



MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
WORTHINGTON ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
WORTHINGTON MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION
January 10, 2019

The regular meeting of the Worthington Architectural Review Board and the Worthington Municipal Planning Commission was called to order at 7:00 p.m. with the following members present: Mikel Coulter, Chair; Thomas Reis, Vice-Chair; Kathy Holcombe, Secretary; Edwin Hofmann; David Foust; Amy Lloyd; and Richard Schuster. 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 – 7:00 p.m.

1. Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Oaths of Office

Mrs. Bitar swore in returning Commission members for a 3 year term: Kathy Holcombe and Edwin Hofmann; and returning Board members for a 1 year term: Amy Lloyd and Richard Schuster.

4. Election of Officers

Mrs. Holcombe nominated Mr. Coulter for Chair; and Mr. Reis for Vice-Chair. Mr. Reis nominated Mrs. Holcombe for Secretary. All members voted, "Aye," and the nominations were approved.

5. By-Laws

Mr. Reis moved to approve the ARB and MPC By-Laws, and Mrs. Holcombe seconded the motion. All Board members voted, "Aye," and the By-Laws were approved.

6. Approval of minutes of the December 13, 2018 meeting

Mr. Reis moved to approve the minutes and Mr. Hofmann seconded the motion. All members voted "Aye" and the minutes were approved.

7. Affirmation/swearing in of witnesses

B. Architecture Review Board – Unfinished

1. Fence – 605 Evening St. (David & Amy Yenkin) AR 113-18

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

The house on this property is one story with a walk out lower level to the rear. In the late 1980's a covered porch was added to the rear at the southern part of the house; and in 2015 approval was granted for the porch to be replaced with a deck. The property is at the northwest corner of Evening St. and Short St.

This is a request to construct a fenced-in area on the south side of the property to allow for a dog run.

Project Details:

1. The fence is proposed to enclose the side yard, running out from the southeast corner of the house, along the south property line, and finishing at the southwest corner of the deck. Because the property is considered a corner lot, the fence would be required to be 20' from the south property line. A variance would be needed for the proposed placement.
2. The proposed fence is a 5' high black metal picket fence.
3. There is vegetation along the south side of the property.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

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

Recommendation:

The proposed open fence style was appropriate but should not be higher than 4'.

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar explained the applicant would like to install a 6' high black aluminum fence instead of a 5' foot fence requested because their new dog would be able to jump the fence. David Yenkin, 605 Evening St., Worthington, Ohio came forward as the applicant. Mr. Yenkin said he would prefer a 6' high fence but 5' would be doable. He said he met with the breeder of the dog, a boxer, and boxers are very playful and have a lot of energy. He felt a 6' would be better to contain the dog and keep other animals out. Mr. Schuster asked Mr. Yenkin how far away the vegetation was that was shown on the overhead photograph. Mr. Yenkin said the vegetation is on the edge of the yard and the fence would go up to the bushes, not through the bushes. The vegetation would not be removed. Mr. Myers asked for clarification as to which fence was being installed because the packet of information included three different fences. Mr. Yenkin explained he would be installing the fence like picture number 1. Mr. Foust said he was okay with the look of the fence and felt the

fence was appropriate for the neighborhood, but he had some concerns with the 6' height. Mrs. Holcombe and Mr. Reis felt the vegetation was the key, but 6' was too high.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY DAVID & AMY YENKIN FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL FENCING NO HIGHER THAN 5' AT 605 EVENING ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 113-18 DRAWINGS NO. AR 113-18, DATED DECEMBER 13, 2018, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING AND THAT THE VEGETATION ON THE OUTSIDE OF THE FENCE BE MAINTAINED.

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

2. Screening – **135 W. Clearview Ave.** (Kay Holland) **AR 114-18** (Amendment to AR 50-12)

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This Colonial Revival house was originally built in 1934, with a major addition and renovation constructed in 2013. At the time of the addition, a large hedge was adjacent along the west side that was to be retained to help soften the look of the addition and screen the mechanicals. Last year the homeowner removed the hedge and put up a ~6' high, mostly solid, white vinyl fence to screen the mechanicals and a window well from view. Due to the style, material and placement of the fence in the right-of-way, staff advised using an alternative method of screening, rather than seeking approval of the existing fence.

Project Details:

1. The existing vinyl fence is slated for removal.
2. Proposed are eight Hicks Yews that would be 5'-6' high at planting. Six are proposed parallel to the house, just over the property line; and two would be on the sides. The Service Director has approved the plantings in the right-of-way.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Keep functional items such as trash containers and mechanical equipment well screened with fences or plantings.

Recommendations:

Staff recommended approval of this application. The proposed shrubs should make an effective screen for the mechanicals.

Discussion:

Kay Holland, 135 W. Clearview Ave., Worthington, Ohio, said she did not want to remove the fence, but understood the issue. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present to speak for or against this application but no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY KAY HOLLAND TO AMEND THE PREVIOUSLY APPROVED CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS WITH CHANGES TO THE SCREENING ON THE WEST SIDE AT 135 W. CLEARVIEW AVE., AS PER CASE NO. AR 114-18, DRAWINGS NO. AR 114-18, DATED DECEMBER 6, 2018, 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. Reis, aye; Mrs. Coulter, aye; Mr. Hofmann, aye; Mr. Foust, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye; and Mr. Schuster, aye. The motion was approved.

3. Window Replacement – 55 W. South St. (Keith Kirkwood/Jacobson) AR 115-18

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This American Foursquare is a duplex that was constructed in 1905 and is a contributing building in the Worthington Historic District. Additions to add a carport on the east side and a second story to the rear were approved in the 2000's.

With this application the owner is looking for an easier time with maintenance, so would like to replace the original wood windows.

Project Details:

1. Sixteen windows are proposed for replacement: fourteen are 28" x 66" and two basement windows are 28" x 54". Most of the existing windows have exterior storm windows, and decorative trim. The larger windows are one over one style, and the smaller windows are west side basement windows in a two over two lights style. The second floor front windows would be replaced, but the first floor front windows would be retained. The other windows slated for replacement are on the sides of the structure, with 6 on the west side and 4 on the east side.

2. Proposed to replace the windows are Marvin white aluminum clad wood windows. The exterior window trim, which includes a pediment on the top, is also proposed to be clad in white aluminum with a flat look.

Land Use Plans:Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Retention and repair of existing historic windows is always preferable to replacement. Because they usually comprise so much of a building's exterior surface, windows are a major part of its character. Keeping them is one of the most important ways to protect that character. Even non-original windows may be of sufficient age and design quality to warrant their retention. If historic windows are too deteriorated to repair cost effectively and replacement is justified, the preferred option is an in-kind replacement in the same material and design. This usually means real wood windows with true through-the glass muntins (if appropriate) in dimensions and profiles that duplicate the originals. Window suppliers have become very good at doing such work at reasonable prices, but this still may take some persistence and hunting around. New windows made of substitute materials such as aluminum, vinyl, or clad wood can be an acceptable second choice if they provide a reasonably good match for the windows being replaced. Number of panes, real muntins, and correct profiles still are important.

Be sure that window and door designs are appropriate for the style or time period of the house. Design and materials should be traditional, and compatible with the existing structure.

Recommendation:

Although it is always preferable to keep historic wood windows, if replacement is necessary the proposed windows seem to offer a reasonably good match for the existing windows. Cladding the exterior trim may be the most noticeable part of the change to the windows, and is not desirable.

Discussion:

Keith Kirkwood, 959 Village Brook Way, Columbus, Ohio, and Tina Jacobson, 55 W. South St., Worthington, Ohio came forward to represent the application. Ms. Jacobson said preservation is her number one goal, she also owns property in the German Village area. She said she has been searching for the right windows for the past year and she felt the windows she picked were well suited for the house and would look appropriate for the neighborhood. Mr. Schuster asked about the durability of the cladding. Mr. Kirkwood explained the exterior cladding is thinner but covers the exterior trim, and the material is aluminum with integral color. He felt the new windows would easily last 100 years. The exterior color of the window trim would be white.

Mr. Foust said he had some concerns with replacement windows in the historic district because the windows are key to the house. Mr. Foust felt the windows could be maintained instead of replaced. Ms. Jacobson said the windows on the west side of the home were in really bad condition. Mr. Foust felt replacing the windows would be going against the architectural review standard. Mr. Hofmann asked if the decorative nature of the current windows would be maintained. Mr. Kirkwood said the windows would be treated the same as the next door neighbors windows. The neighbors used a utility trim up to the decorative trim at the top, which would stay. He said the cornices will remain wood, and be painted. Mrs. Holcombe said she was pleased to hear the cornices will remain because she felt those made the house stand out. She said her own

home was built in 1896 so she understand the pain of dealing with old windows. Ms. Jacobson said that her home did not have the original wavy glass, but if it did she would not be replacing the windows. Mrs. Lloyd said she appreciated the efforts Ms. Jacobson has put forth to keep the house looking as original as possible. Mrs. Holcombe asked if all of the existing windows were single paned, and Mr. Kirkwood said yes. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present to speak for or against this application but no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY KEITH KIRKWOOD ON BEHALF OF TINA JACOBSON FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO REPLACE WINDOWS 55 W. SOUTH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 115-18, DRAWINGS NO. AR 115-18, DATED DECEMBER 21, 2018 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. Reis, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Hofmann, aye; Mr. Foust, nay; Mrs. Lloyd, aye; and Mr. Schuster, nay. The motion was approved.

4. Dormers & Portico – **86 W. North St.** (Anna Patitucci & Luca Filippi) **AR 116-18**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This Cape Cod was built in 1939 and is a contributing building in the Worthington Historic District. The eastern portion of the structure has a gable roof that is lower than rest of the building. The house has wood lap siding which is painted a light green color, and asphalt shingle roofing. A one-story rear addition was added in the late 1980's and replaced with a larger one-story addition in the late 1990's. Also in the late 1980's, a rear shed dormer was added on the west side of the roof. The dormer was expanded in the late 1990's.

The applicants are proposing construction of additional dormers to make the east part of the upstairs usable (~250 sf), and a portico for the front entrance with this application.

Project Details:

1. A gabled dormer with two double hung windows is proposed on the front of the roof.
2. On the rear, continuation of the rear shed dormer across the east part of the house is proposed. A rear building elevation is needed.
3. A gable roof supported by square columns is proposed to cover the front stoop.
4. All materials would match the existing on the house.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Cape Cod style houses are characterized by having three-bay facades, rectangular form, gabled roofline with roof dormers, brick or wood siding, a central entrance, multiple-paned windows with shutters and classical detailing around the entrance and in the cornice.

Roofline additions such as skylights and dormers can be appropriate on rear elevations of existing buildings but generally should be avoided on sides and front elevations. Wood siding is preferred, and should be used in one of its traditional forms: shingle, board-and-batten, shiplap or beveled siding. New siding should match the thickness and width of the old as closely as possible.

New porches (located where one is missing or there has not been a porch in the past) should be built in a simple, contemporary design. Look at original porches on similar buildings -- height, materials, roof slope, width -- and use these to develop a design. Avoid ornamentation such as spindles and scrollwork unless they were traditionally used on the porches of similar buildings. Be sure that a new porch is large enough to accommodate furniture, swings, or other elements.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of this application with the following considerations:

- The front portico seems appropriate for the structure.
- While the rear dormer changes the look on the east side, it is appropriately located and will match the existing rear dormer to the west.
- While staff understands the need for additional space, it is not typical to have a single dormer to the side of a Cape Cod roof. That area of the roof being lower and slightly set back may help with the look, however, the dormer should be centered in that roof area and on the window below. Also, use of one double hung window centered on the window below might give a more balanced look.

Discussion:

Luca Filippi, 86 W. North St., Worthington, Ohio came forward as the applicant. Mr. Foust had concerns with the front portico and asked if the project could be done without putting the gable on the front and without raising the height of the roof. He said he would prefer to see a very small dormer with more of a New England style that would let in a little bit of light and had a pitched roof. Mrs. Holcombe said she has always admired the house because of the front design. Mr. Coulter said he converted attic space in his own home, but he did not have the ceiling height, only four foot high walls on the east and west side of the room. He did not have a problem with what Mr. Filippi wanted to do and did not feel the change would affect the marketability. The alteration would give Mr. Filippi more usable area on the second floor. Mrs. Holcombe asked Mr. Filippi if he was okay with a single window instead of a double and he said, "Yes." Mr. Foust said he would like to see a flat roof over the porch instead of the gable. Mr. Hofmann felt what was shown was awkward and he thought lowering the gable could be lowered. Mr. Foust pointed out the drawings were not accurate. Mr. Coulter felt lowering the porch roof 6"-9" was acceptable; and the front gable should have one window and be narrower by at least 1' on each side if possible. Mr. Schuster was concerned about the space above the front door. Mr. Coulter said the applicant could return with revised drawings, or get a verbal approval based on those changes. Mr. Filippi asked for a motion rather than tabling the application.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY ANNA PATITUCCI & LUCA FILIPPI FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO ADD DORMERS AND A PORTICO AT 86 W. NORTH ST. AS PER CASE NUMBER AR 116-18, DRAWINGS NUMBER AR 116-18, DATED DECEMBER 21, 2018 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 FRONT ELEVATION DORMER BE A SINGLE WINDOW ON THE FRONT;**
- **THAT THE DORMER SIDES BE MOVED IN ONE FOOT EACH;**
- **THAT THE FRONT DOOR ROOF BE LOWERED;**
- **THE DRAWINGS BE REVIEWED BY CITY STAFF PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION.**

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

5. Directional Signs – 6550 N. High St. (City of Worthington) AR 117-18

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

The Louis J. R. Goorey Worthington Municipal Building was constructed in 1992. Although the building was designed with a front entrance, the north and south doors were always used more due to the proximity to the parking lot. In more recent years, the front entrance has been locked due to security concerns, and the rear doors have always been locked, with access only by employees with keys. The north entrance is closest to accessible parking, and typically the only door open for evening meetings. The City would like to officially designate the north entrance as the main entrance, and install directional signs to help visitors to the site, many of whom are confused about where to enter.

Project Details:

1. Four freestanding directional signs and one building mounted sign are proposed.
2. Three of the freestanding signs would consist of 1' wide x 1' 4 1/2" high aluminum panels with an arched top, mounted on a 3" square aluminum post. The tops of the signs are proposed to be 4' 7 1/2" above grade, thus requiring a variance for height. Vinyl graphics for the sign would include an Indigo (dark blue) background, white lettering pointing to the Municipal Building main entrance, and the back is proposed as a blue herringbone pattern. The signs were designed in conjunction with the City's wayfinding program. Placement of these 3 signs would be: in the landscaped area in front of the west (front) entrance; by the parking lot south of the southeast corner of the building; and centered on

the rear of the building.

3. The other freestanding sign is proposed near the parking on the north side of the building. Sign style would be similar to the other three, but the sign would be larger (1' 3" wide x 1' 11" high), say "Welcome" in blue on a cream (Barite White) background, and have the herringbone pattern at the bottom as well as the back. Also, two 3' high posts would be used for this sign. A height variance would also be needed.
4. The building sign would consist of ¼" thick, 4 ½" high white acrylic individually mounted letters above the arched transom over the north door, and would say "Main Entrance".

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Guideline recommendations for signage include being efficient in using signs. Try to use as few and as small signs as are necessary to get the business message across to the public. Signage is a standard of review per the Architectural District ordinance.

Worthington Codified Ordinances

"Directional sign" means a sign used to direct on-site traffic and identify services such as restrooms, hours of operation, etc., and of which no more than fifty-percent of the graphic area is non-directional information. The display area for such signs shall not exceed twenty-four inches in height or width, and the above grade height for freestanding directional signs shall not exceed thirty-six inches. The total area for all such signage shall be no more than 20 square feet per parcel. Directional signs are excluded in the computation of sign area.

Staff Analysis:

- Designation of the main entrance and directional signage pointing to that entrance would be helpful for visitors.
- The size and number of directional signs is appropriate.

Discussion:

Mrs. Holcombe asked if anyone uses the front entrance. Mrs. Bitar said people used to occasionally use that door, but it had been locked for a number of years. Mr. Hofmann felt the Municipal Building is a terrific building but he did not feel the building needed to have any signage on the building. He felt the pedestrian sign on the north could be higher, but the others should be kept to 3' and face the sidewalk. Mr. Brown said the signs were meant to direct people already on the sidewalk to the building entrance, so should be higher. Mr. Hofmann thought the City should follow the Code. Mr. Reis and Mrs. Holcombe agreed they did not want a sign on the brick wall.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY THE CITY OF WORTHINGTON TO INSTALL DIRECTIONAL SIGNS AT 6550 N. HIGH ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 117-18, DRAWINGS NO. AR 117-18, DATED DECEMBER 21, 2018, 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 MAIN ENTRANCE LETTERING PROPOSED NOT BE EXECUTED;**
- **THAT ALL DIRECTIONAL SIGNS WILL FOLLOW CITY GUIDELINES;**
- **THAT THE SIGNS BE PLACED TO ORIENT TO THE SIDEWALK AND NOT FACING THE PARKING LOT. (Moved back from sidewalk.)**

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

D. Other

There was no other business to discuss.

E. Adjournment

Mr. Reis moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mrs. Holcombe. All Board members voted “Aye,” and the meeting adjourned at 8:15 p.m.