

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

May 27, 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: Richard Hunter, Chair; Kathy Holcombe, Secretary; Chris Hermann; Amy Lloyd; and Jo Rodgers. Also present was Development Coordinator Lynda Bitar. Council Member David Foust arrived late. Members absent: J. Sauer, Vice-Chair and Mikel Coulter.

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

1. Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Approval of minutes

There were no minutes to approve.

4. Affirmation/Swearing in of Witnesses

Mrs. Bitar swore in those who planned to speak.

B. Architectural Review Board

1. Unfinished Business

- a. Replace Fence and Roof, Re-paint, New Door and Window – **794 Evening St.** (Tom Zack) **AR 25-10**

Mrs. Bitar indicated this item was on the agenda for the last Board meeting. Some of the items under consideration were not originally a part of the application, such as the front door, new window and the new copper gutters. The previous discussion indicated the roof is slate, but it is actually a manufactured product that looks like slate. The fence, arbor, a portion of the roof and the house color are a part of this application for approval. Only the front portion of the roof was replaced. There is a dead tree in the front yard that needs to be removed.

The findings of fact as indicated in the staff memorandum:

ARB and MPC Meeting—April 8, 2010

1. *The applicant is asking for approval for changing the roof from 3-tab shingle to slate, painting the house brown, and replacing a fence. Only the front portion of the roof has slate shingles.*
2. *Removal of an existing chain link fence and replacement with a wood fence painted white is proposed. The fence is described as having 1" x 4" wood slats, but detail of exact location and style (including dimensions) of the fence are still needed. The proposed fence will replace the chain link fence on the south side of the house, and will match the style of the adjacent picket fence to the south.*
3. *A 7' high arbor is also proposed. The arbor would need a variance for its placement in proximity to the property line as a structure, or its height as a fence. A variance application is on the Board of Zoning Appeals agenda for June 3, 2010.*
4. The applicant has installed a new front door and window above, and new gutters and downspouts that also need approval.

The conclusions as indicated in the staff memorandum:

1. Although the new roofing and paint may be appropriate, some discord is created with the different styles of roofing.
2. The new door, window, gutters and downspouts are appropriate.
3. The proposed fence and arbor are appropriate, with approval of the Board of Zoning Appeals of a variance for the arbor.

Seth Cramer, 806 Evening Street, Worthington, Ohio, came forward and provided photographs of the roof that displayed the different roof types.

Mr. Hunter clarified it is a composite roof designed to look like slate, not a slate roof.

Mr. Cramer indicated there are four different styles of roof between the house and the garage.

Mr. Richard Zack came forward and indicated he is the son of Mr. Tom Zack.

Mr. Hunter asked whether Mr. Tom Zack was present. Mr. Richard Zack indicated he was out of town.

Mr. Hunter indicated there was a problem because the roof was represented as slate and it is not slate. He also indicated he does not like to review work after it was completed, however he votes based on how he would have voted if the work was not already done. He indicated he would not have approved the roof if it came in front of the Board before the work was done because only half the work was done and the material was misrepresented.

Mr. Zack indicated there are not four different roofs on the house. Mr. Hunter indicated he counts three different roofs on the house.

Mrs. Holcombe said the house looks good from the street, but the neighbors see this house too. She stated the Board considers not only the front of the house, but also the other sides of the house and how it appears from neighboring property owners. Mrs. Holcombe indicated the Board needs to discuss the situation with the applicant.

Mr. Hunter asked whether anyone from the audience wanted to speak and indicated the Board expects to table the item, so it will come before the Board again.

A member from the audience asked for clarification as to whether all of the work, not just the roof, would be discussed the next time. Mr. Hunter indicated that would be the case.

Mr. Hunter apologized for not noticing the appearance from the other sides of the house. He does not usually trespass on private property to review a property.

Mrs. Holcombe moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY TOM ZACK FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO REPLACE THE ROOF AND FENCE, RE-PAINT THE HOUSE AND INSTALL A NEW DOOR AND WINDOW AT 794 EVENING STREET AS PER CASE NO. AR 25-10, DRAWINGS NO. AR 25-10, DATED APRIL 30, 2010, BE TABLED.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Hermann. The motion was approved unanimously.

1. New

- a. Extension of Previous Approval - Pump Changes (AR 63-08) – **640 High St.** (Sam Langley/BP) **AR 27-10**

Mrs. Bitar indicated this request extends the approval date from the previous Certificate of Appropriateness which was issued in October 2008. They were requesting to put a new face on the pumps. She showed an image of the proposed pump and indicated the same change was made at the other BP station at Wilson Bridge and High Street.

As indicated in the staff memorandum, this application was originally approved by the ARB on October 9, 2008, and approvals are only valid for 18 months. The applicant would like permission to install the pump graphics as was previously approved.

The findings of fact, as indicated in the staff memorandum:

ARB and MPC Meeting—April 8, 2010

1. BP would like to add graphics identifying “Invigorate” to all of the pumps. The graphics were in place, but were removed at the City’s request awaiting Architectural Review Board approval.
2. Although the drawing of the pump included with the application indicates a pump topper, there is no other indication that portion will be added or the basic pump style will change. The graphic change will be to the base of each pump, below the price indicator area. The previous approval was only for the base.
3. The new graphic is white, light green and blue. A sample has been submitted.

The conclusions as indicated in the staff memorandum:

1. The addition of the proposed graphics does not alter the character of the site or neighborhood.
2. Placement should be limited to the faces of the pumps and not allowed on the sides.

The applicant was not present.

Mr. Hunter asked for comments from the audience. There were no comments.

Mr. Hunter stated since this item was previously heard, he had no problem moving forward without an applicant.

Mrs. Rodgers moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY SAM LANGLEY ON BEHALF OF BP TO EXTEND THE APPROVAL OF CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS AR 63-08 TO PLACE GRAPHICS ON THE PUMPS AT 640 HIGH ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 27-10, DRAWINGS NO. AR 27-10, DATED MAY 10, 2010, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Hermann.

Mrs. Bitar called the roll:

Yes	5	Hunter, Holcombe, Hermann, Lloyd, Rodgers
No	0	

b. Roof & Siding – **45 W. Short St.** (Todd Musgrove) **AR 28-10**

Mrs. Bitar stated the applicant is proposing architectural shingles in place of three-tab shingles and new HardieShingle siding in place of wood siding. The colors are proposed to be changed. Mrs. Bitar showed images of the proposed appearance and indicated staff does not have concerns.

The findings of fact as stated in the staff memorandum:

1. The applicant is proposing new colors and design/materials for the roof and siding.
2. The existing green 3-tab asphalt shingle roof will be replaced with brown architectural asphalt shingles.
3. Existing gray wood siding shingles will be replaced with “HardieShingles” which are tan in color. The basic design of the new shingles will match the existing.

The conclusion as stated in the staff memorandum:

1. The proposed changes are appropriate.

The applicant, Todd Musgrove, 45 W. Short Street, Worthington, Ohio came forward and stated he was asking for one color of roof and it is not slate.

Mrs. Lloyd and Mrs. Holcombe stated they thought the proposal looked nice.

Mr. Hermann moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY TODD MUSGROVE FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO REPLACE THE ROOF AND SIDING AT 45 W. SHORT STREET, AS PER CASE NO. AR 28-10, DRAWINGS NO. AR 28-10, DATED MAY 10, 2010, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

The motion was seconded by Mrs. Holcombe.

Mrs. Bitar called the roll:

Yes	5	Hunter, Holcombe, Hermann, Lloyd, Rodgers
No	0	

c. Fence – **117 E. North St.** (Lee's Fencing Co.) **AR 29-10**

Mrs. Bitar stated this is a proposal to fence the rear yard of this home. The proposed fence will enclose the back yard and include a gate between the house and garage. Mrs. Bitar showed an image of the originally proposed fence which is a scalloped picket fence with a low point of 48 inches and a high point of 54 inches on the scallop. The pickets are four inches and the space between fences is two inches. Typically, the Board likes to see a more open style fence with a height of no more than three or four feet. The applicant is requesting this fence style to contain their dogs. There is vegetation around the yard, which does not appear to be year-round vegetation.

The findings of fact as stated in the staff memorandum:

1. A scalloped picket fence is proposed to enclose the rear yard of this property.
2. At the top of the scallops, fence height is 54"; at the bottom fence height is 48".
3. Four-inch wide pickets with two-inch spacing between pickets is proposed.
4. The recommendation for fences in the Design Guidelines calls for fences to be open style and three to four feet in height.

The conclusion as stated in the staff memorandum:

1. The proposed fence does not meet the typically approved style for the district; however, the Architectural Review Board has in some instances approved fences that are higher and not at least 50% open.

The applicant, Paul Rogers, 1888 Tamarack Circle South, Columbus, Ohio, came forward. He stated he knows the Board's preferences and the homeowner is willing to make concessions. They are trying to contain a golden retriever and are concerned that the dog will be able to get over a lower fence. He suggested a fence that averages height of 48"; 51" at the highest point and 45" at the lowest. Regarding the spacing, if you space the pickets too far apart on a scalloped fence, you lose the curvature.

Mr. Hunter stated he likes the style of fence.

In response to a question from Mr. Hunter, Mr. Rogers stated the proposal would have the pickets two inches wide, which will become 2.5 inches once the lumber shrinks.

Mr. Hermann stated he prefers to keep a fence no more than four feet tall when it is along the property perimeter. He is willing to consider an average. He would also like to see close to 50% on the spacing on a perimeter fence.

Mrs. Lloyd asked for clarification on how the 50% is determined. Mrs. Bitar stated it is interpreted that the spacing should be the same width as the picket.

Mr. Rogers indicated this property borders multi-family in some directions. Mr. Hunter stated the Board has allowed privacy fences when properties border multi-family.

Mr. Hunter asked for comments from the audience. No one came forward.

Mrs. Holcombe indicated she would like to see more spacing. As proposed, she thinks it looks too much like a privacy fence. She is not bothered by the height, particularly when considering the average.

The Board considered the images presented by the applicant.

Mr. Hunter stated he thinks a fence with four-inch pickets and three inches of spacing with a height no higher than 54” could get support from the Board.

Mr. Hunter indicated Mr. Foust, the representative from City Council, arrived at the meeting.

Mr. Hermann moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY LEE’S FENCING CO. FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO CONSTRUCT A FENCE AT 117 E. NORTH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 29-10, DRAWINGS NO. AR 29-10, DATED MAY 13, 2010, BE APPROVED WITH THE CONDITIONS THAT THE SPACING BETWEEN THE FOUR-INCH PICKETS BE THREE INCHES AND THE HEIGHT OF THE FENCE NOT EXCEED AN AVERAGE OF FOUR FEET (51” HIGH AND 45” LOW) BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

The motion was seconded by Mrs. Holcombe.

Mrs. Bitar called the roll:

Yes 5 Hunter, Holcombe, Hermann, Lloyd, Rodgers

No 0

d. Screened Porch – 235 W. Dublin-Granville Rd. (The Dublin Framing Co.) AR 30-10

Mrs. Bitar stated this application is for a screened porch on the rear of the house, on the east side, in place of an existing patio. A new foundation will be installed. She showed

images of the proposal. Mrs. Bitar indicated the submitted drawings do not show a screened porch, but rather a finished room. The proposal is for a porch with screens from top to bottom with white-painted wood between the screens and the door facing to the rear. There is an existing all-season room on the other side at the back of the home. The proposed screened porch will have the same style and profile but not finished like the all-season room.

The findings of fact as stated in the staff memorandum:

1. A screened porch is proposed for the southeast corner of the house, in place of an existing patio.
2. The proposed porch will be constructed of wood, and have roof shingles to match the existing house roof as closely as possible. Screens and a storm door are proposed.
3. The drawings in the application seem to be different from the description of the screened porch. Clarification is needed.

The conclusion as stated in the staff memorandum:

1. Installation of a screened porch to the rear of this house is appropriate.

The applicant, John Flannigan, 6767 Fallen Timbers Drive, Dublin, Ohio, came forward. He indicated he has revised drawings but he was at the emergency room all day and he came straight from the hospital and does not have them with him. Mr. Flannigan indicated the new drawings reflect the information already described.

Mrs. Bitar asked if it will have the same base. Mr. Flannigan indicated it will be almost a mirror image except the door will be in the rear and instead of windows it will have screens. Mrs. Bitar asked about the door. Mr. Flannigan indicated it will be a single storm door, not a standard door.

Mrs. Lloyd asked what will happen with one of the windows. Mr. Flannigan indicated they will do a window well in the roof which will not be visible from the ground, but will enable the window to remain operable.

Mr. Hermann indicated he is not normally comfortable with approving something for which they have not seen drawings. However, he feels comfortable approving this item as long as Mrs. Bitar receives drawings that reflect what has been verbally described. Mr. Hunter concurred the drawings need to be given to Mrs. Bitar.

Mr. Hunter asked for comments from the audience. No one came forward.

Mrs. Holcombe moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY THE DUBLIN FRAMING CO. FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO CONSTRUCT A SCREENED PORCH AT 235 W. DUBLIN-GRANVILLE RD., AS PER CASE NO. AR 30-10, DRAWINGS NO. AR 30-10, DATED MAY 27, 2010, WITH THE SCREEN PORCH TO MIRROR THE EXISTING PORCH, WITHOUT WINDOWS, A SINGLE DOOR ON THE BACK SIDE, SUBJECT TO FINAL APPROVAL BY STAFF, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

The motion was seconded by Mrs. Rodgers.

Mrs. Bitar called the roll:

Yes **5** Hunter, Holcombe, Hermann, Lloyd, Rodgers

No **0**

C. Municipal Planning Commission

Mr. Hunter stated there are only three of the five members of the Municipal Planning Commission present, thus approval requires support from all three members. Applicants may ask to table until the full Commission is present, which would need the support from the Commission to table.

1. Conditional Use Permit

a. Restaurant in C-5 – **681 High St.** (Barbara McCracken Bussa) **CU 03-10**

Mr. Hunter stated he understood the applicant wishes to table this item.

Mrs. Bitar stated the applicant has requested it be tabled.

Mr. Hunter indicated if tabled, it would be heard on June 10, 2010.

The findings of fact as stated in the staff memorandum:

1. The applicant is proposing a coffee house, The Purple Finch Café, for the northern half of the former Curio Cabinet space. The business will offer light fare (no kitchen will be installed) such as baked goods, salads, wraps and smoothies in addition to coffee and tea. There will be live music (ie. easy listening piano and guitar) throughout the week.

2. Indoor and outdoor seating is proposed for the space. A layout of the outdoor seating in front and in the passage on the north side of the building is needed.
3. The café will not be open longer than 7:00 am to midnight every day.
4. Architectural Review Board approval will be needed for all exterior elements that are part of the proposal.

The conclusions as stated in the staff memorandum:

1. There will be a minimal effect on traffic patterns (addition of tables in the sidewalk area); public facilities; sewerage and drainage facilities; and utilities.
2. No safety or health considerations, or environmental hazards have been identified.
3. The business seems compatible with the neighborhood.

Mr. Hermann moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY BARBARA MCCRACKEN BUSSA FOR A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO OPERATE A RESTAURANT IN THE C-5 ZONING DISTRICT AT 615 HIGH STREET AS PER CASE NO. CU 02-10, DRAWINGS NO. CU 02-10, DATED APRIL 29, 2010, BE TABLED.

The motion was seconded by Mrs. Holcombe. The motion was approved unanimously.

2. Rezoning

- a. AR 4.5, Low Density Apartment to C-5, Central Commercial – **38-40 E. New England Ave.** (John & Maureen Coffey) **REZ 05-10**

Ms. Bitar said this property is adjacent to the municipal parking lot. The property started as a single family home, was converted to a duplex, and then converted back to a single by the applicant. The applicant has requested zoning to the C-5 Zoning District. This property has two parcels, one with the house on it and a smaller one to the north. This is at the rear of a parcel with two single-family homes. There is R-10 zoning to the north and south, and C-5 to the west. The property is currently zoned AR-4.5. The land uses do not match the zoning in all cases. Currently, there are commercial use (print shop) and commercial parking to the north. There is AR-4.5, which is part of the Lodge property, to the south. The R-10 directly to the south is used as a driveway for the parking lot of the Methodist Church and green space. There are single family homes to the east and southeast on the corner of Hartford and New England. The applicants stated they have had difficulty using the home as single family mostly due to the driveway to the

commercial parking lot, which is in an easement on their property. They have children and don't want them near the traffic on the driveway. The property is a nice home and needs a little maintenance. Mrs. Bitar showed pictures of the property and the neighboring properties. A recommendation from the Municipal Planning Commission to City Council is requested.

The findings of fact as stated in the staff memorandum:

1. The applicants, John and Maureen Coffey, are asking for approval to rezone this property (two parcels) from residential to commercial. The main parcel that the house sits on is currently zoned for multi-family use. A small contiguous parcel to the north, which is the site of commercial parking, is zoned for single-family residential. The requested C-5 Zoning District is the primary district for Old Worthington commercial properties.
2. This property is adjacent to C-5 zoning to the west (the municipal parking lot and the lot behind the shops on the east side of High St.); R-10 Zoning to the north (print shop, commercial parking, and a rear residential structure on a two-structure lot); AR 4.5 to the east (single-family house - rental property); and R-10 and AR 4.5 on the south side of New England Ave. (parcel owned by Grand Lodge – green space and drive for Methodist Church; single-family house). The zoning map for the area is included in your packet, attached to the Ordinance.
3. 38-40 E. New England Avenue had been converted from a single-family home to a two-family in the first half of the twentieth century. In the last decade, the current owners changed it back to a single-family structure. They express difficulty living in the house due to the commercial traffic on the property. An access drive to the commercial parking to the northwest is on the west side of the property, next to the house.
4. If the requested rezoning is approved, the owner's intent is to open an antique store in the existing building - preserving the structure and maintaining the residential character as much as possible.
5. City Council referred the rezoning Ordinance to the Municipal Planning Commission after its introduction for investigation and report. When the Municipal Planning Commission's recommendation is given to Council, Council will set a date for public hearing.

The conclusions as stated in the staff memorandum:

1. Although the current zoning does not reflect it, this property has commercial uses on three sides (south – church drive; west – parking lot; north – parking lot and print shop); and a commercial drive on the property.

2. Protection of this structure and the ability for the general public to enter is desirable.
3. The addition of an antique store should draw additional consumers to Old Worthington.

The applicant, John Coffey, 720 Village Boulevard, Unit F, Plain City, Ohio, came forward. Mr. Coffey stated he thinks an antique business is the appropriate use for the house. He stated he cares about the property and the architecture of the house. He started his restoration on the inside of the house and removed many layers to get to the original oak. He thinks there is a way to accomplish his proposal and have minimal impacts on the property. Mr. Coffey would like to rezone the property to C-5 in order to run an antique shop. There is commercial activity on three sides and much of the residential property is rental. This property has come before the Board before when Dr. Jerman wanted to level the building in 1999. He is glad that proposal was turned down. He and his wife, Maureen, purchased the house in 2003 and began restoration. Mr. Coffey attempted to have the easement for the commercial drive removed in 2005. The lack of privacy and safety concerns (he was hit in the driveway) prompted Mr. Coffey to leave his home and relocate his family to a condo in Plain City. Since that time, the house has sat with very little maintenance and served as storage for his antique shop. Mr. Coffey felt the property could never be effectively used as a single family property. He showed photographs and a video of the parking lot and driveway. Mr. Coffey stated the house was built in 1909 (not as shown in the Franklin County records that indicate it was built in the 1920s) for a dry goods and shoe merchant. The house was converted around 1932. The house was originally mustard with black sashes. Mr. Coffey explained he is an antique dealer and restoration expert. He believes this property is one of the best transitional bungalows in Worthington and the business will open it up to the public. He stated this is expanding commercial, but this house does not lend itself to being a single family home and the antique shop is a good fit. Mr. Coffey stated the antique shop will promote Worthington and Worthington businesses.

Mr. Hunter agreed the business and use as an antique shop would be an asset to the area and a good use for the house. He concurs that he does not think it will be a single family home. He was disappointed when the plan to create a municipal parking lot fell through because the easement should have been eliminated. However, zoning sets the use for the property, not for the owner. When Mr. Coffey moves on, the property will remain C-5. Mr. Hunter said he was uncomfortable with permanently zoning the property C-5.

Ms. Holcombe agreed with Mr. Hunter's statement. She said as a realtor she had clients look at the house and declined purchasing it because of the burden of the easement. She said she almost got hit in the parking lot because of the loss of line of sight caused by the privacy fence around the commercial parking lot. Ms. Holcombe said that it is a fabulous house and Mr. Coffey's proposal would be a great fit for the area and would not have a greater impact than the Saturday Farmer's Market. She reiterated Mr. Hunter's earlier

ARB and MPC Meeting—April 8, 2010

comments that C-5 is not what the Commission wants because they cannot predict what the next owner will do. She would like to come up with some kind of conditional use.

Ms. Bitar presented the permitted and conditional uses for C-5. The permitted uses are sale of goods at retail, personal services, business services, specialty goods, arts and crafts, financial services, public uses, semipublic uses, social activities, essential services and accessory uses. Conditional uses are drive-in commercial uses, recreational facilities, printing and publishing, public service facility, entertainment facilities, theaters, off-street parking, motels and hotels, banks, administrative and business office, residential uses, bed and breakfast, medical/dental offices and restaurants. The higher impact uses are conditional uses.

Mr. Hermann said demolition of or additions to the property would need to come through the Municipal Planning Commission or the Architectural Review Board. The conditional uses would have to come through the Commission, so the Commission and the Architectural Review Board would have control over the property. Mr. Hermann added the proposal is a great idea and it would be great to add more businesses. He stated that if the property transitions to C-5, he thinks rather than the fence between the drive and the parking lot, the fence needs to be on the east property line. He would like to see the parking lot issue resolved.

Mr. Hermann asked how the print shop exists in the residential district. Mrs. Bitar stated it has been in existence longer than the zoning.

Mr. Foust inquired about conditional business uses for R-10. Mrs. Bitar stated only home occupations are allowed. Ms Bitar stated AR-4.5 allows bed and breakfast and non commercial recreational facility. Public and semi public uses (such as churches and schools) are allowed in all residential zoning districts, and therefore would be allowed without rezoning.

Mr. Hunter asked for comments from the audience.

Susan Finefrock, 687 Hartford Street, Worthington, Ohio, came forward and stated she is opposed to the proposal. She wants the residential zoning to be kept residential. Ms Finefrock said the owners were aware of the situation when they bought the property. It worked as a duplex, so it should have stayed as a duplex. She thinks this change encroaches on the neighboring properties.

Marian Grueling, 655 Hartford Street, Worthington, Ohio, came forward and stated she is in favor of the use as an antique shop, but is concerned about the use down the road when the next owner wants to use the property under another use that is allowed under C-5. She is also concerned that if the owner of the property between her property and the Coffey's decides to sell, that owner may want retail. That would put retail right beside her house.

Dr. Charles Allen, 665 Hartford Street, Worthington, Ohio, came forward and stated the Coffeys tried to run their antique business from the house after they moved in without approval. He stated the antique shop would not be an appropriate use in the area and there are no assurances someone will not be able to do something less desirable under the C-5 zoning. He stated if the Coffeys want to operate the antique business at the location, he suggested a Conditional Use Permit might be the best option. Mr. Hunter stated that is not an option in AR-4.5.

Mr. Hermann reiterated no one will be able to demolish the house or change the appearance of the exterior of the house without coming through the Architectural Review Board.

Mr. Hunter agreed that he would not vote for demolishing the house. He stated if the house fell in further disrepair, he doesn't know how the Board would vote. Mr. Hunter said he would like to see the parking lot situation solved and the easement lifted.

Mr. Coffey recounted his experience attempting to get all property owners in agreement to have the easement removed. He stated the City asked for property owners to give up their ownership interest. He approached the parties with a compromise solution and the agreement fell apart.

Mr. Foust said the Commission has always struggled with finding a way to balance the commercial and residential uses. He understands the challenges of living next to a public parking lot. Traditionally the City has tried to keep the commercial uses separate from the residential district. Multifamily housing is what is used as a buffer, but, if he had to pick a retail use as a buffer, it would be an antique shop. Mr. Foust asked whether there is a way to approve conditional zoning. Mrs. Bitar and Mr. Hermann stated they do not think it is possible. Mr. Foust recommended further research with the Law Director to find a way for conditional use that follows the business, not the property. He does not think a rezoning to C-5 benefits the neighbors and it yields much long-term future control. Regarding demolition, there are limitations to the control of the Municipal Planning Commission and Architectural Review Board in preventing it.

Mrs. Holcombe mentioned the Rectory which serves as a museum and antique shop. She thinks it is similar to the proposal from Mr. Coffey. Ms. Bitar said it is currently zoned R-10 and is allowed as a semi-public use. Mrs. Holcombe recommended to Mr. Coffey to table the proposal.

Mr. Hunter stated he agreed with the suggestion of tabling because Mr. Coffey does not have full backing of the Commission and he does not have the entire Commission present. He stated he would like to see Mr. Coffey's business at this location because it has low impact. High Road Gallery is an example of a low impact business that works.

If Mr. Coffey goes away, Mr. Hunter stated he would like to have control over what happens at the property.

Mr. Coffey stated he understands the concern. He would be supportive of a conditional approval.

Mrs. Holcombe stated she thinks there could be another answer for this property to allow the antique business, but the problem is the C-5 zoning.

Mr. Foust stated he would still like to explore the possibilities for conditional approval or other restricted approval.

Mr. Hunter asked for additional comments from the audience. No one came forward.

Mr. Hunter stated the importance of having minutes for the discussion so that absent Commission members have an opportunity to review the discussion on this item.

Mr. Hunter stated he is not hearing objection from the Commission to the proposal if a way can be found to control the uses on the property..

Mr. Hermann moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY JOHN AND MAUREEN COFFEY TO REZONE THE PROPERTY AT 38-40 E. NEW ENGLAND AVENUE FROM AR 4.5 TO C-5 AS PER CASE NO. REZ 05-10 BE TABLED.

The motion was seconded by Mrs. Holcombe. The motion was unanimously approved.

D. Other

1. Planning and Zoning Code Amendments

a. ARB – Administrative Approval of Certain Projects

Mrs. Bitar stated this item is not ready for discussion.

Mr. Hermann offered comments about growing interest from Sustainable Worthington and around the country in “dark skies” that do not allow any light to go up into the sky. Mrs. Bitar stated there is a local architect that has expressed interest in that for several years.

Mr. Hermann also indicated he would like to talk about installation size of landscaping. Two recent examples at the dentist’s office and Villa Nova have involved plants that he thinks are too

ARB and MPC Meeting—April 8, 2010

small. Mrs. Holcombe suggested the Board and Commission can begin specifying minimum planting sizes.

E. Adjournment

There being no further business, Mrs. Holcombe moved to adjourn with Mr. Hermann seconding the motion. All members voted aye. The meeting was adjourned at 9:15 p.m.