



MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING  
WORTHINGTON ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD  
WORTHINGTON MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION  
April 13, 2017

The regular meeting of the Worthington Architectural Review Board and the Worthington Municipal Planning Commission was called to order at 7:00 p.m. with the following members present: Mikel Coulter, Chair; Thomas Reis, Vice-Chair; Kathy Holcombe, Secretary; James Sauer; and David Foust. Also present were: Scott Myers, Worthington City Council Representative to the Municipal Planning Commission (arrived at 7:20 p.m.); Lee Brown, Director of Planning & Building. Commission member Edwin Hoffman, and Board member Amy Lloyd were absent.

**A. Call to Order – 7:00 p.m.**

1. Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Approval of minutes of the March 23, 2017 meeting

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

4. Affirmation/swearing in of witnesses

**B. Architectural Review Board**

Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Foust to explain the photograph on display. Mr. Foust said he did not have any historic photographs of chickens in Worthington, so he brought a photo of his great-great grandmother from the 1890's. She was born in 1840 and raised chickens on the family farm near Akron, Ohio.

**1. New**

- a. Chicken Coop – **570 Hartford St.** (Brant & Suzanne Gipson) **AR 24-17**

**Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

Mr. Brown reviewed the following from the staff memo. He also wanted to note there are two letters in support of this project from Mr. Gilbert Borlaza, and Mr. & Mrs. James Roop.

**Background & Request:**

This Bungalow was built in the early 1900's and is a contributing building in the Worthington Historic District. The house sits on a 0.58 acre parcel that is 100' wide and 240' deep. At the rear of the property, the original alley was vacated. A 15' wide unimproved alley right-of-way adjacent to the south of the property still exists.

The property owners are seeking approval for installation of a chicken coop in the rear yard.

**Project Details:**

1. Worthington's Codified Ordinances require chickens to be kept at least 150' from any residence. The 5' x 5' coop is proposed to be placed 22' from the rear property line and 12' from the north property line, which would allow it to be 150' from the nearest residence on South St.
2. The proposed coop would be constructed with cedar, wire and standing seam metal roofing on the sloped roofs. A planter basket would also be part of the design.
3. The coop would house a hen kept as a family pet.

**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.

Code Section 505.08 – Nuisance Conditions Prohibited

(a) No person shall cause or allow any place where an animal is kept to become unclean or unwholesome. No person shall keep any swine, sheep or goats in the City. Horses, cattle and chickens may not be kept anywhere within the City within 150 feet of any residence, other than the residence of the person keeping such animals or fowl.

**Recommendation:**

Staff is recommending approval of this application. The proposed structure is appropriately designed and located on this property.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Brant Gipson and Mrs. Suzanne Gipson, of 570 Hartford Ave., Worthington, Ohio, wanted to clarify there will not be a rooster on the property, only female chickens. He said he spoke with as many neighbors as he could prior to the meeting and explained there will not be a rooster on the property. Mr. Brown said staff spoke with the neighbors who originally had some concerns, but they had their questions answered and are no longer concerned. Mrs. Holcombe said the neighbors' letters sound like they are fully in support of the project, and she felt the style of the chicken coop looked great. Mr. Sauer asked how many

chickens a coop of that particular size could accommodate and Mr. Gipson replied up to four mid-size chickens, but also depends on the type of chicken. He said there are large chickens available, but only two of those types of chickens would fit into this style of a coop, Mr. Sauer asked how many chickens are allowed, and Mrs. Gipson said up to five chickens are allowed per the City's Ordinance, but they will not have five, only up to four chickens. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

**Motion:**

Mrs. Holcombe moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY BRANT & SUZANNE GIPSON FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO ADD A CHICKEN COOP AT 570 HARTFORD ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 24-17, DRAWINGS NO. AR 24-17, DATED MARCH 20, 2017, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.**

Mr. Sauer seconded the motion. Mr. Brown called the roll. Mr. Coulter, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Sauer, aye; Mr. Foust, aye. The motion was approved.

**C. Municipal Planning Commission**

**1. Conditional Use Permit**

- a. Ancillary Retail/Service in I-1 – **460 Schrock Rd., #C** (Greg Davis/Leo Meyers Uniforms)  
**CU 03-17**

**Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

Mr. Brown reviewed the following from the staff memo:

**Background & Request:**

This property is on the north side of Schrock Rd., adjacent to the railroad, and has 3 buildings that were built in the late 1980's. Unit C is in the front (southernmost) building in a center suite. A new business, Leo Meyers, Inc., plans to move into the suite and would like to devote an area for ancillary retail, which is a Conditional Use in the I-1 Zoning District.

**Project Details:**

Leo Meyers Uniforms is a company that supplies uniforms for public safety and private sector clients. The majority of the business is conducted via internet sales and shipping, but there would be 2-3 clients per day that would visit the site to pick up or get fitted for the products. A 250 square foot space at the front of the 4811 square foot suite (labeled "Customer Service" on the floor plan) would be used for the ancillary retail part of the business.

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

1. Effect on traffic pattern – Retail traffic is expected to be 2-3 people per day, and could be accommodated with the parking that is available adjacent to the suite.
2. Effect on public facilities – No effect has been identified.
3. Effect on sewerage and drainage facilities – The effect would not change.
4. Utilities required – No new utilities would be required.
5. Safety and health considerations – None have been identified.
6. Noise, odors and other noxious elements, including hazardous substances and other environmental hazards – None have been identified.
7. Hours of use – Monday through Thursday from 7:30 am to 5:00 pm, and Friday from 7:30 am to 1:00 pm.
8. Shielding or screening considerations for neighbors – No change to the building or site is proposed except for signage typical of other businesses in the building.
9. Appearance and compatibility with the general neighborhood – No change to building or site.

**Land Use Plans:**

Worthington Conditional Use Permit Regulations

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

Ancillary Retail definition:

"Ancillary retail/service" means a retail or service facility that is clearly incidental and subordinate to the primary use of a structure. Such retail or service facility shall not occupy more than ten percent (10%) of the gross floor area of the structure where located.

**Recommendation:**

Staff is recommending *approval* of this application. The proposed business would meet the basic standards for conditional uses.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Greg Davis, of 127 St. Julien St., Worthington, Ohio, said he has lived in the Ville Charmante are for over ten years, and prior to that raised a family in Worthington, Ohio, on Robbins Way. Mr. Davis said he purchased Leo Meyer's Uniforms in 1983 and was located downtown for years but is very happy to relocate his business to Worthington, and only be two miles from work. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

**Motion:**

Mr. Reis moved:

Page 4 of 10

ARB/MPC Meeting April 13, 2017

Minutes

**THAT THE REQUEST BY GREG DAVIS OF LEO MEYERS UNIFORMS FOR A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO ALLOW ANCILLARY RETAIL IN THE I-1 ZONING DISTRICT AT 460 SCHROCK RD., #C, AS PER CASE NO. CU 03-17, DRAWINGS NO. CU 03-17, DATED MARCH 30, 2017, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE PLANNING GOALS OF THE CITY, AS REFERENCED IN THE LAND USE PLANS AND ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.**

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

## **2. Rezoning**

a. R-10, Low Density Residence to WBC-1, Medium Density Residential – **181 E. Wilson Bridge Rd., Lots 16 & 17 (City of Worthington) REZ 01-17**

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

Mr. Brown reviewed the following from the staff memo:

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

City Council adopted Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Zoning in 2016 to reflect the planning working that was done for the corridor. Now, the City is initiating the rezoning of parcels in the corridor to the newly created zoning districts.

This request is to rezone two parcels totaling approximately 2.05 +/- acres on the south side of E. Wilson Bridge Rd. just east of the center of the block. The vacant properties are lots 16 & 17 of the Northhigh Acres subdivision, which was created in 1923. The parcels are identified by numbers 100-002477 (Lot #16) & 100-002478 (Lot #17). Lot #16 is also known as 181 E. Wilson Bridge Rd. as there was a house on the lot from about 1995 – 2011. These properties are currently in the R-10 Zoning District, Low Density Residence.

City Council introduced an Ordinance to change the zoning on these parcels at its meeting on April 3, 2017 and referred it to the Municipal Planning Commission for investigation and report. A recommendation from the MPC to City Council is requested.

#### **Proposed Zoning District:**

##### **WBC-1 – Medium Density Residential:**

An area along the WBC that allows for medium density residential housing, offering a variety of housing styles and pricing options that complement the residential and architectural patterns and styles in the City.

- (1) Permitted Uses: Multi-family dwellings, Home Occupations, Public uses, Essential services and Accessory uses.
- (2) Maximum Building Height: Three stories except buildings on the south side of Wilson Bridge Road between Westview Drive and McCord Park should be limited to 2 ½ stories and 30’.
- (3) Density: The maximum number of dwelling units allowed per acre for development within the WBD-1 shall be 14, with a desired number between 10 and 14 dwelling units.

**Surrounding Zoning & Recommended Land Use:**

Direction	Current Zoning	Recommended Land Use
North	C-3 – Institutions & Offices	WBC-4 - Office
East	R-10 – Low Density Residential	WBC-1 – Medium Density Residential
South	R-10 – Low Density Residential	R-10 – Low Density Residential
West	R-10 – Low Density Residential	WBC-2 – Professional Office

**Land Use Plans:**

Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Study

The Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Study, adopted in 2011, makes recommendations for the Wilson Bridge Road corridor from the Olentangy River to the west to the Railroad Crossing to the east. The Study recommends the need to promote the redevelopment of the Wilson Bridge Road Corridor into a mixed use area that will generate new economic growth within the City. These requirements are intended to foster development that strengthens land use and economic value; encourage a mix of uses; enhance livability of the area; to augment pedestrian and bicycle connections; and to promote construction of high-quality buildings and public spaces that create and sustain long-term economic vitality.

Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning

City Council adopted the Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning (Chapter 1181) on April, 18 2016, creating new zoning districts and development standards for the Wilson Bridge Corridor.

**Recommendation:**

Staff is recommending the Municipal Planning Commission forward a recommendation of approval of this request to City Council.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Brown explained to the Board members the two parcels before them, both vacant and are two separate parcels of record. The parcels are heavily wooded, but the wood is more like scrub trees, according to the City’s Arborist who visited the area over a year ago and documented the area with a tree survey of what is actually on the parcel. Mr. Brown said looking west along East Wilson Bridge Road, included the area where they did the plan in 2015 for the Wilson Bridge Road Streetscape Improvements that called for the multi-use path and lighting throughout the corridor.

Mr. Brown discussed the house that was recently built on East Wilson Bridge Road over a year ago (located at 173 East Wilson Bridge Road) within the corridor. He said there is no development plan or a development proposed for these parcels at this time, the City wanted to be proactive and rezone the two parcels to alleviate anyone else purchasing the two parcels to build additional single family homes in the future. Mr. Brown reiterated the area along East Wilson Bridge Road is near the Community Center, and directly across from the Worthington Education Center. Mr. Brown said the maximum density recommended for residential units would be up to 14-units per acre.

Mr. Brown reiterated there is no development proposal at this time. He explained a recommendation from this body would be forwarded to City Council and they will introduce the item next Monday night for a hearing on May 1<sup>st</sup>, 2017 for a future hearing date. At that time the rezoning hearing would take place and in the future if a development proposal comes in, the plan would have to be submitted to this body. The Development Plan would have to be approved by the Municipal Planning Commission and then ultimately approved by City Council once there is a proposal on the table. Mr. Brown said proactively rezoning the two parcels which are currently vacant, and staff has already been in contact with the owner who is a willing participant in the rezoning process, just alleviates any individual from purchasing the property to perpetuate that single family use in the corridor. Staff recommended approval because it does match up with the Corridor Study and matches up with the Wilson Bridge Road zoning.

Mr. Coulter asked if the parcels are owned by the same entity, and Mr. Brown said yes, the parcels are owned by Metropolitan Holdings (Matt Vekasy). Mr. Sauer asked about the parcel which lies to the east of the two parcels being discussed and if that property is for sale. Mr. Brown said yes, he believed the parcel Mr. Sauer was inquiring about was already in contract. Mr. Brown explained the owner of the other nearby property with the newly built home was present at the meeting. He also said city staff has discussed the potential rezoning of the corridor with several potential buyers of the lot that was for sale, so all were aware of the plans to rezone the area.

Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Brown if the rezoning of the area had been discussed for the past four years and Mr. Brown replied the rezoning was mentioned in the 2005 Comprehensive Plan, and again in the 2011 Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Plan which was approved by the Commission and City Council and recommended focusing on the development of the south side of East Wilson Bridge Road and the new zoning categories development standards which were discussed last year for the entire corridor. In the plan, the south side of East Wilson Bridge Road was divided into nine parcels for medium density residential and nine parcels for professional office. The plan looked at setback and height requirements and an additional bump up in landscaping, screening and material requirements. Mr. Coulter explained the area being discussed has gone through many public discussions over the past several years.

Mr. Brown explained part of the Plan which was approved and recommended by City Council included the use of a 10 ft. multi-use path that will run along the south side of East Wilson Bridge Road, from North High Street which will connect people to the Community Center and is part of the North East Gateway Project with East Wilson Bridge Road, Huntley and Worthington-Galena Road being realigned in 2019. The path will continue the trail from Sancus Road to Schrock Road

which will lead to the City of Westerville, Ohio. Mr. Brown said these are baby steps to getting to what the City has planned for the corridor.

Mr. Myers explained this project comes to the Board & Commission from City Council. He explained at the City Council retreat this past year, the council members identified Wilson Bridge Road development as their top priority this year. Mr. Myers said they have been in discussions with Mr. Vekasey for the past year and a half and they wanted to make certain that they could keep this development consistent with their long range plan and that is why they had referred this to the Planning Commission for a vote tonight so City Council can recommend the area to be rezoned.

Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak for or against this application.

Mr. Harold Careins, 173 E. Wilson Bridge Rd., Worthington, Ohio, said his house is directly west of the two parcels being discussed. Mr. Careins said after he and his wife purchased the lot to build a home they were contacted by the city to discuss the future plan for rezoning the area. Mr. Careins said the city offered to purchase the lot from him, and he gave them what he thought was a fair price, but the city declined, and they built a home. He said the price he offered was the same price being offered for both of the other two parcels now. Mr. Careins said he has spoken with the neighbors and they are happy where they are at even though the zoning change is moving forward. He said he is aware some of the neighbors went to speak with developers but were disappointed at the price they were offered for their lots. Mr. Careins feels that the property values surrounding the area will be reduced by the rezoning. He said he put a lot of money into his property to build a home. Mr. Careins said he was contacted by an interested party about building a home next door to his, but the owner of Metropolitan Properties said it would depend on the zoning. Mr. Careins said the area has been mainly residential for a very long time, but he realizes the city wants to rezone the area to make money, but he felt the city does not have a need for more apartments and besides the increased population would overburden the aging infrastructure and cause more traffic congestion. Mr. Careins said the water pipes along East Wilson Bridge Road are always breaking and needing to be repaired, and he felt there is no need to rezone the area. He said he and his neighbors discussed concerns about transient apartment traffic and uninvited visitors wandering onto their residential properties and wanted to know if there were any plans to build fencing between the residential and commercial property. Mr. Careins reiterated he is not in favor of the area being rezoned.

Mr. Reis asked Mr. Careins if he was aware of the potential rezoning around the property he was purchasing and Mr. Careins said no. He said he never met the original owner of the lot, only the realtor, and the realtor did not disclose that information. Mr. Myers said that he thought he heard Mr. Careins say earlier that prior to building his home he was approached by the City. Mr. Careins said yes, he was contacted by the City because they were interested in purchasing the lot. Mr. Myers said, but prior to building the home Mr. Careins told Mr. Reis that he was unaware of the city's plans until after the home was built. Mr. Careins said after he purchased the lot he was contacted by the city. Mr. Brown explained the property originally had an old decrepit house on the lot that was torn down and then Mr. Careins built a new home on the lot after the old house was torn down. Mr. Sauer asked Mr. Careins if he was aware of the rezoning plans before the



construction of the new home and Mr. Careins said he was aware of the rezoning plans after making a deposit with a builder to build a new home. Mr. Careins said he offered to sell the land to the city but the city did not respond to his offer or make a counter offer.

Mr. Reis asked Mr. Careins if the City made it clear at that time of what their intentions were in regards to the rezoning plans and Mr. Careins said he received a call and the city told him about it, but that was after they had already purchased the plans to build a new home. Mr. Brown said he wanted to clarify he did meet with Mr. Careins and explained what was planned for the corridor since 2005 to 2011 and what the city is in the process of doing. He said the city's previous Economic Development Director, Jeff Harris and the City's Law Director, Pamela Fox, also discussed the plans with Mr. Careins and Ms. Fox has documented correspondence regarding the discussion. They clearly explained what was going to be changing in the corridor prior to the construction of the new house.

Mr. Sauer said he understands the city's desire, but he realized there was a plan approved by the Board and then City Council but he disagrees with moving forward with the rezoning at this point only because he feels the city's actions could have an adverse effect on the nearby residential properties. Mrs. Holcombe said there have been numerous meetings in which Mr. Sauer was a part of concerning this topic, and all of the abutting neighbors were all called to attend the meetings. Mrs. Holcombe said she is in favor of the rezoning. Mr. Brown said from the staffs' standpoint the plan matches up with what has been recommended and the language has been adopted by City Council who will give guidance while moving forward. He continued to explain Worthington is a land locked community with very few areas to be developed or have the potential for redevelopment to happen.

**Motion:**

Mr. Reis moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY THE CITY OF WORTHINGTON TO REZONE LOTS 16 & 17 OF NORTHIGH ACRES FROM R-10, LOW DENSITY RESIDENCE TO WBC-1, MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL, AS PER CASE NO. REZ 01-17, DRAWINGS NO. REZ 01-17, DATED MARCH 30, 2017, BE RECOMMENDED TO CITY COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL BASED ON THE PLANNING GOALS OF THE CITY, AS REFERENCED IN THE LAND USE PLANS, AND ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.**

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

**D. Other**

Mr. Brown said the restaurant in Sharon Square, called Over the Counter is finally opened and have been opened for the past 2-3 weeks. They will probably be coming to the next meeting for approval for umbrellas for their patio, the patio was already approved by this Board. The applicant may also have signage request coming in the future, and asked if the Board would have any

concerns related to the proposed sign complimenting the neighboring neon sign. Mr. Myers and the other Board members expressed openness to see what might be proposed.

Mr. Brown explained there will be no ARB-MPC meeting for September 28<sup>th</sup>, 2017.

#### **E. Adjournment**

Mr. Reis moved to adjourn the meeting at 7:46 p.m. and Mrs. Holcombe seconded the motion. All Board members voted, "Aye." The meeting was adjourned.