



MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING  
WORTHINGTON ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD  
WORTHINGTON MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION  
October 25, 2018

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; David Foust; Amy Lloyd; and Richard Schuster. 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. Commission member Thomas Reis, Vice-Chair, was absent.

**A. Call to Order – 7:00 p.m.**

1. Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Approval of the Minutes of the September 27 & October 11, 2018 meetings

Mr. Hofmann moved to approve the minutes and Mr. Foust seconded the motion. All members voted “Aye” and the minutes were approved.

4. Affirmation/swearing in of witnesses

**B. Architectural Review Board**

1. Fence – **105 W. Clearview Ave.** (Grant & Elizabeth Baldwin) **AR 93-18**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

**Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

**Background & Request:**

This property is 50’ wide and 162’ deep, containing a Colonial Revival Influence style house that was built in 1938. The house and detached garage are contributing buildings in the Worthington Historic District. A fence to enclose the rear property is requested.

**Project Details:**

1. The fence is proposed to start at the southeast corner of the garage and enclose the rear yard, finishing at the southwest corner of the house with a gate. The application indicates 2 gates are proposed.
2. Proposed is a 4' high unpainted cedar fence with dog-eared pickets. The 4" pickets (3 ¾" wide) would be spaced 3 ¾" apart.

**Land Use Plans:**

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Fencing should be open in style; constructed with traditional materials; 3' to 4' in height; in the back yard; and of simple design, appropriate for the house style. Design and materials should be compatible with the existing structure.

**Recommendation:**

Staff recommended approval of this application. The proposed fence met the guidelines for the Architectural Review District.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Elizabeth Baldwin, 105 Clearview Ave., Worthington, Ohio, said she has small children and would also like to get a puppy, and that is why they would like to enclose their backyard. Mrs. Baldwin said she received approval from the owners of the abutting properties. Mr. Foust said he was okay with the proposal as long as the spaces between pickets were as wide as the pickets. 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 GRANT & ELIZABETH BALDWIN FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO ADD FENCING AT 105 W. CLEARVIEW AVE. AS PER CASE NO. AR 93-18, DRAWINGS NO. AR 93-18, DATED OCTOBER 5, 2018 BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.**

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

2. Attached Garage, Door, Deck, Carriage House – **594 Hartford St.** (RAS Construction/Huffman) **AR 94-18** (Extension and Amendment to AR 03-15)

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

**Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

**Background & Request:**

The house and barn on this 100' wide x 253' deep property were constructed in the early 1900's. In 2007, aluminum siding was removed and the original clapboard siding was restored. Also, a front porch was added which was similar to the front porch originally constructed with the house and removed in the early 1970's. In 2012 the windows were replaced with simulated divided light vinyl clad wood windows.

An addition and garage were approved for this Dutch colonial house in 2014, as was the removal of the barn. There were 2 phases of construction planned: Phase 1 allowed construction of a 26' x 26' two-story addition to the rear of the home; Phase 2 involved construction of a two-story garage attached to the addition. Phase 1 is now complete, and the applicant would like to extend the approval for the attached garage and barn demolition. Also, the applicant is now proposing a rear patio door leading to a deck, and a new carriage house.

### **Project Details:**

1. Extension of the Phase 2 approval would allow for demolition of the existing barn, and construction of a new roughly 26' x 26' garage with a room above attached to the south side of the Phase 1 addition. Two separate barn style garage doors would face south and allow for entry from an extension of the existing drive. A matching gambrel roof is proposed for the two story structure that would extend south with the peak being much lower than the roof of the house due to the downward slope of the property. In addition to the matching materials proposed for the house addition, this structure would have a cupola and a rear entry door. The proposed materials would continue to match the existing house including: clapboard siding, slate roof, clad wood simulated divided light windows, and split faced and parged block for the foundation. Carriage lights are proposed near the doors.
2. In the original approval, a small deck was approved at the southeast corner of the addition, with steps leading down to the driveway. In 2015, that approval was modified to not include the deck, but instead add stairs down from a south-facing exterior door. That door and stairs would be interior with the new garage, and an exterior lower level entrance is proposed on the rear elevation. New to this proposal is a deck spanning the rear of the house. The deck is proposed to be 7' deep and about 25' 7" wide, with a Timbertech railing and supported by wood posts wrapped in fiber cement material. Stairs would be on the north side, and heading down to the east. An exterior door is now proposed in place of a window on the main house level. Patio doors would continue to be included for lower level access to the back yard.
3. A 16' x 20' carriage house is now proposed 9' from the south property line, and about 14' east of the house. The freestanding structure would have a gambrel standing seam metal roof and siding to match the house. The applicant would like a choice of roof colors, either Burnished Slate or Light Gray. A single barn style garage door is proposed on the west side and a six panel man door is proposed on the north side. Carriage lights are proposed near the doors.

### **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. Design and materials should be traditional, and compatible with the existing structure.

Older outbuildings, sheds, and garages should be retained and repaired. They add variety and visual interest to the streetscape and are part of Worthington's character. 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.

**Recommendation:**

Staff recommended approval of this application. The garage addition is to the rear and at enough of a lower elevation to appear subordinate to the house. The proposed deck is of a design and material that are appropriate to the rear of the addition. Although it is unfortunate the existing barn cannot be saved, the proposed carriage house is appropriate.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Sean Kocheran, representing the home owners of 594 Hartford St., Worthington, Ohio, said he did not have anything further to add to the presentation. Mr. Hofmann asked why the front garage windows were low, about a foot off of the floor, and Mr. Kocheran explained the windows were lower due to the ceiling height and would be more manageable. Mr. Coulter asked the Board members if anyone had an opinion as to the color of the standing seam roof. The Board members had no opinion for the color. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak either for or against this application.

Mrs. Marlene Orloff, 590 Hartford St., Worthington, Ohio, said she lived next door and wanted clarification about the garages. Mr. Coulter explained there would be an attached garage on the side of the house and a single car garage would replace the old barn. Mrs. Orloff asked if the applicant would be making their driveway more flush with theirs. Mrs. Bitar said she did not recall plans to change the driveway grade. Mr. Coulter explained the Board members did not have site plans that included grade changes. Mrs. Orloff asked what date the construction would begin and what time of day construction equipment could be heard. Mrs. Bitar suggested asking the General Contractor. Mr. Kocheran said they would be respectful of any noise ordinances, but their general workday is from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. He said he would be working with the homeowner regarding parking. They are sensitive to parking in the neighborhood. Mr. Kocheran said the driveway is long and most of the construction vehicles will fit in the driveway. They would not park vehicles in the no parking zone.

Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Kocheran when they plan to begin construction and Mr. Kocheran said they plan to begin construction mid-November, and as long as the weather is nice they could be finished by the end of April 2019. They will begin with the attached garage first. The barn will need to be taken down before they can build the carriage house. Mr. Kocheran said they are seeking a variance for accessory structure area. Mrs. Holcombe asked about the driveway concerns and Mr. Kocheran responded they would take a look at the driveway, and do not intend to cause a negative impact to anyone. Mr. Kocheran said he planned to ask his client if they wanted to survey the property to clarify the property lines. He said they would not be pouring the driveway until spring. Mrs. Orloff said she was interested in pursuing a survey to see who the trees in the middle of the

two properties belong to and she would discuss this with her neighbor. There were no other speakers.

**Motion:**

Mr. Shuster moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY SEAN KOCHERAN OF RAS CONSTRUCTION TO EXTEND CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS NO. AR 44-15 BY ALLOWING CONSTRUCTION OF AN ATTACHED GARAGE AND DEMOLITION OF A BARN, AND FOR APPROVAL TO CONSTRUCT A DECK AND CARRIAGE HOUSE AT 594 HARTFORD ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 94-18, DRAWINGS NO. AR 94-18, DATED OCTOBER 10, 2018, 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. Hofmann, aye; Mr. Foust, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye; and Mr. Schuster, aye. The motion was approved.

**3. Garden Shed – 120 E. South St. (Sean Crowley) AR 95-18**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

**Findings of fact & Conclusions**

**Background & Request:**

This 80' wide x 140' deep property has a two-story house that was built in 1972. The applicant would like to install a shed in the rear yard.

**Project Details:**

1. An 8' x 14' shed is proposed at the northeast corner of the property. The shed would be 5' from the east property line and 15' from the north property line.
2. The proposed shed would have a gable roof and be constructed with wood. The color would be a custom tan to match the house, and Weathered Wood asphalt shingles are proposed to also match the house.
3. Double doors and two windows are proposed on the west side of the building, and a window with a transom above is proposed on the north side.

**Land Use Plans:**

**Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance**

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.

**Recommendation:**

Staff recommended approval of this application, as the proposed shed was compatible with the house and appropriate for the District.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Sean Crowley, 120 E. South St., Worthington, Ohio, said he and his wife have three boys, and would like to be able to park both of their cars in the garage. He would like to store lawn equipment and tools in the shed so they have room to park their cars. Mr. Myers asked what Mr. Crowley planned to do between the shed and the garage and the adjoining property. Mr. Crowley said he would like to plant boxwoods because the deer would not attack those, and the boxwoods would match the landscaping in the front yard. Mr. Myers said plantings would be nice. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak either for or against this application and no came forward.

**Motion:**

Mr. Foust moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY SEAN CROWLEY FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL A SHED AT 120 E. SOUTH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 95-18, DRAWINGS NO. AR 95-18, DATED OCTOBER 11, 2018, 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. Hofmann, aye; Mr. Foust, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye; and Mr. Schuster, aye. The motion was approved.

- 4. Demolition & New Dwelling – **155 W. Dublin-Granville Rd.** (Schumacher Homes/Tschofen) **AR 97-18**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

**Findings of fact & Conclusions**

**Background & Request:**

This parcel was established in 1957 as part of the Kilbourne Village subdivision. The existing 1740 square foot split-level house was constructed in 1960. Last year there was a request to demolish the existing house and construct a new 2400 square foot single-story residence. In May of 2018, the homeowner gained approval to renovate and add onto the existing house. Now, the owner would like to go back to the original plan of demolition and building new, except with some design modifications.

**Project Details:**

- 1. Site Plan:

- The proposed house would be constructed in approximately the same location as the existing house, but extend further to the rear. The existing house is situated 51’ from the front property line; 7’ from the west property line; 10.7’ from the east property line; and ~93’ from the rear. The proposed house would be the same distance from the front property line; ~8.3’ from each side property line; and ~70’ from the rear. The garage would extend in front of the house by 4’.

- A landscape plan is included with the application, showing retention of existing trees in the front and rear yards, and proposed bushes, shrubs and perennials.

2. Building:

- Proposed is a one-story structure with a gable roof running east and west. Gables are proposed above the garage and front entrance, and a shed roof dormer is proposed on the front of the roof between the two gables.
- Double 4” traditional lap white vinyl siding is proposed around the entire house except white vinyl shakes are proposed in the front gables. Originally Dutch lap siding was proposed, but the property owner has agreed to use a traditional lap siding instead. A photograph of the textured siding in Dutch lap is in the packet, but a picture and sample of traditional lap will be available at the meeting. Pewter colored dimensional asphalt shingles are proposed for the roof.
- Vinyl clad wood Andersen windows are proposed for the house. The main openings would consist of paired double hung windows with muntins between the glass in a 4 over 1 pattern. Pairs of smaller windows with 4 lights are proposed for the dormer and in the gable above the garage. The rear windows are proposed without muntins, and include picture and double-hung windows. On the west side a double hung window is proposed toward the front, and a small fixed transom window would be toward the rear. Three small transom windows are proposed on the east side.
- A fiberglass door with the look of vertically oriented planks is proposed. The door is shown in the elevation with sidelights and a transom.
- A white steel garage door with 32 square raised panels is proposed.

**Land Use Plans:**

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

A decision on whether a particular demolition is appropriate must be made in light of several factors, including whether the demolition is full or partial; the age of the structure; the level of integrity of the structure being demolished (has it been extensively altered?); the impact of the demolition on Worthington’s character; and plans for the site following demolition (is the proposed replacement appropriate for Worthington? Does it follow the design guidelines for new structures?)

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

Building placement and orientation are important design considerations. There are two primary considerations: 1) most main entrances should face the street; and 2) garages should avoid facing the street. The City of Worthington wants to avoid new development that turns main entrances inward or away from the street, and it wants to avoid dominance of the streetscape by garage doors.

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

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

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

Entries: For newly-built buildings, simpler designs usually look better than more ornate ones. Avoid heavy ornamentation on doors and entrances. Observe entry placement on existing buildings. Whether located symmetrically or asymmetrically, entries usually are aligned with a window on the second floor so that a regular rhythm of openings is maintained on both floors. Entries should be located so they are easily visible, and they should be oriented toward the street.

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

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

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

The standards of review in the Architectural District ordinance are:

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

**Staff Analysis:**

- The proposed house has a more traditional look than the previously proposed new house at this location due to the gabled roof, simpler application of siding, and fenestration. Many features are similar to other houses in Kilbourne Village.
- Although it is typical for garage doors to face the street in this area, having the garage closer to the street than the house is not preferred.
- The proposed single story house would be more accessible than the existing split-level.
- Changes to the house color and side windows should be considered.
- Taller plant materials on the east side could help soften that elevation.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Peter Tschofen, 155 W. Dublin-Granville Rd., Worthington, Ohio; Joe Young, 8537 Leader Dr., Columbus, Ohio; and Ty Palmer 5087 Columbus Pike, Lewis Center, Ohio. Mr. Tschofen said he was before the Board a year ago with a similar proposal, and earlier this year with a remodeling proposal. He has now gone back to the teardown and rebuild because it would only be about \$25,000 more than the remodel would have cost. Mr. Tschofen wanted to come before the Board again and present a more traditional style and to see if the style would be accepted.

Mrs. Bitar asked if the color sample was the chosen color for the house and Mr. Tschofen white is the preferred color. Mr. Schuster said he did have some concerns about the side windows, and felt the Board must look towards the future to see if the windows would be appropriate for the area. Mr. Schuster said he also had concerns about the house being white because it makes the house stand out. Mr. Tschofen said they had some additional side elevation drawings prepared with some different windows. Copies were distributed to the Board members and the image was projected for the audience. Mr. Tschofen said one of the reasons he wanted the transom windows was because the home on Evening Street is at a higher elevation and looks down into the side of his house, but he fully understood the desire to have more traditional windows. He said he still had a transom in the main bathroom but on the other elevation on the other side the two windows are 24" x 24", so there are two of those in the master bathroom. Mr. Tschofen said if space allowed he would be willing to put those types of windows in the main bathroom on the east side.

Mr. Hofmann said he felt some attention has been paid to the façade which is generally working but around the corner seems like a different project, and instead should feel like a complete home. He said there are trim lines and window scales going on with the façade that must track on both the left and the right side. Mr. Hofmann said the east side view can be seen for four or five blocks. He felt window coverings could help with privacy, or possibly frost the glass so the look is appropriate and keep the light and the look. He felt window style and trim elements should continue around to the sides of the house. Mrs. Lloyd felt the front gable windows could be used on the sides. There was a discussion amongst the members about window ideas. Mrs. Holcombe suggested adding windows to the east side of the house because the house would have a more open feel and morning sunlight.

When asked why he wanted all white for the house, Mr. Tschofen said he was willing to go with light gray color for the house and would like to leave the shakes white. Mr. Coulter discussed how details could be carried around to the sides of the house. Mr. Foust asked about the shed roof dormer, and Mr. Hofmann said the key is 360° design. Mr. Myers said the Board would like to see a little more detail for the landscaping plan, with particular interest on the east side.

Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak for or against this application. The applicant and Board briefly discussed treatment for the sides of the house. Mr. Tschofen requested to table the application.

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

## 5. Window and Door Replacement – 583 Hartford St. (Catherine Watson) AR 99-18

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

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

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

This 1920's two-story house could be described as a foursquare with its boxy form and simple ornamentation, but also has influences from the Craftsman style of architecture, such as the windows. The owner reports some of the existing wood windows and a side door are in poor repair, and in need of replacement.

#### **Project Details:**

1. Seven windows are proposed for replacement: three on the front; three on the south side; and one in the rear. The existing windows are double-hung with 3 over 1 lights. Proposed are fiberglass clad wood windows in the same size, color and light pattern as the existing windows. The new Beechworth windows would be simulated divided light style, including spacer bars between the double panes of glass. Existing wood trim around the windows would remain.
2. Replacement of an existing wood side door with a fiberglass door is proposed. The existing white door has a glass window in the top third of the door, and three horizontal panels below. The proposed door would also be white, but would have a smaller window at the top and three vertical panels below.

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

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

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.

Be sure that window and door designs are appropriate for the style or time period of the house. Design and materials should be traditional, and compatible with the existing structure.

#### **Recommendation:**

Staff recommended approval of this application. The proposed replacement windows seemed to offer a reasonably good match for the existing windows. Although the proposed door did not

match the existing door style, the new door would be an appropriate style for use on the side of this house.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Catherine Watson, 583 Hartford St., Worthington, Ohio, said she is planning a phased approach to replacing all 30 windows in the house. 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 CATHERINE WATSON FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO REPLACE WINDOWS AND A DOOR AT 583 HARTFORD ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 99-18, DRAWINGS NO. AR 99-18, DATED OCTOBER 12, 2018 BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.**

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

6. ATMs, Façade changes, Signage & Lighting – **54 W. Wilson Bridge Rd.** (Bank of America, N.A.) **AR 96-18**

&

**C. Municipal Planning Commission**

1. Drive-in Bank – **54 W. Wilson Bridge Rd.** (Bank of America, N.A.) **CU 16-18**

Mr. Hofmann moved to table this application, seconded by Mr. Foust. All Board members voted, “Aye;” and the application was tabled.

&

2. Signage – **54 W. Wilson Bridge Rd.** (Bank of America, N.A.) **ADP 08-18**

Mr. Hofmann moved to table this application, seconded by Mr. Foust. All Board members voted, “Aye;” and the application was tabled.

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

**Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

**Background & Request:**

This outbuilding on the Shops at Worthington Place property has always functioned as a financial institution, most recently Telhio Credit Union. This request by Bank of America is the first time the space is proposed to be used without employees, with the only bank functions being accomplished with Automated Teller Machines (ATMs).

### **Project Details:**

1. Two ATMs are proposed for the site, one for walk-up traffic and one for drive-thru traffic.
  - The walk-up ATM is proposed in place of the front door facing W. Wilson Bridge Rd. The proposal involves removing the existing vestibule, and installing an ATM machine with a red surround and Bank of America sign at the top.
  - The second ATM is proposed beneath the drive-thru canopy at the rear of the building. This machine is also proposed with a sign at the top, with the topper being framed in red. Roughly 4 ½' wide by 7 ¾" high directional signs are proposed on the edge of the canopy. Bollards are proposed to protect the machine, and would be gray with narrow red stripes.
2. A wall sign is proposed to be mounted in place of the existing sign box (24 sf in area), that consists of a 150" wide x 62" (~65 sf in area) panel to match the brick, with 15" white channel letters spelling "Bank of America" and a 22 ¾" high logo. The lettering and logo are proposed to be halo lit. The panel would likely cover the decorative brick work at the corners of that wall.
3. A new sign box is proposed to top the existing pole in front of the building. The existing sign box on the pole is 14 sf in area per side. The new box would be 6' 8 ¾" x 3' 10 ⅜" (26 sf in area per side), and tan in color. Concave sign faces would be slightly smaller than the box, with a white background, and blue lettering and a blue and red logo. The sign backgrounds are specified as opaque. The pole is proposed to be wrapped in 1'8" wide tan material.
4. Building trim is proposed to be repaired to match the existing. Retention of the windows is planned, although a film is proposed on the interior to obscure the view. A photograph of a storefront with similar treatment is included in the packet.
5. New lighting is proposed for the site and building.
  - Eight 15' high bronze poles with fixtures would be installed around the site. On the east side, the poles are proposed in the existing parallel parking spots, and would have concrete bollards for protection, as the concrete bases would not extend above grade. The 4000K LED fixtures would direct light downward, producing light levels up to 13.7 footcandles. The existing 25' pole in front of the building is proposed for replacement, and would also have bollards for protection.
  - New canopy light fixtures are proposed, also being 4000K LED, and producing up to 22 footcandles of light.
  - Eight bronze cylindrical wall sconces are proposed around the building in the same color temperature as the other proposed lights.

### **Land Use Plans:**

#### Architectural District and Development Plan Ordinances

The Board should review the exterior detail and relationship of the changes to existing sites and building. Primary building entrances should be on the street-facing principal facade.

The Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance recommend signs be efficient and compatible with the age and architecture of the building. While the regulations permit a certain maximum square footage of signs for a business, try to minimize the size and number of signs. Place only basic names and graphics on signs along the street so that drive-by traffic is not bombarded with too much information. Signs must be distinctive enough to be readily visible, but avoid incompatible modern colors such as “fluorescent orange” and similar colors. Bright color shades generally are discouraged in favor more subtle and toned-down shades.

#### Chapter 1181 - Wilson Bridge Corridor Districts

##### 1181.05 Development Standards.

(b) Buildings. Building design should enhance the character of the WBC. A diversity of architectural styles is encouraged to provide visual interest and add to the overall appeal of the corridor.

(1) Design. A principal building shall be oriented parallel to Wilson Bridge Road, or as parallel as the site permits, and should have an operational entry facing the street.

(d) Lighting. All exterior lighting shall be integrated with the building design and site and shall contribute to the night-time experience, including façade lighting, sign and display window illumination, landscape, parking lot, and streetscape lighting.

(1) The average illumination level shall not exceed 3 footcandles. The light level along a property line shall not exceed 0 footcandles.

(2) The height of parking lot lighting shall not exceed 15' above grade and shall direct light downward. Parking lot lighting shall be accomplished from poles within the lot, and not building-mounted lights.

(3) For pedestrian walkways, decorative low light level fixtures shall be used and the height of the fixture shall not exceed 12' above grade.

(4) Security lighting shall be full cut-off type fixtures, shielded and aimed so that illumination is directed to the designated areas with the lowest possible illumination level to effectively allow surveillance.

(e) Signs.

(1) General.

A. All new signs, including sign face replacement, shall be subject to the provisions herein.

B. The provisions in Chapter 1170 shall apply to all signs in the WBC unless otherwise stated in this section.

C. Exterior lighting fixtures are the preferred source of illumination.

(2) Freestanding Signs

A. There shall be no more than one freestanding sign on parcels less than 2 acres in size, and no more than two freestanding signs on parcels 2 acres in size or greater.

B. Freestanding signs shall be monument style and no part of any freestanding sign shall exceed an above-grade height of 10'. Sign area shall not exceed 50 square feet per side, excluding the sign base. The sign base shall be integral to the overall sign design and complement the design of the building and landscape.

D. Light sources shall be screened from motorist view.

(3) Wall-mounted Signs

- A. Each business occupying 25% or more of a building may have one wall sign and one projection sign. Wall-mounted signs shall not exceed 40 square feet in area, and projection signs shall not exceed 12 square feet in area per side.

Worthington Code 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
2. Effect on public facilities
3. Effect on sewerage and drainage facilities
4. Utilities required
5. Safety and health considerations
6. Noise, odors and other noxious elements, including hazardous substances and other environmental hazards
7. Hours of use
8. Shielding or screening considerations for neighbors
9. Appearance and compatibility with the general neighborhood

#### 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.

#### **Staff Analysis:**

1. Replacing a front entrance with an ATM machine is not appropriate. Either retaining the vestibule and placing the ATM inside, or locating the walk-up ATM on the side or rear of the building should be explored. Regardless of the walk-up ATM location, the wide red surround and topper sign should be eliminated.
2. The topper panel with a sign on the drive-thru ATM should not be permitted.
3. Although the style of the proposed wall sign is somewhat acceptable, the size should be reduced to be no larger than the previous wall sign, which was 24 square feet. The brick corner detailing should not be covered in any case.
4. The proposed freestanding sign is larger than the existing former sign, which is not preferred on a 12' high sign on a pole. Also, design similar to the proposed wall sign (halo lit) should be considered.
5. The improvements to the building are appropriate. The use of interior blinds rather than placing film on the windows may provide a more typical look for the District.
6. The new light poles and fixtures seem appropriate for the site, except proposed light levels are higher than typically seen. The Wilson Bridge corridor standard calls for lighting not to exceed an average of 3 footcandles. Other ARB approvals have limited the light level under the canopy to 15 footcandles, rather than the proposed 22 footcandles.
7. The effect based on Conditional Use Permit Standards and Review Elements should be minimal with an unmanned facility, however expected traffic numbers have not been reported.

8. The elimination of the need for variances by reducing sign size, and removing the ATM signs from the proposal would be appropriate.
9. An unmanned banking facility is not typical for the community.

**Recommendations:**

Staff recommended approval of the drive-thru ATM without the topper; the directional signs for the drive-thru; and the building renovations. The ATM on the front of the building should be denied, with relocation being considered. Reduction in the size of the proposed wall and freestanding signs is needed, and redesign of the freestanding sign is desired. Reduction in the amount of light being produced on the site is warranted. The Conditional Use permit should be approved. The Amendment to Development Plan may not be necessary with the reduction in the size of the wall and freestanding signs, and elimination of the ATM signs.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Paul Wolenski, representing JLL Bank of America, said this is a new market for the bank. They are in the process of deploying several remote ATM sites in the Columbus area, and plans are in the works for projects that involve financial centers in the summer and fall of 2019. Mr. Wolenski said he had a staff report with some of the comments and he met with Mrs. Bitar and discussed what some of the concerns were, and then he discussed those concerns with the Bank Deployment and Strategy Groups.

Mr. Wolenski said he had a list of items to discuss and started with the Staff Analysis. He said the bank is very firm in regards to the front entrance. They want to maintain the proposed plan to have a walk up ATM in place of the front entry vestibule. They discussed leaving the existing vestibule to create an interior type of ATM where the customer would walk into the building and then from that point use the ATM while they are inside the building, but that could create some security concerns. Also, Bank of America does not want customers to think this is a banking center rather than only an ATM. Mr. Wolenski said he felt proposed signage could comply with the Code. The proposed frosted glass film is preferred because the bank felt adding blinds to the windows would give the appearance the bank was open at certain times. They want to be obvious and clear the bank building is strictly just for ATM use only. Mrs. Holcombe asked if there would be any signage stating this building is just ATM use. Mr. Wolenski said they did talk about that, and he thought there were plans with the pylon sign to have ATM on the sign. Mr. Coulter said he was fine with the film on the windows and understood why they want the windows to be opaque. Mrs. Holcombe and Mr. Coulter said they were fine with the ATM instead of the front door.

Mr. Hofmann asked if Bank of America has ever done this before, taken over a building and stripped the front door. Mr. Hofmann said he was concerned because this was an entrance to the corridor area and he was uncertain of the economics. He was very concerned with the idea of a ghost building. Mr. Foust asked if they considered a solid front door with two ATMs in place of the windows. Mr. Hofmann reiterated this idea of using a whole building for just an ATM. Mr. Schuster asked Mr. Myers what the economic value of two ATM's would be to the city, saying he shared Mr. Hofmann's concerns. Mr. Myers said there would be no income tax, but there is no income tax now. There would be a small increase in real estate tax but that would go to the School Board. Mr. Myers said he did not look at this project like a revenue issue, instead he

looks at it as a traffic issue. Mr. Myers said Council has taken the position of being very supportive of the mall and they have tried to do whatever they could to increase revenue and increase traffic to the mall and that has been a priority of City Council for many years since the mall was taken over by Tom Carter and in that respect he felt this ATM project would help the mall. Mr. Myers said as far as the Wilson Bridge Corridor goes this would not help and is not what they are looking for. He said they are focusing on the east side of Wilson Bridge Corridor right now and the only thing happening right now is the Northeast Gateway Project. Mr. Myers felt there were conflicting priorities. He said he would love to hear Bank of America is just starting with the ATMs to build a customer base, and then turn the building into a real bank. Mr. Hofmann asked Mr. Wolenski how long the lease term was and Mr. Wolenski said the lease term is for five years with renewable options. Mr. Myers explained the Board and Commission members should not be concerned with the economics, just the architecture and conditional use.

Mr. Schuster ask about the material around the front ATM. Mr. Wolenski said the surround would be 4", and the area around would be framed out with break metal, and could be white or match the brick instead of being red. Mr. Myers asked about illumination of the surround and Mr. Wolenski said the surround is backlit with LED lights. Mrs. Holcombe asked if security cameras would be installed and Mr. Wolenski replied, "Yes."

Mr. Myers felt the issue of whether this is a bank or not should be explored further. Should different types of vehicles to do banking activity be called a bank? Mr. Hofmann wondered if a building would still be a building without a front door. He and Mr. Myers were struggling with the Board's purview. Mrs. Bitar mentioned the guidelines were pretty specific saying all buildings along a street should have an operable front door. Mr. Hofmann said this would set a precedent.

Mr. Foust pointed out there is mature landscaping on the property and thought there should be something in the plans to show it would be retained. He did not want to see it all be removed.

Mr. Myers said there are some things that need further discussion and clarification, so no decision was likely that evening. He said in the meantime he will round table some of the other Council members to gather some thoughts as to what they think.

Mr. Coulter mentioned again the idea of having a solid door with two ATMs. Mr. Foust said it could be a six-panel traditional looking front door with no handle. Mr. Wolenski explained the side windows do not offer enough room for the ATM. Mr. Myers and Mr. Hofmann the area could be reworked with a smaller door to allow room for the ATM under the overhang. Mr. Hofmann felt he could be more supportive of the request if it still looked like a building with an entrance. Mr. Wolenski said there would be only one walk-up ATM and Mr. Coulter said that would be fine, and there could be a window on the other side. Mr. Hofmann said a door and one window would be okay too, and would still have a cover. The Board members were okay with taking out the vestibule.

Mr. Hofmann asked about the signage and Mr. Coulter said he would like to see the pylon sign stay the same size so a variance would not be needed, and should identify "ATM Center" or "ATM Only". Mr. Wolenski said that would not be a problem and they have no plans to modify the landscaping, but there will be some maintenance done.

Mr. Coulter said in terms of lighting, he preferred the fifteen foot poles but suggested Mr. Wolenski speak with Mrs. Bitar about acceptable light levels. Mr. Wolenski asked if the existing sign area would be the limit of what would be approved. Mrs. Bitar said any ATM signage would need a variance as an additional wall sign. Mr. Wolenski thought the bank felt pretty strongly about the walk-up having a sign, but thought the drive-up might be ok without. Mrs. Bitar asked if either of the ATMs would have to be illuminated. She said there were so many variations when she looked for photographs of Bank of America ATMs that there should be something available without the need for illumination on the ATM. Mr. Wolenski said he was not sure. Mrs. Bitar said the new lighting in the canopy will shine down on the ATM so the area would not be dark. Mr. Wolenski said he would check to see what was available and look at the lighting of the surrounds and the topper on the drive-up ATM. Mrs. Bitar suggested installing a sign in the front gable rather than on the south side. Mr. Wolenski pointed out the Chase bank next door has two ATMs with a lot of signage. Mrs. Bitar said Chase bank was not approved for all of that, so would be investigated.

Mr. Wolenski asked for his applications to be tabled.

Mrs. Holcombe moved to table the application, seconded by Mr. Hofmann. All Board members voted, "Aye;" and the application was tabled. Mr. Hofmann moved to table the two MPC applications and Mr. Foust seconded the motion. All MPC members voted "Aye" to table.

#### **D. Other**

Mrs. Bitar said there was resident in the audience who would like to address the Board. In June of this year, the schools decided to pursue security at the high school on the north side, east of the baseball field. There was a wooded area that was very thick, and kids were going back into to area and doing things they should not have been doing. The school decided to go in and remove all of the honeysuckle and limb up the trees. In 1990, the Architectural Review Board (ARB) approved a specific plan for screening the former bus loop area from the residential area to the north that was very dense and would not allow car lights to go through. Mrs. Bitar explained the plan would need to be amended, and the school representatives said they would work with the neighbors. Mr. Coulter asked if Mrs. Bitar had spoken with Mr. Gehring and she replied, "Yes."

Arthur Chakalis, 285 Medick Way, Worthington, Ohio, said he wanted to make the Board members aware that the School Board would likely be asking for relief from the existing approved site design for the Thomas Worthington High School due to physical changes that they have already implemented. On Friday, June 1 the woods behind his home began to be cleared with bobcats and chainsaws, so he went back to start taking photographs of the damage. His wife then sent emails to all of the neighbors in Medick Estates to let them know what was going on. The neighbors immediately called the school and asked them to stop, but unfortunately their pleas were ignored. About a dozen of the neighbors met the next day to see what they could do. An email from the neighborhood residents was sent to the school board. The clearing continued for several days and as a result there was extensive damage done to large trees and all shrubbery was removed. Mr. Chakalis said he consulted with the Arborist (degreed) who works on his property and asked him to assess the damage. The Arborist told him he had never seen work done so poorly and that the place was a mess. After the demolition was completed, the Assistant Superintendent, Randy Banks, agreed to meet with the neighbors with school board members in

attendance. Mr. Chakalis said his wife attended that meeting and was told by Mr. Banks that there was no plan and an Arborist was not consulted prior to the clearing. All of the honeysuckle, saplings, small trees and native species were removed.

Mr. Banks said in hindsight he had wished he had done things differently. Mr. Banks said he had the area cleared because kids were drinking and using drugs. Mr. Chakalis asked him if the clearing resolved the school's drug problem but no answer was given. He said the students who were drinking and doing drugs will just move to a different wooded area. Clearing out the woods will not solve the school's drug problem. At the meeting Mr. Banks said they would be replanting native species but that has not taken place yet. Mr. Chakalis said he spoke with Mr. Banks earlier in the week and was told they planted a ground cover which did not take and will be reseeded. Mr. Chakalis said he spoke with the City's Planning Department and was told the original plan included a light barrier from the parking lot. Mr. Chakalis said he is retired licensed engineer from the State of Ohio and has site development planning and implementation experience for manufacturing facilities but not residential areas. He said he believed the plans would likely include the earthen mound on the north edge of the parking lot as well as all of the shrubbery and trees that had been planted on that mound which enhanced the blocking ability. Since the shrubbery and trees are no longer there he said he was seeking a temporary solution until the damaged area can be restored back to the state as required by the original permit due to the loss of foliage. The plants there now are deciduous and the leaves are now on the ground. Mr. Chakalis said he would like to propose rerouting the traffic pattern which would dramatically reduce the number of car headlights. He and his family spend all of their time in their glass sunroom which is located in the back of their house. Re-routing the traffic pattern would eliminate about 95% of the car headlights shining into their home. He requested the school be denied for a variance. Mr. Chakalis showed Mrs. Bitar where he believed additional asphalt was needed, and he made a suggestion for a new traffic pattern so their area only sees taillights instead of headlights. Mrs. Bitar explained the area next to the mounded earth was originally supposed to be a bus loop, so all of the screening and mounding were intended to block the lights from the buses.

#### E. Adjournment

Mr. Hofmann moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mrs. Holcombe. All Board members voted, "Aye" and the meeting adjourned at 9:04 p.m.