



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

July 10, 2014

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: James Sauer, Vice Chair; Kathy Holcombe, Secretary; Mikel Coulter; Thomas Reis; Amy Lloyd; and Jo Rodgers. Also present were: Lynda Bitar, Planning Coordinator and Clerk of the Municipal Planning Commission; and Melissa Cohan, Paralegal. Richard Hunter, Chair; and Scott Myers, Worthington City Council Representative for the Municipal Planning Commission were absent.

A. Call to Order – 7:30 p.m.

1. Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Approval of minutes of the June 26, 2014 meeting

Mr. Coulter moved to approve the minutes, and Mrs. Holcombe seconded the motion. All members voted, "Aye".

4. Affirmation/swearing in of witnesses

B. Architectural Review Board

1. New

- a. Fencing – **550 Hartford St.** (Outdoor FX/Heskett) **AR 35-14**

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mr. Sauer asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Ben Heskett approached the microphone and stated his address is 550 Hartford St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Heskett said the fence will not be visible from South Street and he has the approval of the neighboring property owners. Mr. Heskett said he would like to have a solid privacy fence around the area of his hot tub that will be sixteen feet in length, five feet high with

dog eared panels. The rest of the fencing would be shadowbox style, thirty-two feet in length, four feet high, with no gates. Mr. Heskett said that Home Depot will be installing the fence.

Mrs. Rodgers asked Mr. Heskett if he realized that the Design Guidelines for the Architectural Review area recommend picket style of fencing with spacing in between the pickets that are equal to the width of the picket. Mr. Heskett said he likes the style of the shadowbox style of fencing better than the picket style, and shadowbox gives more privacy.

Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Heskett why he is not building the entire fence using the shadow box style of fencing, and why he needed the two different heights. Mr. Heskett said he was not sure if the shadowbox fencing was available in the five foot height.

Mr. Sauer asked Mr. Heskett why he needed the solid fencing to be five feet high, and Mr. Heskett said he needed the higher fencing around the hot tub area for privacy reasons. Mr. Sauer said the Board typically does not like to approve five foot fences, nor solid fences.

Mr. Coulter asked if Mr. Heskett could get the shadowbox style of fencing in five foot high style, if that is what he would prefer. Mr. Heskett said he probably would prefer that.

Mrs. Rodgers said she was struggling with approving a solid fence in the Architectural Review area. Solid or shadowbox style of fencing has been approved in the past when residential properties are adjacent to commercial properties or have sight lines on the property. Mrs. Rodgers said she is not comfortable voting for a higher fence just based on the owner's taste of style because she would have a difficult time telling someone else that they could not have a solid fence because they think the fence looks better.

Mrs. Holcombe said she believes a shadowbox style of fence around the hot tub area for privacy would be fine. She said she had no problem with the hot tub being screened from the neighbors' property. Mr. Coulter said he agreed with Mrs. Holcombe. Mr. Reis said he would be okay with the shadowbox style of fence around the hot tub if the rest of the fence was a standard picket style fence. Mr. Sauer asked Mr. Heskett what the color of the fence would be and Mr. Heskett said the fence will be natural. Mr. Sauer asked if there was anybody present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This property is a corner lot, with a 1961 Colonial Revival house facing Hartford St. and located approximately 14' from the right-of-way line. The south side of the house is about 35' from the South St. right-of-way. On the east side, the main part of the house is about 25' from the property line; an addition is approximately 15' from the property line; and a patio and hot tub are closer. There is vegetation along the east property line, and an existing fence amongst the landscaping. The homeowners would like to install new wood fencing east of the house.

Project Details:

1. The 48' of proposed fencing would be located about 10' from the east property line. The 16' of fencing furthest to the south is proposed as a 5' high shadowbox fence, and would screen the hot tub; and the 32' of fencing north is proposed as a 4' high open style picket fence.
2. The setback from South St. would need to be at least 20' to meet Code requirements.
3. The existing vegetation will remain.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Fencing should be open in style; constructed with traditional materials; 3' to 4' in height; in the back yard; and of simple design, appropriate for the house style. Design and materials should be compatible with the existing structure.

Recommendation:

The narrowness of the rear yard may warrant approval of more solid fencing than is recommended in the Design Guidelines.

Mr. Coulter moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY OUTDOOR FX FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL FENCING AT 550 HARTFORD ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 35-14, DRAWINGS NO. AR 35-14, DATED JUNE 18, 2014, AS AMENDED THAT A 5 FOOT SHADOWBOX FENCE SHALL BE AT THE HOT TUB AND THAT A 4 FOOT OPEN STYLE PICKET FENCE WILL BE TO THE NORTH, 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. Sauer, nay; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Coulter, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye; and Mrs. Rodgers, nay. The motion was approved.

b. Fencing – **5750 N. High St.** (A:Z Contracting/St. Michael Catholic Church) **AR 36-14**

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mr. Sauer asked if the applicant was present. Ms. Sheri Rogers, representing St. Michael church of 5750 N. High St., Worthington, Ohio came forward. Board members did not have any questions. Mr. Sauer asked if there was anyone present in the audience that wished to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

St. Michael Catholic Church has operated an elementary school for many years, and is now planning to open a preschool. In order to meet the state requirements, the preschool has to have its own playground. This request involves fencing in a portion of an existing play area on the north side of the property.

Project Details:

1. Green galvanized chain link fencing is proposed for the enclosure. Similar fencing is used for a ball field at the northeast corner of the site, but the proposed fencing may be a darker shade of green.
2. The area would be approximately 35' wide by 17' deep, and adjacent to the parking lot. A gate is proposed on the west side.
3. The proposed fence is 4' in height.
4. An existing solid wood fence would block the view from the north.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Fencing should be constructed with traditional materials and appropriate for the site.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending *approval* of this application. Although green chain link is not traditional material, it is commonly used and appropriate for school related sites and would not be seen from the right-of-way.

Mrs. Rodgers moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY A:Z CONTRACTING FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL FENCING AT 5750 N. HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 36-14, DRAWINGS NO. AR 36-14, DATED JUNE 20, 2014, BE APPROVED BASED 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. Sauer, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Coulter, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye; and Mrs. Rodgers, aye. The motion was approved.

- c. Window Relocation – **581 Oxford St.** (Owens Construction/Holub) **AR 37-14**
(Amendment to AR 11-14)

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mr. Sauer asked if the applicant was present. Mrs. Sabine Holub approached the microphone and stated her address is 581 Oxford St., Worthington, Ohio. Mrs. Holub said the window will be relocated to her laundry room and she wants to be able to look outside and see nature while she folds laundry. Mr. Sauer asked if her application originally included relocating the air conditioning units. Mrs. Bitar said the issue is

something that recently came up with a call from the contractor asking what it would take to relocate the air conditioning units to the north side of the house. Mrs. Bitar said one was there previously and had a variance. The second unit would need a variance. Mrs. Bitar said the location would not be adjacent to another house. Mr. Coulter asked Mrs. Holub if she would like to move both units to the north, and she said she would like the option to do that because she said she still needs to discuss pricing with her contractor.

Mrs. Holcombe asked Mrs. Holub if she considered using a double hung window and Mrs. Holub said yes, but wanted to reuse the existing window. Mr. Sauer asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This Farmhouse was originally constructed in 1857, and has been added onto over the years. This property is 97' wide, which is larger than many lots in the neighborhood. The homeowners gained approval in April to construct a 3 season room addition and deck to the rear, and a covered walkway between the garage and a side entrance. Relocation of an existing window is requested with this application.

Project Details:

1. A small sliding window is on the west side of the house, and would have been covered by the proposed addition.
2. The proposed location for the window is on the south, west of the side entrance to the house.
3. An existing radon system on the south side is proposed to be moved; the new location has not been identified.
4. The homeowner would like the option of moving the condensing units to the north side of the house. A variance for extending into the side yard setback would be needed for one of the units; the other already has a variance.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Avoid use of inappropriate window designs, and pay attention to the size, shape and materials of the individual window units and the overall harmonious relationship of window openings

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending approval of this application. Relocation of the window is appropriate.

Mr. Coulter moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY OWENS CONSTRUCTION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO RELOCATE A WINDOW AT 581 OXFORD ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 37-14, DRAWINGS NO. AR 37-14, DATED JUNE 24, 2014, AND THAT THE AIR CONDITIONING UNITS CAN BE MOVED TO THE NORTH SIDE AT THE

OWNER'S OPTION, AND BE APPROVED BASED 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. Sauer, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Coulter, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye; and Mrs. Rodgers, aye. The motion was approved.

C. Municipal Planning Commission

1. Amendment to Development Plan

- a. Parking Lot and Landscaping Modifications – **835 Proprietors Rd.** (Simsbury Investments, LLC) **ADP 06-14**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mr. Sauer asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Chris Vince approached the microphone and stated he is the developer for 835 Proprietors Rd., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Vince said Mrs. Bitar gave a very thorough explanation of the project. Mr. Vince said he plans to clean up the back area and add landscaping, filling the void areas with trees and shrubs. Mr. Vince said the parking lot area had to be reduced and he discussed the reasoning. He said because of the reduction of space he was concerned about cars turning into the garages so he eliminated the screening in front of the air conditioning units. Mr. Vince said the parking lot would also be difficult to plow with the islands, so that is another reason he decided to eliminate the island areas. Mr. Coulter said he agreed with Mr. Vince's reasoning about the island areas and snow plowing would have been difficult. Mr. Coulter said he would like to make sure that plantings will go in the space between the fence and curb, with the additional trees and beds. Mr. Vince agreed and said he wants to make sure the area looks nice.

Mrs. Holcombe asked Mr. Vince how he will maintain the other (west) side of the fence. Mr. Vince said he will not be maintaining that area. He said that fence line has been there for so long that the neighbors just assume that area belongs to them. Mrs. Holcombe said she understood the reasoning for the elimination of the islands in front of the air conditioning units and that the area will be easier to plow the snow without them. Mr. Sauer asked if there was anyone else that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

After demolition of existing Worthington Foods offices, combination of lots into a single parcel, and rezoning to multi-family residential, a Development Plan was approved for this site in 2005. The plan included 2 three-story buildings with parking on the first floor that were to be mirror images of each other. Each building was to have a footprint of roughly 13,600 square feet (sf), and have 16 units ranging in size from 950 – 1530 sf. After approval, the southern building was constructed as proposed, with the intent of selling the units as condominiums. A downturn in the

market left the building vacant for several years, until the current owner purchased the property at the end of 2010, and finished and rented the units.

In November, 2012, approval of a building with 10 townhouses was granted for the northern portion of the site. When Simsbury Place was originally approved, a variance was granted to allow 32 units on the site; the reduction in numbers of units was acceptable. Also, variances were granted for exceeding the maximum percentage of lot coverage for buildings; front yard setback for the building; and rear yard setback for the parking.

During construction, changes were made at the rear of the site to allow preservation of trees near the property line, and retention of other existing vegetation. Approval of those changes is requested with this application.

Project Details:

1. A 6' high solid wood fence was approved for placement along the rear property line. East of the fence there was to be landscaping; 4 tree islands in the parking lot; and small landscape islands near the garages to screen the condensing units.
 - During construction, it was decided the fence could not be placed at the property line without removing trees and other vegetation, so the fence was installed 6' from the property line.
 - The area between the fence and the parking lot curb was also widened to accommodate existing plants. The proposed landscaping in this area has changed to allow for retention of existing mature plants. Eight 3" caliper Cleveland Select Pear trees, and 17 dwarf burning bushes are proposed to fill in the gaps.
 - The parking spaces along the curb are 18' deep; this leaves about 17' for the drive aisle. Tree islands were eliminated to allow for increased maneuverability.
 - The planting areas between the garages were eliminated due to lack of room to extend into the pavement, and it was felt plants could not grow in the planting islands near the condensing units.
2. A revised landscape plan has been submitted that does not graphically show the changes to the site, except one version shows the correct dimensions.
3. Variances for the following discrepancies would need to be granted by City Council:
 - Parking space size 171 sf (typically 9' x 19') required; 162 sf (9' x 18') provided
 - 22' drive aisle required; 17' provided.
4. The owners must combine the parcels to be in compliance with previous approvals.

Land Use Plans and Code Requirements:

Worthington Comprehensive Plan

The Plan identifies Proprietors Rd. as an existing multi-family residential corridor where urban village residential redevelopment could successfully occur within Worthington. Redevelopment plans should substantially improve on the existing development.

Section 1173.01 Community Development Projects

Amendments to approved development plans should keep the character of the development. Changes must be forwarded to City Council if the plan does not comply with the Planning and Zoning Code.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending *approval* of this application. Although the parking area is more constrained, retention of existing mature vegetation and additional setback from the residential property line are accomplished with this plan.

Mr. Coulter moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY SIMSBURY INVESTMENTS, LLC TO AMEND THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR 835 PROPRIETORS RD., AS PER CASE NO. ADP 06-14, DRAWINGS NO. ADP 06-14, DATED JUNE 16, 2014, BE RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL 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. Sauer, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Coulter, aye; and Mr. Reis, aye. The motion was approved.

D. Other

There was no other business to discuss.

E. Adjournment

Mrs. Holcombe moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:23 p.m. and Mr. Coulter seconded the motion. All members voted, "Aye". The meeting was adjourned.