



MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
WORTHINGTON ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
WORTHINGTON MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION
December 10, 2015

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; Amy Lloyd; and Edwin Hofmann. Also present were: Lee Brown, Director of Planning & Building; Lynda Bitar, Planning Coordinator and Clerk of the Municipal Planning Commission; and Melissa Cohan, Paralegal. Scott Myers, Worthington City Council Representative to the Municipal Planning Commission was absent.

A. Call to Order – 7:30 p.m.

1. Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Approval of the minutes of the November 12, 2015 meeting

Mr. Coulter moved to approve the minutes and Mr. Reis seconded the motion. All members voted, “Aye”. The minutes were approved.

4. Affirmation of the witnesses

B. Architectural Review Board

- a. Building and Site Renovation – **6851 N. High St.** (Lusk Architecture/Telhio Credit Union)
AR 99-15

&

C. Municipal Planning Commission

1. Amendment to Development Plan

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

- a. Building and Site Renovation – **6851 N. High St.** (Lusk Architecture/Telhio Credit Union)
ADP – 08-15

&

2. Conditional Use Permit

- a. Drive-in Bank in C-2 – **6851 N. High St.** (Lusk Architecture/Telhio Credit Union) **CU 25-15**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This parcel is 1.63 acres in size, and located in the C-2, Community Shopping Center Zoning District. The existing 5949 square foot building was originally constructed as a Bill Knapp's restaurant in the early 1970's. In the early 2000's, Prospect bank purchased the site and added the front entry feature and drive-thru lanes to the south. The property was most recently home to a Huntington Bank branch. Telhio Credit Union purchased the property at the end of 2014 and would like to renovate the site and building for its use. The following information applies to the Architectural Review, Amendment to Development Plan and Conditional Use Permit applications.

Project Details:

1. Site Plan & Landscaping:

- The elimination of asphalt parking areas and conversion to green space is proposed at the front of the site; at the rear of the site; in the rear parking lot; and adjacent to the building. Ample parking would remain, located along the north property line; in the rear parking lot; and adjacent to the building on the north and east sides.
- Extension of the drive-thru canopy to the east is proposed so two cars can be served at the same time in the two lanes to the south that would have tellers. Stacking room is available west of the canopy and building. The lane closest to the building would accommodate an afterhours drop.
- Retention of four mature trees at the corners of the parking lot is proposed.
- Fourteen 2" caliper Sawleaf Zelkova trees are proposed in the newly created landscape islands near the building; in the rear parking lot; and in the newly created landscape strip at the rear of the property. Two Japanese Maples are proposed as part of landscape beds on the south side of the building.
- Existing shrubs on the north side would remain. New shrubs are proposed along the south and west property lines and in the beds near the building, as are other grasses and ground cover.
- A dumpster enclosure is proposed at the southwest corner of the site. Details of the brick dumpster enclosure are now included. The structure would be about 26' x 14.5', with a steel framed door faced with Hardiplank siding.
- The 20' x 20' storage building originally proposed at the southwest corner of the site

has been eliminated. Instead, the storage area would be incorporated into a 33'4" x 14'8" addition at the rear of the building that would also include the mechanical equipment. Brick walls painted to match the others at the rear of the building are proposed on the north, south and part of the rear. The rest of the rear wall would consist of pre-finished aluminum louvered screens. The shed roof would be charcoal colored standing seam metal to match the other new roofing proposed for the building.

2. Building:

- Removal of the front gable on the building is proposed. The new entry feature would be square with an arched element sitting on clerestory windows. Behind the entry feature another clerestory feature is proposed. The front door would be part of a glass storefront system. A flat metal canopy roof is proposed above the door area.
- Parapets are proposed along the front and sides of the building. The existing north-south gables would remain, but be clipped at the ends, not extending above the drive-thru canopy.
- Proposed materials consist of:
 - New Rustic Burgundy brick veneer for the front portion of the building
 - Brick and cast stone accents
 - Metal roofing (charcoal) for the clerestory elements and gables.

Material samples have been submitted and will be shown at the meeting.

2. Lighting:

- Eight existing poles would be replaced with 15' high square poles with an open fixture on top. The fixture comes in a range of lumen levels and color temperatures, which in addition to the pole and fixture color must be specified.
- Wall fixtures are proposed for the building. The proposed fixtures consist of a cylindrical light inside an open rectangular bronze frame.

3. Signage:

- Details of the signage would need to be submitted for approval.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Scale, Form & Massing: Simple geometric forms and uncomplicated massing tend to make buildings more user-friendly and help to extend the character of Old Worthington into the newer development areas. Inclusion of sidewalks, pedestrian-scaled signage, and planting and lawn areas will help communicate a sense of a walkable pedestrian scale.

Setbacks: Parking areas should be located toward the rear and not in the front setbacks if at all possible. Unimpeded pedestrian access to the front building facade from the sidewalk should be a goal.

Roof Shape: Generally, a traditional roof shape such as gable or hip is preferable to a flat roof on a new building. Roof shapes should be in scale with the buildings on which they are placed. Study traditional building designs in Old Worthington to get a sense of how much of the facade composition is wall surface and how much is roof.

Materials: Traditional materials such as wood and brick are desirable in newer areas, but other materials are also acceptable. These include various metals and plastics; poured concrete and concrete block should be confined primarily to foundation walls. Avoid any use of glass with highly reflective coatings. Some of these may have a blue, orange, or silver color and can be as reflective as mirrors; they generally are not compatible with other development in Worthington. Before making a final selection of materials, prepare a sample board with preferred and optional materials.

Windows: On long facades, consider breaking the composition down into smaller “storefront” units, with some variation in first and upper floor window design. Use traditional sizes, proportions and spacing for first and upper floor windows. Doing so will help link Old Worthington and newer areas through consistent design elements.

Entries: Primary building entrances should be on the street-facing principal facade. Rear or side entries from parking lots are desirable, but primary emphasis should be given to the street entry. Use simple door and trim designs compatible with both the building and with adjacent and nearby development.

Ornamentation: Use ornamentation sparingly in new developments. Decorative treatments at entries, windows and cornices can work well in distinguishing a building and giving it character, but only a few such elements can achieve the desired effect. Traditional wood ornamentation is the simplest to build, but on new buildings it is possible to use substitute materials such as metal and fiberglass. On brick buildings substitute materials can be used to resemble the stone or metal ornamental elements traditionally found on older brick buildings. As with all ornamentation, simple designs and limited quantities give the best results.

Color: For new brick buildings or additions, consider letting the natural brick color be the body color, and select trim colors that are compatible with the color of the bricks. Prepare a color board showing proposed colors.

Signage: While the regulations permit a certain maximum square footage of signs for a business, try to minimize the size and number of signs. Place only basic names and graphics on signs along the street so that drive-by traffic is not bombarded with too much information. Free-standing signs should be of the “monument” type; they should be as low as possible. Such signs should have an appropriate base such as a brick planting area with appropriate landscaping or no lighting. Colors for signs should be chosen for compatibility with the age, architecture and colors of the buildings they serve, whether placed on the ground or mounted on the building. Signs must be distinctive enough to be readily visible, but avoid incompatible modern colors such as “fluorescent orange” and similar colors. Bright color shades generally are discouraged in favor more subtle and toned-down shades.

Worthington Comprehensive Plan

The 2005 Worthington Comprehensive Plan identifies the High Street Corridor (Extents Area) as a place where consistent site design should be encouraged such as landscape screening and interior

planting of surface parking areas, and the location of large parking areas should be to the rear of the site. The corridor could accommodate redevelopment at a higher density, with such projects meeting the needs of the City, providing green setbacks and meeting the Architectural Design Guidelines.

The plan recommends promoting a high quality physical environment, encouraging the City to continue to emphasize strong physical and aesthetic design, and high-quality development. Also recommended is encouraging the private market to add additional commercial office space within the City

Staff Analysis:

1. The existing gabled roof form is in keeping with the Design Guidelines; the proposed is not.
2. Window style and materials should be more traditional.
3. Proposed detailing with brick and stone is appropriate, but the proposed brick is much darker than is typical for Worthington and would not enhance the character.
4. The proposed light fixtures are not appropriate for the building or site, due to their modern styling. A photometric plan would be needed once appropriate fixtures are identified.
5. Signage specifications would be needed.
6. Removal of unneeded asphalt areas is an improvement.
7. An updated landscape plan showing the rear addition and elimination of the freestanding building is needed.
8. The drive-in bank use is appropriate for the site.

Recommendation:

Staff continues to feel the proposal does not adhere to the Design Guidelines, including the roof form, windows, brick color and lighting. Some modifications would improve the project.

Discussion:

Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Michael Lusk stated his address is 2011 Riverside Dr., Columbus, Ohio 43221. He said he is the Architect of record and thanked the Board members for their comments at the last meeting. They took their comments into consideration and made some improvements in the drawings. Mr. Lusk said they would like to get the Board's feedback on the proposed lighting. He asked Mr. Edward Feher if he had any comments to add. Mr. Feher stated his address is 4041 N. High St., Suite 203A, Columbus, Ohio. Mr. Feher explained what materials are going to be used and also brought a sample of the materials to the meeting. He explained the trim can also be changed to a lighter color. Mr. Feher brought two samples of brick that are commonly used in Worthington. One sample was much lighter in color and the second sample was in between the dark and the light brick, more of a medium shade of reddish orange. He explained if the Board members preferred one of the other colors of brick they would have no problem making the change. Mr. Feher said one thing that needs to be considered is the mortar between the bricks because twenty percent of a wall is mortar and the samples that he brought do

not have mortar in between the bricks. The mortar will lighten up the wall a little bit. A slightly tinted mortar will be used.

Mr. Sauer said he wanted to reiterate what he said at the last meeting. He likes the design of the building, the details and the proportions. He believes the building is well done, and likes the relocation of the storage area. Mr. Sauer said he did not have any strong feelings in regards to the light fixtures and he could be persuaded either way on the window options. Mr. Sauer said his least favorite brick color was the lightest color sample, but he was fine with the other two options.

Mr. Hofmann said the lightest color sample was actually his favorite, but all options will work fine. He said the thing he was having a problem with was the arched element on top of the building, but he understands the element is being used as part of the bank's trademark. He said he would appreciate the mullion and steel structure matching the stone color. He believes the building would look fine with a flat roof but he understands their client wants the arched roof for branding purposes.

Mr. Hunter said he likes the arched roof for several reasons. The first reason he said is because the arched element resembles the sign and roof at the Worthington Mall. He said if you take a look at the Wilson Bridge Road Corridor and wayfinding signs, the tops of the signs are similar. There are also arched signs in the parks. He feels this design fits into the community really well. Mr. Hunter said this design would not fit in to the historic downtown area, but there is a lot of space between this location and downtown. He said he liked the darker mullions because they deemphasize the window somewhat. Mr. Hunter said he also wanted to echo Mr. Sauer's comments about moving the storage building, and agrees that the site has improved.

Mr. Reis said if the decision were up to him he would choose the brick sample in the middle, and the gray mullions to deemphasize the windows. He also believes that the design looks great.

Mrs. Lloyd agreed and said the building looks great. She also likes medium and darker brick samples. Mrs. Lloyd said she would prefer seeing the darker mullions with the darker brick.

Mr. Hofmann asked the other Board members if they would accept the element on top to be in a lighter color, such as the sandstone look, and the other Board members agreed.

Mr. Coulter asked Mrs. Bitar if she had any information yet regarding signage and Mr. Lusk said he is not ready to apply for signage yet. Mrs. Bitar explained the lighting plan and signage will need to come back before the Board. She asked the Board members to give an opinion on the lighting structures that they saw. Mr. Coulter said he prefers the light fixture that looks as if there is a flat arm coming out. Mr. Coulter said he has seen the other option used with LED lights and he did not like that style. Mr. Lusk said he prefers the same fixture that Mr. Coulter does. Mr. Hunter said he agrees. Mr. Sauer suggested everyone look at the lighting levels the BP Station.

Mr. Coulter asked Mrs. Bitar to go to the presentation photographs of the site plan. He thought the dumpster might need to be moved to the left to be more in line with the drive. Mr. Lusk said

there is a Sycamore tree in that location they are trying to preserve. Mr. Coulter suggested putting the dumpster on the north side instead to get away from the tree. Mrs. Holcombe agreed and said that people would be able to see the beauty of the tree.

Mr. Lusk asked the Board members about the lighting on the building and Mr. Coulter said he liked the version presented this evening better. Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

Architectural Review Board Motion:

Mr. Coulter moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY LUSK ARCHITECTURE FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO RENOVATE THE BUILDING AND SITE AT 6851 N. HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 99-15, DRAWINGS NO. AR 99-15, DATED DECEMBER 3, 2015, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING WITH THE FOLLOWING AMENDMENTS:

- That the upper portion of the arch will be lighter in color to match the stone;
- The window trim on the base of the building will be gray in color;
- The brick will be the middle selection of color of the three that were presented at the meeting tonight;
- The preference on the lighting for the parking lot is to use the leaner light fixture and photo metrics will have to come back with a layout;
- The signs will come back for approval;
- The dumpster enclosure will move to the northwest corner of the lot;
- The gabled roofs will be a slate gray colored standing seam style or asphalt shingles.

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; Mrs. Lloyd, aye and Mr. Hofmann, aye. The motion was approved.

Amendment to Development Plan Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY LUSK ARCHITECTURE TO AMEND THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR 6851 N. HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. ADP 08-15, DRAWINGS NO. ADP 08-15, DATED DECEMBER 3, 2015, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING, INCLUDING THE AMENDMENTS IN THE ARB MOTION.

Mr. Coulter 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.

Conditional Use Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY LUSK ARCHITECTURE FOR A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO ALLOW A DRIVE-IN BANK IN THE C-2 ZONING DISTRICT AT 6851 N. HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. CU 25-15, DRAWINGS NO. CU 25-15, DATED DECEMBER 3, 2015, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING, INLCUDING THE AMENDMENTS IN THE ARB MOTION.

Mr. Sauer 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. Architectural Review Board (continued)

2. New

- a. Siding and Doors – **118 W. Granville Rd.** (APCO Home Improvements/Hopton)
AR 102-15

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This 2 ½ story vernacular structure was originally constructed in 1920. In 1983 a single story rear addition was constructed, and in 1985 the front porch was removed and the main house was sided with light green 5” vinyl lap siding. The house is a contributing property in the Worthington Historic District. Approval is sought to replace the siding, trim and two of the doors on the rear addition, and add octagonal gable vents.

Project Details:

1. The addition was constructed with wood siding, and there is now water damage. Removal of the existing siding and replacement with 5” vinyl lap siding in a color close to the light green siding on the main house is proposed. White vinyl trim, soffits and fascia are also proposed. Clarification is needed as to whether the existing shutters would be re-installed on the new siding.
2. The existing gable vents are triangular and at the peak of the gables. Proposed are octagon shaped vents in the gables.
3. Replacement of 2 of the wood doors with fiberglass doors is proposed. The existing patio doors facing south would be replaced with similar doors in white with muntins between the panes. The rear door facing north, near the garage, would be replaced with a matching raised panel door with sidelights. The proposed doors are white; the existing have been painted green to match the siding.

4. The gutters would be repaired or replaced as part of this project.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Wood siding is the preferred exterior material for new buildings, additions to existing buildings, or new garages and outbuildings. The siding should be used in one of its traditional forms: shingle, board-and-batten, shiplap or beveled siding. If replacement siding is installed over or in place of wood siding, it should be located only where the original siding was used. Avoid removal of or damage to window and door surrounds, ornamental elements such as eave brackets, and decorative panels or shingled areas. The new siding should match the thickness and width of the old as closely as possible. Consider removal of existing replacement siding, including cement-asbestos, but only if the underlying original siding is in good condition or can be repaired.

When reviewing applications in the Architectural District, the Board should give consideration to the compatibility of design and materials.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending *approval* of this application, except the proposed octagonal vents may not be in character with this house, and the existing doors that will remain should be painted white. The previous approval to install vinyl siding on the main house, along with the condition of the wood siding on the addition, make the change appropriate.

Discussion:

Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. David Hopton stated his address is 118 W. Granville Rd., Worthington, Ohio. He said this is a second generation home and he has lived in this house for fifty-nine years. Mr. Hopton said the tax record was created in 1915 but the house was actually built sometime between 1913 and 1914. He explained they are just doing upkeep and repair. Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY APCO HOME IMPROVEMENTS ON BEHALF OF THE HOPTONS FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL NEW SIDING, TRIM AND DOORS AT 118 W. GRANVILLE RD., AS PER CASE NO. AR 102-15, DRAWINGS NO. AR 102-15, DATED NOVEMBER 9, 2015, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

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

Mrs. Holcombe asked if the shutters would be put back on the house and Howard Lauderback of APCO Industries said they would be putting the shutters back.

- b. Light Pole Relocation – **80 E. Wilson Bridge Rd.** (Kessler Sign Company/ McDonald's) **AR 103-15**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

Site lighting was originally approved for McDonald's when the restaurant was planned in 1978. At its meeting on September 10, 2015, the ARB approved replacement of the light poles. This is a request to change the location of one of the poles.

Project Details:

1. The pole to be moved was originally at the northwest end of the parking lot. Reportedly there are underground utilities that prevent a new foundation being constructed in the same location. The new location for the pole is near the back of the building on the north end.
2. As before, the existing foundation of the pole to be removed would be cut to 4" below grade and covered with soil and seed. The new foundation is planned to be larger and sit 2' – 3' above grade. The pole would not to be higher than the existing, and the base and fixture would be painted to match the new pole.
3. Landscaping was supposed to match the approved plan.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

The Board should review the exterior detail and relationship of the changes to the existing site.

Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Study

The following draft development standards for lighting in the corridor have been developed based on the Wilson Bridge Rd. Corridor Study:

All exterior lighting shall be integrated with the building design and site and shall contribute to the night-time experience, including façade lighting, sign and display window illumination, landscape, parking lot, and streetscape lighting.

- (1) The average illumination level shall not exceed 3 footcandles. The light level along a property line shall not exceed 0 footcandles.
- (2) The height of parking lot lighting shall not exceed 15' above grade and shall direct light downward. Parking lot lighting shall be accomplished from poles within the lot, and not building-mounted lights.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending *approval* of this application. The location change is appropriate.

Discussion:

Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Roger Kessler stated his address is 170 Pinehurst Dr., Granville, Ohio. Mr. Kessler said he works for Kessler Sign Company and he is representing McDonald’s this evening. Mr. Kessler said they found an existing gas line close to the existing pole so they need to move the light fixture away from the gas line. The light will be relocated about thirty feet from the existing base, and will still serve the drive-thru entrance. Board members and audience members did not have any questions or comments.

Motion:

Mr. Sauer moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY KESSLER SIGN COMPANY FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL A LIGHT POLE IN A DIFFERENT LOCATION AT 80 E. WILSON BRIDGE RD., AS PER CASE NO. AR 103-15, DRAWINGS NO. AR 103-15, DATED NOVEMBER 19, 2015, BE APPROVED 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; Mr. Reis, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye and Mr. Hofmann, aye. The motion was approved.

c. New Front Door and Deck Removal – **20 W. North St.** (Jeremy Yohe) **AR 104-15**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This 1 ½ story Cape Cod style house is one of the newer homes in Old Worthington, being built in 1991. The owner replaced the front door and removed the deck, and is now asking for approval.

Project Details:

1. The new fiberglass door is Mahogany in color, with raised panels on the top and bottom. The old door was a standard 6 panel door.
2. The rear deck was removed and not replaced. If a new deck was planned, the ARB would have to approve it before a Building Permit could be issued.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

It is important that any doors and the entrances in which they are set should be compatible with the style and period of a building. Compatibility of design and materials and exterior detail and relationships are standards of review in the Architectural District ordinance.

Decks and patios should be limited to the rear of buildings. Decks should be built of wood and kept low to the ground. Finishes should be either paint or an opaque stain to match the color of the building or its trim.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending *approval* of the application. The door change and deck removal are appropriate.

Discussion:

Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Jeremy Yohe stated his address is 20 W. North St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Yohe apologized and said he was unaware of the process for home improvements. He and his wife moved in last April and said prior to their moving in the home had been vacant for about four or five years. Mr. Yohe said the gutters were leaking, and rotted the front door and the area was beginning to mold so the door needed to be replaced immediately. The back deck had not been cared for either in the same amount of time and had become a hazard and needed to be removed. Mr. Hunter asked Mr. Yohe if he had new plans for the deck yet and Mr. Yohe said no, not yet, but he would bring the drawings to the Board for approval in the near future. Mr. Reis said the front door is an improvement. Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

Motion:

Mrs. Holcombe moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY JEREMY YOHE FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS FOR DOOR REPLACEMENT AND DECK REMOVAL AT 20 W. NORTH ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 104-15, DRAWINGS NO. AR 104-15, DATED NOVEMBER 19, 2015, 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; Mrs. Lloyd, aye and Mr. Hofmann, aye. The motion was approved.

- d. Amendments to Previous Approval – Lighting, Speakers, Equipment and Dumpster Screens - **671 High St.** (Harold C. Baker) **AR 105-15** (Amendment to AR 16-15)

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This vernacular style commercial building was constructed in the 1800's, and additions/new construction occurred in the 1900's. Recent work has involved converting the former Damsels in

this Dress space into Harold's American Grille. This is a request to amend the previous approval for Harold's with several additions and amendments.

Project Details:

1. Emergency light fixtures were added above the entrances. The double-headed fixtures are gray in color.
2. Security cameras and speakers were added in the front and rear. The speakers and rear cameras are white; the front camera fixture is dark.
3. Bronze lights were added to the rear steps.
4. Solar lights were added in the planters
5. A rear window was moved south.
6. The gate previously approved at the rear has been replaced with a chain.
7. The rooftop equipment was located close enough to the rear of the roof that a guard and screen are warranted. Proposed is white vinyl lattice along the north and west sides of that equipment area.
8. Rather than metal doors for the dumpster enclosure, the applicant would like to use the same vinyl lattice proposed for the equipment screen.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

- There are recommendations in the Worthington Design Guidelines to use exterior materials traditionally used on commercial building in Worthington.
- Compatibility of design and materials and exterior detail and relationships are standards of review in the Architectural District ordinance.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending *approval* of the additions and changes already completed, but that the Vinyl lattice for the dumpster enclosure doors and equipment screen *not be approved*. The lattice is not in character with the building. A more traditional looking alternative should be used.

Discussion:

Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Sam Baker stated he is the owner of the building and restaurant at 673 High St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Baker said he was informed by the Ohio Department of Liquor Control that he must have a chain across the back area. He was told that he did not have to have an actual gate because some of his patrons access the restaurant from the back area, and a gate would also hinder handicap accessibility. Mr. Coulter said he does not want to see all of the restaurants having their own music playing in front, but he is okay with the restaurant having a speaker in the back. Mr. Coulter said he is also concerned about the security light. He referred to the dual security light that was approved at the Sweet Carrot restaurant located at 752 High St., and he would like to see a similar light installed that would serve as dual purpose. Mr. Coulter and Mr. Reis asked Mr. Baker if there was some other type of screening that could be used. Mr. Baker said he chose that particular type of screening in order to get circulation of air, and he is also required to have a guard rail by law. Mr. Coulter suggested using some screening that had more detail.

Mrs. Holcombe asked Mr. Baker why there was a speaker in the front of the restaurant and Mr. Baker said the company he hired to install the speaker in the back had actually installed a speaker in the front of the restaurant also without his approval. Mrs. Holcombe and Mr. Sauer both agreed there should not be a speaker in the front of the restaurant. He said he would remove the front speaker.

Mr. Sauer mentioned a concern with the things sitting outside west of the dumpster enclosure. Mr. Sauer thought that stuff should be enclosed. Mr. Baker and the Board members discussed ideas of how to dress up the area, and what to use for the screen and dumpster doors. A vinyl shadowbox fence was shown for the screen and dumpster doors. The linens stored outside could be stored inside the dumpster enclosure. Mr. Reis felt the enclosure should not be in front of the window. Mr. Baker did not want to lower the enclosure due to the view from the barber shop stair. Members felt the enclosure should not cross the window, so Mr. Baker recommended the enclosure height be lowered to the bottom of the window. Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

ARB Motion:

Mr. Coulter moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY HAROLD C. BAKER TO AMEND CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS NO. AR 16-15 WITH MODIFICATIONS AT 673 HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 105-15, DRAWINGS NO. AR 105-15, DATED NOVEMBER 25, 2015, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING WITH THE FOLLOWING AMENDMENTS:

- The speaker in the front of the building must be removed;
- The emergency light at the front door is to be removed and replaced with a dual purpose light in the soffit;
- The linen hamper that is currently on the back side of the building is to be relocated inside the dumpster area when finished;
- The enclosure around the mechanical equipment on the roof is to 14” high vinyl shadowbox and can be “L” shaped as proposed;
- That the dumpster enclosure is to be white when it is completed, and both the north and south wall will be cut down to match the bottom of the window that it adjacent and the door will be of a shadowbox design.

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

e. Shed, Fencing & Satellite Dish – **140 W. New England Ave.** (Sherri & Stephan Cooke)
AR 106-15

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This Cape Cod style house was constructed in 1962, and has been modified and renovated over the years. The homeowners recently added an outdoor shower and a small metal shed. At its October 22, 2015 meeting, the ARB approved the shower but did not feel the metal shed was appropriate. Also, the Board asked that the trash cans stay out of sight from the public right-of-way. Approval is now sought for construction of a new wooden shed, fencing to screen the trash cans, and the addition of a satellite dish.

Project Details:

1. The proposed shed would be 5' x 12', and placed adjacent to the existing fence on the north side of the property. The shed would be constructed of wood, and match the existing playhouse in materials and colors. A door are proposed on the south side. The Board of Zoning Appeals granted a variance at its December 3, 2015 meeting to allow the shed to extend 1.5' into the side setback.
2. The current fence ends at a low wall which is adjacent to the drive area. Proposed is a 10' x 3'8" area of fencing west of the wall to screen the trash cans. This fence would line up with the existing fence, which is 3'6" from the north property line, and match the style of the proposed shed. A gate is proposed on the south side.
3. The metal shed will be removed.
4. A small satellite dish to provide Direct TV is proposed. The property owners do not have a definite location for the dish because AT&T would have to make a determination based on reception. The owners would commit to requesting placement be on the back or top of the house at the east or west corners, or on the front only if hidden behind a bush.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

The Guidelines call for outbuildings to be compatible in appearance to the house they accompany. The ARB reviews the compatibility of design and materials.

Side yard fences should be open in style (avoid solid, opaque fences that block all views) and three to four feet in height.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending *approval* of this application. Both structures are compatible with the house. Although the Guidelines recommend avoiding solid fences, the proposed may be preferable to screen trash cans. Placement of the dish should be in a location providing the least visibility from the rights-of-way.

Discussion:

Board members asked for clarification of the fence enclosing the trash cans, and Mrs. Bitar answered the questions.. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Stephan Cooke stated his address is 140 W. New England Ave., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Cooke said he just intends to clean up the area where the garbage cans are located and have some storage for other items. Mr. Cooke said they contacted his neighbor directly and went through the list of their concerns. He said they have brought down the height of the storage unit.

Mr. Sauer said he had a question because he visited the property earlier in the afternoon before the meeting. He asked Mr. Cooke if he could store the trash cans inside the proposed shed. Mr. Cooke said the goal of the shed was to store the lawn mower, a snow blower and a generator, so he could park two cars in the garage. Mr. Sauer asked Mr. Cooke what else was inside the garage. Mr. Cooke said he stores his cars in the garage with bicycles for his three children. Mr. Sauer said that he would rather see a shed that is 8' x 12' instead of 6' x 12', so the trash cans could be stored within the shed, instead of having a second storage unit for the trash cans. Mr. Reis said he does not care for sheds but he does agree with what Mr. Sauer has suggested. Mr. Cooke said he bought really heavy trash cans, and also contacted an exterminator to address the mice problem. Mr. Cooke said they used to leave their recycling bin open and they no longer do that, they put their recycling material inside trash cans now.

Mrs. Holcombe said she also is opposed to sheds and she drove past the area earlier in the day and agrees with what Mr. Sauer said. She would like to see the trash cans incorporated into one storage unit rather than having multiple structures on the property. Mrs. Holcombe said she would like to hear from the neighbor about their compromise. Mr. Cooke said there is an awkwardness about the way his neighbor's property is tucked up so close to his. He said he took a walk around the neighborhood and he has not seen any other houses as close together as his house is next to his neighbor's house. Mrs. Holcombe asked Mr. Cooke if he was going to be adding bushes to help with screening and Mr. Cooke said yes. He said the area is usually denser, but the screening becomes less when the leaves fall.

Mr. Coulter asked in regards to the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA) approval, if they kept the length as proposed which is 12' and increased the depth to 8' coming back towards the house, and get rid of the fence, would that have to go back to the BZA for approval. Mrs. Bitar said no. Mr. Coulter said with an increased depth size the shed could contain the trash cans and by removing the fence there would be more space to park cars and bicycles. Mr. Hunter agreed that he would like to see the trash cans contained within the shed, and that should also help take care of keeping the mice away. Mr. Hunter said he would like to hear from the neighbor to see if he has any objections to this proposal. Mr. Sauer suggested having the shed's gable run east to west instead of north to south, that way the structure would look more conventional. Mr. Coulter said a gutter would be needed on the back side to make sure water does not spill into the neighbor's yard.

Mr. Cook said there was some concern about catching the neighbor's house on fire and he met with the Fire Chief and there are no restriction, but if the cost is reasonable, he would consider using fire retardant wood to build the structure to appease the neighbor, in terms of the back panel.

Mr. Hunter asked the neighbor if he would like to make comments. Mr. Dwight Barkhurst stated his address is 664 Evening St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Barkhurst said his side property line is next to Mr. Cooke's back property line. He does not think there is a compromise because he is against Mr. Cooke having a shed. Mr. Barkhurst said the reasons he is against Mr. Cooke having a shed is because he feels that the neighbor's shed will cause his property to decrease in value. He said another reason he is against the structure is because the Cooke's playhouse also functions as a shed, and he does not feel that a second structure is necessary. Mr. Barkhurst said that a similar request for a second shed was made a number of years ago by another neighbor and the Architectural Review Board (ARB) turned down that request. Mr. Barkhurst said his third reason is because of his letter to the ARB, dated October 22, 2015, he indicated what is currently found in the Cookes' back yard and the back yard is already crowded and a shed would only make the situation worse. Mr. Barkhurst said his fourth reason is because he feels that Mr. Cooke could park his cars in his driveway instead of using his garage. The garbage cans could be stored in the garage. Mr. Barkhurst feels that Mr. Cooke also should have shown the Board pictures of the lack of space in his garage. Mr. Barkhurst feels that he could compromise if the shed was located on the driveway and incorporated storage of their garbage cans.

Mr. Sauer asked Mr. Barkhurst if there is to be a shed that he would want the shed to be located where the current structure is on the driveway? Mr. Barkhurst said yes, not in the yard. Mr. Barkhurst said if the shed was located in the yard, then he would want the structure screened to be screened. He said he has already paid \$800.00 to screen the view of Mr. Cooke's trash cans and he is not willing to pay for screening of his shed. Mrs. Holcombe asked Mr. Barkhurst if he was okay with the shed if the shed was located on the driveway and Mr. Barkhurst said yes, as long as the shed was not hanging over the driveway. He believes that is a good compromise, but he prefers no shed at all.

Mr. Cooke said for the record, the playhouse is used by his son. They only time he uses the playhouse for storage is during rainy weather. He said they have six patio chairs and they store the cushions in the playhouse during rainy weather. The goal of the shed is to clean up the area. Mr. Cooke said Mr. Barkhurst's original complaint was that his shed was killing Mr. Barkhurst's bushes and he's concerned about Mr. Barkhurst's original complaint. Mr. Cooke said he is also taking away his children's basketball hoop.

Mr. Hunter said he has a problem with the shed being any further toward the street than the wall because that is almost within the streetscape. Mr. Hunter would like to see the shed located behind the wall, away from the street, and be big enough to enclose the trash cans. Mr. Cooke welcomed the Board members to take a tour of his garage. Mr. Coulter said he agreed with Mr. Hunter and he would be concerned about bringing the structure closer to the street. Mr. Coulter would also like to see the shed located behind the block wall, and with a greater depth of 8' instead of 6'.

Mr. Hunter said he does not want to see the precedent set of bringing the shed closer to the street which would be in the side yard. Mr. Barkhurst asked if there could be screening on both sides of the shed and Mr. Coulter said yes. He would like to see trees planted that would be tall enough to screen the shed, and he would like the back wall to be fire retardant. Mr. Barkhurst also said if the

neighbor's screening dies, he would like to see the trees replaced. Mr. Coulter said if the shed is placed in the grass after approval from the BZA, and trees are planted in the north side location, they will be subject to the overshadowed by the growth that is already there. Mr. Barkhurst said that the growth would need to be removed because there is honeysuckle in that area. Mr. Cooke expressed concern with the expense of removing the existing vegetation. Mr. Sauer felt it would be the Cookes responsibility to pay for removal.

Mr. Coulter asked about the satellite dish. Mrs. Bitar explained the satellite dish has not been installed yet. When the company comes out to the property they try to find clear vision and the homeowner has agreed that the dish will not be installed on the front of the house unless it was hidden by the bushes, preferably somewhere on the rear of the house. Mrs. Bitar said she believed the dish is to be mounted at the upper portions of the wall. Mr. Reis suggested striking this portion from the motion and have the applicant come back with the location. Mr. Hunter said he does not want to see a satellite dish in the front yard that was approved by this Board. Mr. Cooke agreed he does not want the dish to be visible either. Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone else present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Coulter moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY SHERRI & STEPHAN COOKE FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO CONSTRUCT A SHED AND FENCED AREA, AND TO PLACE A SATELLITE DISH AT 140 W. NEW ENGLAND AVE., AS PER CASE NO. AR 106-15, DRAWINGS NO. AR 106-15, DATED NOVEMBER 25, 2015, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING WITH THE FOLLOWING AMENDMENTS:

- That the shed as proposed be 12' in length but is allowed to be 8' deep instead of 6' deep to enclose the trash cans and that the shed shall be screened on the north side and on the east sides with new shrubbery to match the existing shrubbery already there to hide the trash cans, in size and spacing and be maintained;
- That the shed is to be constructed with fire retardant wood;
- That the satellite dish location cannot be visible from either Evening Street or West New England Avenue.

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

f. Replacement Playground Equipment – **5750 N. High St.** (St. Michael Church) **AR 107-15**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Page 18 of 39

ARB/MPC Meeting December 10, 2015

Minutes

Background & Request:

St. Michael Catholic Church has operated an elementary school for many years. The existing playground equipment is in need of replacement.

Project Details:

1. The existing playground equipment is located at the northeast corner of the main parking area. The new equipment would be located in the same location and occupy roughly the same footprint.
2. The new unit would include 3 covered areas; the existing does not have any roofs.
3. The colors of the new equipment would be brown, tan, and 2 shades of green. The existing equipment is yellow, brown and green.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Architectural District Ordinance

Accessory structures should not be designed as to be detrimental to the interests of the District.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending approval of this application. The proposed upgrade of play equipment is appropriate at this location.

Discussion:

Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mike Keller stated his address is 517 Stevenson Ave., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Sauer asked how often the mulch was replaced and Mr. Keller said annually. Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

Motion:

Mrs. Holcombe moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY ST. MICHAEL CHURCH FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL NEW PLAYGROUND EQUIPMENT AT 5750 N. HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 107-15, DRAWINGS NO. AR 107-15, DATED NOVEMBER 25, 2015, BE APPROVED 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; Mr. Reis, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye; and Mr. Hofmann, aye. The motion was approved.

g. Signage – **660 High St., Suite 201** (Nicole Covington) **AR 108-15**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This commercial building was constructed in 1900 and is a contributing property in the Worthington Historic District. In 2013, renovations took place to convert the first floor space from the former Scottie MacBean into Jet's Pizza. The second floor has historically housed small offices. This is a request by the office tenant at the rear of the second floor to move the Jet's sign to the north; install a matching sign on the front of the building for Farmers Insurance; and add the Farmers Insurance and agency name to the existing projection sign. There is a door in the middle of the storefront leading to a stair to the second floor. A variance was granted by the Board of Zoning Appeals to allow this tenant without frontage to display the business name on the front of the building.

Project Details:

1. The Jet's wall sign consists of raised metal lettering and a border mounted on a 2" thick composite panel painted "Cordovan" (Sherwin Williams #6027). The border is 1" deep metal painted gold (Sherwin Williams #6395 "Alchemy"). The letters are 1" deep metal painted white (Sherwin Williams #7010 "White Duck"). The sign is 11' x 22", or approximately 20 square feet in area. The proposed sign would match the size, style and colors of the Jet's sign, but say Farmers Insurance with the logo.
2. Existing gooseneck lamps would illuminate the Farmers and Jet's Pizza wall signs; the signs would be centered on the outer lamps.
3. A panel would be added below the projection sign of the same style, size and colors as the existing Jet's sign, which is approximately 1 square foot in area per side.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

The Worthington Design Guidelines recommend signs be efficient (as small as necessary to get the business message across to the public) and compatible with the age and architecture of the building. Use of traditional sign materials such as wood, or material that looks like painted wood, is the most appropriate material for projecting and wall signs. Traditional sign types most appropriate for Old Worthington include projecting, wall, awning and non-illuminated window signs. Colors for signs in Old Worthington should be chosen for compatibility with the age, architecture and colors of the buildings with which they are associated. Compatibility of design and materials and exterior detail and relationships are standards of review in the Architectural District ordinance.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending approval of this application, as the proposed signage fits in with the existing and is appropriate for Old Worthington.

Discussion:

Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Ms. Nicole Covington stated her address is 660 High St., Suite 201, Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Coulter asked how many tenants are on the second floor and Ms. Covington stated there are a total of four tenants, including herself. She stated there is a beauty spa across the hall from here which is never open, and another tenant who works with computers, and a tenant that has a beauty salon that works by appointments only. Ms.

Covington stated she is the only full time tenant upstairs. She is requesting a blade sign as well as a wall sign. Ms. Covington said she has spoken with the company that designed the Jet's Pizza sign but she has not been able to speak with the business owner yet to see if he has any concerns. She has already spoken with the landlord, who said he would speak to the owner of Jet's Pizza. Board members expressed concerns that the Jet's owner had not been communicated with, and Ms. Covington said she would like to table this application until she has a chance to speak with the other tenant.

Mrs. Holcombe moved to table the application. Mr. Sauer seconded the motion. All Board members voted, "Aye". The application was tabled.

Mr. Hunter said the Board would take a ten minute break.

C. Municipal Planning Commission (continued)

3. Conditional Use Permit - New

- a. Automotive Services – Major in I-1 – **6955 Worthington-Galena Rd.** (Keith Atien/ Urban Express Charter) **CU 26-15**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This single tenant building was constructed in 1983, and is located adjacent to the east of the railroad right-of-way on the north side of Worthington-Galena Rd. The Municipal Planning Commission approved a Conditional Use Permit for an automotive services business to operate at this property at its October 22, 2015 meeting. That approval was conditioned on the business improving the property with additional landscape screening and sticking to a specific parking plan.

This applicant would like approval to use the property for Urban Express Charter, which would store and service transportation vehicles at this location. The application includes the site plan approved for the last prospective business modified to meet the needs of this business.

Basic Standards and Review Elements: The following general elements are to be considered when hearing applications for Conditional Use Permits:

1. Effect on traffic pattern – The applicant has submitted 2 alternatives for parking six 40' x 8' busses on the site. Plan #1 does not seem to leave room for the buses to maneuver. Neither plan would allow for more than 8 cars to park legally on the site. The applicant indicated approximately 5 employees would work at this location, and that the existing tenant would not be staying.
2. Effect on public facilities – No effect has been identified.
3. Effect on sewerage and drainage facilities – The effect would be minimal.

4. Utilities required – No new utilities would be required.
5. Safety and health considerations – No safety or health considerations have been identified.
6. Noise, odors and other noxious elements, including hazardous substances and other environmental hazards – Proper storage and disposal of any hazardous materials (used oil) would be required.
7. Hours of use – Hours would mainly be Monday - Friday from 8:00 am to 5:00 pm. Weekend work would be occasional.
8. Shielding or screening considerations for neighbors – Landscape screening is shown as was approved before, along the front of the parking area. Existing landscaping by the building and around the site would remain.
9. Appearance and compatibility with the general neighborhood – With the addition of screening and street trees in the tree lawn, the appearance should be compatible and acceptable to those that drive through the corridor. One wall sign that meets Code requirements should be allowed.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Conditional Use Permit Regulations

The following basic standards 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.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending *approval* of this application, with parking per Plan #2. The following provisions that were part of the last Conditional Use Permit would be expected: the addition of 2” caliper trees and shrubs in the right-of-way; retention of existing vegetation at the east and west sides of the site, and in front of the building; removal of the existing recycling dumpster; and the commitment to provide an enclosure for any new dumpster.

Discussion:

Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Mike McNulty said he is representing his client Mr. Keith Arien at 6955 Worthington-Galena Rd., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Sauer asked how many busses would be parked at this location at one time and Mr. McNulty said six. Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY KEITH ATIEN FOR A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO OPERATE AN AUTOMOTIVE SERVICES – MAJOR BUSINESS IN THE I-1 ZONING DISTRICT AT 6955 WORTHINGTON-GALENA RD., AS PER CASE NO. CU 26-15, DRAWINGS NO. CU 26-15, DATED NOVEMBER 25, 2015, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

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

- b. Semi-public Use in R-10 Zoning District – **6121 Olentangy River Rd.** (Congregation Beth Tikvah) **CU 27-15**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

On May 14, 2015 the Municipal Planning Commission approved a Conditional Use Permit for Congregation Beth Tikvah to operate a Co-located Child Day Care Center, Nursery School and Preschool in the R-10 Zoning District. At that time, there was discussion of a possible fencing change on the north side of the property. On July 23, 2015, the Commission approved an application to split off the back 1.15 acres of the Beth Tikvah parcel to sell to a neighbor to the rear.

This application includes a final fencing plan; minor changes to the parking lot and library addition; a new walk with path lighting; a proposed utility shed; and a sign change.

Project Details:

1. Fences:

On the north side there is existing 4' high wood fencing in some locations in varying distances from the property line. Approval of this proposal would allow removal of the 4' fence, and construction of 6' high wood fence along the north to match the fence installed on the south side of the property, which is a solid fence. The north fence would be placed anywhere from on the property line to 10' from the property line depending on tree locations and avoiding removal. The fence would extend to 15' from the right-of-way on the east side of the site. On the west side the fence would taper to the south to avoid trees. Variances would be needed for the proximity to the north property line because the adjacent properties are in an "R" district, and extension into the front setback of Olentangy River Rd.

Extension of the existing 6' high wood fence along the south property line was proposed to the east with the last approval. This application includes a 40' extension to the west.

2. Parking Lot:

With the lot split the synagogue was left with about 40' of additional land on the west end of the site. This proposal was originally proposed with a row of parking added along the rear property line, but was amended to place the parking off of the existing asphalt. A variance would be needed for proximity and lack of screening adjacent to an "R" property.

A small library addition at the northwest corner of the building was approved as part of the last application. In order to allow traffic to navigate around that addition, removal of an island in front of the entrance is proposed. Re-location of a catch basin will be part of that work.

3. Library Addition:

The structure is now proposed to be covered in brick rather than fiber cement siding, and would be taller than was originally approved. The windows have also changed.

4. New Walk:

A new 4' wide sidewalk is proposed near the north property line, running from the existing recreation path on the west side of Olentangy River Rd. to just past the building. Exact placement would be determined in the field based on tree preservation. Path lighting is proposed along the walk.

5. Utility Shed:

A 10' x 12' x 6' high utility shed is proposed adjacent to the fence on the south side of the building.

6. Sign Change:

The addition of lettering identify the JCC Early Childhood Program is proposed at the bottom of the existing freestanding sign.

Basic Standards and Review Elements: The following general elements are to be considered when hearing applications for Conditional Use Permits:

1. Effect on traffic pattern – The additional parking spaces would be a benefit.
2. Effect on public facilities – No effect has been identified.
3. Effect on sewerage and drainage facilities – The effect would be minimal.
4. Utilities required – No new utilities would be required.
5. Safety and health considerations – None have been identified.
6. Noise, odors and other noxious elements, including hazardous substances and other environmental hazards – Nothing has been identified.
7. Hours of use – No change.
8. Shielding or screening considerations for neighbors – New, higher fencing on the north side and the extension of fencing on the north and south sides should provide adequate screening for the neighboring residents. As the lot to the west is heavily vegetated and vacant, screening would not be necessary. The new shed would be screened by the fence.

9. Appearance and compatibility with the general neighborhood – The building addition and fencing proposed are compatible with this property and the existing neighborhood because of design and materials. The change to the sign is appropriate.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Conditional Use Permit Regulations

The following basic standards apply to conditional uses in any "S", "AR" or "R" 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 the use will not be hazardous, inconvenient or conflict with the normal traffic on residential streets, taking into account the relation to main traffic thoroughfares and to street intersections, parking, screening and the general character and intensity of development of the area. The provisions for parking, screening and signage shall also be specified by the applicant and considered by the Commission.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending *approval* of this application based on the standards and review elements, and with the condition the Board of Zoning Appeals would need to approve any variances.

Discussion:

Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Andy Shafran stated his address is 7128 Bluffstream Ct., Columbus, Ohio, and he is representing congregation Beth Tikvah this evening. He said the Conditional Use Permit that exists extends only to the western edge the parking lot. The hope is the new Conditional Use Permit would extend to the west property line regardless of the site plan approved this evening, which shows the addition of parking adjacent to the existing west side of the parking lot. As he understands it, that would allow Beth Tikvah to preserve the right to ask for approval of changes to that area at a later date. Mrs. Bitar confirmed it would, but a site plan different than approved this evening would still need to return to the MPC for approval.

Mr. Shafran said as part of Beth Tikvah's application to the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA) they would like to seek a variance to allow the parking spaces to be 18' instead of the required 19' deep; to allow extension of the parking lot to the west property line without screening; and for placement of the fence on the north closer to the property line than would be allowed. Mr. Shafran said he has been working closely with everyone here at the meeting this evening, including Bill Cooper who owns the property to the west. Mr. Cooper has given his approval to proceed with development of the parking lot into the setback and without the need for additional screening, and Mr. Shafran would like to preserve that agreement. He said there is a huge elevation difference in the western edge location and additional screening would not be necessary anyway.

Mr. Sauer asked Mrs. Bitar if the Commission goes ahead and approves this application and the congregation does not do anything with it until several years from now, they will not need to come back to the Commission for that approval and Mrs. Bitar said that his correct. Mr. Sauer asked why Beth Tikvah is being restricted from doing what they want with their piece of property. Mrs. Bitar explained they are an institutional use in a single family residential district and that is why

they are under a Conditional Use Permit and need to get approval for any change to their property. If the property had been rezoned to S-1, they would not have this situation. They chose to work with their neighbors instead. Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and a couple of people raised their hands.

Jeff Louis said he is an attorney, and he had not been sworn in yet. Mrs. Bitar swore in Mr. Louis and another speaker. Mr. Louis said he is representing the Groenveld family who live near the north end of Beth Tikvah's property. He explained the agreement and showed a diagram to illustrate the additional spaces added at the existing edge of the parking lot. He said he understands that the applicant is going before the BZA to get a variance to reduce the required 19' parking spaces to 18', and is fine with either figure. He believes the maximum extension of the lot would be 22', with the three extra foot spacing for the drive lane. Mr. Louis said his clients, the Groenevelds, are in agreement with that, and placement of the fence on the northern side, and extend that all the way to the property line at an angle to save trees. Mr. Louis said for the record, he has a written Agreement between the parties as well as the drawing that was shown to the Commission members.

Mr. Shafran stated the driveway is 22' feet today, there will be no changes to the driveway. They will only be adding 10 parking spaces to the west side of the parking lot. Mr. Coulter said there was a discussion about a fence on the north and south sides of the property, and Mr. Shafran said yes, the neighbors on the north and south sides of the property want the fence.

Tom Groeneveld stated his address is 885 Middlebury Dr., Worthington, Ohio, which is immediately north of the Beth Tikvah property. He said most of the request is near his backyard. They have lived at this address for forty years, before Beth Tikvah was granted the Conditional Use to build the synagogue. Mr. Groeneveld said the original application was denied, but then there were negotiations between themselves and neighbors at Shaker Square and elsewhere, and they came to an agreement to support a Conditional Use Permit. They indicated at that time the intent was to remain a small congregation. Mr. Groeneveld explained the overhead photographs and where the new property lines would be. He said Beth Tikvah wants to extend the parking lot within five feet of the new property line. Mr. Groeneveld explained the topography of the area and how the land is flat in some areas and slopes upward to the west, and there are quite a few trees in the area. He said they came to an agreement to extend to the west so that trees would not have to be destroyed. Mr. Groeneveld continued to say that in all the years they have lived next door to the synagogue, during their normal worship services and daily activities, do they rarely fill up the parking. The only time the parking overflows is during the high holidays. Mr. Groeneveld said the reason he and his pregnant wife moved into this area is because they wanted their child to go to Worthington Schools and because it looked like they lived in a dense forest in the summer time. They just want to make sure they keep the area the way it is now.

Mr. Hunter said he appreciates the congregation and the neighbors working together to achieve this agreement. He asked if there was anyone else that wanted to speak and Mr. Scott Whitlock raised his hand.

Mr. Whitlock stated his address is 6081 Olentangy River Rd., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Whitlock said he is the south neighbor to the parking lot. He said he wanted to congratulate the Chairman, Mr. Hunter, on his great work and service to the community who is retiring from the ARB and MPC and he said this will probably be his own last appearance before this Board involving Beth Tikvah. He has lived in his current house for about 44 years. Mr. Whitlock said he has appeared before this Commission involving every proceeding case involving Beth Tikvah going back to the original proceedings in 1978. His wife was present for the 1987 application so there is a sense of history. Mr. Whitlock believes the agreement is clear and sees that Mr. Coulter is ready to make the motion. Mr. Whitlock continued to summarize the situation and wanted to give great credit to his neighbors to the north, the Groenevelds and the congregation for working very hard to come up with a very sound plan. Mr. Whitlock continued to tell the Commission a list of things that they should do:

“1. In 1978 a Conditional Use line was established and with the sale of over an acre to the west of the roughly 4.09 acres, it was not granted within the Conditional Use and not going to be used for Beth Tikvah. It was going to be used for something else. The property was sold to the neighbor Mr. Bill Cooper who has added it to his residential property, however, where the line ended up, separating what is now the Cooper property from the Beth Tikvah property is a little bit west of where the Conditional Use line was drawn in 1978. This application moves that Conditional Use line west to the property line so that Beth Tikvah would have for the entire tract that they own a Conditional Use both for its semipublic use and for its co-located day care. If they want to have a picnic of day students out there they could. If they want to park cars in ten new spaces that are to be built, which I do not think that all of that is in the Conditional Use, this moves the Conditional Use line so somebody going to either a religious service or to the school could park their car there. Small point, but I think we all agree, the Conditional Use would now cover the entire remaining property that is owned by Beth Tikvah;

2. They would have the ability to develop ten parking spaces oriented east and west at the end starting at the end of the blacktop and those spaces would be either 18’ or 19’ deep depending on the action of the BZA;

3. They would extend the existing fence on the south side to the property line. On the north side they would be rebuilding the fence which exists on the north side and that will be rebuilt all the way along the north side of the property to match the fence on the south side and that fence would also be extended at an angle that has been agreed upon with the Groenevelds’ to the property line. There would be no fencing along the west property line, and he has confirmed that with his neighbor, Mr. Bill Cooper.

Mr. Sauer said he would like to make a comment. He said, “It seems like, and I have been here for a number of years, and Beth Tikvah has been in front of this Board on a number of occasions and it seems as though every time they come before us and try to do something it’s like pulling teeth with the community. There is this resistance to everything they try to do and I really feel sorry for the congregation that they have to fight the battle that they do every time and that is all I am going to say.”

Mr. Whitlock said, “Well I would like to respond to that because I have been involved, and if you talk about resistance you must be talking about me, and I will tell you in the end I have supported every single application in the final analysis that has been presented before this Commission and City Council with one exception in the year 2000. We have worked with Beth Tikvah and they have worked with us.”

Mr. Sauer said he agrees with that statement but feels it has always been difficult.

Mr. Shafran said he would like to include with the application, several signed letters from their neighbors, which state they fully approve of this plan and also the neighbor to the east which approves of the extension of the fence to the east within the Olentangy overlay area.

Mrs. Bitar explained that item will need a variance from the BZA because they are proposing to be fifteen feet from the right of way with this fence.

Mr. Shafran said he has one other question. Since they amended how far west the parking lot is going to go, could they stop the fence at the end of the parking lot so there will not be twenty feet of fence into the woods on the north and the south.

Mr. Hunter said taking the fence to the property line would be good idea because the property line is established and also would establish privacy on both sides for each owner. Mr. Shafran agreed and said that would be fine either way.

Motion:

Mr. Coulter moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY CONGREGATION BETH TIKVAH FOR A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO MODIFY THE SEMI-PUBLIC USE AT 6121 OLENTANGY RIVER RD., AS PER CASE NO. CU 27-15, DRAWINGS NO. CU 27-15, DATED NOVEMBER 25, 2015, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING, AND CONDITIONED ON APPROVAL FROM THE BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS FOR NECESSARY VARIANCES WITH THE FOLLOWING AMENDMENTS:

- That the congregation is approved to add ten additional parking spaces at the west end of the existing parking lot from where it stands today;
- That the fence on the north side and the south side will be extended to the west property line;
- That the Conditional Use Permit would cover the entire property, and at any point in the future it cannot be required that screening be added along the west property line regardless of the location of parking.

Mr. Hunter said he would like to make a friendly amendment. He stated the north fence line pulls in slightly. Mr. Coulter said that is already indicated on the drawings.

Mrs. Holcombe 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.

4. Amendment to Development Plan – New

a. Signage – 7020-A Huntley Rd. (Zaftig Brewing Co.) ADP 09-15

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This site has two multi-tenanted buildings constructed in the late 1960's. Unit A is the westernmost suite of the southern building on the site. The suite has frontage along Huntley Rd. The Zaftig Brewing Co., which is currently housed on Schrock Rd. in the I-2 Zoning District, was approved for a Conditional Use Permit to operate a Brewery in the I-1 Zoning District at 7020 Huntley Rd. The space will include an 1800 square foot tap room and 4700 square feet for production and distribution space.

During review of the Conditional Use Permit, the Commission viewed sign options that would be attached to the brick wall on the west side of the building. The applicant also indicated a sign would be desired on the front of the suite. This application was necessary due to the requested sign area and number of signs exceeding the allowable based on Code requirements.

Project Details:

1. The proposed sign on the west side of the building would be 8' high x 24' wide or 192 square feet, and located inside a panel in the wall that is framed by a soldier course of brick. The proposed material would be a black vinyl or aluminum print material that would adhere to the wall. The print on the sign is proposed to say "Zaftig Brewery & Tap Room", with a small Brewing Co. below Zaftig. Three sizes and styles of lettering would be used. Three gooseneck style lamps are proposed above the sign.
2. Each suite on the site has a 1' x 6' metal panel above the entrance identifying the business name.
3. Variances would be required for:
 - Exceeding the allowable sign area – 100 square foot/business allowed; 198 square proposed
 - Exceeding the limit of 1 wall sign per business – 2 proposed
 - Having more than 2 styles of text, unless "Zaftig" is considered a logoCity Council approval would be needed due to the variances.

Land Use Plans:

Page 29 of 39

ARB/MPC Meeting December 10, 2015

Minutes

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 approval of this application be recommended to the City Council. The proposed design for the signs is in character with the building and location.

Discussion:

Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Jason Blevins stated his address is 950 Evening St., Worthington, Ohio. Commission members did not have any questions or concerns. Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Coulter moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY ZAFTIG BREWING CO. FOR APPROVAL TO AMEND THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN BY ADDING SIGNAGE AT 7020 A HUNTLEY RD., AS PER CASE NO. ADP 09-15, DRAWINGS NO. ADP 09-15, DATED NOVEMBER 25, 2015, 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. Site and Building Renovations - **350 W. Wilson Bridge Rd.** (Trivium Worthington LLC)
ADP 10-15

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This 4.47 acre property is located on the north side of W. Wilson Bridge Rd. in the C-3 Zoning District. It was originally developed as part of Officescape, which includes the properties at 400, 450 and 500 W. Wilson Bridge Rd. This building, constructed in the late 1970's, was home to notable companies like Mettler Toledo and Corecomm but has been vacant for many years. The new property owner would like to renovate the building and site to accommodate 53,000 square feet of modern office space.

Project Details:

1. Building: Reuse of the existing building is proposed. The building is approximately 350 feet from the right-of-way with the parking lot in front.
 - Addition - In order to accommodate a new medical user on the site, the applicant plans to construct a new entry feature central to the building which would provide a lobby, and elevator and stair access to the three-story building. The addition would extend approximately 32' from the existing building and be about 49' wide. A rectangular form is proposed, with the elevator being 46' 6" above adjacent grade, extending higher than the rest of the addition. A variance will be needed for that element. Glass curtainwalls with sage brown framing are proposed on the front and sides of the structure, with Nichiha fiber cement panels at the corners. The panels would also be a shade of brown. A canopy for patient drop off is proposed on the southeast side of the addition. Information regarding glass color is needed.
 - Existing structure – Paint and new windows are proposed for the existing building. The colors would all be in the brown/bronze/tan families. Information regarding glass color is needed.

2. Site: Access to the site would continue to be from the entrance in front of the 400 W. Wilson Bridge Rd. building that lines up with Reiber St. and uses a traffic signal. There is an easement in place for access across the site.
 - Parking - The plan involves re-working the parking lot in front of the building to create a drop off area and additional handicap parking near the new building entrance. Parking would be increased in the remainder of the lot by removing the grass strips between rows of parking, and reducing the space area from the Code required 171 square feet (typically 9' x 19') to 162 square feet (9' x 18'). Required parking for 53,000 square feet of office space would be 212 spaces. The applicant is providing 279 spaces to accommodate medical office users. Four bike racks are proposed near the southeast corner of the building. Retaining walls are proposed at the southwest corner of the building to accommodate the change in grade to the relocated drive, which runs south of the entry addition.
 - Pedestrian Access – A 5' sidewalk with an 18" wall is proposed along the eastern edge of the parking lot. The walk would connect to the public sidewalk near the southeast corner of the parking lot, and to the building entrances. Crosswalks are proposed between the parking lot and entry plaza. A gravel path between this site and the 250 Old Wilson Bridge Rd. site would be restored. Use of a different material might be more appropriate.
 - Equipment – Mechanical equipment and dumpsters are proposed on the west side of the building with retaining walls and landscaping for screening. The chiller, transformer and generator would need a variance for placement in the required side yard.
 - Patio – A roughly 16' x 28' block paver patio is proposed at the northwest corner of the building. The patio would be framed with a limestone slab wall and Winter

Gem Boxwoods. A variance may be needed for the wall.

- Utilities –
 - An existing 6" watermain runs along the east side of the property and turns west near the front of the building. In order to accommodate the new front addition, the watermain would have to be relocated to the south. A new easement would be needed.
 - A new gas line is proposed that would connect to the existing line on the south side of Wilson Bridge Rd.
 - A sanitary sewer connection exists at the rear of the site.
 - Storm water would be directed to an existing storm sewer system near the south end of the parking lot.

3. Landscaping:

- Parking lot tree requirements – With 279 parking spaces, 93" of tree trunk is required. The islands at the ends of parking aisles would remain or be relocated, and planted with grass and trees, primarily 20 - 2.5" caliper Princeton Sentry Ginkos, providing 50" of tree trunk. Two 2.5" Lacebark Elm trees are proposed at the northern edge. Four each Flowering Crabapple and Eastern Rebud trees are proposed in islands at the north and east sides of the parking lot. Also, there are existing trees that will remain along the south and east property lines and around the building. Those near the parking lot can count toward the requirement.
- Other landscaping – Extensive landscaping is proposed around the building and entry area, including trees, shrubs, perennials and ornamental grasses. Retaining walls would frame and run through many of the planting areas.
- Furniture – Three steel benches and 1 trash can are proposed in the entry plaza. All would be powder coated with a black finish. Specifications have been submitted.

4. Lighting:

It appears new LED light fixtures would be attached to the existing poles. The exact strength and color have not been identified. Bollard lights are proposed near the building and along the drive. Further explanation regarding the proposed lighting is needed.

5. Signage:

- Freestanding – An existing freestanding sign identifying the 350 and 400 buildings is west of the drive entrance to the site. It is not clear if that sign would be used to identify tenants. On this site, two directory signs are proposed:
 - One sign is proposed approximately centered on the building, 10' from the right-of-way in a landscape bed. The sign is proposed with an 18" high x 7' wide brick base; an angled shape similar to the building, topped with a rectangular 2'4" x 4'3 1/2" box with the address; and an offset 8' high x 2'6" wide structure to match the entrance wall panels with 4 black and white tenant panels. The sign materials and colors would match the building. The sign would be internally illuminated, with light shining only through the tenant names and

- address. The sign area, not including the base, would be roughly 48 square feet per side.
- The second sign would be a smaller, externally illuminated directory sign near the building. This sign would be approximately 25 square in area per side excluding 2' of the exposed decorative base, which would be faced with block to match the retaining walls. The cabinet would have a cream textured background, with bronze address, tenant panels and trim. Four tenant panels with white lettering are proposed.
 - Wall Signs – Two signs are proposed for Central Ohio Urology Group.
 - A 100 square foot sign is proposed on the north side of the building, and would consist of individually mounted internally illuminated channel letters on an aluminum panel that would be vertical rather than at the angle of the top part of the building. It appears the panel would be painted to match the wall behind. The proposed letters are blue.
 - On the south side of the building a 40 square foot sign is proposed on the east face of the building, of the same design.
 - A placeholder is shown on the west half of the south side for a future tenant. A 40 square foot location would be appropriate.
 - Variances – Variances would be needed for sign area, having more than 3 tenants on a freestanding joint identification sign, and more than one wall sign for a business.

Land Use Plans:

Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Study

The following draft development standards are based on the Wilson Bridge Rd. Corridor Study:

Building Design.

- A principal building shall be oriented parallel to Wilson Bridge Road, or as parallel as the site permits, and should have an operational entry facing the street.
- Building Frontage that exceeds a width of 50' shall incorporate articulation and offset of the wall plane to prevent a large span of blank wall and add interest to the facade.
- Entrances shall be well-marked to cue access and use, with public entrances to a building enhanced through compatible architectural or graphic treatment.

Materials.

- Long-lived and sustainable materials should be used.
- Generally, exterior insulation finishing systems (EIFS), are not preferred material types.
- A variety of textures that bear a direct relationship to the building's massing and structural elements to provide visual variety and depth should be provided.
- The color palette shall be designed to reinforce building identity and complement changes in the horizontal or vertical plane.

Windows and Doors.

- Ground-floor window and door glazing shall be transparent and non-reflective. Above the ground floor, both curtain wall and window/door glazing shall have the minimum reflectivity needed to achieve energy efficiency standards. Non-reflective coating or tints are preferred.

- Windows and doors shall be recessed from the exterior building wall, except where inappropriate to the building's architectural style.

Landscaping. There shall be landscaping that complements other site features and creates relief from buildings, parking areas and other man-made elements.

- Drought tolerant, salt tolerant, non-invasive, low maintenance trees and shrubs should be utilized.
- Deciduous trees shall be a minimum of 2" caliper at the time of installation; evergreen trees shall be a minimum of 6' in height at the time of installation; and shrubs shall be a minimum of 24" in height at the time of installation.
- Parking lot landscaping shall be required per the provisions in Chapter 1171.
- Seasonal plantings should be incorporated into the landscape plan.
- The approved landscape plan must be maintained across the life of the development.

Screening.

- Exterior service, utility, trash, and mechanical equipment shall be located to the rear of buildings if possible and screened from view with a wall, fence or landscaping. Such equipment shall be completely screened from view. Materials shall be consistent with those used in the building and/or site. Equipment located on buildings shall match the color of the building.

Lighting. All exterior lighting shall be integrated with the building design and site and shall contribute to the night-time experience, including façade lighting, sign and display window illumination, landscape, parking lot, and streetscape lighting.

- The average illumination level shall not exceed 3 footcandles. The light level along a property line shall not exceed 0 footcandles.
- The height of parking lot lighting shall not exceed 15' above grade and shall direct light downward. Parking lot lighting shall be accomplished from poles within the lot, and not building-mounted lights.
- For pedestrian walkways, decorative low light level fixtures shall be used and the height of the fixture shall not exceed 12' above grade.
- Security lighting shall be full cut-off type fixtures, shielded and aimed so that illumination is directed to the designated areas with the lowest possible illumination level to effectively allow surveillance.

Parking.

- Non-residential Uses. Parking shall be adequate to serve the proposed uses, but shall in no case exceed 125% of the parking requirement in Section 1171.01.
- Bicycle Parking. Bicycle parking should be provided and adequate to serve the proposed uses.

Public Spaces. A minimum of one Public Space Amenity as approved by the Municipal Planning Commission shall be required for every 5,000 square feet of gross floor area of multi-family dwellings, commercial or industrial space that is new in the WBC. 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 250 square feet;

- Sitting space (e.g. dining area, benches, or ledges) which is a minimum of 16 inches in height and 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.

Worthington Comprehensive Plan

The 2005 Worthington Comprehensive Plan stresses the importance of local business as a means to support municipal services provided to residents. The plan points to the success of the freeway commercial area as being critical to the health of the City.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending *approval* of this application. Renovation of the existing building and site, and the addition are appropriate treatments of this property. The building design incorporates articulation and offset, and the entrance would be well marked. Additional parking on a site is acceptable when it can be shown it is necessary. The landscape plan and pedestrian connections, are improvements. Incorporation of sustainable measure would be beneficial. Bringing back the viability of this building and site is very important to the community.

Discussion:

Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mrs. Bitar swore in the applicants. Tim Spencer stated he is the owner of 350 W. Wilson Bridge Rd., Worthington, Ohio. He purchased the building this past September. He said when he originally looked at the building he was thinking about demolition considering the age of the property, but after being in the building for fifteen seconds he realized that demolition was not a reasonable expense because of the construction. The building is built like a bomb shelter, with precast concrete poured on site, and is probably one of the safest buildings in central Ohio. He said he regrouped and figured out he has a piece of property with freeway visibility, and they have a top notch, blue chip tenant Central Ohio Urology, which is a \$50 million Urology practice. Mr. Spencer said he built their surgery center and headquarters on the east side of Columbus out by the airport and this would be a complimentary office for them as they consolidate offices at Riverside and Chatham Lane. Those practices would be coming together. He said as they did their due diligence they realized the building had a trend of vacancy since 2000 and that was because of its configuration. The elevator shafts are very small and there a long dark hallways, similar to what you would see in the 400 W. Wilson Bridge Rd. building, and sister buildings.

He said his team did an analysis on the site and there are areas that will need to be made ADA compliant. Mr. Spencer said he would like to raise the site up to the existing stairs and reposition the stair wells to make this site marketable. They will be adding sprinkling systems, all new mechanical and electrical systems throughout the building. He said they wanted to figure out how

to position the building in order to be competitive. Mr. Spencer said typically municipalities are contacted and a request for proposal goes out for office space. They put together a plan to make the building attractive and competitive with other locations and decided they could do that by making the building attractive and efficient. Mr. Spencer went into details about the material changes. He said they will be taking out the seven foot sliding glass doors and replacing those on all three levels with a wall system and they will be replacing all the glass panels.

They will be reducing 35% of the existing glass, thus increasing the energy efficiency. There will also be LED lighting throughout the project, internally and externally, to keep the expenses lower.

Mr. Spencer said he has asked Columbia Gas to bring service to the corporate side of West Wilson Bridge Road. Currently, only the Rieber Street area and south has natural gas service. The new tenant will be able to have gas and electric services. They will be picking up a few thousand feet of leasable space with the addition.

He brought members of his team with him to the meeting to answer questions. All the new mechanicals will reduce the operating expenses and make the building competitive with places such as Polaris, Dublin, Easton, etc. Mr. Spencer said he is already in negotiations with medical users to complement Central Ohio Urology, which will take up the entire first floor, approximately 23,000 sq. ft. The back office operations will take up about 3000 sq. ft. on the second floor. There will also be a backup generator to make sure services will not be interrupted, or a safe evacuation if necessary. It will cost about \$25,000.00 to bring natural gas to the site.

Mr. Sauer said he applauds what Mr. Spencer is doing and he hopes he is successful because he can demonstrate that a similar approach can be taken to enliven the other nearby buildings.

Mr. Hunter said he spent some time looking over the drawings and he would also like to congratulate Mr. Spencer for what he is doing. Mr. Reis also agreed. Mr. Spencer said he has been working with the city for about a year trying to find available space for this business, and he thanked his team members for their work as well.

Mr. Sauer asked Mr. Spencer if he had a target date. Mr. Spencer said possibly between August and October. Mrs. Bitar asked Mr. Spencer if the glass will be all the same color and Mr. Spencer said yes. Mr. Ferris, a landscape architect discussed how they are trying to save trees and they will be tying in a sidewalk that will lead to the city's bike path.

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

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY TRIVIUM WORTHINGTON LLC FOR APPROVAL OF AN AMENDMENT TO DEVELOP PLAN APPLICATION TO RENOVATE THE SITE AND BUILDING AT 350 W. WILSON BRIDGE RD. AS PER CASE NO. ADP 10-15,

DRAWINGS NO. ADP 10-15, DATED NOVEMBER 25, 2015, 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. Sauer 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.

5. Subdivision

- a. Final Plat – **918 High St.** (Plank Law Firm/MK&K Realty Inc.) **SUB 03-15**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

The applicant has requested Final Plat approval to allow the part of the property that is occupied by CVS to be separated from the rest of the property. Also, two additional parcels at the east end of the site that house parking would be combined with the resultant southern parcel. The total area of the 3 parcels is 2.135 acres; the resultant lots would be 0.844 acres and 1.021 acres. The split would allow the property owner to potentially sell or develop the vacant lot, and separate the property taxes.

The parcels are zoned C-2 (Community Shopping Center) and were subject to Development Plan approval for any development on the site. After the proposed split the site would continue to be subject to the previous Development Plan approval until new approval is granted. The entire site would remain in the Architectural Review District.

At the Preliminary Plat hearing, the Commission requested the applicant contact CVS to inform of the change. A copy of the contact letter is in the packet, as is a copy of the sub-sublease agreed to by CVS which includes language giving the property owner the right to obtain one or more lot splits for purposes of obtaining separate tax parcel designations.

Zoning Requirements:

| | C-2 Zoning | North Lot | South Lot |
|------------------------------|------------|----------------|---|
| Lot Width | 150' | 252' & 145.54' | 176.69' |
| Lot Area | 1 acre | 0.844 acres | 1.291 acres |
| Front Setback | 50' | Established | 13'2" and 22'4" If constructed per ADP 07-12 |
| Rear Setback | 40' | >40' | 40' |
| Minimum Width Each Side Yard | 40' | 0' | 10'8" If constructed per ADP 07-12 |

| | | | |
|---------------------------|-----|-------|-----|
| Maximum % of Lot Coverage | 25% | 35.4% | 25% |
|---------------------------|-----|-------|-----|

Variations:

1. Parking: After the subdivision, Lot 1 would have 39 regular parking spaces and 4 handicap spaces for a total of 43 parking spaces; 57 spaces would be required. Perpetual easements are in place for ingress and egress on the adjacent parcels. Joint parking agreements were approved by the Board of Zoning Appeals on November 5, 2015 to accommodate the split.
2. Lot Coverage: The CVS building on Lot 1 is 13,013 square feet and the overall square footage for Lot 1 is approximately 36,764.64 square feet for total coverage of 35.4%.
3. Side Yard Set Back: 0’ for the CVS building being directly against the proposed property line. The southern wall would be required to be fire rated to meet the Building Code, which is reportedly the case. A 5’ pedestrian, access, utility and encroachment easement is proposed in that location.
4. Acreage: Lot 1 is 0.844 acres; 1 acre is the required minimum.

Land Use Plan:

Worthington Comprehensive Plan

At this intersection, the preferred traditional urban design principals — moving the buildings forward to the sidewalk, placing the parking to the rear (screened by the building), and creating an inviting streetscape with an attractive two-story building façade would apply.

Recommendations:

Staff is recommending *approval* of the application. Because the north portion of the site is fully developed the variances mostly reflect existing conditions. The rest of the site being on a separate parcel does not change the conditions of previous approvals.

Discussion:

Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Donald Plank stated he is an attorney representing his client and his address is 145 E. Rich St., Columbus, Ohio. Mr. Plank said the property currently has three tax parcels. They are combining the parcels together and splitting them in half to create two tax parcels instead of having three. Nothing else changes on this site except the tax parcels are getting shifted around. Mr. Coulter asked if the parking agreement with the urgent care will remain and Chris Kessler with the Plank Law firm at 145 E. Rich St., Columbus, Ohio, said the parking agreement is a declaration of record and will remain in place. Mr. Plank said the Memorandum of Lease discusses the cross access and easements. Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Coulter moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY PLANK LAW FIRM FOR APPROVAL OF A FINAL PLAT TO RE-SUBDIVIDE THE PARCELS AT 918 HIGH ST. AS PER CASE NO. SUB 03-15,

DRAWINGS NO. SUB 03-15, DATED NOVEMBER 19, 2015, BE RECOMMENDED TO CITY COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

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

D. Other

Mr. Sauer read the Resolution of Appreciation to Mr. Hunter for his years of outstanding service to the Architectural Review Board, The Municipal Planning Commission and the Board of Zoning Appeals.

Mr. Jim Seals thanked Mr. Hunter for his thousands of hours of service.

E. Adjournment

Mr. Coulter moved to adjourn the meeting at 11:49 p.m. and Mrs. Holcombe seconded the motion. All Board members voted, "Aye". The meeting was adjourned.