



MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
WORTHINGTON ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
WORTHINGTON MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION
March 24, 2016

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: Michael Coulter, Chair; James Sauer, Vice-Chair; Kathy Holcombe, Secretary; Thomas Reis; Edwin Hofmann; 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; and Lynda Bitar, Planning Coordinator and Clerk of the Municipal Planning Commission.

A. Call to Order – 7:30 p.m.

1. Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Approval of minutes of the March 10, 2016 meeting.

Mr. Coulter explained the minutes are not ready for approval yet but will be available at the next meeting.

4. Affirmation/swearing in of witnesses – Members of the audience were sworn in by Mrs. Bitar.

B. Architectural Review Board

1. New

- a. Fence – **72 E. Granville Rd.** (Jim & Jordy Ventresca) **AR 37-16**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar explained the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This house is not only a contributing building in the Worthington Historic District, but is also individually listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The original structure was built in the early 1800's, and additions were added at several points over the life of the house. There is an

existing white wood fence with pickets that are straight across the top along the sides of the property, and a wire mesh fence exists toward the rear of the property. The wire fence is located between Beech trees that were planted 10 years ago to screen the addition constructed to the north. The applicant would now like to replace the wire mesh fence with a white vinyl picket fence.

Project Details:

1. The purpose of the rear fence, which is south of the driveway to the freestanding garage, is to enclose the yard so the owners' pets cannot leave the property. Unfortunately, the existing rear fence is not substantial enough to accomplish that task.
2. Proposed is a roughly 4' high white vinyl picket fence. The pickets appear to be dog-eared, and the height would vary with a rolling arch style. Spacing between pickets appears to be the same as the picket width. The vinyl fencing was described as textured with a mat finish, but a material sample is needed.
3. In addition to the Beech trees, there is a large evergreen planting at the west end of the proposed fence.

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:

Staff is recommending *modification* of this application because vinyl is not a traditional material and not typically used in the District in locations that are visible from the right-of-way. Although this fence would be amongst plantings, the color and style would allow it be seen from the right-of-way, especially during the winter months. If the style was an exact match to the existing wood fencing, or additional evergreen plants were added, it may not be so evident the fence was constructed with vinyl. However, fencing in a traditional material, or in a color or style that is more likely to disappear into the background, as the existing wire fence does, would be more appropriate in this location.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Rob Bruno stated his address is 4459 Carroll Southern Rd., and he is representing Ace Fence & Deck. He said Mr. Ventresca apologized for not being able to attend the meeting this evening. Mr. Bruno said the fencing disappears into the landscaping in the back left corner where it meets the existing fence. He said after meeting with Mr. Ventresca and seeing the original photograph, they came up with a more uniform look. Mr. Bruno said he was unable to get an exact sample. Instead of a dog eared picket, there will be a flat edge like the existing fence. Mr. Ventresca is very concerned about making sure the fence looks appropriate for the neighborhood. Mr. Bruno said this type of fence is a more expensive option for him, but Mr. Ventresca is concerned about the maintenance of the fence because of the location of the dense vegetation. Mr. Bruno said he is not sure he can match the fence exactly because the fence is wood. He said what he can do is come up with an inverted flat cap that would be on every

post. Mr. Bruno said if he needs to wrap with an additional picket around the rim he can do that. Mr. Bruno said Mr. Ventresca told him to mention that he is an avid gardener and he is willing to add screening if necessary. Mr. Coulter asked if there will be a gate going back to the garage. Mr. Bruno said no, but on Mr. Ventresca's property, where the driveway comes in through the side, the wood fence begins and ends on both sides of the driveway.

Mrs. Bitar explained the fence needs to be at least thirty feet from the right of way or a variance will be needed. Mr. Sauer asked if Mr. Ventresca owns both parcels and Mrs. Bitar said yes. Mr. Sauer asked if there was something to put on top of the posts to look like the rest of the existing fence and Mr. Bruno said yes, he will be using a flat cap on all the posts. Mr. Sauer said he could be persuaded to accept the vinyl fencing if it looks just like the wood fencing already in place. Mr. Hofmann asked if the vinyl system would allow the use of vinyl pickets and then have the posts be made out of wood. There would be a minimal amount of painting and the vinyl would hang between the wood posts. Mr. Bruno said there is an issue with the way the vinyl would be connected to the post.

Mr. Foust asked Mr. Bruno if he discussed with Mr. Ventresca what he would do with the existing wood fence in terms of maintenance, and if the wood fence would be replaced at some point. Mr. Bruno said Mr. Ventresca is only concerned with the area of where the staggered Dogwood trees are planted. Mrs. Bitar thought Mr. Ventresca did not intend to replace the existing fence with vinyl. Mr. Foust said he is concerned that Mr. Ventresca may want to come back before the board and ask to replace the rest of the fence with vinyl. Mr. Foust said he remembers a discussion with First Financial Bank and how the Architectural Review Board explained that vinyl fences are not the norm in the district. Mr. Foust explained he would prefer seeing additional wood fencing.

Mrs. Holcombe said she too is concerned with maintaining the existing fence as wood and feels the Board is trying to remain consistent with decisions made in the district. Mrs. Holcombe agrees with Mr. Foust and she would like to see the rest of the fence be wooden to match the existing fence. The fence will always need to be maintained and you cannot always count on the vegetation being there. Mrs. Holcombe said this is a very prominent area of Old Worthington.

Mr. Foust said something else that has not been discussed is that the open area of the fence has to be as wide as the pickets that are used. He asked if the new fencing would be spaced as far as the current wood fence. Mr. Bruno said he can get the vinyl fence custom fabricated to match the existing width of the pickets, but at some point there is an issue with being able to contain small animals within a yard. Mrs. Bitar clarified what Mr. Foust was discussing about picket widths. She said if you have a three inch picket then there needs to be a three inch opening between the pickets. Mr. Bruno asked at some point could there be a solid fence and Mrs. Bitar said no, that is not considered in the district. Mr. Coulter said before he could give his approval the fence would have to match the existing picket space.

Mrs. Bitar explained that the Board also needs to be concerned with the shininess of the vinyl fencing. She said she has discussed with the Mr. Bruno how glossy the vinyl fencing would be and would like to know if a matte finish is available. Mr. Bruno said there are many different

suppliers, but to easily explain the finish he said the higher the gloss, the better the quality. Mr. Bruno said there are suppliers which have a laminate finish but the product is creating problems for home owners because the ones that look like wood are not holding up with their color. Mr. Bruno said the fence Mr. Ventresca chose is the same color all the way through. Mrs. Lloyd asked about the color sample that Mr. Bruno brought with him to the meeting and if that is what the fence will look like, and Mr. Bruno said yes. Mr. Foust explained that everything the Board has discussed Mr. Bruno has disregarded, such as a matt finish, the use of wood posts, and proper picket spacing. Mr. Bruno said he disagreed with Mr. Foust, and said he would make sure that the fence conforms to whatever the Board suggests. Mr. Bruno explained to Mr. Sauer where exactly the new fencing would be placed. Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Bruno if he had Mr. Ventresca's permission to replace the fence with wood fencing to match and Mr. Bruno said yes, if that is what the Board feels would be proper. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY JIM & JORDY VENTRESCA FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL A WOOD PICKET FENCE TO MATCH THE EXISTING FENCE IN ALL FEATURES AT 72 E. GRANVILLE RD. AS PER CASE NO. AR 37-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 37-16, DATED MARCH 3, 2016, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

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

- b. Parapet Wall Repair – **649 High St.** (The Worthington Inn Condominium Association) **AR 38-16**

Findings of fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

The Worthington Inn was first used as a commercial building in the mid 1800's, after being constructed as a residence in 1834. In the 1980's, the original building was restored and an addition was constructed to house guests. In 2005, approval was given to convert the inn rooms to residential condominiums. At the time, balconies and carports were added at the rear of the site to make those units more marketable. Garage doors were approved last year to enclose four of the carport parking spaces. The Worthington Inn is a contributing building in the Worthington Historic District.

There is a parapet wall on the second floor that is cracked and in need of repair, and approval of a minor modification is requested.

Project Details:

1. The wall is about midway back on the Worthington Inn roof, and constructed of brick. There is a crack in the lower portion of the wall.
2. Repair of the wall would involve removing some of the brick on the north side in a stair-step pattern, and rebuilding and tuck pointing as needed. Re-use of the existing brick and cap stone is planned.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance
Exterior detail and relationships are review elements in the District.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending approval of the application, as the proposed repair would not harm the character of the building.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Kevin Rohyans stated he is the representative for the Worthington Inn Condominium Association at 649 High St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Coulter explained if the approval goes forward this evening he suggested that Mr. Rohyans speak with the City's Engineer about the fire partition on the other end of the wall. Mrs. Bitar explained the City's Building Department has already taken a look at this issue and feels this is a good solution. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Sauer moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY THE WORTHINGTON INN CONDOMINIUM ASSOCIATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO REPAIR THE PARAPET WALL AT 649 HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 38-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 38-16, DATED MARCH 7, 2016, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING WITH THE UNDERSTANDING THAT THERE WILL BE STAIR STEPS.

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

c. Satellite Dish – **900 Evening St.** (Steven W. Balogh) **AR 39-16**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This property is at the southeast corner of Evening St. and North St. The house was constructed in the 1950's, and is made up of a 2-story element in the middle; a 1-story garage to the north facing the street; and a one story room to the south. This structure is a contributing building in the Worthington Historic District. A new fence was recently added to enclose the rear yard.

This application is a request for retention of a satellite dish.

Project Details:

1. The homeowners report the dish was installed prior to their purchase in November of 2014.
2. The satellite dish is located on the rear of the second story roof gable, and is gray to match the roof shingles. There is existing vegetation along the Evening St. right-of-way that largely conceals the dish.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Satellite dish placement should be in a location that minimizes the visual impact as seen from the right-of-way.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending *approval* of the application, as the dish is not readily seen from the right-of-way. The dish has been in this location for years and was not noticed until included on the list of satellite dish locations submitted by a resident.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Steven Balogh stated his address is 900 Evening St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Balogh said he would be concerned about his roof if he has to remove the dish. He thought the dish was already approved when he bought the property. Mr. Coulter explained that he drives past the house all the time and he never noticed the dish. Mr. Foust said he wanted to clarify that this house sits on a corner lot where it is very difficult to hide a dish. Mr. Coulter explained the Board had to request that a dish be removed that was on the front of someone's house last week. Mr. Foust said if and when Mr. Balogh decides to get a new roof, there might be some other options where to place the dish. Mr. Balogh said he plans to get a new roof within the next couple of years. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

Motion:

Mrs. Holcombe moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY STEVEN W. BALOGH FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO RETAIN A SATELLITE DISH AT 900 EVENING ST. AS PER

CASE NO. AR 39-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 39-16, DATED MARCH 9, 2016, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

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

Mr. Coulter explained that several items would be tabled this evening in the event someone was waiting to hear those cases. The Agenda items that will be tabled this evening are: h., j., k., by the Architectural Review Board, and item a. will be tabled by the Municipal Planning Commission. Item c. on the MPC agenda has been withdrawn.

d. Addition – **251 W. Dublin-Granville Rd.** (Robert Giesken, Architect/McKirnan) **AR 41-16**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This house was constructed in 1961 and is a bi-level design, with aluminum siding and a block rear foundation painted white. In 1998 a deck was added across the rear of the house at the upper level. Aluminum windows were replaced with vinyl windows in 2011.

This request is for approval of a rear room addition.

Project Details:

1. The addition would be roughly 19' wide x 20' deep (\pm 358 square feet), requiring removal of part of the existing deck. A 13' wide area would act as a connector from the existing house to the addition. The 3' 8" wide space would have a window on the east side, and a door on the west side to provide access to the deck. The floor of the new room would then be 3 steps down. Windows are proposed on all 3 sides of the addition, including a large picture window to the rear. They would be vinyl to match the house.
2. A 12' wide concrete block wall is proposed as the foundation for the room addition. The block would be a tan color and have a milled finish. White aluminum siding to match the existing house is proposed above. The structure would have an opening underneath, like the existing deck.
3. The proposed roof has a low pitched gable, and would have shingles to match the house. Small gables are also proposed on both sides of the connector. The areas would be finished with a gray vinyl shingle siding.

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

Recommendation:

The addition is appropriately sized and to the rear, and the aluminum siding and roofing are complementary. The additional materials proposed, and the configuration of the side gables and base are a bit atypical for District, but would only be seen by the rear neighbors.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Robert Giesken stated his address is 4400 Colerain Ave., Columbus, Ohio. Mr. Giesken said the shake material will be more of a grey color than buff as shown in a photograph, and the house will be white. Mr. Hofmann asked Mr. Giesken if he had any samples with him and Mr. Giesken said he had a sample of the shake. Mr. Giesken said there are some pretty bad vinyl shakes on the market but the one he brought with him this evening is a pretty good one. Mr. Hofmann said he is more curious about the block and the detailing. Mr. Giesken said he did not have a sample of the block material. Mr. Hofmann asked if there would be a crawl space below and Mr. Giesken said no, the area will be left open for storage.

Mr. Sauer asked why the block will not be painted since the house currently has painted block now. Mr. Giesken said he believes that painted block looks bad, and he is trying to keep the massing of the house down. The house will already be white and if he paints the block white the addition will look even bigger. Mr. Coulter said he actually likes the milled concrete better than the painted block. Mrs. Holcombe said she agrees and that the only thing she would be concerned about is that the block does closely match the siding. Mr. Hofmann asked Mr. Giesken about the color of the grout and Mr. Giesken said the grout will be white. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY ROBERT GIESKEN, ARCHITECT ON BEHALF OF HALE & LORI MCKIRNAN FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO CONSTRUCT AN ADDITION AT 251 W. DUBLIN-GRANVILLE RD. AS PER CASE NO. AR 41-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 41-16, DATED MARCH 9, 2016, 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. Sauer, nay; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; Mr. Hofmann, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye and Mr. Foust, aye. The motion was approved.

e. Pergola – **48 W. South St.** (Chad Owens) **AR 42-16**

Findings of fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This mid-19th century Farmhouse is not only a contributing building in the Worthington Historic District, but is also individually listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The property is 120' wide x ~178' deep, with a detached garage and a rear patio. The owner would like approval to add a pergola to the patio.

Project Details:

1. The proposed pergola would be a 12' x 12' structure constructed with treated lumber and painted white.
2. Placement is proposed on the 3-tiered brick patio which wraps around the rear of the house. The patio is mainly screened from view from the right-of-way by the main house and existing vegetation. The owner would like approval to place the structure on the patio with the ability to move it between the 3 sections of the patio. The structure would not be permanently fixed, and would likely be disassembled and stored in the garage in the winter months.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Architectural District Ordinance

Compatibility of design and materials and exterior details and relationships are standards for review in the Architectural District ordinance.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending *approval* of the application. The proposed pergola is appropriate on the rear patio regardless of the exact location.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Chad Owens stated his address is 48 W. South St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Owens said the posts are 6 x 6 treated lumber that will be bolted together. He said the structure is very heavy duty and should be okay in terms of weather, and you should not be able to see the structure because of the line of trees between the properties.

Mr. Sauer asked if the City Inspector will take a look at the structure after being built to make sure the structure is sound. Mrs. Bitar explained this type of structure does not require inspection per the Residential Code of Ohio. Mr. Owens said he is not against someone taking a look at the structure after being built to make sure that the structure is plumb. Mr. Foust said he is okay with the structure being placed behind the house, because it would not be seen from the right-of-way. He felt a more visible structure would have to be a different style to go with this house. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no

one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Holcombe moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY CHAD OWENS FOR APPROVAL OF A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO CONSTRUCT A PERGOLA AND PLACE IT ON THE REAR PATIO AT 48 W. SOUTH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 42-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 42-16, DATED MARCH 9, 2016, 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. Sauer, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; Mr. Hofmann, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye and Mr. Foust, aye. The motion was approved.

f. Fence – **6152 Maxton Pl.** (The Fence Guy/Kanumilli) **AR 43-16**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This two-story house at the northeast corner of Maxton Pl. and E. Granville Rd. was constructed in 2003. In 2007, approval was granted for an L-shaped fence to be installed to screen the rear patio. The homeowners would now like to install additional fencing to enclose the patio.

Project Details:

1. The existing fence is a 5' high shadowbox style wood fence with 1' of lattice above. The fence has been partially painted and needs maintenance or replacement. Also, there is a small section of stockade fence adjacent to the house that was not approved.
2. The owner would like to install new fencing to enclose the patio. The fence would start at the existing, head north, extend out around a tree, and head west to a gate about 4' north of the side of the house. A second gate is proposed near the tree. The proposed style is a 48" high dog eared cedar picket fence with 4" wide pickets and 4" spacing between pickets.

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.

Recommendations:

Staff is recommending approval of the application, conditioned on the existing fence being repaired or replaced, and the paint being removed. The stockade portion of the fence should also be replaced. The new fence would be appropriate for the District

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Ms. Sahiti Kanumilli stated her address is 2152 Maxton Pl., Worthington, Ohio. Ms. Kanumilli said they initially needed the fence for privacy issues because the side of their house faces Dublin-Granville Road. She said they were getting beer bottles thrown into their back yard and there was no privacy. At the time, they wanted a solid fence because of the issues they were having. Ms. Kanumilli said they planted shrubs along the sidewalk that faces the road. She explained they now need more fencing to enclose the area because she has a two year old child now. Ms. Kanumilli said she intends to have a gate by the house, and what is there now can easily be removed. Ms. Kanumilli said she would prefer a taller fence but is willing to install a four foot fence with four inch pickets and spacing. Mrs. Holcombe asked Ms. Kanumilli if she planned to have a gate by the house that will match the fence and Ms. Kanumilli said yes.

Mr. Sauer suggested the shadow box fence could match all the way around with no lattice on the top, and only 4' in height. The horizontal members would need to line up. Ms. Kanumilli said that would be fine.

Mr. Foust asked Mrs. Bitar when the fence at this house was originally approved and Mrs. Bitar replied that the year was 2007. Mr. Foust asked if it was the same applicant and Mrs. Bitar said yes. Mrs. Bitar said there were supposed to be evergreen plantings that were three feet high and less than or equal to thirty inches on center. Mr. Foust said he remembers the application coming through. He also remembers there were satellite dishes on the side of the house with wires and those were supposed to have been taken down. He said he is a bit cautious now for future approvals and wants to make sure there is follow up in what is being approved. He said if the Board approves a package which includes landscaping then the entire package needs to be installed not just part of the package that the applicant chooses. Ms. Kanumilli stated she recently planted two cherry trees, one blueberry and one raspberry. Mr. Foust said Ms. Kanumilli needs to plant what was originally approved.

Mr. Hofmann thanked Ms. Kanumilli for installing the shrubbery in between the sidewalk. He said they are concerned with the starkness of the area. Mrs. Holcombe said she has no problem with the matching of the fence and going around to the north side of the property, but she would like to see the plantings installed that were approved with the original fence. She asked if Ms. Kanumilli could do that and she said yes. Mr. Foust said that since planting season is coming up he would like to have the motion reflect the original plantings of the size and spacing that were approved before be planted before the new fence is installed. Mr. Sauer explained the Board approved a taller fence than what is normally allowed in the district because of the situation of the home being so close to Dublin-Granville Road, but in return they asked for plantings to help screen the taller fence to help the appearance of the area. Ms. Kanumilli said she will get the rest of the work done, but would like the approval from the Board this evening so she can get the fence started

while her brother is still in town. Mr. Coulter explained this can all be approved at the same time, but whomever crafts the motion will have to make sure the fence style will match the shadowbox portion of fencing, only forty-eight inches high instead of 5 high plus lattice.

Mr. Brown said that he wanted to note that a fence permit is required to install the additional fence. Mrs. Bitar said the fencing contractor has already submitted a permit application for the fence, but there is no permit on file for the original fence. Mr. Myers said he understands Ms. Kanumilli's concern for the safety of her child but she must promise to fulfill the obligations of the first approval and she said she would take care of the matter. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Foust moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY THE FENCE GUY ON BEHALF OF VIJAY & SAHITI KANUMILLI FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL A 48" OPEN STYLE PICKET FENCE AT 2152 MAXTON PL. AS PER CASE NO. AR 43-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 43-16, DATED MARCH 10, 2016, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- That the fence be a shadow box style to match the existing fence;
- That there will be a matching gate in lieu of the section that is adjacent from the house and to be painted the same color throughout the fence;
- That the vegetation that was approved in the previous application be planted or installed before the new fence is constructed
- That the four foot fence have the horizontal elements carried through and the look of the fence will match the existing except be 4' high and without lattice.

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

g. Addition – **55 W. Stafford Ave.** (Lee & Jolene Spector) **AR 44-16**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

A Farmhouse constructed in 1920, this house is a contributing building in the Worthington Historic District. The roof form of the original house is a two-story "L" shaped cross gable, and there is a front porch and a 1 ½ story gabled addition to the rear. A screened porch was added at the southwest corner of the house in 2004.

Page 12 of 20

ARB/MPC Meeting March 24, 2016

Minutes

The owners would like to remove the rear portion of the house and construct a two-story addition.

Project Details:

1. The footprint of the house with the new addition would be similar to the existing structure, except would extend a few feet further to the rear and to the east side. On the east side, the addition would be set in about 1' from the front part of the house. On the west side, the addition is proposed to extend 4' west of the existing house wall, which is about the same as the screened porch to be demolished. One tree would need to be removed on the west side, and others would need to be trimmed.
2. For the addition, the existing north-south gable at the front of the house would be continued south to a new cross gable, and then at a lower level to the end of the structure. The rear cross gable would be at a shallower pitch (12:8) than the existing cross gable in the front (12:12), and would be at a lower height.
3. Similar to the existing rear of the house, a screened porch with a roof to match the front porch is proposed at the southwest corner. Steps would lead down to the yard from the porch and the new rear of the house.
4. The addition is proposed to be sided with Hardieplank lap siding in the same width and painted the same color as the existing aluminum siding on the house. "Pewter" dimensional asphalt shingles are proposed for the new roof, and would also match the existing.
5. Aluminum clad wood windows with simulated divided lights are proposed. Many of the windows on the east and west elevations would be double-hung, and sized and divided to match the existing windows on the house. Shutters to match are also proposed. A door in the same style is proposed on the east elevation. Smaller double-hung windows are also proposed: on the east elevation second floor for a bathroom; and the west elevation first floor for the kitchen. On the rear, a bank of four double-hung windows are proposed upstairs and a double door with full width skylights and a transom are proposed downstairs.
6. Carriage lights are proposed at the east side and rear doors. Two security lights are proposed, one on the east side and one at the southwest corner of the house.
7. A second condensing unit is proposed for installation adjacent to the existing on the west side of the house. An existing lattice fence would be extended, plus there is existing vegetation toward the front and along the side property line to screen the units.

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

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending *approval* of this application. Although the addition extends beyond the wall on the west side, it is in the same location as the existing screened porch, the roof line is lower, and it is about 32' back from the front of the house. Those factors should help maintain the integrity of the front façade. The design and materials are traditional and compatible with the existing structure. Care should be given with placement of the security lights as to not bother adjacent neighbors.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked Mrs. Bitar if there are any variances required and Mrs. Bitar said no variances are required. Mr. Coulter asked for the applicant.

Mr. Lee Spector stated his address is 55 W. Stafford Ave., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Spector said he is open to suggestions for the security light because he does not want to bother his neighbors. Mr. Coulter asked if the lights would be motion detectors and Mr. Spector said yes. Mr. Sauer asked if the motion lights could be lowered on the house. Mr. Spector said yes, their main goal is if someone comes to that door the light will automatically turn on.

Mrs. Holcombe said she feels this is a great plan. Mr. Hofmann asked to see the east elevation and wondered if there was any consideration for the addition to have similar eaves and roofline to the house. Mr. Spector said he did not understand the architectural terminology. Mr. Hofmann tried to clarify what he was asking Mr. Spector. He said he feels the east elevation is a little out of character with the rest of the house and looks a little sloppy but the rest of it looks fine. Mr. Coulter asked if Mr. Hofmann was suggesting the overhang should be matched and Mr. Hofmann said yes and the creation of the additional gable.

Mrs. Jolene Spector stated her address is 55 W. Stafford Ave., Worthington, Ohio. She asked if the one side was moved in six inches and added to the other side so the floor plan was not changed, would that be acceptable? Mr. Hofmann explained the shift may only be three inches and that could come off of the bedroom or a closet. Mrs. Spector said they had originally planned a steeper gable but that was going to cause a problem with pushing the roofline in the rear. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY LEE & JOLENE SPECTOR FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO CONSTRUCT AN ADDITION AT 55 W. STAFFORD AVE. AS PER CASE NO. AR 44-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 44-16, DATED MARCH 10, 2016, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING WITH THE OPTION TO MAKE THE CHANGE ON THE EAST ELEVATION.

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

h. Signage – **6600 N. High St.** (Fastsigns/FC Bank) **AR 45-16**

Mr. Coulter explained the applicant has requested to table this application. Mrs. Holcombe moved to table the application and Mr. Reis seconded the motion. All members voted, “Aye.” The application was tabled.

i. Deck Modification – **184 E. Granville Rd.** (Scott Hahn/Aljancic) **AR 46-16** (Amendment to AR 36-15)

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This house was originally built in 1930 and is two-stories with a gabled roof and a one-story addition to the rear. In June, the owner was approved to construct a 9’ x 9’ addition at the northeast corner of the house. This request is to modify the shape of the deck.

Project Details:

1. Previously, the deck was proposed to partially next to the east side of the addition, possibly extending south to screen the condensing unit. An option for landscape screening was also approved.
2. Proposed now is a deck that would be 13’1” x 14’ and adjacent to the north side of the addition. A 4’ tall piece of removable lattice would be placed south of the deck to screen the condensing unit. The lattice screening the bottom of the deck would be the same as the extra section.
3. Cedar is still presumed to be the deck and screen material.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

There are recommendations in the Worthington Design Guidelines for additions and decks to be located as far to the rear as possible. Design and materials should be traditional, and compatible with the existing structure.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending *approval* of this application, as the change to the design is appropriate.

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar explained when the deck was originally proposed, there were to be plantings on the east side of the existing condensing unit. When the unit is behind a structure the code does not require

screening, however, when this application came to the Board before, the Board asked for the unit to be screened. As part of tonight's application they are proposing a removable panel with lattice that would match the bottom of the deck. The property owner to the east who can see this unit would prefer to have shrubs planted for screening. There is not a lot of area to do this but he could possibly fit in shrubs outside of the sidewalk. Mrs. Bitar said with a previous approval, the gutter straps were to be installed underneath the shingles rather than on top and that has not been accomplished yet. Mrs. Bitar explained that is still required. She said this is not the typical look in Worthington to have the straps showing. Mrs. Bitar said another concern that was pointed out by the next door neighbor was the Board required the storm water to be piped to the street and that has not been done. There are downspouts on the back of the existing house and Mrs. Bitar said the applicant is proposing to put extensions on them to run the water out onto the drive. She said she is not sure which way the driveway is sloped, but believes the water drains back towards the house. The neighbor's concern has to do with a cistern located next to the house that was filled with broken concrete, and would be covered with the deck. She is afraid the water will flow back to the cistern and cause a situation of standing water which could be a breeding ground for mosquitos. The neighbor feels the cistern needs to be properly capped, or she should be assured the water is not going to flow that way. Mrs. Bitar said staff has had conversations with both property owners but the decision is up to the Board because the Board asked the home owner to pipe the storm water to the street. The home owner would prefer to use a surface method to get rid of the water so he would like the Board to re-think the original decision.

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Michael Aljancic stated his address is 201 E. New England Ave., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Aljancic said he has had many inquiries about this house over the past year. Mr. Coulter said he would like to begin with the questions about the gutter brackets still on top of the shingles. He said whatever decisions are made about other is made this evening the brackets will need to be underneath the shingles.

Mr. Sauer asked Mr. Aljancic why the two gutters do not attach. Mr. Aljancic said he is not a contractor, he hired someone to build the addition and he does not know why the gutters do not attach together. Mrs. Bitar explained that realigning the gutters was not a condition as part of the last approval. Mr. Aljancic said the matter was discussed though.

Mr. Coulter said as far as screening goes, he agrees with the neighbor and would like to see a soft landscape screen rather than a removable lattice. The lattice over time would require maintenance or replacement, so Mr. Coulter would prefer to see shrubbery. Mr. Aljancic asked where the shrubbery should be located. Mr. Coulter suggested placing the shrubbery between the edge of the driveway and the sidewalk. Mr. Aljancic said that property belongs to the neighbors. Mr. Sauer asked where the property line is in relation to the walkway and Mr. Aljancic explained where the property line is and he only has about a foot near the neighbor's property. He feels the area is too tight to plant shrubbery and that is why Mr. Aljancic suggested using a lattice. Mr. Aljancic said there was nothing there before and the lattice would be the same color as the house, but he is proposing to have no shrubbery and no lattice because he does not want to impede on his neighbor's property.

Mr. Coulter asked about the area of where the new concrete was poured and which direction the slope is. Mr. Aljancic said the concrete slopes west.

Mr. Coulter asked why the pipes were not extended to the street like the Board approved at the last meeting. Mr. Aljancic said he was not at the last meeting for that discussion, and he has hired several different contractors for this project and has had a difficult time getting things done. Mr. Aljancic used his neighbor's house as an example of what he would like to do to get water away from the foundation of the house. He said that digging up the ground and extending the pipes will cost thousands of dollars. Mr. Coulter asked if the gutter on the left could be connected to the gutter on the right so that there would be a single lateral coming out that could be run down the driveway instead of all the way out to the street. Mr. Aljancic agreed that would be a good solution to the problem.

Mr. Coulter asked if there is a cover on the cistern. Mr. Aljancic said the cistern is completely filled with rubble. There was a flower bed over the top of the cistern previously.

Mrs. Bitar asked the Board if they made a decision if screening is necessary for the condensing unit. Mr. Hofmann asked if there is an area of eighteen inches, and a small shrub was planted, and the neighbors want to see greenery, would they mind if the shrub encroached a pinch onto their property. Mr. Aljancic said because of his past experience with the neighbors he does not want to involve them at all in this matter. Mr. Aljancic said he is proposing lattice or nothing for the screening. Mr. Sauer said he would be okay with the lattice to just be done with the project.

There was a discussion as to whether or not a rail was needed for the deck. Mr. Coulter said if the top of the deck is less than thirty inches above the ground then a rail is not required. If the top of the deck is above thirty inches from the ground then a rail will need to be installed. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY MICHAEL ALJANCIC TO AMEND CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS #AR 36-15 BY MODIFYING THE DECK AT 184 E. GRANVILLE RD. AS PER CASE NO. AR 46-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 46-16, DATED MARCH 11, 2016, 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 east and west downspouts be connected horizontally and sloped to allow positive flow, with the outlet being at the west;
- That the condensing unit be screened with lattice fencing to conceal the unit;
- That if a rail is required then the rail shall be installed.

Mrs. Holcombe made a friendly amendment to the motion that home owner has the option to add greenery to the east of the condensing unit, between the owner's house and the neighboring property. Mr. Reis seconded the amendment.

Mr. Reis asked if the motion needed to included putting the straps underneath the shingles and Mrs. Bitar said no, because the straps were already approved to be placed underneath the shingles on the original application.

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

j. Fence – **291 W. Dublin-Granville Rd.** (Susan Kroeker & Ryan Schellenberg) **AR 47-16**

Mr. Coulter said the applicant has requested this application be tabled. Mr. Reis moved to table this application and Mr. Sauer seconded the motion. All members voted, "Aye." The application was tabled.

k. Fence – **666 High St.** (Ian F. Brown/The Whitney House) **AR 40-16**

Mr. Coulter explained the applicant has requested to table the application. Mr. Foust moved to table the application and Mrs. Holcombe seconded the motion. All members voted, "Aye." The application was tabled.

C. Municipal Planning Commission

1. Conditional Use

a. Restaurant in C-5 Zoning District – Outdoor Seating – **666 High St.** (Ian F. Brown/The Whitney House) **CU 04-16**

Mr. Coulter explained the applicant would like to table this application. Mrs. Holcombe moved to table this application and Mr. Sauer seconded the motion. All members voted, "Aye." The application was tabled.

b. Semipublic Use in C-3 Zoning District – **1000 High St., Suite D** (Brian D. Dietz) **CU 03-16**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This multi-tenant building at the southeast corner of High St. and Wilson Dr. currently houses a variety of businesses, including a dentist, hair salon and insurance agent. The applicant is

requesting approval to locate Rose Ministries in the building, which is a conditional use in the C-3 Zoning District as a semipublic use.

Project Details:

1. The applicant is a licensed minister and facilitates an informal spiritual group. The group, which is typically 4-8 people, would meet Monday, Wednesday and Friday at 6:45 pm, and one Saturday morning a month.
2. Parking is available in the private parking lot in front of the space, and the other businesses in the building typically are not open during the same hours.
3. A professional nameplate to match the others in the building would be the only signage. No other exterior changes are proposed.

Zoning Code:

Worthington Conditional Use Permit Regulations

The following basic standards shall apply to conditional uses in any "C" or "I" District: the location, size, nature and intensity of the use, operations involved in or conducted in connection with it, its site layout and its relation to streets giving access to it, shall be such that both pedestrian and vehicular traffic to and from it will not be hazardous, both at the time and as the same may be expected to increase with increasing development of the Municipality. The provisions for parking, screening, setback, lighting, loading and service areas and sign location and area shall also be specified by the applicant and considered by the Commission.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending approval of the application. The impact of the proposed business in this location should be minimal.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Brian Dietz stated his address is 1000 N. High St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Dietz said his group gets together to study, have prayer, read the Bible and other books of philosophy. Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Dietz if he was wanting to have some type of signage. Mr. Dietz said not at this time, but he understands that if he does want signage he would have to go through the correct process to do that. Mrs. Bitar explained the white plates have already been approved in the past and anyone wanting a sign can have one with the specifications that have already been approved. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY BRIAN D. DIETZ FOR APPROVAL OF A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO OPERATE A SEMIPUBLIC USE AT 1000 HIGH ST., SUITE D AS PER CASE NO. CU 03-16, DRAWINGS NO. CU 03-16, DATED MARCH 4, 2016, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

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

c. Printing in I-1 Zoning District – **6955 Worthington-Galena Rd.** (Domenic Romanelli/Sullivan) **CU 05-16**

Mr. Coulter said this application has been withdrawn.

D. Other

Mr. Brown said he would like to remind the Board members that starting in May the ARB-MPC meetings would begin at 7:00 p.m. instead of 7:30 p.m.

Mr. Brown explained that money has been budgeted to allow the Board and Commission members to receive training and there is a conference planned - the Ohio Planning & Zoning Workshop - which will take place on Friday, May 20th, 2016, from 9:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. if anyone is interested. The Board of Zoning Appeals members were also invited.

E. Adjournment

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