

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

February 11, 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, Chair; J. Sauer, Vice-Chair; K. Holcombe, Secretary; C. Hermann; A. Lloyd; and M. Coulter. 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. Affirmation/Swearing in of Witnesses

Mr. Hunter stated that the Worthington Square Mall item will not be heard this evening. It has been tabled.

Mr. Hunter explained the procedures for the meeting.

**B. Architectural Review Board**

1. New
  - a. Shed – **862 Hartford St.** (Timothy Meacham) **AR 05-10**

Mrs. Bitar stated that this property has come before the Board in the past. The applicant would like to install a shed, it is 8' x 10' and it's going to be placed on an existing concrete pad. The structure that was on the pad before was sometimes called a garage but it was really a big chicken coop. It got to the point to where the Building Department said that it had to be torn down because it was dangerous. That was a number of years ago and it's been gone for a while but the concrete pad is still there so that's a good location for the shed. It will be five feet from the property line, which is required by code for that size of shed. Mrs. Bitar showed what it will look like and said it will be painted to match the colors of the house.

Mr. Sauer asked about the little dots along the edge of the driveway. The applicant, Mr. Meacham, stated his father drew it and he is not sure what that is.

The applicant, Tim Meacham, 143 Lake Ridge Drive, Worthington, Ohio, came forward. He stated it should be a nice addition for the homeowner because there is not a place to put lawnmowers. He said they will match it up with the house with the blue trim and then the white. He stated people would not be able to see it because of the location of the house. Mr. Sauer asked if the shingles of the shed match the house. Mr. Meacham said yes, the shingles are pretty close to what is on the house.

Mr. Hunter asked if there were any Board Members with questions or comments. He also asked if there was anyone in the audience that wished to speak for or against this application. No one came forward to speak.

Mr. Coulter moved:

**ARB RESOLUTION NO. AR05-10**

**THAT THE REQUESTS BY TIMOTHY MEACHAM FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO PLACE A SHED AT 862 HARTFORD ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 05-10, DRAWINGS NO. AR 05-10, DATED JANUARY 29, 2010, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.**

The motion was seconded by Mr. Sauer. Mrs. Bitar called the roll. All members voted aye. Mr. Hunter said it has been approved.

Mr. Hunter said this concludes Architecture Review.

Mr. Hunter introduced the remaining item on the agenda, Sustainability in the Architectural Review District. There are an Ordinance and a Resolution. The first item is the Ordinance to Amend Chapter 1177 of the Codified Ordinance of the City of Worthington to add Sustainability as a Standard for Review and that would occur in Section 1177.05. Mr. Hunter stated that there is also a Resolution by Council to Amend the Worthington Design Guidelines for the Architectural Review District to add a Sustainability Section.

Mrs. Bitar stated that much of the Board talked about this language at the last meeting however two members were not present. There was one change made after the last meeting to the language in the first paragraph of the Sustainability Section in the Design Guidelines. This will specifically allow the Architectural Review Board to have sustainability features as a standard for review and provide guidelines of what is expected and encouraged as far as sustainability goes.

Mr. Hunter stated that he did not have a problem with the way they are approaching this, which is with a relatively small item as far as Code is concerned He does not want to focus on energy to the exclusion of anything else in that area.

Mr. Hermann stated that under item 11, they started out to include use of renewable energy sources such solar. He would like to add a reference to bike racks and support for alternative modes of transportation and a reference to rain barrels for storm water run-off control. Mrs. Lloyd stated she wondered if they needed to be that specific. Mr. Sauer said he thought this could be more general and refer to the list as to what it might entail.

Mrs. Bitar said the reason this was worded this way is because these things are above grade items that the Board reviews. The guidelines go into different things and this was intended to keep it simple in the Code. Mrs. Bitar stated what she was not trying to list everything that could be reviewed but rather include examples.

Mrs. Holcombe said she feels this is enough information. If they list everything, they could get into trouble if they leave something out. Mr. Sauer stated he is not advocating for listing everything in this paragraph, but rather writing it in a very general way.

Mr. Hunter said other Code sections have specific examples. Mr. Hunter stated that they should include the use of renewable energy sources, environmentally friendly, and conservation factors.

Mr. Coulter referenced an article in the *Columbus Dispatch* on the steps taken by the City of Westerville which have been received negatively. He talked with the reporter about the approach Worthington is taking which he thinks is a better approach that gives the City more flexibility in terms of what people can propose.

Mr. Sauer suggested taking out the reference to solar, bike racks and rain barrels. It would include the use of renewable energy sources, environmental friendly designs and conservation practices.

Mr. Hunter stated he agreed with that general approach with design guidelines providing the examples. Mr. Sauer stated he didn't want this to be an excuse for limiting proposals.

Mr. Coulter said they need to look at this from two perspectives. One is the ordinance that would affect the entire City of Worthington and then there are the design guidelines which affect a very exclusive area. So he would like to have at least some examples, because some people won't know what sustainable means. Rain barrels have been in the paper a lot the last couple of days. Clintonville is getting \$10,000 dollars worth of rain barrels to do testing. Mr. Coulter stated that bike racks have been advocated in Worthington for a longtime. So he would like to see examples for this part because it is more of a global City wide perspective where the design guidelines are more specific to the Architectural Review Board area.

Mrs. Holcombe said if people are going to take the time to read the Code, then they are probably going to move on to the guidelines. Mr. Coulter stated he didn't think they would unless they live in the Architecture Review District.

Mr. Hunter returned to Section 1177.05 and what it defines in the Code. Mr. Sauer said he thought that Section was pertaining to the specific area in the District. Mrs. Bitar confirmed this section of the Code only relates to the Architecture Review District. Mrs. Bitar read Section 1177.05 of the Code. Mrs. Bitar stated that she thought all of these give examples of the element to be reviewed.

Mr. Sauer asked if there should be a reference in this paragraph to the Design Guidelines. Mrs. Bitar stated that the reason they didn't associate the guidelines with the Code is because the Code is the law. If they put the design guidelines in the Code, then they are not what they were meant to be. Mrs. Bitar continued to say that if people want to do a project in the Architectural Review District, they will either find what they're looking for online or they call her and she tells them where to find the information.

Mr. Foust stated that if they use this abbreviated form, it accomplishes two things. It brings it up for review, which gives the Board control over what's appropriate and what's not. Second, it specifically calls out that these are important items which mean that they're encouraging people to take a look at those, which is intent. He said he thought they should start with this as they confront things that call for different language; they have the opportunity to add or change things in the future.

Mr. Hermann suggested a re-write to say "sustainable features, which shall include environmentally friendly design and conservation practices such as solar energy collectors, bike racks and rain barrels". Mr. Hunter stated that he likes renewable energy over solar energy because he doesn't want to limit it to solar.

Mrs. Holcombe said she worries about the "environmentally friendly design" because they want to be sustainable but they also want to protect the architecture. Mr. Hermann suggested "environmentally friendly features" instead. Mr. Hunter stated he liked that better.

Mrs. Holcombe said she think the bottom line is that they are looking to be environmentally friendly. She doesn't think it needs to be in there because they have jurisdiction over this anyway, but they need to state it so that people know that they consider it and that they are aware of it.

Mr. Sauer and Mrs. Lloyd said they support Mr. Hermann's suggestion.

Mr. Hunter asked if anyone in the audience wished to speak.

Mr. Fred Yeager, 285 Bryant, Worthington, Ohio, came forward. He recommended that it be consistent with the other 10 items in the guidelines. It should read like a continual, consistent theme. He wanted to commend them for considering this and giving it due diligence and deliberation. If it is general enough, they can interpret it widely.

Mr. Hunter asked Mr. Hermann to read the language again.

Mr. Hermann said it reads, “Sustainable features which shall include environmentally friendly details and conservation practices such as solar energy collectors, bike racks, and rain barrels”. They could add “renewable energy” after “environmentally friendly details”.

Mr. Sauer said that Mr. Hermann’s version seems more compatible with the way the others are written. Mr. Hunter stated they can move forward with it and they need a motion and the motion needs to include the actual wording of the Item 11.

Mrs. Bitar placed the proposed wording “sustainable features which shall include environmentally friendly details and conservation practices such as solar energy collectors, bike racks, and rain barrels” on the screen.

Mrs. Lloyd stated she was wondering if they should just say solar energy, which could include solar panels or solar thermal. She is hesitant about using the word renewable because she thinks there are many things that could be included in that.

Mr. Hunter asked for comments, concerns or motions.

Mr. Coulter moved:

**SECTION 1 ITEM 11 SUSTAINABLE FEATURES WHICH SHALL INCLUDE ENVIRONMENTALLY FRIENDLY DETAILS AND CONSERVATION PRACTICES SUCH AS SOLAR ENERGY PANELS, BIKE RACKS, AND RAIN BARRELS.**

Mr. Hunter then stated:

**BE RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL TO AMEND CHAPTER 1177 IN THE CODIFIED ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF WORTHINGTON AND TO ADD SUSTAINABILITY STANDARD FOR REVIEW AS IN SECTION 1177.05.**

Mr. Coulter agreed to add Mr. Hunter’s suggestion to the motion. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hermann. Mr. Hunter called for a voice vote. All members voted aye.

Mr. Hunter introduced Item 2, which is the resolution to amend the City of Worthington Design Guidelines for the Architectural Review District to add a Sustainability Section (“Appendix A – Original Draft” attached).

Mr. Sauer asked about the last sentence under Item A, “preserve and enhance green/open spaces wherever practical.” He asked how this would influence decisions. Does this mean that development of the United Methodist Children’s Home would go against this?

Mr. Foust stated that among other things, this suggests someone shouldn't be putting solar panels in the front yard. They are trying to preserve green space, not trying to cover yards with solar panels.

Mr. Hunter stated that he think this language would have helped them when they have considered items in the past.

Mrs. Bitar stated she doesn't think it means people have to preserve all the green spaces, but it gets people thinking about it as they plan their project.

Mr. Sauer then stated that under paragraph C, there are two things he would like to see added. One is a statement that any component or supports which might be exposed to view would be dark in color. Mr. Coulter stated that there may be instances where that is not appropriate. A roof that has a mill finish would look best with supports in the same color. Mr. Sauer stated he understood Mr. Coulter's statement.

For the second item, Mr. Sauer stated he wants to have something that discourages the removal of trees to enhance the effectiveness of solar panels. Mr. Coulter stated he doesn't disagree, but asked if there is an ordinance in effect that prohibits people in the Review District from taking down trees that are in the front. Mrs. Bitar stated "no".

Mr. Foust stated he thought that could be added in the second paragraph under Item C where it says solar panels at any other location on a building or site may be acceptable if their placement does not have an adverse effect on the architecture of the building, and then insert at that point the removal of significant trees or significant vegetation or the character inside the site in the Architectural Review District.

Mrs. Lloyd said that could fall under the character of the site. The language allows them to make that statement without having to specifically state it.

Mr. Sauer said he wants to encourage the use of solar panels, but not imply that they are more important than trees. Mrs. Holcombe said she thinks it's a good point and she thinks trees should be in there.

Mrs. Bitar said Item A mentions landscape concepts and states they often complement energy conservation and should be maintained and replenished. Mrs. Holcomb agreed. Mr. Foust stated that he thinks the Board has the ability to say no to the removal of big trees.

Mr. Sauer moved on to Item G which states, "Use of natural and controlled light for interior spaces and natural ventilation is recommended". He agrees that is a sustainable feature, but he is concerned that they are getting into interior spaces, which they don't regulate. Mrs. Bitar stated that this is the recommendation in the Design Guidelines for design. It can affect the outside and the inside depending on placement of windows and placement of vents on the building. There are a lot of ways that this can affect the outside architecture but also this is a Design Guideline.

This is something to assist people when they are trying to design their project to get them thinking about it.

Mr. Coulter said the way it is written applies it to the outside of the building.

Mr. Foust said he doesn't think they are telling people how to build the building, but they are giving them a list of things to consider.

Mr. Sauer stated he was trying to understand how to use this language. He referred to a home that had a skylight added and the Board found out about it later and ordered it removed.

Mr. Foust said they are really pushing the envelope. The Architectural Review Standards gives them control over these things. They are never going to be able to identify every single thing that might come before them.

Mrs. Bitar said there is another section in the Design Guidelines that specifically says that skylights should be to the rear and not visible from the streets. Mr. Hunter said the argument on that particular situation was the fact that this was a very prominent architectural feature that was completely inappropriate for the era of the house and the neighborhood.

Mr. Sauer said in reading through some of the other items like Items D, E, F, and G, he is wondering about the intent. He thought there might be a way to broaden those descriptions. He distributed a list of items he is proposing (Appendix B – Sauer Proposal).

Mr. Sauer suggested they substitute these items for B, D, E, F & G. Mrs. Holcombe asked everything but C? Mr. Sauer said to leave C and G so he would substitute it for B, D, E, & F.

Mr. Hunter said he has a problem with "four" simply because it addresses a zoning issue. Mrs. Holcombe agreed.

Mr. Sauer said actually 4, 7 & 8 are all zoning issues. He didn't know if there's a way of including those somehow but he is thinking if they are interested in sustainable practices in communities, then it is something they should think about. Mr. Sauer referred to Number 5. They are trying to reduce and control storm water, run off, and filter pollutants. So he suggests they foster ways to do that and not limit it to rain gardens and permeable pavement.

Mrs. Bitar stated the other version goes on to say "rain barrels and other such means that conserve water and filter pollutants".

Mrs. Holcombe stated that she thinks his suggestions are well thought out, but she thinks almost everything is already in the language. Mr. Sauer said Number 9 is not there. Mr. Hunter said Number 3 is not included.

Mrs. Lloyd wanted to know what they were talking about with “reduce heat elements”. Mr. Sauer suggested things such as roofs, paving, color of paving, shading, the amount of trees in a parking lot, tree islands, and vegetation islands.

Mr. Coulter suggested adding Numbers 3 and 9.

Mrs. Bitar said an average person looking at this would not understand “heat islands effect.” Mr. Sauer stated that there might be another way of saying the same thing or trying to get the principle across. Mrs. Bitar said that she still does not really understand what he means by “heat islands.” Mr. Sauer explained that heat islands are things that absorb heat and then make the micro environment warmer. That’s why cities are warmer in the summertime than the countryside because of black paving and other materials that absorb heat. Cities are a lot warmer and have a higher temperature than the countryside does.

Mr. Hunter said they have to walk the line of this issue with the need for parking for a given type of business. That is addressed in other parts of the Code. Mr. Hunter said if a business doesn’t have enough parking, then the businesses’ activities into street parking and other areas.

Mr. Sauer stated he is looking at sustainability and sustainable communities and the excess of parking areas cause problems. It fosters increased use of automobiles because things are too far apart and people have to get in their car to get to the next stop rather than walk to it.

Mr. Hunter reminded the group they are dealing with Design Guidelines that are being read by people that are not experts.

Mr. Sauer said he wants to look for ways to help educate the public as to the design of a sustainable community. Sustainability is more than rain barrels and bike racks. Mr. Hunter said he thinks the material already reflects that and he doesn’t want to get into negativity

Mrs. Bitar stated that she thinks Mr. Sauer is thinking of commercial projects and they don’t turn to this document as much as residential users.

Mr. Sauer stated that maybe he is trying to put too much into it. They can go with a couple steps and once the community is educated, they can take it another step. Mrs. Holcombe stated that he has a good thought process and a lot of it is covered here but she thinks that less is best. Mr. Hunter said that they will refine it in the next few years. The Design Guidelines are not rigid; they will be modified in the future.

Mr. Sauer asked if Item No. 9 could be included. Mr. Hunter stated he wanted to do that because they have not addressed light pollution. Mr. Sauer stated that light pollution is not an issue in residential as much as commercial. Mr. Coulter stated it can be an issue when they are putting lights in yards. Mrs. Holcombe said she thinks the light from one property shouldn’t bleed over to another. Mr. Hermann agreed.

Mr. Hunter said he thinks they should use wording that minimizes light pollution and holds light within one property. Mrs. Bitar stated there is a regulation on it. She quoted the language in the Code, “any land or building in any district shall not direct a glare that is visible from any property outside an ‘I’ district or from any public street road or highway”.

Mr. Coulter said he thinks this is a little different and he likes the idea of addressing light pollution. Mr. Hunter said he thinks it should “read minimize light pollution”.

Mr. Sauer mentioned the area where they talk about bike racks. He asked if there is anything that talks about designs which are pedestrian friendly. Mrs. Bitar said it is one of the other review elements that is already in the Code and it is addressed in several other places in the Guidelines. Mr. Foust mentioned that “E” says streetscape elements should be of the human scale.

Mr. Sauer said pedestrian friendly means looking at the circulation of traffic and how it interrelates with the circulation of pedestrians. Mr. Hunter suggested adding to Item A, “streetscape elements should be of a human scale and pedestrian friendly”. Mr. Sauer asked if they should expand D to promote something other than the automobile. Mr. Hunter said he think that’s what it does.

Mrs. Bitar said the Standards for Review section of the Code references a pedestrian environment that shall include the provision of features which enhance pedestrian movement and environment which relate to the pedestrians visual perspective.

Mr. Sauer asked if there is anything in there that addresses sidewalks and bike paths. Mrs. Bitar said she does not think it is in the Code. She said the guidelines mention sidewalk connections and but they don’t specifically address bikeway design. Mr. Hunter said he thinks they already have the authority to discuss those issues.

Mr. Hermann suggested Item H be revised to state “careful use and placement of lighting and fixtures to minimize light pollution”. Mr. Hunter said he likes it just the way it is.

Mr. Hunter reminded the Board this is a recommendation to City Council to adopt the Ordinance and Resolution. The Board already made the recommendation on the Ordinance.

Mr. Sauer returned to the discussion of the color of solar panels and he thought Mr. Coulter said something that was reasonable. He asked if they should say the color of components and supports should be compatible with those of the building.

Mrs. Holcombe said that she thinks is getting too specific. Mrs. Lloyd suggested that it is something they can look at when an item is before them. Mr. Hunter agreed.

Mr. Sauer said he agrees and is trying to minimize the visual impact. Other sections of the Guidelines are very specific. Mrs. Bitar suggested they could change the last sentence to indicate it should be screened from view or blend in.

The Board discussed the statement in the proposed Guidelines that indicates flat panels should be five feet back from the edge. They discussed that it should probably say “at least” five feet, because the panels at Evening Street are probably further back than five feet.

Mr. Coulter moved:

**RESOLUTION NO. XX – 2010**

**THAT THE WORTHINGTON DESIGN GUIDELINES FOR THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW DISTRICT BE AMENDED TO ADD A SUSTAINABILITY SECTION AS SHOWN ON THE SCREEN (“Appendix C – Final Draft” attached) BE RECOMMENDED TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL.**

The motion was seconded by Mr. Sauer. Mr. Hunter called for a vote. All members voted aye.

Mr. Sauer asked how big a rain garden must be. Mrs. Bitar said it doesn’t have to be a specific size. A small one will take in a portion of the water from the yard. Mr. Sauer referred to the last parking lot that was brought to them and he said he thought the rain garden should be larger to be practical. He asked if there is a certain size of rain garden based on a percentage of paved area.

Mr. Hermann said typically it is based on the amount of rainwater due to the square footage and type of impervious surface. The amount of square footage will directly correlate to the amount of runoff depending on the location in the United States and that will then impact the size of the rain garden.

Mr. Hunter mentioned he does not think people are using permeable pavement in Worthington. Mrs. Bitar said the application that was approved at the last meeting planned permeable pavers for the whole rear yard in a residential application. She has also talked with someone else that is interested in using them.

Mr. Hermann said that he appreciates Mrs. Bitar’s efforts in putting this all together.

Mr. Hunter asked if there was anything else to be discussed.

Mrs. Bitar said she has one more thing. There was an application on the agenda for the first meeting is January for Mr. & Mrs. Brankamp on Hartford Street for putting in a generator. Mr. Brankamp would like the option of putting it to the rear of the house instead of putting it on the side. He will still screen it with vegetation and it is still far from the neighbors. Mrs. Bitar said she wants to try to find a way to do it, but the Building Department has changed the way they do things. In the past, when there have been minor modifications or someone wants to come in and

do something that doesn't change the character of the house at all and it's just a simple change, staff has been able to sign off on it. Those types of things now, because it's not specifically in the Code, are not going to be accepted. So she may have Mr. Brankamp come in next time in front of the Board.

Mr. Hunter asked if he hears any objection by any of the members to this change. The members said "no".

Mr. Hunter asked if an air conditioning unit in the rear yard must come in front of the Board. Mrs. Bitar stated "yes". Structures, defined as anything permanently located on the ground or attached to a building, must come before the Board

Mrs. Holcombe stated the Board previously voted to allow staff to approve items.

Mrs. Bitar said the Code Review Committee can review this item. Mr. Hunter suggested the condenser sits on a concrete pad but is not attached to that concrete pad.

Mrs. Bitar said the Code Review Committee will discuss it.

Mrs. Holcombe said she would like the Code Review Committee to consider the fact that the Board voted to give staff approval authority. Mr. Hermann suggested they may want to add language to the Code on administrative approvals.

Mr. Sauer asked if the lights on J Lui's were approved by the Board. Mr. Hermann and Mrs. Holcombe stated they should be reviewed by the Board if they were not previously approved. Mrs. Bitar stated she will check to see if they were approved.

Mrs. Holcombe moved the meeting be adjourned with Mr. Hermann seconding the motion. All members voted aye. The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 PM.

“Appendix A – Original Draft”

Sustainability:

Sustainability can be achieved by ensuring the economic, environmental and social concerns of Worthington are addressed in a balanced manner. The City of Worthington and its Architectural Review Board are interested in encouraging sustainable design and building practices, while preserving the character and integrity of the Architectural Review District. The Design Guidelines as a whole work toward that end; and this section addresses additional measures for sustainability.

Recommendations:

A. Energy conservation methods are encouraged. Making use of the existing buildings inherent efficiency features should occur first. Maintaining building components in good condition helps preserve energy, as well as retaining the integrity of the property. Landscape concepts often complement energy conservation and should be maintained and replenished. Utilize indigenous plant materials, trees, and landscape features, especially those which perform passive solar energy functions such as sun shading and wind breaks. Preserve and enhance green/open spaces wherever practicable.

B. Manage storm water run-off through the use of rain gardens, permeable forms of pavement, rain barrels and other such means that conserve water and filter pollutants.

C. Place solar panels in a location that minimizes the visual impact as seen from the right-of-way and surrounding properties. Generally, panels should be located on roofs in the following manner: the rear 50% of the roof off a main building; the rear inside quadrant of the roof of a main building on a corner lot; or on accessory structures in the rear yard. On sloped roofs, place panels flush along the roof unless visibility is decreased with other placement. With flat roofs, keep panels 5' from the edge of the roof, or place at the edge if a building parapet exists that will screen the panels.

Solar panels at another location on a building or site may be acceptable if their placement does not have an adverse effect on the architecture of the building, or the character of the site or Architectural Review District.

The equipment to support solar panels should be screened from view.

D. Bike racks and other methods of facilitating alternative transportation should be utilized.

E. Streetscape elements should be of a human scale.

F. Make use of recycled materials; rapidly renewable materials; and energy efficient materials.

G. Use of natural and controlled light for interior spaces and natural ventilation is recommended.

“Appendix B – Sauer Proposal”

Designs and Practices Are Encouraged Which:

1. Are friendly pedestrians and bike riders (bike racks, bike paths, sidewalks)
2. Encourage use of recycled and rapidly renewable materials
3. Reduce the heat island effect
4. Foster mixed use development and multiple housing types
5. Reduce and control storm water run-off and filter pollutants (rain gardens, permeable paving)
6. Reduce use of potable water for irrigation (rain barrels, drip irrigation)
7. Increase % of vegetation in parking lots (zoning)
8. Reduce requirements for parking (zoning)
9. Minimize light pollution

“Appendix C – Final Draft”

Sustainability:

Sustainability can be achieved by ensuring the economic, environmental and social concerns of Worthington are addressed in a balanced manner. The City of Worthington and its Architectural Review Board are interested in encouraging sustainable design and building practices, while preserving the character and integrity of the Architectural Review District. The Design Guidelines as a whole work toward that end; and this section addresses additional measures for sustainability.

Recommendations:

A. Energy conservation methods are encouraged. Making use of the existing buildings inherent efficiency features should occur first. Maintaining building components in good condition helps preserve energy, as well as retaining the integrity of the property. Landscape concepts often complement energy conservation and should be maintained and replenished. Utilize indigenous plant materials, trees, and landscape features, especially those which perform passive solar energy functions such as sun shading and wind breaks. Preserve and enhance green/open spaces wherever practicable.

B. Manage storm water run-off through the use of rain gardens, permeable forms of pavement, rain barrels and other such means that conserve water and filter pollutants.

C. Place solar panels in a location that minimizes the visual impact as seen from the right-of-way and surrounding properties. Generally, panels should be located on roofs in the following manner: the rear 50% of the roof off a main building; the rear inside quadrant of the roof of a main building on a corner lot; or on accessory structures in the rear yard. On sloped roofs, place panels flush along the roof unless visibility is decreased with other placement. With flat roofs, keep panels at least 5' from the edge of the roof, or place at the edge if a building parapet exists that will screen the panels.

Solar panels at another location on a building or site may be acceptable if their placement does not have an adverse effect on the architecture of the building, or the character of the site or Architectural Review District.

The equipment to support solar panels should be screened from view.

D. Bike racks and other methods of facilitating alternative transportation should be utilized.

E. Streetscape elements should be of a human scale.

F. Make use of recycled materials; rapidly renewable materials; and energy efficient materials.

G. Use of natural and controlled light for interior spaces and natural ventilation is recommended.

H. Minimize light pollution.