

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

April 8, 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; C. Hermann; A. Lloyd; and J. Rodgers . Also present were Council Member D. Foust and L. Bitar, Development Coordinator. Members absent: K. Holcombe, Secretary; M. Coulter;

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

1. Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Approval of minutes of the meeting of March 25, 2010.

Mr. Sauer questioned the motion on page six of the minutes regarding the fences. The motion that was presented discussed an eight-foot fence and during the discussion they talked about increasing it from eight feet to ten feet. He indicated he didn't think it was clear that the fence height would be ten feet not eight feet. Mr. Hunter said he remembers both the motion and recommendation to council was ten feet. Mrs. Bitar said the ordinance for ten feet has already been introduced and there was a memo from the planning commission so this is just a formality. Mr. Hunter asked if it would be acted upon at the next city council meeting. Mrs. Bitar said it will be heard on April 19, 2010, at the same meeting as the Veterans Memorial classification.

Mr. Hunter asked if there were any other changes corrections or additions or motions.

Mr. Sauer moved the minutes be approved with Mr. Hermann seconding the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

Mr. Hunter explained the procedures for the meeting.

4. Affirmation/Swearing in of Witnesses

Mrs. Bitar swore in those who planned to speak.

B. Architectural Review Board

1. Unfinished

a. Sign – 862 Proprietors Rd. (Steve Tipton) AR 14-10

Mrs. Bitar said this is a proposal for signage for the newest building at the Worthington Station Project. This building has two suites in it and the owner wanted a way to identify them and initially was thinking of a free standing sign. Looking at it and as the whole development, there are already two free standing signs approved for the development and they were both at entrances so they went back and decided to do a wall sign instead. The design has signs that hang down from the eaves. They are going to be stationary and will be made of wood; they are not going to dangle. They are proposing an emerald green background. They are relatively small, 16 square foot signs each. Staff felt this was a good solution for this building given the nature of these buildings.

Mr. Steve Tipton, applicant, 4472 Ambridge Lane, Centerville, Ohio, came forward. Mr. Tipton said has been working with Mrs. Bitar on a solution for signs for the doctor in his rental space and she came up with a very good idea. The development had been planned to have a train station look. She suggested they could suspend something like this and it might give it that look. They thought that was a great idea and so did the doctor. They want to suspend it out away from the building to give it the feel of pulling into a train station and to be able to get it long enough. It covers a little bit of the windows but it is not right on top of the window. This makes them big enough to be readable from the street since it will be back just a little bit further. He indicated he has color samples this evening. Unfortunately the doctor is on vacation and he turned his cell phone off. The doctor indicated he wants emerald green. So Mr. Tipton tried to find that color. Mr. Tipton indicated the building is painted in the green family, so they didn't want to go too light and they want the white lettering to stand out.

Mr. Sauer asked if there were two greens proposed. Mr. Tipton said they would probably go with the lighter of the two greens. Mr. Hunter stated it is the emerald. Mr. Tipton said yes, the emerald color. Mr. Tipton asked if they have any objection if the doctor wanted to go with the darker green. Members indicated they were okay with either.

Mr. Hermann said he likes the idea and placement of the signs, and has no problem with anything proposed other than phone numbers on signs in this situation. Mr. Sauer agreed that a phone number is inappropriate for this particular sign.

Mr. Sauer asked about the plans to put signage on the other buildings. Mr. Tipton said he did not know since he is not helping to develop them.

Mrs. Bitar said there are no current plans to put signage on the other buildings but she won't be surprised if there are in the future. The condominium association has looked

over this proposal and signed off on it and felt that it is something that they can carry through to other buildings.

Mr. Sauer said he would like to see whatever is done on one building done on all the buildings, because there is already the precedent of all buildings having similar character and design and it's only logical that this be carried down. Mr. Sauer clarified that it is white copy on a green background. Mr. Tipton concurred. Mr. Sauer said the drawing has a white border around the sign.

Mr. Tipton said they want to have them sandblasted them so they take a block of wood and blast in the green. They paint it green and the white remains on the surface and they paint it white so it raises out, similar to hole markers at golf courses.

Mr. Hunter said he thinks it sets a good precedence for the development as a whole. He doesn't think the phone number is not needed. Mr. Tipton said he did not know of any objection to taking that off.

Ms. Lloyd asked if there were address markers on the other side. She thought that would be more useful. Mr. Hunter indicated he would be fine with that. Mrs. Bitar said the addresses are on the free standing sign and then there are some directional signs. Mr. Sauer said the addresses are on the free standing sign at the entrance. He would prefer to keep them there rather than place them on the building. Mr. Hunter states he thinks that would be less confusing.

Mr. Tipton said he would be willing to take the phone number off and shorten the sign by six inches and just leave "Kevin S. Huelsman, DDS" on it. Mr. Hunter said he felt that sets the precedent for future signs for single line copy. Mr. Sauer questioned whether they would run into a situation where the sign needs to be longer due to the length of the name(s).

Mr. Sauer asked Mr. Tipton about his role. Mr. Tipton said he is assisting the doctor in the development process. Tipton Construction is building the structure and he is helping in the design process.

Mr. Sauer said they had asked for screening around the utilities. He doesn't think that meets the Board's intentions. Mr. Tipton agreed. They know they need to paint the risers to hide them as best they can and put plantings there. There will be more plantings in front of the transformer. Mr. Hunter said the plantings need to be a little bit bigger.

Mr. Sauer said the utilities against the building were supposed to be painted to match the building and blend in.

Mr. Tipton said he will make sure they are painted.

Mr. Sauer stated that the plant material is really tiny. Mr. Hermann asked if there is a code requirement on the plantings around the foundation. Mrs. Bitar said they must comply with the size shown on their drawings when they were approved and she doesn't believe there was a specific size shown. She thinks they were to be in line with what is around the other buildings, which started out a little bit larger.

Mr. Sauer said he was expecting something that was similar to what the other buildings have around the foundation.

Mr. Hunter said the existing building has roughly 18-inch foundation plantings.

Mr. Hunter said they are going to have to be more careful on what they approve on landscape plans on planting sizes.

Mrs. Bitar said she did not think the landscape plan was specific as to size but that it was to match the other buildings.

Mr. Tipton said he will bring it to the doctor's attention and he assured them that he will change it.

Mr. Hunter said that overall he likes the building. The building itself is fine.

Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone in the audience who wished to speak for or against this application. No one came forward.

Mr. Hermann moved:

ARB RESOLUTION NO. AR14-10

THAT THE REQUEST BY STEVE TIPTON FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO ADD SIGNAGE TO THE BUILDING AT 862 PROPRIETORS ROAD AS PER CASE NO. AR14-10 DRAWINGS NO. AR14-10 DATED MARCH 12, 2010, BE APPROVED WITH THE EMERALD GREEN COLOR OR DARKER AND THE PHONE NUMBER MUST BE REMOVED FROM THE SIGN AND THE SIGN CAN BE REDUCED IN HEIGHT BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

The motion was seconded by Mrs. Lloyd.

Mrs. Bitar called the roll. All members voted aye.

C. Municipal Planning Commission

1. Conditional Use Permit

a. Automotive Services Major in I-1 – **6330-F Proprietors Rd.**, (Ayers) CU 01-10

Mrs. Bitar said this classification of use is a conditional use in the district because of the potential for hazardous chemicals. However they have seen many of these types of paint booths over the last few years so they have seen that they are very safe and they take a lot of precautions to make this a safe use. The other thing they are particularly concerned about with this type of a use is that the cars that are damaged are not parked out in front of the building. The applicant says they will either park them behind or inside and mainly they will be inside. They are committed not to park any vehicle with too much damage out in front of the building. There is a pretty big parking lot out in the front area. There are many potential spaces and hopefully that will mostly be for employee parking. There is space behind the building and they have extra room to park vehicles. There is a car shop that is on the south side of the building and she is not sure exactly what they do. Those were the only concerns and she believes the applicant addressed those concerns with staff.

Mr. Bryan Ayers, the applicant, 4860 Veley Road in Delaware, Ohio, came forward. He introduced Matt Tripp who is his business partner. They are applying for the permit to install the booth within the building and to operate in the I-1 area. They are using PPG's, the latest in technology, and water born products, which are low VOC. The booth that they are using is a brand, new state-of-the-art system that they haven't purchased yet but they are hoping to do so very soon. It is set up to adhere to the EPA's new area source rules that are going into effect within the next year or so. It will be more than 98% efficient in filtering the air and the contaminants within the booth. Regarding the parking, they have a wholesale base of their business in which they do work for dealerships and they do retail work as well. Much of that work is minor damage on bumpers, scratches and things of that nature. Those vehicles would be parked within the spaces that are available out front because they are not going to be an eyesore. It is very important for them to have a retail face out front. They want to be friendly and not have a bunch of wrecked cars. They hope to grow the business and build it, but they do have space to park those heavier hit vehicles. They will be within their shop where there is room to park six vehicles. It has doors on both ends to allow them to create a chain of work and be able to move those cars through efficiently.

Mr. Hunter said he did not notice any fencing on the railroad side. He asked if they are planning to do security fencing if they park there.

Mr. Ayers said there is not space for a fence behind their building because there is an alley that runs behind it. They work up in Lewis Center currently. They haven't had any

ARB and MPC Meeting—April 8, 2010

issues at their current location. If they have any vehicles for which they have that concern, they would probably be parked within the building.

Mr. Hunter said speaking as an ex-owner of a building just a little bit south of there, they do get kids and occasional problems. Mr. Ayers said they will keep that in mind.

Mr. Hunter said he has no problem with the facility.

Mr. Sauer said he has a concern. His concern is that directly across the street is an apartment building. He is a little concerned about locating this type of a business directly across from a residential area. As they grow, he sees the potential for the lot out front to start filling up with vehicles getting ready to have their repairs made and he doesn't think that it's appropriate directly across the street from a residential area. He realizes it's an apartment building and not a single family home.

Mr. Hunter said this is also I-1.

Mr. Sauer said he understood that, but he doesn't feel comfortable. He is concerned about pressure on the residential area apartment building, which has a tendency to eventually put pressure on the single family homes behind it as well.

Mrs. Bitar asked if that is because of the cars that will be parked out there and the potential that there will be damaged vehicles parked there. Mr. Sauer indicated yes.

Mr. Hermann said he's alright with it. He said they can talk to the applicant, if it gets to the point where they have that many damaged vehicles, they can talk about their need to come back in and put in some kind of wall or green screen.

Mr. Sauer said he doesn't want it to get to the point that they are there and then the condition develops and they have to go back and try to get some sort of resolution to it.

Mr. Hunter said the previous application in this building was a handicapped vehicle construction plant operated by Worthington Columbus Prescriptions. This building was part of their vehicle construction facility and there were vans in a variety of states of modification prior to this application and there wasn't any problem. Down the street from this was a ready-mix plant at one time and Worthington Foods, which had interesting odors every once in a while. This is an industrial district and the industrial district actually predates the apartment building. He doesn't see a problem. This isn't in the Architectural Review District. If the cars don't run, he wouldn't expect to see them in that parking lot. He suggested they could make that a condition of the approval. He thinks it is a good use for the building.

Mr. Sauer said he is not concerned with the activities inside the building because there is equipment that can control that. Mr. Hunter said this is industrial. Mr. Sauer replied

ARB and MPC Meeting—April 8, 2010

that he understands that, but he is not comfortable. Mr. Sauer said it's the edge of a neighborhood, mostly residential on the west side and light industrial on the other side. The neighborhood is under various kinds of pressures right now and he sees it transitioning if they're not careful and he doesn't want to push it any further.

Mr. Hunter said he does not think this pushes it at all. This is a conditional use and it is one of the lighter impacts that could be put into this facility.

Mrs. Bitar said that they could put conditions on they type of vehicle that could be parked out front.

Mr. Ayers asked if he could respond to that. First, the size of the shop allows six cars to fit within it, but there's only one booth so the number of largely hit cars is going to be very limited. A good part of what they do is retail and minor cosmetic work and refinish the bumps. They want to get those bigger hit jobs because they pay more, but they're not going to have that volume of cars sitting around. The bigger shops have multiple booths and they are able to produce more cars more quickly. It will be a limited volume of work. Secondly, the height of this shop is significantly higher than the other area. It's 25 feet approximately. The exhaust pipe is going to be roughly 30 feet above street level and the prevailing winds are going towards the manufacturing area. They don't want to be unfriendly with the neighbors. Their business is largely going to be retail and they want to be able to have customers walk into the shop. They are not going to gain anything by having heavily hit cars parked out front. He would be happy to talk about an agreement to make them more comfortable.

Mr. Hunter asked about how the business operates. He is hearing this is not metal forming and fender banging. They are replacing parts and painting

Mr. Ayers said they have evolved from a spot repair company and are now refinishing bumpers for dealerships. They replace fenders and they do minor collision repair. They want collision repair to diversify their business. They have the retail, the wholesale and they want to be able to offer the insurance work. It will supplement what they currently do. They are going to take as much as they can but they can only produce so much out of the shop with one booth.

Mr. Sauer said he hears a description of how they might be operating for the first year or two. He also hears they want to expand and grow and take on more. If they succeed, then the potential exists that there could be a lot of vehicles out front that are banged up and the people across the street will have to live with that. He is not comfortable with imposing that on them.

Mr. Ayers said he wants to grow the business and he wants to be able to take on some of the collision repair from the insurance work. So they are currently not doing big insurance jobs right now, but it will happen.

ARB and MPC Meeting—April 8, 2010

Mr. Hunter asked Mr. Sauer if there is a way someone could construct a motion that he would vote for it. Mr. Sauer said he would want something that would take care of and hide any possibility of seeing it.

Mrs. Holcombe asked how many cars they could put through in a day. Mr. Ayers said they haven't pushed that envelope to understand fully the capabilities of the booth. It would probably be two or three cars a day.

Mrs. Holcombe said if she is getting her major collision car fixed and they can't get to it for five days because they have too many cars backed up, then she will go somewhere else. She suggested a compromise requiring them to come back before adding another booth which would allow them to expand their capacity

Mr. Sauer said he would like to see screening issues addressed now. He is thinking there could be a week or two worth of work sitting out front.

Mr. Foust said he is thinking of screening and problem issues they have on Proprietors Road and the only one that comes to mind is with the Worthington Station Development where they had concerns about the Railway Museum and some of their older equipment. He asked if there other complaints that Mrs. Bitar is aware of that have come in on Proprietors Road in the last couple years. Mrs. Bitar said she is not aware of any.

Mr. Foust said he did work in that apartment complex across the street a couple years ago and he remembers there they have two buildings and a very large courtyard in the middle. He doesn't remember any entrances on the Proprietors Road side. He remembered the entrances being on the other side, not on the east side.

Mr. Sauer said there is that apartment unit that's directly opposite the lot.

Mr. Hunter said he suspects the applicant doesn't have three votes out of three and he suggested tabling the item so the entire Planning Commission could hear the item. Mr. Foust clarified it would delay it two weeks.

Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone in the audience who wished to speak for or against this application. No one came forward.

Mr. Ayers asked if the Commission has suggestions for screening. They are limited because they don't own the property.

Mr. Sauer said the building to the north has a fenced area in back and they have cars inside that fenced area so that's where they keep their cars. The cars are behind the building and people don't see them.

ARB and MPC Meeting—April 8, 2010

Mrs. Bitar asked who uses that area. Mr. Ayers said he is not sure but he has requested the opportunity to use it if it becomes available.

Mr. Hunter said there is a chain link fence to the right of the photo that was shown. It looks like it contains construction material.

Mr. Ayers said there is a significant amount of space behind the building that would hold, in his estimate, five cars parked front to back. His last pitch of the night is that they are very limited in terms as to what they are able to produce out of the shop. The shop does not have room to put an additional booth in, so they would need another building at that point.

Mr. Sauer asked if the area behind the building can be fenced in and all vehicles that are being worked on be kept inside the fenced area.

Mr. Hunter said this is matter that they can't adjudicate this evening. It needs to be tabled and the applicant needs to go back to the owner and they need the full Board.

Mr. Hunter said he is not comfortable creating a motion that says, "no overnight parking" or anything like that out front, which is what Mr. Sauer is asking for. If a client drives in and wants to leave his car there and it's damaged they don't have any control over that. Mr. Sauer said he understands, which again is part of his concern.

Mr. Ayers said cars that are dropped off are not going to be heavily hit. Those cars are going to be towed in and delivered to them.

Mr. Hunter said this is an industrial district and this could be a very intensive manufacturing facility with three shifts. If they want to have a motion or conditional use requirement that says non-driveable vehicles will not be left outside, he doesn't have a problem with that, but Mr. Sauer is suggesting he doesn't want anything around.

Mr. Sauer said it's a body shop and he doesn't think a body shop belongs on the other side of the street from a residence. If he were living in that apartment he would not be happy and he is just thinking the neighborhood is under enough duress and they should not create more problems.

Mr. Hermann moved to table. The motion was seconded by Mr. Sauer. The motion was approved.

Mr. Hunter suggested Mr. Ayers go back to the owner and discuss the areas that could be enclosed with fencing that would shield the collision vehicles. As far as a general parking lot, he doesn't see any restriction and he doesn't agree with Mr. Sauer.

Mrs. Bitar said this item will be on the agenda for the April 22nd meeting if that works for him. If he has anything he wants to amend, she indicate he should let her know.

D. Other

1. Planning and Zoning Code Amendments

a. ARB – Administrative Approval of Certain Projects

Mrs. Bitar said she prefers to postpone this discussion again.

Mrs. Bitar said she had one other item she would like to bring before the Board. The City Manager and staff have decided to grant a temporary use permit for 90 days for a garden center that will locate in the parking lot on the south side of the old CVS.

Mrs. Bitar said she thinks it will be a nice use for that area and it brings back some of what Jubilee used to have. It's only for 90 days and if something doesn't work out, they won't do it again next year. This is a retail district; it's not like others that have been approved elsewhere that were not in retail districts.

Mr. Sauer asked if this is the one that used to be down High Street. Mrs. Bitar said this is a Worthington family, the Brankamp's. Mr. Brankamp is the accountant and one of his sons is interested in horticulture and has studied it. They have suppliers and it sounds like they know what they are getting into with this.

Mrs. Bitar said the reason she wanted to talk to the Board is because they talked about having signage on High Street and there is a vacant space on the sign out front. It would just be temporary; they are talking about putting a temporary vinyl adhesive over top of the sign panel on the bottom and it would look like Worthington Garden Center. The only other sign that they are going to have is a sandwich board by their operation, which is right by the building on the south side. She wanted to get some thoughts on doing something like that. She didn't think a temporary sandwich board would be appropriate out at the High Street entrance.

Mr. Hunter said this is no different than the typical temporary banner that was used for the yard show for the Worthington Mall, the Fire Department and several other locations.

Mr. Foust said if they apply vinyl letters to that and if they apply it right to the white face, he thinks they have to hold them to the opaque signage requirement and not have it illuminated.

Mr. Sauer asked about a larger sandwich board. Mrs. Bitar stated she didn't think they wanted a larger one. Mr. Hunter indicated he likes it as proposed.

ARB and MPC Meeting—April 8, 2010

Mr. Hermann said he would either want it to look absolutely homemade or he wants the letters cut out nicely. He wants it to look classic or he wants it to be obvious that it's a temporary sign.

Mr. Foust indicated they are working with Sign-A-Rama. They have a program with a vinyl cutter and they just cut out the vinyl letters and they stick them on whatever board they're going to stick them. His guess is that they're looking at a professional looking sign.

Mrs. Bitar said they should be starting soon.

E. Adjournment

There being no further business, Mr. Sauer moved to adjourn with Mr. Herman seconding the motion. All members voted aye. The meeting was adjourned at 8:29 p.m.