



MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
WORTHINGTON ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
WORTHINGTON MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION
March 10, 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; 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; and Lynda Bitar, Planning Coordinator and Clerk of the Municipal Planning Commission. Commission member Thomas Reis was absent.

A. Call to Order – 7:30 p.m.

1. Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Approval of minutes of the February 11 & 25, 2016 meetings

Mr. Sauer moved to approve the February 11, 2016 minutes and Mr. Hofmann seconded the motion. All Board members voted, "Aye." The minutes were approved.

Mr. Sauer moved to approve the February 25, 2016 minutes and Mrs. Holcombe seconded the motion. All Board members voted, "Aye." The minutes were approved.

4. Affirmation/swearing in of witnesses – Members of the audience were sworn in by Mrs. Bitar.

Mr. Coulter explained the 41 E. New England Avenue application will not be heard this evening.

An unknown man (identified later in the meeting as John Warton, 490 Olenwood Ave, Worthington, OH) in the audience asked Mr. Coulter what his statutory authority is for this Board to ask people to be sworn in by an oath before speaking. Mr. Coulter asked him if he had a concern with being sworn in under oath. Mr. Warton said he does have a concern. He believes asking a person to be sworn in under oath is invoking criminal statutes. Mr. Coulter explained this is done before every meeting, and if he objects to being sworn in, then that is fine. Mr. Warton asked what the statutory authority of the person that just administered that oath is and Mr. Coulter explained that Mrs. Bitar is a City employee. Mrs. Bitar explained she is also a Notary Public. Mrs. Bitar further explained that staff always makes sure the person swearing in is a Notary Public, or the

City Attorney. Mr. Warton claimed that Presidential candidates are not required to take the same oath. He feels this is a constitutional issue. Mr. Coulter asked if he has an issue that he contact the City Attorney and discuss his concerns with her. Mr. Coulter said the Board members needed to move forward with the meeting. Mr. Warton said he would contact the City Attorney and he wanted Mr. Coulter to know that his actions were unconstitutional. Mr. Coulter said that is noted.

B. Architectural Review Board

1. New

- a. Awning Lighting – **5545 N. High St.** (John & Meghan Colleli) **AR 30-16**

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 extending from the building to the freestanding sign was added in November 2014, but removed after the ARB denied approval in January of 2016. Now the owners are requesting approval of placement of the lighting on the front awnings.

Project Details:

1. The same commercial grade outdoor lights are now proposed to be installed along the bottom edge of the awnings.
2. Sixty feet of the awnings edges are parallel to High St. and the remaining edges are perpendicular, for a total of 79'-80' of lighting.
3. The ARB has approved similar lighting in the District.

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, as this type of lighting is appropriate for the District.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mrs. Meghan Colleli stated her address is 669 Farrington Dr., Worthington, Ohio. Mrs. Colleli said after they removed the lights in the front of their restaurant they realized the area was too dark. She said they have decided to go with the

Board members recommendations of adding lighting under the awning. Their awning will have the exact same setup as the Rivage restaurant does, including the same string lighting and bulbs. Mr. Coulter asked if the lights would be at the bottom of the awning and Mrs. Colleli said yes. Board members had no other questions or concerns. 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 THE VILLA NOVA RISTORANTE FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO PLACE LIGHTING ON THE AWNINGS AT 5545 N. HIGH ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 30-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 30-16, DATED FEBRUARY 24, 2016, 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. Coulter, aye; Mr. Sauer, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Hofmann, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye and Mr. Foust, aye. The motion was approved.

b. Deck Replacement & Gazebo – **155 Lake Ridge Rd.** (Matthew & Jill Jehn) **AR 31-16**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

Lake Ridge Rd. was part of the Kenyon Brook Subdivision approved in 1987. Because the original parcel was adjacent to N. High St. and therefore in the Architectural Review District, the entire 15 lot subdivision was retained in the District although only 1 of the lots is adjacent to N. High St. The four easternmost lots of the subdivision have frontage on the Lake Ridge Rd. cul-de-sac, and back up to lots on Kenyon Brook Dr.

This application deals with the 0.4255 acre lot at the southwest corner of the cul-de sac. The house on this property was constructed in 1988, including a first floor deck, and the lower deck was approved in 1989. The current property owners would like to replace the deteriorating rear decks, with an expansion for the upper deck, and add an attached gazebo.

Project Details:

1. The owners would like to enlarge the top portion of the deck to line up with the proposed lower deck for dimensions of approximately 28' x 14' but with clipped corners. Rather than at the southwest corner, stairs are proposed at the northwest corner. At the southwest corner, a 16' wide hexagonal-shaped gazebo is proposed with access at the first floor elevation only. Also, the first floor decking would extend around the south

side of the house like the existing. Total deck area would be approximately 1400 square feet.

2. The existing deck was constructed with cedar; the new deck is proposed to be a composite material (Trex).
3. Due to the addition of a gazebo and expansion of the deck and steps into the required 30' rear yard, a variance from the Board of Zoning Appeals would be needed. On the site plan, the gazebo appears to be about 14' from the rear property line.
4. This property slopes about 10' down from the rear of the house to the rear property line.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

There are recommendations in the Worthington Design Guidelines for additions and decks to be located as far to the rear as possible. Design and materials should be traditional, and compatible with the existing structure.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending *approval* of the application. The proposed deck and gazebo are compatible with the house and appropriately located.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Matthew Jehn stated his address is 155 Lake Ridge Dr., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Jehn said they purchased this home a couple of years ago, and were aware at that time that the deck was in poor condition. He would like to add an addition to the home that will increase the residential value. Mr. Jehn said he will be using Trex materials in order to eliminate an ongoing need for maintenance, and also explained the details of the design. He said they have been working with an architect for the past three months. They tried to come up with a design that would add value to the house. Mr. Coulter asked if the Trex composite material would be stained or painted. Mr. Jehn said the Trex material is available in different colors. He said they will be using an earth tone color so the deck will blend with the wooded area. Mr. Jehn said no one can walk on the deck right now because of safety reasons, the stairs are completely busted out. He said they wanted to make sure that the deck addition would look aesthetically pleasing to his neighbors. Mr. Coulter asked how wide the deck will be from side to side. Mrs. Bitar said sixteen feet wide. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and one person came forward.

Mr. Greg Kuss stated his address is 90 Kenyon Brook Dr., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Kuss said he likes the design but is worried about the aggressiveness of the gazebo. He lives in the house directly behind the Jehn family. Mr. Kuss said in the summer there is quite a bit of vegetation, but he would like to see the gazebo pushed back a little bit. Mr. Hofmann asked Mr. Jehn if the gazebo would be secluded in the summer time and Mr. Jehn said yes. Mr. Sauer asked Mr. Jehn if he considered moving the gazebo out to the side so it would not extend out so far. Mr. Jehn said they had not discussed that because the gazebo is the type that you step down into and they like where they are proposing the gazebo to be. Mrs. Holcombe asked Mr. Kuss if he was more concerned about noise or being able to see the gazebo in the winter time. Mr. Kuss said he was not concerned

about noise he just wanted a better understanding of what was going on. Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Jehn if he considered choosing a deck color that would match the house. Mr. Jehn said no, because they are planning to paint the house grey within the next year. There were no other speakers.

Motion:

Mr. Foust moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY MATTHEW AND JILL JEHN FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO REPLACE THE DECK AND ADD A GAZEBO AT 155 LAKE RIDGE RD. AS PER CASE NO. AR 31-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 31-16, DATED FEBRUARY 26, 2016, 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. Hofmann, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye and Mr. Foust, aye. The motion was approved.

- c. Landscaping & Fence – **547 High St.** (Bildsten Landscape Services Inc./First Financial Bank) **AR 33-16**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This bank was constructed in 1999, having operated as Guernsey Bank until 2014 when First Financial Bank took over the operations. First Financial changed the signage and most recently made changes to the drive-thru area.

Originally, 11 evergreen trees were approved and planted along the west property line to screen the parking lot from the residential property to the west. The trees were apparently removed a number of years ago and not replaced. There is vegetation on the residential property that the bank feels would prohibit any new planting on the commercial property. At the request of the City for replacement of the screening, the bank has now made application for approval of an alternative.

Project Details:

1. The request is to install a 6' high solid sandstone colored vinyl fence. The material has a smooth glossy finish. Vinyl is preferred by the applicant due to lower maintenance over time.
2. Between the fence and the parking lot, sod would be installed.
3. In the island at the northwest corner of the parking lot, 3 Sea Green Junipers are proposed to the west, with an additional section of fencing and Daylilies in front.

Land Use Plans:

Page 5 of 29

ARB/MPC Meeting March 10, 2016

Minutes

Worthington Design Guidelines

Fencing should be constructed with traditional materials and appropriate for the site. Preferred are fences that are open in style and 3'-4' in height. Higher fences are discouraged, but may be appropriate where a commercial use abuts a residential property. Consider using natural plant materials instead of fences. Various bushes and shrubs can be used to mark property lines or to set off private areas. All fencing materials require maintenance. Do not let plants get overgrown or full of litter; keep wood fences painted or coated with opaque stain.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending *denial* of this application. Ideally the original planting plan would be restored. If a fence is desired, it should be constructed of wood and no more than 4' in height, which should be adequate to block headlights. Vinyl fencing is not appropriate in this location due to the visibility. If a fence is added, vegetation should also be added on the bank side of any proposed fence to soften the look. A separate section of fencing in the island is not appropriate.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Mark Bildsten stated his address is 1080 Camden, Columbus, Ohio. He said that First Financial Bank came to talk with him last September. He said that they would have like to put in a tree, but the spacing is too tight, and they stump from the previous pine is still in the ground. Mr. Bildsten said that they took a look at the other side of the property by the fence. Mr. Coulter asked what the distance is from the back of the curb line. Mr. Bildsten said approximately eight feet. Mr. Coulter said that he cannot remember the last time that the Board approved a vinyl fence. Mrs. Bitar explained that there have been a few vinyl fences that were approved but they were in the back of the properties and not visible from the right-of-way. Mr. Bildsten said that he is concerned about a landscaping plan that would include a hedge because the hedge may die because of the lack of space. Mr. Coulter said that he is not comfortable with vinyl fencing at all, and sees no reason for a fence to be six feet high, but he understands that planted material might not work. Mr. Sauer said that after the fence is installed he would like to see some shrubbery on the bank. Mr. Sauer also said that the fence needs to be made of a natural material and would like to see the fence no higher than four feet. Mr. Sauer asked what the point was of the other fence and Mr. Bildsten said to hide the trash cans. Mrs. Holcombe said that she definitely would not approve of a vinyl fence and would prefer to see greenery, but if the greenery would not survive, then she would prefer to see a fence made of natural material. She would also like to hear from the neighbors if they are present at the meeting. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward. Mrs. Bitar said that the neighboring property was in the middle of selling and she is not sure if the property has been transferred yet. She explained that this process began last fall and has just now gotten to the point of getting the application. Mrs. Holcombe recommended tabling the meeting until a new landscape plan was available. Mr. Bildsten agreed.

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

d. Chimney & Rear Door Replacement – **690 Evening St.** (Timothy Shaw) **AR 34-16**

Findings of fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This house was built in the early 1900's and is a two-story Colonial Revival style house. Approval was granted in 2015 by the ARB to allow renovation of the house and replacement of the garage. The owner is now seeking approval for a rear door and replacement of the chimney.

Project Details:

1. The rear door was in poor shape and removed. The proposed door would have 6 lights at the top and 2 panels below, and would match the door installed on the garage. Proposed trim would match the existing on the house.
2. There is a desire to eliminate the chimney to allow the interior staircase to the third level to be rebuilt at a more gradual incline. Also, the flue liners would need to be replaced in order to make the chimney functional, and it is not needed with the updated mechanical equipment placed in the house. The owner is proposing to remove the entire chimney, but reconstruct the exposed portion using wood framing, thin brick and terra cotta pots. The plan is for the part coming out of the roof to look just like the existing chimney.

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. Chimneys are a defining feature of a building and should be repaired and maintained.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending *approval* of the application. The proposed rear door is an appropriate style for this house. Replication of the chimney is a thoughtful treatment of an important architectural feature.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Tim Shaw stated that he is the owner of 690 Evening St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Shaw said that the chimney will be wood framed and he will be using thin brick instead of full brick to reconstruct the chimney. He also said that he hopes to keep one of the terra cotta pots. Mr. Shaw said that the door on the garage was badly decayed with a Plexiglas window. He was when he was framing out the basement and trying to do the jam extensions the nails were not seating well in the jams around the windows and that is when they realized there was some level of decay there. Mr. Shaw said that he would like to use glass blocks to replace the decayed windows or whatever the Board could recommend. Mr. Sauer said that he did not have a problem with the glass block because so much work on other areas have been done

to improve this house, and the Board has allowed glass block in other areas. Mr. Sauer suggested adding some shrubbery around the house and then no one will even see the windows. He also suggested just using the one pot for the chimney that still existed instead since that pot is part of the original structure. Mr. Shaw said that he thinks he can replicate the look, but the pots are very expensive. Mrs. Holcombe said that she really liked the look of the pots. Mr. Coulter said that he did not have a problem with the glass block windows either. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and one person came forward.

Mr. John Warton stated that his address is 490 Olenwood Ave., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Warton said that the plan is beautiful but he wants to know if the Fire Chief has taken a look at the plan because glass block windows would not provide emergency egress from the basement if someone was working on something in the basement and the house caught on fire. Mr. Coulter said that typically the only requirement for an egress window in the basement is when there is a bedroom in the basement. Mr. Warton asked if that type of window could be put on a pivot. Mrs. Bitar explained that the window area would need to be five square feet in order to get an operable window. There were no other speakers.

Motion:

Mrs. Lloyd moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY TIMOTHY SHAW FOR APPROVAL OF A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO REPLACE THE REAR DOOR AND RECONSTRUCT THE CHIMNEY AT 690 EVENING ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 34-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 34-16, DATED FEBRUARY 26, 2016, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING WITH THE FOLLOWING AMENDMENTS:

- That glass block windows are acceptable for the basement windows as discussed at the meeting;
- That vegetative screening will be used to screen the glass block windows

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

e. Amendments to Building and Site Renovations – **6851 N. High St.** (Lusk Architecture/Telhio Credit Union) **AR 35-16** (Amendment to AR 99-15)

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 was approved to renovate the building and site at the December 10, 2015 ARB/MPC meeting. This application is a request to make changes to the previous approval.

Project Details:

1. Site Plan & Landscaping:

- A dumpster enclosure was originally proposed at the southwest corner of the site, but the Board and Commission felt it would be more functional at the northwest corner. After further review of site layout, the applicant would like approval to place the brick enclosure back at the southwest corner of the site. Also, the size would be reduced from 26' x 14.5' to 20' x 12'.
- At the west property line, the existing wall would now be removed because of the poor condition. Also, the number of plants in this area has been reduced.
- Along the south property line, the number of shrubs has been cut in half. A tree island previously proposed would now just be a hatched area on the pavement.
- Drip irrigation is now proposed instead of spray heads.
- Shrubs along the west side of the storage and mechanical building are no longer proposed.
- Bollards are proposed near the drive-thru.

2. Building:

- Roof - Asphalt shingles (Weathered Gray) are proposed for the existing gabled roofs. Previously a choice of standing seam was also approved.
- Clerestory windows - The windows on the sides of the entry feature have been replaced with Hardiepanel. The color is to match the window frames (Charcoal). Behind the entry area, the clerestory windows on the north and south have changed from 3 sets each of double wide windows to 5 single windows on each side.
- North side canopy - No longer proposed
- Windows – Brick is proposed to fill in an existing window opening on the east elevation, and half of the openings for windows on the west and south elevations. New windows are proposed on the south side of the building.
- Storage and mechanical area on west side – Shed roof would only be over storage area. The mechanical area would have perforated metal screen instead of aluminum louvered screens.
- Fascia and soffits – Hardieplank
- Band at top of parapet – Now EIFS, instead of cast stone, in a color to match cast stone at base of building
- Stone base – Continued to north and south elevations
- The window frame in the arch was supposed to match the stone color, but is not

- indicated on the new drawings.
 - Security cameras and wall pack light were shown on the construction drawings, but are not on the ARB submittal. Approval will be needed.
2. Site Lighting:
 - Nine 12' high silver poles are proposed with Lumex narrow rectangular fixtures, similar to those shown at the last hearing. Seven poles would have a single fixture, and two would be in the island to the rear of the building with double fixtures.
 - The photometric plan has not yet been submitted.
 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. Avoid permanent blocking in of windows

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. Externally-lighted signs, where light fixtures shined on the sign surface, were among the most common type of electrically-lighted sign, and they remain the most appropriate type for historic districts.

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 and Recommendations:

1. Placement of the dumpsters in the southwest corner of the parking lot may be less visible from the right-of-way than the northwest corner would have been.
2. Removal of the rear wall should not affect the adjacent property due to the removal of parking and addition of landscaping in that area.
3. The proposed landscaping changes should not change the character of the development.

4. The changes proposed for the materials should not be noticeable; asphalt shingles are acceptable for the gabled roofs. The exception is the use of solid materials on the sides of the clerestory area, which seems contrary to the design.
5. Permanently bricking in windows is not preferred, but should not be very noticeable given the scope of the project and the painted brick.
6. Additional information is needed for the site lighting, use of wall packs, and security camera.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Michael Lusk stated his address is 2011 Riverside Dr., Columbus, Ohio. Mr. Lusk said the lighting feature will shine from the front only and not the sides. Mrs. Bitar asked if the original plan was to have slider windows and Mr. Lusk said no, the windows were never intended to be open. Mr. Lusk said the prices came in a bit higher than originally planned so they would now like to use a Hardiplank material to match the dumpster enclosure for the equipment screen. Mrs. Bitar asked if there would still be brick on the enclosed portion of the storage room and Mr. Lusk said yes. He said ventilation is needed, and that is why there are not plants adjacent to the equipment room.

Mr. Lusk said he may want to return to the Board at a later date to discuss lighting. He said they prepared photo metrics but did not take into consideration wall packs on the building and a street light at J Lui's property across the street. Mr. Sauer asked Mr. Lusk if he had any cuts of the wall packs and Mr. Lusk said no. Mrs. Bitar said the wall packs and security cameras would also need to be shown on the elevations. Mr. Lusk said the owner would like as much security lighting as possible. Mr. Sauer said he would not have a problem with a light that shines down only. He would not want to see a light that shines outward. Mr. Coulter and Mrs. Bitar thought some sort of uplighting on the building or the use of decorative bollards would be more appropriate than wall packs. Mr. Lusk said he will be bringing back the lighting and signage packages at a future date. Mr. Coulter said he appreciates Mr. Lusk coming in to ask for permission regarding the changes instead of asking for forgiveness.

Mrs. Holcombe asked Mr. Lusk why he was bricking up half of two of the windows and Mr. Lusk said that is a remote area for tellers and they did not want visibility in that area. Mr. Sauer asked if there was a way to opaque the window so the opening of the window would be preserved. Mr. Sauer wanted to know if the glass on the building was going to be clear. Mr. Lusk said he would have to check the plans but they have not used heavily darkened glass on any of the other branches. Mr. Sauer said he would prefer a clear glass be used. Mr. Sauer said he had concerns with the use of E.I.F.S. He would like to see some other material used in place of the E.I.F.S. and Mr. Hofmann agreed. Mr. Hofmann said the scaled coping is a nice idea but the stair step might be lost. Mr. Hofmann would prefer to see metal. Mr. Sauer agreed all of the same material should be used.

Mr. Foust said he was not on the Board when this application was originally approved. He said with all due respect to the architect and the other Board members that he wanted to go on record as saying that the design of this building does not seem to fit the Architectural Review District Design Guidelines. Mr. Foust indicated he was surprised that the basic design was approved, not

because the building is unattractive, but the design does not fit with the direction of the original plan. He wants to make sure the Board considers this when making future decisions on upcoming projects. The standard is pretty specific about reflecting on architectural styles from an earlier period in our history and maintaining the village like character of the community. Mr. Foust does not want this building to be setting a precedent for other buildings that may be coming along in the future. Mr. Sauer said that good architecture when done well is welcomed into the community. Mr. Sauer said there are other buildings up and down High Street that have flat roof tops, but he likes the variety of the buildings. They do not all have to have the same look and that is his personal opinion. Mr. Coulter said had this building been further south down High Street, the bank would not have had the same look.

Mr. Myers said there was a similar discussion amongst the City Council members. He said if you asked most of the City Council members if good architecture would be sufficient most of the council members would say no. In addition to good architecture there must also be a pattern and style that is consistent with Worthington. Mr. Myers said he understands that is a debatable approach. He said that Council is hopeful that this Board would not use the building to the north for an example of an acceptable structure in Worthington.

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 LUSK ARCHITECTURE FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO RENOVATE THE BUILDING AND SITE AT 6851 N. HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 35-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 35-16, DATED FEBRUARY 26, 2016, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING WITH THE ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS THAT:

- The windows shown as half (on the west and south elevations) will be full size windows with the use of spandrel glass below where the area is to be blocked from sight;
- That the glass be clear as possible, energy efficient
- That the E.I.F.S. around the top band will be changed to metal the same as the coping;
- That an alternative for the wall packs be considered and be brought back to the ARB with the rest of the lighting.
- That the signage will come to the ARB for review in the future.

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

- f. Site and Building Modifications - **701 Farrington Dr.** (Bryan Road) **AR 36-16** (Amendment to AR 12-15)

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This split level house at the southwest corner of W. Dublin-Granville Rd. and Farrington Dr. was originally constructed in 1961 and part of the Kilbourne Village subdivision. The irregularly shaped lot is 0.3 acres, and is separated from W. Dublin-Granville Rd. by a recreation path and some vegetation. The homeowner gained approval in 2015 to construct additions and renovate the house, including a change to the roofline and installation of different materials on the house. The 1350 square foot house has been expanded to 2100 square feet in area with the additions.

With construction, modifications were made to the building and site. In January, the ARB denied an application for approval of the changes as made. Now the homeowners are now seeking approval with proposed modifications.

Project Details:

1. Building modifications include:

- The Board and batten siding was approved as wood, but James Hardie siding and trim were installed.
- On the north end the owners are proposing to install cedar shakes as originally approved.
- Colors were stated on the original application as natural colors (brown, tan) with white trim, but the siding was installed in white. The cedar would be left natural in color.
- Front Elevation
 - At south end, arched window is larger and fixed; shakes extend into peak
 - Frieze board added in center section
 - Lower level windows changed to double hung
 - Brackets removed at porch overhang
 - Steps with rails added from front porch to lower grade
- Rear Elevation
 - Bump out with additional windows added for upper level at north end
 - South end arched window in gable is larger and fixed
 - Lower level door at south end eliminated
 - Upper level narrow windows eliminated
- North Elevation
 - Dormers changed from gabled to shed style
 - Frieze board added
 - Window added to lower level – 3 windows spaced evenly

- South Elevation
 - Window added at back of garage
 - Garage door moved east
- 2. Site modifications include:
 - A retaining wall was added at the front property line and along the drive to allow leveling of the front grade. The wall is planned to be finished with stone to match the house. Piers are located at the front corner, and at both sides of the walk at the drive. That walk connects to the new steps from the front door. The owner plans to move the wall back into the property about 2'. Location of the front property line is needed to be sure the wall would be out of the right-of-way. A variance is needed, though, to allow the wall in the required 30' front yard.
 - A matching wall with piers is being constructed in the rear to frame a patio area. A stone fireplace and grill area are included. The patio material has not been identified.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Decks and patios should be limited to the rear of buildings. Patios may be constructed of concrete, stone or brick. Consider the style of the house when designing decks and patios, since some styles and some designs are not compatible.

Design and materials should be traditional, and compatible with the existing structure.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending *approval* of this application. The modifications keep the character of the design approved by the ARB. The site changes are complimentary to the house, and in character with other properties in the District.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Bryan Rood stated his address is 701 Farrington Dr., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Rood said they are trying to make the house blend more. He said they are okay with putting back the cedar. In regards to the bump out behind the house, when the house was being built they realized that the architect did not leave any area to put up mirrors in the bathroom. The plan changed so they could add a bathtub and mirrors. Mr. Rood continued to say they did not like the design of the front porch and wanted the porch to match the rest of the house. In regards to the retaining wall, they are trying to get rid of the heavy slope in the front of the yard. The same stone used on the face of the house will be used on the patio and fireplace. Mr. Coulter asked if the concrete slab would be covered with the stone and Mr. Rood said yes. Mr. Sauer said he wanted to confirm that the retaining wall will be moved out of the right-of-way and cedar would be on the front of the home, and Mr. Rood said yes. Mr. Coulter said the bump out window is also a change, and he does like the bump out for the window. Mr. Rood said they did that to match the window on the south side of the house. Mrs. Bitar explained that all of the changes are part of the drawings and that the Board could just refer to the drawings. Mrs. Holcombe asked if there would be grass between the retaining wall and the sidewalk and Mr. Rood said yes.

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. Foust moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY BRYAN ROOD TO AMEND CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS #AR 12-15 TO INCLUDED SITE AND BUILDING MODIFICATIONS AT 701 FARRINGTON DR. AS PER CASE NO. AR 36-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 36-16, DATED MARCH 1, 2016, 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. Hofmann, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye and Mr. Foust, aye. The motion was approved.

g. Site Redevelopment - Hotels and Restaurants – **7007 N. High St.** (Alliance Hospitality, Inc./Holiday Inn) **AR 32-16**

Mr. Coulter explained that this Agenda item will not be voted on this evening. After the presentation everyone will have a chance to speak and ask questions.

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This roughly 7.5 acre parcel, zoned C-4, Highway and Automotive Services, has been home to a hotel on the site since 1975. The original approval was for a Hilton Inn. The brand has changed several times over the years with the most recent being the conversion to a Holiday Inn in 2007, which included many upgrades to the building and site. The owner is proposing demolition of the existing hotel, and redevelopment of the site with a mix of uses. This application includes basic site design and architectural renderings to give an idea of the look of the proposed development. Details will follow based on input from the Board and the public.

Project Details:

1. Uses:

- Two hotels, identified as a Hampton Inn with 110 guest rooms and a Holiday Inn Express with 95 guest rooms, are proposed. The existing Holiday Inn has 232 guest rooms.
- Other potential uses are describe as restaurants; personal/professional services; and quick casual dining and services.
- In the C-4 Zoning District, personal and business services and hotels are Permitted

Uses. Restaurants are Conditional Uses needing approval from the MPC.

2. Site Plan and Landscaping:

- The proposed plan shows an entrance to the site from each of the adjacent rights-of-way. On W. Wilson Bridge Rd., the entrance is proposed at the west end; on Caren Ave. the proposed entrance is toward the middle of the site but on the eastern half; and on N. High St. the entrance is proposed near the middle of the site. All three entrances would be situated similarly to existing site entrances. Elimination of an entrance toward the east end of the site adjacent to W. Wilson Bridge Rd. is proposed.
- The Hampton Inn is proposed about 195' from the western property line and about 83' from the southern property line. The Holiday Inn Express would be east of that building.
- At the perimeter of the site would be single story buildings ranging in size from 5500 square feet to 10,500 square feet in size, and a single level parking deck is proposed at the southwest corner. A combination of evergreen and deciduous trees and shrubs are proposed to be densely planted along the west and south property lines adjacent to the existing residential properties.
- The interior of the site is designed with parking, sidewalks and public spaces which would also accommodate seating areas. Trees and shrubs would be planted throughout the space in islands.
- The property at 120 Caren Ave., which is the easternmost residential property on the north side of Caren was purchased by the hotel property owner. The intent is to demolish the house and add plants and trees to the remaining trees to create a natural looking area.
- Walkways are proposed on the south side of the site to the Caren Ave. sidewalk and on the west side of the site to the sidewalk that connects Greenglade Ave. to W. Wilson Bridge Rd.
- Along Wilson Bridge Rd., the City has planned for future improvements, and has asked the property owner for the dedication of right-of-way. The exact amount is being determined.
- Consideration should be given to burying overhead utility lines at the south property line.
- A storm water plan will be required.

3. Buildings:

- The proposed hotel buildings are four stories; the existing hotel is three stories. An exhibit showing the relationship of the proposed to the existing is included in the packet. In the renderings, some architectural features may make the buildings look taller.
- While the perimeter building would have one story of usable space, the plan is to have them designed to look like 1 ½ and 2 story buildings.
- A mix of design and materials is shown for the buildings. It appears all would have four sided architecture so would have the same treatment on the exterior and interior streets. The included renderings are proposed to give an idea of the design direction, but detailed elevations and material samples would be expected later in the process.

4. Lighting and Signage:
 - As design progresses, a detailed site and building lighting plan would be required. The expectation is for light to not be overly bright, and to not extend over any of the property lines.
 - Signage review will be required.
5. Traffic:
 - A traffic study has been requested and is almost complete. The applicant decided to add the N. High St. entrance after it was suggested at the meeting held at the Holiday Inn to present the project. That change, and some comparative information requested by staff, will be added to the study and the information will be presented as available. Also, the City has contracted with a traffic consultant to review the study and make recommendations.
 - Expansion of the western intersection of the Shops at Worthington Place has been discussed to allow easier access for visitors to and from this site.
6. Variances:
 - Application to the Board of Zoning Appeals would be required to approve any variances requested for the site.
 - The applicant is applying as part of the C-4 Zoning District, but is also trying to meet the requirements for the proposed Wilson Bridge Corridor. Variances would likely be needed for setback, building height and parking not meeting the C-4 regulations.

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. Carefully designed building facades that employ traditional storefronts -- or similarly-sized windows on the first floor -- will help make new buildings more pedestrian-friendly.

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 primary goal. Building up to the required setback is desirable as a means of getting pedestrians closer to the building and into the main entrance as easily as possible.

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, 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.

Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Study

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

Building Design:

- A principal building shall be oriented parallel to Wilson Bridge Road (or High Street), 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 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.

Recommendations:

Staff is recommending *tabling* of this application after discussion, to allow the applicant to make modifications and add detail based on the guidelines and any recommendations made at the meeting. The overall concept seems to be in line with redevelopment anticipated for this site in the Wilson Bridge Corridor.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Ohm Patel stated his address is 600 Enterprise Dr., Lewis Center, Ohio. Mr. Patel said they have been operating this hotel for sixteen years and

have been before this Board numerous times before for many projects and renovations. He said the time has come where the cost of doing business is outweighing the benefits of doing business. Mr. Patel said they only have two options of how to move forward. They can either re-develop the site or divest the asset. He said they feel this property has great potential but are currently losing part of their share of the market because of the other new hotels going up in nearby areas. Mr. Patel said this is a great time to create a mixed use development that will attract the corporate leisure client during the week and the higher end leisure client on the weekends, and that will match the community and what Worthington stands for. He said they have gone over many variations of what would work at this site, and came up with fifteen different plans, starting with a very dense plan, and slowly over time came up with what they are proposing this evening. The franchise hotels that Mr. Patel is considering for the site have non-negotiable criteria that require the structure be at least four stories in height. As hotels are being developed today, they want nearby support services that people can walk to rather than drive to. He said he expects this to be an evolutionary process and they want a lot of feedback from the community. Mr. Patel wants to know how this project will affect the surrounding community negatively and positively so that he can be creatively proactive with design. He said he does not have tenants lined up yet because they are still in the discussion mode. The site will not be developed overnight, this is just a starting point for them. Mr. Patel said they are celebrating the fact that they finally have something to present to the Board this evening. He said they are working on revisions to a traffic study. The renderings are just to show a trajectory because the project is just conceptual at this point. He said as far as architectural design, they want to follow the code and Worthington's traditional style, but at the same time provide elements that provide transition. Mr. Coulter said the Board would like to hear more from the public at this point, than just have a discussion amongst themselves.

The first speaker was Ms. Heather Monroe. Ms. Monroe stated her address 135 Greenglade Ave., Worthington, Ohio. Ms. Monroe asked how many buildings will be on the site. Mr. Coulter said the plans show seven buildings plus a parking structure. Ms. Monroe said she would like to see more greenery added to the plans. She suggested taking a look at the Village Green to see what Worthington is all about.

Mr. Gary Rutledge stated his address is 195 Northhigh Dr., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Rutledge said he was a member of the group that studied the Wilson Bridge Road Corridor. He said what is proposed here is very much in keeping with the concepts that the study group developed, presented and were approved in terms of building height and in terms of density and the location of the building in proximity to the street. Mr. Rutledge said this plan is pedestrian friendly and a sensitive and dynamic plan for a wonderful gateway to the city. He said this gives the city an opportunity to reinforce what was discussed in the study. This plan is a great improvement of what is already there. This plan will actually reduce the amount of traffic in the area, and will blend better with the surrounding neighborhood. Mr. Rutledge said the third entrance makes a lot of sense and this plan makes the site more functional because the cars will not be scattered all about. He said he is excited about this opportunity.

Mr. Steven Rosandich stated his address is 140 Caren Ave., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Rosandich asked Mr. Rutledge what his level of experience was and about the time he spent working on the

development committee. Mr. Coulter said before Mr. Rutledge answers that question, he would like for Mrs. Bitar to explain what the Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Study was about. Mrs. Bitar explained that the Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Study was conducted to enliven the corridor, which is one of the economic drivers of the City. It is important for the income tax revenue to be stable and increase in the future. Mr. Myers asked for more details about the study. Mrs. Bitar said the project started between 2006 and 2007. There was a steering committee made up of members from City Council, the Planning Commission, and a number of residents. The project started on the East side of Wilson Bridge Road and the committee quickly realized that both sides of Wilson Bridge Road should be involved in the study. The mall was not doing well at the time. There were a lot of vacancies there and in the offices, and they were trying to find ways to improve the area. Mr. Coulter said it is important to note that there were a number of Worthington citizens that were a part of that group, and not just city staff. Mr. Rosandich just wanted to make sure everyone knew that Mr. Rutledge was a member of that committee.

Mr. Coulter reiterated that this meeting was informational only and a decision would not be made that evening. There will be several more meetings with plenty of opportunities for public input. Mr. Myers asked Mrs. Bitar if the information for this project is available on the City's website with a link for public input. Mrs. Bitar said the information for this project will be available in the near future. Mr. Brown said there is a link to the Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Study on the website.

Mr. Rutledge stated he was a volunteer for the steering committee, as a resident of the city. He does not have a vested interest in the outcome of this project. He said the committee and public invested many hours into this project. The committee looked at all the potential opportunities for development for the Wilson Bridge Road Corridor in terms of use, in terms of zoning, in terms of building heights and it was an extensive and vetted process. City Council also approved the study.

Mr. Dan Birmingham stated his address is 687 Hayhurst St., Worthington, Ohio. He said he sat in on a few of the meetings about the corridor improvements, and he keeps hearing that when this corridor study was done the community was involved. He said he may not have done his own due diligence but he has talked with his neighbors and no one seemed to know about the study. He said he does not want the Board to think he and his neighbors are passively agreeing to this. Mr. Birmingham said he would have liked to have been able to make comments.

Mr. Myers explained when the study was done in 2007, social media and e-mail notification were not used as readily as they are today. Today the City's website is also a better source for information. Mr. Coulter said Mr. Patel has done a good job of getting the word out to the residents. Mr. Birmingham said he has been to a couple of Mr. Patel's presentations. Mrs. Bitar said changes have been made to the original study because City Council members have listened to all of the comments made more recently. Mrs. Bitar continued to explain that just because Mr. Birmingham did not have a chance to speak earlier, does not mean he cannot speak now. Mr. Brown explained that the two years that they were involved with the steering committee and trying to draft the language for the corridor that Mr. Rutledge was involved with, when you looked at the study there was a much higher density, and much more going on. A lot has changed since 2011.

There was the reemergence of the mall, 350 W. Wilson Bridge Rd. has been vacant for 10 years and now that building is coming back to life, and new apartments were built. There were changes on the East side of Wilson Bridge Road as well. There is still room for modification and change moving forward.

Mr. Birmingham said he has concerns about parking overflowing into the residential neighborhood and traffic. He said he is still confused about zoning and how that will apply to this situation. Mr. Birmingham said his understanding is that the parking structure will be at least fifty feet away from the property line. Mr. Brown explained the new zoning does not yet apply. The hotel is going in under existing C-4 zoning, they will need to apply for variances for height requirement and possibly setback. The proposed language that has been before City Council for briefings is just creating text and not creating districts yet. What will happen is that City Council will have to vote on the language, and it will probably be modified again before moving forward. Whatever is approved, the text has to be created first then the applicant can rezone. This applicant is going under existing zoning, but there are still many more details that will need to be worked out.

Mr. John Warton stated his address is 490 Olenwood Ave., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Warton said staff could find him in the stack of papers under the name of Richard Saunders. He explained that Richard Saunders was Ben Franklin's pseudonym otherwise known as "poor Richard". His signature on the speaker slip is Richard Saunders. Mr. Warton said he was not a resident of the City of Worthington in 2006. He said many residents do not subscribe to the Dispatch. If you do not subscribe to the Dispatch, then often times you do not get the Worthington News delivered either. During the last ten years people have moved away from the printed media and most people would not know to submit their email addresses to City Council. He said an expensive solution to get everyone noticed is to go to the voter rolls and send everyone a notice, but that kind of money is not available. He thought a more practical solution would be to go to the local radio stations, explain upcoming events and suggest sending their email addresses to City Council. Mr. Warton explained the architectural plans are drawings and so is a picture that was created by Salvador Dali. He said the drawings are pretty but it is very difficult to comment on something that is pretty. Mr. Warton said he would rather comment on engineered drawings. He discussed the walkway that is proposed to be between Hayhurst and High Streets. Mr. Warton said he is an old Special Forces soldier and feels that is a bad idea because it is covert ingress to all of the backyards that are back along High Street especially since the plans show the parking structure will have a lower level. People will be able to pull into the garage, walk down the narrow walkway and do their nasty business and then go back to their cars. He likes the concept in the aesthetic sense, but from a practical standpoint that is one that you might really want to re-think. Mr. Warton said it has been many years since he has practiced traffic law in Ohio. He thought making a left turn over a double yellow line is still illegal. He suggested making people that want to drive north use the signal light off of Caren Avenue. That particular light also might need to be readjusted because the light has a sensor. The light does not automatically signal for the left turn unless a car trips the light. Mr. Warton said the whole idea about the parking structure is not a bad one. He also believes that the grade of the land needs to be looked at carefully.

Mr. Warton said the proposed buildings have flat roof tops and the Board just had a discussion

about buildings having character. Mr. Warton said the main entrance to Worthington is right at the corner of Wilson Bridge Road and High Street. He said he would like to know when the Wilson Bridge Road Corridor comes up for discussion rather than a vote for approval. Mr. Warton said he understands that an overlay has been created which speaks to the issue about the heights of buildings in the Wilson Bridge Corridor. The way he reads what has been said in the Council's publications is that once the overlay has been passed then anyone wishing to build must seek a variance. Mr. Brown explained that what will eventually be before Council is to create the districts not creating an overlay for the whole district. If a property owner would want to take advantage of that they would have to rezone the property and go through a public process that would ultimately go before City Council for approval. This is not just carte blanc that a certain height and setbacks will be approved, there will be a public process. If a person wants to build something that deviates from the code they would have to get a variance. Mr. Warton asked Mr. Brown if the district overlay changes the zoning and Mr. Brown said no. Property owners will have the option to rezone. Mr. Warton asked why districts are needed. Mr. Brown explained the districts are being created so they will have better development standards. Mr. Warton said he served on similar committees in the state of Connecticut and their meetings regularly ran until 2:00 a.m. in the morning, so he sympathizes with the Board members dedicating their time to serve for the public. Mr. Coulter suggested that Mr. Warton set up an appointment with city staff to have a better understanding. Mr. Warton said he would do that.

Ms. Heather Monroe stated her address is 135 Greenglade Ave., Worthington, Ohio. She said that she appreciated Mr. Warton's suggestions but she does not want to see increased traffic on Caren Ave. She feels the entrances and exits on High Street and Wilson Bridge Road are much better suited for that. Mr. Coulter said as the plan develops and traffic studies are done there will be a better understanding of what will be at this location, and knowing that will help make and drive decisions.

Mrs. Kristin Kyser stated her address is 6917 Hayhurst St., Worthington, Ohio. Mrs. Kyser said she and her husband live very close to this development site. She would like to ask for more greenery and trees for the area to help shield the light glare onto their property. She said she was appreciative of the changes since the last meeting.

Mr. Jim Keller stated his address is 670 Morning St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Keller said basic upgrading of useful service makes a lot of sense and he believes that the City can benefit from this redevelopment. He liked the area of the gathering space also. Mr. Keller said one specific concern he has is the High Street corridor. He said he is disturbed at the idea of the buildings built up close to the sidewalks. Mr. Keller said he walked up to the area the other day and stood across from the intersection of Wilson Bridge Road and High Street. He said he likes the openness of the area. Mr. Keller believes that building so close to the street would make the area look jagged. He said that he tried to visualize the two buildings in the area but all he could think of was two bucked teeth that needed to be rescued by an orthodontist. He said he was a little leery of seeing four stories along Wilson Bridge Road, it felt like mischief to him. He feels that one day the Village Green area will need to be widened and hopes that the City is in a position to make sure that never happens.

Mrs. Janet Warton stated her address is 490 Olenwood Ave., Worthington, Ohio. She said she is concerned about the height of the buildings and because of the change in grade the buildings will look taller than four stories. All of the nearby neighbors are going to be bothered by the sound of the construction trucks. She is also concerned about the safety, the lighting, the noise, and about the structures and how that will impact the city resources, such as the police and fire departments. Mrs. Warton said she is not sure the emergency vehicles will be able to fit within the turning radius.

Ms. Judy Anderson stated her address is 510 Olenwood Ave., Worthington, Ohio. She wanted to know if the traffic assessment was already completed and when the assessment will be available to the public. Mr. Patel said the traffic study was done when there was no entrance off of High Street and the study will need to be adjusted. She is concerned with the amount of traffic that will be generated in this area, and if there will be enough parking. Ms. Anderson said she would like to see the traffic study available on the City's website.

Mr. Jim Seals stated his address is 123 E. New England Ave., Worthington, Ohio. He said he did not intend to speak this evening but he was inspired to speak because of three things. He was pleased that Mr. Foust said he will enforce the design guidelines for Worthington throughout the historic district. The second thing he was happy to hear was the report by Mr. Myers that some of these issues have been debated by City Council, and Council members have also dedicated themselves to following the design guidelines, and maintaining the architecture of the city. The third comment he was happy about was Mr. Patel saying he also will be adhering to the Worthington Design Guidelines. Mr. Seals said he feels the City needs a vigorous economic development program. The basis of the program would be to encourage people to come to Worthington, and more should be done to build around Medvet. Worthington could be one of the pet friendliest cities in America. He said that building nice hotels will be wonderful, and he would like to see something similar done for Medvet. He said Mr. Coulter suggested that sometimes you have to take the good with the bad so he had some suggestions that he would like to make. Mr. Seals said he hopes Mr. Patel will consider using permeable grass pavers in one of the parking areas so the parking lot will look like a lawn. He realizes that permeable pavers are expensive but hopes they will at least be considered. Mr. Seals said he does not want to see more pizza places in Worthington, but it would be nice to have a Jewish deli. He said flat rooftops do not fit within the design guidelines for Worthington so if you have to have a flat rooftop, insist that the flat roof have solar panels installed.

Mr. Seals continued to say that everyone in the community would like to know how to improve the communication between City Council, the boards and commissions, and the community and he suggested that Mr. Greeson should hold town meetings. He said Mr. Greeson is a very pleasant fellow and if he held town meetings that would go a long way to help with communication. Mr. Coulter said Mr. Greeson is in the back of the room along with many members of City Council. He thanked Mr. Seals for coming out and making comments and said that everyone is in this process together.

Mr. Scott Kyser stated his address is 6917 Hayhurst St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Kyser said he lives close enough to throw rocks at the hotel but he will not throw rocks. He said he moved to the Worthington area about three years ago because he liked the small town feel. He said he hopes they plan to keep the small town charm of Worthington. He would like to see more greenery and trees planted on the site. Mr. Kyser said he is a big supporter of the street tree program and would like to see trees planted in the tree lawn. Mr. Kyser asked if Mr. Patel took a look at having an entrance near the BP Station and Mr. Patel said there would be too much of a conflict with cars in that area. Mr. Patel said they left the entrances where they currently exist because they are compliant with the code as far as distance for ingress and egress.

Mr. John Warton said one things that City Council could do if this gets passed, is to pass an ordinance that makes Hayhurst, Greenglade and Caren to have permit parking only. He is concerned the parking lots will be full and people will want to go to the restaurants and try to park in the residential areas.

Mr. Roger Beck stated his address is 6695 Hayhurst, Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Beck said comparing this project with what they have seen with the UMCH site, he prefers what he sees this evening. From what he understands, Mr. Patel has gone from a higher density to a lower density and he feels this project is moving in the right direction. He said the east-west cross section of the elevations was very helpful to him because the existing heights are shown. He felt an animation would help illustrate the proposed building and site elevations. Mr. Beck said he would also add bicycle racks to the plans in plain public view.

Mr. Coulter asked if the Board members had any comments. Mr. Foust said he wanted to make two comments. He said there have been a lot of comments about the parking garage. The conceptual drawings have an elevation on the backs of the garages. For the neighbors that are going to be close to that he does not know the most effective way to treat or soften the area, but he aware in the planning phase. Secondly, sometimes the description of architecture in Worthington is vague because it does not allow much flexibility in many areas. Before getting to deep into the details of architecture he suggested meeting with City staff because on occasion they will invite commission members to bounce off ideas as this comes together so there will not be a lot of surprises for either side.

Mr. Sauer said he was at the site today on Hayhurst and he has concerns about a proper buffer for the nearby residences and lights that may shine down from the garage structure into the houses. He is concerned about the position of the garage. He said in terms of the scale of the project the buildings fit on Wilson Bridge Rd. Mr. Sauer feels the larger buildings can be moved closer to Wilson Bridge Rd. and maybe the parking garage can be moved closer to Caren Ave. Mr. Sauer agreed with the comment that was made about it being inappropriate to move the buildings closer to the sidewalk. When he has a meal outside at the La Chatelaine restaurant, he said the area is pleasant. While looking across High St., there are only four lanes of traffic and the traffic is slow. That will not be the same experience at this location because there are more lanes of traffic, and the traffic is faster. He agrees the buildings should be moved back a little further from the road. Mr. Sauer said when he thinks of Worthington he thinks of tree lined boulevards.

Mrs. Lloyd feels the things that have been said about the parking structure are valid. She said Mr. Beck made a really good point about the cross section exhibit. Mrs. Lloyd feels the grade changes at the Hayhurst and Greenglade curve are so vast. She believes that if pictures were available with overlaid sketches of what the massing is, that would help everyone understand.

Mr. Hofmann said Mr. Sauer had a very insightful comment about the larger buildings moving to the north of the site and the smaller buildings moving towards the south. Flipping the buildings around would allow more sun exposure into the court and open areas. Mr. Hofmann said in his past experience, parking has always been a function tied to money. He suggested having a study done where there would be one underground level of parking underneath both structures, and the parking structure could be eliminated and replaced with an office building. The revenue may offset the cost of digging down another twelve feet. Mr. Hofmann explained he has been involved with discussions about setbacks along High Street and he likes the building of a wall along that area. He would prefer to see a larger area on the other side of the building where people could gather. Mr. Hofmann said as you bring buildings closer to the street, cars have a tendency to slow down, even in a six lane area. He said what you have to imagine is what the area will be like in five or ten years when the High Street and Wilson Bridge Road area fills in better and will feel more like a village in a better way.

Mrs. Holcombe said she is concerned about the garage and children walking through that area. She said she liked Mr. Hofmann's idea because she feels the garage could be a huge safety issue, but overall she feels that Mr. Patel has done a really good job. Mrs. Holcombe feels this will bring that corner up to date like other nearby cities. She said she realizes that when people travel they would prefer to stay in something new and she understands what the developer is doing and likes what she sees so far, except that the garage is a concern.

Mr. Myers thanked Mr. Patel for listening to the residents. He said he could not point out specific details but is hoping that the development will have the look of Worthington. Worthington structures typically do not have flat roof tops. Mr. Myers said he understands that these hotel brands require four stories, and that he appreciates Mr. Patel's outreach and willingness to work through the community forum.

Mr. Coulter thanked everyone that came to the meeting this evening. He encouraged the audience to come to every meeting that is held regarding the subject. Mr. Coulter said he is not aware when the hotel discussion will be back before the Board, but encouraged Mr. Patel to let Mrs. Bitar and Mr. Brown know well in advance so they can get the word out to the public. He also encouraged Mr. Patel to get out and talk with the community again.

Mr. Patel requested to table the application.

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

Mr. Coulter explained there is a request by the applicant to table the next two agenda items this evening.

h. New Detached Condominium – **41 E. New England Ave.** (Capace) **AR 08-16**

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

B. Municipal Planning Commission

1. Planned Unit Development Modification

a. Changes to Detached Condominium Plan – **41 E. New England Ave.** (Capace) **PUDM 01-16** (Modification to PUD 03-14)

Mrs. Holcombe moved to table this application, and Mr. Sauer seconded the motion. All Commission members voted, “Aye.” The application was tabled.

C. Other

Mr. Brown explained that starting in the month of May 2016, the Architectural Review Board, Municipal Planning Commission, and Board of Zoning Appeals meetings will begin at 7:00 p.m. instead of 7:30 p.m. This will also be posted in the City’s calendar. Mrs. Bitar said the signs that the City places on the properties will also reflect the new meeting time.

D. Adjournment

Mrs. Holcombe moved to adjourn the meeting at 10:50 p.m. and Mr. Hofmann seconded the motion. All members voted “Aye”. The meeting was adjourned.