



MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING  
WORTHINGTON ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD  
WORTHINGTON MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION  
March 12, 2015

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

A. Call to Order – 7:30 p.m.

1. Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance

Mr. Sauer announced there would be no Municipal Planning Commission meeting due to the lack of a quorum.

3. Approval of the minutes of the February 26, 2015 meeting

Mr. Coulter moved to approve the minutes and Mr. Hofmann seconded the motion. All members voted, "Aye". The motion was approved.

4. Affirmation of the witnesses

**B. Architectural Review Board**

**1. New St. (Minoo & Akbar Hadjarpour) AR 09-15**

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application, showing photographs of the fence, including an area on the south side made of different materials. She said the fence consists of wood posts sitting in precast concrete bases with 47" high x 57" wide wire fencing between the posts. Because the supporting members are not permanently fixed, the possibility exists for the fence to move away from its intended position, as is the case with the southeast portion of the fence that

is currently leaning. Mrs. Bitar said the owners plan to add wood across the top to improve the look and make the fence more secure.

Mr. Sauer asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Akbar Hadjarpour approached the microphone and stated his address is 559 High St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Hadjarpour's daughter, Manijeh Hadjarpour of 225 Riverglen Dr., Worthington, Ohio, also stood with him to explain their situation.

Ms. Hadjarpour stated her father was planning to fix the fence. The fence is leaning due to a tree branch that broke and fell on the fence, and due to the snow he was unable to repair the fence. The fence is needed due to wild animals coming on to the property.

Ms. Hadjarpour said the fence will be painted and made to look nice. Mrs. Bitar pointed out that a section of the fence on the south side of the property does not look like the rest of the fence. Ms. Hadjarpour said all of the fencing will match.

Mr. Coulter said he had a couple of concerns about the fence. Mr. Coulter said he has not seen this type of fence anywhere else within the City of Worthington. He would like to see a drawing that shows how the fence will be finished and exactly what the fence will look like. He suggested tabling the application until drawings are available to bring back to the Board for approval. Mr. Hofmann agreed and said a fence that is installed properly should last for at least twenty-five years and add value to the property. The posts should be dug into the ground for stabilization. Mr. Sauer asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

Ms. Hadjarpour requested to table the application. Mr. Coulter moved to table the application, and Mr. Hofmann seconded the motion. All members voted, "Aye". The motion was tabled.

b. Sign – **800 High St.** (Custom Sign Center, Inc./Huntington) **AR 10-15**

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar explained that staff requested some changes and the applicant is complying with that request. Mr. Coulter moved to table the application and Mr. Hofmann seconded that request. All members voted, "Aye". The motion was tabled.

c. Signage – **1000 High St.** (Signcom Inc./Allstate Insurance) **AR 11-15**

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application, displaying and discussing a new drawing that was submitted after the packet was sent out. Mr. Sauer asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Jim Hartley approached the microphone and stated he is representing Signcom and his address is 527 W. Rich St., Columbus, Ohio. Mr. Coulter asked Mrs. Bitar if the new sign drawings

complied with all of the regulations and Mrs. Bitar said yes. Board members had no other questions.

### **Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

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

This property is a multi-tenant building at the southeast corner of High St. and Wilson Rd. The main freestanding sign on this property was an existing non-conforming sign that was allowed to continue by variance for the size and number of tenant panels. Over the years some tenants have gotten a permit to replace the tenant panels and some have not. Variances were not granted allowing more styles and sizes of lettering than permitted in the Code. New signage is now proposed for Allstate Insurance.

#### **Project Details:**

1. The applicant has proposed a panel with a white background and black lettering, with the font style and sizes matching the State Farm panel, to comply with the Code, rather than was shown in the original submittal.
2. Originally, the proposed wall sign did not conform to the others on the building, so the applicant submitted a new sign that would match the size, style and color of the existing building signs, showing the logo and saying "Allstate Insurance" "Erlanger Agency, LLC".

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

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

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

#### **Recommendation:**

Staff is recommending approval of this application. The proposed signage would keep the character of the building and site.

Mr. Coulter moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY SIGNCOM INC. FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL SIGNAGE AT 1000 HIGH ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 11-15, DRAWINGS NO. AR 11-15, DATED FEBRUARY 26, 2015, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS, IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING WITH THE AMENDMENT THAT THE SIGNS THAT WERE REPRESENTED TONIGHT BE THE SIGN OF RECORD FOR BOTH THE PYLON AND THE BUILDING.**

Mrs. Lloyd seconded the motion. Mrs. Bitar called the roll. Mr. Sauer, aye; Mr. Coulter, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye; and Mr. Hofmann, aye. The motion was approved.

d. Addition/Renovation – **701 Farrington Dr.** (Brian Schoch/Road) **AR 12-15**

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application, mentioning the proposed changes would alter the character of the house, which is currently similar to other houses in Kilbourne Village. She also said the proposal would represent a significant investment in the property. Mr. Coulter asked what the 20' easement is for and Mrs. Bitar was uncertain. Mr. Sauer asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Brad Schoch approached the microphone and stated his address is 6800 McNeil Dr., Dublin, Ohio. He said he is the architect of record for this project. Mr. Brian Rood and his wife, of 701 Farrington Dr., Worthington, Ohio, were also standing with Mr. Schoch.

Mr. Sauer asked Mr. Schoch for clarification of the 20' easement. Mr. Schoch said the information on the site plan was derived from surveyors from Pomeroy & Associates, and he does not know what that easement is for. Mrs. Bitar said she recently looked at the plat for this property and she did not notice a platted easement in that location. She said the matter would be resolved before a building permit was issued. Mr. Coulter believed the easement could be for utilities. He stated he likes what is being proposed.

Mr. Sauer agreed with Mr. Coulter and likes the drawings that are being proposed. He said the new design may not look similar to the homes in the area, but what is being proposed has character, and interesting details. Mr. Sauer said one of the things he likes about Worthington is there are a variety of styles. Everything does not look the same. He believes the proposed design contributes to the variety that can be found in the Worthington area.

Mr. Hofmann agreed the richness of the materials and the proportions are well done. He said he is not concerned with the house being close to State Route 161, but because the house is close to State Route 161, he asked the applicant to take a look at the north elevation and give a little more attention to that area since that right side will be facing a primary street. He believes this will be a welcomed addition to the neighborhood.

Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Schoch to discuss the building materials he is proposing to use. Mr. Schoch said he will be using a manufactured stone veneer to go over what is currently the brick base. The house will have a simulated shingle look, made out of vinyl, which is maintenance free. Similarly, the board and batten material will look like authentic wood, but will also be made of a composite material. Mr. Hofmann said he likes the real stone, and would prefer the board and batten to be real. Mr. Schoch agreed to use authentic board and batten material. Mr. Hofmann asked Mr. Schoch about window details and Mr. Schoch said they will be using simulated divided light aluminum clad windows, but they have not picked out whose product would be used. Mr. Schoch said the trim around the window will be a wood that is durable, and primed and painted. Mrs. Lloyd asked what roofing materials would be used. Mr. Schoch said they would be using a thirty year dimensional shingle. Samples were shown to the Board members. A small portion of the roof will have standing seam metal.

Mrs. Bitar asked about the color palette for the trim and siding. Mr. Rood said their house will have either a black or dark gray rooftop. The board and batten will be all white or cream color. The shingles will be light gray.

Mr. Sauer 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 at the southwest corner of W. Dublin-Granville Rd. and Farrington Dr. was constructed in 1961 and is part of the Kilbourne Village subdivision. The split level house sits on a 0.3 acre irregularly shaped lot that is separated from W. Dublin-Granville Rd. by a recreation path and some vegetation. The homeowner would like to construct additions and renovate the house, including a change to the roofline and installation of different materials on the house. The existing house is 1350 square feet, and the additions would increase the area by 750 square feet.

### **Project Details:**

1. The more significant addition proposed would be on the north side of the house, adding garage space for a second car with a master suite above. The 43' 6" x 14' 8" addition would extend into the required setback for W. Dublin-Granville Rd., and therefore need a variance for construction. At least 15' would remain between the addition and the right-of-way; and approximately 45' would separate the addition from the edge of the road.
2. The roofline for the north addition would incorporate a gable running east-west. A gable with the same pitch is proposed at the south end of the house, and a similarly pitched roof would connect the two. The existing house has low-pitched roofs with north-south gables, so the proposed would increase the slope as well as change the configuration of the roofline. The addition to the rear would extend the new southern gable back 6', creating additional room for the kitchen/dining area.
3. Along with the additions and changes to the roofline, the appearance of the house would be altered with all new building materials on the exterior. Shakes are proposed for the gabled areas at the ends; board and batten siding is proposed for the upper part of the house; and stone is proposed for the bottom portion. Material samples are needed. The colors have been identified as tans and browns with white trim.
4. Almost all new windows and doors are proposed for the house, including arched and triangular windows in the southern gable; and a box-type bay window at the rear. Narrow rectangular windows for the upper level bathroom in the rear would remain. The fenestration is completely different from the existing house. Sliding or French doors are proposed at the rear of the house, and to exit the rear of the garage on the south side.

### **Land Use Plans:**

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

Residential additions are recommended to maintain similar roof forms; be constructed as far to the rear and sides of the existing residence as possible; be subordinate; and have walls set back

from the corners of the main house. Design and materials should be traditional, and compatible with the existing structure.

Mr. Coulter moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY BRIAN SCHOCH FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO CONSTRUCT ADDITIONS AND RENOVATE THE HOUSE AT 701 FARRINGTON DR. AS PER CASE NO. AR 12-15, DRAWINGS NO. AR 12-15, DATED FEBRUARY 27, 2015, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING AND AMENDED THAT THE BOARD AND BATTEN SIDING WILL BE WOOD, EITHER PAINTED OR STAINED; THE TRIM WILL ALSO BE WOOD; AND THE NORTH SIDE COULD BE CHANGED AND APPROVED BY STAFF.**

Mr. Hofmann seconded the motion. Mrs. Bitar called the roll. Mr. Sauer, aye; Mr. Coulter, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye; and Mr. Hofmann, aye. The motion was approved.

## **2. Unfinished**

- a. Multi-Family Dwellings – **634 High St. and 41 E. New England Ave.** (Showe Worthington LLC/Masonic Lodge) **AR 50-14**

**&**

## **C. Municipal Planning Commission**

### **1. Planned Unit Development**

- a. Final Plan – **634 High St. & 41 E. New England Ave.** (Showe Worthington LLC/Masonic Lodge) **PUD 03-14**

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mr. Sauer explained that the concept for the project has been approved by the Architectural Review Board, the Municipal Planning Commission, and City Council, and tonight's meeting will not include the discussion about the piece of property where the single family home is proposed, other than to approve what is proposed. Mrs. Bitar said that is correct, if City Council decides to purchase that piece of property that matter will come back before the Board with further details.

Mr. Sauer asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Chris Peterson approached the microphone and stated his address is 45 N. Fourth St., Columbus, Ohio. Mr. Peterson said he did not have anything more to add to Mrs. Bitar's presentation, but asked Mrs. Bitar if she had received new drawings for screening the condensing units. Mrs. Bitar said yes, but the plants shown on the drawings are only twenty-four inches tall. Mr. Peterson agreed to install plants that are tall

enough to screen the units. Mr. Coulter advised Mr. Peterson to discuss the planting distance around the transformers with American Electric Power Company.

Mr. Coulter asked if there were any outstanding issues that have not already been addressed with Mr. Peterson's presentation. Mrs. Bitar said no, but Mr. Myers said he had one issue that came up with City Council and was previously discussed at the Architectural Review Board meeting. Mr. Myers wanted to confirm that an answer was given. There was a discussion and a request to see if a curb could be added at the sidewalk, between the sidewalk and the access drive. He knew there were issues in regards to sloping to meet ADA requirements. Mr. Peterson thought the decision was made to keep the sidewalk at grade level because of the intervening driveways. Mr. Peterson also stated he has not independently verified the ADA issue; however, he just went on the assumption the sidewalk being at grade would be more of a convenience for pedestrians. Mr. Myers asked Mr. Peterson to verify that issue and send a response back to Mrs. Bitar. Mrs. Bitar said the final grading will be reviewed by the City's Engineering Department and they will make sure the project is done correctly in such a way to be beneficial for both drainage and pedestrians on the site.

Mr. Myers asked where the light bollards will be placed, closer to the units or closer to the drive? Mr. Peterson said the light bollards will be located west of the sidewalk. The purpose of the bollards is strictly for security lighting for the sidewalk. Mr. Coulter said that is the appropriate place for the bollards.

Mr. Sauer asked if there will be screening around the south transformer and Mr. Peterson said yes. Mr. Coulter asked if the placard on the front of the building will remain and Mr. Peterson said yes, both of the historical signs will remain on the building. The only sign that will be removed is the post that is in the right-of-way.

Mr. Sauer asked if there was anyone in the audience that wanted to speak either for or against this application and a couple of people raised their hands.

The first speaker was Mr. John Bellay, of 6750 Schreiner Street East, Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Bellay asked what portion of the proposed development has the City been asked to purchase. Mrs. Bitar showed Mr. Bellay a map of that area, which is to the right of the access drive.

The next speaker was Mr. David Robinson of 195 E. Dublin-Granville Rd., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Robinson said he is one of the proponents of the pocket park. Mr. Robinson asked about the permeability of the overall plan, and if the park is developed, what portion of the park would be impermeable. Mr. Coulter said no one knows at this time, the Board members are waiting to see what City Council decides. Mr. Robinson asked if September 11, 2014, was the first hearing for the proposed development and Mrs. Bitar said yes.

The next speaker was Mr. Jim Seals of 123 E. New England Avenue, Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Seals said he moved to Worthington forty-three years ago, and has been aware of the Architectural Review Board (ARB) for several decades. He said he always felt a quiet confidence the Board was looking out for the residents' best interests. Mr. Seals said that he

derived that confidence from comments made by his friends and associates and neighbors who were active in Worthington's Historical Society, the Old Worthington Association or in the ARB itself. Mr. Seals praised the efforts of those individuals who put together the Design Guidelines for Worthington. Mr. Seals said he recently became disturbed because of the proposed development and he does not feel the City, or the ARB are looking out for the residents' best interests. He thanked the Board members for their time, asked them to enforce Worthington's Design Guidelines and asked the Board members not to give preference to developers. Mr. Seals asked the Board members not to make a decision on this matter tonight. He feels that making such a decision would be prejudging City Council's decision. Mr. Seals does not believe the public has had enough time to digest what is going on.

Mr. Coulter asked the audience if there was anyone else that wanted to speak and no one came forward.

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

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

The applicant is requesting Architectural Review Board approval and PUD Final Plan approval to allow for the conversion of the Masonic Lodge to 6 residential condominium units; and the construction of new residential units, consisting of 2 townhomes and a single condominium unit along East New England Avenue.

This request assumes the area east of the access drive will have a residential unit on the site. If the City decides to purchase the area east of the access drive, the applicant would be required to return to the Municipal Planning Commission to amend the Final Plan for the PUD. The amended language added by City Council permits the site to be used as a residential unit if it is not purchased by the City of Worthington for an agreed upon amount negotiated between the developer and the City within 120 days from the date of City Council's approval, which would be May 19, 2015. This request does not give the applicant the right to start construction on the area east of the access drive until after that date.

#### **History:**

##### City Council:

The property was rezoned on January 20, 2015 as a PUD per Ordinance 01-2015, effective February 11, 2015. City Council amended the language in the approved PUD to allow the City 120 days to explore the option of purchasing the area east of the access drive.

The Subdivision and Development Agreement were also approved on January 20, 2015 per Ordinance 02-2015, effective February 11, 2015.

##### Municipal Planning Commission:

Municipal Planning Commission reviewed and unanimously recommended *approval* to City Council of the Ordinance to rezone 634 High Street & 41 East New England Avenue (PUD 03-14) at its meeting on December 11, 2014.

## **Project Details:**

Development Standards and requirements 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 with this application are all residential uses. All C-5 District (Central Commercial) permitted uses are permitted on the property without a modification to the zoning. All C-5 District Uses are permitted on the property without a modification to the zoning except for the area that is currently zoned R-10 (Low Density Residential).

The area that is currently zoned R-10, can be used for residential use, and only residential use, if purchase of the area east of the access drive by the City is not documented in a letter of understanding within 120 days of the date of the PUD approval by City Council.

### 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 project makes use of the historic lodge buildings, provides infill development along E. New England Ave., maintains and formalizes the access drive entrance to the Worthington United Methodist Church parking lot, and adds a 5' wide pedestrian walkway and lighting from the lot to E. New England Ave. The proposed single unit structure on the east side of the drive is intended to buffer the existing single-family residential property from the proposed townhouses on the west side of the access drive. The additional residential units should not adversely affect the surrounding properties.

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

Site layout: Parking for the Lodge residential units is proposed in garages in place of the current Lodge parking. The access drive to the parking lot would remain in the same location, and a sidewalk with lighting is proposed on the west side of the drive. The units west of the drive are proposed 13' from the E. New England Ave. right-of-way line. The single unit east of the drive is proposed 30.5' from the right-of-way line.

Buildings: The existing historic buildings are proposed to house 6 units, 1 in the older part of the building, 3 on the ground floor of the newer part of the building and 2 on the top floor of the newer part of the building. The existing elevator will be rehabilitated for use and will provide

accessibility to 3 units and the lower level. The exterior changes planned involve the replacement of the exterior stairs on the older part of the building; the replacement and addition of windows on the north and south elevations of the newer part of the building; the addition of stairs and entrances to access the units on the north and east sides; and installation of a door in place of a window on the front of the connector between the buildings. The size of the dwelling units in the lodge range from 1,346 square feet to 2,933 square feet in area.

West of the access drive from E. New England Ave. to the parking lot, a two-story structure with 2 townhomes is proposed. The units would each have a two-car garage with access from the access drive to the parking lot. The northern unit, ML #1 would have its entrance facing New England Ave.; the southern unit, ML #2, would have its entrance facing east. Both townhomes would have a private patio area on the west side of the structure. The new structure is proposed as a two-story structure finished with a cultured stone veneer on the main living units and 6" Hardieplank lap siding between the units. Weathered Zinc standing seam metal is proposed for the roofing. Wood columns and trim; single hung 6 over 6 Andersen vinyl windows; and Carolina Lanterns coach lamps are also proposed. The proposed townhomes would each be 2,204 square feet in area.

East of the access drive from E. New England Ave. to the parking lot, a 2,230 square foot two-story single unit condominium is proposed. The new structure is proposed with 6" Hardieplank lap siding in Duxbury Gray, with Monterey White trim and Arroyo Red accents. Charcoal Gray standing seam metal is proposed for the gable trim and porch roofs. Antique Slate asphalt shingles are proposed for the roof. Wood columns and trim; single hung 6 over 6 Andersen vinyl windows; and Carolina Lanterns coach lamps are also proposed. The two-car garage would be attached with the second floor of the house extending above part of the garage. A patio area is proposed west of the structure.

Landscaping: A mixture of landscape and hardscape elements is proposed between and around the units including: ornamental and shade trees; shrubs; perennials; sidewalk and patio surfaces of brick, concrete and stone; a pergola; privacy fencing and gates; and a raised planter wall. The cedar privacy fencing is proposed as 6' high, with the top foot being open style vertical slats.

Lighting: The only lighting would be the coach lamps on the buildings, and 10 proposed bollard lights along the new sidewalk west of the access drive. A catalogue cut of the Era Lantern Bollard is included in the packet.

- c. Screening. *Parking facilities and refuse containers shall be permanently screened from all adjoining residential uses.*

The only residential lot this property adjoins are east of the proposed single-family unit. Shrubs and trees are proposed on that lot. Mechanical equipment, including condensing units, is shown on the plans. Proposed screening is with 24" Wintergreen Littleleaf Boxwood on the lot east of the access drive, and a variety of plant material and fencing on the rest of the site. Trash containers would be stored individually in the garages.

- d. Tract Coverage. *The ground area occupied by all Buildings shall be balanced with green space to soften the appearance of the development. Total Lot/tract coverage shall be set forth in the PUD documents.*

The applicant is representing that 61% of the site would be covered with impervious surface. If this property were in the C-5 Zoning District, 80% would be the maximum lot coverage. Installation of a surface water management facility will be necessary.

3. Traffic and Parking:

- a. Traffic. *Adequate ingress and egress shall be provided as part of the PUD.*

The applicant will utilize the existing access drive from E. New England and is negotiating an easement with the Worthington United Methodist Church to cross a small portion of their property, adequate ingress and egress will be provided.

- b. Parking. *Parking shall adhere to the following standards:*

A. Design. *Parking and service areas shall be designed and located to protect the character of the area.*

Garages would enclose any cars on the site. The townhomes and single unit condominium would have additional room for parking in the driveways.

- B. Residential Uses. *There shall not be less than one parking space per Dwelling Unit.*

Two spaces per dwelling unit are proposed.

- C. Bicycle Parking. *Bicycle parking should be adequate to serve the proposed uses.*

Residents would have room to store bicycles in the units.

4. General Requirements:

- a. 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.*

A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment revealed no recognized environmental conditions.

- b. Natural Features.

A. *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.*

Municipal Planning Commission reviewed and recommended approval to City Council, finding the project met the natural features requirements.

- B. *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.*

A Tree Preservation Plan was submitted and reviewed. No fee is required.

- C. Public Area Payments. *Whenever any new Dwelling Units are 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 two hundred fifty dollars (\$250.00) per each new Dwelling Unit created for deposit in the Special Parks Fund. Such deposits shall be used for costs associated with the City's parks, playground and recreation areas. 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 \$2,250; this would adjust to \$2,000 if the area east of the access drive is purchased by the City.

- D. 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 such as: An accessible plaza or courtyard designed for public use with a minimum area of two-hundred fifty (250) square feet; Sitting space (e.g. dining area, benches, or ledges) which is a minimum of sixteen (16) inches in height and forty-eight (48) inches in width; Public art; Decorative planters; Bicycle racks; Permanent fountains or other Water Features; Decorative waste receptacles; Decorative pedestrian lighting; and Other items approved by the Municipal Planning Commission.*

The applicant has agreed to enter into a lease agreement to provide public access from E. New England Avenue to the Worthington United Methodist Church parking lot. This access will include the existing access drive, a new 5' wide concrete sidewalk, new lighting and landscaping.

The condominium owners would be responsible for snow removal on the 5' wide sidewalk per the lease agreement with the City.

5. Per Chapter 1174 of the Codified Ordinances, the Final Plan submittal shall include the following:

*a. An exhibit showing which phases of the Preliminary Plan are part of the proposed Final Plan, with all phases annotated as to the as-built conditions*

There is one phase for the project.

*b. An updated construction schedule*

A construction schedule has been submitted showing completion by December 2016.

*c. All items of Preliminary Plan, revised to meet approved PUD Ordinance.*

A copy of the approved PUD Development Text has been included in your packet.

*d. Final design and location of structures, accessory structures, drives, sidewalks, lighting, landscaping and screening.*

All information has been submitted and included in your packet.

*e. Evidence that the applicant has sufficient control over the land.*

The applicant is currently in contract with the Worthington Masonic Association, LLC to purchase the property.

*f. Covenants and other restrictions.*

A condominium association would be created to handle all common elements and exterior maintenance on the site.

### **Land Use Plans:**

#### Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Infill sites should be developed in a way that is complementary to their neighborhoods and that integrates well with surrounding building designs and land uses. Compatibility with the neighborhood should be the primary consideration. New structures should complement the form, massing and scale of existing nearby structures. Also, building placement and orientation are

important design considerations. Most main entrances should face the street and garages should avoid facing the street.

Roof: Roof shapes for new buildings should be appropriate to the style or design of the building. If a new building does not follow a particular style but is instead a vernacular design, then roof shapes and heights similar to those in the neighborhood or nearby would be most appropriate.

Materials: Contemporary materials that simulate traditional ones are appropriate, but the preferred option is to use true traditional materials such as wood siding. Incompatible contemporary materials should be avoided. Brick has long been a traditional material in Worthington. Prepare a sample board for review by the Architectural Review Board.

Windows: For new buildings, multiple-paned windows generally are not appropriate. The exception is a building being built in a particular style -- such as Federal, Greek Revival or Colonial Revival -- that would have employed this window type. When in doubt, simple 1 over 1 double-hung sash windows are usually the simplest, least expensive and most appropriate choice. Using the excellent precedents of Worthington's many historic structures, carefully design the pattern of window openings; window sizes and proportions (they must be appropriate for the size and proportions of the wall in which they are placed); pattern of window panes and muntins; and trim around the windows. Good quality wood windows are readily available and more affordable than in the past. True wood windows are always the first preference. Aluminum- or vinyl-clad windows can be appropriate, but primarily on secondary facades and less conspicuous locations. All-aluminum or vinyl windows are not prohibited but are not encouraged. Avoid blank walls.

Entries: As with other design considerations, study Worthington's rich collection of 19th and 20th century architecture for design ideas for entrances and doors. For newly-built buildings, simpler designs usually look better than more ornate ones. Avoid heavy ornamentation on doors and entrances. Observe entry placement on existing buildings. Whether located symmetrically or asymmetrically, entries usually are aligned with a window on the second floor so that a regular rhythm of openings is maintained on both floors. Entries should be located so they are easily visible, and they should be oriented toward the street.

Ornamentation: Observe Worthington's excellent historic architecture for information on the kinds and amounts of ornamentation employed on various building styles and periods. Use ornamentation conservatively. It will be most successful if used in traditional locations: around windows and doors; along a building's cornice or at the corners; in gables; or on gates and fences. Most ornamentation historically was made of simple forms built up to a desired level of complexity. When in doubt, follow the old rule that "less is more." Sometimes just a little ornamentation, well placed, can have a major impact without the need for more extensive (and expensive, and hard-to-maintain) ornamentation. Use compatible materials in ornamental elements. Frame houses should have wood ornamentation, although in cases where the ornamental elements are some distance from the viewer it may be possible to use substitute materials such as fiberglass.

Color: In general, avoid bright colors not typical in Worthington neighborhoods, such as various shades of purple or orange. For infill buildings being placed in an existing streetscape, select colors compatible with those already used along the streetscape. Many buildings follow a pattern of light colors for the building body and darker colors for the trim. Following this pattern is encouraged. In Worthington, the use of white or cream-colored trim also is common and would be appropriate for new construction. Avoid using too many colors. Usually one body color and one trim color are sufficient.

Landscaping: Worthington's mature shade trees are the primary landscaping feature throughout the community. They are a major contributor to its character and help define its neighborhoods as stable, desirable places to live. In general, lawns are generous but not overly large, which contributes to the sense of human scale that is one of Worthington's important attributes. Other landscaping elements tend to be properly scaled and well-tended, which also tends to enhance neighborhood character. Maintain and nurture mature trees to prolong their lives. Plant and maintain street trees in planting areas between the street and sidewalk. Paving can sometimes reduce water absorption of the soil so much that trees do not get the moisture they require.

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.

#### Worthington Comprehensive Plan

Village centers like Old Worthington are logical places to add residential density in and behind the main corridor. Such residential development adds more pedestrian activity, increases the

market base for the retail stores, and can be designed as a product that is attractive to young professionals and empty nesters. In Worthington, redeveloping residential lots within the first High Street block requires expertise to prevent it from tearing into the historic fabric of the City. Such development must be evaluated on a case-by-case basis, but it would be critical to be appropriate for the site in scale and design while at the same time creating a continuous street front. One of the most effective methods for adding residential units in this area is to rediscover and recapture the upper floor spaces in existing and new development along the corridor. The pedestrian-friendly, mixed-use nature of Old Worthington is historically appropriate. Its success indicates that there are significant land use lessons to be applied to redevelopment efforts in Worthington. It appears there may be new opportunities for mixed-use development in appropriate locations. The history of the High Street corridor indicates long-term success for a linear commercial development approach.

### Worthington Area 360° Community Strategic Plan

With an historic community at its core, Worthington offers 21<sup>st</sup> century opportunities and global ties. Neighbors work together, support each other, appreciate diverse opinions and connect across all ages, cultures and beliefs. Strong public institutions foster and invest in infrastructure, technology, economic development and public services that unite our community.

#### Vision:

- Housing – Worthington needs to develop a broad range of quality housing that meets the needs of all people, of all ages, with a diversity of incomes.
  - Strong neighborhoods with a variety of housing options
  - Implement higher density housing downtown
  - Density can be positive when handled correctly
  - Develop walkable, dense, mixed-use housing
  - Create different residential choices
  - Create opportunities for infill development
  - Address aging housing stock
  
- Downtown – Reflects Worthington’s values and becomes a place where people connect to live, learn, have fun, worship, dine, shop, visit and enjoy a distinctive Worthington experience.
  - Pedestrian friendly
  - Hub of activity
  - Higher density, without impacting the feel
  - Mix of uses (residential, retail and office)
  - Sense of place
  - Heart of the community

#### **Final Plan - Municipal Planning Commission’s Role:**

Municipal Planning Commission shall review Final Plans for compliance with the approved PUD Ordinance and shall:

- Approve the Final Plan as requested;

- Approve the Final Plan with modifications as agreed by the applicant which do not change the essential character of the approved PUD and do not need to be reviewed by Council;
- Recommend the Final Plan to the City Council with changes that require an amendment to the PUD Ordinance; or
- Disapprove the proposed Final Plan when said plan does not meet the requirements of the PUD.

**Recommendation:**

Staff is recommending *approval* of the Architectural Review Board application. Staff believes the proposed development is in keeping with the approved PUD Development Text, Development Plan, and Comprehensive Plan; and will assist in the redevelopment of the site while preserving the existing Masonic Lodge.

Mr. Coulter moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY SHOWE WORTHINGTON LLC FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO CONSTRUCT NEW MULTI-FAMILY HOUSING AT 634 HIGH ST. AND 41 E. NEW ENGLAND AVE. AS PER CASE NO. AR 50-14, DRAWINGS NO. AR 50-14, DATED FEBRUARY 13, 2015, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING AND AMENDED THAT THE HEIGHTS OF THE PLANTS BE TALL ENOUGH TO SCREEN THE MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT, AND THE CITY ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT WILL DECIDE IF A CURB IS REQUIRED ALONG THE DRIVE.**

Mrs. Lloyd seconded the motion. Mrs. Bitar called the roll. Mr. Sauer, aye; Mr. Coulter, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye; and Mr. Hofmann, aye. The motion was approved.

**C. Municipal Planning Commission**

The Municipal Planning Commission did not meet due to the lack of a quorum.

**D. Other**

There was no other business to discuss.

**E. Adjournment**

Mr. Coulter moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:10 p.m. Mr. Hofmann seconded the motion. All members voted, "Aye". The meeting was adjourned.