

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

July 8, 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; James Sauer, Vice-Chair; Kathy Holcombe, Secretary; Chris Hermann; Mikel Coulter; Amy Lloyd; and Jo Rodgers. Also present were Lynda Bitar, Development Coordinator and Clerk of the Municipal Planning Commission, and Melissa Cohan, Paralegal.

**A. Call to Order – 7:30 p.m.**

1. Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Approval of the Minutes of February 25, April 8, and June 24, 2010.

Mr. Coulter motioned to approve the minutes, Mr. Sauer seconded the motion, and all members said aye to approve the minutes as submitted.

4. Affirmation/Swearing in of Witnesses

Mrs. Bitar swore in those who planned to speak.

Mr. Hunter explained that Mr. David Foust, the Commission's liaison from City Council, has resigned from City Council because he is moving out of the district. He expressed his sadness and that the Board is going to miss him and his expert advice. Mr. Hunter also stated that a replacement will be appointed by City Council.

**B. Architectural Review Board**

1. New

- a. Fence – **97 W. North St.** (Kasey & Meribethe Ingram) **AR 42-10**

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts of the application and showed photos of the proposed site of the fence. Mr. Kasey Ingram, 97 W. North St., came to the microphone and explained that he and his wife have three children, age 5 and younger, and feel they need to protect their children from the street, and from bothering the neighbors. Mr. Ingram feels that his

children might be able to climb over a four foot high fence, and throw toys or other items onto the neighbor's property. A six foot fence would help prevent that from happening.

Mrs. Holcombe asked Mr. Ingram why he chose a six foot fence as opposed to a four foot fence if the gated portion of the fence is only four foot high. Mr. Ingram stated that his neighbors like to entertain on their back deck, and have dogs. He wants to avoid having the children tease the dogs or being bitten by the dogs, or disrupt the neighbors. He also thinks the six foot portion of the fence cannot be seen from the street, only the four foot portion.

Mr. Hunter asked the audience if there was anyone present either for or against Mr. Ingram's fence proposal. Mr. David Rankey approached the microphone and explained that he lives at 105 W. North Street, and stated that he is in favor of his neighbor's fence proposal. He said that the fence is just replacing the hedge that was there before, and the fence will give him peace of mind knowing that Mr. Ingram's children will be enclosed in a fence. It would increase the safety factor while he backs out of his driveway. Mrs. Holcombe said that she was okay with the fence application if the neighbors were in favor of it. Mrs. Lloyd agreed and stated that the fence was not much of an obstruction.

#### Findings of fact:

1. The applicants would like approval to erect fencing along the western portion of the property.
2. The proposed fence material is cedar and the style is 6" wide dog-eared pickets with 2-3" spacing between pickets. The style matches the existing fence on the property to the north.
3. Four foot high fencing is proposed by way of a 10' wide gate across the drive, and for 27' along the side property line at the rear of the property.
4. Six foot high fencing is proposed to connect to the 4' high gate and extend 34' to the south. A 3 1/2' wide 6' high gate will extend to the garage on the property to the north.
5. In the Design Guidelines for the Architectural Review District, the recommendation is for fences to be open in style, which has typically meant there is the same width opening between pickets as picket width.
6. The guidelines prescribe residential fences be 3' – 4' in height.

#### Conclusion:

1. The proposed fence is appropriate at this location

Mrs. Holcombe made a motion:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY KASEY & MERIBETHE INGRAM FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL FENCING AT 97 W. NORTH ST AND MATCHES THE NEIGHBORS FENCE. AS PER CASE NO. AR 42-10, DRAWINGS NO. AR 42-10, DATED JUNE 18, 2010, 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. Hunter, aye; Mr. Sauer, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Hermann, aye; Mr. Coulter, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye; Mrs. Rodgers, aye. Mr. Hunter said it has been approved.

**b. Fence – 682 Oxford St. (Michael & Mindy Go) AR 43-10**

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the applicant's request to install a fence in their back yard. The applicant, Mr. Michael Go approached the microphone and explained that his property is next to a commercial lot and there is a constant flow of public traffic in his back yard. He and his wife are concerned about the safety of their children and pets. The fence would provide privacy as well as aesthetics. He plans to have his back yard professionally designed so they have more living space. Mr. Hunter asked the applicant how close his property is to the street and Mr. Go replied that it is close. Mr. Sauer asked if there was still a dumpster in the back of the commercial lot, and Mr. Go replied yes.

Mrs. Holcombe said that the proposed fencing is not consistent with the Design Guidelines, and what the ARB has tried to achieve in the District, because of the lack of spacing. Mr. Go said that was necessary due to the proximity to commercial property. Mrs. Barbara Webster who lives at 709 Wesley Court approached the microphone. She was sworn in by Mrs. Bitar before speaking. Mrs. Webster explained that she lives in the condominium behind Mr. and Mrs. Go's house and that they have no problem with Mr. Go's plans. Her only concern was having access to the commercial area where a path has already been established, and Mr. Go had reassured her that her path would not be affected. Mrs. Holcombe asked Mr. Go about the other neighbor, and he replied that she is okay with his plans, but is in the process of moving. Mr. Hermann felt any proposed solid fencing should be on the south property line of the property to the south, not between the two properties.

Findings of fact:

1. A 6' high board on board cedar fence is proposed for installation across the rear and south sides of the property.
2. The rear of this property is adjacent to commercial property. To the south, there is one property between this property and the municipal parking lot. Some of the area adjacent to the parking lot has vegetation that totally screens from the

residential properties at this time of year (appears seasonal). There are other portions that offer little or no screening.

3. A 6' high fence exists between the two residential properties at the west end between the houses. The proposed would be an extension of that fence to the rear of the property.
4. In the Design Guidelines, residential fences are recommended to be 3' – 4' in height, but higher fences may be appropriate where a commercial use abuts a residential property.

Conclusions:

1. Six foot high fencing is appropriate at the rear property line.
2. This property does not abut the commercial property to the south, but there is a clear view between the back yard and parking lot making 6' high solid fencing appropriate.

Mr. Coulter motioned:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY MICHAEL & MINDY GO FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL FENCING AT 682 OXFORD ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 43-10, DRAWINGS NO. AR 43-10, DATED JUNE 25, 2010, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.**

Mr. Sauer seconded. Mrs. Bitar called the roll. Mr. Hunter, aye; Mr. Sauer, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Hermann, nay; Mr. Coulter, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye; Mrs. Rodgers, aye. Mr. Hunter said it has been approved.

D. Other

Mrs. Bitar made an announcement about the upcoming Wilson Bridge Road Walking Tour and invited everyone to the event. It will take place on Saturday, July 17, 2010, at 9:00 a.m. The tour will begin at 345 E. Wilson Bridge Rd (Community Center) and the walk will head west to the Olentangy Parklands where a bus will be available for transportation back to the Community Center. Good walking shoes and your own water bottle will be necessary.

Mr. Coulter made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mrs. Holcombe seconded. All members said aye. Meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.