

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

April 22, 2010

The regular meeting of the Worthington Architectural Review Board and the Worthington Municipal Planning Commission was called to order at 7:30 p.m. with the following members present: R. Hunter, Chair; J. Sauer, Vice-Chair; K. Holcombe, Secretary; S. Myers; M. Coulter; A. Lloyd and J. Rodgers. Also present was L. Bitar, Development Coordinator.

**A. Call to Order - 7:30 p.m.**

1. Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Affirmation/Swearing in of Witnesses

Mrs. Bitar swore in those who planned to speak.

**B. Architectural Review Board**

**1. New**

**a. Deck – 126 W. Stafford Ave. (Paul and Lori Reeder) AR 15-10**

Mrs. Bitar stated these property owners recently constructed an addition on the rear of the house, and would now like to construct a 19' x 7' deck. The lower portion will be covered with lattice and there will be decorative railing to match the existing house railing.

Applicant Lori Reeder at 126 W. Stafford Avenue, Worthington, OH had no comments.

Mr. Hunter spoke positively about the work and asked for questions or comments from the Board and/or the audience. Mrs. Holcombe complimented the addition.

Mrs. Holcombe moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY PAUL AND LORI REEDER FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO CONSTRUCT A DECK AT 126 W. STAFFORD AVENUE AS PER CASE NO. AR 15-10 DRAWINGS NO. AR 15-10 DATED APRIL 2, 2010 BE**

**APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.**

Mr. Coulter seconded the motion and all members voted “aye”. Motion carried.

b. Window and Door Modifications – **600 Evening St.**  
(Nicholson Builders/Biehn) **AR- 16-10**

Mrs. Bitar stated new windows, trim and shutters are proposed. Four windows on the front and an existing patio door on the back will be replaced with new 8 over 8 simulated divided light aluminum clad wood windows. The home will be blue with white trim and shutters will be black.

Michael Fought with Nicholson Builders at 768 Busch Court, Columbus, OH came forward as the applicant.

Mr. Hunter asked for questions or comments from the Board and/or audience.

Mr. Coulter asked why only 2 sides of the house are being done. Mr. Fought said the only other windows in the house are adjacent to the French door on the rear.

Mr. Sauer made a motion:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY NICHOLSON BUILDERS FOR CERTIFICATE FOR APPROPRIATENESS TO MAKE MODIFICATIONS AT 600 EVENING STREET AS PER CASE NO. AR16-10, DRAWINGS NO. AR16-10 DATED APRIL 6, 2010, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT, AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO, AND AS PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.**

Mrs. Lloyd seconded the motion and all members voted “aye”. Motion carried.

c. Signage – **530 High St.** (Archer Sign Corp./Bruegger’s) **AR 17-10**

Mrs. Bitar said the City is extremely pleased to have Bruegger’s Bagels locating in the former Star Bucks building. The applicant is proposing a 38 sf wall sign in the front gable of the building and new aluminum panels and vinyl graphics for the free standing sign. Also, the applicant is asking for approval of a neon sign in the window.

John Paglia, Paglia Homes Inc., 12888 Rockhaven Rd., Munson, OH was the applicant.

Mr. Sauer asked if the colors of the building are remaining the same.

John Paglia stated they are using Sherwin Williams paint. He stated the entire building will be painted “Mannered Gold” # SW6130, accented with “Renwick Olive” #SW2815. Discussion followed, ending in staff reviewing the color samples to assure they match the description in the meeting.

Mr. Hunter stated that typically neon is not permitted in the district even though it would actually be inside the building. Mr. Paglia said it is not a big deal if they do not use the neon sign.

Mr. Hunter asked if the audience had questions or comments?

One audience member asked if the rail in the front of the building would remain the same color and Mr. Paglia stated the rail would also be painted to match.

Mr. Sauer made a motion:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY ARCHER SIGN CORPORATION FOR A CERTIFICATE FOR APPROPRIATENESS TO ADD SIGNAGE AT 530 HIGH STREET AS PER CASE NO. AR17-10, DRAWINGS NO. AR17-10 DATED APRIL 13, 2010 WITH THE EXCEPTION THAT THE AND THAT THE COLORS OF THE BUILDING WHICH WILL BE REPAINTED BE APPROVED BY STAFF AND MATCH THE APPLICANTS DESCRIPTION OF MANNERED GOLD AND RENWICK OLIVE AND THAT THE FENCE OUT FRONT WILL BE PAINTED BLACK.NEON SIGN INSIDE THE GLASS WINDOW WOULD BE ELIMINATED BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT, AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO, AND AS PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.**

Mrs. Holcombe seconded the motion and all members voted “aye”. Motion carried.

## **C. Municipal Planning Commission**

### **1. Conditional Use Permit - Unfinished**

#### **a. Automotive Services Major in I-1 – 6330–F Proprietors Rd. (Ayers) CU 01-10**

Mrs. Bitar stated there was a concern expressed at the last meeting about the potential for parking damaged cars in front of the shop, since residential is located across the street. The applicant has secured an agreement to use the area fenced in behind the building, and the applicant is restricted to six or seven parking spots for use in front of the building in the lease.

Mr. Hunter asked for questions or concerns from the Board Members.

Mr. Sauer asked if the MPC approved the request with a stipulation that no vehicles waiting to be worked on would be parked in the front, would that be acceptable.

Mr. Ayers stated if the board would clarify damaged vehicles, then yes it would be an option, because they do not want heavily damaged vehicles out front. Mr. Ayers continued stating they would use the front for vehicles requiring small repairs such as bumper work or minor scuffs. Also, that if a customer drops a car off, there would be a time frame for the vehicle to be evaluated then moved.

Mr. Hunter stated if we substitute the word inoperable, then those vehicles would be parked in the back.

Mr. Ayers stated there are going times when a vehicle would be parked out front for 4 hours or so, before it is moved to the caged area, behind the building or placed in the shop.

After more discussion, Mr. Hunter asked for questions or comments from the audience.

Mr. Coulter made a motion

**THAT THE REQUEST BY “BRIAN AYERS” FOR A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO OPERATE A MAJOR AUTOMOTIVE SERVICE IN THE I-1 ZONING DISTRICT AT 6330-F PROPRIETORS RD. AS PER CASE NO. CU 01-10, DRAWINGS NO. CU01-10 DATED MARCH 25, 2010 AND THAT NO MORE THAN SEVEN VEHICLES BE PARKED IN THE FRONT LOT. BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.**

Mrs. Holcombe seconded the motion. Mr. Sauer voted nay, Mrs. Holcombe voted aye, Mr. Coulter voted aye and Mr. Hunter voted aye. Motion approved.

#### **D. Other**

Mr. Hunter said the Veterans Memorial zoning has been approved by City Council unanimously.

Mrs. Bitar stated that a visitor would like to address the Board. Mr. Ethan List came forward and stated he represents The Ohio Rail Way Museum on Proprietors. The Museum wants to get the Boards perception and any concerns there might be regarding the organizations activities.

Mr. Coulter stated he noticed that the building had been repainted and looks much better.

Mr. Hunter stated he noticed that one parking lot on the south side of the building has had a lot of improvement. Also, stated he wished there were more operable cars with more track.

Mr. Sauer stated his only real concern is that the pop machine does not fit in with the décor of the station and stands out.

Mr. List said the museum has been a fixture in the community for more than 60 years. The museum has undergone a lot of organizational and administrative changes in the last year to 2 years. Mr. List told the Commission to expect more changes and improvements. As a nonprofit, the mission is education, preservation and community outreach we're trying to get more people involved. They are trying to boost the volunteer numbers and seek funding for improvements.

Mrs. Bitar stated there has been more than one complaint about the pop machine being out front since we don't have that anywhere else in the community. Mr. List said there is some historic and nostalgic element to be considered and maintained he understands it does stand out.

Mrs. Bitar asked Mr. List to keep the City informed so the status can be communicated to the public.

Mrs. Lloyd said the railway was such an instrumental part of the development of Worthington, and that the facility is a great asset to the City.

Mr. List said thank you. We consider ourselves lucky also to represent one of the few examples of real history and not just Worthington but Franklin County and Central Ohio. Mr. List said they still currently operate on our mainline as the Old Columbus, Delaware, and Marion an urban service. Built back in 1903 and abandoned in 1933. You will see elements of it all over the place.

Mr. Hunter said a lot of the property lines are still curved because of that. Mr. List said that is right. Mr. Hunter thanked Mr. List.

## **1. Planning and Zoning Code Amendments**

### **a. ARB – Administrative Approval of Certain Projects**

Mr. Hunter said the Board has been looking forward to administrative approval by staff, rather than taking the time of the Board and the applicants. Mrs. Bitar said that was the goal, to streamline the process for standard basic projects that do not impact anyone else. For example: a generator in the courtyard of the Library is not going to impact anyone, so instead of going to the Board, staff would approve administratively.

ARB and MPC Meeting—April 22, 2010

Mrs. Bitar said tonight the ARB needs to discuss the appeal process and lack of neighbor notification. Also, discussion of a potential list would be helpful.

Mr. Sauer asked if there were situations where something was approved and after the work started a neighbor saw it going on and the neighbor was not pleased? Mrs. Bitar said no.

Mr. Coulter said he thought if there were a restrictive list then having administrative approval with no appeal process would be all right. He mentioned calling the Building Department last year and being told he did not need a permit for replacing his roof.

Mrs. Bitar said staff's practice has been not to require Architectural review to replace shingles with a similar color even if changing from 3 tab to dimensional style. She said for 20 years staff has been approving small things like that and she is not aware of any complaint being received. So this is just a way to codify it and make it a legal process. Mr. Hunter concurred.

Mrs. Bitar said if we put the entire list in the code, changes would have to be made by ordinance. Or we could publish the list on the website and get the word out in other ways that these are the things you can come and have staff review and approve. These approvals could be put in a memo or on the agenda so the Board is informed of what has been approved administratively.

Mr. Coulter said the website is a good location for the list.

Mr. Sauer went back to the appeal process discussion, saying it would not hurt to have an appeal process.

Mrs. Holcombe said an appeal process is needed because other staff may be involved, and the appeal should come directly to the Architectural Review Board.

Mr. Coulter asked about the process being more cumbersome with appeal rights, especially if notification was not given before the permit was issued. It would be a problem to have homeowners un-due work because the project is appealed.

Mr. Hunter felt that is a good reason to have a detailed list, and the applicants should be told to share plans with their neighbors before proceeding because there is an appeal process.

Mr. Sauer asked if there should be a notification process.

Mrs. Bitar said staff has been sending letters and is currently looking at stopping that practice, and instead just placing a sign in the yard with web information. She felt if letters were going to be sent for an administrative approval, there might as well be an application on the agenda because the time savings would not be there.

Mr. Hunter felt the changes should be minor and routinely approved by the ARB.

## ARB and MPC Meeting—April 22, 2010

Mrs. Rodgers said things like dimensional shingles could be part of the list even though a neighbor may not like them, because the ARB always approves the change.

Mrs. Bitar said that is one change staff has approved for years, but is not specifically allowed to in the Code. Mrs. Bitar asked to discuss the list.

The Board discussed roof replacement, and decided to allow replacement with the same material in a similar color.

When asked, Mrs. Bitar said she felt the list should not be in Code so changes could be made easily. She also felt the changes should be reported to the ARB at every meeting.

The Board felt replacement of windows, doors, siding and fencing that maintain the same look.

Mrs. Rodgers said the list would represent things the City can approve not that the City will approve. Staff would have the ability to approved, but if not comfortable with the decision then the normal process is followed. Basically this is a way to circumvent the normal process for cut and dry things.

Mrs. Bitar expressed a staff members concern of unequal treatment of applicants. She felt consistency would not be a problem for her, and should not be for the next person to do this job because they would be required to have the same knowledge of the Design Guidelines, architectural styles, etc.

Mr. Coulter asked if something was turned down by staff, could it be an application before the ARB. Mrs. Bitar said yes. There is a similar process already in place in the Development Plan section of the Code, that allows staff to decide if the change needs to go the MPC or not. The gas tank at MedVet is an example of a project that staff felt needed MPC approval because of its visibility. The difference is those amendments are for a plan that was originally approved by the MPC, unlike ARB features that may have been there when the District was put in place.

Mr. Hunter stated he likes the list the way it is. The fence item might be the only issue that causes trouble.

The Board discussed the change to windows, and whether changing style should be allowed in the rear, and whether minor should be part of the language. It was agreed to leave minor in item #3, without further definition.

Mrs. Bitar said she was not sure if the. Mrs. Holcombe said she does not think new fencing should be on the list because she thinks neighbors need to be notified. Various members agreed.

ARB and MPC Meeting—April 22, 2010

Regarding item #4 (signage) on the list, Mr. Coulter said there are a couple signs around town that have been there for a long period of time and do not comply.

Mrs. Bitar said if they are nonconforming and they change the graphic portion of the sign by more than 50% of its value then they cannot do it without getting a variance and then if they are in the Architectural Review District they will have to come before the Board.

Mrs. Bitar said we need to come up with a way to allow mechanical equipment that is going in a courtyard of a building. The Library is an example, they have a mechanical area that is totally enclosed that nobody sees. She does not think there should be generators or air conditioners on this list at all.

Mrs. Bitar said there might be other situations, for example the high school property. Mr. Hunter brought up minor changes like dugouts and scoreboards on the back of the property which were not going to affect the general public. Mrs. Bitar maybe there is a way to have the rear portion not in the District. The high school can either be on this list as only the front portion of the property is subject to review, or the Architectural Review District can be change to exclude the rear of the property.

Mrs. Holcombe said they could build a building back there.

Mrs. Bitar said they still have the restrictions of an S-1 Zoning District which has pretty large set backs from all property lines. Any one of the schools except Kilbourne Middle School which has no extra land, could put a building up somewhere else and not have to go through this process. Why should it be different in this location if you are not going to see it?

Mr. Hunter said he does not think the high school should be exempted from the Architectural Review District. Mr. Coulter said the item could read that minor changes to the Athletic Fields can be administratively approved. Other members agreed.

Mrs. Bitar said does that include cell towers that are put on the poles?

Mr. Hunter said the City does not have the right to stop because they are governed by FCC.

Mrs. Bitar said every change to a tower and the addition of equipment has been reviewed.

Keeping mechanicals in interior courtyards was to be kept, but other mechanicals need review.

Mrs. Rodgers reiterated this list does not say it will automatically be approved, it means it can be approved.

Mrs. Holcombe asked about painting houses and Mrs. Bitar said approval is not required now because no Building Permit is needed. Mrs. Holcombe pointed out the Design Guidelines recommend appropriate colors. Mrs. Bitar said colors have been required as part of a larger project.

Mrs. Holcombe asked if somebody comes in and staff is in doubt, would you explain that you would discuss it at the next Architectural Review Board to see if the Board should review it?

Mrs. Bitar said if timing works out that way or if they are coming in early enough so to be on the next agenda they can make application.

The Board talked about adding porch replacement to the list.

Mr. Hunter said he thinks this is a good start for the list. He thought the Board could move forward with this list, understanding the list and actual Code change when ready must be approved by City Council

Mr. Hunter asked for a motion and Mr. Sauer moved:

**MOVED AND SECONDED THAT THIS LIST BE ATTACHED AS A FIRST LIST TO GO TO COUNCIL WITH THE CODE LANGUAGE.**

Mrs. Rodgers seconded the motion and all members voted aye.

Mr. Coulter asked if there was anything on East Wilson Bridge.

Mrs. Bitar said there is a meeting tomorrow morning with the consultants to set a schedule. Staff is hoping that the Steering Committee will meet soon. Then we are hoping to have some of the property owners up on Wilson Bridge Road as people who come to the visioning session. There is going to be more lag time because we need to not only identify who the right people are at those properties but to contact them and get them to come.

Mr. Coulter said how about the old CVS site? Mr. Hunter said the Garden Center is in. Mrs. Bitar said it is a positive thing for that corner.

Mr. Hunter asked if there was anything else to come before the ARB.

### **E. Adjournment**

Mr. Coulter moved to adjourn and Mr. Sauer seconded the motion. All members said aye. The meeting was adjourned at 9:35p.m.