

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

March 10, 2011

The regular meeting of the Worthington Architectural Review Board and the Worthington Municipal Planning Commission was called to order at 7:30 p.m. with the following members present: Richard Hunter, Chair, James Sauer, Vice-Chair; Kathy Holcombe, Secretary; Mikel Coulter, Amy Lloyd and Jo Rodgers. Also present were Scott Myers, Worthington City Council Representative for the Municipal Planning Commission; Lynda Bitar, Development Coordinator and Clerk of the Municipal Planning Commission, and Melissa Cohan, Paralegal. Chris Hermann was absent.

A. Call to Order – 7:30 p.m.

1. Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Minutes of the meeting of January 27, February 10, and February 24, 2011.

Mr. Sauer moved to approve the minutes and Mr. Coulter seconded the motion. All members voted “aye”. Mr. Hunter said they have been approved.

4. Affirmation/swearing in of witnesses.

B. Architectural Review Board

1. New

- a. Add Roof Dormer, Enclose Porch & Replace Garage – **587 Oxford St.** (Corinne Meyer)
AR 80-10

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar discussed the facts from the application and reviewed the photographs. The applicant wants to replace an old garage and make it a two car garage with a gabled roof and enclose the back porch. On the second level the applicant would like to add a dormer without a window. Mrs. Bitar also stated that the applicant may need a variance for the garage because of the close proximity to the neighbor’s yard. The proposed plan is six feet from the property line.

Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Ms. Corinne Meyer approached the microphone and stated that her address is 587 Oxford St, Worthington, Ohio. Ms. Meyer said she would like to build a new garage with the dimensions of 20 feet by 24 or 25 feet, and she is not sure if she

wants to have a window on the garage. Mr. Hunter explained the ARB can approve the plan to have a window, and then she can decide later whether or not she wants the window. Ms. Meyer said that she would like to keep the option of having a window for the garage. Mr. Hunter asked Ms. Meyer what the pitch of the roof will be, and she replied she would be fine with whatever the Board suggested it should be. She said the garage is prefabricated. Mr. Sauer said it appears the pitch is close to what she already has on the house, about a 6:12 pitch. Mr. Hunter asked Ms. Meyer if she would be removing the paraphernalia from the back yard, and she said yes.

Mrs. Bitar asked Ms. Meyer if she planned to replace the roof on her house, and Ms. Meyer said that she would like to, but she would be hiring professionals to do that work. She would like to use dimensional shingles, similar to what is already on the house, in a brownish or black tone.

Mr. Sauer asked if Ms. Meyer would be doing the work on her house herself, and she said yes. Mrs. Holcombe asked what type of windows would be used for the porch and Ms. Meyer replied she will be using Anderson casement windows, approximately four feet by four feet.

Mr. Sauer asked about the dormer. Ms. Meyer said that it is hard for her to stand up in her bathroom because the bathroom is very small, and the roof is in the way, so she planned to install a dormer, without a window. Mr. Sauer said Ms. Meyer may experience some problems with the roof when it is cut out. Mr. Sauer and Mr. Hunter recommended the dormer be flush against the wall, to avoid having to recreate the lower portion of the roof.

Mr. Coulter asked about the spout on the side of the house, and Ms. Meyer replied it is a radon removal system. Mrs. Lloyd said that radon removal systems are common in the Worthington area. Mr. Coulter asked about the side yard setback for the garage, and Ms. Meyer replied she would like the garage to be 6' from the property line. Mrs. Bitar said that eight feet is required.

Mr. Sauer mentioned there could possibly be drainage issues between the addition and the garage. Mrs. Bitar said the drainage issue must be taken care of before a building permit could be issued, and Ms. Meyer said she will get it taken care of.

Mr. Hunter asked if anyone present wanted to speak either for or against this application, and no one came forward.

Findings of fact:

1. The applicant is requesting approval to make several changes to the house and garage.
2. Enclosure of an existing porch on the northwest corner of the house, with the addition of a 2' overhang, is proposed to expand indoor living space. The structure will make use of the existing block foundation, with the corner on a pier. Two 4' x 4' windows are proposed facing rear; the door will be moved to the south side of the structure. Trim for the windows and door will match the existing on the house. The aluminum horizontal siding on the existing house will also be matched. The roof pitch will be the same or slightly steeper than the existing shed roof on the porch. Dimensional asphalt shingles are proposed for the existing structure and addition.

3. A dormer with a shed roof is proposed on the second floor at the northwest corner of the house. The materials will match the existing.
4. Demolition of the existing garage and replacement with a larger version is proposed. The existing garage has a flat roof. The proposed will have a gable and the same materials as on the existing house and proposed addition. Dimensions of the structure will be 20' x 25' maximum, with the garage being at least 6' from the south side property line. A variance granted by the Board of Zoning Appeals may be necessary.

Conclusions:

1. The proposed changes to the house are compatible with the existing structure.
2. Replacement of the roof shingles on the existing house, and use of the same dimensional shingles on the addition and garage is appropriate.
3. Size, placement and style of the proposed garage is appropriate.

Mr. Coulter moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY THE CORINNE MEYER FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO MAKE CHANGES AT 587 OXFORD ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 80-10, DRAWINGS NO. AR 80-10, DATED FEBRUARY 24, 2011, BE APPROVED , BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING, AND WITH THE FOLLOWING AMENDMENTS:

House:

1. The existing house and addition shall have new dimensional shingles;
2. New materials and trim styles shall match the existing house;
3. The new windows on the addition shall be casement, approximately 4' wide by 4' high;
4. The existing metal vent pipe on the rear of the house must be removed;

Garage:

1. The garage shall have a single patterned garage door, similar to that shown at the meeting;
2. The side man door and single window are optional;
3. The garage roof pitch shall be 6;12, and the shingles shall match the new dimensional shingles on the house;
4. The garage could be as close as 6' to the property line and the garage could be as deep as 25'.

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

2. **New**

- a. **Signage & Repaint Exterior – 5499 N. High St. (DaNite Sign Co./Firestone)**
AR 17-11

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. The applicant would like to paint the building trim beige, place a new wall sign, and paint the freestanding sign pole blue. Mrs. Bitar stated that the applicant would also like to place a small box sign in the window. According to the code, the sign cannot be illuminated, nor is it allowed to take up more than 25% of the window area.

Mr. Sauer asked if the Board had already approved the freestanding sign, and if it is illuminated. Mrs. Bitar said the illuminated sign was approved with a non-illuminated background. Mr. Sauer asked if the garage doors would be repainted to match the sign band above them, and Mrs. Bitar said yes. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Robert Shore approached the microphone and stated that his address is 3818 Kinsey Ave., Columbus, Ohio.

Mr. Hunter asked Mr. Shore if he brought any samples, and Mr. Shore said yes, and distributed the samples. Mr. Hunter noticed a no parking sign on the wall on the business and asked Mrs. Bitar if that type of sign was allowed in that particular area, and Mrs. Bitar said yes, it is a directional sign. Mrs. Bitar said the temporary signs are not allowed, and asked the applicant if he would advise his client about this matter. Mr. Shore said yes.

Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

Findings of fact:

1. A new wall sign and paint are proposed for the sign band, trim and garage doors on the Firestone station. The existing band is white with red and blue stripes and two signs (one above the office area and one above the bays), which will be removed.
2. The new wall sign will be above the office area and will consist of red and blue internally illuminated letters and logo mounted on a raceway that will match the new tan trim color for the building. The proposed sign area is 27.6 square feet, which makes total sign area for the site 100 square feet including the existing freestanding sign.
3. Blue paint is proposed for the existing pole and cabinet for the freestanding sign. When the new sign was approved in 2009, a two foot wide pole wrap was also proposed, but was never placed.
4. A non-illuminated box sign is proposed for inside the window.

Conclusion:

1. The proposed painting and new wall sign will be an improvement to the site.

Mrs. Rodgers moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY DANITE SIGN CO. FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO CHANGE SIGNAGE AT 5499 N. HIGH ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 17-11, DRAWINGS NO. AR 17-11, DATED FEBRUARY 15, 2011, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING, WITH THE CONDITION THE SMALL FIRESTONE WINDOW SIGN WILL NOT BE ILLUMINATED.

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

- b. Fence – **196 E. Granville Rd.** (Tony & Corinne Konecny) **AR 19-11**
(Amendment to AR 24-10)

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Tony Konecny approached the microphone and stated that he lives at 196 E. Granville Rd., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Konecny said that he would also like to replace the roof of his garage. It has much older shingles than the house. Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Konecny about his solar panel project and if he ever got it finished. Mr. Konecny said no, that the state program had changed and so the costs changed. Mr. Konecny said that he would like to add two sections of split rail fencing. Mr. Myers asked Mr. Konecny if he ever planned to finish fencing the entire yard, and Mr. Konecny said no. He said he originally put up the first two sections as a trellis for raspberries, and to define the corners, but now he would like to add two more sections. Mr. Myers explained that he thought the split rail fencing looked nice, and it is possible to cover split rail fencing with chicken wire if needed. Mr. Konecny said he does not plan to fence the entire yard.

Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone that wanted to speak either for or against this application, and no one came forward.

Findings of fact:

1. Approval was given last year for the addition of 2 sections of split rail fence along the east property line of this rear yard.
2. The property owner has now added 2 more sections, and would like approval.
3. Re-roofing the garage to match the dimensional shingles on the house is requested.

Conclusions:

1. The fencing is appropriate.
2. Replacement of the garage roof is appropriate

Mr. Sauer moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY THE TONY AND CORINNE KONECNY FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO RETAIN FENCING AT 196 E. GRANVILLE RD. AS PER CASE NO. AR 19-11, DRAWINGS NO. AR 19-11, DATED FEBRUARY 23, 2011, AND NEW SHINGLES ON THE GARAGE TO MATCH THE HOUSE AT THE SAME ADDRESS, 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. Hunter, aye, Mr. Sauer, aye, Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Coulter, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye; Mrs. Rodgers, aye. Mr. Hunter said it has been approved.

C. Municipal Planning Commission

1. Historical Marker

a. Worthington Historic District – **Southeast Quadrant of the Village Green** (Old Worthington Association) **HM 01-11**

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mr. Coulter said the City has been involved and may participate in funding the marker. The location for the sign was picked due to the high volume of traffic in the area, so there would be a high level of exposure.

Mrs. Holcombe asked how far away is the sign from the curb. Mrs. Bitar said the sign will be approximately 5' from the curb. Mrs. Holcombe believed this location might be dangerous because of the proximity to N. High Street. She felt it would be safer to have the sign moved to the other side of the sidewalk. Mrs. Holcombe was very concerned about school children gathering near a sign that is so close to the road.

Mr. Coulter said a lot of time had been spent discussing the best location for the sign, and the area that was chosen was because they want people to see and read the sign. Mr. Coulter felt if the sign was moved to the other side of the sidewalk it would be less visible to those people driving and walking along N. High Street. Also, the area selected is difficult to mow, and the entire area could be mulched. Mrs. Rodgers added that the sign is visible from both sides, and it is important for people to know the area is an historic district.

Mr. Hunter asked if brick could be used instead of mulch. Mr. Coulter said he liked the idea of brick pavers. Mrs. Holcombe believed brick would be a better ground surface than mulch, it would be more stable. Mr. Scott Myers asked what the cost would be for ten (10) feet of brick pavers.

Mr. Sauer asked if it was possible to paint the existing sign traffic sign poles to match the same green as the light posts. Mr. Sauer asked that the sign be aligned with the trees and the light post.

Mrs. Bitar asked if the exact wording would be tied down before going to City Council, and Mr. Coulter said yes.

Findings of fact:

1. This marker will identify the Worthington Historic District, which was recently designated and includes almost all of Old Worthington.
2. The proposed location is at the southwest corner of the southeast quadrant of the Village Green, in line with existing trees. Approval will also be needed by City Council to place a permanent structure on the Village Green.

Conclusion:

1. The proposed location is very visible and appropriate.

Mr. Sauer moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY THE OLD WORTHINGTON ASSOCIATION FOR APPROVAL TO ERECT AN HISTORIC MARKER ON THE SOUTHEAST QUADRANT OF THE VILLAGE GREEN AS PER CASE NO. HM 01-11, DRAWINGS NO. HM 01-11, DATED FEBRUARY 2, 2011, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

Mr. Coulter seconded the motion. Mrs. Bitar called the roll. Mr. Hunter, aye; Mr. Sauer, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Coulter, aye.

Mrs. Holcombe moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Coulter seconded the motion. All members said aye. The meeting adjourned at 8:50 p.m.