



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

July 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 Jo Rodgers. Also present were: Scott Myers, Worthington City Council Representative for the Municipal Planning Commission; Lee Brown, Director of Planning & Building; Lynda Bitar, Planning Coordinator and Clerk of the Municipal Planning Commission; and Melissa Cohan, Paralegal. Board member Amy Lloyd was absent.

A. Call to Order – 7:30 p.m.

1. Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Approval of minutes of the July 10, 2014 meeting

Mr. Coulter moved to approve the minutes, and Mr. Reis seconded the motion. All members voted, "Aye".

4. Affirmation/swearing in of witnesses

B. Architectural Review Board

1. Unfinished

- a. Sign – **5655 N. High St.** (Thirty Four Corporation) **AR 19-14**

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mr. Sauer asked if the applicant was present. Ms. Lauren Tonti approached the microphone and stated her address is 4162 Maystar Way, Hilliard, Ohio 43026. Ms. Tonti said she worked with the owner and the sign company to try to reduce the size but keep the appeal of the design while complying with the codes of Worthington. Mr. Coulter asked Ms. Tonti if she discussed moving the sign to the other side of the driveway as they had discussed at an earlier public hearing. She said the owner prefers to

leave the sign in the current location. Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone else that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

The building and parcel at 5655 N. High St. do not front N. High St.; the frontage is along W. Selby Blvd. At the time of construction in the early 1960's, the building was given a N. High St. address and a freestanding sign to advertise the building was installed on a vacant N. High St. lot under the same ownership. Architectural Review Board approval was not required at that time and there is no record of other sign regulations. The sign is located south of the mostly vacant lot's drive (houses a seasonal garden center). That drive also allows access to Key Bank and the building at 5655 N. High St.

The existing sign is considered non-conforming because it is an off-premises sign; is larger than the allowable 30 square feet per side (approximately 64 square feet in area per side); is closer than 10' to the Right-of-way, and 35' to the side property line; and was designed to identify up to 14 tenants on each sign face, rather than the 3 tenants allowed in the current Code. Once a non-conforming sign is altered to an extent of more than fifty percent, it must be reconstructed to conform to the existing Code. The sign has been damaged over the years.

The applicant would like to install a freestanding sign, reusing only the existing sign base, as part of an effort to update the property. On May 22nd, the ARB reviewed a version of the sign (marked as previous submittal in the packet) that was 9'2" high x 9'5" wide sign, approximately 86 square feet in area per side, and included a 2' high x 9'5" wide (19 square feet in area) pediment at the top. On this revision, the panel and pediment heights have been reduced, and the address has been moved to the pediment, eliminating one of the panels.

Project Details:

1. Proposed now is a 7' 4½" high x 9' 2" wide double-sided sign, approximately 68 square feet in area, with a 1'6" high x 9'2" wide (14 square feet in area) pediment at the top. The effective proposed sign area (area below the pediment and above the support poles) would be about 43 square feet, similar to the existing sign. The existing base is concrete, measuring 19" high x 82" wide, and is proposed for reuse in the same location. Because the base falls within the 2' high x 8' wide allowable area for supporting structures, that area need not be included as part of sign area.
2. A non-illuminated aluminum sign cabinet with plastic changeable faces to accommodate up to 9 business names per side is proposed. The cabinet and faces are proposed in a light tan color called "Snow Goose", with the text being brown. The 6" size and the font of all lettering are proposed to match. Leasing information is shown on the sample sign.
3. Due to the existing sign being nonconforming, the applicant would need variances from the Board of Zoning Appeals for sign area, location as an off-premises sign, front and side yard setbacks, and for the number of businesses displayed on the sign.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

The Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance recommend signs be efficient and compatible with the age and architecture of the building. The design guidelines recommend minimizing the size 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.

Recommendation:

Although the proposed sign is still larger than typical, and with more tenant spaces than allowed, the use of only two colors and the same font style and size for all lettering help mitigate the effect of the sign on the High St. traffic. The basic look of the sign is complementary to the building and an improvement from the existing sign. The lack of illumination is also favorable.

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY THIRTY FOUR CORPORATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO REFACE THE SIGN AT 5655 N. HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 19-14, DRAWINGS NO. AR 19-14, DATED JULY 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, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Coulter, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; and Mrs. Rodgers, aye. The motion was approved.

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

The information in this item has been consolidated in PUD 02-14, Agenda Item #C,3,a below.

2. New

- a. Flagpole – **7227 N. High St.**, Space 1 (Richard Cunningham, DDS) **AR 38-14**

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Dr. Cunningham approached the microphone and stated he is owner of the Worthington Dental Group. Dr. Cunningham said he is a big supporter of a charity called Independence Fund that buys motor scooters for wounded soldiers. He feels the flag will look good in the proposed location and be very patriotic. Mr. Sauer said he likes the idea and asked Dr. Cunningham if the color of the flagpole will match the other poles in the area and Dr. Cunningham said it can. Mrs. Rodgers asked Dr. Cunningham if he will continue to keep flowers in the same area too and he

said yes. Mrs. Holcombe asked Dr. Cunningham if he plans to take the flag down every day or if the flag will be illuminated. Dr. Cunningham said there are two light poles nearby. If the flag is not illuminated at night he will take the flag down. Mr. Coulter asked if the mall owner approved the flagpole and Dr. Cunningham said yes, Mr. Carter said the flagpole is fine as long as the Architectural Review Board says okay. Mrs. Bitar confirmed that Mr. Carter signed the application. 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 & Conclusions

Background & Request:

Worthington Dental Group renovated and occupied this space at the southwest corner of Shops at Worthington Place about two years ago. Dr. Cunningham would like to install a pole near the exterior south side entrance to the office to fly the American flag.

Project Details:

1. Proposed is a 30' high black pole, to be located between the entry stairs to the office in a planter.
2. Existing lights would illuminate the flag at night.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Although flagpoles are not directly addressed in the Design Guidelines, all structures need to be appropriately placed as to not detract from the existing environment.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending *approval* of this application, as the flagpole should be a nice addition at this location.

Mr. Sauer moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY RICHARD CUNNINGHAM FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL A FLAGPOLE AT 7227 N. HIGH ST., SPACE 1, AS PER CASE NO. AR 38-14, DRAWINGS NO. AR 38-14, DATED JUNE 18, 2014, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING WITH THE UNDERSTANDING THAT THE FINISH OF THE FLAG POLE WILL BE A DARK COLOR TO MATCH THE ADJACENT LIGHT POLES.

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

- b. Dormer Addition, Window & Condensing Unit – **36 W. South St.** (Brian Zingelmann, Architect/ Collingwood & Green) **AR 39-14**

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Brian Zingelmann approached the microphone and stated he lives at 261 Garden Rd., Columbus, Ohio. Mr. Sauer asked what type of window will be used as the replacement and Mr. Zingelmann said vinyl windows will be used, and are located at the side and on the older addition of the house. 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 & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This house was originally constructed in 1834, with an addition built in 1857. The house has been renovated over the years, but the basic character of the house has not changed. This proposal would add a rear dormer, change a rear window, and approve a condensing unit on the east side of the house.

Project Details:

1. The proposed 6' wide gabled dormer is proposed on the west side shed roof, to allow additional space for a second floor bedroom. Materials for the dormer would include: Asphalt shingles to match the existing roof; cedar shakes to match the style and color of the shakes on the house; trim to match existing house; and a new vinyl awning window.
2. A second floor wood awning window is slated for replacement with a vinyl awning window of the same size in the same location.
3. Approval is sought for a condensing unit that was placed on the east side of the house. The unit is approximately 12' from the property line and screened on the east side with existing vegetation. Additional landscape screening is needed on the south side. Approval was granted by the ARB in 2003 for placement of this unit, but has since expired.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Additions should be subordinate and located as far to the rear as possible. 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. Compatibility of design and materials, exterior detail and relationships, and window treatment are standards of review in the Architectural District ordinance.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending *approval* of this application. The proposed dormer is properly sized and placed and the condensing unit is in an acceptable location. The replacement and new windows should match the style of the existing.

Mrs. Rodgers moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY BRIAN ZINGELMANN FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO CONSTRUCT A DORMER ADDITION AND LOCATE A CONDENSING UNIT AT 36 W. SOUTH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 39-14, DRAWINGS NO. AR 39-14, DATED JULY 9, 2014, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING WITH THE UNDERSTANDING THAT THE AC UNIT WILL BE SCREENED FROM THE STREET.

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

c. New Garage, Roof, Windows & Railing – **123 W. North St.** (Thomas R. Zack) **AR 40-14**

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Thomas Zack approached the microphone and stated his address is 123 W. North St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Zack said he will come back to the Board with drawings for a smaller garage. Mr. Hunter asked Mr. Zack if he wanted to eliminate the garage from the application and Mr. Zack said yes, he will have his architect scale back the drawings for the garage if the Board feels the garage is too large for the location. Mr. Zack was uncertain of the height of the proposed garage. Mr. Sauer said downsizing the garage makes sense. Mrs. Holcombe also agreed the garage needs to be in proportion with the house. Mr. Reis explained the Board is not asking for a reduced number of bays, they would like to see the height of the gable reduced. Mr. Coulter asked Mrs. Bitar if the garage portion of the application can be eliminated, and Mrs. Bitar explained the Board may want to approve just the demolition of the existing garage.

Mr. Zack said he plans to work on the garage project last so there is no need to approve the demolition now. Mr. Hunter explained to Mr. Zack the Board recesses in the month of August, and Mr. Zack said he was not in a hurry to work on the garage. Mrs. Bitar explained the Board could remove the garage portion of the application. Mr. Hunter said he would not have a problem keeping the demolition portion of the garage in the application.

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 & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This main portion of this 1940's vernacular style house is 1 ½ stories with dormers, and there is a single story extending across the rear of the house. This application is a request for approval to make improvements to the house, demolish the existing garage, and construct a new garage.

Project Details:

1. The applicant would like to paint the vinyl siding on the house and install a new roof. The entire roof will be replaced with "Black Shadow" dimensional asphalt shingles.
2. A 36" black aluminum railing is proposed for the east half of the 1st floor roof in the rear, about 8" from the edge.
3. The rear windows on the first floor currently have fixed windows. Replacement of those windows with wood casement windows is proposed. Also proposed for the rear of the house is replacement of a greenhouse window with wood double hung windows, and an existing window and door with a sliding glass door.
4. Demolition of the existing garage is proposed. The existing garage has a gabled roof, one overhead door and an awning style door. Construction of a new three-car garage was proposed but is no longer part of this application. The proposed garage was 24' x 38', with a 12 over 12 gable, three overhead doors and an upstairs storage area. Gabled dormers were proposed on the front, with a shed dormer on the rear elevation. Two double-hung windows were shown on each side, with a man door on the west side. Vinyl siding, painted to match the new house color, and the same roof material were proposed. In elevation, the garage was shown to be taller than the house.
5. Due to the size of the garage, a variance for accessory structure area exceeding 850 square feet was been requested.
6. The house extends across two 50' wide lots that must be combined with this proposal.

Land Use Plans:Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

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

Older outbuildings, sheds, and garages should be retained and repaired. They add variety and visual interest to the streetscape and are part of Worthington's character. New outbuildings should use design cues from older nearby structures, including form, massing, roof shape, roof pitch and height, materials, window and door types and detailing. Try to create a new building compatible in appearance with the house it accompanies.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending *partial approval* of this application. Although the proposed garage has similar design elements to the house, it appears the gable pitch may be steeper than the house making the massing out of character. Clarification or adjustment is needed. The other work proposed is appropriate.

Mr. Coulter moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY THOMAS R. ZACK FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO RENOVATE THE HOUSE, AND DEMOLISH THE GARAGE AT 123 W. NORTH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 40-14, DRAWINGS NO. AR 40-14, DATED JULY 11, 2014, RECOGNIZING THAT THE NEW GARAGE CONSTRUCTION IS BEING PULLED FROM THIS APPLICATION BUT THE GARAGE DEMOLITION CAN GO AHEAD AND OCCUR, AND BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

Mrs. Holcombe seconded the application. Mr. Hunter, aye; Mr. Sauer, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Coulter, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; and Mrs. Rodgers, aye. The motion was approved.

C. Municipal Planning Commission

1. Conditional Use Permit

- a. Wholesale Business in I-1 Zoning District – **1004 Proprietors Rd.** (Terry Hughes/PRH Motorcycles, LLC) **CU 06-14**

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Phil Megla approached the microphone and stated his address is 561 Schrock Rd., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Megla stated his father remodeled the building back in 1983 and the parking lot was approved in the current condition. Mr. Megla said he was confused why cars could not be parked in the same place they have been parked in the past. Mrs. Bitar said they looked at some historical photos for this location and did not see cars parked in the right-of-way. Mr. Megla said if cars cannot park in that location there will be very limited use for the building. He thought at one period of time this particular building used to be a gas station. Mrs. Bitar said there was an expansion of this building approved at some point, with the owner claiming not as much need for parking. Mr. Megla said when he used to have his business at this location he was just using the building for office space. Mr. Brown asked Mr. Megla if the parking was ever striped. Mr. Megla said there may have been a couple of stripes on the right side.

Mrs. Holcombe asked Mr. Megla if he was working on the cars parked in the front, or are if those cars belong to employees. Mr. Megla said his tenant could answer that question. Ms. Michelle Tribble approached the microphone and stated her address is 796 Morning St., Worthington, Ohio. Ms. Tribble said the cars parked in the right-of-way are cars that will be offered to other dealers. She said the purpose of her business is to stage vehicles. She purchases them from a dealer, and then within a day or two those vehicles are sold to another dealer. The cars are parked sometimes for two hours or two days. Ms. Tribble said her employees only perform light maintenance on vehicles before being transferred to another dealer; they do not do any body work on the cars.

Mr. Hunter asked Ms. Tribble if she could park the cars on the other side, next to the building. Ms. Tribble said that is something she can consider and add lines to the lot. Ms. Tribble said she does not have customers, only dealers that will stop by for a short visit to pick out cars. She asked the Board for suggestions as to how she would be allowed to line the parking lot and still have access to the garage door. Mr. Hunter explained if the cars are pulled away from the right-of-way, then the problem will be solved. Ms. Tribble explained that she is not open to the public, her business has very limited hours, and she is asking the Board for a solution so she can park her cars somewhere and operate her business.

Mr. Megla where asked where the right-of-way line is located. Mr. Brown said the right-of-way line is approximately thirteen feet behind the curb. Ms. Tribble asked if she could park the cars anyway she wanted as long as the cars were parked thirteen feet behind the curb. No answer was given. Mr. Coulter suggested that Ms. Tribble have a sight plan completed to determine what would work best for her parking situation. Mr. Hunter suggested tabling the application until further information is available. Ms. Tribble said she would like to do that. She wants to keep her business in Worthington because she lives here and her kids go to Worthington Schools. Mrs. Bitar said Ms. Tribble also needs to apply for a Change of Occupancy.

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 & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This property is an unusually shaped approximately ¼ acre lot, situated north and west of the Ohio Railway Museum's main location. The 1440 square foot building was renovated in 1983 and variances were granted for proximity of the building on the site. In 1990, a second floor office and rear storage addition was approved for use by Perma View of Columbus. At that time the parking requirements were met for the use of the building as office, showroom and storage space. The owner stated that 90% of their business was done away from the site so there was never a problem with parking. The addition was not constructed. At some point between 1980 and 1995 pavement was extended to the back of the street curb.

The current request involves an automobile wholesale business which is operating at the site. Wholesale businesses are conditional uses in the I-1 Zoning District, allowing the MPC to review the effect the business will have on the neighborhood.

Project Details:

1. The business, PRH Motorsports LLC, purchases and sells vehicles without registrations to other dealers and wholesalers. Hours of use are generally 9:00 am to 5:00 pm weekdays, and 9:00 am – 12:00 pm on Saturday. There is a mechanic on site that works on vehicles.
2. A site plan identifying how many vehicles could legally park on the site has not been submitted. No parking spaces are delineated, and it seems there are vehicles parked in the Right-of-way, which is the area within approximately 14' of the back of the street curb.

Parking in the Right-of-way would not be allowed. Also, screening is desirable for the other parking visible from the street.

3. The parking requirements for the business have not been identified. It is not clear how many vehicles are typically on the site waiting to be transferred; how much traffic, if any, comes to the site to look at vehicles; and how many employees are at the site regularly.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Conditional Use Permit Regulations

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

Worthington Comprehensive Plan Update & 2005 Strategic Plan

An area plan focusing on the Proprietors/Huntley Road corridor should be developed that makes recommendations for repositioning it in the market place to make it attractive and competitive in the region. Because of the age and types of uses located here, this compact area is experiencing significant change and has the opportunity to reinvent itself. Issues such as building renovation, aesthetics, and possible road and infrastructure improvements should be addressed.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending *denial* of this application, without more information and potential changes regarding parking. The business seems appropriate on this site, except that parking in the Right-of-way and without screening from the street is not acceptable.

Mr. Reis moved to table this application and Mr. Sauer seconded the motion. All members voted, "Aye". The application was tabled.

2. Amendment to Development Plan

- a. Signage – **125 Old Wilson Bridge Rd.** (Stanley W. Young III, Columbus Sign Co.) **ADP 05-14**

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Stanley W. Young, III, approached the microphone and stated his address is 1515 E. Fifth Avenue, Columbus, Ohio. Mr. Young distributed sample materials to the Board members. He said the first sample is computer cut plate aluminum, and the material will be finished, primed and painted with a gray background. The words "The Heights at Worthington Place" will be decorated with white vinyl. Both will be attached to the extended canopies on both elevations.

Mr. Reis said he was concerned about the size of the address numbers. He felt 42 inch numbers were too large. Mr. Coulter said he was fine with the type of material, but agreed with Mr. Reis about the size of the numbers being too large. Mr. Young said the size of the numbers can be reduced. Mrs. Rodgers explained she is not a voting member for the Municipal Planning Commission, but said she likes the scale at the entrance with the large white space behind. She feels the large white space needs to be filled up with something. Mrs. Rodgers said the other entrance does not have the large white space, and a smaller scaled number would be more appropriate for that location. Mr. Coulter proposed both entrance address numbers be 24 inches tall, and Mrs. Holcombe agreed with Mr. Coulter. Mr. Reis felt 24 inches would be more appropriate. 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 & Conclusions

Background & Request:

The new apartment buildings at Worthington Place were approved in 2013 and construction is well under way, with Building #2 (125 Old Wilson Bridge Rd.) being substantially erected. The applicant is seeking approval for the Building #2 signage to identify the east and south entrances.

Project Details:

1. Two identical signs are proposed with the following specifications:
 - The signs would be cut from flat aluminum plates
 - 24” high address numbers would extend above the canopies; 2’ high x 5’6” rectangular signs (11 square feet in area) identifying “The Heights at Worthington Place” would be below
 - Background shown as Dark Grey; graphics White cut vinyl
 - The proposed signs are not illuminated.
2. A variance is needed to allow two wall signs for a single business.

Land Use Plans:

Wilson Bridge Rd. Corridor Study

Wilson Bridge Rd. Corridor draft criteria limits wall-mounted signage to a maximum square footage of 40 square feet, and calls for the signs to be designed appropriately for the building, and not be constructed as cabinet box signs or have exposed raceways.

Development Plan Amendment Ordinance

If an amendment does not conflict with the character or integrity of the development, but an additional variance is required, the approval must be by City Council.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending *approval* of the application. The signs keep the character of the development and act as directional signs identifying the entrances.

Mr. Sauer moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY STANLEY W. YOUNG III TO AMEND THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR THE APARTMENTS AT 125 OLD WILSON BRIDGE RD. AS PER CASE NO. ADP 07-14, DRAWINGS NO. ADP 07-14, DATED JULY 11, 2014, WITH THE MODIFICATION THAT THE HEIGHT OF THE ADDRESS NUMBERS BE 24 INCHES, AND BE RECOMMENDED TO CITY COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

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

b. Information item – 160 W. Wilson Bridge Rd.

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar discussed the informational item. Mr. Tom Linzell approached the microphone and stated his address is 775 Yard St., Grandview, Ohio. Mr. Linzell said the exterior of the building will not be effected. The one-bedroom units were designed so they could be combined either top to bottom or side by side. Mr. Linzell said on the current plans, there is a three bedroom unit on the sixth floor facing Corporate Hill Drive, and the unit below and across the hallway will be made into three bedroom units. The total of three bedroom units will go from one to eight, plus the two townhouse units. Mr. Coulter asked if the requests were made by families. Mrs. Bitar said she believed the requests were made by empty nesters.

Mr. Linzell said the total number of units will go from 200 to 193, with 81 one-bedroom units, 103 two-bedroom units, and 10 three-bedroom units. Mr. Hunter thanked Mr. Linzell for the information.

3. Planned Unit Development – Final Plan

a. Final Plan for New Grocery Store – 933 High St. (InSite Real Estate, LLC) PUD 02-14 (F1)

Discussion:

Mr. Hunter explained this item has been reviewed by the Architectural Review Board several times, with the PUD (Planned Unit Development) Preliminary Plan approved by City Council. He said the Board will be voting on details for this site. Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Jeffrey Brown approached the microphone and stated he is an attorney representing the applicant. Mr. Brown stated his address is 37 W. Broad St., Columbus, Ohio. Mr. Brown said Patrick Sauerland from InSite Real Estate was in attendance to answer technical questions.

Mr. Brown said there will be benches outside of the store, up against the building, on both the east and west sides. Mr. Brown mentioned there was a typo for the finished floor elevation; the

correct number is 860.5. Mr. Coulter asked if that was the elevation on the Preliminary Plan and Mr. Brown said yes. He apologized for the error.

Mr. Brown said his clients are looking for input and approval of the demolition, architectural and final site plan if enough details have been provided. Mr. Hunter asked where the benches would be located. Mr. Brown said the benches will be grouped together near the open space.

Mr. Hunter said he noted one difference between an e-mail that was circulated to the Board members from a property owner verses what was currently listed for Exhibit D on page 4 for the PUD, about the hours of deliveries. Mr. Brown said they were not interested in changing the hours of the deliveries. Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Brown what delivery hours will be. Mrs. Rodgers said on the PUD the store hours are listed as 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m., and the delivery hours will be 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Mrs. Bitar said that is correct.

Mr. Reis said he believed the windows would look more appropriate if they were lowered, and if the light fixtures on the side of the building were similar to the light fixtures in the parking lot. The majority of the Board members agreed the light fixtures would look more appropriate if they were similar. Mr. Patrick Sauerland approached the microphone and explained which light fixtures were meant to be paired with the other lighting.

Mr. Hunter explained the cart corrals with signs have not been permitted anywhere in the city. Mr. Brown said his client is okay to have cart corrals without signs. Mr. Myers suggested rolling the clock back forty years, and have teenagers accompany the carts and then bring the carts back, and then cart corrals would not be needed. Mr. Reis said that would increase the labor cost. Mr. Brown said cart corrals keep the carts organized. Mr. Sauer said he was concerned having the cart corral by the front door. Mrs. Rodgers said she was fine with the cart corrals because that will keep things cleaner in the long run. Mr. Hunter said he felt that ten cart corrals was a bit excessive. Mr. Sauerland said he wanted to note that the two front corrals were requested for grand opening purposes and those two corrals can eventually be removed and relocated to the next grand opening. Mrs. Bitar asked what time period that would be. Mr. Sauerland said within the first four to six weeks of the store's opening. Mr. Sauer said that the first two months would be acceptable.

Mrs. Bitar asked Mr. Sauerland if the parking lot and building lights would be black, and Mr. Sauerland said yes. Mr. Coulter said that he would like to see all of the furniture match in color, and the store front color should match the color of the light fixtures. Mr. Sauerland said that he can change the storefront color to black, and that he prefers the furniture to be black. Mr. Sauerland prefers the bike racks to be hunter green and yellow. Mrs. Bitar asked if Mr. Sauerland would like the option of using inverted U or leaning bicycle racks and he said yes. Mrs. Holcombe said that a mixture of both types of bicycle racks would be nice.

Mr. Sauerland asked the Board members to review the grading sheets and notice the contours adjacent to the building are 860.5.

Mr. Coulter asked Mrs. Bitar to go to the windows elevation. Mr. Coulter said when he met with the Fresh Thyme group earlier, they discussed the elevations and asked them to bring in the two options to see what they looked like instead of just talking about it. One of things they talked about as you look at the elevation, there was a concern about the horizontalness of the building and keeping all of the windows at the same plane at the second level. He liked the idea of raising the windows on the ends of the upper elevation to add character value. Mrs. Rodgers said the variation of the windows adds interest to the building and she felt they were very appropriate.

Mr. Sauer asked if the windows will be illuminated from behind. Mr. Sauerland said they are willing to consider accent lighting behind the windows. He said that he has already spoken with the architect about possibly adding a track lighting system to any of the windows that are up against a back of house, such as a cooler. Mr. Sauer asked if the windows are moved to the second floor does that preclude them from being backlit. Mr. Sauerland said no because there is structural brick behind the second story windows. Mrs. Rodgers said that she was not concerned with the lighting as long as the windows were balanced. Mr. Sauer said that he did not like the three upper windows in the middle but was okay with the windows on the towers. Mrs. Holcombe said that she agreed with Mr. Sauer.

Mr. Sauer said that he wanted to discuss sheet C-200, and if the transformer on the south side can be screened. Mr. Sauerland said that he can take care of that with landscaping.

Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and one person came forward. Mrs. Jutta Pegues was sworn in by Mrs. Bitar. The speaker said she was concerned about the brick and the black trim. She felt there had not been enough discussion about the aesthetics of the building and did not want the building to look like a prison. She asked if anyone had taken a look at the modern brick buildings in Upper Arlington for ideas. Mr. Hunter said the black finish for the lighting is more modern than the bronze that was originally proposed. Mrs. Pegues said she was concerned how the colors would look across the street from the Orange Johnson House and Tollgate Square. Mr. Sauer mentioned that the Orange Johnson House had many different colors of brick.

There were no other speakers.

Findings of fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

The property at 933 High St. is comprised of 3 parcels, that have been approved for combination into 1, with 2 office buildings (~40,000 square feet total) constructed in the early 1970's. A parking lot surrounds the buildings, with access from High St. by 2 drive entrances. The existing buildings are partially vacant and in disrepair. A proposal to construct a 57,000 square foot three story office building was approved by the MPC in 2009, but the applicant never went forward to City Council for approval because he could not find users for the proposed office space.

InSite Real Estate, LLC would like to purchase the property; demolish the buildings; and construct a new building and site to house Fresh Thyme Farmer's Market grocery store. Fresh Thyme is a new company and this store would be one of its first in Central Ohio.

The property was rezoned as a PUD per Ordinance 21-2024, effective July 9, 2014. The Ordinance and Development Text and Standards are attached to the ARB and PUD applications in the packets.

Project Details:

1. Allowable Uses:

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 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. Fencing and landscaping has been proposed around the site.

(b) Design.

(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 a seating area are proposed along the High St. side of the building, with a connection to the existing sidewalk at the north and south ends. 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, trash receptacles and cart corrals, which will all be black. At the southwest corner of the building, a 2765 square foot (sf) enclosed area is planned for deliveries and trash.

C. The parking lot would have 111 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' – 26' 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 3 parcels was approved and will need to be recorded before a Building Permit can be issued.

(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 was approved as part of the PUD. 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: stone accents; metal coping; fiber cement siding and trim for the main entry gable (west elevation); and standing seam metal awnings above the windows.
- C. Proposed windows on the front and sides of the building are aluminum storefront style for the first and second floors. Due to these areas being the back of the store, and the second floor windows being false, shutters are proposed to screen the view through those windows. The black windows have 2" wide muntins. Accent lighting is proposed behind windows.
- D. At the rear (main) entry, vertical fiber cement siding is proposed for the sign band and gable. Wood barn doors are shown on the plans that are fixed to the building, framing automatic sliding doors.
- E. The finished floor elevation was approved at 860.5, not as shown in the new drawings, 855.0. The elevation was a typo, with 860.50 the proposed FFE.

(3) Landscaping:

The submitted landscape plan shows a mixture of trees, shrubs, ornamental grasses and perennials in planting beds along the north east and west sides of the building.

(4) Lighting:

Gooseneck lamps are proposed at locations around the building. Two alternatives are shown in the packet. One style would be able to be used on the building and on the parking lot poles, and the other would be for the building only. All fixtures are proposed in black. The poles would not be higher than 15', and the concrete bases would 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.

(5) Signage:

Signage design is not included with this application. The freestanding sign can be up to 24 sf/side with a 2' high x 8' wide base, located 8' from the right-of-way line. The wall signs can be up to 52 square feet per sign, with one allowed in the front and one in the back.

(c) Screening. Properties north, west and south of the development would be screened with existing or new 8' – 9' 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. 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.

3. Traffic and Parking:

(a) 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.

Room exists in the drive approach for 1 car to enter, 1 car to wait to exit left, and 1 car to exit right. Along the drive, there is stacking room for a dozen cars waiting to exit the site. Stacking room exists for at least 6 cars to turn left into the site.

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

(1) The 111 parking shown were approved and should be adequate to serve the use.

(2) Bicycle racks are proposed along High St. and near the store entrance. Placement along the back of the building must not conflict with cart corral and ramp placement. The rack is to be moved north.

(3) Cart corrals: Six cart corrals are shown in the parking lot, and 1 or 2 are along the building. The cart corrals at the building will be removed after 2 months.

4. General Requirements:

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

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 numbers must still be evaluated.

The required public area payment would be \$3000.

Public space 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.

5. Additional Information:

- (a) The developer and future property owner is InSite Real Estate, LLC, 1400 16th 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.
- (b) A preliminary construction schedule has been submitted showing completion by the end of April, 2015.

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.

Recommendation:

Approval of both applications is recommended once the details have been finalized. If final approval is not possible at the meeting on July 24, 2014, approval by the ARB to demolish the existing buildings is recommended.

Mr. Coulter moved for the ARB motion:

THAT THE REQUEST BY INSITE REAL ESTATE LLC FOR APPROVAL OF A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO REDEVELOP THE PROPERTY AT 933 HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 14-14, DRAWINGS NO. AR 14-14, DATED JULY 17, 2014, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING WITH THE FOLLOWING AMENDMENTS:

- **THE TRANSFORMER ON THE SOUTH SIDE BE SCREENED;**
- **WOOD FENCE ON SOUTH SIDE TO EXTEND TO THE WEST PROPERTY LINE;**
- **RIP RAP ON WEST TO EXTEND TO THE BOTTOM OF THE HILL;**
- **SIDEWALK ON THE NORTH SIDE OF THE DRIVE AT HIGH ST IS TO ALIGN WITH NEW SIDEWALK ON THE SOUTH SIDE TO THE EXTENT POSSIBLE;**

- **BIKE RACKS TO MATCH SIGN COLORS, STYLE TO BE REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY STAFF (INVERTED “U” OR LEANING BIKE);**
- **NORTH AND SOUTH WINDOWS ON THE EAST ELEVATION BE HIGH, TWO WINDOWS ON EITHER SIDE OF THE CENTER FEATURE TO BE AT SAME ELEVATION OF ADJACENT WINDOWS;**
- **WALL MOUNTED METERS AND TRANSFORMERS ARE TO BE PAINTED TO MATCH THE BRICK BUILDING;**
- **WALL LAMPS AND PARKING LOT LAMPS MUST MATCH WITH CURVED ARM;**
- **BENCHES WILL BE ON EAST & WEST SIDE, BENCHES ON EAST SIDE WILL BE AT THE SEATING AREA ALONG BUILDING WALL;**
- **FINISHED FLOOR ELEVATION WILL BE AS ORIGINALLY PROPOSED;**
- **DELIVERY HOURS WILL BE FROM 7:00 A.M. TO 7:00 P.M. AS ORIGINALLY PROPOSED AND APPROVED;**
- **CART RACKS WITH NO SIGNS**
- **CART RACKS AT THE ENTRANCE OF THE STORE ARE APPROVED FOR THE FIRST TWO MONTHS;**
- **ALL THE SITE FURNITURE SHOULD BE THE SAME COLOR – BLACK;**
- **STORE FRONT AND LIGHTS TO BE BLACK**
- **ACCENT LIGHTING BEHIND WINDOWS.**

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

Mr. Coulter moved for the MPC motion

THAT THE REQUEST BY INSITE REAL ESTATE LLC FOR APPROVAL A FINAL PUD TO REDEVELOP THE PROPERTY AT 933 HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. PUD 02-14 (F1), DRAWINGS NO. PUD 02-14 (F1), DATED JULY 17, 2014, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING AND THAT THEY WILL ALSO ADOPT THE SAME MOTION AND FRIENDLY AMENDMENTS AS APPROVED IN THE ARB MOTION.

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

D. Other (Discussion started at 9:38 pm)

Comprehensive Plan Update – United Methodist Children’s Home Site

The Municipal Planning Commission was asked to make a recommendation on the changes to City Council.

Mr. Lee Brown said that goal of tonight's meeting is to review the Memo that was provided by Mr. Chris Hermann and his team, step by step, and to build on the briefing that was discussed at an earlier meeting. Mr. Hunter explained that the document that will be discussed is a plan that was submitted by Mr. Hermann. He said that thousands of hours have gone into this project, including public review at public meetings, informational meetings, and meetings with developers, etc. Mr. Hunter said that the last meeting covered the details of the Comprehensive Plan and an update has been submitted. Mr. Hermann has the memorandum by points and topics. Mr. Hunter said that this plan is actually a vision. He said when the developers come before the ARB/MPC Board, that will be the time for a lot of the details, and this Board holds the responsibility as first in their hearts and minds to develop this area comprehensively and compatibly with the neighbors as much as they can and at the same time benefiting the City. Mr. Hunter believes that the plan is good, and Mr. Hermann and his team's work has been excellent.

Mr. Hermann said that he appreciated all of the comments at the last meeting which was a month ago. He said that he reviewed his notes and the minutes, and talked with staff to work through some issues. Mr. Hermann referred to the document that was being discussed and said that the changes are in red ink. He said that the Memo is organized by topics instead of chronological order. The document opens up with what the issue was, what the discussion was about, thoughts and reactions and a recommendation.

Mr. Hermann said that he would first like to discuss map corrections. He said that there was a discussion about the area of East Longfellow Avenue as the street bends around into Hayhurst Street at Larrimer Drive, and the idea that the High Street mixed use area in red, the frontage to High Street, touched that piece of Longfellow Avenue, and whether there is a need to be sensitive to the two single family houses on the opposite side of Longfellow Avenue that face that area. Mr. Hermann said that when they are looking at the vision they are assuming that there will be some kind of residential development there, possibly something denser than single family homes. He said the High Street mixed use area in red allows residential development. Mr. Hermann said that the question was asked if a section of that area should be changed to the Worthington Estates edge, the yellow (buffer) color, or should it be changed to orange, which is a neighborhood core, which ensures residential, or should it be left in the High Street mixed use area. Mr. Hermann said that one of the things that you will see throughout all of their discussion of this is that they kept trying to opt for maintaining flexibility, because this is a guiding document, and there areas that need to be protected. He said that their recommendation is to keep this area in the High Street mixed use area, and add text that specifically says "for this location when you are adjacent to, or across from single family residential in the red High Street mixed use area, that we are expecting a residential development or a very sensitive and substantial buffer. He said the big reason was to maintain flexibility that allows a lot of thought of what is going to happen on High Street and if we required residential development there then we would have to think about how big the impact would be or just let the developer come in and put it on record that we are expecting either a residential match, in terms of use, or some kind of buffer.

Mrs. Rodgers said that she would speak first regarding that point, because she is the person that raised that concern. She said she is satisfied with that response; she just wants to make sure that

the homeowners are protected and they will not have to look at industrial views without any form of protection. She said that also gives the Board the ability to stop someone from doing that kind of building there.

Mr. Hermann said that the next discussion item is a subsection called Zone Boundaries, specifically referring to pages 94 and 96. Someone in the audience raised their hand to ask a question. Mr. Hunter explained that questions can be asked while going through each section, or at the end of the discussion with Mr. Hermann. Mr. Jim Rush of 58 Larrimer Avenue approached the microphone to ask a question. Mr. Rush said that he owns the lone house on Larrimer that faces the mixed use development area. He asked Mr. Hermann if the Worthington Edge included his house. Mr. Hermann said yes. Mr. Rush said that there are two houses across the street from him right now, and if those houses are gone, he will be directly facing the development area. Mrs. Rodgers said that is why she suggested adding the language for a visual buffer between that area and the Worthington edge. Mr. Rush asked Mrs. Rodgers to define what a significant buffer would be. Mrs. Rodgers explained this document is not a fixed plan, so she is unable to clearly define what a developer might propose, but the buffer could possibly be a mound with trees, a fence, or maybe a residential development. Mr. Hunter explained that the Board will make sure that Mr. Rush is informed about any proposals. Mr. Rush said thank you.

Mrs. Beth Mitchell, who live at 58 Larrimer Avenue, Worthington, Ohio, thanked the City staff and MKSK for listening to the residents and the various Worthington groups. She said she has been an active member of the WARD Planning Group since the group formed in September 2012. Mrs. Mitchell said as a WARD PG Planner she appreciated all of the public meetings and that MKSK incorporated some of the comments into the plan. Secondly she said she wanted to speak as a homeowner. Her home is located across from the UMCH property. The two home owners across the street have asked their properties be included in the plan, and their lots are included in the drawings. Mrs. Mitchell said she appeals to the Board to respect and treat all home owners adjacent to the property equally and fairly.

Mr. Hermann said that those were great points and that he and his team did think about that and that idea is a possibility. He said if that area was labeled yellow then the houses near the edge would never be purchased and included in a redevelopment because they are single family residential houses. Mr. Hermann said that there would be no incentive for anyone to buy those homes. Mr. Sauer asked Mr. Hermann if those particular home owners wanted their homes to be purchased and Mr. Hermann said yes.

Mr. Hunter said “this is the trap when you draw specific lines, anywhere you draw them, you run into the fact that this is not a plan, and we really don’t know where the borders are”. He said that there is a possibility that someone may not want to develop that corner, but leaving the property as is and inserting the language will help give the home owner some level of protection, and indicate that something may be done that is not there now. If that area is redeveloped, proper screening will be necessary.

Mr. Hermann said that “one of the fundamental assumptions is that the Board will be doing the reviews and going through that process as plans come in, and they will already know the intent and make sure it’s achieved”.

Mr. Hermann said that the second topic is zone boundaries, and he referred everyone back to the map. He said the first paragraph basically says that we understand those edges between those four zones can shift marginally. Mr. Hermann said that the second paragraph states that there is one exceptional to the marginal change and that is if a user came in, that was meeting the employment revenue goal, like the High Street mixed use red area, could be substantially expanded to the west. He that does not mean taking out the Worthington Estates edge and taking out the Tucker Creek Reserve, there will be more discussion about the neighborhood core.

Mr. Coulter said that he agrees with everything else, but does not feel that the word “substantially” is necessary. Mr. Coulter said that the word substantial could mean enormous, and he would rather not have that word in the language.

Mr. Hunter said that the Board would not want to see a developer coming in and saying that they are going to build 1000 ranch style homes with no basement, with the exclusion of anything else. Mr. Hunter said that the language will give the Board the ability to negotiate, and Mr. Coulter said that the Board needs to keep that. Mr. Hermann explained that he will strike the word “substantial” from the language.

Mr. Hermann said that the next topic for discussion was graphics titled the Vision Plan on page 94. He said there is one rendering showing an example of what could be developed there. Mr. Hermann said that they heard loud and clear from many people that all this is doing is focusing on one possibility out of many possibilities, so he has removed that diagram from the plan. Mr. Hermann said that he did add some captions to the graphics on page 95.

Mr. Hermann said that they had a good discussion about alleys and he thought a lot about that discussion. He said that alleys are also mentioned on page 93 in the description of the neighborhood core, and page 98 in the connectivity section. He discussed the use of alleys as they are brought in. Mr. Hermann said that flexibility is important and he did not want to recommend taking alleys out of this document and he referred to the Memo. He discussed the scenarios of where people would park their cars whether in front of the house or in back, or garages could go underneath the house on the first floor, or the driveway could pass the house and the garage would be located behind the house. He said that he would not want to restrict the possibility of the developer bringing in alleys, how they look or how they work. Mr. Hermann said that language could be added to help define how alleys are used.

Mr. Coulter said that he has given alleys some thought, and after talking with several people about alleys at the last presentation he said that he would like to propose to keep alleys in the language, but add a sentence that alleys are to be included in architectural consideration as to how they function and that they be sensitive to the overall design.

Mrs. Holcombe said that she would like to keep the option of having alleys, and referenced the area between Oxford and Evening Streets.

Mr. Hermann said that they had discussed architectural differentiation, and he feels that that specific area has been well addressed in the document.

The next discussion was about streets and connections. Mr. Hermann said that on page 93 there was a sentence that discouraged the use of cul-de-sacs, and on page 98. He said that he just wanted to clarify the reason and that is for the walk ability of the neighborhood, and connectivity. If the roads have a dead end, there will not be a street connection. Mrs. Rodgers said that she would like to see cul-de-sacs allowed. She explained there is a difference between walk ability and driving connectivity. People will be able to walk if there is a walkway, and cul-de-sacs may discourage drive thru traffic on the site. Mr. Coulter said that he also likes cul-de-sacs and that language could be added if cul-de-sacs were created, so that walking to adjacent streets would be encouraged.

Mr. Herman said that the key item is the language that is in the document right now that states that the objective of these connections is to inter connect the site, but strongly discourage vehicular traffic from High Street and commercial office use to the Worthington Estates neighborhood. He said that connections are important, but they are going to push any developer to make sure that these are not cut through streets and that they work for the entire development that does allow connectivity for existing residents to the amenities that will happen here.

Mr. Coulter said that he would like to see language added to back up the word strongly, and make sure that no commercial traffic will be allowed in the development onto Evening Street.

Mr. Tom Hamer approached the microphone and stated his address is 160 Longfellow Ave., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Hamer said he is also an original member of WARD, but he was speaking on behalf of himself this evening as a resident. He said one of the original objectives of the group was to be heard, and listened to, and they were heard. He wanted to echo what Mrs. Mitchell said and thank everyone for all of the work that has gone into this project. Mr. Hamer wanted to support Mr. Coulter's comments about no commercial traffic spilling onto Evening Street and feels that instead of using the word strongly, use the word "prohibited".

Mr. Sauer asked what difficulties would be incurred by adding that restriction. Mr. Myers recommended not adding the word prohibited because that would eliminate commercial repair vehicles from coming into the neighborhood. He said adding such language would prevent cable television vehicles, plumbers, roofers, UPS trucks, etc., from coming into the area.

Mr. Hermann said that they previously discussed High Street intersection relocation and the possibility that the intersection could shift. A sentence was added suggesting that the developer do a traffic study to see if this possibility is feasible. Mr. Sauer asked if there was some way that language could be added to encourage the use of the already existing entrance into this site. Mr. Hermann said that is possible, but he assumes that is already the default.

The next topic for discussion was the High Street frontage area. Mr. Hermann said at the previous meeting they discussed setbacks and heights, and referred to page 92, second to the last

paragraph and pages 98 and 99 which goes into more detail about the idea of what the frontage is going to look like, particularly the fourth paragraph. Mr. Hermann said that the question they are wrestling with is: “does this development want to be more reflective of the auto oriented use with the green setbacks as you move north on High Street, or does it want to be more reflective of the closer more intimate feel like the area around downtown Worthington”. He said the idea is to add density and walk ability to this area. Mr. Hermann said that the more the buildings are setback you will have to worry about what happens in the zone of that setback. Will there be parking lots in front of the buildings? There could be erosion of the neighborhood core as things are laid out. Mr. Hermann said that the paragraph states that the building setbacks will be at least twenty-five feet from the back of the High Street curb line. He said the point is that the buildings cannot be any closer than that, but there is nothing precluding anybody from having a parking lot in front of the building with a hundred foot setback. He said that people will want to see the entire vision plan.

Mr. Sauer said this is the most bothersome part of the whole concept. He said when he thinks about twenty-five feet, he does not buy the argument that a building needs to be up on High Street to encourage walk ability. Mr. Sauer said that there are many buildings in downtown Worthington that are very easy to get to. He said that walk ability does not depend on where the building is located; the reason is because of the function of the character of the street, and the function of the activities that occur within the building. People will be driving to office buildings, and you would not want businesses competing against similar businesses that are located in downtown Worthington, or at the mall. He said the area will be predominately office space so there probably will not be a lot of people walking around this area.

Mr. Sauer said that he checked the setbacks of various buildings in town. He said that Guernsey Bank’s setback is thirty feet; La Chatelaine’s setback is forty feet where they have a dining area. He said if you pull the setback up to twenty-five feet, a dining area would not be possible. Mr. Sauer said that Dewey’s pizza and the Masonic Lodge setback is thirty-six feet. He said the buildings downtown are anywhere from twenty-two to twenty-four feet from the street, and Huntington Bank is forty-eight feet to the columns. The CVS pharmacy setback is thirty-six feet. The fire station’s setback is fifty-two feet, and City Hall’s setback is one hundred and five feet. Mr. Sauer said that there are a lot of examples of buildings downtown that are farther back and still make for a very pleasant street, and he believes that the idea of pulling the buildings up to twenty-five feet is ridiculous, and that also ties in with the building height.

Mr. Sauer said that the Heights apartment setback is sixty feet back from the curb, and that building is five stories high, and there was discussion about an office building be built to four or five stories. An office building on High Street would be just as tall as the apartment building, and with a setback of twenty-five feet, a building of that size on High Street would be horrendous. He feels that the drive into town would be ruined. He said serious thought needs to be given to increasing the setback to more than just twenty-five feet.

Mrs. Bitar said that she wanted to clarify how Mr. Sauer was measuring, and if was measuring the distance between the street to the building, and Mr. Sauer said yes. Mrs. Bitar said that she thought that the distance should be twenty-five feet back from the right-of-way. Mr. Hermann

said that the setback would be twenty-five feet from the back of the curb. Mr. Hermann said the intent is to set a minimum setback. Mr. Sauer said that if you put in the language that a developer can build a 5 story building with a twenty-five foot setback then that will happen. Mr. Hunter said that he would agree with Mr. Sauer if the setback is twenty-five feet from the curb, but if the setback is twenty-five feet from the right-of-way, that is a big difference. Mr. Coulter referred to the map created by Mr. Brown. Mr. Brown said that the right-of-way line is twenty feet back from the curb.

Mr. Hermann said that his firm designs streets in developments, and the way they design streets is by starting with the back of the curb, and take a look at what will the street look like from the back of the curb to the building. He said there should be a tree lawn at least ten feet behind the back of the curb, and a wide sidewalk, at least ten feet wide to encourage walkability, leaving five feet at the closest you could possibly get the building. Mr. Hermann referred to the area of his presentation that listed a cross section of setbacks for five different cities. He said High Street in the Short North area is twelve feet and probably too close. Mr. Hermann said that State Street in Westerville, Ohio, at the shortest is twelve feet, Grandview Avenue is eighteen and a half feet, Main Street in Bexley, Ohio, is twenty feet, Michigan Avenue is thirty feet. He said Michigan Avenue has giant buildings and people love it.

Mr. Darren Meyer approached the microphone and stated that he is one of Mr. Hermann's partners with MKSK. He said that the points that are being discussed are excellent about the setback. He said that Mr. Sauer is 100 percent correct that there are many different examples of gracious front yards with setbacks and trees and very walk able. He said that their biggest concern is High Street, and when they look at mixed use corridors, the greatest way to slow down cars is to perceptually narrow that corridor. He mentioned the off street parking in downtown Worthington calms down the traffic, because people anticipate other people getting out of their cars in that area. Buildings are an extremely critical driving element in terms of creating a corridor that feels comfortable and pedestrian oriented, and when those are set back, like High Street right now, feels like a runway when you drive south. There is not much incentive to go slow. He feels that setbacks are one of the tools available to help keep traffic speeds down and create a better pedestrian environment.

Mr. Meyer explained how a driver perceives the width of the road. When people are on a freeway, the lanes are much wider than the roads in downtown Worthington. When the lanes downtown are much narrower and the street trees are more mature, the buildings are closer, you see people on their bikes those are clues for drivers to slow down. When traffic slows down people are more comfortable to walk in the area. Mr. Hunter said that you cannot have walk ability without destination, and the Board will not know what the destinations will be until developers come before the Board.

Mr. Scott Myers said that he would like to see as much flexibility at this site as possible. He said that he trusts the Board and that they will not allow a six story building with a twenty-five foot setback. He said he also trusts the Board if a business like Le Chatelaine comes in, that the Board will push the setback to fifty feet. Mr. Myers said that he does not want this site to be preordained that he cannot have a step-backed building with nothing but retail on the first floor

that would get people to walk towards the mall. Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Hermann if the language for the setbacks could be revised such that setback will be appropriate for the design of the architecture and leave the numbers out.

Mr. Hermann said that his understanding from the last discussion is that five story buildings were not desired to sit right up against High Street, but there could be pieces of High Street where five stories might be appropriate, but the range will be from two to five stories in that area.

Mrs. Rodgers asked if language could be added to encourage under building parking and Mr. Coulter said yes.

Mr. Hermann said there was also a discussion about density, and he referred to the orange area of the map which is the neighborhood core. That area proposes six to fourteen dwellings per acre. He said that this point goes back to the idea that there is a need for a different type of housing product that does not already exist. Mr. Hermann said that on the development tour there were examples of housing with six to fourteen units per acre. He explained that Harrison West was an example of fourteen units per acre, Ashton Grove had eight units per acre, Keswick and New Albany had twelve units per acre.

Mr. Hermann explained that there could be several different types of development that could happen, but each core area could not have more than fourteen dwelling units per acre. Mr. Sauer asked if people are looking for denser units, or are they looking to more into certain kinds of units. Mr. Hermann said certain kinds of units but those kinds of units usually come with a higher density.

Mr. Michael Bates, of 6560 Evening St., Worthington, Ohio, said that he had a question about higher density. He asked the Commission members about how much of the development will be filled up with ten to fourteen units per acre. Mr. Hermann said that was a good point. He explained that as the need for denser development the need for more green space will also increase. Mr. Hunter addressed the gentleman's question from his own opinion and said that he is unable to answer that question until a developer has submitted plans. Mr. Hunter said that higher the density the more critical his opinion will be because of the surroundings. He said he is very sensitive to the concern, and the infrastructure. If someone were to come in with a plan with all residential, he said he would not be interested in the plan, because of the impact on the city. If someone were to come in with a plan that was all commercial he would not want that either, because of the impact on the community. He wants to see where the balance is.

Mrs. Holcombe asked Mr. Hermann if he had a ratio that he uses for balancing housing and green space. Mr. Hermann said not, because that would depend on what type of development was planned and how that development would influence the green space.

The next subject of discussion was park space, and would the Tucker Creek area be enough, or how much park space should be specified and he referenced to pages 96 and 97. He said that in addition to Tucker Creek there was some discussion about the need for additional green space that could be critical to a more walk able neighborhood. He said that his team is recommending

no changes to the language in this section, but they did add, at the end of the second paragraph, a line that clarifies that additional park land must be usable, so the land must be contributing to the residents, and the workers of the re-developed site.

Mr. Hermann said that were previous discussions about storm water, and storm water is mentioned in a couple of places in the document, specifically at the end of the Worthington Estates edge section because there is thought that there will need to be some form of storm water control in that area. He said that storm water control is also mentioned at the end of the Tucker Creek section, because of the natural topography of the land, see page 99. Mr. Hermann said that concerns were expressed, and they were interesting to think about, because the text did specify retention ponds and basins, and the language was changed to storm water systems. Mr. Hermann said that he wanted to clarify that the City of Worthington, just like all of the other cities across the country, has strict requirements on controlling storm water runoff for any new development, and water quality. He said that the reason they chose to put that specific language in the text is because those requirements need to be met. Mr. Hermann said that often storm systems are engineered to meet the requirements but they are not aesthetic. He said there are ways of meeting the requirements that do not always contribute to the area or the neighborhood, so they wanted to add specific language that storm water systems in certain areas will have to contribute to the natural aesthetics of the neighborhood.

Mr. Coulter said that he liked the removal of the language that initially required retention ponds and or detention basins and instead calling them storm water systems.

Mr. Hermann said that the last topic of discussion was the importance of public private partnerships, and noted the very last paragraph of the document. He said that the logic behind that is where public private partnerships might be possible. Mr. Hermann said that a new last sentence was added on page 91, and read as, "because of the importance of achieving the full potential of the UMCH site for the City and the Worthington community it is expected that public private partnerships will play a role in planning and redevelopment of this site".

Mr. Reis said that he wanted to summarize the discussions of the evening, and said, that when the Methodist Church sells this property the developer who purchases the property has a document that will give him the guidelines, because he will want to make a return on his investment, and the document is not too restrictive or too liberal but will allow the developer to everything he wants to do. He believes the document looks pretty good right now. Mrs. Holcombe agreed.

There was an additional speaker. Mr. Michael Bates approached the microphone and stated that his address is 6560 Evening St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Bates said that he wanted to go back to the discussion about density. Mr. Bates asked what the management tool is used to keep the entire neighborhood core from being completely built out. Mr. Hermann said that there is nothing that precludes that other than the range that indicates that, "we are expecting the area to all be fourteen, and again the language is that as you go towards the upper end we are expecting more green". Mr. Hermann said, "again not precluding someone to come in with all fourteen, but if they did, we would be expecting significant green space". He said if that is an issue then

we can talk about that. He said to look at the range, and what represents the different kinds of products that we think are acceptable. Mr. Bates asked if there is a tool for the Commission to use to require a developer to have different densities in the neighborhood core. Mr. Hermann said that he could add a sentence that there is an expectation that there will be different products with different densities in the neighborhood core if you want to do that. He asked if someone would like to review that and see how someone reacts to that, or be more specific and say we are expecting different pieces. Mr. Hunter said that Mr. Hermann was discussing gross versus net, and gross implies a range to him. Mrs. Rodgers said just because someone comes forward with fourteen does not mean the Board has to approve. The plan will be reviewed by the Board, who will make sure all of the goals set forth have been met. She said they will have to ask the questions: is the plan walkable, is the plan meeting the things that they have found and identified throughout the plan, like the green space. She said there is a possibility some developer could come in and have fourteen approved, but she cannot picture that in her mind. Mrs. Rodgers said “anything is possible”. She said the other gentleman asked what the Board thought as far as percentages, but said she was unable to answer that question. Mrs. Rodgers said she viewed this system as a “ring system”. She said you have Worthington Estates edge and that will be a three to five unit/acre density, who will likely not want fourteen units/acre in their back yard. She said she is kind of picturing behind the three to five, there might be a five to eight density, and maybe behind that there could be a ten to fourteen density. She explained that is what she has in her head, and she has no idea if something like that will come forward. She said each of the Board members gets to vote, and that would be a hard sell for a whole development of neighborhood core of fourteen.

Mr. Sauer said, “it has been said, that the developer coming in here is going to be looking at return on the dollar”. He said, “he or she would anticipate on how to approach the maximums in all of the things that we have given him”. He said that should probably be expected. Mrs. Rodgers explained that the Board would not have any trouble saying no. Mr. Bates reiterated and asked what tool the Commission would use to deny that plan. Mr. Sauer said that if enough people said that they do not like the plan, then maybe that would not happen, but at the same time while sitting at the Board meeting they would have a document that states that they would be willing to accept a density of six to fourteen units. He said that you will not know until you see what is presented.

Mr. Coulter said that Mr. Hermann made a suggestion that seems to make sense, and the Board could add a sentence that there is an expectation that different densities be considered throughout the residential area. Mr. Hunter asked for a five minute recess at that point.

Mr. Hunter said he felt that everything had been covered.

Mr. Coulter moved:

THAT ACCEPTANCE OF THE AMENDMENT TO THE STRATEGIC ANALYSIS PRESENTED BY MKSK WITH THE FOLLOWING CHANGES:

- Pg. 96 Take the word “substantially” out under Zone Boundaries;
- Pg. 98 Add a sentence that states that alleys are to include architectural considerations as to how they function and be sensitive to the overall design;
- Pgs. 93/98 Take “strongly” out, Cul-de-sacs may be included as part of the plan but they be encouraged to include a pedestrian/bikeway with access to adjacent streets and that the street design discourage commercial traffic to exit through the residential development to Evening Street.
- Pgs. 92,98,99 25’ setback changed to “setback shall be reviewed” and decided as part of the architecture of the building, and parking below the office building may be considered;
- Pg. 99 Drawings to be removed; remove double negative
- As density goes up more green space will be required in the neighborhood core;
- There is an expectation that different densities be considered throughout the neighborhood core.

Mr. Reis seconded the motion. All members voted aye to recommend approval to City Council.

Mr. Hunter thanked Chris Hermann for his work.

Mr. Brown said this item should go to City Council on September 2, 2014.

E. Adjournment

Mr. Reis moved to adjourn the meeting at 11:38 p.m. and Mrs. Holcombe seconded the motion. All members said, “Aye”.