



MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
WORTHINGTON ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
WORTHINGTON MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION
July 27, 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; Thomas Reis, Vice-Chair; Kathy Holcombe, Secretary; James Sauer; 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 Edwin Hofmann was absent.

A. Call to Order – 7:00 p.m.

1. Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Approval of minutes of the July 13, 2017 meeting

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

4. Affirmation/swearing in of witnesses

B. Architectural Review Board

Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Foust to explain the photograph on display. Mr. Foust said the building in the photograph was about as close as Worthington had to an industrial building. The business used a Worthington zip code, but was actually located in an area called Chaseland, which was a subdivision on the south edge of Worthington including Lincoln, Chase, and Stanton Avenues. The Brunt Tile Company was built in 1905 on the east side of the railroad track, and extended from Indianola Avenue to Sinclair Road. The building burned down in 1906 and was rebuilt in 1909 and operated until about 1925. They made small floor tile and porcelain insulators and had nine or ten kilns to bake their products. The two-story brick building had nine had a tile roof and nine over nine windows.

B. Architectural Review Board - Unfinished

1. New Single Family Home – **31 E. New England Ave.** (Jamie & Lindsay Cleverley/Worthington Lodge LLC) **AR 57-17**

&

C. Municipal Planning Commission - Unfinished

1. Planned Unit Development Modification

- a. New Single Family Home – **31 E. New England Ave.** (Jamie & Lindsay Cleverley/Worthington Lodge LLC) **PUDM 01-17** (Modification to PUD 03-14)

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo and commented on revised drawings:

Findings of fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

The parcel which includes the former lodge and the new house east of the access drive to the Worthington United Methodist Church (WUMC) parking lot was rezoned as a PUD in 2015. Originally included for the area east of Dewey's along E. New England Avenue was a two-family residential structure. These applicants would like to amend the previous approvals by the MPC and ARB to allow construction of a single-family home instead. The parcel would still remain intact, with the applicants owning the house as a condominium.

The applicants are hoping to gain approval of the placement of a single family house on the site. They are flexible with design, and have presented modified drawings showing a simplified front elevation, a revised west elevation, and positioning of the fence starting south of the chimney.

Project Details:

1. Site Plan:

- The single family house is proposed for location 13' from the front property line; 14.3' east of the access drive to the WUMC parking lot; 11' from the west property line; and ~29' from the sidewalk adjacent to the newly constructed garages behind the former lodge building. The previously approved structure was the same distance from E. New England Ave., however, the entire building was at that location and a stoop extended beyond. The proposed house has a porch set back 13' across a portion of the front, and the remainder of the house would be set back further than 13'. On the east side, the house would be a few feet closer to the access drive, but there would continue to be a 5' sidewalk along the drive. The proposed structure would be shorter to give room for a rear yard. The area of the house would be less than the previously proposed structure.
- The applicants would like to use a fence that matches the lodge fencing to enclose the west side and rear yards. The fence would align with the rear of the house on the east

side and extend to about 26' from the E. New England Ave. property line on the west side.

- A landscape plan is included showing a variety of shrubs, perennials, trees and annuals.

2. Building:

- Proposed is a two-story structure with a gabled roof, the main gable being east to west, with separate gables extending to the north and south. The structure would have a basement.
- The front elevation has gables over the western 2/3 of the house; toward the center nestled in the larger gable; above the entrance; and above a second floor window on the east side. A porch with a shed roof and railing is proposed on the west side. The windows would mainly be simulated divided light vinyl double hung with 6 lights on top and a single light below. A group of three windows that appear to be casement style is proposed in the middle of the second floor. Matching columns would support the porch and entry roofs. The front door is proposed with 3 lights above 2 panels.
- The east side elevation would have windows similar to the front of the house, and 2 garage doors – one double to look like 2 single doors and one single. The roof gable would be above the front 2/3 of the house.
- The rear elevation would have 2 matching gables in a shallower pitch than the front gables. A screened porch with a shed roof is proposed at the southwest corner.
- On the west side is a chimney and the fence is proposed to extend from the south side. The windows are proposed in casement style with divided lights proportioned similarly to other proposed windows. A window well is proposed for basement egress which would not be seen due to the proposed fence.

3. Materials:

- The house is proposed to be sided with LP SmartSide 6" horizontal lap siding. The siding would be painted "Iron Ore", as would the board and batten style siding in the gables. The trim would be the same material and painted "Alabaster".
- The asphalt shingles for the roof would be "Shadow Black".
- Windows are proposed to be vinyl simulated divided light in white.
- The proposed fiberglass front door would be finished to look like wood. Garage doors would have square panels without windows.
- Glen-Gery Marquette brick is proposed for the chimney. Cultured limestone is proposed for the foundation.
- Carriage lamps are proposed for the garage and rear doors, and a light is proposed in the ceiling of the front porch.
- Gutter, downspout, porch rail and column material has not been addressed.
- Front porch and step material appears to be concrete.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Infill sites should be developed in a way that is complementary to their neighborhoods and that integrates well with surrounding building designs and land uses. Compatibility with the

neighborhood should be the primary consideration. New structures should complement the form, massing and scale of existing nearby structures. Also, building placement and orientation are important design considerations. Most main entrances should face the street and garages should avoid facing the street.

Roof: Roof shapes for new buildings should be appropriate to the style or design of the building. If a new building does not follow a particular style but is instead a vernacular design, then roof shapes and heights similar to those in the neighborhood or nearby would be most appropriate.

Materials: Contemporary materials that simulate traditional ones are appropriate, but the preferred option is to use true traditional materials such as wood siding. Incompatible contemporary materials should be avoided. Brick has long been a traditional material in Worthington. Prepare a sample board for review by the Architectural Review Board.

Windows: For new buildings, multiple-paned windows generally are not appropriate. The exception is a building being built in a particular style -- such as Federal, Greek Revival or Colonial Revival -- that would have employed this window type. When in doubt, simple 1 over 1 double-hung sash windows are usually the simplest, least expensive and most appropriate choice. Using the excellent precedents of Worthington's many historic structures, carefully design the pattern of window openings; window sizes and proportions (they must be appropriate for the size and proportions of the wall in which they are placed); pattern of window panes and muntins; and trim around the windows. Good quality wood windows are readily available and more affordable than in the past. True wood windows are always the first preference. Aluminum- or vinyl-clad windows can be appropriate, but primarily on secondary facades and less conspicuous locations. All-aluminum or vinyl windows are not prohibited but are not encouraged. Avoid blank walls.

Entries: As with other design considerations, study Worthington's rich collection of 19th and 20th century architecture for design ideas for entrances and doors. For newly-built buildings, simpler designs usually look better than more ornate ones. Avoid heavy ornamentation on doors and entrances. Observe entry placement on existing buildings. Whether located symmetrically or asymmetrically, entries usually are aligned with a window on the second floor so that a regular rhythm of openings is maintained on both floors. Entries should be located so they are easily visible, and they should be oriented toward the street.

Ornamentation: Observe Worthington's excellent historic architecture for information on the kinds and amounts of ornamentation employed on various building styles and periods. Use ornamentation conservatively. It will be most successful if used in traditional locations: around windows and doors; along a building's cornice or at the corners; in gables; or on gates and fences. Most ornamentation historically was made of simple forms built up to a desired level of complexity. When in doubt, follow the old rule that "less is more." Sometimes just a little ornamentation, well placed, can have a major impact without the need for more extensive (and expensive, and hard-to-maintain) ornamentation. Use compatible materials in ornamental elements. Frame houses should have wood ornamentation, although in cases where the ornamental

elements are some distance from the viewer it may be possible to use substitute materials such as fiberglass.

Color: In general, avoid bright colors not typical in Worthington neighborhoods, such as various shades of purple or orange. For infill buildings being placed in an existing streetscape, select colors compatible with those already used along the streetscape. Many buildings follow a pattern of light colors for the building body and darker colors for the trim. Following this pattern is encouraged. In Worthington, the use of white or cream-colored trim also is common and would be appropriate for new construction. Avoid using too many colors. Usually one body color and one trim color are sufficient.

Landscaping: Worthington's mature shade trees are the primary landscaping feature throughout the community. They are a major contributor to its character and help define its neighborhoods as stable, desirable places to live. In general, lawns are generous but not overly large, which contributes to the sense of human scale that is one of Worthington's important attributes. Other landscaping elements tend to be properly scaled and well-tended, which also tends to enhance neighborhood character. Maintain and nurture mature trees to prolong their lives. Plant and maintain street trees in planting areas between the street and sidewalk. Paving can sometimes reduce water absorption of the soil so much that trees do not get the moisture they require.

The standards of review in the Architectural District ordinance are:

1. Height;
2. Building massing, which shall include the relationship of the building width to its height and depth, and its relationship to the viewer's and pedestrian's visual perspective;
3. Window treatment, which shall include the size, shape and materials of the individual window units and the overall harmonious relationship of window openings;
4. Exterior detail and relationships, which shall include all projecting and receding elements of the exterior, including but not limited to, porches and overhangs and the horizontal or vertical expression which is conveyed by these elements;
5. Roof shape, which shall include type, form and materials;
6. Materials, texture and color, which shall include a consideration of material compatibility among various elements of the structure;
7. Compatibility of design and materials, which shall include the appropriateness of the use of exterior design details;
8. Landscape design and plant materials, which shall include, in addition to requirements of this Zoning Code, lighting and the use of landscape details to highlight architectural features or screen or soften undesirable views;
9. Pedestrian environment, which shall include the provision of features which enhance pedestrian movement and environment and which relate to the pedestrian's visual perspective;
10. Signage, which shall include, in addition to requirements of Chapter 1170, the appropriateness of signage to the building;
11. Sustainable Features, which shall include environmentally friendly details and conservation practices.

Worthington Comprehensive Plan

Village centers like Old Worthington are logical places to add residential density in and behind the main corridor. Such residential development adds more pedestrian activity, increases the market base for the retail stores, and can be designed as a product that is attractive to young professionals and empty nesters. In Worthington, redeveloping residential lots within the first High Street block requires expertise to prevent it from tearing into the historic fabric of the City. Such development must be evaluated on a case-by-case basis, but it would be critical to be appropriate for the site in scale and design while at the same time creating a continuous street front.

Final Plan Modifications from Code:

City Staff - The City staff may authorize minor design modifications that are required to correct any undetected errors or that are consistent with the purpose of the approved Final Plan. Such modifications shall be limited to:

1. Minor adjustments in lot lines provided no additional lots are created;
2. Minor adjustments in location of Building footprints and parking lots, provided the perimeter required Yards remain in compliance;
3. Minor adjustments in Building height;
4. Minor modifications in Structure design and materials, and lighting provided there is the same general appearance; and
5. Minor modifications of landscaping, including substitution of materials.

Municipal Planning Commission - The Municipal Planning Commission shall review modifications other than those listed in the above section, and any of the above modifications as recommended by City staff.

1. Should the Municipal Planning Commission find that such modification keeps the essential character of the approved PUD, and does not require an amendment to the PUD Ordinance, the Municipal Planning Commission shall approve such modification.
2. Should the Municipal Planning Commission find that such modification requires an amendment to the PUD Ordinance, the Municipal Planning Commission shall forward a recommendation of approval or denial to the City Council for such amendment.

Recommendations:

Staff is recommending ARB & MPC approval of the applications when the details are acceptable and with the following considerations:

- The basic form and style of the house and the site plan would be appropriate and keep the essential character of the approved PUD and Old Worthington.
- More green space is proposed than with the previous approval.
- Although the house would be closer to the drive than the garages behind, there is still sufficient distance between the house and drive to accommodate pedestrians, and vehicular traffic should not be effected.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicants were present. Mr. Dominic Luppino, 5530 Shannon Heights Blvd., Dublin, Ohio, and Mr. Jamie Cleverly, 7768 Rowles Dr., Columbus, Ohio. Mr. Coulter

asked Mr. Luppino to discuss the changes that were made. Mr. Luppino said the major change was the unification of the window sizes. The lower levels are 3' x 6' and the uppers are now 3' x 5', and they also made the windows over the front entry a little smaller. Mr. Luppino said the second story floor plan was changed so more windows could be added to the west elevation facing High Street. They also offset the front and rear screened porches from the corners of the house and the design was simplified by getting rid of some of the trim. They removed the projected gables and the fence was also moved to the other side of the chimney.

Mr. Sauer said he believed simplifying the design has helped, but he would still like to see the house moved back so the porch of this house is more in line with the porch on the house next door. Mr. Luppino said their position is the setback was already given to them and they are trying to meet the requirements of what the Board members are telling them but also the requirements of his client. He said his client would like a back yard for his family as well as having a front porch. Mr. Sauer reiterated he thought the house should be further from the street. Mr. Reis said he does not have a problem with where the house is located and having a little bit of change is good and the house seems to be within the guidelines of the setback. He thought the house looked fine. Mrs. Holcombe said she liked the offset of the porch and screened porch, and felt that helped with the setback. She thought the windows were a major improvement on the west side. Mr. Coulter said when he thinks of porches and the way they were used when he was growing up, people used to sit on the front porch. If the house was moved back the porch would be pulled back from being so close to the street. He said this neighborhood has a lot of people who walk to the downtown area and if the setback is kept in line with what was originally approved, that would encourage people to be able to talk with the neighbors when they walk by. Mr. Coulter also said the Hardi Plank has been approved all over Worthington and is a much better material and more permanent than metal or vinyl siding.

Mr. Myers said the comment he has heard from citizens is the house could have been simplified and he was glad to see the architect made great strides in doing that, but there are still a lot of rooflines and projections on the front of the house, so is that enough? He thought that was the question coming into the meeting. Mr. Reis said he felt there was enough character and features to make the house architecturally pleasing. Mrs. Lloyd said because this house is so large it helps break up the façade and without the changes the house might not be the right scale. Mr. Coulter said the previously approved condominium was going to have a massive stone front with a standing seam metal roof which did not really seem to tie into the neighborhood and looked more like a home which belonged in Texas. He felt this home looked more appropriate for the neighborhood in terms of the gable and roof lines which follow the architecture of the floor plan.

Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak either for or against this application. While waiting for speakers to come forward, Mr. Brown said at the previous meeting there was a discussion about doing additional outreach to the Old Worthington Association (OWA) and to the Historical Society and within the past two weeks that has been taken care of. He said he also spoke with Greg Browning earlier in the day about the changes and his comments almost mirror Mr. Myers comments. Mr. Coulter asked if the Historical Society had any comments and Mr. Brown replied, "No."

Mrs. Suzanne Seals, of 123 E. New England Ave., Worthington, Ohio, said she was grateful to the Architectural Review Board (ARB) for being vigilant about the appearance of the house because the house is in such a prominent location and needs to be done well. She said the house is attractive and she appreciated the changes that have been made. Mrs. Seals explained she is not an architect but she would like to see a simpler design similar to the changes the Capace's made to their home. She thought a simpler design would be a better transition from the historic district to the residential area, and she would also like to see the house sit back in alignment with the adjacent house. Mrs. Seals said without vigilance, the historic district could lose charm and character. The house could contribute to this look or could neutralize the area.

Mr. Bob Capace, said his house is next door to the house in question. He felt the proposed house is absolutely beautiful and strongly encouraged approving their proposal. Mr. Capace believed individuality was a good thing for Worthington and felt the house next door did not have to match his house. He said he supports his new neighbors 1000%.

Mr. Doug Matthias, of 5736 Andover Ave., Worthington, Ohio said 15-18 years ago Mr. Cleverley purchased a home across the street from their house and he made vast improvements to the home. Mr. Matthias said he recently heard Mr. Cleverley planned to move back to the Worthington area and he saw the revised plans. He said he has known Mr. Cleverley for 18 years and knows he will do the right thing. Mr. Cleverley was a great neighbor and said in the future he feels the proposed house will be known as "The Cleverley" house.

Mr. Kevin Showe, 634 High St., Worthington, Ohio said he and his wife recently moved into the Lodge and the proposed home will be a dominant view from their living space. He said he recently met Mr. Cleverley on an unrelated matter about expanding their businesses within the City of Worthington, and talked about working and living in an adjacent environment. Mr. Showe said the site was previously approved for a twin duplex with a total of 3206 square feet. Once they moved in, he said they were imagining what a twin duplex would look like and they decided they would rather be looking at a single family home. Mr. Showe said as he became acquainted with the Cleverley's he realized they would be great neighbors. He and his wife are delighted with the elevations and particularly like the exposed brick fireplace chimney, windows, porches and the fact the house projects away from the back towards the street which creates a better enclave for the residential behind. Mr. Showe feels they have a great site plan. He said he strongly supports their proposal and was happy to see the changes that were made.

Ms. Donna Givens, 453 Oxford Ct., Worthington, Ohio, said she recently purchased her home. She retired from teaching in Dublin, Ohio, two years ago, and always wanted to live in downtown Worthington. She said she saw the previously approved renderings and wanted to mirror some of the comments recently made. Ms. Givens said Worthington looks different from house to house and that is why she likes Worthington. She said she moved from Dublin where a lot of the homes all look the same. Ms. Givens felt the proposed house looked lovely and encouraged the Board's approval.

Motion for ARB application:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY JAMIE & LINDSAY CLEVERLEY FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO CONSTRUCT A SINGLE FAMILY HOUSE AT 31 E. NEW ENGLAND AVE. AS PER CASE NO. AR 57-17, DRAWINGS NO. AR 57-17, DATED JUNE 28, 2017, 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. Coulter aye; Mr. Reis, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Sauer, nay; Mrs. Lloyd, aye; and Mr. Foust, abstained. The motion was approved.

Mrs. Bitar explained this modification to the PUD is before the Municipal Planning Commission (MPC) for the site layout and design of the structure, and because this was a two family structure before and is now just a single family home. Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Dominic Luppino, 5530 Shannon Heights Blvd., Dublin, Ohio, had no further comments. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

Motion for PUDM application:

Mrs. Holcombe moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY JAMIE & LINDSAY CLEVERLEY TO MODIFY PUD 03-14 WITH CONSTRUCTION OF A SINGLE FAMILY HOUSE AT 31 E. NEW ENGLAND AVE. AS PER CASE NO. PUDM 01-17, DRAWINGS NO. PUDM 01-17, DATED JUNE 28, 2017, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE PLANNING GOALS OF THE CITY, AS REFERENCED IN THE LAND USE PLANS, AND 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. Coulter, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Sauer, nay. The motion was approved.

- a. Preliminary & Final Plats – **303 E. New England Ave.** (Bob Webb Homes/Johnston) **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 to re-divide the property. The land is in the R-10 Zoning District. Since the MPC meeting on June 22, 2017, the applicant has submitted additional required information. A recommendation of approval of both the Preliminary and Final Plats is sought, and the request would go to the City Council for a hearing on September 5th.

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 meet the dimensional requirements in the Code for frontage and area, and would be able to accommodate structures outside of the required setbacks. Renderings of possible houses were submitted but would not be part of the approval.
2. A no disturbance zone has been identified on the plat in the southern part of Lot 3 to protect the land adjacent to Rush Creek. Nothing within the zone could be disturbed without written approval of the City, including the removal of any trees and vegetation. Stakes have been installed at the edge of that zone to show the location in the field.
3. Trees outside of the zone are shown on the Preliminary Plat, and would likely be removed during construction. New street trees would be required along both rights-of-way. Transformers and other equipment would be required to be screened.
4. Proposed location of utility connections to the site are shown on the Preliminary Plat and have been reviewed by the Service and Engineering Department.
5. Code Section 1103.10 requires sidewalks be provided as part of the Subdivision process. Construction of sidewalks along the east side of Greenwich St. to meet the existing sidewalk on the cul-de-sac, and along the E. New England Ave. side of the property would be required.
6. A Subdivider's Agreement has been drafted and would be finalized before the City Council hearing.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Comprehensive Plan

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

Recommendations:

Staff is recommending approval of these applications be recommended to City Council. The proposed subdivision would meet the Code requirements for division of property.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked Mrs. Bitar if the lot owner would still own the "No Disturbance Zone" and she replied, "Yes." The "No Disturbance Zone" would be like an easement or nature preserve. Mr. Brown said the lot owner would be required to get city approval to do anything such as removing trees, vegetation, or anything to do with the area along Rush Creek. He said this was a great

opportunity to get extra protection for the area. Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Kirk Denyes 10812 Buckingham Pl., Powell, Ohio, and Ms. Pam Johnston, the owner of 303 E. New England Ave., Worthington, Ohio came forward.

Mr. Sauer expressed concern with the proximity of the buildable area of lot 3 with the easement, wondering if it could be constructed without encroaching in or disturbing the designated area. Mr. Brown said the City would be watching the development. Mrs. Bitar asked the applicant if the construction process had been considered. Mr. Denyes said because of the slope it would not be practical to use equipment in that area. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone who wanted to speak either for or against this application.

Ms. Keely Croxton, 595 Greenwich St., Worthington, Ohio, and Mr. Steven Hurt, of the same address came forward. Ms. Croxton said she believed the “No Disturbance Zone” should be extended further north to protect the natural habitat and to keep the value of their real estate. They do not want to look at new homes from their deck and felt the addition of the homes would bring down the value of their property.

Mr. David Robinson, 195 E. Dublin-Granville Rd., Worthington, Ohio, was sworn in by Mrs. Bitar. Mr. Robinson asked what the consequences would be if the no disturbance zone was violated. Mr. Brown replied city staff would work with the Law Director to halt all activity on the property and if necessary remediation would be required to be done.

Mr. Sauer asked for clarification about what vegetation would be saved near the cul-de-sac. Mrs. Bitar said with the sidewalk and utilities not much would be saved. Mr. Brown said many of the trees in that area are near the end of their life and much of the plant material is honeysuckle and grapevine. Also, there is an electric line.

Mrs. Amy Hill, 607 Greenwich St., Worthington, Ohio, lives across the street from the proposed development and said she wanted to mirror her neighbors’ comments. She said the character of the cul-de-sac will be drastically impacted by the development and she believes the “No Disturbance Zone” should be extended. Mrs. Hill said she and her family members are heartbroken to know there will now be homes across the street. She said when she heard the Board members discussing the preservation of homes in the Architectural Review District, she wished they had the same preservation for her street. She felt the homes showed by the developer did not fit the character of her neighborhood. At the last meeting she heard the Board members suggest the developer communicate with the neighbors but she has not had any communication. Mrs. Hill did not think it would be possible to stop equipment once it is in the no disturb easement.

Mr. Brown said he wanted to reiterate this property is not within the Architectural Review District, so the Board does not have any authority over the style and materials. They can only legally use the setbacks and requirements that are within the Planning & Zoning Code for any authority to review. He said in past experience working with this developer he does not believe there will be any issues. Mr. Sauer asked if the City owns the property between the property line and the street and Mr. Brown said the area is public right-of-way. Mr. Sauer and Mrs. Holcombe asked if the

City has any say so in what vegetation might be worth saving. Mr. Brown said he and Mrs. Bitar walked the tree line and observed some of the trees had seen better days, and there were a lot of honeysuckle and vines choking the trees. The homeowner is responsible for maintaining the public right-of-way. Mr. Brown said the current property owner has been a good steward of the land. Mrs. Bitar said maybe the developer should be asked what their policy is for saving trees. Mr. Denyes said he would save as many trees as he possibly could. Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Denyes to be a good steward of the trees that are not within the protected zone and he replied he would.

Mr. Brown said Greenwich St. is currently scheduled on the Street Improvement Plan to be repaved in August or September of this year. In working with the Developer, the City's Engineer was going to require them to bore under the streets so the new asphalt will not be torn up as part of this project. If this application is approved this evening it would be forwarded to City Council for their approval after the August recess which would be the September 5, 2017, meeting, on a Tuesday, because of the holiday. Mr. Brown said meeting notices would go out to all abutting properties, and the blue sign would be placed in the yard. Everyone will have another chance to be heard at the City Council meeting. Mrs. Bitar swore in additional speakers.

Ms. Brenda Cross, 617 Greenwich St., Worthington, Ohio, said she lives next door to Mrs. Hill. Ms. Cross said she has been a neighbor and friend of 303 E. New England Avenue for twenty-five years. She said no one living in the cul-de-sac has been approached by the builder yet. Ms. Cross said she is also concerned about the vegetation, the deer, and other wildlife on the property. She said the whole community has feelings for the Rush Creek area. Ms. Cross said she realizes the area is not within the jurisdiction of the ARB, but she can walk to the house discussed previously within five minutes. She was concerned the developer might build enormous houses on the lot. When she built her home, her builder told her she would not want to be out of place in the neighborhood, so she was cognizant of the surroundings. Ms. Cross said she had to install sidewalks for her home in the cul-de-sac but there are no sidewalks that lead to High Street.

Mrs. Holcombe reiterated this subdivision would allow for preservation of Rush Creek, and felt other trees in good condition should also be saved.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY BOB WEBB HOMES FOR APPROVAL OF PRELIMINARY PLAT AND FINAL PLATS TO DIVIDE THE PROPERTY AT 303 E. NEW ENGLAND AVE. AS PER CASE NO. SUB 02-17, DRAWINGS NO. SUB 02-17, DATED JUNE 16, 2017, BE RECOMMENDED TO CITY COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL BASED ON THE PLANNING GOALS OF THE CITY, AS REFERENCED IN THE LAND USE PLANS, AND 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. Coulter, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Sauer, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye; and Mr. Foust, aye. The motion was approved.

D. Architectural Review Board - New

1. Landscaping – **7227 N. High St.** (The Shops at Worthington Place) **AR 59-17** (Amendment to AR 84-91)

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

The current parking lot design for the eastern half of the main parking lot was approved in 1991, as was the associated landscaping. In the large island at the east end of the main lot, where the large pylon sign is located, the plants were recently removed and grass was planted their place. The previous approval had a mixture of trees, shrubs, annuals and grass. At the City's request the owner is now proposing an amended planting plan for that area.

Project Details:

1. The new plan for the island includes evergreen shrubs (Taxus 18-24") along the length of the island. A 2" caliper Sycamore tree is proposed near the south end and an existing Sycamore remains near the north end. Near the sign, Bunny Grass and Knockout Roses are proposed.
2. There is a transformer south of the sign that would remain unscreened from the N. High St. view.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

While the architecture is of prime importance in a commercial district such as Worthington's, landscaping of building sites is also important. Landscaping works with other site elements such as paving and street furniture to create the district's sense of high quality. Screen parking with landscaping such as low bushes. Fences may be helpful for screening transformers, gas meters, and communication equipment, but also consider using plantings for this purpose. Keep functional items such as trash containers, transformers and electrical boxes orderly and well screened. The Board should review the exterior detail and relationship of changes to existing sites.

Recommendations:

Staff is recommending approval of this application with the addition of some type of screening for the transformer if possible. The proposed hedge should provide adequate screening for the parking as it grows without blocking the buildings and signage.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mark Bildsten, representing Bildsten Landscaping, 1080 Camden Ave., Columbus, Ohio, and Susan Marsh, the Property Manager for 7227 N. High St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Coulter asked what Bunny Grass was and Mr. Bildsten said Bunny Grass is a smaller type of grass that only grows about twelve to eighteen inches. Mr. Coulter asked

Mr. Bildsten if the transformer could be screened on the east side and Mr. Bildsten said yes, possibly two or three taxus shrubs. Mr. Sauer asked if more than one tree could be planted. Mr. Bildsten said the space was already tight, and with the addition of the transformer, he did not think there would be room for an additional tree. Also, there was concern with blocking signage. Mr. Coulter liked the addition of the Knock-out roses, as he is not used to seeing those in commercial landscapes. Mr. Bildsten said they could easily maintain the roses and prune them back every year to keep them looking fresh. Mr. Brown said street trees are planned in the right-of-way as money becomes available. 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. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY WORTHINGTON SQUARE VENTURE, LLC TO AMEND CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS #AR 84-91 WITH CHANGES TO THE LANDSCAPING PLAN FOR 7227 N. HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 59-17, DRAWINGS NO. AR 59-17, DATED JULY 5, 2017, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING WITH THE AMENDMENT OF ADDING LANDSCAPING TO THE EAST OF THE TRANSFORMER.

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

2. Balcony – **50 W. Stafford Ave.** (Sean & Alyssa Harris) **AR 60-17** (Amendment to AR 05-17)

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This two-story house on the north side of W. Stafford Ave. was built in 1964 and is not a contributing property in the Worthington Historic District. It was constructed with brick on the first floor and wood siding painted white on the second, but is currently stuccoed and painted all the same shade of gray. A rear second story addition and front window change were approved for this house at the January 12, 2017 ARB meeting.

This amendment would allow a revision to the rear balcony.

Project Details:

1. The second floor balcony was previously to be supported with columns. Now the balcony would be supported with brackets.

2. Trex decking is proposed in the color “Fire Pit”, and the railing would have rails to match the decking supported by white posts and the balusters would be black.

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. Be sure that window designs are appropriate for the style or time period of the house. Design and materials should be traditional, and compatible with the existing structure.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending approval of this application, as the proposed rear balcony is designed appropriately for the house.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Sean Harris, 50 W. Stafford Ave., Worthington, Ohio came forward. The Board members had no questions or concerns. 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. Foust moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY SEAN & ALYSSA HARRIS TO AMEND CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS #AR 05-17 WITH MODIFICATIONS TO THE PROPOSED REAR BALCONY AT 50 W. STAFFORD AVE. AS PER CASE NO. AR 60-17, DRAWINGS NO. AR 60-17, DATED JULY 13, 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; Mr. Reis, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Sauer, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye; and Mr. Foust, aye. The motion was approved.

3. Sign – 510 High St. (Signarama) AR 61-17

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

In 1999 this building underwent a renovation that included an addition to the building, and installation of a freestanding sign. The sign box was enlarged in 2008 to be 30 square feet in area per side to advertise a second tenant in the building; the color and sign faces were changed in 2011.

This is a request to install different sign faces.

Project Details:

1. With this application the sign box would remain white and the background of the sign faces would continue to be white. The existing brick base would remain, as would the address on the side of the sign box facing the street. External illumination is in place and would continue to be used instead of the internal light sources.
2. The top part of the sign faces would identify “Jerman Family Dentistry” with “Jerman” being part of a logo that includes a tooth. The graphics and text would be in black vinyl. The bottom part of the sign would say “IntrinsicCare CHIROPRACTIC” in black, gray, fuchsia and orange.
3. More colors, sizes and styles than the Code allows are proposed for the sign faces, so variances would be needed.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Place only basic names and graphics on signs along the street so that drive-by traffic is not bombarded with too much information. Free-standing signs should be of the “monument” type; they should be as low as possible. Such signs should have an appropriate base such as a brick planting area with appropriate landscaping or no lighting. Colors for signs should be chosen for compatibility with the age, architecture and colors of the buildings they serve, whether placed on the ground or mounted on the building.

Worthington Sign Code

1170.03 DESIGN REQUIREMENTS.

(c) Styles. Signs shall be comprised of not more than two styles of lettering plus one logo. A logo is an emblem, character, pictograph, trademark or symbol used alone to represent a business, organization, entity or product. There shall be not more than three sizes of all such lettering, including a logo.

(d) Colors. Not more than four colors, including black and white, shall be used on any sign.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending the sign faces be simplified as much as possible to more closely meet the Code requirements.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Dave Mayer, 7282 Innisfree Lane, Dublin, Ohio came forward. Mrs. Lloyd asked if family dentistry was part of the Jerman logo and Mr. Mayer replied he thought it was required. His client would like their sign to be more legible from the road. Mr. Reis said he wondered if the family dentistry font could be made smaller. Mr. Mayer asked Mr. Coulter what changes he would like to see. Mr. Coulter suggested looking at the City’s Design Guidelines and looking at what those recommendations are. He said he noticed color changes within the letters and asked if that was intentional. Mr. Mayer said yes, that is part of his

client's logo. Mr. Coulter said he was not sure if the Board has ever approved of that type of lettering before. Mrs. Bitar said there are signs on Huntley Road, but not within the District. She also said since the sign has more than four colors a variance will also be needed. Mr. Foust said he had concerns with the lettering of the IntrinsicCare sign. Mrs. Holcombe asked if the lettering could be all black. Mrs. Carrie Mancuso, 510-B High St., Worthington, Ohio, said no, the sign cannot be all black. She and her husband started their business in Worthington five years ago within a two hundred square foot room, and have built their business with blood, sweat and tears and a lot of celebration. When they created their logo they put a lot of love and attention into it. Mrs. Mancuso said she understands there are rules and variances that are necessary but this logo is an identifier for their business. Mrs. Mancuso said all of her stationary, business cards, have this logo, so if she changes the logo now she would have to change everything in her office. Mr. Coulter explained the sign should be within the Design Guidelines but it would not mean other materials had to change. Mr. Brown said since variances are approved by a different board, the request could be denied. The sign should comply with the Code as closely as possible.

Mrs. Mancuso asked the Board to either reconsider or allow her time to figure out a different solution. Mrs. Mancuso asked how many colors she is allowed to have and Mrs. Bitar explained four colors are allowed, including black and white also count as a color. Mr. Coulter suggested having the flame be red and word care be a different color, and a variance would not be needed. Mr. Sauer said he liked the sign. Mrs. Bitar said there were too many sizes of lettering and too many styles of font, if the font is part of their corporate logo, they will need a variance no matter what. She said they are allowed two styles of font plus one logo. Mrs. Mancuso said she would rather try to obtain a variance than have to change everything in her office. Mr. Mayer requested to table the application.

Mrs. Holcombe moved to table the application and the second was by Mr. Sauer. All Board members voted, "Aye;" and the application was tabled.

4. Windows, Door & Retaining Wall – **614 Oxford St.** (Kristen & AJ Senff) **AR 62-17**
(Amendment to AR 13-17)

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This farmhouse was constructed in the late 1800's, and there have been modifications and additions over the years. The house is a contributing building in the Worthington Historic District. Last year, the owners received approval to remove the porch railings, and the house was painted white. Earlier this year a rear addition was approved.

This request would allow changes to windows, the addition of a retaining wall, and replacement of the front door.

Project Details:

1. On the rear of the addition smaller windows are now proposed for the outermost windows. An additional window is proposed adjacent to the other two double hung windows on the south side.
2. A 30" retaining wall, much of which would be at grade, is now proposed around the outside walls of the addition. On the north side an egress well is proposed and the rest of the area between the wall and house would be planted.
3. The existing paneled front door has small lights at the top, and there is a storm/screen door. Proposed is a wood door with six larger lights and a panel below.

Land Use Plans:Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Be sure that window designs are appropriate for the style or time period of the house. It is important that any doors and the entrances in which they are set should be compatible with the style and period of a building. Design and materials should be traditional, and compatible with the existing structure.

Recommendations:

Staff is recommending approval of this application, as the windows and door are compatible with the existing house. The wall should not harm the character of the house or property.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. A.J. Senff, 614 Oxford St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Senff agreed with Mr. Coulter that his family will be glad when the work is complete. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak for or against this application and no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY KRISTEN & AJ SENFF TO AMEND CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS #AR 13-17 BY MODIFYING WINDOWS, ADDING A RETAINING WALL, AND REPLACING THE FRONT DOOR AT 614 OXFORD ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 62-17, DRAWINGS NO. AR 62-17, DATED JULY 14, 2017, 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. Coulter, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Sauer, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye; and Mr. Foust, aye. The motion was approved.

5. Windows, Garage Door, Siding & Trim – **822 Oxford St.** (James Ross/Campbell) **AR 63-17**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This Colonial Revival house was constructed in 1925 and is a contributing building in the Worthington Historic District. The property is at the southeast corner of Oxford St. and W. Stafford Ave., with the front of the house facing Oxford St. A one-story addition was constructed in 2004 on the north side along W. Stafford Ave.

This request involves modifications to the home to accommodate interior renovations and includes material changes on the rest of the house.

Project Details:

1. In order to install cabinets as part of a new kitchen along the north wall, four windows would be removed on the north side of the 2004 first floor addition. One new smaller Andersen clad wood window to match the remaining windows would be installed. Relocation of the four removed windows would be to the proposed master bath which is currently a sunroom on the south side of the house.
2. Enclosure of the existing covered porch on the south side of the 2004 addition would allow expansion of the family room. Columns would be removed and walls would be constructed at the outside edge of the patio. Hardiplank is proposed for the siding to match the existing, and the current Andersen windows and sliding door in the colonnade area would be reused.
3. Replacement of the rear door with a fiberglass door to match the existing is proposed. Two smaller Plygem all vinyl windows are proposed to the sides of that door. Removal of three windows on the rear toward the south end is proposed to allow construction of a walk-in closet. Also, the rear door on the south side of the sunroom and the windows are proposed for removal, and installation of the windows removed on the north side is proposed.
4. The applicant indicates all of the remaining wood windows in the house would be replaced with Plygem all vinyl windows with muntins between the panes.
5. Also, it seems replacement of all of the siding and trim with Hardiplank is proposed. It is not clear if new gutters and downspouts would be part of the project and how they would look.
6. The garage currently has two single doors with 24 panels each including two windows in each door. One steel double door with twelve lights at the top and 36 panels below is proposed.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Windows:

Page 19 of 23

ARB/MPC Meeting July 27, 2017

Minutes

Retention and repair of existing historic windows is always preferable to replacement. Because they usually comprise so much of a building's exterior surface, windows are a major part of its character. Keeping them is one of the most important ways to protect that character. Even non-original windows may be of sufficient age and design quality to warrant their retention. 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. This usually means real wood windows with true through-the glass muntins (if appropriate) in dimensions and profiles that duplicate the originals. Window suppliers have become very good at doing such work at reasonable prices, but this still may take some persistence and hunting around. New windows made of substitute materials such as aluminum, vinyl, or clad wood can be an acceptable second choice if they provide a reasonably good match for the windows being replaced. Number of panes, real muntins, and correct profiles still are important.

Siding:

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.

Outbuildings:

For repair work on older outbuildings, use new materials that match the old as closely as possible. Avoid modern materials that are incompatible with the original designs of these structures.

Design and materials should be traditional, and compatible with the existing structure.

Recommendations:

Staff is recommending partial approval of this application.

- Enclosure of the colonnade with the proposed materials to match the existing seems appropriate and would not be easily seen. The removal of windows on the north side of the 2004 addition would be noticeable. The door and window changes on the rear should be acceptable as they would not be seen.
- The replacement of the other windows in the house with all vinyl windows that have internal muntins would change the character of the property. The goal in the guidelines is in-kind replacement in the same material and design. The change should not be approved.
- Using Hardiplank siding in place of wood has been acceptable for additions and new houses, and small replacement projects if the proposed siding matches the profile of the existing, but maintaining existing wood is preferred. If replacement is approved, the exact width of the siding and the relationship with the siding with the addition's siding needs clarification.
- The garage doors should only be replaced with a single door if the door looks like it is separate doors and is in a style that matches the existing. The proposed would change the look of the garage and should not be approved.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. James Ross, 6120 Crystal Valley Dr., Galena,

Page 20 of 23

ARB/MPC Meeting July 27, 2017

Minutes

Ohio, explained they made some changes to their original proposal for the garage door and windows. Mr. Ross said the changes between the picture and the product is that the garage door windows will have four horizontal lights instead of five. He also proposed using a Marvin window with simulated divided lights. Mrs. Bitar asked Mr. Ross if he felt the existing windows are beyond repair and Mr. Ross said some of them have deterioration issues and some of the windows are inoperable. Mrs. Bitar asked Mr. Ross to describe the Marvin windows. Mr. Ross said the window is wood on the interior and fiberglass clad on the exterior which is similar to the Anderson windows. Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Ross if he was proposing to replace all of the wood siding on the house and Mr. Ross said yes. Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Ross if he thought about doing any repair work to the wood siding in order to save it. He asked what the motivation was to remove all of the wood siding. Mr. Ross said his clients would like to secure their house so they can live out their days in old Worthington and not have to deal with the constant maintenance. He said they discussed replacing the wood siding with Hardi Plank because that is what is on the north addition of the house. One third of the house now has Hardi Plank.

Mr. Sauer said he liked the symmetry of the house and to get rid of one window on the south side bothers him. He felt the layout of the bathroom could be changed in order to keep all of the windows. He also felt the small window proposed for the north side did not work. Mr. Ross said he went over ten to twelve different layouts to try to make things work. Mrs. Holcombe asked if the shutters would remain and Mr. Ross said he would be rebuilding the shutters exactly as they look now and painting them the same color. Mrs. Holcombe said she would like to see the windows on the north side of the house remain. Mrs. Bitar asked if the pilasters between the windows on the south side would remain and Mr. Ross said yes, except for those near the door being removed.

Mr. Foust was struggling with the plan to replace all of the siding and all of the windows, which would remove 90% of the original fabric of the exterior of the house. He understands Mr. Ross can make the house look similar to the existing house, but that seems at odds with what the Board has been trying to get home owners to do in the historic district. Mr. Foust said even if the shutters are rebuilt, the house still will not be the same because all of the original siding will have been stripped off. Mr. Foust said he would like to see what can be done in accordance with the City's guidelines to preserve as much of the original structure as possible. Mr. Foust said he did like the solution for the garage door. Mr. Reis said this is a tough situation for the home owner, but he appreciated Mr. Foust's comments. He said the house is a beautiful house and he understood what Mr. Ross was trying to accomplish, putting a master bedroom on the first floor, but the Board is trying to maintain some continuity in the historic district.

Mr. Coulter asked the homeowners if they would like to speak. Jim and Debbie Campbell, 822 Oxford St., Worthington, Ohio came forward. Mr. Campbell said he appreciated the new photographs which highlighted all of the hard work he has done on the landscaping and shows how much he appreciates their new house and wants the house to shine. Mr. Campbell said he really pushed his contractor to have new siding because the final product would look nice and neat, but he understands the exterior changes when you take off wood siding. He said he is just trying to preserve the beauty of the home. He said they would be willing to paint the siding but they need

new windows because the old windows are very drafty. Mr. Coulter said the Board members know Marvin is a good quality window. He said some of their concerns were with the placement of the window and if it was possible to keep maybe one or two of the windows. Mr. Coulter said he agreed with Mr. Foust, and has no concerns with the garage door. He was also happy to hear the shutters will be rebuilt and painted the same color. All the Board members wished to see more of the windows remain. Mr. Campbell said he was willing to keep the siding and have the siding scraped and re-painted.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY THE JAMES ROSS ON BEHALF OF JIM AND DEBBIE CAMPBELL FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO RENOVATE AND ADD ON TO THE HOUSE AT 822 OFORD ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 63-17, DRAWINGS NO. AR 63-17, DATED JULY 14, 2017, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING WITH THE FOLLOWING AMENDMENTS:

- **THAT THE GARAGE DOOR BE ONE OPERATING UNIT AND BE INSTALLED PER THE DRAWINGS AND PICTURES PRESENTED AT THE MEETING;**
- **THAT ALL WINDOWS REPLACED SHALL BE MARVIN WINDOWS WITH WOOD INSIDE WITH SIMULATED DIVIDED LIGHTS;**
- **THAT THE EXISTING SOUTH SIDE SHALL REMAIN WITH THE THREE EXISTING WINDOWS AND THE BATH SHALL BE ADJUSTED ACCORDINGLY;**
- **THAT THE EXISTING SHUTTERS SHALL BE REBUILT AS NECESSARY AND THE DESIGN SHALL REMAIN THE SAME;**
- **THAT THE NORTH SIDE SHALL BE BROUGHT BACK TO THE STAFF AND ADJUSTED TO PRESERVE AND MAINTAIN THE EXISTING WINDOW ALIGNMENT TO THE EXTENT POSSIBLE.**

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

D. Other

Mrs. Bitar explained there was an additional transformer needed near the CVS building on High St., and she showed the Board members where AEP recommended placement. She also pointed out some sidewalk and landscaping changes. Board members said the modifications were minor enough that formal approval would not be needed.

Mr. Brown reminded the Board members there will be no ARB-MPC meetings in the month of August, and there will be only one meeting in September on the 14th. There will not be a meeting on the 28th.

E. Adjournment

Mr. Sauer moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:40 p.m., seconded by Mr. Reis. All Board members voted, "Aye;" and the meeting was adjourned.