



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

The regular meeting of the Worthington Architectural Review Board and the Worthington Municipal Planning Commission was called to order at 7:05 p.m. with the following members present: Mikel Coulter, Chair; Kathy Holcombe, Secretary; James Sauer; Edwin Hofmann; Amy Lloyd; and David Foust. Also present were: Scott Myers, Worthington City Council Representative to the Municipal Planning Commission; Lee Brown, Director of Planning & Building; Lynda Bitar, Planning Coordinator and Clerk of the Municipal Planning Commission; and Melissa Cohan, Paralegal. Commission member Thomas Reis, Vice-Chair, was absent.

**A. Call to Order – 7:00 p.m.**

1. Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Approval of minutes of the June 22, 2017 meeting

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

4. Affirmation/swearing in of witnesses

**B. Architectural Review Board**

1. Roof Repair and Condensing Unit - **6550 N. High St.** (City of Worthington) **AR 25-17**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

**Findings of fact & Conclusions**

**Background & Request:**

The Louis J. R. Goorey Worthington Municipal Building was constructed in 1992. At the time, the utilities were vented through the decorative roof chimneys. Maintaining the openings through the roof has been very difficult in the confined space of the chimneys leading to numerous leaks and extensive water damage over the years. This proposal would improve that condition. Also part of this application is a condensing unit that was installed on the south side of the building.

**Project Details:**

1. The proposed solution for the roof involves re-routing the vents through the roof-facing walls of the chimneys, and removing the existing scupper drains. This would allow the chimneys to be capped. The brick and flashing would be repaired as part of the project.
2. The temperature of the conference room at the southeast corner of the building has always been difficult to regulate. A few months ago, a mini split heating/cooling unit was installed for the room which included an outdoor condensing unit and black line set. The black line set comes out through the brick at about 6' above ground, runs down adjacent to a black shutter to the stone building trim, and then over to the unit. The City plans to install a wall duct kit that comes in a choice of colors to conceal the line set. Also, taller landscaping is planned to help screen the unit.

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

Roofs, gutters and downspouts comprise an integrated system to collect and remove water from a building as quickly as possible. A failure or weakness in one component will hinder or prevent the others from doing their jobs. It is important to watch for signs of trouble and correct problems before they get out of hand. Regular maintenance and cleaning is the best way to keep a roof system in good shape. Watch for blisters, breaks, tears, or holes in the roof surface, and check flashing for loose joints and open seams.

Keep functional items such as trash containers and mechanical equipment well screened with fences or plantings.

**Recommendation:**

Staff is recommending approval of the application. The proposed repairs to the roof should not alter the look of the building. If the cover for the line set is added, it should only be along the stone and colored to match the stone. The line set on the wall blends with the shutter. Evergreen landscape material taller than the equipment should be added. With adequate landscape screening the mechanical equipment should have limited visibility from the right-of-way.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Rob Chandler, acting as the applicant on behalf of the City's Service & Engineering Department. Mrs. Lloyd asked Mr. Chandler if the pipes would be painted to match the brick and he replied yes. Mr. Coulter said he would rather see additional landscaping to cover up the piping instead of capping the refrigerant line. Mr. Myers thanked Mr. Chandler for the addition of the condensing unit because he said they had to open up the chamber doors to get warm air in the winter. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present to speak for or against this application and no one came forward.

**Motion:**

Mr. Hofmann moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY THE CITY OF WORTHINGTON FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO REPAIR THE ROOF AND RETAIN A CONDENSING UNIT AT 6550 N. HIGH ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 25-17, DRAWINGS NO. AR 25-17, DATED MARCH 27, 2017, BE APPROVED, AS AMENDED TO ADD LANDSCAPING TO SCREEN THE UNIT AND THAT THE LANDSCAPING SCREEN THE ENTIRE CONDESNOB LINE AND ANY OTHER GREENERY THAT NEEDS TO BE MOVED SHOULD BE MOVED, 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; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Sauer, aye; Mr. Hofmann, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye; and Mr. Foust, aye. The motion was approved.

2. Fence – **31 W. North St.** (Kevin & Emily Masterson) **AR 55-17**

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

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

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

This two-story home was constructed in 1980 with a brick façade and lap siding, on a lot that is adjacent to commercial property on the east and south sides. In 1983, a 6' high shadowbox fence was added at the rear and west side property lines. There is a cement block wall along the east property line.

The owners would like approval to replace the fencing.

#### **Project Details:**

1. The proposed solid cedar fence would be 6' high with dog ear pickets. The style matches the fence that was approved and installed near the rear property line of the house to the west.
2. The fence would be installed 3' from the rear property line and along the west property line. Gates are proposed on both sides of the house at the front corners. There is currently a gate on the east side of the house in that location, but the west side fencing only extends to the rear of the house. The existing gate on the east side matches the height of the wall, which does not appear to be 6' tall.

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

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

Fencing should be open in style; constructed with traditional materials; in the back yard; 3' to 4' in height; and of simple design, appropriate for the house style. Higher fences are discouraged, but may be appropriate where a commercial use abuts a residential property. Design and materials should be compatible with the existing structure.

**Recommendation:**

Staff is recommending approval of this application with modifications. The gate on the east side should match the wall height. On the west property line, the fence should extend to the back of the house rather than the front to give a more open feel. A lower more open version of the fence between the properties could be considered.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Kevin Masterson did not have any comments. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak for or against this application. Mr. Mike Scholl, 41 W. North St., Worthington, Ohio, said they wanted to go on the record that they are fully supportive of Mr. Masterson’s plans. Mrs. Scholl said they enjoy living in the historic district but backing up against the commercial property is challenging

**Motion:**

Mr. Sauer moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY KEVIN & EMILY MASTERSON TO REPLACE THE FENCING AT 31 W. NORTH ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 55-17, DRAWINGS NO. AR 55-17, DATED JUNE 19, 2017, BE APPROVED, AND THAT THE FENCE ALONG THE SOUTHERN PROPERTY LINE CAN BE LOCATED WHERE IT CURRENT IS, OR BROUGHT IN TO ALIGN WITH THE FENCE ON THE PROPERTY TO THE WEST 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; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Sauer, aye; Mr. Hofmann, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye; and Mr. Foust, aye. The motion was approved.

3. Sign – 2245 W. Dublin-Granville Rd., Suite 105 (Sign Smith LLC/Verizon) AR 56-17

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

**Findings of fact & Conclusions**

**Background & Request**

In 2014 & 2015, the property owner of this land at the southwest corner of W. Dublin-Granville Rd. and Linworth Rd. annexed, rezoned, subdivided, created a Development Plan, and received Architectural Review Board approval to redevelop the property as a neighborhood commercial site. Construction of Linworth Crossing is nearly complete except for a few site issues.

Sign Criteria were developed as outlined in the Land Use Plans below. Inclusion of a logo as part of a tenant wall sign requires approval from the ARB.

**Project Details:**

1. Verizon is locating in Suite 105, which is about in the middle of Building A.
2. The proposed sign for the front of the building would have 24” high, individually mounted acrylic 1 ½” thick lower case letters in black spelling “verizon” with a red check mark at the end.
3. Proposed sign area is 37.3 square feet.

**Land Use Plans:**

Linworth Crossing Development Plan

Approved Sign Criteria per the Development Plan:

- Tenants in a space with a larger sign band are permitted 56 square feet of sign area.
- Maximum character height is 24”.
- Black gooseneck LED lights will be above all signs.
- All signs will consist of 1 ½” thick non-illuminated dimensional letters and logos, centered in the sign band area. The font style can vary.
- The proposed color palette for the signs is red (PMS #7621); blue (PMS #541); green (PMS #561); and PMS Black C.
- Proposed logos must be approved by the ARB.

**Recommendation:**

Staff is recommending approval of this application, as the sign meets the criteria for this development.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Michael Smith, 2760 County Road 26, Marengo, Ohio. Mr. Smith did not have further comments. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak for or against this application and no one came forward.

**Motion application:**

Mrs. Holcombe moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY SIGN SMITH LLC FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO ADD A WALL SIGN AT 2245 W. DUBLIN-GRANVILLE RD. , SUITE 105, AS PER CASE NO. AR 56-17, DRAWINGS NO. AR 56-17, DATED JUNE 21, 2017 BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.**

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

**4. Directional Signs – 644-654 High St. (DeRoberts Family Limited Partnership) AR 58-17**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

## **Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

### **Background & Request:**

This property includes a building housing six merchant spaces (RIDEhome, ELLI Nail Spa, The Candle Lab, House Wine and Graeter's; A Taste of Vietnam has recently closed.), and the parking lot in front at the northeast corner of High St. and E. New England Ave. In 2015, two 18" high x 30" wide, double-sided, directional signs were installed and approved near the parking lot entrances identifying the lot as parking allowed only when visiting those tenants. Reportedly, the merchants expressed frustration with their customers not being able to park in the adjacent lot due to others using the lot. The parking lot appears to be a public lot to many downtown visitors, although it is private property.

This request is for approval of additional directional signs.

### **Project Details:**

1. Signs have been installed at four of the easternmost parking spaces in front of the building designating the spaces be used for "15 Minute Parking for Customers of 644-654 High St." In recent years, fifteen minute parking was allowed adjacent to the property in the E. New England Ave. right-of-way.
2. The signs are 12" high x 10" wide white metal signs with black lettering and a red border. They are mounted on round metal posts with flexible bases.
3. Variances would be needed because the signs are higher than the 36" allowed by Code for directional signs.

### **Land Use Plans:**

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

Guideline recommendations for signage include being efficient in using signs. Try to use as few and as small signs as are necessary to get the business message across to the public. Signage is a standard of review per the Architectural District ordinance.

#### **Sign Code**

"Directional sign" means a sign used to direct on-site traffic and identify services such as restrooms, hours of operation, etc., and of which no more than fifty-percent of the graphic area is non-directional information. The display area for such signs shall not exceed twenty-four inches in height or width, and the above grade height for freestanding directional signs shall not exceed thirty-six inches. The total area for all such signage shall be no more than 20 square feet per parcel.

### **Recommendation:**

Staff is recommending denial of this application. It has not been made clear why the signs are needed, as all of the businesses could have customers staying longer than 15 minutes. Also, additional signage is not preferred, especially if it does not meet Code requirements.

## **Discussion:**

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Dick De Roberts, 1270 Marlyn Dr., Columbus, Ohio. Mr. De Roberts said Downtown Worthington is growing and there is not enough parking space for his tenants' patrons so they were trying to the best with what they have. He said they tried to set up a system for patrons who would only use the parking spaces for a short period of time, such as buying a bottle of wine, getting some ice cream, or going to the restaurant to pick up carry-out. Mr. De Roberts said the other signage they were using became worn and beat up, so they found something else they thought might work. The new signs are flexible and bend over if hit by a car and then pop back up again. Mr. Sauer asked what was written on the signs in front of the parking lot and Mr. De Roberts replied the signs state the area is restrictive for the tenants, but there is no way to police that. Mr. Hofmann said he liked the idea functionally so he does not mind the time limit, but he had an issue with the execution of the signage. He asked if the spaces could be painted instead with some sort of graphic, and if some type of bollard could be used and paint the fifteen minute limit on the bollard in order to get rid of the signage. Mr. Hofmann said he was also concerned if someone drove into the parking space to fast the bendable signage could damage the hood of the car parked across from it, and there were also code issues with the existing signs. Mrs. Lloyd said she had the same idea and mentioned the restaurant had parking spaces labeled for carry-out only painted on the pavement. Mr. Sauer said over the past year in downtown Worthington there seems to have been an explosion of signage with time limits for parking and the area does not have the same charming feel. He said he finds all the additional signage offensive and believes there is a better solution. Mr. Coulter said he agreed with what Mr. De Roberts is trying to do but he also agreed with Mr. Sauer and felt there was a better solution. Mr. Coulter said the height of the sign was an issue for him, and believed Mr. Hofmann's idea might be acceptable. Something shorter, and more stylish. Mrs. Holcombe agreed with the other Board members. She said the parking signs behind Harold's and HER Realtors were much lower and state who can park in those spaces. She felt the current signs were unappealing. Mr. De Roberts requested to table the application.

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

Mr. Brown asked that the applicant not make any changes without prior approval, and that we would work with them on an acceptable proposal to bring back to the Board.

5. Directional Signs – **640 High St.** (Dewey's Pizza) **AR 51-17**

&

## **C. Municipal Planning Commission**

### **1. Conditional Use Permit**

a. Restaurant in C-5 – Patio Use – **640 High St.** (Dewey's Pizza) **CU 06-17** (Amendment to CU 01-12)

Page 7 of 23

ARB/MPC Meeting July 13, 2017

Minutes

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

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

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

Dewey's Pizza was approved to be constructed in 2012 and finished in 2013. A Conditional Use Permit was approved at the time that allowed full restaurant service inside the building and in an area adjacent to the building that had planters and chains as a separator from the rest of the outdoor space to allow alcohol service. It was understood at the time that people would likely buy food to eat out on the patio area, making use of the provided seating.

With approval of the Designated Outdoor Refreshment Area (D.O.R.A.) by City Council, physical barriers are no longer required to allow consumption of alcohol outside of the restaurants along High St. There is a stipulation that patrons must purchase the alcohol inside the restaurant, and can carry it outside in a designated cup if they stay in a signed area to consume the drink.

Dewey's would like approval to expand its Conditional Use Permit to include the outdoor plaza area for the restaurant and add the appropriate signage.

#### **Project Details:**

1. No new tables or seating are proposed with this application. The only appearance change would be the addition of signs at the corners of the plaza area. The 12" high x 9" wide blue signs with white print and trim would say "No Alcoholic Beverages Beyond This Point" and be mounted to the posts of the existing pergolas. The same signs are being used by the restaurants with seating in the right-of-way (the signs are mounted to a stanchion and movable) and will be used for special events that take place in Old Worthington.
2. This change would allow patrons to consume alcohol on the plaza in addition to carry out food. Restaurant service in the plaza is not proposed with this application.

**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 – No effect has been identified.
2. Effect on public facilities – No effect has been identified.
3. Effect on sewerage and drainage facilities – No effect has been identified.
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 – Typically 11:00 am to 10:00 pm Monday – Thursday; 11:00 am to 11:00 pm Friday and Saturday; and 4:00 pm to 10:00 pm on Sunday. The hours are the same as originally approved.
8. Shielding or screening considerations for neighbors – Not applicable.
9. Appearance and compatibility with the general neighborhood – Not applicable.

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

Guideline recommendations for signage include being efficient in using signs. Try to use as few and as small signs as are necessary to get the business message across to the public. Signage is a standard of review per the Architectural District ordinance.

Sign Code

“Directional sign” means a sign used to direct on-site traffic and identify services such as restrooms, hours of operation, etc., and of which no more than fifty-percent of the graphic area is non-directional information. The display area for such signs shall not exceed twenty-four inches in height or width, and the above grade height for freestanding directional signs shall not exceed thirty-six inches. The total area for all such signage shall be no more than 20 square feet per parcel.

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.

Worthington Comprehensive Plan

A good mix of restaurant and niche retail shops are appropriate for Old Worthington. Market to desired retail users that are targeting the authentic town center with pedestrian-oriented store plans and products.

**Recommendation:**

Staff is recommending approval of these applications, as the changes are in line with the D.O.R.A. regulations and appropriate for Old Worthington.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Sauer asked if all of the little signs would installed along the sidewalks and Mrs. Bitar explained any restaurant serving alcohol would need to have these patio area signs if they do not have a fenced in area, which is required by the liquor laws of Ohio. She further explained City Council explored the options. Mr. Myers said the tenants who want to participate in D.O.R.A. must have these signs. He said City Council had three months' worth of meetings discussing the issue. Mrs. Bitar said Dewey's Pizza owns the plaza, so they will be mounting the signs to the pergola up front. She was not sure how high the signs would be mounted. Mr. Coulter said he thought if you purchased a drink from an establishment you could take the drink anywhere within the D.O.R.A. Mrs. Bitar said that is a misconception and not correct. She said only when there are certain special events downtown a person would be able to purchase their drink and walk around within the event area, such as “Picnic with The Partnership.” The mobile signs would then

be placed at the beginning and end points of the event areas, so no alcohol would be permitted beyond those signs. On a normal everyday basis, a person would not be able to leave the patio area with their drink. Mr. Myers replied this is not Bourbon Street or a “Sip and Stroll.” Mr. Foust asked if there are restrictions for the height of the signs, and Mrs. Bitar replied, not when the signs are mounted, only when the signs are freestanding. Mr. Coulter asked in lieu of attaching the signs to a structure could the Board request to use only the same sign so there would be consistency and Mrs. Bitar said yes.

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Eric Kohl, 2144 Riverhill Rd., Columbus, Ohio, requested to have their mounted sign a little bit smaller so the sign would fit within the width of the pergola. Mr. Coulter said for the record, the City’s Law Director, Pam Fox, was in attendance of the meeting and available to answer questions. Mr. Coulter asked Mrs. Fox, the signs the Board saw this evening, if those are regulated by size or legislation they have to conform to or if there is a little bit of flexibility. Mrs. Fox said the stanchions the Board member were looking at were already approved by City Council by way of the Ordinance. The size of the sign was included in the approval. There was an exhibit which showed what the sign was going to look like. Mr. Coulter asked if the sign on the pergola could be reduced in order to honor the restaurant’s request. Mrs. Fox said City Council gave leeway to City staff to make decisions in certain situations such as this. She felt this would be consistent with Council’s approval, but said not to go too far beyond the regulated size. The signs need to be visible so people do not walk past a certain point with their beverages. Mr. Hofmann asked if the signs could be put away in winter and just have the stanchion signs displayed during the warmer seasons in lieu of having permanent mounted signs. Mr. Kohl said they would need their signs out the majority of the time because on a forty degree December evening, people will let their children run around on the plaza and they may want to have a drink while they are waiting for a table. Mrs. Fox addressed Mr. Hofmann’s question and said they were not at the Conditional Use part of the application yet, but that will dictate when the patio can be used, whether forty degrees in December or seventy degrees in February, the signs will need to be up. The business would have to be diligent and make sure people are not pouring their drinks into a cup and allowing people to go outside without the signage in place. Mr. Hofmann asked if there was a sign by the exit for no alcohol beyond this point if that would suffice and no answer was given. Mr. Sauer asked if the City determines the season and Mrs. Fox said no, the D.O.R.A. is in effect year round. Mr. Kohl said he does not want to limit the public from being able to use the plaza. Each business will have two stanchion signs. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present to speak for or against this application and no one came forward.

**ARB Motion:**

Mr. Hofmann moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY DEWEY’S PIZZA FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL DIRECTIONAL SIGNS AT 640 HIGH ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 51-17, DRAWINGS NO. AR 51-17, DATED JUNE 9, 2017, BE APPROVED WITH THE AMENDMENT THAT SIGNS WILL BE 9” BY 12” AND BE MOUNTED ON THE DEWEY’S SIDE OF THE BRICK WALL AND ADJACENT TO THE ENTRIES**

**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; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Sauer, aye; Mr. Hofmann, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye; and Mr. Foust, aye. The motion was approved

Mr. Eric Kohl, 2144 Riverhill Rd., Columbus, Ohio, remained at the podium for further discussion. Mrs. Fox discussed some of the D.O.R.A. regulations with Mr. Kohl, and stressed the importance of following the rules. Mrs. Fox asked Mr. Kohl what kind of training he is giving his bartenders, hostesses and waiters. Mr. Kohl replied he has not trained his staff yet because he was waiting for the Conditional Use to pass but the plan is to ask recipients, or people waiting to sit, if they plan to go outside on the patio, and if so, he already has the approved cups for beverages to be taken on the patio. Mrs. Fox said she knows the restaurant gets very busy at times, and wanted to make sure the wait staff is trained so if they see somebody outside with a bottle of beer or a glass of wine they will have them come back inside the restaurant and exchange their beverage into an approved cup. She said this is only fair to the other permit holders to make sure the rules are followed. Mr. Kohl said he will make sure his employees follow the rules. Mr. Myers said to make sure the restaurant staff keeps the area clean and trash picked up and to make sure the managers know the liquor rules also.

**MPC Motion:**

Mr. Hofmann moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY DEWEY'S PIZZA TO AMEND CU 01-12 TO OPERATE A RESTAURANT IN THE C-5 ZONING DISTRICT AT 640 HIGH ST. AS PER CASE NO. CU 06-17, DRAWINGS NO. CU 06-17, DATED JUNE 9, 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. Mrs. Bitar called the roll. Mr. Coulter, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Sauer, aye; and Mr. Hofmann, aye. The motion was approved.

**B. Architectural Review Board (continued)**

6. New Single Family Home – **31 E. New England Ave.** (Jamie & Lindsay Cleverley/Worthington Lodge LLC) **AR 57-17**

&

**C. Municipal Planning Commission (continued)**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

## **2. Planned Unit Development Modification**

- a. New Single Family Home – **31 E. New England Ave.** (Jamie & Lindsay Cleverley/  
Worthington Lodge LLC) **PUDM 01-17** (Modification to PUD 03-14)

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

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

The parcel which includes the former lodge and the new house east of the access drive to the Worthington United Methodist Church (WUMC) parking lot was rezoned as a PUD in 2015. Originally included for the area east of Dewey's along E. New England Avenue was a two-family residential structure. These applicants would like to amend the previous approvals by the MPC and ARB to allow construction of a single-family home instead. The parcel would still remain intact, with the applicants owning the house as a condominium.

#### **Project Details:**

##### 1. Site Plan:

- The single family house is proposed for location 13' from the front property line; 14.3' east of the access drive to the WUMC parking lot; 11' from the west property line; and ~29' from the sidewalk adjacent to the newly constructed garages behind the former lodge building. The previously approved structure was the same distance from E. New England Ave., however, the entire building was at that location and a stoop extended beyond. The proposed house has a porch set back 13' across a portion of the front, and the remainder of the house would be set back further than 13'. On the east side, the house would be a few feet closer to the access drive, but there would continue to be a 5' sidewalk along the drive. The proposed structure would be shorter to give room for a rear yard. The area of the house would be less than the previously proposed structure.
- The applicants would like to use a fence that matches the lodge fencing to enclose the west side and rear yards. The fence would align with the rear of the house on the east side and extend to about 26' from the E. New England Ave. property line on the west side.
- A landscape plan is included showing a variety of shrubs, perennials, trees and annuals.

##### 2. Building:

- Proposed is a two-story structure with a gabled roof, the main gable being east to west, with separate gables extending to the north and south. The structure would have a basement.
- The front elevation has gables over the western 2/3 of the house; toward the center nestled in the larger gable; above the entrance; and above a second floor window on

- the east side. A porch with a shed roof and railing is proposed on the west side. A bay window is proposed on the east side. Various window shapes and styles are proposed. The first floor windows would all have transoms above double hung windows that are divided on top and single light below. On the second floor, there is a mixture of double hung windows with transoms above and windows that appear to be casement style. Matching columns would support the porch and entry roofs. The front door is proposed with 3 lights above 2 panels.
- The east side elevation would have windows similar to the front of the house, and 2 garage doors – one double and one single. The roof gable would be above the front 2/3 of the house.
  - The rear elevation would have 2 matching gables in a shallower pitch than the front gables. A screened porch is proposed at the southwest corner.
  - On the west side is a chimney and the fence is proposed to extend to the north side. The first floor windows are proposed with solid panels below divided lights. A small window is proposed in the gable. A window well is proposed for basement egress.
3. Materials:
- The house is proposed to be sided with LP SmartSide horizontal lap siding. The width has not been identified. The siding would be painted “Iron Ore”. In the gables, board and batten style siding is proposed, which would be painted “Alabaster”. Trim is proposed in the same material and “Alabaster” in color.
  - The asphalt shingles for the roof would be “Shadow Black”.
  - Windows are proposed to be vinyl simulated divided light in white.
  - The proposed fiberglass front door would be finished to look like wood. Garage doors would be paneled without windows.
  - Glen-Gery Marquette brick is proposed for the chimney. Cultured limestone is proposed for the foundation.
  - Carriage lamps are proposed for the garage and rear doors, and a light is proposed in the ceiling of the front porch.
  - Gutter, downspout, porch rail and column material has not been addressed.
  - Front porch and step material appears to be concrete.

**Land Use Plans:**

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Infill sites should be developed in a way that is complementary to their neighborhoods and that integrates well with surrounding building designs and land uses. Compatibility with the neighborhood should be the primary consideration. New structures should complement the form, massing and scale of existing nearby structures. Also, building placement and orientation are important design considerations. Most main entrances should face the street and garages should avoid facing the street.

Roof: Roof shapes for new buildings should be appropriate to the style or design of the building. If a new building does not follow a particular style but is instead a vernacular design, then roof shapes and heights similar to those in the neighborhood or nearby would be most appropriate.

**Materials:** Contemporary materials that simulate traditional ones are appropriate, but the preferred option is to use true traditional materials such as wood siding. Incompatible contemporary materials should be avoided. Brick has long been a traditional material in Worthington. Prepare a sample board for review by the Architectural Review Board.

**Windows:** For new buildings, multiple-paned windows generally are not appropriate. The exception is a building being built in a particular style -- such as Federal, Greek Revival or Colonial Revival -- that would have employed this window type. When in doubt, simple 1 over 1 double-hung sash windows are usually the simplest, least expensive and most appropriate choice. Using the excellent precedents of Worthington's many historic structures, carefully design the pattern of window openings; window sizes and proportions (they must be appropriate for the size and proportions of the wall in which they are placed); pattern of window panes and muntins; and trim around the windows. Good quality wood windows are readily available and more affordable than in the past. True wood windows are always the first preference. Aluminum- or vinyl-clad windows can be appropriate, but primarily on secondary facades and less conspicuous locations. All-aluminum or vinyl windows are not prohibited but are not encouraged. Avoid blank walls.

**Entries:** As with other design considerations, study Worthington's rich collection of 19th and 20th century architecture for design ideas for entrances and doors. For newly-built buildings, simpler designs usually look better than more ornate ones. Avoid heavy ornamentation on doors and entrances. Observe entry placement on existing buildings. Whether located symmetrically or asymmetrically, entries usually are aligned with a window on the second floor so that a regular rhythm of openings is maintained on both floors. Entries should be located so they are easily visible, and they should be oriented toward the street.

**Ornamentation:** Observe Worthington's excellent historic architecture for information on the kinds and amounts of ornamentation employed on various building styles and periods. Use ornamentation conservatively. It will be most successful if used in traditional locations: around windows and doors; along a building's cornice or at the corners; in gables; or on gates and fences. Most ornamentation historically was made of simple forms built up to a desired level of complexity. When in doubt, follow the old rule that "less is more." Sometimes just a little ornamentation, well placed, can have a major impact without the need for more extensive (and expensive, and hard-to-maintain) ornamentation. Use compatible materials in ornamental elements. Frame houses should have wood ornamentation, although in cases where the ornamental elements are some distance from the viewer it may be possible to use substitute materials such as fiberglass.

**Color:** In general, avoid bright colors not typical in Worthington neighborhoods, such as various shades of purple or orange. For infill buildings being placed in an existing streetscape, select colors compatible with those already used along the streetscape. Many buildings follow a pattern of light colors for the building body and darker colors for the trim. Following this pattern is encouraged. In Worthington, the use of white or cream-colored trim also is common and would be appropriate.

for new construction. Avoid using too many colors. Usually one body color and one trim color are sufficient.

Landscaping: Worthington's mature shade trees are the primary landscaping feature throughout the community. They are a major contributor to its character and help define its neighborhoods as stable, desirable places to live. In general, lawns are generous but not overly large, which contributes to the sense of human scale that is one of Worthington's important attributes. Other landscaping elements tend to be properly scaled and well-tended, which also tends to enhance neighborhood character. Maintain and nurture mature trees to prolong their lives. Plant and maintain street trees in planting areas between the street and sidewalk. Paving can sometimes reduce water absorption of the soil so much that trees do not get the moisture they require.

The standards of review in the Architectural District ordinance are:

1. Height;
2. Building massing, which shall include the relationship of the building width to its height and depth, and its relationship to the viewer's and pedestrian's visual perspective;
3. Window treatment, which shall include the size, shape and materials of the individual window units and the overall harmonious relationship of window openings;
4. Exterior detail and relationships, which shall include all projecting and receding elements of the exterior, including but not limited to, porches and overhangs and the horizontal or vertical expression which is conveyed by these elements;
5. Roof shape, which shall include type, form and materials;
6. Materials, texture and color, which shall include a consideration of material compatibility among various elements of the structure;
7. Compatibility of design and materials, which shall include the appropriateness of the use of exterior design details;
8. Landscape design and plant materials, which shall include, in addition to requirements of this Zoning Code, lighting and the use of landscape details to highlight architectural features or screen or soften undesirable views;
9. Pedestrian environment, which shall include the provision of features which enhance pedestrian movement and environment and which relate to the pedestrian's visual perspective;
10. Signage, which shall include, in addition to requirements of Chapter 1170, the appropriateness of signage to the building;
11. Sustainable Features, which shall include environmentally friendly details and conservation practices.

### Worthington Comprehensive Plan

Village centers like Old Worthington are logical places to add residential density in and behind the main corridor. Such residential development adds more pedestrian activity, increases the market base for the retail stores, and can be designed as a product that is attractive to young professionals and empty nesters. In Worthington, redeveloping residential lots within the first High Street block requires expertise to prevent it from tearing into the historic fabric of the City. Such development must be evaluated on a case-by-case basis, but it would be critical to be appropriate for the site in scale and design while at the same time creating a continuous street front.

### Final Plan Modifications from Code:

City Staff - The City staff may authorize minor design modifications that are required to correct any undetected errors or that are consistent with the purpose of the approved Final Plan. Such modifications shall be limited to:

1. Minor adjustments in lot lines provided no additional lots are created;
2. Minor adjustments in location of Building footprints and parking lots, provided the perimeter required Yards remain in compliance;
3. Minor adjustments in Building height;
4. Minor modifications in Structure design and materials, and lighting provided there is the same general appearance; and
5. Minor modifications of landscaping, including substitution of materials.

Municipal Planning Commission - The Municipal Planning Commission shall review modifications other than those listed in the above section, and any of the above modifications as recommended by City staff.

1. Should the Municipal Planning Commission find that such modification keeps the essential character of the approved PUD, and does not require an amendment to the PUD Ordinance, the Municipal Planning Commission shall approve such modification.
2. Should the Municipal Planning Commission find that such modification requires an amendment to the PUD Ordinance, the Municipal Planning Commission shall forward a recommendation of approval or denial to the City Council for such amendment.

### **Recommendations:**

Staff is recommending ARB & MPC approval of the applications when the details are acceptable and with the following considerations:

- The basic form and style of the house and the site plan would be appropriate and keep the essential character of the approved PUD and Old Worthington.
- More green space is proposed than with the previous approval.
- Although the house would be closer to the drive than the garages behind, there is still sufficient distance between the house and drive to accommodate pedestrians, and vehicular traffic should not be effected.
- On the west side, the fence should stop at the south side of the chimney to allow view of the chimney and be further back from the street.
- While the house would be comprised of many traditional elements, the design on the front elevation appears a bit complicated.
- The use of solid panels in the windows on the west elevation is unusual.
- Clarification and samples of materials are needed.

### **Discussion:**

Mrs. Bitar said there needs to be some clarification with what lighting will be used on the porch roof. Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Dominic Luppino, 5530 Shannon Heights Blvd., Dublin, Ohio, Jamie Cleverly, 7768 Rowles Dr., Columbus, Ohio. Mr. Luppino said he was representing Residential Design Solutions. He said on the first elevation they were

Page 16 of 23

ARB/MPC Meeting July 13, 2017

Minutes

going for a New England Craftsman Cottage style, and with that style there is an asymmetric look. Mr. Luppino said there were several other similar examples of this type of architecture on the street. Some of the windows are different sizes but the majority of them are 3050 standard windows with transoms above. Even though some of the windows are different sizes, they kept the same proportions so that the divided light grills would all have the same proportions throughout.

Mr. Hofmann said he had a question about the west elevation because of the slight incline, that side of the house is what will be mostly seen from downtown Worthington. He feels that side of the house could use a little more love and attention given the amount of the exposure and views this house will have. Mr. Hofmann said for instance where the glass or screened porch is, should the quarter trim come straight through and then maybe the small triangle piece is left over to be slightly detailed differently. The placement of the windows could also be a little more thoughtful in terms of how it presents itself. He said in reality, the front of the house is where the front door is, but the majority of people will be viewing the house from the side. Mr. Luppino said the house is a block away from downtown Worthington, but the house also sits behind Dewey's Pizza. Mr. Hofmann said if this house was in a different part of the city he would not have a problem with the elevation. This side of the house will be viewed from the core of downtown and needs to have more detail and interest.

Mr. Myers said he wanted to go back a couple of years. He said this is a beautiful house, but you may hear some things you do not like. Mr. Myers said the people in elected positions who have to answer to the voters expend a tremendous amount of political capital. The Board and Council members had to work really hard to get a compromise to get any building at all on this lot. What the citizens of Worthington were willing to accept was the building that was originally designed as a stone building because they felt they could live with that juxtaposed to the Masonic Lodge. Mr. Myers said he only saw one or two interested parties in the audience from that discussion. He asked that this matter be tabled so he can take this matter to City Council to get some input to see how the other City Council members feel. He said what he does not want to do is, if this matter was approved this evening, would be to file an Appeal. He believed this first needs to be approved by City Council because they worked for so many months, so hard, and had so much public input to get what they got and now that is being changed one hundred and eighty degrees. Mr. Myers said he has no problem with a single family home and does not believe the other Council members will either but he cannot speak for the other members, and eventually Council members will need to approve this anyway. A lot was at stake to get this house how it was originally designed, and without letting the public know, he would not feel comfortable having this house decided upon at this evening's meeting. Mr. Coulter said he was not sure they would be making a decision at the meeting. Mr. Myers said this house is so different than what the people finally said they would be willing to accept and live with.

Mr. Sauer said what Mr. Myers discussed made sense and he believed that was a fair request to go back and re-visit with those who fought the battle. Mr. Myers said the Historical Society needs to be notified as well as the other interested parties. Mr. Coulter said before throwing the baby out with the bath water, they would like to proceed with the details and see where they end up at the

end of the meeting. Mr. Brown said he wanted to note he and Mrs. Bitar emailed all of the interested groups that are on the “notify me” list. Mr. Brown also mentioned there is also a motion to amend the PUD, so this matter could go on to City Council eventually if needed. He said they need to discuss the architectural details this evening to get the matter moving forward. Mr. Foust said if he heard Mr. Myers correctly, there are some conceptual issues with the period of the building’s style, and construction materials. Mr. Myers said there were issues within issues. There was the original setback and then that was moved to thirteen feet so the question was, were people willing to accept and they probably would have preferred what was suggested this evening. There were a whole series of compromises during the public discussions. Mr. Myers said he was surprised there has not been more public input and he feels obligated to seek out that input if those people were not at the meeting this evening. He said one of City Councils goals this year is to make sure they do reach out to the citizens

Mr. Sauer agreed this building is different than what was originally planned and because of that he is looking to see how the proposed house would fit into the neighborhood. He said he remembered the other corner to the east, when that house was built, there was a lot of feedback about the house’s size; the house on the southwest corner of New England Avenue and Hartford Street. He said he was concerned about how close the house sits to New England Avenue, and believed the proposed house should have the same setback as the house on the eastern corner so the house fits in the neighborhood.

Mr. Coulter said the design of the house is markedly different than the house that was previously approved and asked why the applicant drastically changed the design and materials. Mr. Luppino asked his client what type of house he wanted to live in, and they discussed what styles would be appropriate for the neighborhood. He said there is always give and take, and compromises, but there were many examples of the proposed house already on New England Avenue. He said they also discussed a family size home, and what type of lifestyle they wanted to live. Mr. Luppino said his client is very excited with the possibility to be able to live on this street. They have small children and would like to have a backyard to play in. He said he thought they were staying within the parameters of the setback. Mr. Coulter suggested tabling the meeting to allow for further public input. Mr. Cleverly said the first home he ever bought was in Worthington in Colonial Hills and he fell in love with the area. He said he wants to be diligent and have the proper home that would fit into the community and be good neighbors. Mr. Cleverly has been a small business owner in the Worthington area for the past thirteen years and he said he does not take this matter lightly. Mr. Brown and Mr. Myers said they would reach out to the other groups to get further input before the next meeting. Mrs. Lloyd reiterated what Mr. Hofmann said about the windows that will be facing downtown Worthington and if there is another treatment option. No answer was given. Mr. Coulter asked why brick was used on the fireplace and stone for the base. Mr. Luppino felt a stone foundation would be common. Mrs. Bitar explained this is a very typical treatment for homes in Worthington to have a stone foundation. Mr. Luppino said there would be a lot of landscaping to help soften the space. Mr. Hofmann asked Mrs. Bitar to refer back to the photograph of the house which was originally approved. He said he prefers the style of the house that was approved for this location. This house will have a huge presence in the downtown area and needs to be carefully

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

Ms. Kay Keller, 670 Morning St., Worthington, Ohio, said she wanted to applaud the concerns which were already expressed and feels they are going in the right direction. She also thanked Mr. Sauer and Mr. Myers for their concerns about the setback. The condominium which was originally proposed for this location was much closer to the road, and she felt they found a good compromise by putting the setback where it is now. Ms. Keller said she was pleased to see this is a one family residence instead of a two-family and would like to see the setback even with the house to the east. Mr. Luppino requested to table the application.

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

Mrs. Bitar said it would be helpful to have some other members weigh in on what should be different, does this house have to be like what was approved before, does the house have to be stone; she said she was not clear on how to advise the applicant and what to do in the next two weeks before coming back to the Board. Mr. Coulter said one of the main concerns is the setback, possibly going back to some of the same materials that were previously approved, possibly going back to some of the same design elements. He also agreed the fence should be placed on the other side of the chimney. Mr. Coulter said he did not hear any disagreement with the style because it is replicative of what is already constructed on nearby property. Mr. Hofmann said anytime you build something downtown there will be challenges. He said materiality, and the simplicity or beautifulness of proportion will matter. Mr. Hofmann said the Board is not dictating what style to bring back for discussion but to take a look at what the other transitional homes are doing. He said most of the other homes probably have some level of hard surface, whether stone or brick, to transition from the retail corridor to the residential area. Mr. Hoffman suggested taking photographs of the features that Mr. Cleverly found appealing and part of the fabric of the downtown neighborhood. Mrs. Holcombe said this house is a transition from the Masonic Lodge and she would like to see the setback even with the new house because they are both new and they will both be sitting out there. She said she does not have an issue with the new plan but she does like the idea of more stone, and felt the second story window was too small.

Mr. Cleverly said he has three small children and when he came before with a plan they drew a line across the front where the setback was approved previously with the thirteen foot setback and they said basically that is the boundary they cannot go beyond. He said they felt they were trying to do better there by just making the edge of the porch and then making the rest of the house come back further. He said he has pressed a lot of the design stage to get a thirty foot back yard for his children to play in, and if he has to give up another seven to ten feet, he may not be able to build on this lot. Mr. Sauer said to be perfectly blunt, if you take a small urban lot and try to put a really large structure on it and try to meet some of the requirements for setback you do end up with a small back yard. He said you cannot sacrifice the fabric of the neighborhood because you want more back yard. Mr. Cleverly said he thought keeping the thirteen foot approved setback was okay. Mr. Brown said he heard four of the Board members refer to this lot as being transitional.

He reminded the Board of when they were going back through this process two and a half or three years ago they did talk about the transition from the commercial area to this lot, the transitional zone, and protecting the houses and residential area to the east. All of the Old Worthington lots are small, and range in size, widths and depths, and having at least a thirty foot rear yard for a family makes sense, but you still have a porch that was active. You could sit on your front porch and engage with people walking up and down New England but you still had that private space for your children in the back. Mr. Coulter suggested to take a look at the setback and see if there is any room to possibly move back some, maybe not all, but closer to be in line with the house to the east. He also suggested meeting with a smaller group of Board members ahead of time, before the next meeting to review plans before they are re-submitted. He also suggested talking with the Old Worthington Association, and the Historical Society, Mr. Foust said he would be abstaining from voting on this application but he had a question. He asked if there is any flexibility in going to a side yard setback to change the shape of the buildable space. Mrs. Bitar said she believed they already had looked at that option because she talked to them about that early on. Mr. Luppino said they heard earlier that keeping the width of the access drive was important and to not crowd the sidewalk because people use that as a means of egress for the church, therefore not wise to make the house wider.

Mr. Sauer moved to table the PUDM application, seconded by Mrs. Holcombe. The application was tabled.

### **3. Subdivision**

- a. Preliminary & Final Plats – **303 E. New England Ave.** (Bob Webb Homes/Johnston) **SUB 02-17** **Remained tabled**

### **4. Rezoning**

- a. C-4, Highway and Automotive Services to WBC-3, Mixed Use – **7007 N. High St.** (The Witness Group/Holiday Inn) **REZ 02-17**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

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

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

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.

City Council adopted the Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning on April, 18 2016, creating new zoning districts and development standards for the Wilson Bridge Corridor. The next step in the process

is to initiate the rezoning of parcels in the corridor to be in compliance with the adopted Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Plan and the Wilson Bridge Corridor Zoning.

This request is to rezone approximately 7.5 +/- acres of land located on the west side of North High Street at 7007 North High Street, south of West Wilson Bridge Road, Parcel #100-001218 from the C-4 District, Highway and Automotive Services to the WBC-3 District, Mixed Use. This parcel currently houses a 232-room Holiday Inn Express.

The property owner (The Witness Group) has been working with the City over the past year on the redevelopment of the site to provide a mix of uses that would complement the Wilson Bridge Corridor.

The proposed redevelopment will still require MPC and ARB approval after the property is rezoned.

**Land Use Plans:**

Wilson Bridge Corridor Study:

The purpose is to promote the redevelopment of the Wilson Bridge Road Corridor into a mixed use area that will generate new economic growth within the City. The Code changes are intended to foster development that strengthens land use and economic value; to encourage a mix of uses; to enhance the livability of the area; to augment pedestrian and bicycle connections; and to promote construction of high-quality buildings and public spaces that help 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.

WBC-3 – Mixed Use:

An area along the WBC that allows for a mix of retail and office uses both vertically and horizontally. Retail uses are encouraged for the first floor of multi-floor developments. Pedestrian facilities and public spaces are encouraged. Some residential uses may be incorporated in this area.

- (1) Permitted Uses: Uses listed in Chapter 1147 of the Codified Ordinances as permitted uses in the following districts: “C-1” Neighborhood Commercial, “C-2” Community Shopping Center, and “C-3” Institutions and Offices.
- (2) Conditional Uses: Residential Uses, Hotels, Motels, Drive-in Commercial Uses, and Breweries, Distilleries and Wineries.
- (3) Maximum Building Height: 3 stories for properties south of Wilson Bridge Rd; except for the WBC-3 Mixed-Use location south of Wilson Bridge Road and west of High Street, where the

maximum building height shall be 3 stories within the westernmost 180 feet and 4 stories in the remaining area; 4 stories for properties north of Wilson Bridge Rd.

Surrounding Zoning & Recommended Land Use:

<b>Direction</b>	<b>Current Zoning</b>	<b>Recommended Land Use</b>
North	C-2 – Community Shopping Center	WBC-3 – Mixed Use
East	C-3 – Institutions & Office	WBC-3 – Mixed Use
South	C-3 – Institutions & Office	C-3 – Institutions & Office
West	R-10 – Low Density Residential AR-3 – Medium Density Apartment Residence	WBC-1 – Medium Density Residential R-10 – Low Density Residential

**Discussion:**

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Jack Reynolds said he is an attorney with Smith & Hale, and representing his client, the owner and the applicant. He said they started looking at this project in 2015 and they were guided by City staff to look at the Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Overlay, and to be in line with the recommendations in that study. Mr. Reynolds said he was asked at the beginning of June to move forward with the rezoning. He said they still have to get the development plan together and approved. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak either for or against this application.

Ms. Carol Meehan, 130 Caren Ave., Worthington, Ohio, said she is trying to sell her home because she does not want to put up with the tear down and rebuilding of the hotel. She said she has had some trouble trying to sell the house that has been on the market since May. Her house is now the first house on the street and you can now see High Street from her back yard. Ms. Meehan said Mr. Patel told her she could help with the landscaping near her home but he has not followed up on that. She said if the greenspace near her was landscaped the area would not look like a big open field. Ms. Meehan said the hedges next door have not been trimmed or cared for and blocks her view when she backs out of the driveway. She was told by Mr. Patel that would also be taken care of but has not been, so she and her grandson had to cut them back. She said her sister almost hit a little girl on a bike because she could not see around the overgrown hedges. Ms. Meehan said she sent a letter to the Public Service Department and asked them to cut the hedges back, but she was told they could not do that because it is private property, and as long as nothing is blocking the sidewalk there is no violation. She said she wanted to object to the variance because she does not want the hotel behind her home torn down. Mr. Coulter said he did read her emails and saw the response from the city. Mr. Coulter suggested having Mr. Patel’s attorney take the message back to him and see if he can take care of some of the issues that were raised this evening.

**Motion:**

Mr. Hofmann moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY THE WITNESS GROUP TO REZONE THE PROPERTY AT 7007 N. HIGH ST. FROM C-4, HIGHWAY AND AUTOMOTIVE SERVICES TO WBC-3,**

**MIXED USE AS PER CASE NO. REZ 02-17, DRAWINGS NO. REZ 02-17, DATED JUNE 21, 2017, BE RECOMMENDED TO THE 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.**

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

**D. Other**

Mr. Brown said they have one more fifteen minute video to watch for ethics training at the ARB-MPC meeting on July 27<sup>th</sup>, 2017.

**E. Adjournment**

Mrs. Holcombe moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:27 p.m., seconded by Mr. Sauer. All Board members voted, "Aye," and the meeting was adjourned.