



MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
WORTHINGTON ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
WORTHINGTON MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION
June 22, 2017

The regular meeting of the Worthington Architectural Review Board and the Worthington Municipal Planning Commission was called to order at 7:00 p.m. with the following members present: Mikel Coulter, Chair; Kathy Holcombe, Secretary; James Sauer; Edwin Hofmann; Amy Lloyd; and David Foust. Also present were: Scott Myers, Worthington City Council Representative to 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. Commission member Thomas Reis, Vice-Chair, was absent.

A. Call to Order – 7:00 p.m.

1. Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Approval of minutes of the June 8, 2017 meeting

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

4. Affirmation/swearing in of witnesses

B. Architectural Review Board

1. Patio Replacement, New Fire Pit & Deck Modifications – **900 Evening St.** (Steven W. Balogh) **AR 49-17**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This property is at the southeast corner of Evening St. and North St. The house was constructed in the 1950's, and is made up of a 2-story element in the middle; a 1-story garage to the north facing the street; and a one story room to the south. This structure is a contributing building in the

Worthington Historic District. The existing deck was constructed in 1999, and a new fence was added in 2016 to enclose the rear yard.

This application is a request for approval to replace the patio, add a fire pit, and modify the existing deck.

Project Details:

1. The deck extends from the back of the house with the stairs at the southeast corner, emptying to the east. The rectangular brick paver patio starts at the southern edge of the deck and extends west, south and east beyond the stairs. There are also existing stairs to the basement at the southeast corner of the house that are adjacent to the patio.
2. Proposed is removal of the patio and deck steps. New pressure treated wood steps with a railing to match the existing would be constructed on the west side of the deck, emptying about even with the southern edge of the deck. A new kidney shaped patio is proposed adjacent to both sets of stairs and even with the southern edge of the deck. A fire pit is proposed for the southwest side of the patio.
3. Sandstone colored Unilock pavers with a basalt colored accent row around are proposed. A Unilock landscape wall in a mixture of colors would be on the east side of the patio and the fire pit would match.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Decks and patios should be limited to the rear of buildings. Patios may be constructed of concrete, stone or brick. Consider the style of the house when designing decks and patios, since some styles and some designs are not compatible.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending approval of the application. The proposed changes are complementary to the house and District.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Steven Balogh, 900 Evening St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Myers asked Mr. Balogh to be considerate of his neighbors when burning wood, and to make sure the wood is not damp, or blowing into the homes of his neighbors. Mr. Balogh said he understood. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Sauer moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY STEVEN W. BALOGH FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO REPLACE THE PATIO, ADD A FIRE PIT AND MODIFY THE DECK AT 900 EVENING ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 49-17, DRAWINGS NO. AR 49-17,

DATED JUNE 2, 2017, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

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

2. Fence Replacement – **307 W. Dublin-Granville Rd.** (Robert & Joe Ann Douglass) **AR 50-17**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This two-story house was constructed in 1961 in the Kilbourne Village subdivision. Last year, rail fencing was replaced in the front, requiring ARB and BZA approval. The fencing has not been painted white yet, and the homeowner would like approval to leave it natural. An in-ground swimming pool has been to the rear of the house for 40 years, fenced in with a 40” high chain link fence. This application is a request to replace some of the existing fencing.

Project Details:

1. A 6’ high black aluminum fence would be installed in place of the existing chain link fencing on the west side of the property, including a portion with a gate connecting to the house. There is a lot a vegetation that screens the remainder of the chain link fence in the rear yard, and the fence is rusty.
2. The owner would like to leave the rail fencing in the front natural in color.

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. Design and materials should be compatible with the house and neighborhood.

Codified Ordinances:

Non-portable 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 be so walled or fenced as to prevent uncontrolled access by children or other persons from the street or other adjacent properties except that the pool, wall or fence may not penetrate the front yard

setback as defined by City ordinance. The wall or fence may be separate from or part of the pool itself. The fence or wall shall be not less than six feet in height as measured from ground level at any point around the perimeter of the pool. Fences and walls may exceed six feet where topography forces such excess in order to achieve an agreeably aesthetic appearance. In such cases this section will take precedence over other sections which restrict fence or wall heights to a maximum of six feet.

(4) All walls and fences surrounding such pools shall be equipped with a gate and a lock which shall be installed and maintained in conformance with the provisions of Section 1325.01.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending approval of the application. Having 6’ fencing on one side of the pool is an improvement and the style is attractive. The front fencing blends into the background more easily in a natural color.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Robert Douglass, 307 W. Dublin-Granville Rd., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Douglass said he spoke with his neighbors and they approve of the fence. Mrs. Lloyd said she liked the front fence in the natural color and the other Board members agreed with her. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak for or against this application and no one came forward.

Motion:

Mrs. Holcombe moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY ROBERT AND JOE ANN DOUGLASS FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO REPLACE FENCING AT 307 W. DUBLIN-GRANVILLE RD. AS PER CASE NO. AR 50-17, DRAWINGS NO. AR 50-17, DATED JUNE 8, 2017, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING AND THAT THE FENCE IN THE FRONT YARD WILL REMAIN NATURAL.

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

3. Demolition of Three Buildings – **445 E. Granville Rd.** (Step By Step Academy) **AR 52-17**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

Harding Hospital was founded in 1916 by George T. Harding II, MD as the Columbus Rural Rest Home. The hospital provided treatment for people with physical, mental, social and spiritual needs

on the 45 acre Worthington campus until 1999, when it became part of The Ohio State University's Wexner Medical Center. In 2014, Step by Step academy purchased the property and has been providing mental health services out of some of the buildings on the property. Many of the buildings have not been used or maintained in years.

This application is a request to demolish buildings D, E & F. Building D is a Tudor style building that was constructed in 1928 and used as a women's residential unit. Building E, constructed in 1925, was initially a men's residential unit and then housed adolescent patients. Building F was an office building constructed in 1924. Former pictures of the buildings with brief descriptions are included with the application.

Project Details:

1. The three buildings in question are on the northwest part of the campus, with buildings D & E being adjacent to Rush Creek. Building C is adjacent to D and is being evaluated for future demolition.
2. The applicant reports the buildings have not been maintained in over 25 years, were not used for many years prior, are in disrepair and are not able to be renovated. Many pictures were submitted show the current state of the buildings, all of which have roof damaged. A portion of Building F's roof has collapsed and the other 2 have holes. Interior damage appears extensive.
3. Grass seed is planned for the sites after demolition.
4. Both the Divisions of Police and Fire are aware of the buildings and feel they are a hazard. The fire chief has been in the buildings and reports interior collapses, exposure to the elements and vandalism as contributing to the damage. Both support demolition of the structures, as is state in memos attached to the application.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines

Demolition is final. Because it is an irreversible act, full or partial demolition must be carefully considered before any decision is made. A decision on whether a particular demolition is appropriate must be made in light of several factors, including whether the demolition is full or partial; the age of the structure; the level of integrity of the structure being demolished (has it been extensively altered?); the impact of the demolition on Worthington's character; and plans for the site following demolition.

- Generally, demolition of pre-1950s buildings should be avoided. These tend to contribute the most to a community's character. However, it may be desirable to avoid demolishing a newer building, depending on what is proposed to replace it.
- For projects in which demolition of an older structure is proposed, the applicant should contact the City of Worthington as early as possible. The city may be able to help with evaluating alternatives to demolition. In all cases where demolition is proposed, applicants should be prepared to explain and to document the financial and technical reasons why it is not feasible to accomplish their goals while retaining the existing building.
- It may be acceptable to demolish an older building that has been so altered over the years that its integrity is low and it has lost most or all of its historic character. This does not,

however, always apply, since even altered buildings can sometimes be important placeholders along the streetscape. Because of age or design, some building additions may be nearly as important as an original building. Removing these elements might affect the building's character, and this should be taken into account when demolition is proposed.

- Demolition to create parking lots should be avoided, particularly along the dense streetscape of High Street. Loss of buildings here would permanently alter the character of the whole district.
- Demolition to combine lots for larger developments is strongly discouraged. Small-scale buildings on closely-spaced sites characterize much of Worthington's older areas. Assembly of land in these areas for large lots and construction of large buildings, especially involving demolition of existing structures, is not appropriate.
- When full or partial demolition of an existing structure is proposed, the applicant should be prepared to present detailed plans for the replacement building. Demolition may not proceed until it has been determined that the structure conforms to the new construction design guidelines.

Architectural District Ordinance

- Whenever a building within the District is proposed to be demolished, partially demolished or removed, an application for a certificate of appropriateness shall be filed with the City Clerk as provided in this chapter. Such application shall set forth the intent to demolish.
- The Board of Architectural Review shall hear the request not sooner than twelve days nor later than sixty days from the date the application is filed and shall advertise such hearing to provide time for public comment. The Board may request a statement from the City's Division of Building Regulation on the structural condition of the building and the conformity of the building to applicable building codes. In addition, the Board may request at the City's expense a written statement concerning the proposed demolition by a registered architect, historical conservator or other professional having experience with historic structures. Such statement shall be taken into consideration in determining the appropriateness of the request. The applicant may provide at his or her expense any evidence or testimony from a registered architect, historical conservator or other professional having experience with historic structures. The Board of Architectural Review shall act on the request not later than thirty days after the initial hearing on the application. The applicant may waive this requirement by filing with the Director of Planning and Building a written statement waiving the right to have his or her application acted upon within such thirty-day period.
- The Board of Architectural Review shall determine by a vote of its members whether to issue a certificate of appropriateness based on the determination:
 - That such building is not historically or architecturally significant;
 - That if the building is found to be historically or architecturally significant, there is no feasible or prudent alternative or change that would allow preservation of the building; and
 - The proposal for grading, landscaping and other design treatment once the structure is removed meets the standards of this chapter.

- In any circumstance, the Board shall not deny a request for a certificate of appropriateness if it determines either:
 - o That such denial will deny all reasonable use of the property or
 - o That such denial shall result in an unsafe condition because of the structural or physical condition of the building.
- No building shall be demolished or removed in the Architectural Review District without the owner or his or her representative first obtaining a certificate of appropriateness approving such removal or demolition, unless such building presents an immediate danger to public health and safety in the opinion of the City's Chief Building Official, in which event, the Chief Building Inspector may order removal or demolition of such building in order to protect public health and safety.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending approval of the application. Although it is never desirable to demolish early twentieth century buildings, the condition of the buildings has been reported as unsafe, and no feasible or prudent alternative has been presented that would allow preservation. The whole property is in the Architectural Review District, but these buildings cannot be seen from E. Granville Rd. due to distance, grade and vegetation.

Discussion:

Mr. Brown explained to the Board members City staff had already been in contact with the Worthington Historical Society, and the Society would like to go out and document the existing conditions. Mr. Coulter asked if the applicants were present and Dr. Patrick Maynard, 4900 Olentangy Blvd., Columbus, Ohio and Ms. Lori Sontag, 236 Fenway Dr., Columbus, Ohio came forward. Ms. Sontag said they are very concerned about safety issues. They acquired Step by Step in May and taking care of the buildings in disrepair is the first thing on their agenda.

Mr. Sauer said he visited the area and the buildings are a mess. Mr. Coulter believed the buildings were beyond repair unless there was an unlimited budget to be able to save the buildings. He asked if there were any architectural details of the buildings worth saving that a salvage company might be interested in before the buildings are demolished. Ms. Sontag said they will be working with a project manager who will require them to do that type of an evaluation. Mr. Foust asked the applicants who they purchased the property from. Dr. Maynard said they just took over the Step By Step Academy in June, but the Step by Step purchased the property from the Ohio State University. Mr. Foust asked the applicants if they had an overall plan for the site. Mr. Maynard said not yet, but they put in a request for proposal for an architectural planning firm to come in and help them create a master development plan. Dr. Maynard said they plan to keep the park like setting and use it for the same types of services that are there now. Mr. Coulter said he would like to request, as the applicants are doing the demolition to protect the trees that are on the property to

the extent possible. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak either for or against this application.

Mr. Ron Sears, 500 Park Overlook Dr., Worthington, Ohio, said he has lived in the area for thirty-six years and is strongly in support of this project. (Please see comments attached at the end of the minute.)

Mr. Brian Wunderle, 563 White Oak Pl., Worthington, Ohio, said he walked around the property after he got the letter in the mail. He strongly disagreed with tearing all three of the buildings down. Mr. Wunderle felt buildings D and F were in a complete state of disrepair, but felt building E could be an anchor or centerpiece for the academy. He felt the demolition of such a historical building was horrible and wanted to know what the area would be used for in the future. Mr. Wunderle felt giving the applicants the approval to demolish all of the buildings would be a bad idea. He hoped someone would at least save building E and thought the building would serve as an amazing visitor or historical center.

Dr. George Harding said he was greatly interested in what happens to this property. He said seventeen years ago, Harding Hospital merged with the Ohio State University (OSU) but then the university decided to build the psychiatric program on campus and that put the program at Harding Hospital in limbo. Dr. Harding said in the agreement for the merger, the area grounds were to be used for educational, health or medical purposes. He said they were very appreciative when the Step By Step Academy leased space and then acquired the land to provide much needed services for an underserved group of people. Dr. Harding said Step By Step Academy has kept in touch with him and they have been asking for the history of the buildings, and explaining what all needs to be done. He said he has been happy to provide information to them and make suggestions. Dr. Harding said all of the building were built in the 1920's. Building F was constructed after a residence that was part of the estate was destroyed in a fire in 1923. The building used to be a medical office, but a hole in the roof developed and after years of neglect the building is in no position to be brought back to life. Dr. Harding said the other two buildings served as residences for patients and had hydro-therapy and recreational therapy programs in them that were very useful and very valuable. The Tudor style building was designed by a student of the Ohio State University School of Architecture who happened to be the son of an administrator of the hospital. Everyone thought the building was a real beauty. Dr. Harding said they were saddened when they learned vandals were going into the building and ripping out the copper pipes. He said this was a deep disappointment because this building had more architectural beauty to it than most of the rest. The third building (D) was a utilitarian building. He said early on, some of the patients would put their fists through the walls so they decided to make the walls out of cement, which will also make it harder to demolish. Dr. Harding said the Step By Step administration studied to see whether the buildings could be saved and utilized in a productive way but the costs to restore the buildings was a major concern. Dr. Harding said he is in support of the motion because he believes this will provide for a campus that will suit the children and younger people being treated. When the hospital opened in 1916 the mentally ill were quite frequently ignored at that time, but the Hardings pioneered to help raise the treatment levels and awareness. Dr. Harding said they cared for the whole person, their physical, spiritual and mental welfare. He said he is very appreciative of what

Step By Step has been doing and is supportive of taking the buildings down and supporting Step by Step's mission into the future.

Mrs. Bitar swore in Mr. Seitz. Mr. Brian Seitz, 415 E. South St., Worthington, Ohio, said he and his wife were fortunate that Dr. Harding sold them the southernmost piece of property he owned in Rush Creek. He said their home is one of the six that abuts the Harding property. Mr. Seitz said he has mixed feelings about the demolition. He said he was in support of the new ownership and they are great neighbors. The Step By Step administration has kept them informed of everything they are doing. Mr. Seitz said he agreed with Mr. Wunderle about Building E and thought the building was beautiful. He said he would like to see more studies done on the building to see if the building is salvageable. Mr. Seitz said the building is special and might have an extra bit of life left in it.

Mr. Foust wanted to know if they had control of the entire campus, and Dr. Maynard said, "Yes." Secondly, Mr. Foust asked if there are other vacant buildings which will follow the same direction. Dr. Maynard said there were a couple of other buildings scheduled to be torn down but they pulled them off of the list because they would like to find a way to save them. Dr. Maynard said the study done on Building E concluded over a million dollars would be needed for renovation. Ms. Sontag said the Ice House building was also scheduled for demolition but they are trying to save that building too.

Mr. Sauer said he understands the desire to save the buildings of historical value but he had concerns with saddling a new owner with the responsibility of putting a lot of money into a building when the money could be better used to save and restore the rest of the campus. Mr. Sauer said he would prefer to see the rest of the campus well maintained. Mr. Sauer said he is in favor of the proposal as presented.

Mr. Foust added that he agrees, but was concerned with total redevelopment of the property that may call for demolition of all buildings. Although they are not seen from E. Granville Rd., it is part of the history of the community. That is why he is conflicted.

Mrs. Elizabeth Seitz, 415 E. South St., Worthington, Ohio. Mrs. Seitz said she walks this area everyday with her dogs and is very familiar with all of the buildings. She said she agrees with the demolition of Buildings D & F, but feels Building E should not be rushed. She suggested maybe having a separate motion for each building to be demolished. She said this is a great property and could potentially be a gateway into the city from the State Route 161 Corridor, and she admired what the owners are doing with the property. Mrs. Seitz said tearing down all three buildings at once leaves a huge void and asked the Board to slow down and take a look at each building on a case by case basis.

Mr. Coulter said he trusts the structural engineering firm and the studies that have been done to these buildings, but he also agrees with Mr. Foust's concerns about looking at a master plan. Mr.

Coulter said Mr. Sauer's idea to use the money to save the other buildings was a worthwhile thought.

Motion:

Mr. Sauer moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY THE STEP BY STEP ACADEMY, INC. FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO DEMOLISH BUILDINGS D, E & F AT 445 E. GRANVILLE RD. AS PER CASE NO. AR 52-17, DRAWINGS NO. AR 52-17, DATED JUNE 9, 2017, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

Mr. Foust seconded the motion. Mrs. Bitar called the roll. Mr. Coulter, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, nay; Mr. Sauer, aye; Mr. Hofmann, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, nay; and Mr. Foust, nay. The motion failed.

Mr. Foust moved to reconsider the application. It was seconded by Mr. Hofmann and all members voted Aye.

Mr. Sauer wondered if they could proceed with demolition of two of the buildings. Mr. Foust thought all three would come down at some point, but felt more comfortable with slowing down on Building E. Mr. Myers asked the Board members what they would want to see from the applicant to support the third building's demolition. Should the applicants get a structural report from an engineer or does the Board want something different to decide whether or not a building can be saved. Mr. Coulter said typically they would like to see a more detailed report of the physical condition of the building, including the structural system, mechanical, plumbing, and electrical systems. The Board would also want to know if there are holes in the roof tops, damage to the building, if there is mold or mildew, and if the rafters have started to deteriorate and fall. The Board needs to know if the study shows the cost of the repairs is unreasonable. Mr. Foust said he wants to make sure this is not a casual decision because there are always conversations in the community, and the meetings are no longer covered by local news reporters who used to give the community a good feel for what is going on. He said a lot of the time, the people in the community find out things after the fact and then they are unhappy. Mr. Foust said he would feel more comfortable if the Board could overcome what he thinks could be a problem.

Mr. Coulter asked the applicants if they would approve of a motion which did not include the demolition of Building E and Ms. Sontag said yes. She said if necessary, they can spend more money to show the building is in disrepair. Ms. Sontag said she understood Mr. Foust's concerns about a masterplan because they have several buildings that OSU closed up in the 1990's that need a plan on how to bring them back to life and that will cost a lot of money. She said they serve a population that is funded through Medicaid and they are very careful about how they spend money. Mr. Foust said he appreciated what they are doing and he knows they do not have deep pockets, but the previous owner did not take care of the buildings like they should have.

Mr. Myers said everyone knows how the property got here, and he remembered when he was sitting on the Architectural Review Board (ARB) when the application for parking lights for the mammogram buses came in, across from the residential area. He said what they got was Yankee Stadium, and he was told by OSU representatives that they were owned by the "State of Ohio", and City rules did not apply to them. He was told the State of Ohio trumps City rules and ordinances. Mr. Myers said he did not want to put the entire burden on the new owners who are trying to do the right thing, but he does not have a vote. He said he just wanted to call out the culprit of the problem, and who was responsible for the deterioration of the property.

Mr. Brown said in regards to Mr. Foust's comments, the City does have a special section on the City's website where people can be notified by e-mail about anything going on regarding the Harding Hospital site. A news blast was e-mailed to those who signed up for the information.

Dr. Maynard explained Step By Step is a social services agency and he reiterated their funding comes from Medicaid. They do not have deep pockets to do more studies so he hoped the neighborhood would help with the fundraising.

Mrs. Holcombe said she liked Mrs. Seitz suggestion to have Step By Step come back one building at a time, and she would like to see the Ice House saved. Mr. Seitz said he wanted to mention Buildings K & J are quickly deteriorating like Buildings D, E and F.

Mr. Wunderle said he appreciated the Board members listening to the residents in attendance at the meeting and said if they are going to re-open the motion and approve the demolition of two of the buildings he would like the Board to have a moratorium on razing any more buildings until the full master plan is received.

Mrs. Bitar said even though this process may be slowing down there are still hazardous buildings on the property that have been identified by the police and fire departments who respond to calls and they do not want this to continue. The Chief Building Official can take action and order the demolition whether there is ARB approval or not if this is a hazardous situation. Mrs. Bitar said delaying the demolition until the master plan is available is not realistic because demolition needs to move forward. Mr. Foust felt the delay for approval of demolishing Building E was still appropriate. Dr. Maynard was concerned it would cost more to demolish the buildings at different times. Mr. Myers confirmed the approval would be good for 18 months, so the applicant could come back for approval of E and still demolish at the same time.

Motion:

Mr. Foust moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY THE STEP BY STEP ACADEMY, INC. FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS AMENDED TO DEMOLISH BUILDINGS D & F AT 445 E. GRANVILLE RD. AS PER CASE NO. AR 52-17, DRAWINGS NO. AR 52-17, DATED JUNE 9, 2017, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

Seconded by Mr. Sauer. Mrs. Bitar called the roll. Mr. Coulter, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Sauer, aye; Mr. Hofmann, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye; and Mr. Foust, aye. The amended motion was approved.

4. Dormer Siding & Gutter Replacement – **117 W. New England Ave.** (Pioneer Roofing/McCallister) **AR 53-17**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This house was built in the early 1900's and is a contributing building in the Worthington Historic District. The house style is described as vernacular in the Historic District nomination, but the house has the feel of an early Cape Cod style being 1 ½ stories with a three-bay façade on the first floor. There is a one-story room on the east side, and shed dormers in the front and back. The house is primarily brick, with vinyl lap siding on the dormers.

The applicant is proposing to replace the existing siding on the dormers and install new gutters and downspouts.

Project Details:

1. The proposed siding for the dormers is Alside Pelican Bay “Cape Cod Shingle” style vinyl siding in a light green color (Juniper Ridge). The siding is molded to give the look of separate shakes that have texture but are even across the bottom. The siding would be double 4”. The shutters would be painted to match.
2. The existing 4” (upstairs) and 5” (first floor) gray gutters and downspouts would be replaced with 5” gutters and downspouts that are white (Natural Linen) in color. The existing trim on the house would also be painted to match.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Wood siding is preferred, and should be used in one of its traditional forms: shingle, board-and-batten, shiplap or beveled siding. New siding should match the thickness and width of the old as closely as possible. Gutters catch water as it flows off the edge of the roof and usually have one of two designs: semi-circular “half round” gutters, consisting of troughs suspended on straps or wires that run under the roofing material; and “ogee” gutters with a flat back and an S-curve front profile, attached by long nails to a vertical fascia board below the edge of the roof. Design and materials should be traditional, and compatible with the existing structure.

Recommendation: Staff is recommending approval with modifications. A shake style siding should be appropriate for the dormers on this house and the style should look like wood when viewed from ground level. Replacement of the gutters and downspouts is appropriate.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Annmarie McCallister, 117 W. New England Ave., Worthington, Ohio, said she just wants to raise her house to the level of her neighbors and make it look good. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Hofmann moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY PIONEER ROOFING ON BEHALF OF JEFF MCCALLISTER FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO REPLACE THE SIDING ON THE DORMERS, AND INSTALL NEW GUTTERS AND DOWNSPOUTS AT 117 W. NEW ENGLAND AVE. AS PER CASE NUMBER AR 53-17, DRAWINGS NUMBER AR 53-17, DATED JUNE 9, 2017 BE APPROVED, BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

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

5. Fencing & Landscaping Modifications – **634 High St.** (Worthington Lodge, LLC) **AR 54-17** (Amendment to AR 66-16)

Findings of fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

In January of 2015, the City Council approved rezoning the Masonic Lodge property for use as multi-family housing. The Architectural Review Board and Municipal Planning Commission approved final plans for the project in March of 2015, and modifications in May of 2016. As construction nears completion, approval of a few minor fencing and landscaping modifications is requested.

Project Details:

1. Fencing:
 - A section of matching wood fencing (6' high with the top 1' being slats with separation between) with a gate was installed near the front of the building between Dewey's and the lodge. This section provides a barrier so people will not walk between the buildings; screens the condensing units; and is behind some landscaping at the front.
 - On the north side of the garages there was originally a gate proposed between the garage and proposed duplex. Now the location of that structure will be changing, so

matching fencing is proposed between the garage and the southeast corner of Dewey's lot. A gate is proposed at the sidewalk near the garage.

- A section of black aluminum picket fencing was added at the southwest corner of the southern garage to connect to and match the existing fence along the southern lodge property line owned by the church.

2. Landscaping:

- Shrubs and bushes planned for the south side of the south garage would now be eliminated with grass planted instead.
- The north side of the patio at the southeast corner of the building would now extend to the building, eliminating a landscape bed.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Fences and walls are traditionally used as boundary markers and security features and can also be used as effective screening. Traditional types of fences and walls include masonry walls, cast and wrought iron fences, wood rail or board fences, rows of trees and shrubs, or a combination of these. Paint or opaque stain are the preferred finishes for wood fencing, but leaving it to weather naturally is also acceptable. Side and rear fences may be as much as six feet in height, especially when concealing trash containers and utility boxes.

A small amount of landscaping can have a positive impact. Small, well-executed and well-maintained landscaping is appropriate.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending approval of this application, as the proposed changes are appropriate for the project.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Kevin Showe, 634 High St., Worthington, Ohio, said he heard back from the State's Historic Preservation Office and they feel the small fence between Dewey's Pizza and the Lodge building should be painted white/off white to match the trim color on the building. Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Showe if he was okay with that and Mr. Showe said yes. The Preservation Office did not feel the natural cedar fence was appropriate. Mr. Sauer said he thought the final product was gorgeous. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak for or against this application and no one came forward.

Motion:

Mrs. Holcombe moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY WORTHINGTON LODGE LLC TO AMEND CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS AR 66-16 WITH CHANGES TO FENCING AND LANDSCAPING AT 634 HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 54-17, DRAWINGS NO. AR 54-17, DATED JUNE 9, 2017, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT

AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING AND THE GATE BETWEEN DEWEYS AND THE LODGE IS TO BE PAINTED WHITE.

Mr. Hofmann seconded the motion. Mrs. Bitar called the roll. Mr. Coulter, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Sauer, aye; and Mr. Hofmann, aye.

C. Municipal Planning Commission

1. Subdivision

- a. Preliminary Plat – **303 E. New England Ave.** (Bob Webb Homes) **SUB 02-17**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This request involves reconfiguring the three lots which currently accommodate 303 E. New England Ave. into three lots that would each have frontage on Greenwich St. The land was originally Lots 81 & 82 of the Morris Addition, but was reconfigured into three lots at some point in time. The existing parcel at the corner is 132' wide along E. New England Ave. and 96' wide along Greenwich. South of that parcel are two 66' wide parcels that are ~239' deep, extending into the ravine. The existing house straddles the lots to the south, and would need to be demolished before the City could sign the new plat and re-divide the property. The land is in the R-10 Zoning District.

A full Preliminary Plat has not been received, but is expected by meeting time.

Project Details:

1. The northern two lots would be 80' wide each along Greenwich St. and 132' deep; and the southern lot would be 181.93' along Greenwich St. and 132' deep. All three lots would be able to meet the Code dimensional requirements for frontage, area and setbacks.
2. A preservation/no disturb easement is required to protect the land adjacent to Rush Creek. Topographical information is still needed to determine exact placement of that easement.
3. Other natural features such as trees and other vegetation have also not yet been identified. A tree preservation plan is needed.
4. Proposed access to the lots would need to be shown.
5. Exact location of proposed utilities and any necessary easements to accommodate those utilities would need to be shown.
6. Code Section 1103.10 requires sidewalks to be provided as part of the Subdivision process. Inclusion of sidewalks along the east side of Greenwich St. to meet the existing sidewalk on the cul-de-sac would suffice.
7. A Subdivider's Agreement will be required as part of the Subdivision process.

Land Use Plans:Worthington Comprehensive Plan

The 2005 Worthington Comprehensive Plan recommends residential development for the area.

Recommendations:

Staff is recommending tabling of this application after discussion. There are missing items that are required for Preliminary Plat approval, and time will be needed to review the information. The Preliminary and Final Plats could both be voted on at the next MPC meeting.

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar displayed the preliminary plat on the screen. She mentioned there was farmland on the west side on Greenwich St. before those homes were constructed. Mrs. Bitar spoke about the ravine being preserved and placement of the southernmost house being further west than the existing house on the flat area. Mr. Brown explained that staff has asked for a no disturbance zone along the southern edge of the property, next to Rush Creek, which will be noted on the preliminary plat. There will be a hard line as to where disturbance can happen. They will be working with the City's Law Director for language on the no disturbance zone. Mr. Sauer said what they have before them is a proposed Tree Preservation Easement and if that is something the applicant is doing or the City. Mrs. Bitar clarified the City will verify where the line is. Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present.

Mr. Kirk Denyes, 10812 Buckingham Pl., Powell, Ohio, said he was representing Bob Webb Homes. Mr. Denyes asked for clarification if the Board members and staff needed to see staking for the house or the preservation line and Mrs. Bitar said they would like to see both. Mr. Coulter said they would like to know where the house sits from the front, the side and the approximate size. Mrs. Bitar said before the City can sign the plat that will be recorded the existing house will have to be demolished. Mr. Coulter said from what he can see, the eighty foot width of the lots does meet the minimum requirement, and explained the Commission members will also want to see a tree survey. Mrs. Bitar explained the City will also want to know which trees will be saved and which trees will be removed. Mr. Brown explained this application will also be reviewed by City Council for their approval. Mr. Myers wanted to know, if looking at lot one, if the square represented the size of the house and Mr. Denyes said the square represents the buildable area. Mr. Myers said he would not want to see all the wide open space gone with three large houses crammed into the lots. Mr. Hofmann said the renderings seem to indicate a nice flat plot but there is clearly a lot of elevation. He asked if there would be a lot of cut and fill or would the grade remain between lots two and three and Mr. Denyes said the other two houses will step down with the grade. Mr. Sauer asked if there are ever lots that are unbuildable and Mrs. Bitar said yes, but the City would not approve a division that created a lot which was not buildable. She said that is why it is important for the City to verify where the line needs to be and to determine if there is room to build on the southernmost lot.

Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak for or against this application.

Mr. Steven Hurt, 595 Greenwich St., Worthington, Ohio, said he just purchased the home across from the proposed development which he feels will double the number of homes on the cul-de-sac. He said he has some real concerns about his property maintaining value. Mr. Hurt said he paid a premium to live on the cul-de-sac because it is quiet and has very low traffic. The proposed development will double the amount of traffic, and he is concerned about the safety of the children that live on the street, including his own. He called the area a natural paradise and said there is a substantial amount of wildlife that live in this area and they will be harmfully impacted by this development. Mr. Hurt said they are on a waiting list trying to get their child into Worthington Schools.

Mr. Brown said this street is on the City's Street Improvement Plan and will be paved towards the end of the summer. If the applicant would be building in this area, there would be only two access points granted from Greenwich, and the corner lot would possibly have access from New England Avenue., but the whole cul-de-sac is scheduled to be repaved. Mrs. Bitar confirmed the City would require the applicant to construct the sidewalk along Greenwich St. and New England Ave.

Mrs. Amy Hill, 607 Greenwich St., Worthington, Ohio, said her house faces the proposed development. She lives there with her husband and two young sons. Mrs. Hill said the proposed development would completely change the feel of the street and she and her family enjoy watching the wildlife pass by their home. She said the quiet street would become overcrowded with traffic, and she cannot imagine having to look outside her house and see three big houses instead of the wildlife.

Mrs. Keely Croxton, 595 Greenwich St., Worthington, Ohio, said she wanted to echo the comments of her husband and her neighbor. She said the photo of the proposed development made her feel sick. She said they paid a premium for the house because of the privacy and the wildlife nature nearby. To see all of the wildlife gone would be heartbreaking. She said they have not moved in yet, nor had a chance to enjoy the atmosphere.

Mrs. Elizabeth Seitz, 415 E. South St., Worthington, Ohio, asked if lot number one would have a New England Avenue address or Greenwich Street, and Mr. Coulter said no one knows yet, but typically would be whichever street the front door faces.

Mr. Sauer said he was disappointed the tree line will be moving to the far south. Mrs. Bitar felt the exact location of the proposed house on lot #3 vs. the existing house vs. the grade needs to be determined.

Mr. Myers asked what authority the Commission has to grant or deny this application, and what are the standards they are looking for. Mrs. Bitar said the only other thing that can be in question, because there are no variances, is natural features. Mr. Myers said the Commission needs to know if there is any impact on the natural environment. Mr. Brown said all of the other things need to be looked at before a Final Plat is ready. Mr. Myers said he believed the only possible way for the Commission to reject this application would be if the development impacts the natural features.

Mr. Sauer asked if there is an existing Tree Preservation Easement and Mr. Brown replied, “No.” He said this subdivision is an opportunity to have a preservation easement.

Mr. Denyes asked the Commission to table this application. Mrs. Holcombe moved to table the application and Mr. Hofmann seconded the motion. All Board members voted, “Aye.” The application was tabled.

E. Adjournment

Mr. Hofmann moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:03 p.m., seconded by Mrs. Holcombe. All members voted, “Aye” and the meeting was adjourned.