



MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
WORTHINGTON ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
WORTHINGTON MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION
December 14, 2017

The regular meeting of the Worthington Architectural Review Board and the Worthington Municipal Planning Commission was called to order at 7:00 p.m. with the following members present: Mikel Coulter, Chair; Kathy Holcombe, Secretary; Edwin Hofmann; Amy Lloyd (arrived at 7:37 p.m.); 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; Thomas Lindsey, Law Director; and Melissa Cohan, Paralegal. Commission member Thomas Reis was absent. Board member Amy Lloyd arrived at 7:37 PM.

A. Call to Order – 7:00 p.m.

1. Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Approval of minutes of the October 26, 2017 meeting

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

4. Affirmation/swearing in of witnesses

B. Architectural Review Board – Unfinished

1. Addition & Windows – **117 W. South St.** (Ketrone Custom Builders/Graf & Johnston)
AR 94-17

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This Cape Cod style home was constructed in 1939, with a large addition and a deck added in the late 1990's. This request is for approval to construct a 4' rear addition and replace windows.

Project Details:

1. The proposed addition would be to the rear of the house in the center, with the first floor wall being 4' to the south to expand the family room area. Sliding doors are proposed that would match existing doors on the rear of the house, and steps would be added to allow access to the rear yard. Proposed exterior materials would match the existing, including Cedar siding, asphalt shingles, and composite steps.
2. Eight windows in the front of the house (4 on the front and 2 on each side) are proposed for replacement with Marvin casement windows styled to look like double-hung windows. The windows are proposed to be wood windows clad in white aluminum, with simulated divided lights to match the pattern in the existing windows.
3. A set of two windows is proposed for the rear dormer at the west end of the house to replace the existing single window. The same Marvin windows are proposed.

Land Use Plans:Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Residential additions are recommended to maintain similar roof forms; be constructed as far to the rear and sides of the existing residence as possible; be subordinate; and have walls set back from the corners of the main house. Be sure that window designs are appropriate for the style or time period of the house. Design and materials should be traditional, and compatible with the existing structure.

Compatibility of design and materials, exterior detail and relationships, and window treatment are standards of review in the Architectural District ordinance.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of this application, as the proposed addition and window changes meet the Design Guidelines and are appropriate for this house.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Travis Ketron, with Ketron Custom Builders, 3611 Deeds Rd., Granville, Ohio, said he would be using a Marvin SDL aluminum clad with wood interior for the windows. They will only be adding a four foot bump out to the back of the house, and matching the doors to the previous addition and all of the materials will match the existing house.

Mr. Sauer asked Mr. Ketron if he was proposing to change all of the windows from double hung windows to casement windows and Mr. Ketron replied, "Yes." Mr. Coulter asked why they were switching out the windows for casement style and Mr. Ketron said because his client requested that style of window. Mrs. Sarah Johnston, the home owner, said she requested the casement style of window because she and her husband are getting older and the casement windows are easier to open. Mr. Hofmann asked why she was only adding four feet to the house and Mrs. Johnston said she did not want to rip out the nice work her husband did on building the fire pit, and she also did not want to lose her garden. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone who wanted to speak for or against this application and no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Hofmann moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY KETRON CUSTOM BUILDERS ON BEHALF OF SARAH ILES JOHNSTON & FRITZ GRAF FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO CONSTRUCT AN ADDITION AND REPLACE WINDOWS AT 117 W. SOUTH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 94-17, DRAWINGS NO. AR 94-17, DATED NOVEMBER 30, 2017, BE APPROVED 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; and Mr. Foust, aye. The motion was approved.

2. Addition & Renovation – **688 Hartford St.** (Marcus W. Hitt) **AR 95-17**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This house is a Cape Cod that was built in 1938 and is a contributing building in the Worthington Historic District. This property is 43' wide and extends roughly 252' to the east. The owners would like to construct a rear addition; replace the siding and windows; renovate the garage; construct a shed; replace existing fencing; and add brick to the front porch and drive.

Project Details:

1. The proposed two-story addition would extend 22.6' to the rear and be 18'8" wide. The north wall is proposed 5.47' from the property line which would require a variance for placement closer than 6'. The existing wall is 1.8' from the north property line. The south side of the addition would be set in ~1'2" from the south wall of the house, but only extend back 6' along that line before stepping in 7'8" to the main addition wall. Additional living space would be 472 square feet on the first floor and 432 square feet on the second floor.

A gabled roof is proposed that would be several feet lower than the existing north-south gable and would have a 6/12 pitch, with a nested 12/12 gable to complement the main gable on the house. New dimensional asphalt shingles, likely in gray, are proposed for the entire roof.

Windows in the addition would be white vinyl double-hung in a 6 over 6 pattern like those in the existing house. The grills for the windows would be between the glass panes. On the rear elevation a three-panel French door and a single door are proposed in a style similar to the windows. Light fixtures are proposed by the rear doors.

2. The addition and the main house are proposed to be sided with dark blue 5" double Dutchlap vinyl siding. The existing house has wider siding that is aluminum and in a light tan color. Trim for the house and addition would be

- white, and the applicants would like to paint the brick chimney white.
3. Vinyl replacement windows are proposed for the existing divided light wood windows in the house. The proposed windows would be the same size as the existing, but would have grills between the glass panes. Retention and repair of the existing windows is being considered.
 4. For the garage, replacement of windows and siding to match the new on the house is proposed. A new sliding door is proposed for the rear.
 5. A 10' x 8' shed is proposed at the southeast corner of the property, 5' from the side and rear property lines as is required by Code. The shed is proposed with materials to match the house.
 6. Replacement of 40 feet of chain link fence is proposed along the south property line near the garage. The new fence would be 4' high with 3 ½" pickets and 4" spacing between pickets to match the existing fence on the adjacent property.
 7. There is an existing stretch of fencing (24') on the north side that is proposed for replacement with a 4' open style fence to match the rest of the north property line. The condensing unit is proposed for replacement in the same location, which is at the northeast corner of the existing house.
 8. The owners would like to repair the front porch and steps, and face them with brick. The existing black metal railings would be reinstalled. Brick is also proposed for placement adjacent to the drive approach to be installed at grade.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Additions:

Residential additions are recommended to maintain similar roof forms; be constructed as far to the rear and sides of the existing residence as possible; be subordinate; and have walls set back from the corners of the main house. Be sure that window designs are appropriate for the style or time period of the house. Design and materials should be traditional, and compatible with the existing structure.

Windows:

Retention and repair of existing historic windows is always preferable to replacement. Because they usually comprise so much of a building's exterior surface, windows are a major part of its character. Keeping them is one of the most important ways to protect that character. Even non-original windows may be of sufficient age and design quality to warrant their retention. If historic windows are too deteriorated to repair cost effectively and replacement is justified, the preferred option is an in-kind replacement in the same material and design. This usually means real wood windows with true through-the glass muntins (if appropriate) in dimensions and profiles that duplicate the originals. Window suppliers have become very good at doing such work at reasonable prices, but this still may take some persistence and hunting around. New windows made of substitute materials such as aluminum, vinyl, or clad wood can be an acceptable second choice if they provide a reasonably good match for the windows being replaced. Number of panes, real muntins, and correct profiles still are important.

Siding:

Wood siding is preferred, and should be used in one of its traditional forms: shingle, board-and-batten, shiplap or beveled siding. If replacement siding is installed over or in place of wood siding, it should be located only where the original siding was used. Avoid removal of or damage to window and door surrounds, ornamental elements such as eave brackets, and decorative panels or shingled areas. The new siding should match the thickness and width of the old as closely as possible. Chimneys are a defining feature of a building and should be repaired and maintained. Chimneys on frame buildings should not be covered with siding.

Outbuildings:

New outbuildings should use design cues from older nearby structures, including form, massing, roof shape, roof pitch and height, materials, window and door types and detailing. Try to create a new building compatible in appearance with the house it accompanies.

Compatibility of design and materials, exterior detail and relationships, and window treatment are standards of review in the Architectural District ordinance.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of this application with the following amendments:

- The existing windows should be retained and repaired, or if that is not possible the replacements should be in the same profile as the existing with simulated divided lights (grids on the outside and inside).
- Matching the size and profile of the existing siding should be discussed.
- Consideration should be given to leaving the brick chimney unpainted and matching that brick color for the front porch and drive work.

The size, design and location of the proposed addition and the other modifications are appropriate. The proposed shed is compatible with the house.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Marcus Hitt, 688 Hartford St., Worthington, Ohio, said he and his wife are making a major investment in the property. They purchased the house three years ago and recently brought home their second newborn baby so they have officially outgrown their house. We are not just doing an addition, we would like to renovate and restore the rest of the house. He said he was flexible as to the materials to be used but was anxious to get the project started. Mr. Hofmann said he appreciated the sensitivity to the addition and thought great value would be added to the house. He asked Mr. Hitt why he chose Dutch lap siding. Mr. Hitt replied the aluminum siding was not original and the house was built in 1938 and Dutch lap siding was more common at other times. He thought the siding was similar to a Colonial style. Mr. Hofmann asked Mr. Hitt what he thought of Mrs. Bitar's window recommendations and Mr. Hitt said up until the latest cold snap he was considering restoring the windows, but you can feel the breeze coming through the old windows and even see your breathe sometimes. He said he has an appointment with a window company to get an estimate of what the cost would be to re-build each window, and if it is feasible they would try to do that. Mr. Hitt said he had not thought about

the divided light detail but they are supportive of doing the dimensional divided light on the vinyl product. Mr. Sauer asked if the existing windows are single pane or double, and Mr. Hitt said the windows are single pane. Mr. Sauer said with today's concerns about energy, and the cost to rebuild the windows, Mr. Hitt might be better off installing new insulated windows instead, and Mr. Coulter said those type of windows would probably be cheaper, than rebuilding the existing windows.

Mrs. Holcombe suggested vinyl clad outside with wood inside windows would add more value to the house. Mr. Hofmann suggested exterior muntins that would reflect the time period of the house. Mr. Hofmann said he found Dutch lap and vinyl to be difficult, or somewhat offensive, and largely a personal thing, but he thought a 4" lap would be more appropriate and would look terrific on the house and more historically accurate. Mr. Sauer said the Board also encourages the use of Hardi Plank in lieu of vinyl siding. Mr. Hitt said he did explore some options, but he has a lot of house to consider within a certain budget. Mr. Foust said he would like to echo Mr. Hofmann's thoughts in regards to the siding proposed and felt the lap vinyl siding would be far more appropriate than the Dutch lap. He also agreed with the comments on the windows, however understood the issue and felt that he would work with staff's recommendations for the windows. Mr. Sauer asked Mr. Hitt if he was still planning to paint the fireplace and he replied no. He said he has since revised his application and will not be painting the fireplace. He will also match the bricks for the porch and driveway apron to match the color of the bricks on the fireplace. Mr. Sauer said he urged caution with regard to the deck and because of the deck's height, the deck will probably require railing. He would suggest that the motion be crafted to allow for a railing if the Building Inspector says it is required. Mr. Hitt said ideally, they would rather install a patio instead of a deck but they did not have the time to design the patio and work out the details and will probably come back later to discuss the patio, however he agreed to add a railing if needed.

Mr. Hitt asked why wood Dutch lap siding was not recommended and what caused the distaste and if it was more of an appropriateness issue. Is the issue because it's wood or vinyl. He went on to state that he sees it throughout Worthington. Mrs. Bitar said Mr. Hofmann referred to that earlier and City staff felt the same way that a different look is created when the product is not wood. Mr. Foust stated that Dutch lap siding was appropriate in the 1860s-1870s Victorian area, not this style of house. Traditional lap siding was the appropriate style siding for this house in the day. Mr. Hitt asked if the Board members were okay with a standard vinyl product and Mr. Hofmann said yes, preferably in a smaller 4" lap. Mr. Hitt asked if you would be ok with them using fibrex boards, and would be need to come back to the Board for approval. Mr. Coulter stated no, it might be about cost, however we can craft a motion to allow for options. Mr. Hitt stated he would Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone to speak for or against this application and no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Hofmann moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY MARCUS W. HITT FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO CONSTRUCT AN ADDITION AND RENOVATE THE HOUSE

AND PROPERTY AT 688 HARTFORD ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 95-17, DRAWINGS NO. AR 95-17, DATED NOVEMBER 30, 2017 BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING WITH THE FOLLOWING AMENDMENTS:

- **THAT THE WINDOWS WILL HAVE AN EXTERIOR EXPOSED MUNTIN AND CAN BE VINYL**
- **THAT THE WINDOWS BE OF A CHARACTERISTIC AND STYLE THAT IS APPROPRIATE FOR THE NEIGHBORHOOD**
- **THAT THE SIDING CAN BE A 4" STANDARD LAP AND NOT A DUTCH LAP**
- **THAT THERE IS AN OPTION FOR USE OF HARD MATERIAL SUCH AS HARDI PLANK IF THE HOME OWNER SO WISHES**
- **THAT THE CHIMNEY SHALL REMAIN UNPAINTED**
- **A RAILING WILL BE ADDED TO THE DECK**

Mr. Hitt said he agreed to the amendments above except for the requirement of the 4" lap and said he preferred 5" lap because there are better 5" options of lap siding. Mr. Hofmann said the 4" lap is more traditional for a Cape Cod style of home. Mrs. Bitar explained Mr. Hitt could table the application or accept the amendments this evening and come back at a future date with an amendment after deciding what materials he would like to use. Mr. Sauer offered an amendment that would allow either 4" or 5" lap siding. Mr. Hofmann said he would like the motion to remain at 4".

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

For the record, Mr. Coulter stated that Mrs. Lloyd was now in attendance at the meeting at 7:37 p.m.

3. Renovation – **697-709 Wesley Ct.** (David Kerr Architect, LLC/Village Green Condominium Association) **AR 97-17**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

The Village Green Condominiums were constructed in 1980, and are comprised of 7 units in two buildings. This request is for approval to make exterior renovations to the condominiums

Project Details:

1. Existing brick on the building will remain as is and the roof material is not proposed for replacement.

Page 7 of 30

ARB/MPC Meeting December 14, 2017

Minutes

2. The existing lap wood siding is proposed to be replaced with board and batten cementitious siding in Aged Pewter and Pearl Gray. A cementitious siding with a “cedar shake” look in Rich Espresso is proposed above several of the entrances and below a bay window on Building One. Fypon or Durabrac decorative brackets would be installed in limited locations on both buildings.
3. New entrance doors and garage doors are proposed. The fiberglass doors would be Toffee, Rustic Bronze or Embossed Mahogany in color. New light fixtures are proposed in locations adjacent to doors.
4. New prefinished aluminum gutters and downspouts are proposed.
5. Existing aluminum window frames are proposed to be painted.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Wood siding is preferred, and should be used in one of its traditional forms: shingle, board-and-batten, shiplap or beveled siding. If replacement siding is installed over or in place of wood siding, it should be located only where the original siding was used. Avoid removal of or damage to window and door surrounds, ornamental elements such as eave brackets, and decorative panels or shingled areas. The new siding should match the thickness and width of the old as closely as possible.

Paint only surfaces that have been painted before. Stone surfaces were seldom painted originally; brick surfaces sometimes were but usually were not. Poor weather resistance or damage to a wall were the usual reasons for painting brick, though sometimes it was just to change the building’s look. Very old Federal or Greek Revival style brick buildings were often painted to protect their soft handmade brick. Brick red or white were typical paint colors. Avoid using too many colors on a building. Late 19th century buildings should have a maximum of three different colors (the body color and two trim colors); those from earlier and later periods should have no more than two. Consider using light and dark shades of the same color when choosing body and trim colors.

In selecting new light fixtures, simple designs are usually the best. Avoid overly ornate fixtures and ones that are out of scale with the building. Select fixtures appropriate to the building’s character or that are similar to those used on buildings from the same period or style.

Compatibility of design and materials and exterior detail and relationships are standards of review in the Architectural District ordinance.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of this application. The proposed changes are in character with the existing buildings and the District.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. David Kerr, 7792 Olentangy River Rd., Columbus, Ohio. Mr. Kerr said there are seven units within the two buildings and all of the owners just recently got together and agreed on the proposed renovations. He said the buildings still have

the original cedar siding from when they were built in 1980. The condominium owners are having issues with animals getting into the buildings such as bees, birds pecking at the wood, so they would like to replace the siding with maintenance free material that will be long lasting. They are looking at Hardi Plank products or LP engineered siding, both of which are very long lasting and have high warranties. The brackets will also be maintenance free, and they will make sure all of the windows get painted to match the new color scheme. They will also be getting new doors and garage doors. Per the condominium agreement, the doors and garage doors will be provided by the owners and not the condominium association, however the condominium association cannot compel the owners to invest money into buying new doors, but says in their agreement if the doors cannot be repaired they have a specific recommendation to use, and must be replaced within five years. The light fixtures will also be replaced. Mr. Sauer asked if the doors would be painted to match the rest of the building and Mr. Kerr replied, "Yes."

Mr. Kerr shared examples of the light fixtures they planned to purchase. He also submitted two additional light fixtures as options for the Board to consider. Mr. Coulter stated that we can craft a motion to include all three light fixtures that are being presented at the meeting. Mrs. Holcombe said this will be a great improvement for this complex and add a lot of life back into the buildings. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone to speak for or against this application and no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Hofmann moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY DAVID KERR ARCHITECT, LLC ON BEHALF OF THE VILLAGE GREEN CONDOMINIUM ASSOCIATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO RENOVATE THE CONDOMINIUM BUILDING AT 697-709 WESLEY CT., AS PER CASE NO. AR 97-17, DRAWINGS NO. AR 97-17, DATED DECEMBER 1, 2017, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING WITH THE FOLLOWING AMENDMENTS:

- **THAT ANY OF THE THREE EXTERIOR LIGHTS PRESENTED AT THE MEETING BE ALLOWABLE**
- **THAT ALL OF THE GARAGE DOORS THAT ARE NOT REPLACED BE PAINTED THE SAME COLOR AS THE NEW UPON COMPLETION OF THE EXTERIOR IMPROVEMENTS.**

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.

4. **Additions & Renovation; New Garage – 124 W. North St. (J.S. Brown & Co./Maher) AR 98-17**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This house was constructed in 1939 and is described as being of Colonial Revival Influence in the historic district nomination. The house is a contributing building in the Worthington Historic District. ARB approvals were granted in 2012 and 2013 for a front porch remodel and a fence. This request is for approval to construct an addition; add a sliding door and patio; construct a screened porch; replace all siding and windows; demolish the existing garage; and construct a new garage.

Project Details:

1. A two-story addition is proposed at the northwest corner of the house in place of an existing patio. The 9' ½" x 14' 7/8" structure would allow for a mudroom on the first floor and a master bathroom on the second floor. The addition wall would be almost 4' east of the west wall of the house. A door with bluestone steps would allow for a separate entrance to the mudroom. Windows are proposed for the addition and a light is proposed near the door.
2. On the rear of the house a sliding door is proposed with steps leading to a patio. The patio would extend to an existing fence on the west side, and curve around an existing Oak tree on the east side. New landscaped areas are proposed at the north and southwest corners of the patio and to the east along the house.
3. A 9' x 9' 11 ½" screened porch is proposed on the east side of the house at the rear wall. Extension to 3' from the property line would require a variance. The structure would have a gabled roof and three large screens on each side. The remainder of the walls would be sided, and an asphalt shingle roof to match is proposed.
4. The existing house is sided with vinyl lap siding. Proposed is all new shake style vinyl siding in Colonial Grey. A sample has been submitted.
5. The applicant would like to replace all of the original wood windows with simulated divided light vinyl windows. The condition of the existing windows is not known.
6. Demolition of the existing freestanding two-car garage is proposed so a new, larger freestanding garage can be constructed in a location further to the rear. The proposed two-car garage would be roughly 24' x 21' with a north to south gable, and a nested gable above the garage door. A man door is also proposed. A window is proposed on the east side, and light fixtures would be by the doors. The materials of the garage would match the house. The garage is proposed 3' from the west property line, so a variance would be required.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Additions:

Residential additions are recommended to maintain similar roof forms; be constructed as far to the rear and sides of the existing residence as possible; be subordinate; and have walls set back from the corners of the main house. Be sure that window designs are appropriate for the style or

time period of the house. Design and materials should be traditional, and compatible with the existing structure.

Windows:

Retention and repair of existing historic windows is always preferable to replacement. Because they usually comprise so much of a building's exterior surface, windows are a major part of its character. Keeping them is one of the most important ways to protect that character. Even non-original windows may be of sufficient age and design quality to warrant their retention. If historic windows are too deteriorated to repair cost effectively and replacement is justified, the preferred option is an in-kind replacement in the same material and design. This usually means real wood windows with true through-the glass muntins (if appropriate) in dimensions and profiles that duplicate the originals. Window suppliers have become very good at doing such work at reasonable prices, but this still may take some persistence and hunting around. New windows made of substitute materials such as aluminum, vinyl, or clad wood can be an acceptable second choice if they provide a reasonably good match for the windows being replaced. Number of panes, real muntins, and correct profiles still are important.

Siding:

Wood siding is preferred, and should be used in one of its traditional forms: shingle, board-and-batten, shiplap or beveled siding. New siding should match the thickness and width of the old as closely as possible.

Outbuildings:

New outbuildings should use design cues from older nearby structures, including form, massing, roof shape, roof pitch and height, materials, window and door types and detailing. Try to create a new building compatible in appearance with the house it accompanies.

Compatibility of design and materials, exterior detail and relationships, and window treatment are standards of review in the Architectural District ordinance.

Recommendations

The following should be considered:

- The two-story addition is appropriately sized and to the rear, and should fit with the existing house.
- The new rear door is appropriate and the patio complements the house.
- Addition of the screened porch would change the look of the house from the road, although it would be toward the back of the house, of matching material, and subordinate.
- Although vinyl siding is not preferred in the District, replacement of existing vinyl with new should be an improvement.
- Retention and repair of original wood windows is preferred as they are part of the character of Old Worthington. If replacement is necessary, clad wood can be acceptable. Any new

windows should at least have the same profile and look of the existing.

- The proposed new garage is acceptable, but openings are typically desired on all sides.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Ms. Courtney Bowe, 1522 Hess St., Columbus, Ohio. Mr. Foust suggestion keeping the corner boards on the front of the house. Mr. Coulter said he was okay without the corner boards but he could go either way. He liked the scale of the house, and the proposed materials are better than what is on the house now. Mr. Hofmann said the corner boards would be a nice touch, and could be painted to match the window trim to give the house a little more personality. Mr. Sauer said he liked the added detail of the corner boards. Mrs. Lloyd said she agreed because it would break up the massing of the house with the new materials. Mr. Foust asked Ms. Bowe if that is something she would consider and she replied, “Absolutely.” She said she will discuss the recommendation with the home owner. Mrs. Lloyd said overall the improvements are very nice. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak for or against this application and no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Hofmann moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY J.S. BROWN & CO. ON BEHALF OF JAMES AND THERESA MAHER FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO RENOVATE, AND CONSTRUCT ADDITIONS AND A NEW GARAGE AT 124 W. NORTH ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 98-17, DRAWINGS NO. AR 98-17, DATED DECEMBER 1, 2017, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING WITH THE AMENDMENT OF ADDING CORNER BOARDS WITH THE NEW SIDING AND ENSURING THE FRONT PORCH AND BAND BOARD BE MAINTAINED.

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.

5. Addition – **870 Oxford St.** (J.S. Brown & Co./Sumner) **AR 99-17**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This Cape Cod was constructed in 1949 and is a contributing building in the Worthington Historic District. In 2007 & 2008 the house was completely renovated, including conversion of an attached garage to living space. Also, a freestanding garage was constructed. This request is for approval to add a mudroom on the north side of the house.

Project Details:

1. A one-story 15’4” x 14’ 1 1/8” mudroom is proposed on the north side of the house at the

east end. The addition would extend 4' 11 ¼" north of the main part of the house. An existing brick landscape wall in that area would be removed.

2. Cedar siding to match the size and style of the existing is proposed. The proposed windows and door would also match the existing. A new light fixture is proposed.
3. The entire house would be painted Little Falls or Mineral Alloy, which are both shades of gray.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Additions:

Residential additions are recommended to maintain similar roof forms; be constructed as far to the rear and sides of the existing residence as possible; be subordinate; and have walls set back from the corners of the main house. Be sure that window designs are appropriate for the style or time period of the house. Design and materials should be traditional, and compatible with the existing structure.

Siding:

Wood siding is preferred, and should be used in one of its traditional forms: shingle, board-and-batten, shiplap or beveled siding. New siding should match the thickness and width of the old as closely as possible.

Compatibility of design and materials, exterior detail and relationships, and window treatment are standards of review in the Architectural District ordinance.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of this application. Although the addition extends north of the existing house, it would still be subordinate due to its location behind the main part of the house and its massing. The materials are complementary.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Ms. Courtney Bowe, 1522 Hess St., Columbus, Ohio, confirmed where the new windows would be located and said the new windows would match what is already existing on the home. The brick landscaping wall will be removed. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak for or against this application and no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Hofmann moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY J.S. BROWN & CO. ON BEHALF OF GREGORY AND AMY JANE SUMNER FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO CONSTRUCT AN ADDITION AT 870 OXFORD ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 99-17, DRAWINGS NO. AR 99-

17, DATED DECEMBER 1, 2017, BE APPROVED 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.

6. Additions & Renovation – 665 Oxford St. (Gerry Bird Architect/Depew) AR 96-17

*Mr. Coulter stated that Mr. Foust would be exiting the room since he is an immediate neighbor of the property.

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This house was constructed in 1949 and is described as being English Revival in the historic district nomination. The house is a contributing building in the Worthington Historic District. The one and one-half story structure has a gabled roof with asphalt shingles, and has stone on the front with the remainder of the walls sided with a composite material in a wide lap pattern. There is a one-car garage to the south of the house that is also a contributing building in the district. The lot slopes down to the west.

Approval of this application would allow for renovation of the existing house and garage and additions to expand and connect the two.

Project Details:

1. The front of the house would be modified to relocate the entrance door from the side to the front of the house. A new Anderson clad wood window is proposed in the front. A covered porch at the southeast corner of the house would be removed and a gabled roof structure is proposed above the front of the house. The existing stone on the front would be retained. New cementitious siding is proposed for the structure, with board and batten in the gables and 6” lap siding for the first floor. The windows and trim are proposed as white (Snowbound), with the siding being a light gray (Light French Gray). An existing chimney on the south side would stay and is not proposed to be painted.
2. On the south side of the house a garage addition is proposed that would incorporate the existing freestanding garage at the rear, and include a gable above the new garage door that matches the gable of the old garage. The new space would allow for 2 cars to park and the new and old garages and the house to have an internal connection. The same siding and windows as used on the front of the house would be installed. The existing concrete drive would be widened behind the sidewalk to allow for entrance into the new garage. The proposed garage door would have lights at the top and vertical panels below.
3. To the rear of the existing house, an addition is proposed that would extend 30’ to the rear

and 3' to the north. A gable to match those on the front of the house is proposed and a shed dormer would be on the north side. On the rear elevation, patio doors are proposed upstairs and for the walkout lower level. A 12' deep deck is proposed for the upper level with stairs going down to the yard. Matching siding and windows to the front of the house are proposed. The decking would be a composite material – details are needed.

4. Simple landscaping is included with the packet.
5. Light fixtures are shown but the exact style has not been identified.
6. Information is needed regarding placement of any condensing units.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Additions:

Residential additions are recommended to maintain similar roof forms; be constructed as far to the rear and sides of the existing residence as possible; be subordinate; and have walls set back from the corners of the main house. Be sure that window designs are appropriate for the style or time period of the house. Design and materials should be traditional, and compatible with the existing structure.

Siding:

Wood siding is preferred, and should be used in one of its traditional forms: shingle, board-and-batten, shiplap or beveled siding. If replacement siding is installed over or in place of wood siding, it should be located only where the original siding was used. Avoid removal of or damage to window and door surrounds, ornamental elements such as eave brackets, and decorative panels or shingled areas. The new siding should match the thickness and width of the old as closely as possible.

Compatibility of design and materials, exterior detail and relationships, and window treatment are standards of review in the Architectural District ordinance.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of this application. The proposed modifications allow the front of the structure to keep its basic size and style, while adding square footage and modern functionality. The distance from the road to the rear addition helps mitigate the impact. The inclusion of design elements from the existing house and garage help keep the character.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Lloyd DePew, 5400 River Forest Rd., Dublin, Ohio, said he purchased the property in July of 2017. They removed 3500 concrete blocks that were sitting inside the house. Mr. DePew said he wanted to keep the original look of the house as much as possible. He said he used to live in Worthington from 1981 to 1987 and renovated the house at 118 E. New England Avenue, and then he lived in the Potter's Creek area for twenty-five years. Mr. Coulter said he lives very close to the house Mr. Potter is updating so he said he appreciated what he is doing to fix and improve the house. Mr. Myers asked if Mr. DePew would

be keeping the existing stone and Mr. DePew said yes. He will be adding Hardi Plank Board and Batten siding. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone to speak for or against this application.

Mr. Patrick Porter, 659 Oxford St., Worthington, Ohio, said he has lived next door to this house for fifteen years and greatly appreciated what Mr. DePew is doing to upgrade the property and he is fully in support of the project. There were no other speakers.

Motion:

Mrs. Holcombe moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY GERRY BIRD ARCHITECTS ON BEHALF OF LLOYD DEPEW FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO CONSTRUCT AN ADDITION AND RENOVATE THE HOUSE AT 665 OXFORD ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 96-17, DRAWINGS NO. AR 96-17, DATED NOVEMBER 30, 2017, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

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

*Mr. Foust was not in attendance for the presentation, nor did he vote on the item since he is an immediate neighbor to the north.

C. Municipal Planning Commission

1. Planned Unit Development - Unfinished

- a. Preliminary Plan – Alzheimer’s/Dementia/Memory Care Facility – **800 Proprietors Rd.**
(The Griffin 105 Group, LLC) **PUD 01-17**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

Worthington Foods was a manufacturing facility that occupied 8.75 acres at the northeast corner of Proprietors and E. Granville Roads. The property was sold in 2005 and the plant and most other buildings were demolished to allow for redevelopment of the site into 88,000 square feet of office condominiums. The northern building, which was a retail store that sold the Morningstar Farms products manufactured at the facility, was split from the larger parcel and has housed several businesses since that time. The southern 7.75 acres began to develop in 2005 with four office condominiums being constructed over the following four years, covering roughly 3 acres. For various reasons, a small piece of land on the north side and the southern ~4.75 acres were never developed. Different developers have proposed various uses over the years, including storage

facilities and residential. With the former manufacturing facility and the previously proposed office, income tax generation was a significant consideration on the site. The other proposed uses did not offer that same amenity.

This is an application for a use that would also fall short of the original income tax goal, but would have some employees. The plan is to construct a memory care facility on the southern 4.84 acres. Thirty-five full time employees and 5 part time employees are planned for the first year, and that number may increase in future years.

Project Details:

The Preliminary Plan submittal should include the following:

- (1) A legal description and vicinity map showing the property lines, streets, existing Zoning, and land uses within 300 feet of the area proposed for the PUD;

A legal description of the 4.841 acre piece of land is included with the packet. A subdivision is needed to align the parcel lines with the proposed and existing developments. The property is adjacent to railroad right-of-way to the east; office condos to the north; and multifamily residential to the west.

- (2) Names and addresses of owners, developers and the registered land surveyor, engineer or architect who made the plan;

The Griffin 105 Group LLC is the owner and is represented by David Hodge, attorney with Underhill & Hodge LLC. Advanced Civil Design is the engineer; Faris Planning and Design is working on the site design and landscaping; and the architect is Collaborative Design, Ltd.

- (3) Date, north arrow and total acreage of the site;
- (4) A topographical survey of all land included in the application and such other land adjoining the subject property as may be reasonably required by the City. The topographical survey shall show two foot contours or contours at an interval as may be required by the Municipal Planning Commission to delineate the character of the land included in the application and such adjoining land as may be affected by the application. Elevations shall be based on North American Vertical Datum of 1988 (NAVD88). In lands contiguous to or adjacent to the flood plain of the Olentangy River, existing contours shall be shown in accordance with the elevations set forth in Chapter;
- (5) Existing Structures, parking and traffic facilities, Easements and public Rights-of-Way on the subject property as well as within 300 feet of the area proposed for PUD;
- (6) Existing sewers, water mains, culverts and other underground facilities within the tract and in the vicinity, indicating pipe size, grades and exact locations;

This information is included on the drawings.

- (7) The location of Natural Features and provisions necessary to preserve and/or restore and maintain them to maintain the character of the surrounding neighborhood and community;
- (8) A tree preservation plan showing all existing trees 6" caliper or larger;

Many existing trees and vegetation on the site would be removed, except the 200+ year old 72" Oak tree near the Proprietors Rd. right-of-way would be preserved and maintained. Protection would be needed for the tree during construction, and a future plan for maintenance is needed. Placement of any structures, including sidewalk, under the tree canopy should be avoided.

Other trees are either in poor condition or growing into power lines and may be replaced. The vegetation at the south end of the property in the right-of-way should be replaced. **The Tree Preservation Plan (D-8) identifies 8 trees to preserve.**

- (9) A preliminary grading plan;

The existing and proposed grades for the site are relatively flat.

- (10) Preliminary design and location of Structures, Accessory Structures, streets, drives, traffic patterns, Sidewalks or Recreation Paths, parking, entry features, site lighting, landscaping, screening, Public Space Amenities and other features as required by the City;

Four buildings are proposed for the site, with connection by breezeway or in one case an activity room. Each of the residential buildings are proposed with interior courtyards. Preliminary sketches show an architectural character that may be compatible with the office condominiums to the north (depot style) and Worthington architecture generally. Brick and cementitious lap and board and batten siding are the main materials proposed for the buildings.

Parking would be on the north and east sides of the buildings, with a drive connecting from Proprietor's Rd. to the railway property to the east through an access easement. The curb cut and turning radii are proposed large enough to allow trucks to pass through the site. The total number of parking spaces required for the site would be 43, and 51 spaces are shown on the proposed plans. Bicycle parking is shown. Trees are proposed throughout the parking area as is required by the Code.

Landscape plans with a mixture of trees, shrubs, and perennials are included for the areas around the buildings, and in the main entry to the office which would

accommodate some of the visitors to the site. The entrance would have a circular drive off of Proprietors Rd. near the north end of the site, and included a curved masonry wall used for a sign.

Sidewalks are proposed adjacent to the parking areas, between the parking and buildings, and in the Proprietors Rd. right-of-way. In order to protect the Bicentennial Oak, sidewalk will not be required or allowed along Proprietor's Rd. in the area in front of the Oak. Also, sidewalk would not be required between the circular drives in front of the building.

The northernmost drive entrance would need a variance for width.

Tract coverage by buildings is stated as 23.5% in the development text.

A screen wall was installed along the rear property line when Worthington Station was planned. The existing wall would remain and the addition of a gate across the opening for the access easement is likely.

- (11) The proposed provision of water, sanitary sewer and surface drainage facilities, including engineering feasibility studies or other evidence of reasonableness of such facilities;

Existing and proposed utilities have been identified and reviewed by the City Engineer.

- (12) Parcels of land intended to be dedicated or temporarily reserved for public use, or reserved by deed covenant, and the condition proposed for such covenants and for the dedications;

No land would be dedicated.

- (13) Proposed Easements;

Proposed is relocation of the access easement to the Norfolk & Western Railway Co. property adjacent to the east, currently used by Silcott Railway Equipment Ltd. The business provides services to the railroad industry. An existing easement that runs east to west at the entrance to Silcott would be moved so the entrance is at the north end, and then heads south near the east property line.

Existing easements for the screen wall and utilities would stay in place, and new utility easements may be needed.

- (14) Proposed number of Dwelling Units per acre;

The applicant is proposing 54 private and semi-private rooms which average 399 square feet per resident, or approximately 11 units/acre.

- (15) Proposed uses, including area of land devoted to each use;
The only use would be a memory care facility.
- (16) Proposed phasing of development of the site, including a schedule for construction of each phase;
Information is needed.
- (17) Homeowners or commercial owners' association materials;
Information not needed.
- (18) Development Standards Text; and
Included in packet.
- (19) Any additional information as required by the Municipal Planning Commission and the City Council.

Public Space Amenities

Ten would be required based on almost 50,000 square feet of building area. The following have been identified:

- **3 Benches**
- **2 Bicycle Rack**
- **Clock Tower – Near the intersection**
- **Preservation and maintenance of Oak – Including up-lighting and lightning protection**
- **Landscaping along E. Granville Rd.**
- **Wall preservation at intersection**
- **Plaza area at north end**

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Comprehensive Plan Update & 2005 Strategic Plan

An area plan focusing on the Proprietors/Huntley Road corridor should be developed that makes recommendations for repositioning it in the market place to make it attractive and competitive in the region. Issues such as building renovation, aesthetics, and possible road and infrastructure improvements should be addressed. In any case it is critical that the City protect the industrial corridor as an employment center.

Code Section 1174.05 Development Standards and Development Standards Text

Development Standards Text shall be a comprehensive narrative detailing the Development Standards for the proposed development, including without limitation the following:

Page 20 of 30

ARB/MPC Meeting December 14, 2017

Minutes

(a) Design Regulations:

(1) Character. The proposed PUD shall consist of an integrated and harmonious design with properly arranged traffic and parking facilities and landscaping. The PUD shall fit harmoniously into and shall not adversely affect adjoining and surrounding properties, Roadways & public facilities.

(2) Design. Site layout, Buildings, Accessory Structures, landscaping and lighting shall be compatible with or enhance the surrounding neighborhood and community.

(3) Screening. Commercial and industrial uses, including parking facilities and refuse containers, shall be permanently screened from all adjoining residential uses.

(4) Tract Coverage. The ground area occupied by all Buildings shall be balanced with green space to soften the appearance of the development. Total Lot/tract coverage shall be set forth in the PUD documents.

(b) Traffic and Parking:

(1) Traffic. Adequate ingress and egress shall be provided as part of the PUD. The proposed PUD shall be located so that reasonably direct traffic access is supplied from major thoroughfares and where congestion will not likely be created by the proposed development. Where potential congestion may be alleviated by installation of Improvements on streets abutting the development, the developer shall be required to pay the cost of the construction of Improvements and shall dedicate or deed lands necessary for street widening purposes when so required by the City. A traffic study shall be provided by the applicant as required by the City.

(2) Parking. Parking shall adhere to the following standards:

A. Design. Parking and service areas shall be designed and located to protect the character of the area.

B. Non-residential Uses. Parking shall be adequate to serve the proposed uses, but shall in no case exceed one-hundred and twenty (120) percent of the parking requirement in Section 1171.01.

C. Residential Uses. There shall not be less than one parking space per Dwelling Unit.

D. Bicycle Parking. Bicycle parking should be adequate to serve the proposed uses.

(c) General Requirements:

(1) Environment. The City may request environmental studies for the property, and may request and receive reports and studies from any agency having jurisdiction over the property, indicating whether there are any environmental issues that would affect the property and/or surrounding properties with the proposed development.

(2) Natural Features.

A. The Municipal Planning Commission shall not recommend a PUD unless it finds that such development preserves, restores, maintains and/or enhances: (1) Natural Features and (2) the character of the surrounding neighborhood and community.

B. The Municipal Planning Commission shall not recommend a PUD if it finds that the Natural Features on such property have been or will be removed, damaged, altered or destroyed in anticipation of development until agreement is reached between the applicant and the Municipal Planning Commission on permanent restoration of Natural Features. All healthy trees 6" caliper or larger shall be retained, or replaced with total

tree trunk equal in diameter to the removed tree, and this shall be documented as part of an approved Natural Features preservation plan and/or landscape plan. In the event the Municipal Planning Commission determines that full replacement would result in the unreasonable crowding of trees upon the Lot, or that such replacement is not feasible given site conditions, a fee of four hundred fifty dollars (\$450.00) per caliper inch of trees lost and not replaced on such property shall be paid in cash to the City for deposit in the Special Parks Fund. Such deposits shall be used for reforestation on public property.

(3) Public Area Payments.

A. The City Council shall determine whether a portion of such PUD should be dedicated on the plan to a public agency for park, playground or recreational uses. Such dedication may be required only if the City Council determines that there is a need for such property and that the dedication is related both in nature and extent to the impact that the proposed development will have on the parks and recreation system.

B. Whenever commercial or industrial space is created as part of a PUD, then the developer or owner, as the case may be, shall make a cash payment to the City in the amount of one hundred dollars (\$100.00) per 1000 gross square feet of new or expanded commercial or industrial space for deposit in the Special Parks Fund. Such deposits shall be used for costs associated with the City's parks, playground and recreation areas. This section shall not apply to any PUD for which a dedication of land to the City was required pursuant to subsection (A) hereof.

C. Whenever any new Dwelling Units are created as part of a PUD, then the developer or owner, as the case may be, shall make a cash payment to the City in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250.00) per each new Dwelling Unit created for deposit in the Special Parks Fund. Such deposits shall be used for costs associated with the City's parks, playground and recreation areas. This section shall not apply to any PUD for which a dedication of land to the City was required pursuant to subsection (A) hereof.

D. The public area payment required by this section shall be made prior to the issuance of the building permit for the project.

(4) Public Space Amenities. A minimum of one Public Space Amenity as approved by the Municipal Planning Commission shall be required for every five-thousand (5000) square feet of gross floor area of multiple family dwelling, commercial or industrial space that is new in the PUD. Public Space Amenities are elements that directly affect the quality and character of the public domain such as:

A. An accessible plaza or courtyard designed for public use with a minimum area of two-hundred fifty (250) square feet;

B. Sitting space (e.g. dining area, benches, or ledges) which is a minimum of sixteen (16) inches in height and forty-eight (48) inches in width;

C. Public art;

D. Decorative planters;

E. Bicycle racks;

F. Permanent fountains or other Water Features;

G. Decorative waste receptacles;

H. Decorative pedestrian lighting; and

I. Other items approved by the Municipal Planning Commission.

City Code Section 1174.08 PUD Procedures:

(a) Pre-application. The applicant may request review and feedback from City staff and/or the Municipal Planning Commission prior to preparing a Preliminary Plan. No discussions, opinions, or suggestions provided shall bind the applicant, or the City, or be relied upon by the applicant to indicate subsequent approval or disapproval by the City.

(b) Preliminary Plan.

(1) Municipal Planning Commission. The Municipal Planning Commission shall recommend to the City Council that the application for PUD be approved as requested, approved with modifications, or disapproved. In the event the Municipal Planning Commission disapproves the application, the petitioner may elect not to have the same recommended to the City Council.

(2) City Council. Upon receipt of the recommendation of the Municipal Planning Commission, the requested PUD shall be set forth in Ordinance form and shall thereafter be introduced in writing at a meeting of the City Council, and the City Council shall fix a date for a public hearing. Such hearing may be held on but not before the fourteenth day following the fixing of the date or on any day thereafter. Notice of the public hearing shall be given by announcement of the day, hour, place and subject, one time, in a newspaper of general circulation in the City, and the hearing date and time shall be posted on the property to be considered for the PUD. During the period between the fixing of the date of the hearing and the date of the hearing, the Preliminary Plan, shall be kept on file in the office of the Planning and Building Department for public examination during regular office hours. The availability of such materials shall be indicated in the published notice of the hearing.

After receiving from the Municipal Planning Commission the recommendations for the proposed PUD and after holding the above public hearing, the City Council shall consider such recommendations and vote on the passage of the proposed PUD Ordinance. The City Council may, by a majority of all its members, adopt or reject the proposed Ordinance, with or without change.

(c) Final Plans.

(1) The Municipal Planning Commission shall review Final Plans for compliance with the approved PUD Ordinance and shall:

A. Approve the Final Plan as requested;

B. Approve the Final Plan with modifications as agreed by the applicant which do not change the essential character of the approved PUD and do not need review by the City Council;

C. Recommend the Final Plan to the City Council with changes that require an amendment to the PUD Ordinance; or

D. Disapprove the proposed Final Plan when said plan does not meet the requirements of the PUD.

Recommendations:

Use Considerations:

When the Development Plan was approved for this site, it was anticipated the proposed Worthington Station office condominiums would house businesses which would generate significant income tax for the City. Although this proposal is an attractive plan aesthetically and a needed use in central Ohio, the proposed use would produce just a fraction of the amount of income tax originally expected. The southern part of the property has been vacant since 2005, but has not generated a problem for the City.

Design Considerations:

- The proposed plan for the site with the building, driveway and parking layout and the proposed landscaping is designed to fit with the surrounding properties without adversely impacting the area. The entrances to the site are shown away from the intersection with E. Granville Rd. and site design appears to allow needed access to the railway while providing adequate parking for the facility. The site layout seems appropriate with buildings toward the street and parking to the rear.
- The general architectural style is appropriate for this site. Additional detail has been provided and can be further modified with the Final Plan and Architectural Review Board applications.
- General landscaping and lighting seem compatible with the Architectural Review District.
- The proposed location and screening of refuse containers is appropriate.
- Parking is appropriate.
- No environmental issues have been identified by the applicant, but should be addressed if present.
- The significant natural feature is the Oak tree. Protection during and after construction is critical, and has been agreed to by the applicant. Removal and installation of sidewalks or other permanent structures under the tree canopy should be avoided. Modifications have been made to the sidewalks to accommodate the Oak.
- Public Space Amenities likely exceed the Code requirement.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. David Hodge, said he is an attorney with Hill & Hodge, representing his client, 8000 Walton Parkway, Suite 260, New Albany, Ohio and Mr. Greg Cini, 353 S. Parkview Ave., Bexley, Ohio. Mr. Hodge said Mrs. Bitar's report was very thorough, and this was the third meeting he has had with the Commission concerning this project, and he has had many meetings with staff, as well as neighboring property owners such as the Silcott's and the Ohio Railway Museum, and with the Architect Brian Jones to create the right aesthetics. Mr. Hodge said they learned early on how important this corner is to the City which is why they gave real focus to southern façade of the building and also the corner with the introduction of the clock. Mr. Hodge said people will have a difficult time trying to see the building while driving down Dublin-Granville Road. He said he looked at the topography map and there is about a ten foot difference in the grade. The slope is steep and cannot be planted with grass. He said they have put together the frame, or skeleton, of the PUD, and they will come in later with a Final Development Plan after working with City Council. Mr. Cini said at the

previous meeting they discussed the south end and two finishes and adding a little bit of height to the south east corner and also lowering the windows.

Mr. Sauer said he liked the character and the project even though the project is not what the City had originally intended in terms of producing a lot of revenue but he felt this is the right project for the area. He felt the project was well done.

Mr. Brown said along with this project, Mr. Hodge has also cleaned up the strange easement issues, and Mr. Hodge said, "Almost." Mr. Myers said he wanted the City Council members to be schooled on what a PUD is before the next meeting. Mr. Hodge said he understands there is a learning curve with this type of development and it can be complex at times, but the PUD process in Worthington and most other places is the way to ensure the governmental entity and the surrounding property owners that what is ultimately going to be developed on the property is what is shown on the plans and the piece of paper. Mr. Hodge said if you take a look at the PUD process in the Code, Section 1174.08 C, which discusses the Final Plan requirement and what that plan has to do and that plan to be consistent with what was in the Preliminary Plan.

Mr. Lindsey said the Board's actions regarding a regularly zoned property is to take what is a general set of requirements for a property and apply it to all of the properties within the zone and then apply it to a particular property and then further refine what is going on within that property. In reality, the action involving a PUD is no different in that the PUD action by City Council is the rezoning of that property and the subsequent review of the final plans by the ARB-MPC Board members. The confusion not exists for new City Council members but also for the general public who does or does not understand this process. A PUD involves a particular development and a rezoning of property in a more particular way. The PUD goes to City Council as a legislative Act, not and administrative Act. The act of implementing the PUD happens when it comes back to the ARB-MPC body. He said it is important for the public to also know that the City Council meeting is not the final meeting for the project but the project will be coming back to ARB-MPC after going to City Council. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present to speak for or against this application and no one came forward.

Motion:

Mrs. Holcombe moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY THE GRIFFIN 105 GROUP, LLC FOR APPROVAL TO REZONE THE PROPERTY AT 800 PROPRIETORS RD. AS A PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT, AS PER CASE NO. PUD 01-17, DRAWINGS NO. PUD 01-17, DATED DECEMBER 1, 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. Mr. Coulter, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Sauer, aye; and Mr. Hofmann, aye. The motion was approved.

2. Conditional Use Permit

- a. Research and Development – Measurement Devices – **6600 Huntley Rd.** (Mettler-Toledo LLC) **CU 17-17**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

Mettler-Toledo has been located at the southeast corner of Huntley and Schrock Roads for decades, operating as a manufacturer and marketer of precision instruments for use in laboratory, industrial and food retailing applications. This request is to add a measurement device as part of a research and development effort.

Project Details:

1. The proposed underground structure would be on the east side of the property, 4' to 12' from the property line. A variance would be needed due to the proximity.
2. Two 100' x 12' reinforced concrete pads at grade would have a 10' x 12' scale in between. All exterior changes would be at grade.

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 – The effect would not change.
4. Utilities required – No new utilities would be required.
5. Safety and health considerations – None have been identified.
6. Noise, odors and other noxious elements, including hazardous substances and other environmental hazards – None have been identified.
7. Hours of use – Intermittent between 8:00 am and 5:00 pm.
8. Shielding or screening considerations for neighbors – Existing fence and vegetation.
9. Appearance and compatibility with the general neighborhood – No change.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Conditional Use Permit Regulations

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

Worthington Comprehensive Plan Update & 2005 Strategic Plan

An area plan focusing on the Proprietors/Huntley Road corridor should be developed that makes recommendations for repositioning it in the market place to make it attractive and competitive in the region. Issues such as building renovation, aesthetics, and possible road and infrastructure improvements should be addressed. In any case it is critical that the City protect the industrial corridor as an employment center.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of this application. The proposed use is appropriate in the I-2 Zoning District.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Thad Boggs, 10 W. Broad St., 23rd Floor, Columbus, Ohio. He said he is with the law firm of Frost, Brown & Todd, and representing his client, Mettler-Toledo. Mr. Boggs said two employees from Mettler-Toledo were also in attendance at the meeting, Mr. Jeffrey Jackson and Mr. Bill [REDACTED]. Mr. Boggs said Mettler Toledo is a provider of measurement devices for laboratory industrial food retail operations and is a multi-national corporation. The business in Worthington employs over one hundred and ten people and the building is about one hundred and twenty thousand square feet. The building sits within the I-2 Industrial District and the activities will not be noticeable to an outside observer. There will not be an increase in noise or traffic, or the use of city services or utilities. Trucks will be helping Mettler-Toledo test vehicle scales at this particular pad location. 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 METTLER-TOLEDO FOR A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO CONDUCT RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT BY INSTALLING A MEASUREMENT DEVICE IN THE I-2 ZONING DISTRICT AT 6600 HUNTLEY RD., AS PER CASE NO. CU 17-17, DRAWINGS NO. CU 17-17, DATED DECEMBER 1, 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.

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.

3. Amendment to Development Plan

- a. Addition – **370 E. Wilson Bridge Rd.** (Material Properties, LLC/Patrick J. O’Donovan)
ADP 10-17

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This property was originally part of a development plan that included the buildings at 330 and 350 E. Wilson Bridge Rd., so is still subject to approval by the MPC and City Council for changes to the site. The property is adjacent to the Norfolk and Western railroad right-of-way on the east side. The brick office building was constructed in 1987 as a bank with a drive-thru.

The applicant is requesting approval to construct an addition.

Project Details:

1. A single-story 3332 square foot addition is proposed to the rear (northeast corner) of the existing 4000 square foot building. The new structure would be 28' from the north property line and 10' from the east property line, requiring variances from the Code requirements of 30' from the rear and 15' from the side.
2. The building is proposed to be stucco, with metal trim, gutters and downspouts. The colors would match the existing building, as would the windows, doors and lights.

Land Use Plans:

Development Plan Amendment Ordinance

When an applicant wishes to make modifications following approval of a Final Development Plan, and variances are included, the modification must be approved by the City Council.

2005 Worthington Comprehensive Plan

This area is designated as the commercial office center of Worthington. The advantage of this area is the freeway visibility and access. Reinvestment in the existing buildings is encouraged to make the buildings more competitive in the market place.

Chapter 1181 – Wilson Bridge Corridor

The purpose is to promote the redevelopment of the Wilson Bridge Road Corridor into an area that will generate new economic growth within the City. The requirements 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. Generally, exterior insulation finishing systems (EIFS), are not preferred material types.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of this application to be recommended to the City Council as the proposed addition maintains the character and integrity of the original development. Although the use of EIFS is not preferred, the addition would not readily be seen from the road due to its location. The requested variances should not have an impact.

Discussion:

Page 28 of 30

ARB/MPC Meeting December 14, 2017

Minutes

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Patrick O'Donovan, 657 Tim Tam Ave., Gahanna, Ohio. Mr. O'Donovan said the addition will be tucked back behind the building and probably will not be able to be seen from the roadway. Mr. Coulter asked Mr. O'Donovan if he was planning to add additional employees and Mr. O'Donovan said yes, he is planning to double the size of the company. 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 MATERIAL PROPERTIES, LLC FOR APPROVAL TO AMEND THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN BY CONSTRUCTING AN ADDITION AT 370 E. WILSON BRIDGE RD., AS PER CASE NO. ADP 10-17, DRAWINGS NO. ADP 10-17, DATED NOVEMBER 22, 2017, BE RECOMMENDED TO CITY COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL BASED ON THE PLANNING GOALS OF THE CITY, AS REFERENCED IN THE LAND USE PLANS AND 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. Directional Signs – 740-760 Lakeview Plaza Blvd. (Joseph Fiala) ADP 11-17

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

The property at 740-760 Lakeview Plaza Blvd. was rezoned to C-3, Institutions and Office in 2010. There are two buildings containing office condominiums on this roughly 5.7 acre property.

The owners would like to install signage.

Project Details:

1. A main sign would be installed at the southeast corner of the property near the intersection of Sancus and Lakeview Plaza Blvds. The sign (Sign #1) is proposed to be “L” shaped with 48” wide x 36” tall white panels and corner posts. Black copy would say “740-760 Lakeview Plaza Blvd.” in the same font and 2 sizes.
2. Two directional signs (Sign #2) are proposed, one at the Lakeview Plaza Entrance and one at the Sancus entrance. The signs would be double faced and placed perpendicular to the street, having the same graphics as the main sign. The proposed size is 36” wide x 24” tall, which exceeds the allowable area and likely the height for directional sign ($\leq 24” \times 24”$ and 36” high), so a variance would be needed.

Land Use Plans:Development Plan Amendment Ordinance

When an applicant wishes to make modifications following approval of a Final Development Plan, and variances are included, the modification must be approved by the City Council.

2005 Worthington Comprehensive Plan

This area is referred to as a primary corporate office park where reinvestment is encouraged.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of this application to be recommended to the City Council. The proposed signs would be beneficial to the tenants and the size is appropriate in this location.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Dr. Joseph Fiala, 25 Kenyon Brook Dr., Worthington, Ohio. Board members had no questions or concerns. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone to speak for or against this application and no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Sauer moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY JOSEPH FIALA FOR APPROVAL TO AMEND THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN BY ADDING SIGNAGE AT 740 – 760 LAKEVIEW PLAZA BLVD., AS PER CASE NO. ADP 11-17, DRAWINGS NO. ADP 11-17, DATED NOVEMBER 30, 2017, BE RECOMMENDED TO CITY COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL BASED ON THE PLANNING GOALS OF THE CITY, AS REFERENCED IN THE LAND USE PLANS AND 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.

D. Other

Mr. Brown said the City has put out a request for proposal for audio visual equipment so they can stream City Council meetings and then eventually stream ARB-MPC and BZA meetings. The recordings will be available if anyone wants to listen to the meetings. There will also be tweaks to the Minute taking to help reduce the volume. Mr. Brown presented Melissa Cohan with a Certificate of Appreciation for time and dedication spent attending the ARB-MPC meetings and transcribing meeting minutes.

E. Adjournment

Mr. Sauer moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mrs. Holcombe. All Board members voted, “Aye, “ and the meeting adjourned at 9:26 p.m.