

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

January 28, 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: K. Holcombe, Acting Chair; M. Coulter; S. Myers, A. Lloyd; and C. Hermann. Also present were Council Member D. Foust and L. Bitar, Development Coordinator.

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

1. Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Minutes of the meeting of January 14, 2010. The minutes of the meeting were not ready to be approved.

Mrs. Holcombe began the meeting. She stated they don't have any items scheduled for Municipal Planning however they will be discussing sustainability. Mrs. Holcombe explained the meeting procedures that will be followed.

B. Architectural Review Board

1. Affirmation/Swearing in of Witnesses

Mrs. Bitar swore in those who planned to speak.

1. New

- a. Sign – **2151 W. Dublin-Granville Rd.** (Greg Karl/Gary Wilkins) **AR 03-10**

Mrs. Bitar said this is a request to put a new sign in the existing sign panel on this building. The business is locating in the former Vonn Jazz space, and she is not sure about the existing Vonn Lounge and Espresso Bar signs and whether they will be staying. The proposed sign would go in the blank sign panel, which is right above the door. Mrs. Bitar showed what it would look like. She explained that there was approval for certain text styles for this whole center at one point and the proposed style is not one of them, so that is why it is before the Board this evening. She indicated that the Board has approved different styles over the years at this center.

Mrs. Holcombe asked if there were any comments from the Board. Mr. Coulter stated he liked the sign and there is already different signage there in the center, so it's not setting precedence

and it allows for more individuality. Mr. Hermann stated he likes it much better than the “all caps” on some of the other signs. Mrs. Holcombe stated she agrees.

The applicant introduced himself as Gary Wilkins of 6860 Magdalena Lane, Canal Winchester, OH 43110.

Mr. Wilkins stated that there are going to be two of the signs. He explained that the middle sign panel will be blank. The two outside corners where the Vonn Lounge sign is located and also where the Espresso sign was, will have the G Worthy’s sign. So it will be the same G Worthy’s logo on the sign that was shown to the Board. He specified there will be two of them. Mrs. Holcombe stated that she didn’t think they could do that. Mrs. Bitar stated that the City only allows one sign for a business. Mr. Wilkins stated agreement with one sign.

Mrs. Holcombe asked if there was anything Mr. Wilkins would like to add to it. Mr. Wilkins stated that they will be taking down the Vonn Lounge and the Espresso signs.

Mr. Hermann asked if the letters are going to be individually attached. Mr. Wilkins indicated they would be individually attached and would be an ivory color.

Mrs. Holcombe asked if there is anyone in the audience that wished to speak. No one spoke.

Mr. Hermann moved:

ARB RESOLUTION NO. AR-03-10

THAT THE REQUEST BY GREG KARL & GARY WILKINS FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL A NEW SIGN AT 2151 W. DUBLIN-GRANVILLE RD. AS PER CASE NO. AR01-10, DRAWINGS NO. AR 01-10, DATED DECEMBER 30, 2009, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEEETING.

The motion was seconded by Mrs. Lloyd.

Mrs. Bitar called the roll. Mr. Coulter, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye; Mr. Hermann, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye.

Mrs. Holcombe stated the motion was approved.

b. Renovations – 196 E. Granville Rd. (Vivid Design Group, Inc./Konecny) AR 04-10

Mrs. Bitar stated that there are quite a few changes that are proposed. She started with the site improvements. There are steps all the way at the front of the site at the sidewalk in the public right-of-way and they are planning to rework those steps. She added that the front stoop will be done as well. She indicated the east side of the house currently has an asphalt area almost to the

property line and a concrete area that runs right next to the house. She explained the applicants are proposing to remove the slab of concrete and the existing fence and they are going to put grass pavers in much of the area then a small area of steps going into the kitchen entrance. The plan also shows a proposed shed, which will require a variance because it's shown right on the property line. Typically the shed would need to be at least 3 feet from the property line due to the building code. They are also proposing a fence along that property line. They would like to put a six-foot high fence to help screen from the neighbors. Mrs. Bitar showed that brick pavers are proposed for the area going into the kitchen and around to the back, and the rest is grass pavers. She indicated what the proposed fence would look like. For the proposed shed, Mrs. Bitar stated she did not know if the applicant had located another spot for it, but that she would inquire.

Mrs. Bitar explained that the next door neighbor has some concerns with the placement of the air conditioning unit because of the proximity to his bedroom window.

Mrs. Bitar stated that the other site changes are to continue the grass pavers around to the rear and there will also be a brick paver patio on the rear of the proposed garage. At the two back corners they are proposing rain barrels to catch the storm water that comes off of the roof and also a pizza oven in the back corner. She showed the pictures going around their backyard.

Mrs. Bitar said the change to the house is based on renovation of the kitchen. They are going to be moving the basement stairs so that they can put the sink along the back and some cabinets along the back of the kitchen and would like to place a window in that area. They would like it to be an open picture window so they can look out over the backyard. They are proposing to match the concrete sills to what is on the front and other sides of the house, as well as shutters to match. The door and the steps going up to the back door are proposed to be replaced. They are proposing a stone veneer finish to the steps and on the front of the house, which would actually wrap around the side part of the house as well.

They are going to put a small kitchen area in the garage. Mrs. Bitar checked with the Building Department and the thing that would make this a second dwelling unit is having the range in there. So they have proposed it without putting a stove out there. They discussed possibly having it there while they are redoing the kitchen inside so they have something to use but then it would have to be removed or else it's a second dwelling unit and the City would not allow that. They are proposing sliding glass doors out the back and new windows. Also the proposal that was submitted showed the front portion of the roof being turned into a hip roof with solar panels placed on it. Mrs. Bitar explained that there are some other options that she has seen and that she would let the applicant talk about what they think they want to do. She stated that it was a very thorough application and she was very pleased to see all the environmentally friendly elements to this plan.

Jeff Harrison with Vivid Design Group Architects, 445 Hutchinson Avenue, Suite 125, Columbus, Ohio introduced himself as a representative of the applicant.

Mrs. Bitar asked Mr. Harrison about the type of stone veneer to be used. Mr. Harrison stated the best option is to match the stone look of the foundation of the house. He showed that the proposed veneer is about an inch and a quarter thick and would be tucked in beneath the siding.

Mr. Coulter asked if the stone would be just at the foundation level or if it would be added to the entire height of the wall. Mr. Harrison said it would be added just at that foundation level.

Mr. Foust asked if Mr. Harrison was looking at doing the steps also. Mr. Harrison said no, the stairs will still be concrete and they would have a surface applied. The step portion that is going to be altered is the back stairway off the back family room, which will have the landing enlarged. He will still be building out of the same building materials, the concrete masonry units, and still doing a concrete top but he will put the same faux stone to tie it back into the foundation look. Mr. Harrison said the brick pavers are self-explanatory.

Mr. Harrison then moved to the fence portion of the plans. The fence would remain mostly the existing length, but for the most part be a little bit higher. He stated that his client would like to limit the view of adjacent properties with the fence and the shed. They would like to apply for a variance to put the shed on the property line because it is a movable shed. Mrs. Holcombe clarified that his plans right now are to keep it where it is. Mrs. Lloyd asked where the shed is located. Mr. Harrison stated adjacent to the tree. Mrs. Bitar clarified there is no foundation proposed for it. Mr. Harrison said it will just be a slab on grade. Mr. Coulter asked if it is a concrete slab or is it a wood platform that's interval to the shed. Mr. Harrison said they would pour a 4-inch concrete slab and then put the shed on top of it. The shed comes pre-manufactured and gets crated up and brought out to the sight and placed. Mrs. Bitar asked how that will affect the tree. Mr. Harrison said it should not affect the tree, but the tree may have a few lower branches trimmed up. In response to a question from Mrs. Holcombe, Mr. Harrison stated the shed will be where the shrubs are located.

Mr. Coulter asked if the air conditioning compressor is an additional compressor or is a replacement for one that's already there. Mr. Harrison said there is one window shaker in an existing window on the side. He stated they will remove the existing shed and tuck it back into the corner. So he will be removing that one and putting a new compressor back.

Mr. Coulter asked if the concrete slab comes out. Mr. Harrison stated yes, it all becomes grass pavers. Mr. Hermann asked if the grade is going to drop and Mr. Harrison stated yes.

Mr. Hermann asked if the foundation is going to be exposed. Mr. Harrison stated it is the existing foundation but they are going to be back around the door. He indicated to the Board the stairs that are larger to step-up back into that kitchen. They are going to be addressing water infiltration issues against the concrete slab. There are leaks in the cellar right now because the concrete is sloping the opposite way towards the house.

Mr. Foust offered a comment about the air conditioning unit. If it is going to be relocated, Mr. Harrison is probably going to have a new line set. Mr. Foust stated running to the other side of

the house where there's a larger area and where there are already shrubs might be an alternative to the potential noise problem the way the houses are so close together. Mr. Harrison said that they would have to go through the crawl space into the cellar to tap into the furnace. Mrs. Holcombe asked if that would be a possibility. Mr. Harrison stated it's in the realm of a possibility. Mrs. Bitar said that one issue that would present itself is that there's a fifty-foot required setback on E. Granville Rd. and the house is at 32 so it would have to be back another 18 feet, and she is not sure if Mr. Harrison has that much space. Mr. Foust stated the Board of Zoning Appeals might consider a variance because of the existing hardship in setback. Mr. Coulter stated if Mr. Harrison could set it on the other side of the chimney then it would be well back from 50 feet. Mr. Harrison stated it's going to be closer to the family room. Mr. Coulter stated that the newer equipment is a lot quieter than the window shaker that they have now. Mr. Harrison said that his clients shut the air conditioner off during the night because they are doing all of the energy efficiency steps. The time it would actually be running would be during the heat of the day.

Mrs. Holcombe asked if anyone had any comments over the pizza oven. Mr. Hermann asked about code issues. Mrs. Bitar stated she was not positive but they would have to satisfy any requirements of the Fire Department.

Mrs. Holcombe asked about the fence and stated the Board doesn't usually like solid fencing. However at this location, she did not have a problem with it. She asked if the fencing is 6 feet high and Mr. Harrison stated it is. Mr. Hermann clarified that the run is from the proposed air conditioner to the shed. Mr. Hermann stated that he doesn't have a problem with solid fences when they are in between houses like this. He stated that he thinks the transparency is more for the yard. Mr. Coulter asked where the fence starts and stops. Mr. Harrison stated it's 33 feet long and it's from the shed and the air conditioning unit to the tree. Mrs. Lloyd stated she doesn't have a problem with the design of the fence either, and that she thinks it's appropriate. Mr. Coulter stated he thinks it's a better fence than what's there today. Mrs. Holcombe stated she agrees. Mrs. Lloyd asked if it was cedar. Mr. Harrison stated yes. Mr. Coulter asked if the opposite side is going to look the same as it does on this side. Mr. Harrison said yes.

Mr. Hermann asked if there were concerns about the shed. Mr. Coulter stated he would really like to see it off the property line. Mrs. Lloyd stated she has a few concerns about the location of it. Mr. Coulter asked Mrs. Bitar that if it came in the feet would that issue go away. Mrs. Bitar said they still need a variance, but the building code issue would not be a problem. Mr. Coulter asked if it would be acceptable to bring it in three feet. Mr. Harrison stated he would have to talk to his client.

Mr. Foust said the Building Department may not let Mr. Harrison put it there. Mrs. Bitar stated it would have to have fire rated material on at least that three-foot portion of the structure. It is a small structure so it might not be a problem. Mr. Coulter stated he thought if it was brought in three feet it would not take away from the grass pavers, which he thinks are absolutely marvelous. Mrs. Holcombe agreed. She felt that with it being on the property line, they may need to hear from neighbors.

Mrs. Lloyd asked about the roofline. She stated she was a little confused based on the drawings. Mr. Harrison explained the drawings. In response to a question from Mrs. Lloyd, Mr. Harrison explained the fastening system, which will be hidden and not visible.

Mr. Coulter asked why Mr. Harrison was changing the roof configuration on the south elevation so that it looks different than what it does now. Mr. Harrison responded that he needs more area to get enough kilowatts out of the service to get a grant from the Ohio Energy Office. Mr. Harrison distributed and explained other alternatives.

Mr. Foust asked if it is strictly rectangular panels or if the triangular sections that are shown on the drawing are also panels. Mr. Harrison said the triangular portions are also panels.

Mr. Coulter asked how far back the garage sits from the curb line. Mrs. Bitar stated a little more than 120 feet. Mrs. Lloyd asked if Mr. Harrison had explored putting these on the ground versus on the garage. Mr. Harrison said they had not. Mr. Harrison said there are a lot of trees for the proposed location, which will require a lot of tree trimming. Mr. Hermann asked if the garage is staying white and the answer was yes. Mrs. Bitar asked if they mount right onto the roof. Mr. Harrison said they will reinforce the trusses and post off the roof.

Mrs. Bitar asked if one of the alternatives has the same surface area as the triangular portion. Mr. Harrison stated no, it meets the grant minimum. Mrs. Bitar asked if the other is higher than the minimum. Mr. Harrison stated it's lower but it cost more. Mr. Harrison stated he is trying to make it as aesthetically pleasing as possible. Mr. Hermann said he liked the solution they presented.

Mr. Foust said there are a couple of things that might make this workable. One is that with the triangular panels you get a complete solid surface that would be the same surface as if you put on roof shingles. The second thing is, the black color, which is sort of a matte finish. It is not a terribly reflective, bright, pure glass color and it doesn't have any outstanding lines or features that would make it markedly different from a roofing material. To drive by and see it this far back from the street with matte black finish like that, it might not stand out to the point of being unworkable. Mr. Coulter said the thing that helps is the panel; because it's trimmed in black they're never going to see the horizontal lines from the street.

Mrs. Holcombe stated that they want this done and it's a fine balance as to making it look architecturally right in their district, but to support the environmental aspect. Mrs. Lloyd said that this is the first application they have seen with something that is street facing. Mrs. Lloyd said she thought it was an appropriate design for having something that is street facing. Mr. Foust said if this was right out on the street parallel with the front of the house he would have more concern but they have two houses there that both have black roof shingles that are similar in color as what's here so it could blend. This may be one of those installations that becomes a trial to evaluate how it works. Mr. Foust wants to be clear that if they endorse this, it's a trial run to see if this works.

Mr. Hermann asked about the grade of the earth around the front steps from the sidewalk. Mr. Harrison said the grade will be brought down and be safer to exit the driveway in a low-lying car.

Mr. Coulter asked if anyone has an issue with the picture window on the north. No concerns were expressed by the Board.

Mrs. Holcombe asked if anyone from the audience wanted speak for or against the application.

Paul Finlayson of 202 E. Dublin-Granville Road came forward. He stated he has the house to the east. He stated he has been a neighbor as long as the applicant has owned their home and he congratulates them on being forward looking with solar & rain barrels and he complemented the gardening. He stated he does not want the shed on the property line or even close to it. He has been offered \$125,000 for the lot, just to bull doze the whole building. He doesn't want to see changes that would affect his property. He would like to see the shed go someplace else. The other issue is the air conditioning unit. He indicated it is as far as possible from their master bedroom and it's as close to his house as could be legally allowed. He would prefer that it not be right up against that portion of his house. Other than that he thinks it is a beautiful design.

Mr. Hermann asked if the fence were extended behind the shed, would that be acceptable. Mr. Finlayson said he does not want the shed there. Mrs. Holcombe asked if he would be supportive if it were moved in three feet. Mr. Finlayson said he was still opposed.

Mr. Coulter asked how far the shed would need to be relocated away from the side property line in order to avoid the need for a variance from the Board of Zoning Appeals. Mrs. Bitar stated it would have to be five feet from the side property line. Mrs. Holcombe asked if they had another possibility for the shed. Mrs. Bitar asked if he considered putting it the other direction, putting it perpendicular, putting it east-west instead. Mr. Harrison said that would block more of the view to the gardens in the rear, which is the reason they are putting the picture window from the kitchen. Mrs. Holcombe asked if it was possible to move it to the back of the lot. Mr. Harrison said they could explore different opportunities for that. Mrs. Lloyd asked about the homeowners' plans for the shed, Mr. Harrison responded they plan to store their recycling and trash bins in it.

Mrs. Holcombe asked if they thought the air conditioner could be moved to the other side. Mrs. Bitar stated if it were put up near where the front of the fireplace is located, it should not need a variance, but it would have to be screened.

Mr. Coulter asked for it to be screened with shrubbery. Mrs. Holcombe stated that the only item left unresolved is the location of the shed.

Mr. Hermann said he would find it acceptable if the fence continued to where the shed was proposed to be. That would make it even with the pavers. Mr. Coulter said it would be a smaller

structure. Mrs. Lloyd stated it wouldn't even be a structure; it would just be an enclosure of the fence. Mr. Coulter asked if that is a possibility. Mr. Harrison agreed it is a possibility. Extension of the fence along that property line would be something they would do if the shed goes away. They may address the shed with a completely different option.

Mr. Hermann summarized the two things he is hearing from this group, which is they really appreciate the effort on the solar panels and they love the pavers and all the effort of renovation. The sticking points are the shed and the location of the air conditioner. Mr. Hermann stated it takes all four of the Board members to vote in support of this item to receive approval, since there are a few members absent. He indicated the applicant has the options of tabling this item to the next meeting when more members may be present, or agree to some changes on the two items, or take those items off the application and go with everything else and come back.

Mr. Coulter suggested another option. They could move the air conditioning compressor to the west side of the home adjacent to the fireplace on the south side of the chimney to be enclosed with shrubbery. Mr. Harrison said he agrees with that. A second option is to extend the fence further and build a small enclosure to handle recycling and trash bins in the same manner as the fence construction. Mr. Harrison asked does that mean they should come back to the Board with that option. Mr. Coulter stated they would leave that for staff to approve once the staff sees a sketch. Mrs. Holcombe stated that if they settled for this option, they could come back in the future if they want the shed.

Mr. Harrison said he would like to remove the shed from the submittal at this time and then come back to the Architectural Review Board regarding the shed.

Mrs. Lloyd asked if they are approving the extended fence idea. Mr. Harrison said they will consider it and address it when they come back. They will leave the fence as originally proposed for now. They will move the air conditioner as discussed.

Mr. Foust clarified that the finished side of the fence has to extend outward toward the neighbors property, with any backside and supporting members on the applicant's property not on the other one. As for the rain barrels, if they are using old wooden whiskey barrels, he suggests, based on experience, that they not take the entire top out of the barrel. They should cut a hole in it and make sure to have enough support in the top or the stays will work in very quickly.

Mrs. Holcombe asked for additional comments from the audience. There were no comments.

Mr. Coulter moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY "VIVID DESIGN GROUP" FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO MAKE RENOVATIONS AT 196 E. GRANVILLE ROAD AS PER CASE NO. AR04-10, DRAWINGS NO. AR04-10 DATED JANUARY 15, 2010 BE APPROVED WITH THE FOLLOWING STIPULATIONS: (1) MOVEMENT OF THE AIR CONDITIONING COMPRESSOR TO THE WEST SIDE OF THE HOME

ADJACENT TO THE FIREPLACE ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF THE CHIMNEY (2) BOTH SIDES OF THE FENCE NEED TO LOOK IDENTICAL AND (3) THE SHED BE REMOVED FROM THE APPLICATION AT THIS POINT IN TIME BUT IT CAN BE RESUBMITTED LATER AND THAT THIS MOTION BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS ON THE STAFF MEMO AND BE PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Hermann.

Mrs. Bitar called the roll. Mrs. Lloyd, aye; Mr. Hermann, aye; Mr. Coulter, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye.

Mrs. Holcombe stated that concludes the Architectural Review and they moved to the next item on the agenda.

C. Municipal Planning Commission

D. Other

1. Continued discussion of sustainability in the Code and Guidelines

Mrs. Bitar stated that she identified two things that she heard from the Board last time. One is a change to the code and the other is an addition to the design guidelines. The change to the code specifically mentions items that are above grade, which are the items typically reviewed by the Architecture Review Board. She specifically listed solar, bike racks and rain barrels and then included other environmentally friendly conservation practices because that will encompass other items that might come up. Then she went into more detail in the guideline portion of it. She used a lot of what Mr. Scott Meyers and Mr. Coulter developed before but she added other things and she researched guidelines from all over the country. She requested their comments. They can move forward tonight if everyone agrees on it or they can utilize the Code Review Committee or she can rework something and come back to this group.

Mr. Coulter clarified which items were in the Code and which were in the Design Guidelines. Mrs. Bitar stated most of it is in the Design Guidelines. Mr. Coulter stated that he thinks it is a good compromise that it puts Worthington where it needs to go because he thinks the City of Worthington is behind the curve in comparison with other suburbs.

Mrs. Bitar stated there are more steps that could be taken. There are things that could be put in the Code instead of just suggestions. She thinks the Architectural Review Board will see more and more of these types of applications so it is important to get something in place for review.

Mr. Foust asked about the statement on the placement of solar panels (“Place solar panels in a location that minimizes the visual impact as seen from the right-of-way and surrounding

properties”). Based on the discussion tonight, he would like to see something that says in the case of historic properties or in the case of properties in the Historic District; applications shall either enhance the property or shall not take away from the historic character. Mrs. Bitar stated she tried to incorporate that type of language in the first paragraph above the recommendations.

Mr. Foust stated he doesn't want to give the impression that it is more important in the Architecture Review District than in other areas of the community. Mrs. Bitar said she meant to state that it is important to have a balanced approach. Mr. Foust suggested expanding the sentence.

Mr. Coulter suggested adding “this concept is especially important to take a balanced approach while maintaining the architectural significance of the District. Mrs. Lloyd stated she thinks the entire sentence can be removed. Mr. Foust indicated that removal of the sentence could work to address his concern.

Mr. Hermann expressed his appreciation for Mrs. Bitar's work on this item.

The members discussed whether to approve it tonight or continue the discussion to involve the absent members.

Mr. Foust asked if it would make sense to forward this to the City Council to let them know what is under consideration. Mrs. Holcombe asked if he thought it would be important to do, because the recommendation goes to them for approval anyway. Mr. Foust said he can see both options. Mrs. Bitar stated City Council can always send it back for additional discussion.

Mrs. Holcombe asked for comments from the audience.

Beth Richardson introduced herself and stated she lives in Powell, within the Dublin School System, but her son attended Worthington Kilbourne. She is an adjunct teacher at Columbus State Community College and has worked as a Landscape Architect for more than 17 years in Toronto as well as in Columbus. She is very interested in sustainability and works with native plants and the Wildlands group. She thinks this is great. City Codes often require the same type of street trees on a street. She encourages a mixture of species to hopefully prevent diseases. Throughout Worthington and the Historic District there is a mix of trees and she would like to see that continue, especially in the new areas. She wants to encourage plants that contribute to diversity, habitat renewal, and habitat-supportive type of plants. She wants to know if that can extend beyond the Architectural Review District.

Mr. Foust commented the City has a street tree program where the City will pay half the cost of trees planted in the tree lawn between the curb and the sidewalk. That program offers different varieties of trees based on the width of the tree lawn and what will work in the location, which helps provide that mix she mentioned. Additionally, City Council authorized funding to review the features for the proposed North High Street and I-270 interchange which includes things like

fencing and signs. He doesn't know how landscaping fits in that project but he will relay this point to the discussion.

Mrs. Richardson said it is difficult in a tree lawn that is only five feet wide which restricts the species. It is a five-foot area and the root zone is particularly at risk because of sidewalk, salt and other issues in the street.

Mrs. Bitar said that the Architectural Review Board does not have street trees in their purview. However, the City has a Parks and Recreation Commission that makes recommendation as to species and the number of trees. The Parks Maintenance crew is also very good at evaluating trees and they recommend diversity in the tree species. She planted a street tree a year ago and they did not say the tree must match the rest of the street. The City has struggled with pear and ash trees so they try to learn from their experience.

Mrs. Richardson mentioned permeable paving and special soil as options to explore to bring moisture down to the roots.

Jo Rodgers introduced herself and stated she lives at 575 Evening Street. She stated she thinks this is a wonderful step forward. She is a member of the Old Worthington Association and she think this allows Worthington to be on the forefront of mixing things that are really great. The Historic District has so much to offer and there are many people here that are willing to offer their time and money to further this technology. She thinks it is wonderful and there is a balance and she applauds the efforts.

Mr. Foust stated that in the past, they have had some very controversial architectural issues that the Old Worthington Association has not been the least bit bashful about coming forward and stating their opinions. He stated he thinks they are a very important force sometimes in helping the community keep in mind the purposes of the Old Worthington Association and the protection of that area.

Mr. Hermann stated he would like to take the next two weeks to look this over, think about it and comeback to have a discussion about it. Mrs. Bitar stated she would like it to be looked at more closely and make sure it says what it should.

Mrs. Holcombe stated that she thought it was very well done. It's one of those things that we should probably read and review. She also stated that she can't see anything that is glaring to her and if they wanted to move forward they could but if they wanted to take the time and review and discuss it at the next meeting would be appropriate.

Mr. Hermann said that Mr. Hunter would probably want to take a look at it. Mrs. Holcombe said she believes that Mr. Sauer and Mr. Hunter would want to review it. Mr. Coulter stated the one sentence could be taken out based on their discussion. Mrs. Bitar stated she will do that.

Mrs. Holcombe asked if there is any other discussion. Mr. Hermann asked about the Wilson Bridge Road study. Mrs. Bitar stated that she has the new scope of services from the consultant and it will be shared with the City Council before moving forward with the expanded scope. Mrs. Bitar stated there were no meetings of the steering committee in January and there will not be in February either. A new schedule will be created and distributed.

Mr. Hermann asked about Worthington Square Mall. Mrs. Bitar said she thought she was going to get the drawings tomorrow, but is not positive. The other thing that will be coming in February, probably at the second meeting, is potential changes to the Kilbourne Memorial Library Building. The Community Improvement Corporation has sketches and wants to get the opinion of the Architectural Review Board.

Mr. Hermann reported briefly on the Worthington Area 360 meeting that he attended over the weekend. He would like to report on the results once they are prepared. Mrs. Bitar stated that once they get the report she will share it with them and perhaps have someone come in and present it too the Planning Commission.

E. Adjournment

Mr. Coulter moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Hermann seconded the motion. All members said aye. The meeting was adjourned at 8:56 PM.