

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

April 24, 2014

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

**A. Call to Order – 7:30 p.m.**

1. Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Approval of minutes of the April 10, 2014 Meeting

Mr. Coulter moved to approve the minutes, and Mr. Sauer seconded the motion. All members said, “Aye”.

4. Affirmation/swearing in of Witnesses

**B. Architectural Review Board**

**1. New**

- a. Fencing – **868 Hartford St.** (Krysten & Tyler Phillips) **AR 13-14**

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mrs. Krysten Phillips approached the microphone and stated her address is 868 Hartford St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Hunter asked Mrs. Phillips if she had any questions or comments and she said no. Mr. Sauer asked Mrs. Phillips if she considered a smaller more standardized fence, or open style of pickets. Mrs. Phillips said because the property backs up to apartments and people cut through her property frequently she feels there is a need for a privacy fence. Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone else present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

**Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

**Background & Request:**

The vernacular style house and detached garage on this 70’ wide property were constructed in 1929, well before the Stafford Village apartments came in the 1970’s. A portion of the apartment parking lot was built adjacent to the rear lot line of 868 Hartford St. The homeowners would like to install fencing along the rear and sides of the property.

**Project Details:**

1. The fencing would enclose the rear yard: portions are proposed extending north and south from the front of the garage; north from the northeast corner of the house; along the north side property line; and along the rear property line.
2. The proposed fence style is 6’ high cedar solid picket fence with dog-eared pickets.
3. The homeowners would like privacy; screening from neighboring properties; and a safe place for their dog.

**Land Use Plans:**

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

The recommendations in the Guidelines say “Select fencing appropriate for the house's period and style.” and “Side yard fences should be open in style (avoid solid, opaque fences that block all views) and three to four feet in height. In the back yard, generally avoid fences over four feet in height; higher fences are discouraged but may be appropriate where a commercial use abuts a residential property.” The Architectural Review Board has typically approved 6’ solid fences between single-family residential and commercial properties, and occasionally to screen homeowners from objectionable properties.

Mr. Reis moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY KRYSTEN PHILLIPS FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL FENCING AT 868 HARTFORD ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 13-14, DRAWINGS NO. AR 13-14, DATED APRIL 10, 2014, 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. Hunter, aye; Mr. Sauer, nay; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Coulter, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye; and Mr. Reis, aye. The motion was approved.

b. New Windows & Signage – **667 High St. (Harold C. Baker) AR 15-14**

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Sam Baker approached the microphone and stated his address is 673 High St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Baker said the gift shop that will be moving into this location will be called the Finery. He said they are proposing to replace a single glazed window that has been

broken, and some of the frame has rotted. Mr. Baker said he plans to replace the window using an aluminum frame to help with energy efficiency. He said he would wrap the window with wood trim so that the window's appearance would not change. Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Baker why he is not using a wood replacement window. Mr. Baker said wood windows have problems with sweating and other complications and leak more energy than aluminum. Mr. Coulter said the aluminum window does not match the historical character of the downtown area. Mr. Baker said the window would be wrapped with wood and the aluminum would not be visible. Mr. Coulter said he believed Mr. Baker would have trouble wrapping the window and getting a tight seal between the wood and aluminum.

Mr. Sauer said the profile does not appear to be the same. Mr. Baker said the wood trim would cover the entire perimeter of the frame. Mr. Sauer said you could still see a portion of the aluminum. Mr. Baker agreed it would be possible at the very top, but not at the sight line. Mr. Sauer said if a wood frame was used, Mr. Baker could still use insulated glass and that wood has excellent thermal properties. He felt Mr. Baker would still get energy efficiency while maintaining the historical character by using a wood frame.

Mr. Baker said he would use wood replacement windows instead of aluminum. Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone else present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

### **Findings of fact & Conclusions**

#### **Background & Request:**

A new retail shop named "Finery" is proposed for the former Emlolly Candy space, which is approximately 800 square feet in area. Replacement windows and signage are proposed to accommodate the new store.

#### **Project Details:**

1. New windows with white aluminum frames were proposed for the existing front and side storefront windows. The existing windows are wood and have some broken glass and framing. Because retention of wood windows is preferred, the applicant agreed to installing wood windows at the meeting.
2. Signage is proposed to replace the existing, including a wall sign and projection sign. Both signs are proposed with gold lettering on a black PVC background that would look like wood. The 5' wide x 2' 11 3/4" high wall sign is proposed to be mounted on the front part of the roof. The 2' 6" x 1' 6" projection sign would be mounted on a bracket similar to the photo in the packet, at the second floor height at the north end of the shop.

#### **Land Use Plans:**

##### **Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance**

There are recommendations in the Worthington Design Guidelines for use of traditional design and materials when renovating structures in the District. If windows must be replaced due to extensive deterioration, use new windows of the same size, design and profile (cross-section), to the greatest extent possible. The guidelines also say wood windows are preferred.

Guideline recommendations for signage include:

- Be efficient in using signs. Consider the audience – small signs can cater to pedestrians and can provide plenty of information in a small area. Try to use as few and as small signs as are necessary to get the business message across to the public.
- Use traditional sign materials and lighting. Traditional sign types most appropriate for Old Worthington include projecting, wall, awning and non-illuminated window signs. Painted wood, or material that looks like painted wood, is the most appropriate material for projecting and wall signs, with external lighting.
- Sign regulations permit signs that project up to three feet from a building wall. This traditional type of sign is appropriate in Old Worthington and can easily be made visible to both pedestrians and people in cars. Sidewalk signs are permitted in the Central Business District.
- Colors for signs in Old Worthington should be chosen for compatibility with the age, architecture and colors of the buildings with which they are associated. Signs must be distinctive enough to be readily visible but should avoid incompatible modern colors. Bright color shades generally are discouraged in favor of more subtle and toned-down shades.

Compatibility of design and materials, exterior detail and relationships, window treatment and signage are standards of review per the Architectural District ordinance.

Mr. Coulter moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY HAROLD C. BAKER FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO REPLACE WINDOWS AND ADD SIGNAGE AT 667 HIGH ST. , AS PER CASE NO. AR 15-14, DRAWINGS NO. AR 15-14, DATED APRIL 11, 2014, AS AMENDED THAT THE WINDOWS BE OF WOOD CONSTRUCTION, 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. Hunter, aye; Mr. Sauer, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Coulter, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye; and Mr. Reis, aye. The motion was approved.

c. Demolition and New Grocery Store – **933 High St.** (InSite Real Estate, LLC/Fresh Thyme Farmers Market) **AR 14-14**

Discussion:

Mr. Hunter explained the next two applications would not be voted on that evening, that the ARB and MPC want to hear questions, comments and concerns at this point in time.

Mrs. Bitar explained the Planned Unit Development application would go to City Council for approval. Once a preliminary plan was approved, final details would return to the ARB and MPC. She said with a larger tract of land there would be a more conceptual approval that would

go on to City Council, but because this is a small area and has just one owner and one developer, the expectations are a little different. Staff and the Board members want to have as much detail as they can up front, but there also needs to be some flexibility. The final plan and ARB approvals would be after the preliminary plan is approved.

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mr. Hunter asked what the state easement was for up front. City of Worthington Engineer, Mr. Bill Watterson, explained the state easement was for a culvert underneath High Street. Mr. Coulter asked if the easement could be vacated. Mr. Watterson said the easement was purchased by the state of Ohio, and could not be vacated unless the easement was bought back. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present.

Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Jeff Brown approached the microphone and stated he is an attorney that works for Smith & Hale and is representing the applicant. Mr. Brown said the developer, architect and engineer were also present and would be able to help answer questions. His client is very anxious to be a part of the Worthington Community. Mr. Brown made reference to the area plan, and noted the community has missed the former Jubilee grocery store, a smaller scale grocery store that is very pedestrian friendly, and Fresh Thyme would fulfill that desire.

Mr. Brown said he had appreciated the time spent working with City staff. Mr. Brown said when they first started this process, staff told them the building needed to be brought up to the street, and there should only be one curb cut located as far north as possible. Mr. Brown said both of those issues were addressed in the drawings. Mr. Brown said the site plan is very pedestrian friendly, with sidewalk access planned along High Street and north and south of the building to the back of the property. He said the old building sat deeper within the property, and the new building will be closer to the High Street with less intrusion into the neighborhood like it is now, replacing the area with a parking lot. Mr. Brown said they had an open house with the neighbors and received a lot of good comments and suggestions. Mr. Brown introduced his client, Justin Haasch, the Director of Real Estate and Market Research for Fresh Thyme, to help answer questions about their concept.

Mr. Haasch said it is a new company, with the first store opening in Mount Prospect, Illinois yesterday. Mr. Haasch said the store could be referred to as the child of the marriage between Whole Foods and Trader Joes. He said they are a little more original than that concept, with a very fun and inviting neighborhood scale shopping experience. The store is small, approximately 28,000 square feet. Mr. Haasch said when you enter the store, you can see the side and back walls, you are invited by colorful produce, prepared foods on the right hand side, and the experience is very unintimidating. Mr. Haasch said he does all of the research for where his company finds stores. He said the neighborhoods he looks for are exactly like Worthington, with highly educated, middle income residents, rather than the very high income other natural and organic companies look for.

Mr. Haasch said that he has presented plans to several landlords and developers over the past eighteen months, and yesterday he was able to take real pictures of the first store's grand opening. Pictures were shown on the overhead screen. Mr. Haasch pointed out the "giving tree" that is painted on the store's window which he said represents their values. He said the "giving

tree” is a way to reach out to local charities and groups. When customers check out, they can choose how the store will donate to charities within the community.

Mr. Coulter asked if the corridor to a front door is intended for customer use, and Mr. Brown said it is for employees. Mr. Brown said the patio along High Street serves two functions. One, customers can sit and enjoy prepared foods from the store, or secondly, anyone walking along, such as customers from Dairy Queen are welcome to sit down and enjoy the patio. Mr. Hunter said it would be really nice in late afternoon because the patio is on the shady side of the building. Mr. Coulter said everyone is excited to see this store coming to Worthington.

Mr. Coulter said his other concern is how customers will get out of the property. Mr. Coulter felt at certain times of day, the traffic will begin to back up in the parking lot. Mr. Brown said they will take a look at the plans to see what can be done.

Mr. Hunter mentioned the idea of a food cart for the east side, and thought the secondary signs would be better placed on the street face of the building since the customers in the parking lot will already be a captive audience. Mr. Hunter said instead of making a faux entrance way, close the doors and make the faux entrance look like a carriage set of doors so customers will know it is not an entrance. He said there is a lot to do between now and the final plan being developed, and he is looking forward to hearing the comments from other Board members and the audience.

Mr. Reis said he is excited about the opportunity to have this store in the community, and is certain they will be able to work through the details and address everyone’s concerns.

Mrs. Lloyd said she is also excited about having this store in Worthington. Mrs. Lloyd said she wished the store would have a street front entrance to encourage pedestrians to come into the store, because she feels the store is catering to cars and not pedestrians. Mrs. Lloyd said she likes the style of windows that are proposed, she feels they look very compatible with the building.

Mrs. Holcombe agrees there should be an entrance somewhere along the High Street side of the building. Mr. Brown said there will be sidewalks on the north and south sides of the building to encourage pedestrians. They tried to make a High St. entrance work but were not able.

Mr. Myers asked if the west face of the building will be east of the neighboring homes. Mr. Brown referenced the aerial, pointing out the building is further toward High St. than the existing. Mr. Myers said he wants to make sure the parking lot and drive entrance are screened from the nearby residences.

Mr. Brown said they met with the homeowners of the nearby residences and they are trying to accommodate everyone’s wishes. Mr. Myers said on the original plans he noticed some rain garden swales as an additional way to retain runoff. He asked if those were still on the table or if those plans have been eliminated. Mr. Brown said they still have some rain gardens in the current plans. Mr. Myers said the ravine that is immediately west of the property is a significant feature to the neighborhood, and the ravine is somewhat fragile. Mr. Myers would like to see everything possible to be done to preserve and even enhance the ravine area. He believes the

pervious pavers will also help. Mr. Patrick Sauerland from InSite Real Estate discussed the rain gardens. He said the rain gardens were initially on the plans, but after their Civil Engineer took a look at the plans, and noticed the slope of the land from east to west, he recommended a pooling area for all the water because of the velocity of storm water that will be coming across the parking lot. The large amount of runoff would not have been maintained by only rain gardens, so that is why pervious pavers were added. All of the rain water will flow to the back of the site, be caught by the curb at the parking lot, and then be absorbed through the pervious pavers. The pavers would act as the infiltration and cleansing that the bio swales were originally intended to do. Mr. Myers asked Mr. Sauerland if more or less storm water will be emptied into the ravine. Mr. Sauerland said the amount of storm water entering the ravine should be about the same or slightly less. Mr. Brown said the OEPA standards are stricter now in terms of water quality and volume than when this site was constructed, and will be followed.

Mr. Coulter asked if Mr. Sauerland had done any of the design calculations on the pipe that will be retaining some of the runoff water, and Mr. Sauerland said yes. Mr. Watterson said he has seen the calculations, and they may need a bit more work, but he is comfortable with the concept.

Mr. Myers asked about the photometric plans and wanted to make sure there will be no light spillage onto the neighboring residential properties. Mr. Sauerland said they may use shades to make sure there are zero candles at the lot line. Mr. Myers reiterated that screening of the neighbors, the runoff, and the light spill are critical issues concerning this property and Mr. Sauerland said he completely understood.

Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Sauerland what type of lamps will be used in the lights. Mr. Sauerland said they are looking at metal halide and possibly LED. Mr. Coulter said that LED would be fine as long as the warm cast LED's are used. Mr. Coulter said they do not want to see the real bright white lights used.

Mr. Myers suggested using a tractor as part of the building design.

Mrs. Lloyd asked Mr. Sauerland if there is any pursuit of LEED certification for this project. Mr. Sauerland said they are not seeking LEED certification at this point but they are including sustainable materials such as pervious pavers, bike racks, and the pedestrian friendly nature of the site.

Mr. Reis agreed with Mrs. Lloyd's comment about the need for an entrance off of High Street. He believes a High Street entrance would be a very positive experience for pedestrians.

Mr. Sauer said he is also disappointed there is not an entrance off of High Street. Mr. Sauer said that he always enjoyed walking past Jubilee and seeing all the plants and flowers for sale, and he believes that would be a good idea for Fresh Thyme to sell plants and flowers on the High Street side of the building. Mr. Sauer also did not like the faux entrance and believes something needs to be done to let customers know that is not the entrance. He also believes the sidewalk leading to the faux entrance should be eliminated. Mr. Sauer said he agreed with Mrs. Lloyd about the windows, and thinks they are fine.

Mr. Hunter asked Mr. Brown if they thought about an entrance only from the High Street side of the building, or if they had a cash-out stand like Lowe's does in their garden center. No answer was given.

Mr. Hunter asked how many people wanted to speak and several people raised their hands.

The first speaker was Mr. Robert Weber, 300 Greenbriar Ct., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Weber said he owns the house and vacant lot immediately adjacent from this property to the north. Mr. Weber said he does like the store's concept; he has missed Jubilee and feels that this new store may be similar to Jubilee. He appreciated the owner being present at the meeting and the fact that they met with residents before to receive input. Mr. Weber said he does have a few concerns. First he is concerned about the amount of traffic coming and going from 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. every day of the week. He asked Mr. Haasch about the number of customers they anticipate having per week and Mr. Haasch stated they hope to have approximately 10,000 customers each week. He said they have double ads on Wednesdays which usually draws more people, and Saturday is generally their busiest day of the week, but will vary from week to week. Mr. Weber asked Mrs. Bitar if that many people are coming and going now, and Mrs. Bitar said they considered the amount of traffic as if the buildings were fully occupied, and those people were coming and going four times a day, arriving, leaving for lunch, returning to work, and then going home for the evening. Mr. Weber said some consideration needs to be given as to the amount of traffic that will be coming and going from this site, and that impact upon the immediate property owners. Mr. Weber said he asked what could be done on the north side of the property as far as setback and buffering because he has not seen any plans regarding this. He suggested moving the driveway further south, or the building should become longer and narrower, or there needs to be consideration for a south exit. Mr. Weber did say he was happy to see the cooling tower removed, but he would like City Council to address the fact that the buffering issue against neighboring property needs to be discussed. He would like to make sure the pine trees located in the easement remain in place. Mr. Weber also believes that a front entrance would be more pedestrian friendly.

Mr. Sauer asked Mr. Weber who owns the easement and Mr. Weber said he was not sure. Mr. Brown said he would check on that issue. There is an existing fence there now, and there will be a fence to screen the property. Mr. Coulter said after reviewing the plans, the trees appear to be behind the fence, but he too would like to see that issue clarified.

The second speaker was Mr. Neil Gant who lives near the west side of the site. He said his biggest concern is the erosion of the ravine, and all of the property west of the parking lot. He said the erosion is due to poor drainage which will be addressed. Mr. Gant said he has spoken with the new owner, and they promised to address that issue, which will be a positive step in the right direction. He is also concerned about the overall maintenance of the site after the fence is installed. He wants to make sure the owner takes care of the property. Mr. Gant felt that keeping the store open until 10:00 p.m. was too late. He figures that people working until 10:00 p.m. will not be leaving the store until 10:30 or 11:00 p.m. and he feels that is too late to have the store open, and would like to see that issue put on the table. Mr. Gant said he is in support of the store, and believes the store will be good for the neighborhood.

The next speaker was Mr. Adam Tomlinson who stated his address is 260 Greenbriar Ct., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Tomlinson said his back door is about ten steps away from the parking lot, so he has a vested interest, but he said he feels very comfortable with the owners and how the owners have been interacting with the neighboring property owners. He said the meetings with the owners have been very positive. Mr. Tomlinson strongly believes the owners care about the property owners' thoughts and wishes, and he hopes that all parties involved work as quickly and prudently as possible to secure such a wonderful opportunity for the residents and the City of Worthington.

The next speaker was Ms. Mary Damsel who stated her address is 970 High St., Unit G, Worthington, Ohio. She said she has lived in the area since the 1970's and has been a resident of Tollgate Square for twenty plus years. Ms. Damsel said she was listening to the concerns about traffic and was wondering if anyone considered problems the Fire Department might have getting through to where they need to go. She wanted to make sure the safety factors are considered.

The next speaker was Doug Chaney, who stated his address is 970 High St., Unit D2, Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Chaney said he is also a resident of Tollgate Square. He said he wanted to echo Ms. Damsel's concerns, but he also wanted to discuss the look of the new building. He said the main reason he chose to live in the Worthington area was because of the heritage of the New England style of architecture. Mr. Chaney feels the proposed building looks like a typical stock building that he has seen in many other places. His request is for the consideration of what the heritage is, and to make sure that all the building materials match what is appropriate for the area.

Mr. Brown thanked everyone for their comments and suggestions, and asked to table the application to address those concerns, and come back with a package that everyone will be comfortable with.

Mrs. Bitar said that there a few things that need to be clarified, such as what the Board would feel comfortable with for the windows that are not going to be seen though. She asked if everyone was comfortable with the window coverings on the front of the building. Mr. Sauer said the way the windows were handled by CVS were acceptable. CVS did not use spandrel glass; they used a shadow box style. Mr. Sauer felt that something like the shadowbox style of window would be more appropriate than the spandrel glass. Mrs. Bitar also asked about the architecture of the building. Mrs. Holcombe said that she wanted to echo what Mr. Chaney discussed about the New England style. She said when they discussed the proposed building that was to be built in 2005, some of the architecture similar to the Orange Johnson House was incorporated into the style. Mrs. Holcombe would like to see the New England style that is seen throughout downtown Worthington, incorporated into this new building.

Mr. Coulter said he would like to see a cross cut in the next drawings that show the roof line, on the inside between the parapets and the heights of the mechanical equipment. He would also like to see what the sight lines are from High Street, and from the neighboring properties behind the site.

Mr. Myers asked the Board members if they had any other suggestions about the faux door on the front of the building. Mr. Sauer said he likes the proposed building better than the building that was proposed back in 2005. Mr. Sauer said that one of the things he likes about Worthington is the variety of architecture which he finds very appealing, but has a common thread of New England detail.

Mr. Hunter reiterated that he looks forward to having this store in town. Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Haasch what other questions he had. Mr. Haasch said he appreciated the input they received this evening and now they can go back to the designer and work on the nitty gritty details. Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Haasch when they would be back. Mr. Haasch said he was not sure, he would have to check with his architects and engineers to determine their schedules. Mr. Myers mentioned he would like to see Mr. Haasch come back as soon as possible to get this project moving before the Board takes a recess in August.

### **Project Details:**

Development Standards from the PUD code are *italicized* and information specific to this plan are in standard text:

1. Allowable Uses:

*The mix of uses allowed in a PUD shall meet changing economic and demographic demands; permit implementation of development standards, plans, studies and guidelines adopted by the City Council; and/or provide the opportunity to retain and enhance the character of the City, and the health, safety and general welfare of the inhabitants.*

The allowable uses would be Grocery and Office Uses (as defined in Section 1123.542 of the Codified Ordinances). Hours of operation would be between 7:00 am and 10:00 pm.

2. Design Regulations:

(a) Character. *The proposed PUD shall consist of an integrated and harmonious design with properly arranged traffic and parking facilities and landscaping. The PUD shall fit harmoniously into and shall not adversely affect adjoining and surrounding properties, Roadways & public facilities.*

The site has been designed with the building at the southeast corner of the property. One drive entrance on the north side is proposed to allow the maximum amount of stacking for cars heading northbound and turning left into the site. Parking is proposed to the rear of the building. Adequate screening for the residential property owners to the north will be necessary.

Typically, the building entrance from the Right-of-Way would be preferred. Due to the City's desire for the parking to be to the rear of the building and the store's need to have a location in the store for food storage and preparation, Fresh Thyme is proposing only one entrance located in the rear adjacent to the parking lot.

(b) Design. *Site layout, Buildings, Accessory Structures, landscaping and lighting shall be compatible with or enhance the surrounding neighborhood and*

*community.*

(1) Site Layout:

- A. The building is proposed 32.1' from the High St. Right-of-Way for the northern part of the property, which is approximately 50' from the road. There is additional Right-of-Way adjacent to the southern part of the property that was obtained for highway purposes at some point in time. For that portion of the High St. frontage the building is proposed at 1.4' from the Right-of-Way.
- B. Walkways and seating areas are proposed along the High St. side of the building, with a connection to the existing sidewalk at the south end. A connection is also needed at the north end. Sidewalks on the north and south sides of the building and a 26' wide drive aisle on the north side of the site would lead to the building entrance and parking lot to the rear. An additional seating area is proposed adjacent to the rear of the building, north of the store entrance. Specifications have been presented for tables, chairs, benches and trash receptacles. Cart corrals are proposed north and south of the entrance, adjacent to the building. No corrals are shown in the parking lot. Clarification of exact placement is needed. At the southwest corner of the building, a 2765 sf enclosed area is planned for deliveries and trash.
- C. The parking lot would have approximately 117 parking spaces, including 5 accessible spaces. All parking is proposed to the rear of the building along the north, west, and south sides of the property. Access around the parking area would be by way of a 23' – 24' wide drive aisle circling the property. Additional parking is proposed in the middle. The turning radii have been designed to allow delivery vehicles comfortable access to the site. Landscape islands are shown throughout the parking lot.
- D. The combination of parcels is requested as part of the approval.

(2) Building:

- A. One building is proposed which would have 28,800 sf devoted to the grocery store and 2765 sf for the enclosed loading and trash area. A variance from Section 1174.03 (f) which limits retail uses to 20,000 square feet in gross floor area would be needed as part of the approval. No accessory structures are proposed.
- B. The building is designed to look like a 2 story building with a flat roof, with the upper façade being a parapet that would screen the mechanicals on the roof. The main material planned for the building is a structural brick, which would be used for all 4 sides of the building. Brick pilasters are included on the east, north and south elevations, and larger protruding corner elements are proposed. Other materials proposed are: a stone

vener water table; stone accents; metal coping; fiber cement siding and trim for the main entry gable (west elevation); and standing seam metal awnings above the windows. Samples have been provided, but specification sheets are needed for the brick and stone. The way the stone is shown extending up the pilasters, but not abutting the nearest windows, seems contrary to traditional design.

- C. Proposed windows on the front and sides of the building are aluminum storefront style for the first and second floors. Second floor windows would have traditionally been smaller and simpler than first floor storefront windows. Due to these areas being the back of the store, and the second floor windows being false, spandrel glazing and shutters are proposed to screen the view through those windows. As spandrel glass is not typical for Worthington, alternatives should be given careful consideration. The rear windows are closer to the traditional fenestration seen in Worthington, with larger windows on the first floor and smaller windows on the second floor. The dark bronze windows should have wide muntins. Specification sheets will be needed.
- D. At the entry, the stone in the water table would extend up to a gable which would have vertical fiber cement siding. Wood barn doors are shown on the plans that are fixed to the building, framing automatic sliding doors. On the front of the building, a more substantial feature is shown in the middle, with barn doors as a frame to the windows. The barn doors seem to be in character with the rear entry feature, but may not be appropriate on the front of the building. The placement of man doors on the front, especially the northernmost door, is awkward.

(3) Landscaping:

The submitted landscape plan shows a mixture of shrubs, ornamental grasses and perennials in planting beds along the north east and west sides of the building. Along the perimeter of the parking lot and in landscape islands 21 trees are proposed. Additional landscaping is desired at the west end of the parking lot and if possible along the north side of the drive.

(4) Lighting:

Gooseneck lamps are proposed at locations around the building, with wall packs being proposed on the south side to illuminate the sidewalk. Decorative light fixtures are proposed for the parking lot. The poles should not be higher than 15', and the concrete bases should not be exposed. Light is not permitted to shine on adjacent properties, and the light source should not be visible from off of the site. The photometric plan does not indicate 0 footcandles of light at the property lines., which will be required.

(5) Signage:

The applicant is proposing a freestanding sign along High St. and wall-

mounted signs on the front and back of the building identifying Fresh Thyme Farmer's Market. Also, smaller product signs are shown above the windows on the rear elevation. The design guidelines recommend minimizing the size and number of signs; free-standing signs should be monument style and as low as possible, and have a base appropriate to the building; traditional sign materials and lighting are preferred (wood or composite to look like wood; individually mounted lettering is preferred; no cabinet box signs or exposed raceways; external or halo illumination) and bright colors are generally discouraged. Sign size limitations and design standards should be set with the PUD Preliminary Plan approval, but final design could be approved with the Final Plan and ARB approvals.

- (c) *Screening. Commercial and industrial uses, including parking facilities and refuse containers, shall be permanently screened from all adjoining residential uses.*

Properties north, west and south of the development would be screened with existing or new 6' wood board on board fencing. Additional landscaping may also be needed in those areas. The loading dock and dumpster would be inside the building.

- (d) *Tract Coverage. The ground area occupied by all Buildings shall be balanced with green space to soften the appearance of the development.*

Tract coverage as shown is similar to the existing development. The addition of landscaping around the building and parking lot should help soften the appearance of the development. Additional street trees may be desired.

### 3. Traffic and Parking:

- (a) *Traffic. Adequate ingress and egress shall be provided. The proposed development shall be located so that reasonably direct traffic access is supplied from major thoroughfares and where congestion will not likely be created by the proposed development. Where potential congestion may be alleviated by installation of Improvements on streets abutting the development, the developer shall be required to pay the cost of the construction of Improvements and shall dedicate or deed lands necessary for street widening purposes when so required by the City. A traffic study shall be provided by the applicant as required by the City.*

Safety to and from the site should be improved by reducing the number of curb cuts to one, and locating it on the north side of the property. No need for improvements in the Right-of-Way has been identified. Delivery Truck and service vehicles would only access the site between 7:00 am and 7:00 pm.

- (b) *Parking:*

- (1) *Design. Parking and service areas shall be designed and located to protect the character of the area.*

The parking lot is being screened with fencing and landscaping, which should protect the adjacent properties.

- (2) *Non-residential Uses. Parking shall be adequate to serve the proposed uses, but shall in no case exceed one-hundred and twenty (120) percent of the parking requirement in Section 1171.01.*

Clarification will be needed on the number of parking spaces, shown as 117 and 122 on different sheets. Per the existing Code, 200 spaces would be required. The shown parking should be adequate to serve the use.

- (3) *Bicycle Parking. Bicycle parking should be adequate to serve the proposed uses.*

Bicycle racks are proposed along High St. and near the store entrance. Exact style, number of racks and locations will need to be identified.

4. General Requirements:

*Environment. The City may request environmental studies for the property, and may request and receive reports and studies from any agency having jurisdiction over the property, indicating whether there are any environmental issues that would affect the property and/or surrounding properties with the proposed development.*

No environmental issues have been identified. Storm water runoff from the site should be improved with detention of the water from the site.

*Natural Features.*

*The Municipal Planning Commission shall not recommend a PUD unless it finds that such development preserves, restores, maintains and/or enhances: (1) Natural Features and (2) the character of the surrounding neighborhood and community. The Municipal Planning Commission shall not recommend a PUD if it finds that the Natural Features on such property have been or will be removed, damaged, altered or destroyed in anticipation of development until agreement is reached between the applicant and the Municipal Planning Commission on permanent restoration of Natural Features. All healthy trees 6" caliper or larger shall be retained, or replaced with total tree trunk equal in diameter to the removed tree, and this shall be documented as part of an approved Natural Features preservation plan and/or landscape plan. In the event the Municipal Planning Commission determines that full replacement would result in the unreasonable crowding of trees upon the Lot, or that such replacement is not feasible given site conditions, a fee of four hundred fifty dollars (\$450.00) per caliper inch of trees lost and not replaced on such property shall be paid in cash to the City for deposit in the Special Parks Fund. Such deposits shall be used for reforestation on public property.*

Trees and the slope at the west end into the creek are the Natural Features of the site. The applicant is proposing saving as many trees as possible; removing invasive plant species and dead or dying trees; and adding turf mat and rip-rap as necessary to prevent erosion on the slope. Tree replacement must be evaluated.

Public Area Payments.

*The City Council shall determine whether a portion of such PUD should be dedicated on the plan to a public agency for park, playground or recreational uses. Such dedication may be required only if the City Council determines that there is a need for such property and that the dedication is related both in nature and extent to the impact that the proposed development will have on the parks and recreation system.*

There is no land to dedicate.

*Whenever commercial or industrial space is created as part of a PUD, then the developer or owner, as the case may be, shall make a cash payment to the City in the amount of one hundred dollars (\$100.00) per 1000 gross square feet of new or expanded commercial or industrial space for deposit in the Special Parks Fund. Such deposits shall be used for costs associated with the City's parks, playground and recreation areas. This section shall not apply to any PUD for which a dedication of land to the City was required pursuant to subsection (A) hereof.*

*The public area payment required by this section shall be made prior to the issuance of the building permit for the project.*

The required public area payment would be \$3000.

Public Space Amenities. *A minimum of one Public Space Amenity as approved by the Municipal Planning Commission shall be required for every five-thousand (5000) square feet of gross floor area of multiple family dwelling, commercial or industrial space that is new in the PUD. Public Space Amenities are elements that directly affect the quality and character of the public domain.*

Amenities are indicated as follows:

- An accessible plaza designed for public use
- Seat walls
- Decorative planters
- Bicycle racks
- Decorative waste receptacles
- Decorative pedestrian lighting is listed as an amenity but not shown.

**Land Use Plans:**

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

There are recommendations in the Worthington Design Guidelines to extend the pedestrian scale and walkability of the city's commercial heart. The Guidelines call for extension of the pleasant scale of Old Worthington into new areas; use of simple geometric forms and uncomplicated

massing; parking areas located toward the rear; use of traditional materials, avoiding any use of glass with reflective coatings; and traditional design. Use traditional sizes, proportions and spacing for first and upper floor windows. The standards of review in the Architectural District ordinance are:

1. Height;
2. Building massing, which shall include the relationship of the building width to its height and depth, and its relationship to the viewer's and pedestrian's visual perspective;
3. Window treatment, which shall include the size, shape and materials of the individual window units and the overall harmonious relationship of window openings;
4. Exterior detail and relationships, which shall include all projecting and receding elements of the exterior, including but not limited to, porches and overhangs and the horizontal or vertical expression which is conveyed by these elements;
5. Roof shape, which shall include type, form and materials;
6. Materials, texture and color, which shall include a consideration of material compatibility among various elements of the structure;
7. Compatibility of design and materials, which shall include the appropriateness of the use of exterior design details;
8. Landscape design and plant materials, which shall include, in addition to requirements of this Zoning Code, lighting and the use of landscape details to highlight architectural features or screen or soften undesirable views;
9. Pedestrian environment, which shall include the provision of features which enhance pedestrian movement and environment and which relate to the pedestrian's visual perspective;
10. Signage, which shall include, in addition to requirements of Chapter 1170, the appropriateness of signage to the building.
11. Sustainable Features, which shall include environmentally friendly details and conservation practices such as solar energy panels, bike racks, and rain barrels.

#### Worthington Comprehensive Plan Update & 2005 Strategic Plan

The plan calls this area the “Old Worthington Transition Area”, and recommends the creation of an additional pedestrian-oriented neighborhood retail node, and targeting desired retailers. Shortly after completion of the plan, Jubilee Foods closed in 2006. Worthington residents have been asking for a small specialty grocery store in or near Downtown Worthington since that time.

Mr. Coulter moved to table the application. Mr. Sauer seconded the motion. All Board members voted “Aye” and the motion was tabled.

### **C. Municipal Planning Commission**

#### **1. Planned Unit Development – Preliminary Plan**

- a. Zoning for New Grocery Store – **933 High St.** (InSite Real Estate, LLC/Fresh Thyme Farmers Market) **PUD 02-14**

## **Findings of fact & Conclusions**

### **Background & Request:**

The comments from the Architectural Review Board agenda item, case #AR 14-14, also apply to this application.

### **Project Details:**

1. The comments from the Architectural Review Board agenda item, case #AR 14-14, also apply to this application.
2. Per Chapter 1174 of the Codified Ordinances, the Preliminary Plan submittal shall include the following:

(a) *A legal description and vicinity map showing the property lines, streets, existing Zoning, and land uses within 300 feet of the area proposed for the PUD*

A legal description has been submitted. The description and a Final Plat will need approval from the Franklin County Engineer's Office.

(b) *Names and addresses of owners, developers and the registered land surveyor, engineer or architect who made the plan*

The developer and future property owner is InSite Real Estate, LLC, 1400 16<sup>th</sup> St., suite 300, Oak Brook, IL 60523. The surveyor/engineer is Woolpert, One Easton Oval, Suite 310, Columbus, OH 43219. The architect is NORR, 719 Griswold St., Suite 100, Detroit, MI 48226.

(c) *Date, north arrow and total acreage of the site*

The submittal date was April 11, 2014; north arrows are shown on all pages necessary; and total site area is approximately 2.65 acres.

(d) *A topographical survey of all land included in the application and such other land adjoining the subject property as may be reasonably required by the City. The topographical survey shall show two foot contours or contours at an interval as may be required by the Municipal Planning Commission to delineate the character of the land included in the application and such adjoining land as may be affected by the application. Elevations shall be based on North American Vertical Datum of 1988 (NAVD88)*

See page C100.

(e) *Existing Structures, parking and traffic facilities, Easements and public Rights-of-Way on the subject property as well as within 300 feet of the area proposed for PUD*

See page C100 for the subject property and High St. Right-of-Way.

- (f) *Existing sewers, water mains, culverts and other underground facilities within the tract and in the vicinity, indicating pipe size, grades and exact locations*

See page C100.

- (g) *The location of Natural Features and provisions necessary to preserve and/or restore and maintain them to maintain the character of the surrounding neighborhood and community*

Trees and the slope at the west end into the creek are the Natural Features of the site. The applicant is proposing saving as many trees as possible; removing invasive plant species and dead or dying trees; and adding turf mat and rip-rap as necessary to prevent erosion on the slope.

- (h) *A tree preservation plan showing all existing trees 6" caliper or larger*

Plan number C101 shows retention of the trees at the perimeter of the property. The trees internal to the site would be removed and re-planted with the development as shown on the landscape plan, C400

- (i) *A preliminary grading plan*

See sheet C300.

- (j) *Preliminary design and location of Structures, Accessory Structures, streets, drives, traffic patterns, Sidewalks or Recreation Paths, parking, entry features, site lighting, landscaping, screening, Public Space Amenities and other features as required by the City*

The comments from the Architectural Review Board agenda item, case #AR 14-14, also apply to this application. The preliminary finished floor elevation is 860.50, which is close to the existing grade.

- (k) *The proposed provision of water, sanitary sewer and surface drainage facilities, including engineering feasibility studies or other evidence of reasonableness of such facilities*

(1) Plan C300 shows:

- A. Connecting the new building to the existing 12" sanitary sewer along the south property line with a 6" lateral;
- B. Connecting the new building to the existing 6" water main on the west side of the High St. Right-of-Way with a 2" domestic water service;
- C. Removal of the existing 30" and 42" storm sewers on the south end and in the middle of the property;
- D. Installing a new 54" storm sewer at the north end;

- E. Installing 12” storm sewer at the north and south property lines;
- F. Installing an underground storm water detention basin to collect the storm water from the site.

(l) *Parcels of land intended to be dedicated or temporarily reserved for public use, or reserved by deed covenant, and the condition proposed for such covenants and for the dedications*

This provision is not applicable.

(m) *Proposed Easements*

An easement would be necessary for the bypass storm sewer along High St. and across the site, and should be shown on the plat. There is already an easement along the south property line for the existing sanitary sewer.

(n) *Proposed uses, including area of land devoted to each use*

The entire site would be devoted to Fresh Thyme Farmer’s Market.

(o) *Proposed construction schedule*

The construction schedule has not been submitted.

(p) *Development Standards Text*

The Development Standards Text has been submitted, but will need additions and revisions.

(q) The Municipal Planning Commission and the City Council may require any additional information.

3. Included in the packet is a copy of the applicant’s presentation to be made at the meeting.

**Land Use Plans:**

The comments from the Architectural Review Board agenda item, case #AR 14-14, also apply to this application.

Mr. Coulter moved to table the application. Mrs. Holcombe seconded the application. All Board members voted “Aye” and the motion was tabled.

**D. Other**

There was no other business to discuss.

**E. Adjournment**

Mr. Reis moved to adjourn the meeting, and Mrs. Holcombe seconded the motion. All members said, "Aye". The meeting adjourned at 9:38 p.m.