



MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING  
WORTHINGTON ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD  
WORTHINGTON MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION  
January 14, 2016

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: Michael Coulter, Chair; James Sauer, Vice Chair; Kathy Holcombe, Secretary; Thomas Reis; Edwin Hofmann; Amy Lloyd and David Foust. Also present were: Scott Myers, Worthington City Council Representative to the Municipal Planning Commission; Lee Brown, Director of Planning & Building; Lynda Bitar, Planning Coordinator and Clerk of the Municipal Planning Commission; and Melissa Cohan, Paralegal.

**A. Call to Order – 7:30 p.m.**

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

Mrs. Bitar swore in returning MPC member Mrs. Holcombe; new MPC member Mr. Hofmann; returning ARB member Mrs. Lloyd; and new (not returning from last year; left MPC at end of 2007; was ARB starting in 1983) ARB member Mr. Foust.

4. Election of Officers

Mr. Reis moved to nominate Mr. Coulter as the new Chairman, and Mrs. Holcombe seconded the motion. All members voted aye. Mr. Sauer moved to nominate Mrs. Holcombe as Secretary and Mr. Reis seconded the motion. All members voted aye. Mr. Coulter moved to nominate Mr. Sauer as the Vice Chair and Mrs. Holcombe seconded the motion. All members voted aye. Mrs. Holcombe moved to nominate Mr. Coulter and Mr. Reis to serve as representatives to the Board of Zoning Appeals and Mr. Sauer seconded the motion. All members voted aye.

5. Approval of minutes of the December 10, 2015 meeting

Mr. Reis moved to approve the minutes and Mr. Sauer seconded the motion. All Board members voted, "Aye". The minutes were approved.

6. Affirmation/swearing in of witnesses

## **B. Architectural Review Board**

### **1. Unfinished**

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

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

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

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

At the December meeting, the Board was in favor of the proposed signs but felt Jet's should give consent before the application was approved. The applicant has contacted Jet's Pizza and is expecting a favorable report from the owner by meeting time.

*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. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Ms. Nicole Covington stated her address is 660 High St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Michael Glass stated he is her husband, and of the same address. Mrs. Holcombe asked Ms. Covington if she had spoken with the owner of Jet's Pizza yet. Ms. Covington said she was unable to come up with a resolution with the owner about the sign being moved over. She said she still needs to sit down and talk with him because they have only been communicating via e-mail. Ms. Covington said in the last conversation she had with a representative of Jet's Pizza, she was told there are issues with the wall behind Jet's sign. Apparently there is a hole in the wall, but Ms. Covington said she was not certain if that is true. Mr. Sauer asked if the landlord has offered any help. Ms. Covington said the landlord believes she needs a sign to conduct her business, and he was shown the mockups of the signs and signed the application. Mr. Reis said the landlord will be responsible for repairing any holes in the wall.

Ms. Covington said she would like a little more time to talk with Jet's Pizza about their wall sign being relocated, but she would like to seek approval of the projection sign this evening because her customers are having a difficult time finding her office. Mr. Coulter said typically wall signs are allowed for first floor tenants and he was concerned with setting a precedent. Ms. Covington felt bigger 2<sup>nd</sup> floor tenants should have signage, and mentioned the BZA approval. Mr. Foust wondered about the other 2<sup>nd</sup> floor tenants in the building. Ms. Covington spoke of the 2 beauty salons and the 1 tech company that use their spaces only part of the time. She felt they would not seek permanent signage. Mr. Foust thought that should all be discussed as part of a plan with the landlord. He asked if there was signage on the door to the upstairs. Ms. Covington said the door had a sign for the beauty salon, but she was working to get her name in that location. Mrs. Bitar said if the signage is on the inside of the door then signage is allowed without approval as long as it does not take up more than 25% of the window area. Mr. Sauer asked what would stop another upstairs from requesting a wall sign. Mrs. Bitar said the ARB would not need to approve additional signs. Mr. Coulter said he thought he saw a sign identifying second floor tenants in the recessed area in years past. Mrs. Bitar thought it was a community message board. Mr. Coulter suggested moving forward with the projection sign this evening and the landlord should come back showing a master plan.

Mr. Glass said Jet's Pizza and his wife's business are the only two national brands in the building. The other tenants sort of come and go and use their spaces as convenience and not as fulltime

business owners that have an interest in the space. His wife also takes care of the shared public bathroom on the second floor. Mrs. Holcombe said the Board is not against having a wall sign; they would just like to see an agreement between the landlord and Jet's Pizza because they have already been before this Board, and that particular sign was previously approved. Ms. Covington said she understood. Mr. Coulter 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 NICOLE COVINGTON FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO ADD A PROJECTION SIGN ONLY AT 660 HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 108-15, DRAWINGS NO. AR 108-15, DATED NOVEMBER 25, 2015, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.**

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

**2. New**

- a. New Front Entry Steps, Ramp & Door – **882 High St.** (Greg & Phil Giessler) **AR 01-16**

**Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

**Background & Request:**

Approval of this building was granted in 1986, and it was constructed in 1987. The existing accessible ramp was added in 1993. The property owners are now asking for approval to remove the existing ramp and steps by the front door and install a new version.

**Project Details:**

1. The existing ramp and steps extend in front of the building. Proposed is a porch area in front of the door with steps on the front and south side, a ramp that runs along the north side of the building. A walk is proposed to extend to the existing sidewalk in the front, and a paver patio is proposed off of the south side of the front steps. A single railing along the steps in the front is proposed, and a railing would run along the ramp. Existing landscaping in the area would be retained.
2. The proposed railing style would be wrought iron with a top and bottom rail and no balusters.
3. A new steel front door with sidelights to match the existing is proposed.

4. Board of Zoning Appeals approval is needed due to the railings in the front setback. The existing building is about 21' from the right-of-way.

**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.

**Recommendation:**

Staff is recommending *approval* of this application. The proposed will enhance the building by adding a direct entrance from the public sidewalk, and moving the ramp to the side.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Greg Giessler stated his address is 882 High St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Sauer asked Mr. Giessler if the ramp had been built on top of the steps and Mr. Giessler said there are no steps there right now, only a ramp. He said that whomever does the concrete, will create two steps that will head west and south. The railing will be at a ninety degree angle between the two steps. Mr. Coulter asked about the pavers and plantings that will be used. Mr. Giessler said they hope to reuse the plantings already in front of the building. There will be a variety of hostas and Chinese boxwoods. He said the pavers will likely be 10" x 10". The patio will include a picnic table out front, maybe something similar to what Fresh Thyme has out in front of their store. Mr. Sauer said Mr. Giessler may also need a handrail on the steps heading south. Mrs. Bitar thought only the primary means of egress would need the handrail. Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Giessler if he was going to be replacing the bollards and Mr. Giessler said no, the bollards will be removed from the parking lot. Mr. Coulter 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 GREG AND PHIL GIESSLER FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO MAKE MODIFICATIONS TO THE ENTRANCE AT 882 HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 01-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 01-16, DATED NOVEMBER 25, 2015, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.**

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

- b. Front Handrail – 181 E. Granville Rd. (Scott Potter & Jill Welch) AR 02-16

**Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

Page 5 of 24

ARB/MPC Meeting January 14, 2016

Minutes

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

**Background & Request:**

This Greek Revival house was originally constructed in 1870, and has been added onto and remodeled over the years. The owners are proposing a railing for the front steps.

**Project Details:**

1. The existing front stoop is brick and has 3 steps.
2. The proposed handrail would be black wrought iron with square spindles.
3. A variance was granted by the Board of Zoning Appeals to allow the railing in the front setback.

**Land Use Plans:**

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

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

**Recommendations:**

Staff is recommending *approval* of this application. The proposed handrail would keep the character of the house and property.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Coulter asked for the applicant. Mr. Scott Potter stated his address is 181 E. Granville Rd., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Potter said he liked the handrail that was just approved by the Board in the previous case, but he is also okay with what they are presenting because the house is very old and the handrail seems fitting for this house. Mr. Sauer said he agreed with what Mr. Potter has already picked out, and the handrail looks more appropriate for the older home. Mr. Coulter 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 SCOTT POTTER & JILL WELCH FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO ADD A HANDRAIL AT 181 E. GRANVILLE RD., AS PER CASE NO. AR 02-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 02-16, DATED DECEMBER 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. Mrs. Bitar called the roll. Mr. Coulter, aye; Mr. Sauer, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; Mr. Hofmann, aye; Mrs. Lloyd aye; and Mr. Foust, aye. The motion was approved.

c. Front Lighting – **5545 N. High St.** (Villa Nova Ristorante) **AR 04-16**

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

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

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

Villa Nova Ristorante was started in 1978. The building and site have been renovated over the years, including the addition of parking to the south with the demolition of the former Just Pies building. String lighting was added in November 2014 for the holidays and not removed. Approval to leave the lights in place permanently is now requested.

#### **Project Details:**

1. Five rows of lights are hung between the building and sign. The outside two rows are 40' long; the inside three rows are 25'. The lights are commercial grade outdoor lights.
2. The applicant intended the lighting to look like Italian street lights.
3. The property is across the street from Columbus businesses.

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

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

Use of fairly small lighting fixtures, and as few as possible, is recommended. Fixtures should not be overly ornate. Avoid excessive brightness. Design and materials should be compatible with the existing structure.

#### **Recommendation:**

Staff is recommending *approval* of this application. This type of lighting seems to fit with this type of business in this location.

#### **Discussion:**

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant is present. Mr. John and Meghan Colleli stated their address is 669 Farrington Dr., Worthington, Ohio. Mrs. Colleli apologized for not going through the proper channels for putting up the string lights. She said they were not sure they were going to keep the lights up, and secondly, she did not realize that she would have to go before the Board to receive approval to put the lights up. Mrs. Colleli said they got the idea from Natalie's Coal Fired Pizza, and Pies & Pints, both located in Worthington, Ohio. Mrs. Bitar explained city staff will be talking with those restaurants in the near future to discuss the string lights. Mr. Foust asked how long the lights have been on, because he has driven up and down High Street quite a bit and does not remember seeing the lights. Mr. Colleli said the lights have been for the past twelve months. Mr. Foust said they must not have offended him. Mr. Coulter said he has noticed the lights for the past six months and that he did not remember seeing the string lights at Natalie's but he will stop by the restaurant to take a look. Mrs. Colleli shared photographs of the lights at Natalie's and Pies & Pints. Mrs. Holcombe said that she liked the way Natalie's lights are displayed on the awning, and Villa Nova might look good with the lights on the awning as well. Mr. Brown explained Natalie's restaurant is on the list for Code Enforcement, so they may be coming before the Board

in the near future. Mr. Hofmann said he does not have a problem with the lights but would like to see the lights with a more thoughtful pattern, perhaps as Mrs. Holcombe suggested having the lights on the awning.

Mrs. Lloyd asked Mr. & Mrs. Colleli if adding the lights to the underside of the awning would still provide the look they want, such as additional light for people waiting outside. Mr. Colleli said he would prefer to have the lights strung the way they are now. He said he was open to suggestions from the Board if he is unable to string the lights to the pole. Mrs. Holcombe said she does not want to see a precedent set with the way the lights are strung to the pole. She feels this makes the area look like a used car lot. Mr. Sauer said he agrees the lights give the area a more festive feel, but at the same time he also thought the area resembled a used car lot. He said he would feel more comfortable if the lights were similar to what Rivage has done, putting lights on the awnings. Mrs. Holcombe explained that Mr. and Mrs. Colleli could table the application this evening and come back with a different plan for the lights. Mrs. Colleli said she is concerned about adding lights to the awning because the awning is not high. She said the restaurant has about thirty security cameras and she is constantly seeing young children trying to hang from the awning. Mrs. Colleli is worried if the lights were on the awning the children would try to unscrew the lights and break them. Mr. Colleli said he could hang the lights from underneath the awning but not from above because that might puncture the awning. Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Colleli what he would like to do, table the application and come back with a better plan, or take a chance to see how Board members would vote this evening. Mr. Colleli said he would like to take a vote to see if he could keep the string lights as they are now. Mr. Coulter 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 THE VILLA NOVA RISTORANTE FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO RETAIN LIGHTING AT 5545 N. HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 04-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 04-16, DATED DECEMBER 16, 2015, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.**

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

d. Rear Awning – **656 High St.** (Magic Cruises & Tours) **AR 05-16**

**Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

**Background & Request:**

This commercial building was originally constructed in the early 1900's and is a contributing property in the Worthington Historic District. Magic Cruises & Tours has been at this location since 1989. Previously there were burgundy awnings on the front of the building. The owner would like to install a fabric awning over the rear stairwell.

**Project Details:**

1. The proposed awning is 25'6" across, 3'2" high, and would extend 5' from the wall.
2. Proposed fabric for the awning is Burgundy and manufactured by Sunbrella.
3. A small sign is proposed on the awning in the area above the door. If the sign is less than 2 square feet in area, a variance would not be needed to have a second sign for the business.

**Land Use Plans:**Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Fabric awnings are appropriate but should have a matte rather than a glossy surface. Awning colors should be compatible with historically appropriate colors used on the building, but avoid overly ornate patterns and too many colors. Use traditional flat, sloping awnings.

**Recommendation:**

Staff is recommending approval of this application. The design and color of the awning are appropriate for this building.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Coulter asked for the applicant. Mr. Tom Salser stated his address is 5643 Slater Ridge Rd., Hilliard, Ohio. Mr. Coulter asked if the back door is the main entrance and Mr. Salser said he believes that some of the clients enter the building through the back entrance. Mr. Coulter said the improvement looks nice. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

**Motion:**

Mr. Sauer moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY MAGIC CRUISES & TOURS FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL A NEW REAR AWNING AT 656 HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 05-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 05-16, DATED DECEMBER 18, 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. Coulter, aye; Mr. Sauer, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; Mr. Hofmann, aye; Mrs. Lloyd aye; and Mr. Foust, aye. The motion was approved.

e. Garage – 559 High St. (Akbar & Minoos Hadjarpour) AR 06-16

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

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

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

This parcel has a commercial building at the front and a single family home at the rear, with split zoning to reflect those uses. The property owners purchased the property in 2012, moved their business, Haddad Oriental Rugs, into the commercial building near High St., and live in the house to the rear.

The owners are seeking approval to construct a three-car garage behind the commercial building to house company vans and equipment.

#### **Project Details:**

1. The proposed garage would be 816 square feet in area, with a double overhead door to the west and a single overhead door facing south at the east end. The garage would be connected to the commercial building by way of a 5' wide breezeway with a roof structure at the north end. An existing door on the back of the building would lead to double man doors on the east face of the garage. Also, a single man door is proposed on the south side near the west end and a window is proposed facing south. The exact door styles have not been identified, however the trim and window are to match the house.
2. Materials proposed for the garage include: asphalt shingles for the gabled roof (which matches the house) and siding to match the cementitious lap siding recently installed on the commercial building. Corner trim and downspouts would also match the existing commercial building. Residential light fixtures are proposed near the doors, but the style has not been identified.
3. An existing strip of landscaping along the north property line would remain. Otherwise, the rest of the area around the garage consists of existing concrete.

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

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

New outbuildings should use design cues from older nearby structures, including form, massing, roof shape, roof pitch and height, materials, window and door types and detailing. Try to create a new building compatible in appearance with the house it accompanies.

#### **Recommendation:**

Staff is recommending *approval* of this application once satisfactory door styles have been presented. The proposed new garage is appropriate for this property and house.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Coulter asked for the applicant. Mr. Akbar Hadjarpour stated his address is 559 High St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Coulter asked Mrs. Bitar if this application was approved this evening if the Board of Zoning Appeals would also need to approve and Mrs. Bitar said no because this property is in the C-5 district so there is not a side setback required.

Mr. Sauer said he likes the exterior improvements that Mr. Hadjarpour has done to the building, but wanted to know why a flat roof is not planned for the new addition. Mr. Hadjarpour said he has water leaking problems with the existing flat roof. Mr. Reis said he did not have a problem with the addition. Mr. Hofmann said he felt opposite and wanted to know if the addition could look more like the house, like matching the siding. Mrs. Bitar said the siding on the house is vinyl; the siding on the business is fiber cement. Mr. Hofmann wondered if the narrower lap of the house siding should be used on this structure. Mr. Hofmann said the new sign seemed glaring and loud and was not the same sign approved at the prior meeting. Mr. Reis said he agreed with Mr. Hofmann in regards to the sign. The sign does not look anything like the sign that was originally approved by the Board. The font is much larger than what was approved, and there was additional wording and decoration. Ms. Akbar said they wanted to keep the historical look of the sign. Mr. Hofmann said it does not match the approval. Mr. Coulter suggested just moving forward with the approval of the garage this evening and have the Hadjarpours' come back before the Board at a later time to address the issue with the awning sign. Mr. Coulter 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 AKBAR & MINOO HADJARPOUR FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO CONSTRUCT A NEW GARAGE AT 559 HIGH ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 06-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 06-16, DATED DECEMBER 21, 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. Coulter, aye; Mr. Sauer, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; Mr. Hofmann, aye; Mrs. Lloyd aye; and Mr. Foust, aye. The motion was approved.

e. Shed – **669 Evening St.** (David Griffin) **AR 09-16**

**Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

**Background & Request:**

This 0.29 acre property has a split level house with a two-car garage. It was built in 1951 and is not a contributing property in the Worthington Historic District. The owners would like to construct a shed in the rear yard.

**Project Details:**

1. An 8 x 12 shed is proposed 5' from the rear property line and 15' from the north side property line.
2. The shed would be constructed of tongue and groove pine siding with a clear stain, and a gabled roof with asphalt shingles to match the house. Also included would be a window, doors with windows at the top, and a cupola to match the cupola on the existing garage.

**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.

**Recommendation:**

Staff is recommending approval of this application. The proposed shed is complementary to the house and appropriate for the District.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. David Griffin stated his address is 669 Evening St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Griffin said he has too many things in his garage and he needs a shed to store his children's bikes so he can park his cars in the garage. Mr. Sauer asked Mr. Griffin if he will be painting the shed to match the house. Mr. Griffin said eventually they might paint the shed to match the house, but they want to repaint the house first, but have not decided on what color at this point in time. He said they will be putting a light stain on the shed now and painting the trim in white. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

**Motion:**

Mr. Hofmann moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY DAVID GRIFFIN FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL A SHED AT 669 EVENING ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 09-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 09-16, DATED DECEMBER 23, 2015, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.**

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

- f. Modifications to Previous Approval – **933 High St.** (InSite Real Estate, LLC/Fresh Thyme Farmers Market) **AR 10-16** (Amendment to AR 14-14)

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

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

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

InSite Real Estate, LLC received approval from the ARB in July of 2014 to construct a new building on the site to house Fresh Thyme Farmer’s Market. The property, formerly zoned C-3 and containing 2 office buildings, was rezoned as a PUD to accommodate the project. In September of 2015, Fresh Thyme opened its doors to the public with a Temporary Certificate of Occupancy. As InSite continued its work on the site and building, various alterations to the previous approval were made. Approval is now sought for those changes already made, and for additional modifications.

#### **Project Details:**

1. Landscaping & Site Plan:

- a) At the northeast corner of the building, a small landscaped area was eliminated to allow for an easier pedestrian path around the corner. This change also allowed for placement of 3 benches and 2 inverted “U” bicycle racks along the building. One bicycle rack was originally planned further south. Two inverted “U” racks were also installed in the rear by seating; and one “Leaning Bikes” rack was installed in the rear, south of the entrance.
- b) Near the southeast corner of the building, deteriorating trees were removed from this property and the neighboring Sprint Lube site. Replacement was with 3 Regal Prince Oak trees. Equipment originally shown south of the sidewalk in this area is now adjacent to the building, and partially screened with Boxwood and Yews.
- c) Off of the southwest corner of the building, a tree was not planted in the island due to underground utilities.
- d) Along the fences south and north of the parking lot, proposed trees could not be planted due to unground utilities. English Ivy was planted in these areas.
- e) At the north and southwest corners of the site, Tulip Poplar trees were planted instead of Bald Cypress trees, and 3 additional Pine trees were planted in each location to help with screening and to meet the tree requirement.
- f) Boxwood was planted instead of Emerald Arbor Vitae in a small area along the north side of the building.

2. Furniture:

Separate tables with chairs or benches were originally approved for the front and rear patios. Instead, square Pine tables with attached benches were provided. Black structural steel tubing is used for the supports. Umbrellas for the tables were originally approved as yellow and green without logos. Logos were added so need approval. A variance from the sign code to allow additional signs would also be necessary for retention of logos on the umbrellas.

Six cart corrals were installed in the approved locations, but are not the approved style. The corrals were approved to be black without a sign on top and are instead silver with a sign. Apparently Fresh Thyme will either replace the racks or make application to have the existing approved at a later date.

3. Lighting:

The Board approved the same style of lamp shade for the building and parking lot pole lights, which was to be black and angled. Neither the gooseneck lamps on the building nor the parking lot lights met that approval when installed.

- a) Building Lighting - The fixtures were initially installed in the correct style but silver in color. Subsequently, those fixtures have either been replaced with black fixtures or painted black to match the approval. The applicant is now proposing 3 new fixtures on the north side of the building to illuminate the drive. Placement would be higher on the building than the existing lights and awnings, and the fixtures would match those in the parking lot in style which are black, have a bell-shaped shade and are LED. On the north building elevation, the fixtures are shown as triangles and denoted as white. Also, the applicant is looking into the addition of a light mounted on the existing utility pole near High St., extended above the entrance.
- b) Parking Lot Lighting - Black bell-shaped shades and fixtures which do not match the shape of the building lights were installed. The poles were supposed to be no higher than 15' but were installed at about 17'. The concrete bases were not supposed to be exposed but are, and have been painted black. Due to complaints about lack of lighting from customers, and Fresh Thyme's idea of what appropriate lighting would be, the applicant is proposing to: relocate 2 poles; add 1 pole; raise the pole height to 20' for all poles; and install additional fixtures on all but 2 of the poles. The new and relocated poles are proposed in the same location as existing trees. Pictures will be shown at the meeting, but the Board is encouraged to visit the site at night to view the existing conditions. Staff noticed that not all light fixtures are working, and that some of the pole light fixtures may be more effective if rotated.
- c) South Side – Five bollard style lights are proposed along the sidewalk on the south side of the building to improve visibility.

**Land Use Plans:**

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Have a regular maintenance program for landscaping, paving, furniture and other streetscape elements. Small details such as weed-filled planters or accumulated litter can give a strong negative impression. Fences may be helpful for screening transformers, gas meters, and communication equipment. Also consider using plantings for this purpose, but be sure they do not interfere with meter-reading or maintenance of equipment. Keep functional items such as trash containers, transformers and electrical boxes orderly and well screened.

Lighting - Use of fairly small lighting fixtures, and as few as possible, is recommended. Fixtures should not be overly ornate. Simple and smaller usually is better. Keep lighting at a pedestrian

scale along the streetscape. Avoid lighting fixtures mounted high above the ground. Higher fixtures may be appropriate in parking lots in newer commercial areas. Avoid excessive brightness. Watch for excessive “spilling” of light onto adjacent properties and into nearby windows, especially from parking lot lighting. Fixtures can include shades or screens to help with this. Light levels of 0 footcandles at the property line are approved.

**Recommendation:**

Staff is recommending *partial approval* of this application based on the following information:

- The landscaping changes, site furniture and bicycle racks are in character with the original approval.
- The addition of logos on the umbrellas is appropriate in this location, with approval of a variance.
- Although lighting a drive area with building mounted lighting is typically not preferred, the constraints of this site warrant the addition of lights on the north side of the building. Due to the difference in height and purpose, the combination of fixtures/shade styles should be acceptable. Placement of the easternmost light one pilaster to the west would help with symmetry. The addition of a light on the utility pole near High St. would also help.
- The bollards for lighting on the south side of the building are appropriate.
- The site lighting plan for the parking lot should not be approved in its current form. Additional pole height above the already higher installation of approximately 17’ in the parking lot is not appropriate in this setting surrounded by residential. Rotation of existing fixtures, and the addition of fixtures and poles may be warranted, but must be submitted with a plan that does not interfere with the adjacent residential properties or disrupt the trees. Staff has discussed potential alternatives with the applicant and is expecting a revised plan before next week’s meeting.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Brown stated that Mr. Tomlinson, of 260 Greenbrier Ct., Worthington, Ohio, the neighbor to the north of the store, wanted a letter read into the record because he was unable to attend the meeting this evening.

“Dear Architectural Review Board members, I am writing this statement to be read during tonight’s meeting because my mother is in Hospice, and it could be anytime now, while these requirements from Insight are trivial compared to my grief at this time it’s nonetheless important that I make my voice heard to stop any additional lighting to be installed in the parking lot at 933 High Street, especially in the wake of numerous complaints, reports, and concerns that I have filed and emailed to numerous members of the City during and after the building on the site. My voice needs to be heard and actions to protect my neighbors’ property need to be taken.” Mr. Brown said as a side note that the City continues to work with Mr. and Mrs. Tomlinson about these issues, and some of the problems are ongoing. “My wife and I attended every meeting regarding this process. While we support the store on the property, the construction process has been incredibly disappointing, dirty and disruptive and continues despite the store opening almost seven months ago. We have endured noise, waking us up in the morning and keeping us awake at night, for over a year. Enough is enough, please. In addition, we have contacted the City of Worthington no less

than twice to document light pollution coming onto our property, from over, under and in between the fence boards near the northwest corner of the parking lot. This was not supposed to be allowed in the PUD nor in the submitted lighting plan. This should be fixed and all lights lowered to the approved height of fifteen feet from grade. I also do not understand why these lights were installed on exposed pedestals when it was also clearly forbidden as part of the PUD. This issue should have been fixed during construction, not seven months after the store was opened. The parking lot was supposed to be more beautiful than before, and with no light pollution and better drainage and this has not yet been achieved. We visit Fresh Thyme daily, and often more than once. Never since the opening of the store have we seen anyone parking along the perimeter of the parking lot along the north and west sides. Even during the busy holiday season, from Thanksgiving to Christmas, half of the parking lot was empty, and no cars were parked in the north and west spaces. We have also heard from other neighbors on Greenbrier Court who say they can see the underside of the lights, find it ugly and disturbing. They are also against any additional lighting being installed and would like the existing lights to be installed as per the original PUD. In addition to lighting we have also been communicating with the City's Engineer throughout the building process and after to keep water drainage from the property, an issue that did not exist prior to construction. I have produced numerous reports, several pictures and calls and had several meetings in an attempt to fix these issues before, during, and after construction, but no changes were made. Erosion is already occurring on my property and ongoing. I don't understand how lighting a property is more important than the destruction of my current property is being caused by Insight property. I think you for your time and I hope to get back to life as normal and focus on the more important aspects of life." From Adam and Heather Tomlinson.

Mr. Sauer said the lights in the parking lot are not the right lights, and the lights should not be shining into the neighbor's back yards. If they need to install different lights, and more of them to get the light levels, then that is maybe what should be done. He said he completely understands the problems the neighbors' are having with all of these light sources.

Mrs. Bitar explained there are some other things that need to be done. There are poles that are faced a certain way that if turned ninety degrees would illuminate the parking lot instead of grass islands. There a number of things that seemed like they could have been done better. If the light poles were the correct height that would be better for the neighbors.

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Edwin Gebauer stated he is representing Insite Real Estate and his address is 1400 16<sup>th</sup> Street, Oak Brook, IL 60523. Mr. Gebauer said InSite is the developer, owner and landlord of the Fresh Thyme project. The construction project is mostly complete, however, they were frustrated with some of the delays and things that drug out and things they had to come back and fix. A second general contractor had to be hired to finish the project. Mr. Gebauer said he shares the frustration of the neighbors that have had to put up with the construction project that was longer than originally anticipated and they are working diligently to make sure they get this right. He said as Mrs. Bitar mentioned earlier, there were several things on day one that were not complete or not correct that they had to come back and fix. Mr. Gebauer said InSite is not trying to change anything without coming before this Board for permission and that is why he is at the meeting tonight. He is present at the meeting tonight to ask for some field

changes and to discuss other changes such as the lighting.

Mr. Gebauer said the bollards on the side of the building can be easily changed to be made black. The light on the AEP pole out front by the intersection is something he is working on with AEP and not part of this submittal this evening. As far as the parapet wrap arounds, he will look into making those the appropriate colors and match the masonry of the building. There were some comments about plants on the north side of the driveway, but Mr. Gebauer wanted to clarify that they only own about eighteen inches of the land on that side, north of the driveway curb, and between those limited spaces are utility lines that run along the property, and that is the main physical constraint at the location. They are unable to plant large root balls in that area. The existing plants will grow, but that was their only option because of site constraints.

Mr. Gebauer said the revisions to the original plan are for landscaping, and site furniture that were due to substitutions related to constructability constraints and also due to availability of certain products. He said they made sure the size of plants, if not possible in certain locations, were accommodated elsewhere so the total caliper of trees planted on the property is equivalent to the original approval. In some of the areas where there were supposed to be trees along the fence there were site constraints so they could not plant trees. Instead they planted English Ivy which will grow and further screen the perimeter of the property and the board on board shadowbox fence. Mr. Gebauer said as far as the furniture goes, InSite provided the yellow umbrellas and Fresh Thyme requested the logos, and it is in character with the development of the property so they are requesting to keep the Fresh Thyme logos on the umbrellas. He said the picnic tables are quality tables and have benches that are fixed to the table so the chairs will not blow away or be taken. He said they feel these tables are in character with the original approval. The bike racks, benches and trash receptacles are all in accordance with the original plan. Mr. Gebauer said they have already placed them on site as part of the approved plan.

Mr. Gebauer said as far as the lighting goes, he understands there is a problem with the lighting and he said he would like to eliminate additional poles as part of the discussion, or table that portion to be discussed at a future date. He said the complexity of this issue is to do some things that were not installed exactly per plan and they are retroactively seeking relief. The poles were intended to be in character, and the bases were painted black to fit in with the appearance. They add durability so they will not be dinged up with lawn or snow plow equipment or customer cars over the years. Mr. Gebauer feels the light poles should be left in place. The square fixtures will be replaced with decorative circular base caps. He said as far as the illumination of the site lighting, the original plan was for the fifteen foot poles with LED fixtures, and they were unable to get LED fixtures and now the poles are not the correct height because of the bases. He is asking for relief from the two feet of additional height as well as the fixture style which is consistent with the architectural feel yet not exact because they chose to go with an LED fixture, which is more energy efficient. Mr. Gebauer said they are seeking relief to leave the poles in place because the store has already received many complaints from customers who do not feel safe in the parking lot at night. What they would like to do is light up the parking lot a little bit further, but still be cognizant of the zero footcandles at the lot line.

Mr. Gebauer said if there is a way to ask for additional light poles in the future he may want to pursue that, but for now he is omitting the additional light poles from his request and focusing on the existing poles that are there.

Mr. Sauer asked if the height of the light pole includes the base, and Mr. Gebauer said the height of the fixture is where the illumination comes out. Mr. Gebauer said the light source will be visible to the neighbors regardless of the height of the fixture because there is only an eight foot fence around the perimeter of the parking lot. The only way to get rid of the light source is to get the source below the sight line, and that is not feasible. The English Ivy should help block glare from the headlights once it grows. He said the light shown from the neighboring yard is light from viewing the source, not light spilling into the neighbors' yards. This is the only way to light the parking lot.

Mr. Coulter said he shops at Fresh Thyme at night and the last time he was there he noticed some of the pole lights were not operating. Mr. Coulter suggested Mr. Gebauer remove the lights from his application altogether, and discuss the lights at a later date with the neighbors from Greenbrier Ct. Mr. Coulter said Mr. Gebauer could still move forward with the discussion about the lights for the side of the building, negotiations about the landscaping, and he does not see a problem with the picnic tables either. He said the main problem is the lighting from the building and the parking lot. Mr. Coulter said he appreciates Mr. Gebauer painting the lights black also.

Mr. Gebauer said he appreciates the feedback and concerns. He said as far as the maintenance and warranty items, he does have someone coming out to take a look at the lights that are not operating. Mr. Gebauer said he does not have a problem separating out the parking lot lights from the application but he would like to request permission to keep the style of the existing parking lot lights and match the lights for the side of the wall with the bell shape fixture head. Mr. Gebauer said he would like to request for fixture heads to be placed on the building, in between where the pedestrian oriented fixtures are located, but up higher. Mrs. Bitar explained where the lights would be located on the elevation drawings.

Mr. Sauer asked what the proposed height of the wall lights would be and Mr. Gebauer said sixteen feet. Mr. Sauer how that particular number was achieved. Mr. Gebauer said the number was determined by using the photometric analysis to keep the zero footcandles at the lot line.

Mr. Hofmann said the problem is not with the style of the lamps, but the brightness of the light source. LED's tend to be very bright. He asked Mr. Gebauer if he considered using accessories with the lights or a different style of lamp that would use louvers, otherwise he would like to see the light source at fifteen feet to minimize the brightness. Mr. Reis suggested experimenting with different options. Mr. Sauer agreed with Mr. Hofmann about the problem of the light source being too bright. Mr. Hofmann said he works with a lot of LED's and they have to use louvers sometimes to soften up the lighting. Mr. Coulter said over the past couple of years a newer version of the LED's have been developed that have a warmer cast. Mr. Hofmann suggested Mr. Gebauer go back to his lighting designer and have a discussion about how to resolve these issues.

Mr. Myers said the City has a big problem. He strongly suggested removing consideration of lighting from this application tonight. He did not feel the lights should be approved as they are and wants to see them changed because they do not comply with the approval. He sees the problem with the lot not being bright enough for customers, and being too bright for the neighbors. Over the years working with multiple developers and ideas for this property, the number one priority was to take care of the neighbors. Mr. Myers stated that is Council's priority here, so this lighting plan needs to be re-worked or staff be instructed to remove the poles. He told the applicant to re-work the lighting and get back to the MPC as soon as possible, with the number one priority being sensitivity to the neighbors and the second priority being safety to the customers.

Mr. Myers also asked if anyone had any issues with the umbrellas. No answer was given. He said he has always taken the position that the logos on the umbrellas are considered signage. If they are going to put them up with a sign, they have exceeded their sign space so they will need to get a variance. Mrs. Bitar agreed.

Mrs. Holcombe said the only reason she is willing to accept the umbrellas with logos is because the front of the store does not look like a grocery store. Mr. Myers said he loves the store, but City Council has run a lot of interference for the store. Mr. Gebauer said he appreciated Mr. Myers feedback.

Mr. Foust asked if anyone has actually measured the height of the lights. Mr. Brown said city staff was out at the site with the previous superintendent to measure the lights, and the lights are at seventeen feet within an inch or two. Mr. Brown said city staff can continue to work on the parking lot lighting with the applicant and the community.

Mr. Foust said he wanted to address the issue with the cart corral. He said they went through that issue with Kroger years ago, and the decision was made to only allow the cart corral without signage. Anyone putting the grocery cart away knows what store the cart belongs too, so he would like to see the cart corral sign go away. Mr. Gebauer said they have already put in the request to order replacement black cart corrals without signage.

Mr. Brown wanted to make it known for the records there has been a lot of trash flying around the parking lot area.

Mr. Gebauer respectfully requested taking the lighting portion out of the application. Mr. Brown asked if that included the bollards on the south side of the property too and Mr. Hofmann said, "Yes." Mr. Sauer asked city staff to go back and see if the color of the lighting was ever discussed. Mrs. Bitar said the developer did install the light source that was approved.

Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application. A couple of people raised their hands.

The first speaker was Mr. Steve Harness, of 287 Greenbrier Ct., Worthington, Ohio. His property looks directly into the grocery store's parking lot. He said that surprisingly, this development is a

huge improvement from what was there before. He said what was there was horrible, but they lived with it for twenty-five years. Mr. Harness said he greatly appreciates the Commission and Council taking care of the neighbors. Mr. Harness said he does not understand why the applicant wants to add seven new light fixtures; it seems excessive. Also, he thought some of the large landscaping shown on the drawings does not exist, and the ivy was only planted on one small section of the fence that is a nine foot section. Mr. Harness also wanted to comment on the lighting on the north side, at the driveway, and council should take note that the lighting faces the office area which closes down at 6:00 p.m. so that lighting should not be as much as a problem there for the residents. Mr. Harness said he would question why lighting is needed in the back area after 10:30 p.m. He understands that some of the lighting is needed for security reasons, but why are all of the lights left on, and why does the Fresh Thyme sign have to be left on for twenty-four hours?

Mr. Coulter thought that some of the parking lot lights were supposed to be turned off after a certain time. Mrs. Bitar said she believed there was a discussion about the Fresh Thyme sign being turned off after a certain period of time, but not the parking lot lights. Mr. Harness said that even though Fresh Thyme is not allowed to have deliveries until 7:00 a.m., the trucks arrive early at 6:00 a.m. and wait to unload. Mr. Foust said something could possibly be done by asking the police department to make the trucks leave and come back at 7:00 a.m. Mr. Harness thanked everyone on the Board for their help. Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Harness if he would like to see the ivy planted along the entire fence line and Mr. Harness said that would be a good idea.

The next speaker was Mr. Neil Gant, of 70 W. North St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Gant said he would like to concur with Mr. Harness's comments. He does not want Fresh Thyme to add more lights to the parking lot, and agrees that the cart corrals should be black without signage. He said one of the things they discussed with InSite and the City was the drainage on the lot. He is concerned about the ongoing maintenance needed for the pavers that were installed at the back of the lot to help with drainage. If the pavers are not maintained the water coming off the slope of the driveway will be a big problem for the neighbors. Mr. Gant said the process was very frustrating trying to get things done the way they were supposed to have been done. More sensitivity should be taken into account in future developments. He feels there should be trash receptacles at the back of the property, or some clean-up process, because trash is flying under the fence and looks bad. He said the subcontractors did not seem to have their heart in their work, and he felt like he had to supervise them daily to make sure work was done.

Mr. Myers asked Mr. Gant if his property abuts the creek and if there has been in any erosion in the area and Mr. Gant said yes, his property includes the creek. He said when the sewer pipe was first installed, it contained a lot of debris that proceeded to wash into the creek with a big rain. It took a company called Badger 2 weeks to clean out the creek. Then, it happened again so the company was there 3-4 weeks total. Mr. Gant was not sure about the amount of erosion because he said that matting has only been in for about a month. Some places are nice and flat and others places are starting to crunch up. He wants to make sure this area is monitored for future problems. Mr. Myers asked Mr. Gant to keep an eye on the area and keep him informed if there are any problems. Mr. Gant said the area looks nice, but getting to that point has been difficult.

Mr. Brown said he wanted to add to Mr. Gant's comments, and said the maintenance of the pervious pavers were a concern of city staff so there is an operations maintenance plan in place and staff will reach out to the applicant if necessary to address maintenance issues. The applicant will also be responsible for turning in reports to the City's Service & Engineering Department. Mr. Brown also said when the PUD was developed there was a mechanism put in place for quarterly reviews as well.

Mr. Reis asked if there were any photographs of the Gants property. While Mrs. Bitar was looking for photographs Mr. Reis said he was planning to include the following in the motion: removing lighting; parapets; umbrella signage; cart corrals; adding trash receptacles at rear of property; rear Fresh Thyme sign illumination; and future lighting plan adjusted to reduce lighting after hours. Mr. Reis asked if they need to deal with any of the landscaping around the mechanicals on the north side of the property. Mr. Brown said those mechanicals were already in place and are not the property of the application.

**Motion:**

Mr. Reis moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY INSITE REAL ESTATE, LLC FOR APPROVAL TO AMEND CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS NO. AR 14-14 FOR THE PROPERTY AT 933 HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 10-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 10-16, DATED DECEMBER 23, 2015, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING WITH THE FOLLOWING AMENDMENTS:**

- All lighting as requested in this approval be removed and that you will come back with a new lighting plan that meets the Code and zero footcandles at the property lines;
- That the existing parapets will be completed with material that currently exists and wraps around and not seen from the street;
- That the umbrella logos be removed;
- That the cart corral signs be removed, and the corrals be black;
- That additional trash receptacles be placed at the rear of the property to eliminate trash that is blowing into the neighbors' property;
- That the lights for the sign on the rear of Fresh Thyme's building be turned off after hours;
- When they come back with a lighting plan, the rear parking lot lights will be adjusted accordingly for off hours.

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

## **C. Municipal Planning Commission**

### **1. Amendment to Development Plan**

#### **a. Signs – 300 E. Wilson Bridge Rd. (Advance Sign Group/MedVet) ADP 02-16**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

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

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

The building at 300 E. Wilson Bridge Rd. was constructed in 1979 along with the neighboring building at 250 E. Wilson Bridge Rd. Medvet purchased and renovated the 300 property in 2002, and has periodically made changes to the building and signs. Variances were granted as part of the last sign change for the total area and number of signs currently on the site. This is a request to change the wall and freestanding signs to reflect the business' new image, and within the previously approved variances for size and number of signs.

##### **Project Details:**

1. Face changes are proposed for the existing freestanding sign. The new faces would be installed in the 4' -2 ¼" x 7' 6 ¼" sign cabinet. The cabinet would be painted PMS 281 to match the proposed face background, which is a darker blue than the current signs. The background must be opaque. MedVet in white would be at the top of the sign; "24 HR EMERGENCY" in red on white would be in the middle; and IDEXX Laboratories is proposed in white at the bottom. A variance would be needed for the requested number of letter styles and sizes. Although the proposed is similar to the existing, a variance was not previously granted.
2. The wall-mounted signs are proposed with a 2' 4 ½" high x 12' wide (28.8 sf) non-illuminated background panel in the same blue (PMS 281). Five inch thick white internally illuminated channel letters, 1' 7 ½" in height, are proposed to be mounted on the background panels. Both wall-mounted signs would be in the top portion of the building wall, one facing south and the other north, and moved further away from the building corners than the existing.

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

###### **2005 Worthington Comprehensive Plan**

This area is designated as the commercial office center of Worthington. The advantage of this area is the freeway visibility and access. Reinvestment in the existing buildings is encouraged to make the buildings more competitive in the market place.

###### **2011 Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Study**

The study recognizes the corridor can provide vital support for the future of the City's economy and quality of life. The site is recommended as Office to accommodate large-scale office

development/redevelopment with freeway visibility and smaller offices to support the streetscape along Wilson Bridge Road.

#### Proposed Chapter 1181 – Wilson Bridge Corridor

Signs – Generally exterior lighting fixtures are the preferred source of illumination. Freestanding signs shall be monument style and no part of any freestanding sign shall exceed an above-grade height of 10'. Sign area shall not exceed 50 square feet per side, excluding the sign base. The sign base shall be integral to the overall sign design and complement the design of the building and landscape. Businesses occupying 25% or more of a building abutting the I-270 Right-of-Way may have a wall-mounted sign facing each Right-of-Way. Such signs may have a non-illuminated background up to 200 square feet in area. The graphic portion of such signs shall not exceed 100 square feet in area. Wall-mounted signs shall be designed appropriately for the building, and shall not be constructed as cabinet box signs or have exposed raceways.

#### Worthington Sign Code

Current zoning regulations for the site allow each businesses to have 1 wall-mounted sign, and each development to have 2 freestanding signs. Maximum sign area cannot exceed 100 square feet per business. No more than two styles of lettering plus one logo, and three sizes of lettering and logo are permitted.

#### **Recommendation:**

Staff is recommending *approval* of the application. The proposed amendment maintains the character and integrity of the development and does not exceed the sign area previously approved for the site. Also, the proposal fits within the proposed Wilson Bridge Corridor Code language.

#### **Discussion:**

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Stanley W. Young, III, stated he is representing Advance Sign Group, and his address is 2379 Hardesty Drive North, Columbus, Ohio 43204. Mr. Michael Robin (Facility Manager for Medvet) was also with Mr. Young, and stated his address is 300 E. Wilson Bridge Rd., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Young asked the Board if they could grant relief so a variance was not needed, and Mr. Coulter said they were not able but would be supportive of the approval. He then asked if there could be approval of the wall signs so they could get started making it, while waiting for the variance for the freestanding sign and Mrs. Bitar said that would be fine.

#### **Motion:**

Mrs. Holcombe moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY STANLEY W. YOUNG, III OF ADVANCE SIGN GROUP TO AMEND THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN BY CHANGING THE SIGNAGE AT 300 E. WILSON BRIDGE RD. AS PER CASE NO. ADP 02-16, DRAWINGS NO. ADP 02-16, DATED DECEMBER 13, 2015, BE APPROVED AND THAT ONLY THE FACES FOR THE FREESTANDING SIGN 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. Coulter, aye; Mr. Sauer, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; and Mr. Hofmann, aye. The motion was approved.

**D. Other**

Mrs. Bitar mentioned the use of City e-mail addresses. Mr. Brown explained the City's Engineer will be retiring tomorrow. The Wilson Bridge Road Corridor zoning went to City Council this past Monday for briefing. There was a two hour discussion about setbacks, heights and appearance and will be further discussed at the next meeting in February. Mr. Brown also mentioned a development proposal City staff had seen for the south side of E. Wilson Bridge Rd.

**E. Adjournment**

Mr. Reis moved to adjourn the meeting at 10:27 p.m. and Mr. Sauer seconded the motion. All members voted, "Aye." The meeting was adjourned.