

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
WORTHINGTON ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
WORTHINGTON MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION

January 14, 2010

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: R. Hunter; K. Holcombe; J. Sauer; M. Coulter; S. Myers; C. Hermann; and A. Lloyd. Also present were Council Member D. Foust and L. Bitar, Development Coordinator.

A. Call to Order - 7:30 p.m.

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

Mrs. Bitar delivered Oaths of Office for reappointment of Mr. Hunter and Mrs. Holcombe to the Municipal Planning Commission (MPC) for the period 1/12/2009 through 12/31/2012; Mr. Coulter to the MPC to fill the unexpired term of Mr. Myers for the period 1/12/2009 through 12/31/2010; and Mrs. Lloyd for reappointment to the Architectural Review Board (ARB) for the period 1/12/2009 through 12/31/2009.

4. Election of Officers

The Board/Commission unanimously elected Mr. Hunter as Chair, Mr. Sauer as Vice-Chair, and Mrs. Holcombe as Secretary.

5. Appointment of MPC Representative to Board of Zoning Appeals.

The Board/Commission unanimously elected Mr. Hunter as the MPC representative to the Board of Zoning Appeals, with Mr. Hermann, Mr. Sauer and Mr. Coulter as alternates.

6. Approval of the minutes of the meeting of December 10, 2009

Mr. Hermann moved the minutes of the December 10, 2009 meeting be approved with Mrs. Lloyd seconding the motion. All members said "aye." The minutes were approved as submitted.

7. Affirmation/Swearing in of Witnesses

Mrs. Bitar swore in those who planned to speak.

B. Architectural Review Board

1. **New**

a. Generator – **782 Hartford St.** (Adam or Tom Brankamp) **AR 01-10**

Mrs. Bitar stated that this is an application to place the generator on the south side of the home where there are currently air-conditioning units. It was not shown on the drawing, but there will be evergreen shrubs that totally screen the unit.

Mr. Adam Brankamp of 610 S. Lazelle St., Columbus, OH, came forward.

Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant plans on enclosing all of the units (including the existing condensing units) with shrubbery.

Mr. Brankamp responded “yes”.

Mr. Hunter stated that normally the Board requests this type of unit be tested during the daytime hours so there is minimal disturbance for the neighbors. The applicant agreed to adding that to the motion.

Mrs. Holcombe moved:

THAT THE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL A GENERATOR AT 782 HARTFORD ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 01-10, DRAWINGS NO. AR01-10 DATED DECEMBER 30, 2009, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO, AND AS PRESENTED AT THE MEETING, SPECIFICALLY: THERE SHALL BE BUSHES TO SCREEN THE UNIT AND THE TEST CYCLE WILL BE BETWEEN THE HOURS OF 8:00AM AND 5:00PM.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Hermann. Mrs. Bitar called the roll and all members voted aye.

b. Renovations - **88 Worthington Square Mall AR01-10**
To be Tabled

The applicant would like to table this agenda item.

The motion to table was made by Mr. Coulter and seconded by Mrs. Holcombe. All members voted aye.

C. Municipal Planning Commission

a. Renovations – **88 Worthington Square** (M + A Architects) **ADP 01-10**
To be Tabled

The motion to table was made by Mr. Coulter and seconded by Mrs. Holcombe. All members voted aye.

b. Sign – **5721 N. High St., Worthington** (Rahman Bahrami) **ADP 02-10**

Mrs. Bitar stated this was the property the ARB reviewed in December and recommended changes be made to the original sign design. A variance was required to have 4 businesses on a pre-standing joint identification sign. It will also go to council with whatever recommendation you make.

Mr. Rahman Bahrami, 5721 N. High St. identified himself as the applicant.

The sign was well received.

Mr. Hunter asked if there is anyone in the audience who wished to speak for or against this application.

Mr. Coulter moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY RAHMAN BAHRAMI TO AMENDMENT DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR 5721 N. HIGH ST. BY CHANGING THE PRE-STANDING SIGN TO DISPLAY FOUR BUSINESSES AS PER CASE ADP 02-10 DRAWINGS NO. ADP 02-10 DATED JANUARY 8, 2010. BE RECOMMENDED TO CITY COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT INCONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THIS MEETING.

The motion was seconded by Mrs. Holcombe. Mrs. Bitar called the roll and all members voted aye thereon.

c. Zoning of a newly annexed area to the City of Worthington.

R-10 Zoning District – **6226 Alrojo St.** (Janoski) **REZ 01-10**

Mrs. Bitar stated that this is one of the last eight or so properties that is still in the township. The zoning surrounding the property is R-10 which is low density residence, and this property fits all the requirements of that zoning district. This will be a recommendation to City Council on the zoning; Council annexed the property two meetings ago. Mrs. Bitar stated the applicant was not required to be present.

The Commission discussed a map of the area on the screen, asking for clarification of which properties have not been annexed. A question was raised about the house on the southwest corner of Olentangy Rived Rd. and W. Dublin-Granville Rd. Mrs. Bitar stated the property would need to be annexed when redeveloped in order to hook up to water and sewer. Mr. Hermann stated that was really the cause of these annexations and Mrs. Bitar confirmed, sighting difficulties with some of the wells. Mrs. Bitar stated they have talked to several others who are also thinking of annexing. Several members stated it is good to see it and to clean-up the City boundaries.

Mr. Hunter asked for comments from the audience and hearing none requested a motion.

Mr. Hermann moved:

THAT THE REQUEST TO ZONE NEWLY ANNEXED PROPERTY AT 6226 ALROJO ST. AS R-10, LOW DENSITY RESIDENCE, AS PER CASE NO. REZ 01-10 BE RECOMMENDED TO CITY COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Coulter. Mrs. Bitar called the roll. All members voted aye.

d. Amendment to Planning and Zoning Code Discussion

To Amend Chapter 1177 of the Codified Ordinances of the City of Worthington to Add Sustainability as a Standard for Review in Section 1177.05.

Mrs. Bitar started the discussion with some pictures of the solar panel installation at Evening Street Elementary. Mrs. Lloyd sent some of the pictures and others were taken today. They were difficult to tell with some snow on the roof. Mrs. Bitar believed the installation is done but has not seen anything on the website. We will look for that in the future. Mr. Coulter stated when he talked to the installer last week it still wasn't 100% complete. Panels were up but they still have some wiring and some of the other things to make final connections. They thought it was going to be done in the next couple of weeks.

As Mrs. Bitar was attempting to draft an ordinance for sustainability in the Architectural Review District with the language that Mr. Myers had presented, a number of things occurred to her. The most important is if we just change the Code it seems as though we are only trying to regulate these items, rather than encourage them. She believes the ARB wants to encourage and be able to review in the Architectural Review District as well. She felt more discussion was needed. One thought is to put it in the design guidelines as well as in the Code. If we just put sustainability in the Code allowing the board to review, there is not

really any direction given. We're just saying that the board is allowed to review sustainable items.

Mrs. Holcombe asked if that direction really needs to be put in the Code. She believes the Board should review and that everybody is very excited about sustainability. But, it seems to put limitations and she does not think that is what the Board wants. At the same time she thinks that the Board wants to be able to know what's going on so it can have a handle on it and look at each piece individually.

Mr. Coulter stated there are a couple things that are occurring. There is work being done to add a sustainability section to the Building Code. If added to the Building Code, and adopted by the city, it would affect the entire City, not just the Architectural Review District. He really likes the idea of coming up with something in the design guidelines with recommendations on how to use sustainable items. There are some things he would like to do on his house like add solar panels to the garage to run trellis lights in the back and maybe my garage lights and garage door opener. Mr. Hunter stated that Code typically addresses safety rather than design point. Mr. Coulter reduction in energy usage is being mandated. Some of this is already in place in the State of Ohio in terms of reduction of energy over the next five years.

Mr. Hunter stated the focus is on solar, but there is a lot more to sustainability than that. There is thermal, air, wind and a lot of other energy saving practices. He is not sure we are ready for a hundred foot wind turbine in the Architectural Review District. Mr. Coulter stated he is looking at burying a 1500 gallon tank in my yard to capture rain water and use it as a sprinkler system. Mr. Hunter felt looking back in the City's history, he wishes there were discussions like this when the first electric, telephone and telegraph wires put up. Because of that very point, Mrs. Holcombe felt it was important to be very careful because the technology is going to change at a rapid speed and the regulations must be open enough to accommodate that change. Mr. Coulter gave the example of working to install a solar panel array on one of his office buildings. They have worked for a year to prepare a submittal to the State of Ohio for funding, and in that time they are on the fourth generation of solar panel technology. Technology is getting so much better. The only bothersome thing about solar panels is that so many of them are made in China, which has approximately 80% of the worlds market. Some of them are very good and some of them are exceedingly bad. The panels his company is buying are made here in Ohio. He wants to encourage people to buy products that are made in the State of Ohio.

Mr. Hermann talked about the proposed amendment being a list of things that the Board is allowed to consider, and does not see that as a bad thing. Mrs. Bitar stated it feels like another layer of regulation without any guidance as to how to do it, so reviewing plus offering guidelines may be a better way to go. Mr. Hunter said he is struggling to balance encouragement versus regulation. Mr. Hermann felt it makes some sense to be thinking about a way to encourage sustainability and to help communicate what is acceptable from a design point of view.

Mr. Hermann wondered about applicants that have not considered sustainability. Mr. Hermann thought if the ARB felt strongly about it, this Code amendment would allow the Board to argue that point. Mrs. Holcombe felt homeowners, such as her, may not want to be told what to do. She thinks this is government regulation and the Board should be careful about making aware vs. requiring green initiatives. Mr. Coulter stated there are some municipalities around the country that are requiring much stronger sustainability as part of the Code, including the City of Columbus. There are some school districts in other states that are doing the same thing. Mrs. Lloyd stated that it has been mandated since 2007 that Ohio schools built through the state are required to be lead certified. Mrs. Lloyd went on to agree with Mrs. Holcombe about being very careful about regulating, and feels encouraging and making suggestions would bring awareness.

Mr. Foust stated two thoughts: 1) He is supportive of encouraging, as long as the final wording of the standard does not give that encouragement so much power behind it that it overpowers or overshadows the basic substance of the Architectural Review District. As a staunch protector of the district, he feels it is important that residents do not feel they are being encouraged to do something that will harm the district. 2) Mr. Coulter's comment brings to mind that with new iterations and changes in the industry, the City will want to put the language in such a manner that it is open to change. This will be an ongoing process and whatever the standards are will probably need to change.

Ms. Holcombe also thought that the Board needs to protect what the district already has. She felt there is a very fine line putting the new regulation in the Code and yet offering encouragement. Mr. Foust stated the review will be a lot like the review of fences. Each application has a different look and different neighbors. The ARB must be assured the standard gives this Board the power to get the appropriate input and make a decision.

Mr. Hunter mentioned there are instances throughout the City where the Board has reviewed elements like storm water retention basins, etc. It is not just solar panels on a roof that are being dealt with. Mr. Hunter invited comments from the audience.

Fred Yaeger of 285 Bryant Ave. offered the following comments and questions after reviewing the starting document: the management of runoff seems a bit narrow; does the use of recycled materials including resource reuse include sustainable offsite disposal of materials? Does reuse mean re-use it on the same property? Mr. Coulter said it would not have to and there is already a requirement by Franklin County that materials have to be recycled with demolition projects. He thought the percentage is 25.

Mr. Yaeger asked if about the use of natural and controlled light. He also pointed out use of trees as a sustainability mechanism way beyond what he thought before. Trees can lessen runoff by as much as 30%. Also, he pointed out that trees can lower heating and cooling costs. There are now some studies out that it lengthens pavement life considerably to have things shaded. Could the City do things to encourage passive solar? Mr. Yaeger said the

current Code requires that even for a \$400 awning there is a \$50 fee for inspection. That seems a little bit discouraging to somebody doing something that is a pretty simple way to accomplish passive solar implementation. He would like to see a graduated scale of permit fees for things to encourage types of activity like that. Is this the forum to talk about commercial buildings in terms of what they could do to be more sustainable? He feels we could do more by increasing the density of the businesses in the area, and there are lots of ways to do that. One is to require at least two stories; another is to require frontage be all business; and whenever possible not allow drive-through windows. He knows some of these things are pretty radical, but it has been done in some reasonable communities. He would also like to see some sort of a ratio that could be done with bicycles versus automobiles or put some sort of a cap on the maximum vehicular parking. He thinks all of those things would cause us to be a little denser in the right sense.

Mr. Hunter asked if we restrict the parking on a given business, will employees and customers park on the street. Does the City have to be able to realistically allow the businesses to operate? Mr. Yaeger said it is tough to balance where parking is located. Just capping parking without doing other things to encourage non-vehicular traffic is kind of like just shooting one arrow instead of trying a whole bunch of multi-prong things. Your point is well taken if it is the only thing done in a concerted effort.

Mr. Hunter stated that he would dearly love to ride a bicycle but can not in his neighborhood due to various dangerous streets that he would not even walk on from his house. The City needs to encourage sidewalks or bike paths or multi-use paths. Mr. Yaeger said again it will take a multi-prong effort

Mrs. Bitar asked about providing bicycle and pedestrian options instead of parking when winter comes, when many are not able to bike or walk?

Mr. Yaeger said he had thought some about that, and he agreed ice or snow can make it difficult. He has personally committed to bike no matter the temperature, as long as there is not snow and ice. Mr. Yaeger stated that the point he comes back to a lot is density should be increased in a smart way. If people can drive to one spot and accomplish many things, more pooled parking would take care of that. But until the City gets that density, that is not always possible. All things must be considered at the same.

Mrs. Bitar stated that she thought the City has done a pretty good job of that in the Central Business District. There is multi-use parking there within walking distance to a lot of places. She thinks the challenge is to extend that same philosophy elsewhere.

Mr. Yaeger said there was a lot of lamentation about Maple Lee leaving and the Curio Cabinet. One of the responses was “companies come and they go, and that’s just the nature of the business”. He agrees that is the nature of business, but he does not think it is about whether companies come and go. He thinks it is about the ratio of the coming and going. Mr. Yaeger stated there was an article this past week in one of the local papers about foot

traffic slowing. What that means to him is that fewer people are coming by means of cars. So are there ways that can be implemented about increasing foot traffic by marketing to the people who are in Worthington? He would like to see more discussion and brainstorming about that.

Mr. Hunter stated that he had heard that same thing about Maple Lee. That business moved to a place with no foot traffic at all anywhere near it. .

Mrs. Holcombe suggested that foot traffic is really good on Saturday morning, and even into Sunday, feels the City has done a lot to make that happen.

Mr. Coulter stated that there is just not enough parking downtown. He believes in walking or riding a bike, but also there needs to be enough core parking. He does not think it is necessary to design for 100% of the need 100% of the time, but stills there is not enough parking downtown. He said some of the parking that we do have is very disjointed and if we could get agreements between property owners we could get a lot better efficiency out of it.

Mr. Yaeger stated the 752 High St. building is a great example of that. He feels the City should incentivize non-vehicular parking, because for every person who does not bring a vehicle everybody wins.

Mr. Greg DeLong 552 Eden St. said he spoke with Mr. Myers several times about his goal of promoting Worthington as a forward thinking sustainable community. He feels that is a big selling point for potential new businesses and residents. He stated there is a certain risk involved in itemizing a list, as opposed to some kind of an incentive to promote sustainable issues. He feels a broader, less confining statement about sustainability made somewhere (not necessarily in the Code), would be beneficial. There are many sustainable issues that he knows would be more controversial, such as having chickens on your property. Food is a big part for Sustainable Worthington. The biggest concerns of that group are to have a market in Worthington and people being able to be self-sustaining on their property (gardens, livestock). He agreed with Mr. Yaeger's comments about increasing density and foot traffic. As part of the Worthington area 360 steering committee, he sat in on the focus groups. One huge selling point of Worthington was the downtown area, but he guessed that very few people in those meetings had ever set foot inside Worthington Hardware or Maple Lee. Promoting downtown is a sustainability issue.

Mrs. Bitar said she attends the Old Worthington Business Association meetings. They are doing quite a bit to promote Old Worthington, and they have a lot of new ideas and projects. They are partnering with the CVB and doing a good job in her opinion, and thinks there will be more promotion of Old Worthington in the future. There have been travel writers that have visited, and have been provided an experience like making candles or using a real printing press. There seems to be a lot of good ideas and good energy.

Mr. DeLong apologized and stated he did not intend to criticize the Old Worthington Business Association. He feels it is a very, very conflicted issue to have Maple Lee moving out to Polaris. It is the old big box Walmart issue.

Mr. Hunter reiterated Maple Lee moved north of Powell Rd. on High Street. Between Powell and Orange on the West side of 23 is not Polaris and is not a center of anything. Mrs. Bitar stated they are in the heart of the Wal-Mart, Meijer, and Home Depot triangle. Mr. Hunter said Maple Lee is next to Advanced Autoparts, in a building formerly used as a custard shop. They did not move because of foot traffic or because of anything that he can understand.

Mr. Hermann stated it was a bigger problem of being bought out by a corporation and is no longer locally owned.

Mrs. Holcombe said that she does like the idea of incentives. She thinks that is something we should explore as a City – for example, waving permit and inspection fees for sustainable features.

Mr. Hunter mentioned the Municipal Planning Commission is not really a Planning Commission, rather a Review Commission.

Mrs. Bitar commented the decisions that this body has made over the decades, are the reason that this community looks the way it does

Mr. Hunter stated that over the long haul he agrees with Mrs. Bitar, but does not feel that has been the case the last five years. He believes the MPC has the ability and the brainpower to plan and would like to the MPC having a planning focus.

Mrs. Holcombe stated the MPC has to be aware of everything that is going on around it. She believes the MPC does have a big part in planning, and feels the group constantly needs to be aware of what is going on.

Mr. DeLong was not sure what type of incentives would be used for sustainable projects. He knows there is a small incentive to do a LEED project, but a lead project for a residence or business is a commitment on their end. He would like to see every building project be include sustainability practices, but the reality is only a few are going to be overtime.

Mrs. Bitar stated the City offers a financial incentive for LEED projects. Mr. DeLong said it is a modest amount compared to the man hours involved and documenting the project. Mrs. Lloyd asked if that was only for commercial properties. Mrs. Bitar stated that she did not think it was restricted to commercial. Mrs. Lloyd stated there are no incentives for renovation at this point.

Mr. DeLong felt there is a certain risk in itemizing elements that are hard to define until you see something on paper in someone's home or someone's business. The mission was for Worthington to be a forward thinking sustainable community.

Mr. Coulter disagreed, liking the idea of lists. Until sustainability becomes a matter of fact, lists are helpful. He felt, though, some combination of verbiage could accomplish the intent of the amendment.

Mrs. Lloyd felt the Code and Design Guidelines could work hand in hand to convey the sustainability message, with the detailed information being in the Guidelines.

Mr. Coulter said with the Design Guidelines examples could be shown of how to do a project well.

Mr. Hermann asked for the impact of having sustainable elements in the Code versus no change.

Mrs. Bitar felt the Board has consistently reviewed sustainable issues without the Code language, so the addition would legitimize those actions.

Mr. Coulter said with nothing in the guidelines it will be status quo. Mrs. Holcombe she did not know how the guidelines can be so specific and felt the ARB may be locked into a position that does not work for every situation. Mr. Coulter felt giving some specifics would be a place to start. Mrs. Bitar said the other standards for review are pretty brief and not as detailed as what was proposed.

Mrs. Bitar stated they need to put together something that might go in the design guidelines and at least start from there. Mrs. Bitar did not feel the Code review committee should handle this because it is a design guideline issue. The Code language amendment can be very straight forward and an addendum can be added to the design guidelines.

Mrs. Lloyd thought the Code language could have sustainable design and materials added.

Mr. Hunter polled the ARB about two things: very specific language that defines some things in the Code; versus very general language in the Code with the specific details being in the design guidelines.

Mrs. Lloyd stated it needs to be simplified in the Code. For example, in the design guidelines under materials there are examples. Mr. Hermann concurred.

Mrs. Holcombe was unsure about adding regulations.

Mrs. Bitar said something to remember about the other standards on the list are not all items that are reviewed on every project. The new Code language would just give the ARB the right to say things like solar panels need to be screened.

Mr. Coulter stated on one hand he firmly believes the fewer laws you have the better, giving more freedom to people. Typically the reason government has control of building Codes, is to prevent things from happening that are going to be detrimental to either individuals or the community at large. The Code should say items related to sustainability and alternative energy styles particular. He also believes the information should be in the design guidelines.

Mr. Foust said the community believes in sustainability. He feels the Code should address sustainability and alternative energy styles in particular. If the ARB has that in the Code, then if something comes up we certainly look at it the same way we look at building height, doors, windows, drainage, etc.

Mr. Coulter said the word sustainability means different things to different people, so a better definition is needed, and could be accomplished through examples. He is not an advocate of saying “you have to do this.” When cities start requiring that their buildings absolutely have to have sustainable elements, quite often there are huge dollar prices that go with the requirement. He does not want the ARB to be in a position when someone comes before them to put solar panels on the front of a house, and there is nothing in the Code to address the request. Mr. Coulter said again he is trying to provide more definition.

Mr. Foust said general flexibility is needed and he has a problem using the Code to encourage people to do things. He feels there are methods to state the City’s intent.

Mrs. Holcombe state she does not see a purpose to adding sustainability to the Code, since the ARB will review items either way.

Mrs. Bitar said looking at the current standards, there are a couple standards that would be applicable. Exterior detail and relationships and compatibility of design and materials could apply to anything, not just the actual building. The ARB looks at the whole site, including landscape planting and screening of undesirable views

Mr. Foust agreed that maybe sustainable development is covered by the existing Code. He said this whole conversation came up many, many months ago when the Board realized it was going to start seeing applications for solar panels in the Architectural Review District. The ARB needed to get prepared to address that, as to what is good, what is bad and what are the Board’s limits. Now the Board has expanded that to the terms of sustainability in general and now we are trying to write encouraging Code. Maybe we are covered and maybe Mrs. Bitar should have a discussion with Mike Minister

Mr. Hunter referred to a previous case with skylights on the front of the roof, and was afraid an inappropriate application for solar panels could be before the Board. He felt without absolute

authority for the ARB, there might not be enough to stop an inappropriate application for solar panels. Mr. Hunter thought addressing the issue in the Code was a good idea politically, and Mr. Foust said the political statement had already been made by the ARB and City Council. Added language to the Code is about law and control. Mrs. Holcombe reiterated the information should be in the design guidelines and not in the Code.

Mr. Foust agreed and went on to say that these issues are discussed in a public forum to work through the differences of opinion and let the public know what is proposed. He feels by having these meeting, the ARB is letting the community know how supportive the City is of sustainable design. The recent approval of solar panels on Evening St. School is also an example. He thinks the ARB makes reasonable decisions, and feels it will continue to do so, and he again expressed the desire to see the information in the Design Guidelines.

Mrs. Bitar concurred that the ARB has before, and will always regulate solar panels, just as it does generators, air conditioners, etc.

Mr. DeLong said it struck him when a member said the word sustainability means different things to different people, but to some people it does not mean anything. If good and bad examples were in the Design Guidelines, people would have a sense of what is expected of them for design. Mrs. Holcombe said the guidelines would show what the City would like property owners to consider.

Mr. Yaeger agreed the guidelines would be a useful tool

Mr. Hermann said there are a lot of things that would fall into the existing review elements, but some could be made more robust like: pedestrian environment could be pedestrian, bicycling or alternate transportation mode. Bike racks could be referred to.

Mr. Hermann summarized there are four major topics being discussed: 1) Encouraging sustainability and wanting Worthington to be known as a sustainable community. 2) Desiring incentives to encourage people to use sustainable design. 3) Concerns that people are going to bring designs in that are off track because the City has no ideas to show people. 4) Is Code language needed to support this effort? All four are being discussed at the same time which makes the discussion difficult. He expressed the desire to discuss Design Guidelines first.

Mr. Hunter agreed, but expressed he would still like to see something in the Code even if it is just a sentence addressing sustainability. He said a definition of what the Board means by sustainability. He asked for other items to come before the Board.

Mrs. Bitar stated there are two things that will be coming to the ARB. Council is hiring a consultant to look at the design details for the interchange project at US 23 and I-270. Also, the Community Improvement Corporation is still working with the Kilbourne Memorial Library building. Most recently there was a discussion of accommodating accommodate

retail and restaurant in the building. There are preliminary designs that will be brought to the board in February, approval of which will be helpful for marketing purposes.

Mr. Coulter asked about when Worthington Mall will come back before the Board. Mrs. Bitar stated that she has not heard from them, it could be January 28th or it could be in February. There were final details that really needed to work out before drawings were submitted, like treatment between the mall and Kroger buildings, and a comprehensive signage package for the whole property. Mr. Hermann stated he would like to see a temporary wall or banner between Kroger and the mall to block the view, if the project will take awhile.

Mr. Hermann mentioned a presentation by a staff member in his company regarding storm water management, available for the ARB or City Staff to see.

Mr. Coulter asked when the East Wilson Bridge Rd. project would be back on the MPC agenda. Mrs. Bitar said timing is unsure because the City is changing the scope of the project to include all of Wilson Bridge Rd. The decision was based on the feedback from the residents, talking about the condition of the rest of Wilson-Bridge Rd, and the market study. The City is in negotiations with the consultant regarding the revised project and providing information to City Council. The CIC discussed the project at last night's meeting and feel it was the correct way to proceed. A visioning session will be part of the revised project.

Mrs. Bitar said the Law Director is setting-up an Ethics Session with the Attorney General's office for sometime in February.

Mr. Hunter said the City of Worthington Police Department is doing another Citizens Police Academy for residents. It is a six week evening session that Mr. Hunter has been through. He found it fascinating to see both the problems and issues that the Police Department deals with everyday. There are interesting real life situations that participants are faced with. Applicants must be eighteen with no criminal record and able to defend yourself.

Mrs. Bitar mentioned the City of Worthington now participates in Facebook and Twitter.

Mr. Hunter asked if anything else is to come before this Board this evening?

Adjournment

Mr. Hermann motioned for adjournment, and Mrs. Lloyed second the motion. All members said aye. The meeting adjourned at 9:17 pm