mr. Tressler said they are considering that idea, but because of the chicken coop needing a clearance of one hundred and fifty feet from the property line, and the fact that this property had a deep lot were some of the reasons they decided to purchase the property.

Mr. Sauer said when he walked in the back yard this afternoon, he was impressed with the large area. He said he did notice a fence, but the fence was off in the distance. Mr. Sauer said Mr. Tressler's property lies in the middle of the open area, and to fence the entire property would change the character of whole area. He agreed with the suggestion to enclose a smaller portion of the property. Mr. Hunter said he agreed with fencing a smaller portion of the property, but he cannot support enclosing the entire area the way the plans are currently drawn. Mrs. Lloyd asked for clarification as to where the chicken coop sits in comparison to where the shed is. Mr. Tressler said the coop sits far back on the property because of the one hundred and fifty foot requirement from the neighboring properties.

Mrs. Holmes said she realizes Mr. Tressler does not want a smaller fence, but he may be more successful in getting the Board's approval for a fence if he reduces the area to be enclosed. She suggested tabling the application for now and have Mr. Tressler determine how much smaller of a fence he could live with. Mr. Tressler said he cannot live with a smaller fence. He also stated he did not realize a building permit would be needed from information he gathered from the City's webpage.

Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and several people raised their hands.

The first speaker was Ms. Carole Mathews of 662 Hartford St., Worthington, Ohio. Ms. Mathews said she had a six-foot board on board fence, that was approved, for many years when she had smaller children and animals, and she has lived in the area for approximately forty years. She said she later had the fence taken down when her children did not live at home anyone. Ms. Mathews said she wanted to mention that there is a fence located on the corner of Evening Street and State Route 161, the home that was restored, and that house has quite a lengthy picket fence that was allowed. She wanted to know why the Board approved the Evening Street picket fence but disagrees with the fence for this application.

The next speaker was Tony Konecny, who stated his address is 196 E. Granville Rd., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Konecny said he lives three houses east of the Tresslers and contrary to Ms. Mathews comments, he and his family spend a lot of time outdoors in their back yards. Mr. Konecny said he and his wife like to sit on the back porch and drink their coffee and view the nature in the open space area, and a lot of other neighbors' commune in the area also. He feels

the fence as proposed is too extensive and cuts right down the center of a large open space, and there are not that many open spaces left in Worthington. Mr. Konecny said his other concern, as expressed in an earlier email, is setting precedence for fences of that size. He would like to have their area kept free of fences as much as possible, but would understand the need to have a smaller fence to keep children and animals safe. He said the fence as proposed is too large.

Mr. Coulter asked Mrs. Bitar if the alley in the drawings is an active alley. Mrs. Bitar said that alley is only active much further to the west. She said a variance will be needed to put any structure within thirty feet of the alley.

The next speaker was Mr. Hans Kohles of 149 E. North St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Kohles said his father has lived in the area for approximately sixty years and he may inherit the property very soon. He said when he viewed the photographs of this area, he loved the expansive view. He feels that the open area is very pertinent to the nearby neighbors. He said he is dealing with a few neighbors now that do not keep up the maintenance on their fences, and fences do rust and fall over. He feels that a fence through the expansive area would be very intrusive.

The next speaker was Mrs. Mary Arthmire of 189 Franklin St., Worthington, Ohio. She said that she loves the openness of the area. She said she believes that neighbors would possibly agree to a smaller fence, but she plans to expand her back deck into a patio area, and would love to see the area remain open as much as possible. Mrs. Arthmire said one neighbor has offered to let her children use their swing set, and another neighbor has offered to share vegetables from their garden. She also said that a few years ago, the alley was used for a neighborhood get together. Mrs. Arthmire would prefer to see the open space remain open.

The next speaker was Ms. Peggy Barnum, of 120 W. Clearview, Worthington, Ohio. Ms. Barnum stated the property in question is not community property; the property belongs to the applicant, Mr. Tressler. She understands he wants to protect his children and pets and as property owners they should be allowed to do that. Mr. Hunter explained this property lies within the Architectural Review District and that puts restraints on what can be done with the property. He said he always makes the comments that "you don't own the view of your neighbors". Mr. Tressler has the right to build a fence, but part of the Architectural Review standards are the character of the neighborhood. Ms. Barnum stated that the Clearview property also lies within the Architectural Review District, and the view is affected. Mr. Hunter said the Clearview property started life long ago until about four years ago as a single lot of record that could be built on. Ms. Barnum said she did not want to revisit the Clearview property discussion, but she wanted to address the comment that someone made saying the area was "community property" and that is not true. The property belongs to Mr. Tressler. There were no other speakers.

Mr. Coulter said he would like to make a suggestion. He explained there is a high probability that Mr. Tressler would not get a positive vote on the fence as proposed. Mr. Coulter suggested tabling the application and come back to the Board on December 11th with a revision of a smaller fence, or ask for the vote now see how the Board members vote. Mr. Tressler said he would like to take a vote.

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This property is located on the north side of E. Granville Rd. and is 50 wide x 260' deep. The house is an American Foursquare that sits about 40' from the right-of-way line. The property owner would like to enclose the yard starting at the rear of the house with a fence.

Project Details:

1. The proposed fence would start at the rear of the house and run along the rear property line, stepping in the asphalt turnaround for the driveway. Several gates are proposed, including along the rear property line.
2. A 4' high cedar picket fence with French gothic tops is proposed. The proposed pickets are 1" x 4", and supported by 4" x 4" posts and 2" x 4" rails. The proposed gap between pickets on the drawings is 1 ½" and the homeowner is willing to widen the gap to 2". Due to a small dog he would not like to go any wider than 2".

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 is recommending *approval* of this application. The proposed fencing is close to meeting the recommendations of the design guidelines, and view from E. Granville Rd. should be limited.

Mr. Coulter moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY CORY TRESSLER FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL FENCING AT 172 E. GRANVILLE RD., AS PER CASE NO. AR 66-14, DRAWINGS NO. AR 66-14, DATED OCTOBER 30, 2014, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

Mr. Sauer seconded the motion. Mrs. Bitar called the roll. Mr. Hunter, nay; Mr. Sauer, nay; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Coulter, nay; Mr. Reis, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, nay and Mrs. Rodgers, nay. The motion was not approved.

e. Exhaust Fan – **445 E. Granville Rd., Building L** (Step By Step Academy, Inc.) **AR 67-14**

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Rick Murphy approached the microphone and stated he is the owner of Precise Remodeling & Construction, and his address is 5565 Westerville Rd., Westerville, Ohio. He

stated he is the General Contractor for this project. He said they designed this project with the exhaust fan going up the back wall instead of up through the roof to keep the exhaust fan out of view of the neighbors, and everything is in compliance with the OBBC Code. Ms. Marla Root approached the microphone and stated she is the Executive Vice President at Step By Step Academy, 445 E. Granville Rd., Worthington, Ohio. Ms. Root said she has spoken with many of the nearby families that will be exposed to the building and what business would be there, and the neighbors did not have any concerns. Board members did not have any questions or concerns. Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

Building L is located near the southwest corner of the former Harding Hospital property. The building has been used in recent years by the current owner of the property, Step by Step Academy, to provide services. Step by Step Academy would like to remodel the kitchen in the building to allow for residential care. A food license is a requirement for licensure with the Ohio Department of Job and Family Services.

Project Details:

1. The addition of an exhaust fan is required for the commercial kitchen. The fan would extend to the outside on the west side of the north wing of the building. The noise level would be approximately 60 db, which is similar to office conversation.
2. Existing plant material would screen the fan visually from neighboring property owners, which are more than 200' away.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Landscape materials can be used to screen or soften undesirable views.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending *approval* of this application. The exhaust fan should not be seen or heard from nearby residences.

Mrs. Rodgers moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY STEP BY STEP ACADEMY, INC. FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL AN EXHAUST FAN AT 445 E. GRANVILLE RD., AS PER CASE NO. AR 67-14, DRAWINGS NO. AR 67-14, DATED OCTOBER 31, 2014, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

Mr. Reis seconded the motion. Mrs. Bitar called the roll. Mr. Hunter, aye; Mr. Sauer, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Coulter, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye and Mrs. Rodgers, aye. The motion was approved.

f. Freestanding Sign Change – **5577 N. High St.** (True/Hans Schell) **AR 68-14**

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Jay Trueman approached the microphone and stated his address is 6819 Joslyn Pl., Worthington, Ohio, and he is representing True LLC, the sign contractor. Mr. Trueman said the new sign is due to State Farm's corporate rebranding. The sign will be the same color and same size. Board members did not have any questions. Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

Hans Schell purchased this building in 2008 and installed the existing signage at that time. This request would allow replacement of the State Farm sign faces on the existing freestanding sign.

Project Details:

1. The top half of the existing sign is devoted to Hans Schell's State Farm Agency, being a red panel with white lettering. Replacement of the panels on both sides is proposed.
2. The new 30" high x 59" wide panels would have the agent name and phone # in white on a red background at the top, and the State Farm name and logo in red on a white background at the bottom.
3. The sign would continue to meet Code requirements for lettering.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Guideline recommendations for signage include being efficient in using signs. Try to use as few and as small signs as are necessary to get the business message across to the public. Signage, including the appropriateness of signage to the building, is a standard of review per the Architectural District ordinance.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending *approval* of this application. The proposed sign is an improvement

Mr. Sauer moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY TRUE FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO CHANGE THE FREESTANDING SIGN AT 5577 N. HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 68-14, DRAWINGS NO. AR 68-14, DATED OCTOBER 31, 2014, 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 roll. Mr. Hunter, aye; Mr. Sauer, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Coulter, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye and Mrs. Rodgers, aye. The motion was approved.

g. Wall Sign – **5598 High St.** (Collage Salons) **AR 69-14** (Amendment to AR 48-14)

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. David Creighton approached the microphone and stated his address is 5598 N. High St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Creighton said he had to change sign contractors, and the new contractor had concerns with the “salon” portion of the sign being lower, and how the sign is attached. He said the sign will be in the same location but a different shape. Board members did not have other questions. Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This neighborhood shopping center was built in 1953, with the northern part of the building being in the City of Worthington and the remainder in the City of Columbus. This space was most recently occupied by Colonial Music, but was formerly Nicklaus Drugs. A new business called Collage Salons is planning to move into part of the space, and is requesting approval for signage. The proposed signs have been designed to be similar to the original Nicklaus Drugs signage and logo. This application presents a modified version of the previously approved sign.

Project Details:

1. The amended sign is proposed above the mounting banner, with the letters being channel style with the channel to the rear. The letters are proposed as a stainless steel color, with green neon outlining the faces. The individual letters would be in the same font as “Nicklaus Drugs” was in the original sign.
2. “Salons” is proposed as ¾” thick white letters in a cabinet with a recessed green face, and lit with LED illumination hidden in the perimeter.
3. Because the freestanding sign is in Columbus, the proposed panel is not subject to ARB approval. The design, however, would match the proposed wall signs.

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. The design guidelines recommend minimizing the size of signs; traditional sign materials and lighting are preferred (wood or composite to look like wood; individually mounted lettering is preferred; no cabinet box signs or exposed raceways; external or halo illumination).

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending *approval* of this application. The proposed wall-mounted sign would be appropriate for this center.

Mr. Sauer moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY COLLAGE SALONS OF WORTHINGTON TO AMEND CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS #AR 48-14 TO INSTALL A NEW WALL SIGN AT 5598 N. HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 69-14, DRAWINGS NO. AR 69-14, DATED NOVEMBER 3, 2014, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

Mr. Reis seconded the motion. Mrs. Bitar called the roll. Mr. Hunter, aye; Mr. Sauer, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Coulter, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye and Mrs. Rodgers, nay. The motion was approved.

B. Architectural Review Board

1. Unfinished

- a. Multi-Family Dwellings – **39 & 41 W. New England Ave.** (Showe Worthington LLC/Snow House) **AR 51-14**

&

C. Municipal Planning Commission

1. Conditional Use Permit - Unfinished

- a. Residential in C-5 Zoning District – **39 & 41 W. New England Ave.** (Showe Worthington LLC/Snow House) **CU 09-14**

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Chris Peterson approached the microphone and stated he is going to let the Architect take over the presentation and he would be available for any questions. Mr. Carter Bean approached the microphone and stated his address is 4400 N. High St., Columbus, Ohio. Mr. Bean said he has pared down the presentation a bit to focus on the new design, and he has deleted a lot of the reference images. Mr. Carter explained the western unit next to the Snow House has been pulled back to be in line with the rear face of the Snow House. The face of the eastern unit will be located at the midpoint of the Snow House. Each of these units will be individually owned condominiums, have their own private outdoor space, and attached two car garage. The two condominiums that will be nearest the Snow House will be built with brick, and the others will be built with a combination of brick and siding. Mr. Carter said they are planning to have large open plans on the ground level with dining, living and kitchen spaces and half baths, and the upper levels will typically have two suites with their own bathrooms, and walk-in closets. The structures are now more in scale with the size of the Snow House.

Mr. Sauer asked if Mr. Bean is looking for full approval at tonight's meeting, and if the Board has received all of the information they would normally have. Mrs. Bitar said that some things need to be finalized before this application is voted on, such as exact materials. She said she would like to see what the brick sample looks like next to the Snow House, and details of the landscape plan. Mr. Coulter said he would like to see samples of the roof materials, more information about what type of siding will be used, which trees will remain on the property, and what is being removed and what is being added, in terms of the pavement materials. He also said he would like to hear more definition about the amenities, and details about the fence on the property.

Mr. Sauer said he believes this project has come a long way and looks pretty decent now. He said he is very optimistic about the project, but understands why some of the residents were concerned. Mr. Sauer said what he sees now may have alleviated some of those concerns. Mr. Coulter asked for clarification if all of these units will be condominiums and Mr. Bean said yes. Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this project and several people raised their hands. Mr. Reis said this is an example of a good collaboration of listening to everybody who expressed their opinions before, and said Mr. Bean has done an excellent job on this project and listening to the historic society, and members of the community who have expressed their opinions.

The first speaker was Mr. James Ventresca of 72 E. Granville Rd., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Ventresca said the renderings were flashed pretty quickly on the screen and he was trying to concentrate on them. He would like to see more details of the drawings. Mr. Bean said he has gone through great lengths to design modern buildings that have the ceiling heights that are expected within them, while dropping the eaves and pushing ridge lines back specifically so that the structures will not dwarf the Snow House. Mr. Bean also said he will be coming back before the Board with more details.

The next speaker was Tracy Steinbrenner of 95 E. New England Ave., Worthington, Ohio. Ms. Steinbrenner asked if there would be a discussion about the condominiums across the street later this evening and Mr. Hunter said yes, and Ms. Steinbrenner said she would discuss her concerns at a later point in time.

The next speaker was Hans Kohles of 2952 Hiawatha St., Columbus, Ohio. Mr. Kohles said that he vehemently opposes the whole condominium scheme. He said he saw condominiums built just below South Street, and no one walks around the condominiums, unless they walk on High Street, but many people do walk past the Worthington Inn on High Street which is a prominent space in old Worthington. Mr. Kohles said he opposes any development in that area. He said that as a child, he used to visit Dr. Blackburn in the Snow House and believes the proposed buildings do not match the Snow House. He continued to say if there are going to be buildings next to the Snow House then those buildings should look like the Snow House and match old Worthington. He said the Board should oppose this development unless they are looking for tax dollars per square foot. Mr. Hunter explained that tax dollars do not come from the residents, the tax dollars come from businesses.

The next speaker was Ms. Carole Mathews of 662 Hartford St., Worthington, Ohio. Ms. Mathews said she agreed with the last gentleman that spoke, and agrees that green space is being lost in old Worthington. She explained that if something is going to go into that area, she would like to see a model to see how much space there will be between the buildings. Ms. Mathews said she purchased a home in the old Worthington Historic District and she wants to see the area remain a historic district. She does not want to see buildings ripped down and changed because you lose the historic quality. As a resident of the area she prefers to see this plan not come to fruition. She does not want to see change, and she does not want to see the loss of green space.

The next speaker was Mrs. Suzanne Seals of 123 E. New England Ave., Worthington, Ohio. Mrs. Seals said she wanted to reiterate what the past two speakers discussed, and said, "It is a shame that we are here tonight". Mrs. Seals said when the Comprehensive Plan was revised in 2005 that some special compensation was given to the historic district to protect what the earlier speakers were discussing and protecting the historic district. She said the architect has done a wonderful job with the modifications but still agrees that the development is not historic looking.

The next speaker was Mr. John Marsh of 115 W. New England Ave., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Marsh said he had questions about density and traffic. He said this new plan is an improvement because of the reduction in the number of units, but he still has safety concerns about the amount of additional traffic that will be generated because he has small children. He asked if there were any plans to do a traffic study. Mr. Peterson said he has not been asked for a study. Mr. Marsh said he would like to put in the request for a traffic study for the area, and he greatly appreciates the improvements in the plans. Mr. Marsh also said he wanted to know if there will be any drainage issues and if there has been an analysis done to see if there will be any impact to the houses below this development. Mr. Peterson said that is an ongoing consideration, and they are currently looking into various options short of having to build three hundred feet of storm drainage from the site down to Oxford Street, such as permeable surfaces, onsite ponding, etc... He said he will not be getting a building permit until the City is satisfied that the surface water management is taken care of and the neighbors to the south are happy. Mr. Hunter explained the City's Engineer, Mr. Bill Watterson, is involved with the whole process and will continue to be, for both sites.

The next speaker was Mr. Greg Hopkins of 608 Hartford St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Hopkins said the plans for the condominiums really look nice, but that is a lot of stuff for a small area, and the condominiums do not look any different than any other high end condominiums in other areas. He believes the condominiums do not have the character of old Worthington. He said that he is concerned about the east elevation and what the area will look like coming from the Worthington Inn. He said he was also opposed to the addition onto the Worthington Inn.

The next speaker was Mr. Jim Seals of 123 E. New England Ave., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Seals said one of his work assignments required him to live in a small historic village in Germany, and the village had been preserved for over eight hundred years. He said this small village would never allow new buildings in the center of their historic area. Mr. Seals also was concerned about the fact that the developer and architect for this project do not live in Worthington. Mr. Seals does not want to see regulations set aside and see exceptions made for this developer just

because he wants to do business in Worthington. Mr. Seals thanked the Board members for the job they are doing and asked them to continue.

Mr. Coulter moved to table the ARB application and Mrs. Holcombe seconded the motion. All members said, "Aye".

Mr. Sauer moved to table the MPC application and Mr. Coulter seconded the motion. All members voted, "Aye".

B. Architectural Review Board

1. Unfinished

b. Multi-Family Dwellings – **634 High St. and 41 E. New England Ave.** (Showe Worthington LLC/Masonic Lodge) **AR 50-14**

C. Municipal Planning Commission

2. Rezoning - Unfinished

a. Planned Unit Development – **634 High St. & 41 E. New England Ave.** (Showe Worthington LLC/Masonic Lodge) **PUD 03-14**

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mr. Brown said he wanted to point out an item of discussion, as part of this proposal the City is asking the applicant to plat and dedicate an actual twenty-six foot easement. The current access drive to the church and to the Lodge, is owned by the Lodge, and there is no common access easement. As part of this process the City is asking the applicant to dedicate a twenty-six foot easement that will entail the access drive, a five-foot sidewalk and lighting throughout that corridor to help pull people from the south part of the church parking lot up north to New England Avenue. Mr. Sauer said he did not understand the concept of moving the sidewalk from the east side of the easement to the west side, where there are more driveways to cross, and potentially many more vehicles around people walking along that area. Mrs. Bitar said if you take a look at the way people travel through this drive access, they walk down the middle, and sides. Mr. Sauer said people will have to walk through messy street openings that have a lot of slush and ice, as opposed to being on a sidewalk. Mrs. Bitar said there will be still be a sidewalk, and Mr. Sauer said he understands that, but there will still be messy street openings that will have to be crossed. Mrs. Bitar said that staff felt that the sidewalk would be more utilized on the western side. Mr. Hunter asked Mr. Carter Bean to continue his presentation.

Mr. Bean said his address is 4400 N. High St., Columbus, Ohio 43214. Mr. Bean said with the reduction in density, they have allowed themselves more room for outdoor space. What

previously stretched up into the area north of the Lodge as parking is now an outdoor common space for the residents of the condominiums, primarily for those that will live in the Lodge structure. Mr. Bean said he would bring back a higher level of details at the next meeting, including the landscape and hardscape. He said anything in conjunction with the Lodge itself they wanted to stay consistent with that particular style, but the townhomes to the east of Dewey's in the single family across the drive they were able to mix up the styles which he presented with 3-D images. He pointed out a garage has now been attached to the single family structure. Mr. Bean said in the distance you can see the new concept for the townhomes, which has gone from four units to two, introducing a new material altogether, which is stone, a very high quality material. He said that part of the success of the synthetic stones is in how they are applied between the mortar joints. Mr. Bean showed a rendering which depicted the sample of an old world butter joint type of application. The stones will look as if they are taken from agricultural fields and used right on site. They have also chosen a darker trim palette for that particular building with a rich brown color, and then a galvanized standing seam roof. Something that has a historic farm house character. Mr. Bean showed a rendering that depicted the rear of the "fifty-five" building. What is being proposed now are two garage structures, each structure having three garages per building. Each of the six units will have their own two garage spaces. Each of the townhome units will have their own two-car garage spaces as well.

Mr. Hunter asked the Board members if they had any comments or questions. Mr. Reis said he wanted to reiterate that Mr. Bean has been very responsive to the comments that have been made at previous meetings. He said the only comment he had was about the building to the west that faces Dewey's appears to be a little out of scale but he likes the materials. Mr. Sauer said he believes the overall concept has value. He likes the facts that there are a variety of materials. Mrs. Rodgers said she likes the use of stone for this project because the stone echoes the materials used on the U.S. Bank building on High Street. She agrees with Mr. Sauer about the entry, and said the entry seems out of character with the simplicity of the building. She would like to see the entrance toned down. Mr. Sauer asked Mr. Bean if the next time he comes back before the Board if they will see an image that will show the west side of the complex and Mr. Bean said yes, for the west side of both projects. Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone in the audience that wanted to speak either for or against this application and several people raised their hands.

The first speaker was Mrs. Ellen Scherer of 112 E. New England Ave., Worthington, Ohio. Mrs. Scherer said the appearance of the materials is very pleasing, the reduced number of units and heights of the buildings are improved, and the house proposed for E. New England Avenue to the left of the alley did look more appealing with the porch going across the front entirely which was shown in the first rendering. Mrs. Scherer said the setback of the proposed small house is thirty and a half feet, the Smith house of 49 E. New England Avenue has a setback of seventeen feet three inches, the two unit condominium on E. New England Avenue to the right of the alley has a setback of nine feet. She said from the viewers and pedestrian's visual perspective described by the Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance compatibility with the neighborhoods should be the primary consideration, new structures should complement the form, massing and scale of the existing nearby structures. Also, building placement and orientation are important design considerations. Mrs. Scherer continued to explain that existing residential

zoning protects our unique community and a nine foot setback for the two unit condominium does not achieve that goal. She believes a seventeen foot setback would be nearer to the stated goal. Mrs. Scherer said the two unit condominium is essentially the same foot print as the original proposal, and believes the building is too large for the plot of land. She said this raises issue with the very subjective nature of the planned unit development and the specter it raises for encroachment into old Worthington's residential neighborhoods and along the High Street corridor.

Mrs. Scherer said she supports the five point Old Worthington Association statement to make this residential project great, one of which is the pocket park. Mrs. Scherer said it would be great if City Council would review and make a decision in regard to a pocket park before the Architectural Review Board and Municipal Planning Commission (ARB/MPC) considers signing off on the small house to the left of the alley. She said a couple of neighbors' view is the ARB/MPC will watch out for old Worthington. She said the Board has many pressures from many directions, and will only know what the residents think if the residents tell them. Mrs. Scherer said the residents are the city. She wants to keep the existing condition of the small town feeling and charm of Old Worthington because it is what anchors the center of town and is the wellspring of city history. Mrs. Scherer said the precedent of ARB/MPC decisions will affect Old Worthington for the foreseeable future. She believes that other issues are about to come forward in the next few months that could really dramatically change the visual in Worthington and the whole feel.

The next speaker was Sunny Allen of 665 Hartford St., Worthington, Ohio. Ms. Allen asked not to sell the last green space that is being enjoyed by Worthington residents. She said the green space along the drive to the church has been a beautiful buffer zone between businesses and the residential neighborhood. Ms. Allen said the last green space symbolizes the beautiful relationship that was established over two centuries ago, between business and citizens who live around that area. She said this area is not an area to trifle with. Secondly, she said the Methodist Church has a nursery area located next to the Masonic Lodge, and she is concerned for the children's safety and security and she is fearful for their well being. She said that no one has addressed the traffic and congestion that she and her neighbors suffer every year because of the activities during the summer. She asked the Board take their time to review this project.

The next speaker was Suzanne Seals of 123 E. New England Ave., Worthington, Ohio. Mrs. Seals thanked the Board members for the residents' opportunity to be heard and the developer for addressing some of their concerns. Mrs. Seals said she supported everything that Mrs. Scherer discussed previously and she would like to make a couple of other points. She believes that a nine foot setback is inadequate, and the lot looks way too crowded. Mrs. Seals said when you look at the setbacks that have been placed on the W. New England side, that area looks friendlier. She also believes the dark brown entrance looks too heavy. Mrs. Seals read from Worthington's Design Guidelines about setbacks. She said for those that were unaware, this document was created to guide rehabilitation and new construction of the Architectural Review District which includes this original village plat. She said there are four points that she wanted to quote. The overall visual character of the ARB District is very high in quality, and the residential and in the historic commercial areas this is largely due to consistent use of compatible

scale, setbacks and building material. She said another quote is that uniform setbacks in old Worthington have created an intimate character, another, the uniform setbacks and compatible buildings scale contributes to visually interesting and pleasant streetscapes. She continued to quote the instruction portion, and stated the setback be observed from adjacent and nearby structures in the area where a new building will be placed. She said in this case, the condominium sits too far out on the block from everything else. Mrs. Seals said the center of town is the face of the community and that should be the last place that standards are compromised. She explained that these standards are enforced in the rest of the community, and setbacks are highly valued, but she is not seeing that done for this situation. It was her understanding that the Planned Unit Development gives that option of overriding those standards, but she does not think that makes it okay. She feels that is a mistake, and urged the developer to find a way to decrease the size of those units and give more setback. Mrs. Seals next addressed the east lot and said that she'd like to propose the question of the want of another single family house on a lot that is too small, and actually believes that the footprint looks larger now, or would people prefer a pocket park in an area that is becoming increasingly dense. She understands what would benefit the developer but her concern is for the people that live in the neighborhood. Mrs. Seals said she and her husband lived in Germany for four years in a high rise condominium that was located in an urban village. She said that was the new part of the town, and what made that okay was that interspersed throughout the area were little pockets of green and little parks, like a way to get away and commune with nature and the country did a very good job of that. Mrs. Seals said to create a pocket park would be a traditional Worthington-like thing to do, a gift to the residents and visitors, and to the future residents that will be moving into the new condominiums because they are going to be primarily surrounded by hardscape. She also urged the commission to reject the proposal for a single family house and recommend that the City purchase the east lot and create a pocket park of green space for everyone to enjoy. Mrs. Seals said in closing she would like to say that one hundred and thirty-five neighbors in the East New England Ave. area, as well as the Old Worthington Association, agree with her on those points.

The next speaker was Melinda Barr of 970-M High St., Worthington, Ohio. She referenced the WOSU special on Worthington, which used the historic character statement of "public spaces matter". She said the City Manager explained that "we cannot grow in miles, so we have to grow in richness". She said that must be considered.

Mrs. Jordy Ventresca of 72 E. Granville Rd., Worthington, Ohio spoke next. Mrs. Ventresca said she had some prepared remarks that she wanted to make known to everyone. She said she is present at the meeting to support Dr. Chosy's declaration that the City should buy and save the 1820 Masonic Lodge. She said the cost of the investment is justified by the 1820 era, fine hand crafted architecture, and also the interior of the Lodge's historic integrity. She explained that the interior has not been remodeled. All of the colors and ritualistic symbols are intact. Mrs. Ventresca said she is representing many residents who want to see this last monumental site of Worthington history preserved intact. The very active history of the Masons in Worthington and our nation is also Worthington's social and political history. As the latest Worthington Historical Society Intelligencer article about the Masonic Lodge reveals, there is something technically wrong when despite the years of hard work by the Commission members, she has observed and

lived through years of decisions that advents developers and profitability and trumps historic preservation. She said we must find separate standards for historic properties. Mrs. Ventresca said she and her husband live in Worthington's most modest house, the love of history buffs, because the house represents an early unschooled building. She said a former zoning commissioner said to her husband, "if he had his way, their house would have been torn down" because the house is technically a zoning violation for being too close to the road. Mrs. Ventresca said the house existed before the road was built. She said the quirky originals remind people of the city's progress through time, but tonight's effort is not about the few quirky originals still standing, but one monumental and fine building whose interior is as important as its exterior. She said Worthington's acclaimed history was represented through the architecture which had little intrinsic value while still standing, represented other eras. These buildings have been lost by city councils and architectural planning commissions taking the sides of entrepreneurs and developers. The Masonic Lodge is one of the last historic sites. She asked the Board to please deny the advancement of this project until the Showe Family can agree with the City over the future of the Masonic Lodge.

The next speaker was Mr. Jim Keller of 670 Morning St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Keller said he wanted to circle back and strongly agree with the criticism about the West New England property in addition to his comments about the East New England property. He said the people at the meeting are looking at pretty buildings, but he said the sum total of this project is going to overwhelm the community. He does not believe that everyone is looking at the big picture. Mr. Keller believes there is not only a strong concern within the audience in attendance at tonight's meeting, but in the neighborhood as well. Mr. Keller said he sees that improvements have been made to the plan since the original application, and he appreciates the good will of compromise and hopes to see that continued and carried out in a way that works best for all concerned. He said that attention has been called to the lack of visible green space to the obtrusive site which is close to the sidewalk. He feels the single family house is too large for the piece of land that the house will be built on. Mr. Keller referred to the staff's memo which states the layout of the site has not substantially changed. He said apart from the High Street commercial corridor there is a neighborhood of abundant green space, most obvious in the front yard streetscapes. Mr. Keller said the only exceptions are in continuations of High Street building frontages as they affect the side streets and a few historic anomalies such as the Snow House. Mr. Keller said he submits that the side street ample front yard character is an inextricable part of the historic fabric and that an over twenty foot vertical building mass, not even counting the roof, with a nine foot setback, would strongly tear into the fabric and mar the streetscape inappropriately. He said whether or not the building is considered attractive enough is not the issue. The historic district consists of a mere two blocks on either side of High Street. This proposed building would be situated down the first of these two blocks and the fabric is not exactly unlimited. Mr. Keller said that staff further comments on the proposed development, "it would be critical to be appropriate for the site and scale and design while at the same time creating a continuous street front". Mr. Keller continued to say that the proposed nine foot setback hardly constitutes a continuous street front. He said that single family homes in his neighborhood have front yards, not just nine feet from the sidewalk like the proposed development for the west side of the lot. He does not believe that the single family home should be built on a substandard lot.

The next speaker was Ms. Tracy Steinbrenner of 95 E. New England Ave., Worthington, Ohio. Ms. Steinbrenner asked to see the photograph of the original lot. She said the reason she moved to Worthington twenty-two years ago was because of the green space, and there used to be horses that lived down the road, and there were nature preserves. Ms. Steinbrenner said she does not understand how putting condominiums or houses in old Worthington is preserving the integrity of old Worthington. She said the Board members have shown their feelings tonight about the importance of open space by denying one of the residents of having a picket fence. She does not see how the Board can justify putting the buildings in old Worthington. If the Board thinks a picket fence is obtrusive, what do you think these buildings will be. She believes the Board is contradicting themselves if they approve the buildings and not a picket fence.

The next speaker was Mrs. Kathy Barkhurst of 664 Evening St., Worthington, Ohio. Mrs. Barkhurst said this project reminds her of a vacation she took in Granby, Connecticut. She said she and her husband drove around looking for the village green and they could not find it. She said they stopped by a drugstore to ask where the village green was located. She asked several people, and no one knew where the village green was located. An older woman told her where the village green used to be, but the area was ripped up and replaced by tennis courts and condominiums. She said as she looks at the drawings tonight, that is what she feels is happening to Worthington.

The next speaker was Mr. Greg Hopkins of 608 Hartford St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Hopkins asked to see the photograph that shows the condominiums looking west, towards High Street. He said people throw in everything in today's architecture, like standing seam roof tops, cedar roof tops, brick, and all kinds of hard surfaces. He said if you look at the picture, you see a structure with a cupola up on top, then you see the Masonic Lodge, then you see these common looking garages. He feels this project is just a mish mash of architecture with no consistency, and that is what people will see when they walk to the farmers market. He does not believe a sidewalk will make a difference because people will just walk down the street anyway. He believes this project is a disservice to the community.

The next speaker was Mrs. Steffanie Haueisen of 587 Fox Lane, Worthington, Ohio. Mrs. Haueisen said she keeps hearing about how much the residents love the green space, and the 1820's building. She wanted to know how much it would cost to build a pocket park, and how much it would cost to buy the Masonic Lodge. Mr. Peterson said he could not discuss that publicly. She wanted to know if the dollar figure was within reach for the residents to purchase. Mr. Peterson said this building has been on the market for two years. He said he was uncertain what dollar figure would be reachable, and the Board would not be able to answer questions about city council's budget. Mr. Myers explained the City has spent approximately three million dollars already on the Kilbourne building and the building is not close to being leased, and a million and a half has already been budgeted. The City paid nothing for the building itself. Asbestos had to be removed, the building is not ADA compliant, the roof needed to be sealed, needed a new HVAC system and council has already spent three million dollars on a building that does not have a tenant. He said on several occasions people have brought up the Kilbourne building and the McConnell Arts Center as examples of how historic buildings have been saved. Mr. Myers said he could argue as to whether the Packard Art Building was historic or not, he

believes that the building was not historic, but both the Kilbourne building and McConnell Arts Center were repurposed. Any building that the city would purchase would not be able to just sit empty. Any building that the city has purchased has been done with the eye of repurposing them. The Kilbourne building has not been a library for fifty years. The library has been repurposed on multiple occasions and will be repurposed again.

He said you need to ask yourself how much more money are you willing to pay in additional income tax to buy a building. That is the bottom line.

The next speaker was Mr. Tim Strawn of 5938 Tetlin Field Dr., New Albany, Ohio. Mr. Strawn said he is a member of the New England Lodge and a past Master there, and Chairman of the committee that has been dealing with the Lodge and the possible change in ownership for the past four years. The Lodge is very proud of their 1820's building and proudly recognized and promoted as the oldest continuously operating Masonic Temple west of the Allegheny Mountains. He said they worked decidedly to find someone that would allow them to keep or maintain the building, but they were unsuccessful in doing so. They are proud of their relationship with the Historical Society over time and recognize that as well as their relationship with the City of Worthington. If the Historical Society knew of someone that was able to purchase their building, it would have been very helpful if the Society stepped forward during the fifteen month period when the building was for sale, and well posted as being for sale. He said no one, including the Historical Society and its members, is more devastated at the loss of their building than the Masons. They appreciate the pride that you share in the building, but that is their home. That is why to maintain a physical connection to their history and their old home they are painstakingly going to remove the canopied principal officers stations, rare in Masonic buildings, of the old Lodge, preserve them, and put them in their new future home, where they belong as the Masons connection to their history. The Masons are very appreciative of the Showe organization's commitment to historic preservation and sensitivity to the Lodge's history. Mr. Strawn said this sensitivity is nothing new for this organization as it is lovingly and carefully cared for the Snow House, their meeting place before the old Lodge was built in the 1820's and home of one of the Lodge's early leaders John Snow. The Showe organization was willing to put its commitment to preservation in writing in its purchase agreement. He said he doubted any other developers would be willing to do that. The Showe organization is going to go further than originally planned to preserve unique architectural details and fraternal markings on the building. The Masons are very proud of their partnership with the Showe organization on this project and believe that the Historical Society and City of Worthington should be also. He said he hesitates to mention as they did once before that every person they talked to, eighteen potential buyers were walked through the building, everyone of them except the Showe organization would have turned that valuable green space into a black top parking lot. He realizes that any potential buyer would have had to come before the Board and pass muster, but that was the intent of everyone except the Showe organization. He said they appreciate their long standing strong relationship with the Historical Society and the City itself. Worthington has no stronger booster or loyal citizen than New England Lodge Number Four. As the community's oldest organization they feel proud and proper in having such allegiance, so much so, that after a brief meeting in another area Masonic facility they planned to find a new location for the Lodge within Worthington where they will again proudly display the canopied principle officers stations from the old Lodge.

The next speaker was Mrs. Kay Keller of 670 Morning St., Worthington, Ohio. Mrs. Keller said she has lived in Worthington for thirty-seven years. She said that she had a zoning question and was not sure if that was going to be address this evening or not. Mr. Hunter explained this matter would be tabled this evening. She commended the Showe organization for addressing many of the issues that were raised. The Worthington Comprehensive Plan has also been cited as encouraging further multi-family housing, but no one is asking the basic question. Is this the right plan for these two sites? Just because you have a developer who wants to build here, and the City says that they want more multi-family housing does not mean that every single site is appropriate for multi-family housing. It is the contention of many of the residents in Old Worthington these sites should not be redeveloped in this way, and the only way you can do that is if you change the zoning. Most Old Worthington residents really did not envision a plan like this, in a location like this, in Old Worthington when they thought about multi-family housing. Housing over retail space, yes. In fact that has been cited as ideal. Adaptive reuse like the proposed 1950's Lodge building, yes. That is appropriate, but oversized large buildings on spaces way too small for them so that they are shoe horned into that space are not. Our present building codes and guidelines would not allow a single family house to be built there. They would also require a greater setback. The only way they are getting around this is by proposing a Planned Unit Development (PUD). That is how the existing zoning building standards appear to her. She said the Comprehensive Plan states that old Worthington is recognized as the most successful, original town center in Ohio. Mrs. Keller said the town is the heart and symbol of the community. She said a lot of this attraction relates to the well executed and maintained streetscapes and design and the human scale of architecture. People want to live in this authentic community. She asked why the residents would want to compromise all the things that attract people to Worthington. She asked the Board to deny the rezoning request for East and West New England Avenue.

The next speaker was Ms. Judy Haager of 306 E. New England Ave., Worthington, Ohio. She said she wanted to thank the Board for the work they have done this evening, and all the people that have attended the meeting to speak from their hearts about what is right.

The next speaker was Mr. Jim Ventresca of 72 E. Granville Rd., Worthington, Ohio. He said he was drafted by the Old Worthington Association (OWA) to represent them. He felt that tonight's meeting was very exciting. He wished there would have been more public meetings before this project was so far along. He said that one of the things he was chartered to do was to reaffirm the OWA's statement of principles, which they still back, and urge the Board to consider it before they make any decisions, which is basically five points: reduce project density, increase green space, enhance new construction architecture, quality design and materials, reduce structural massing on East and West New England Avenue, create a pocket park on East New England, and maintain the Masonic Lodge historic integrity. He said that the narrative that he wanted to complete is based on the idea that we can learn from history. In 1999, the Historic District committee made an application which was denied. In that denial there is a story and he wanted to briefly say what happened. The Historic District status is granted by the U.S. Department of the Interior but on the recommendation of the Ohio State Historical Society. The State Historical Society said that Worthington did not have a historic district. He said that he was jarred by that. He said that if you look at the map he put on the overhead projector, and you

look at the little x's on the map, those x's are flagship historic contributing properties in Worthington that have been destroyed. He said if you look at the total number in that area, there are a lot of contributing properties, but early nineteenth century contributing properties number about fifty. Forty percent of those structures have been destroyed. Mr. Hunter asked Mr. Ventresca which historic properties on East or West New England are going to be destroyed and Mr. Ventresca said neither one. He said, "If we continue on with the way we have been going it won't be very long until the City does not have a historic district anymore". Mr. Ventresca continued to say that for the historic district, the City needs to set about new regulations of approving modifications to historic sites. Mr. Sauer asked Mr. Ventresca if there are any state guidelines that tell you how to deal with historic sites. Mr. Ventresca said there are state guidelines that tell you whether you have a contributing building or not. Mr. Sauer said he is not referring to a building. He asked Mr. Ventresca if there are any state guidelines that tell you what you can do with a piece of property. Mr. Ventresca said a piece of property is under control of the owner, and under the control of Boards such as the Architectural Review Board. Mr. Hunter explained the Showe's already own property in the case of the Snow House and they can scrape it if they chose to. Mr. Ventresca said he is suggesting there needs to be a new focus on regulations for historic structures.

There were no other speakers.

Mr. Coulter moved to table the ARB application. Mr. Reis seconded the motion. All members voted, "Aye."

Mr. Coulter moved to table the MPC application. Mr. Reis seconded the motion. All members voted, "Aye."

D. Other

There was no other business to discuss.

E. Adjournment

Mr. Coulter moved to adjourn the meeting at 10:57 p.m. Mrs. Holcombe seconded the motion. All members voted, "Aye". The meeting was adjourned.