



MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
WORTHINGTON ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
WORTHINGTON MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION
March 28, 2019

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; and Richard Schuster. Also present were Lee Brown, Director of Planning and Building; Lynda Bitar, Planning Coordinator, and Clerk of the Municipal Planning Commission. Scott Myers, Worthington City Council Representative to the Municipal Planning Commission; Commission member Thomas Reis, Vice-Chair and Board member Amy Lloyd were absent.

A. Call to Order – 7:00 p.m.

1. Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Approval of the minutes of the March 14, 2019 meeting

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

4. Affirmation of witnesses

B. Architecture Review Board – Unfinished

Mr. Coulter explained two Agenda items would not be heard: 41 W. South St., which was tabled at the previous meeting, and would remain tabled, and the applicant for 46 W. North St. requested to withdraw their application.

1. Demolition and New Single-Family Dwelling – **53 Short St.** (James McAllister) **AR 02-19**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

Although this house is listed as a contributing building in the Worthington Historic District, there is a long history of neglect of this early 1900’s Vernacular style house. City records regarding the

need for maintenance of the property and building date back to 2004, although the issues likely were present earlier but just not recorded in the City's current record keeping system. Since 2004, trash, clutter and inoperable vehicles have been removed from the site. The structure, though, has reportedly fallen into disrepair from lack of utilities, infiltration by animals, and general lack of maintenance. The City condemned the property in 2017 shortly after the tenant moved out. Clarification of ownership finally led to the sale of the property in October of last year.

The new owner is seeking approval for the demolition of the house, which has now taken place, and construction of a new dwelling and garage. The plans for the new house have been revised since the February 14th hearing. Revisions are in bold below.

Project Details:

1. Demolition of the existing house and attached garage is proposed. The owner refers to the dilapidated condition of the property and structure. **The house and garage were demolished the week of March 11th.**

2. Proposed Site Plan:
 - **The house is now planned to be 28' wide instead of 32' wide, and the depth of the house has been reduced from 43.33' to 32.33' on the west side to allow for garage placement at the southwest corner of the site.**
 - The new house is proposed for placement about 23' from the front property line, which is the prevailing setback based on the position of the neighboring houses. A walkway is proposed leading from the public sidewalk to the front steps of the house. The east setback is proposed as 6', and the west side would be ~~42'~~ **16'**. For Existing Lots of Record, 6' is the required minimum for side yards. Thirty-five feet is proposed from the rear property line **for the east 13' of the house.**
 - Window wells ~~were~~ shown on both sides of the house. **Now, window wells would be on the west side only, with an egress window at the rear part of the house.**
 - A detached 20' x 20' garage is proposed at the ~~southeast~~ **southwest** corner of the site, 3' from the rear property line and **3' from the west side property line.** Variances are required for both setbacks.
 - The driveway is shown as two strips of pavement leading to a paved pad in front of the ~~side-loading~~ **front loading** garage. Clarification of the pavement material is needed.
 - A **revised** landscape plan is included in the packet, showing retention of a maple tree at the southwest corner of the site, and an existing street tree. **Photographs of the new plantings are now included in the packet, and would be installed as follows:**
 - **A Red Maple tree (8'-9') in the front yard**
 - Viburnum bushes along the front
 - Boxwoods and Dwarf Grass along the west side of the house
 - Burning bushes **at the rear of house**
 - Periwinkle ground cover on the east side of the house.
 - **The existing wood fence and Taxus hedge along the east property line would remain.**
 - **A White Oak tree (8'-9') in the rear yard**
 - **Three Regal Prince Oak trees (12'-15') in height along the west property line**
 - **A condensing unit was previously shown at the southeast corner of the back of the**

house but is not on the revised drawing. Unit location should be included with this approval.

3. Proposed Building:

- The new house is proposed to be a two-story house modeled after the Greek Revival style. The structure is proposed with a three-bay façade, a gabled roof with the gabled end facing the street, an entrance with an entablature, pilasters and sidelights, cornice trim and corner boards. Building height would be **33' 28' 2"** to the peak of the gable. **A comparison showing the buildings on both sides of this house and the grade of the street is now included in the packet.** Hardie 5" lap siding in dark blue with white trim is proposed for the house, and a black dimensional shingle roof would be used. Split faced block is proposed for the foundation.
- **The front façade is proposed with two 36" wide x 72" high double-hung windows and an entrance to the west on the first floor; three 36" wide x 62" high windows on the second floor; and one smaller six light casement window in the gable.** The proposed windows are Windsor Next Dimension Classic vinyl in white, which would have 7/8" wide simulated divided light muntins. Hardie trim is proposed around the windows. Eighteen-inch-wide black shutters made of composite wood are proposed for the front windows and would be mounted on brackets. The recessed entrance would be detailed with crown molding and pilasters in white Hardie trim, and a fiberglass 6-panel door with a transom. The door color has not been identified. A light fixture is proposed for the ceiling.
- **The rear of the house now would have the look of a nested gable, with the main gable at 32.33' from the front and the eastern 13' wide gable extending an additional 11' to the rear. The door is now proposed facing west with stairs and a black metal railing.** The gables would have the same detailing as the front. **Pairs of six over six double hung windows (36" wide x 62" high) are proposed for the two sections of the second floor and on the west side of the first floor. On the east side of the first floor, two smaller casement windows (drawing dimensions are not accurate) are shown. The rear west-facing door is proposed with 9 lights above 2 vertically oriented panels.** A decorative wall light is proposed next to the door.
- The side elevations would include **36" wide x 72" high** double-hung windows on the first floor and **36" wide x 62" high** windows on the second floor. **A 52" high window is proposed in the kitchen area.** Trim boards between the floors are proposed. **Two 36" wide x 28" high basement windows with wells are proposed on the west side. A 36" wide x 62" high egress window is shown at the rear of the west elevation.**

4. Proposed Garage:

- The **47'9" 16'5"** high garage is proposed with a gable pitched to match the house that runs **north to south**, with materials to match the house.
- The two-car door would resemble carriage doors, with windows at the top. The metal door would be white. A man door with 9 lights over 2 panels is shown on the **east side**, as is a 36" wide x 62" high double-hung window. A light matching the light adjacent to the rear house entrance is proposed next to the door. A window is also included on the **west side**.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Page 3 of 35

ARB/MPC Meeting March 28, 2019

Minutes

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?) Generally, demolition of pre-1950s buildings should be avoided. These tend to contribute the most to a community's character.

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. Greek Revival typical character-defining features are:

- Three- or five-bay facades
- Gabled or hipped roofline
- Gable end facing the street
- Beveled or smooth board siding with corner boards
- Entrance with transom, sidelights and entablature
- Columns or pilasters used on entrances and porches
- Multiple-paned 9 over 6 or 6 over 6 windows
- Cornice with returns.

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:

- Typically, demolition of a house of this age is not desirable. The condition and unremarkable character of the existing structure, however, may mean the demolition and new structure produce a better outcome than renovation of the existing.
- **The reduction in size with this submittal brings the proposed house closer in massing to the houses adjacent to the sides. Old Worthington has a variety of styles and sizes of houses.**
- Many elements of the proposed house are in keeping with the Greek Revival style, which is found elsewhere in the District.
- The siding, trim and roofing materials are appropriate.
- All vinyl is not preferred for windows unless the proposed product appears to look like wood. It is not clear from the submission if the sashes have enough width to resemble a wood window. Being simulated divided light with 7/8" muntins on the inside and outside is a preferred feature of the proposed windows.
- Construction of a detached garage is appropriate for the neighborhood.
- **The landscaping plan is appropriate for this property.**

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. James McAllister, 1307 Wyandotte Rd., Grandview Heights, Ohio; and Sean McAllister, 708 Stonewood Ct., Columbus, Ohio. Mr. McAllister said the main concern at the previous meeting was the massing of the house. The size of the house was greatly reduced from 2,600 square feet to 2,000 square feet by lowering the pitch of the roof and the size of the rooms. Mr. McAllister said they surveyed the peaks of the adjacent houses to get a realistic picture of what the streetscape would look like. The house directly across the street would be six and a half feet taller than the proposed home. Mr. McAllister said he heard at the last meeting the desire for the new house to have a front porch, but there was not room for a front porch, and the houses on the south side of the street did not have front porches either. Mr. Sean McAllister said they dropped the roofline five feet which was inline with the house to the

left, and everything else was scaled down including the garage. Mr. Foust thanked Mr. McAllister for listening to everyone and making the changes to scale down the massing. He felt the changes made a difference, but also thought the corner boards needed to be wider. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present to speak for or against this application.

Mr. Don Miesle, 54 W. Short St., Worthington, Ohio, said he felt the changes made a lot of sense.

Ms. Peggy Barnum, 120 W. Clearview Ave., Worthington, Ohio, said she grew up in Worthington, and has lived at her house for twenty-eight years. One of things that attracted her to Worthington was the traditional respect for low density properties. She said in 2015, she did not have time to do research ahead of time, but the lot next door to her house was split and a house was built that required many variances. Ms. Barnum referenced a house on the east side of Evening Street that was in horrible condition that they were not permitted to demolish. She said she felt there was a double standard that existed, and some people are allowed to demolish while others cannot, some people can build, while some people cannot.

Mr. Coulter explained the Board, as a course of record, does not allow the demolition of any property in Worthington unless the property has been condemned, either by the Fire Department or by the Department of Health. Mr. Coulter said most of the Board members are either Architects or Engineers and they would much rather try to save the properties, but in this case, the house was way beyond being able to be saved. Mr. Coulter also explained what happened to the house on Evening Street was actually his neighbor, and the house did not have a foundation and the front of the home had to be removed because the home had sunk down eight inches and required numerous repairs. Ms. Barnum stated that it would have been much cheaper to demolish than renovate the existing house and that the original property owners had to sell it off because it was too expensive to renovate. Mr. Coulter stated that once the property owners got into the house, there was much more to do than originally anticipated. They never proposed to demolish the house. We prefer to see buildings renovated and saved, however in this case the building was condemned and too far gone, it was not salvageable. Ms. Barnum stated that you are allowing for more density and a much larger house than what was existing. She was also upset because all the trees had been removed. Mr. Coulter pointed out that the proposed square footage is actually a smaller footprint than the existing home.

Mr. Alexander Serrano, 59 Short St., Worthington, Ohio, said he was happy to see the significant changes to the project in terms of the size of the house. Questions for the architect: spot elevations were done, what is the final height? I don't have a problem with the variance requested, I just want them to understand that they will not come in and hack the tree on the corner of the lot. The additional side yard is appreciated. He was also happy to see the house was moved further off of the lot line, and the five feet on the side of the house near his property was also saved and that additional trees would be planted along the property line and on the site. Moving the driveway off the property line is an improvement. There should have been a public discussion related to the demolition and removal of the trees prior to the demolition. Mr. Foust asked Ms. Bitar for clarification related to the City putting a waiting period on all demolitions. Ms. Bitar stated that there is not a waiting period, however ARB approval is required prior to demolition. The Board should have approved the demolition at the last meeting, however it was not approved at the previous meetings. The Board at the previous meeting did not object to the demolition.

Mr. Schuster asked if the condensing unit would be screened. Ms. Bitar stated that it would be required, and the applicant stated that it was proposed to be screened as shown on the landscape plan.

Motion:

Mr. Hofmann moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY JAMES MCALLISTER FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO DEMOLISH THE HOUSE AT 53 SHORT ST AND CONSTRUCT A NEW HOUSE AS PER CASE NO. AR 02-19, DRAWINGS NO. AR 02-19, DATED MARCH 15, 2019, BE APPROVED WITH GARAGE PLACEMENT CONTINGENT ON A SETBACK VARIANCE BEING GRANTED BY THE BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS, AND BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING AND AMENDED:

- **THE CORNER BOARDS WILL BE WIDENED TO SIX INCH PANELS;**
- **THE BUILDER WILL INSURE PROPER PROTECTION TO THE LOT LINE TREE;**

Mr. Coulter reminded everyone this property would need a rear and side yard variance for the garage.

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

Mr. Coulter mentioned that there have been several people come in since we did the swearing in of witnesses and asked Ms. Bitar to swear those in that would like to speak.

2. Addition – **41 W. South St.** (J.S. Brown & Company/Yang) **AR 18-19** (Remained tabled)

C. Architecture Review Board – New

1. Garage Door – **46 W. North St.** (Matt Boone) **AR 20-19** (Withdrawn)
2. Wall Signs & Front Door – **529 High St.** (Jeanne Lennon) **AR 21-19** (Amendment to AR 106-18)

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This 3400 square foot commercial structure was constructed in the early 1970's and is currently home to Lennonheads Salon & Spa. Approval was granted by the ARB to construct additions on the north and west sides of the building in June of 2017. In January of 2018 the plans were

modified with a revised rear addition, and later in 2018 approval was granted to extend the rear addition, delete the front addition and approve all elevations. This application is a request to modify the wall signs and front door.

Project Details:

1. Two wall signs were approved with the previous ARB approval and by the BZA, with the understanding the existing freestanding sign would be removed. The previous version of the signs had individual letters in a simple font. The newly proposed sign would also include individually mounted matte black letters but be in a different font. Gooseneck lamps were approved above the signs. The elevations show a different style of light fixture than the individual drawings. Also, the electrical plan shows the lights on the east end differently than the elevation and renderings in the packet. Clarification is needed.
2. The new door and adjacent windows are proposed as metal with dividers that would split the glass horizontally.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

While the regulations permit a certain maximum square footage of signs for a business, try to minimize the size and number of signs. Colors for signs should be chosen for compatibility with the age, architecture and colors of the buildings they serve. Use of traditional sign materials such as painted wood, or material that looks like painted wood, is the most appropriate material for projecting and wall signs. Use exterior materials traditionally used on commercial buildings in Worthington.

Staff Analysis:

- The proposed signs have a font that appears unfinished and is not typically seen in Worthington. It is difficult to determine if the “E” characters would be mounted separately due to the design being just 3 separate lines.
- The proposed entrance style is not typical of buildings in the district and may not be compatible with this building.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Ms. Jeanne Lennon, 529 High St., Worthington, Ohio, said their logo changed in the fall, and she did not catch the logo before the sign arrived. She said there would be no changes to the letters, size, or materials, except the font style. She clarified there would be three lights above each of the signs based on the lighting people’s advice. The light is a matte finish not a glossy finish. The lights will be installed similar to the lights at CVS. The base of the lights will match with is what is shown on the screen. Mrs. Bitar said she had not seen three lights above each sign, nor did she see the drawings for three lights on the electrical plan. Ms. Lennon said the letters would be individually mounted. Mr. Hofmann had a comment about the proposed door with the sidelights and asked if the door would be the same height as the sidelights or if the door had a transom. Ms. Lennon explained the door had a transom. Mr. Hofmann asked if the door could be taller and eliminate the transom. Ms. Lennon explained she wanted that look in the first place but was not sure if there was an architectural reason why there was a transom. She said she agreed with Mr. Hofmann and would see if that could be done. Mr. Foust felt the divided lights had a more contemporary look and he was not comfortable with

the look within the historic district, and he does not like the windows as proposed, but he could live with the windows that were proposed even though they were not his favorite. Mr. Foust felt the divided lights should be taller than they were wide, and he would prefer to see large single panels. He said he felt every step with this project seemed to get a little more contemporary, and less fitting with the building character that we are charged with reviewing for the community. He felt that he has about hit is point that he does not want to go another step towards a more contemporary design. The entire concept keeps changing and has evolved over time to a more contemporary design after each of the times the applicant comes to the board for changes to what was originally approved years ago. Ms. Holcombe asked for clarification related to Mr. Foust's comments concerning the windows and doors. The doors should match with the original approval. Mr. Coulter stated we are here to approve the signage and lighting at this time. Mr. Coulter asked what the applicant would like tonight. Ms. Lennon agreed that she would just focus on the signage and lighting tonight and go with the previous approval for the windows and doors. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak for or against this application.

Mr. Ronald Zimmerman, 557 Oxford St., Worthington, Ohio, said he liked the improvements and said he had noticed cooler lighting in some areas and asked if there was a specification for the lighting. Mr. Coulter explained the Board preferred warmer LED lighting now that those type of lights are available. He asked for the board to limit the kelvins to 3,000 max.

Motion:

Mr. Hofmann moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY JEANNE LENNON TO AMEND CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS AR 106-18 WITH DESIGN MODIFICATIONS TO THE SIGNS AND ENTRANCE AT 529 HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 21-19, DRAWINGS NO. AR 21-19, DATED MARCH 7, 2019, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING WITH THE AMENDMENT THAT THERE BE THREE LIGHTS PER EACH SIGN IN A MATTE FINISH WITH A KELVIN TEMPERATURE OF THREE THOUSAND DEGREES AND WILL HAVE A WARM COLOR. THE DOORS AND SIDE LIGHTS WILL BE PER THE PREVIOUS APPROVAL AND WILL NOT BE DIVIDED.

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

3. Garage Extension – 116 E. Granville Rd. (Shawn McNeil/Miller) AR 22-19

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

The Cottage style house on this property was constructed in 1920, and the house and freestanding garage are contributing buildings in the Worthington Historic District. The property is 61' wide x 123' deep, and is the second house west of Morning St. Access to the garage is by way of a

driveway from E. Granville Rd. shared with the house to the east.

The property owner is requesting approval to add onto the back of the garage.

Project Details:

1. The existing garage is 18’ wide by 22’ deep. The proposed addition would extend the garage back another 8’. Variances have been requested for the extension to be 3’ from the rear property line, and to continue the side of garage at 2’ from the east side property line. No openings would be permitted closer than 3’ from a property line per the Building Code, so the shown window would not be allowed.
2. The west side elevation shows the addition gable lower than existing roofline, but on the rear elevation only one gable line is showing. Clarification is needed. A double door is proposed on the west side of the addition, but details have not been provided.
3. Siding material for the addition would be cementitious painted to match the wood on the garage and house. The roof shingles would also match the existing.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

There are recommendations in the Worthington Design Guidelines for new outbuildings to use design cues from older nearby structures and be compatible in appearance with the house it accompanies.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of this application. The proposed addition to the garage keeps the design of the existing.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Shawn McNeil, 370 Charleston Ave., Columbus, Ohio; Mr. Shaun Miller, and 116 Dublin-Granville Rd., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. McNeil would like to improve the garage and realized that a variance would be needed to match the existing garage setback. Board members expressed no concerns over the proposal. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present to speak for or against this application, but no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Hofmann moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY SHAWN MCNEIL ON BEHALF OF SHAUN MILLER FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO CONSTRUCT AN ADDITION ON THE REAR OF THE GARAGE AT 116 E. GRANVILLE RD., AS PER CASE NO. AR 22-19, DRAWINGS NO. AR 22-19, DATED MARCH 8, 2019, BE APPROVED CONTINGENT ON A SETBACK VARIANCE BEING GRANTED BY THE BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS, AND BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING AND AMENDED THAT NO WINDOW OR OPENING BE ALLOWED ON THE EAST SIDE OF THE BUILDING GIVEN THE 2 FOOT SETBACK.

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

4. New Door – **2185 W. Dublin-Granville Rd.** (Randy Roberty/Cameron’s) **AR 23-19**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This shopping center was originally constructed in the 1950’s, with a major addition and renovation completed in the late 1980’s and the entire center was re-painted in 2017. This application is a request to add an additional side door for Cameron’s restaurant in order to provide a compliant means of egress.

Project Details:

1. The new door would be in place of one of the windows on the west side of the building toward the rear.
2. The style would match the others in the building, and infill siding would match the existing.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Use simple door and trim designs compatible with both the building and with adjacent and nearby development. Compatibility of design and materials and exterior detail and relationships are standards of review in the Architectural District ordinance.

Recommendations:

Staff recommended approval of this application as the proposed door would match the rest of the building.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Randy Roberty, Architecture Design Collective, 151 Nationwide Blvd., Columbus, Ohio. Mr. Coulter asked who required the additional ingress/egress. Mr. Roberty said they had an event at the restaurant that doubled ADA’s issues and concerns, so they are updating the restrooms and taking care of the other ADA issue which was the ingress/egress. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present to speak for or against this application, however no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Schuster moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY RANDY ROBERTY ON BEHALF OF CAMERON’S FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL A NEW DOOR IN PLACE OF A WINDOW AT 2185 W. DUBLIN-GRANVILLE RD., AS PER CASE NO. AR 23-19, DRAWINGS NO. AR 23-19, DATED MARCH 14, 2019, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

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

5. Installation of Modular Classrooms – 885 Evening St. (EMOD LLC/Evening Street Elementary) AR 24-19

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

Worthington Schools has been evaluating its facilities and has begun making changes to upgrade facilities and accommodate enrollment numbers. Some of the solutions involve permanent changes such as construction of additions, and other situations warrant temporary solutions. In order to accommodate increasing enrollment at Evening Street Elementary, the applicant is proposing modular classrooms. The time period for use is not known at this point, but the lease would be for 4 years.

Project Details:

1. Site details:

- A single building is proposed south of the school in a portion of the blacktop. The building would be ~102' from the Evening St. property line;
- A connection to the south door would be made with a canopy covered walkway that would allow for pedestrian and bike access along the south side of the school as there is now.
- Removal of the existing storage building and chain link fence near Evening Street is proposed.
- A planting plan is with the application and includes a mix of Spruce Trees, a Maple, an Oak, Red Buds, and Dogwoods. The vegetation is concentrated east of the building to help with screening.

2. Building details:

- Six classrooms and two restrooms would be part of the modular building.
- The 70' wide x 98' long structure is proposed to be finished with faux red brick that would extend to the ground. A cementitious trim board is shown around the top of the building and would be painted to match the coping. The exact color needs to be determined. Gutters and downspouts are also called out as matching the coping or brick. Condensing units would be on the outside of each room, painted to match the walls.
- Steps are proposed on the south side and a ramp would be on the north side with a metal roof and rail. The skirting at the bottom of both would be cementitious type material that could be painted.
- A metal canopy system with metal columns would connect from the modular building to the south door of the school.
- Wall packs are proposed above both doors.

Land Use Plans:Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Use simple door and trim designs compatible with both the building and with adjacent and nearby development. Compatibility of design and materials and exterior detail and relationships are standards of review in the Architectural District ordinance.

Recommendations:

Staff recommended approval of this application with the following conditions:

- The cementitious trim and skirt, canopy systems, HVAC units, and gutters and downspouts should be painted dark gray to match the coping.
- The metal railings could be dark gray or black.
- Wall packs should be painted to match and a style that hides the light source as much as possible, as is shown on Lithonia Lighting page 2 of 3 as “Full Cutoff”.
- Landscaping should be maintained for as long as the modular building is in place.
- Re-evaluation of enrollment numbers and options for accommodating students would be expected in the future.

Although temporary structures are not typically desired, staff understands the need in this situation and would like the building to look as good as possible for the time it is in place.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter recused himself from the dais before the beginning of this discussion due to a conflict of interest. Mr. Coulter is currently working on a project for the Worthington School Board. Mrs. Holcombe took over running the meeting.

Mrs. Holcombe asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Michael Chrisman, 2245 Ridge Rd., Hinckley, Ohio, stated that all of the items mentioned earlier were able to be powder coated to a different color and the skirting brick wall would go all the way to the ground. He stated that they are in agreement concerning the lighting. Mr. Chrisman said the brick is made of faux material and there are not a lot of different color options available. The material is a fiberglass and requires no maintenance. It is a staggered panel and looks similar to brick. The material does not have much weight to the materials that would impact the building. He said they had planned on painting the building, up to the mansard, in the dark gray and he was advised by the School Board to make the appropriate changes. It would have a brick face and a solid color. Mr. Schuster asked if the metal canopy system would be the same color. Mr. Chrisman replied yes. Mr. Foust asked if there were other brick options available that would match closer to what is on the school now. Mr. Chrisman showed a color sample to the Board members. Mixed reactions from the board members concerning the samples.

Mr. Hofmann asked about the location of the modular unit on the site. Mr. Chrisman stated that the two main reasons were the existing paved area and have a clear access view from one building to the next building. There were also available other utilities in the area for water, sewer and electric. Mr. Hofmann believed that it should be moved further away for the street, and even located behind the school would be a better location, or at least to the back of the paved portion of the lot. The proposed material needs to be looked at, this is not appropriate. The proposed location

just does not seem to fit. Is this to replace the McConnel Arts Center (MAC) classrooms? The applicant replied that the proposed modular would replace those classrooms. Mr. Hofmann replied that his children were housed at the MAC and had to walk a further distance to the main building than pushing this building towards the back of the lot. Mr. Chrisman replied that moving the location to behind the school would impact the existing playground and that there is also a retaining wall behind the school. Mr. Hofmann replied that this would be preferred, and that it would just mean displacing the playground equipment and relocated the equipment to another area. The big fear is that these will be there for many more years than the 4-years mentioned, this would then help if it was located behind the building. This should not be too expensive to relocate a playground.

Mr. Jeff Eble, 200 E. Wilson Bridge Rd., Worthington, Ohio, the Business Director for the School District, said they looked at several different locations, trying to stay away from the streetscape, but all of the other locations were not safe for children. Every location we looked at we did not feel was safe for the children and would become a very expensive endeavor. The goal is to keep the kids closer to each other and that it was a safety factor. The time period is not the schools preference, however we find ourselves in a bit of a box to figure out how to house all the children. Mr. Eble said the process of the Master Facility Plan would enlarge the middle schools so that in the fall of 2021 they could move all of the sixth graders out of the elementary schools and into the middle schools which would help create space in the elementary schools. Evening Street Elementary would not be changing because they have already moved the sixth graders out of the building. Mr. Eble said the change would be temporary and he explained how they came about a four-year lease and that it would be a decision point to determine how to move things forward. In the year 2022, Phase II of the Master Plan would be on the ballot which would be for the remodeling of Thomas Worthington High School. Phase II is focused on Thomas Worthington High School. He said they are looking at four years for a reassessment point but they really do not know how long they would need the additional space, and there were 12 modular classrooms going into place this summer. The enrollment of kindergarten students last year and this year are high, if this is a bubble, then 4-years is realistic. However, if it is not a bubble, then we may have to come back for a longer timeframe. Mr. Hofmann felt the modular should be placed at the back of the playground and the climbing wall could be moved to a different location in the event the modular needed to stay longer than four years. Could the climbing area be rebuilt and moving the modular unit to that location. Mr. Eble stated that they would like to keep the kids contained for supervision. What if the climbing apparatus went away and we focused on teaching areas. Mr. Eble stated that there would be a cost, however the bigger concern was the hidden areas created and supervision issues related to rotating the building. Mr. Hofmann stated that you have already created areas on the playground where kids can hide, he doesn't necessarily buy the argument that you are now making things worse. He would like to push it away from the street and screen it more since this may not be a bubble, and then there would be a need for it to stay much longer. I would rather see the playground equipment moved than have to see the modular unit for a long period of time. Mr. Eble stated that there would also be a need to move the basketball courts closer to Evening Street.

Mr. Foust stated that we have tried to work with the schools over the years. If this was someone else proposing this, we would say no. Since it is the school, we are trying to work with you. He asked if the asphalt area was used as a play area during the day and Mr. Elbe said, "Yes." I would

agree that there are places that would be better on the site from an architectural standpoint. I could live with the location; however, the timeframe is the issue. He said he wanted to go on the record for stating the motion should be clearly for four years but if this were to become a permanent installation that there would be other ways to address permanent classrooms at the other schools. There should be other ways to permanently address the issue vs. just looking at it temporarily, there is a need to be looking for a permanent solution for additional classrooms on the site.

Mr. Eble said he agreed with Mr. Foust, and they did not want to have the temporary modular any longer than they have to because they prefer a permanent solution. One of the constraints the district has is a limited borrowing capacity which is why all the project had to be phased. The assessment identified \$258 million worth of work to do on our schools. We are capped by Ohio law at \$100 million in our borrowing capacity, this is the main reason for everything needing to be phased. We will be looking at the entire Thomas site in the future. We looked at a variety of options, big issue was the timeline to make it for fall school year. We can make what is proposed quickly to be open this fall. The back area would need sustainable work to make it happen. Mr. Foust said he had no concerns about demolishing the old concession stand. Our discussion on the materials seems limited, there has to be more choices of materials than what was proposed. Mr. Hofmann stated that there are definitely more materials out there, they just might be more expensive. Ms. Bitar asked if the proposed material was acceptable. Mr. Hofmann and Mrs. Holcombe both stated no, and that there needed to be better materials and products out there. Real brick was shown in the materials provided and up on the screen as an example. Mr. Schuster stated that if this was longer than 4-years then the materials proposed would be an issue. Mrs. Holcombe asked if there was anyone who wanted to speak for or against this application.

Mrs. Holcombe asked Ms. Bitar to swear in anyone that would like to testify that has not already been sworn in at this time.

Brandi Ferris, 210 W. South St., Worthington, Ohio, said she had a child at the elementary school, and was also on the Playground Committee at the school. She had some thoughts about the removal of the playground. Ms. Ferris said moving the playground and equipment would cost hundreds of thousands of dollars and they were currently doing some research regarding the removal of the turf area and that alone would cost over one hundred thousand dollars. This equipment was paid for by the PTA. The climbing unit was \$48,000.00 dollars and could be torn down and relocated but that would cost half of the amount of the equipment. She explained to the Board members that playgrounds cannot be picked up and moved that easy and would be easier to move the modular buildings than move the playground. Ms. Ferris was in support of where the modular building would be located, not only from the playground standpoint, but also the children would be protected from the street.

Joyce Casey, 826 Werner Way, said she had three children that attend school at the McConnell Arts Center, and had to walk across the street. She said she did not think the proposal was related to kids walking across a paved area, she believed it was more related to safety and trying to accommodate the students and the families that go the building. Ms. Casey said there have been two classrooms in the back for the last eight years and now there would be eight classrooms housed outside of the building, so that would be a great number of children that would be housed outside of them main structure. She said there was a meeting at the Elementary School about the proposal

and she appreciated the concerns for safety and the placement of the building. The back of the playground is a pick up and drop off for the children every day.

Ms. Sarah Kuhnell, 359 Pinney Dr., Worthington, Ohio, said she is also a parent of a child that attends Evening Street Elementary, including a Kindergartner who attends class at the McConnell Arts Center now. She said her children are walking far distances to school and she would like to see the children walk a shorter distance to school. Ms. Kuhnell said she was also on the Playground Committee and the costs mentioned earlier were no joke and the Parent Teacher Organization is paying for the equipment so the idea of raising hundreds of thousands of dollars for equipment cannot be done overnight, nor over a short period of time. She said the safety issue should not be overlooked, and they have safety professionals that come to the school to discuss those issues which are much different than those twenty or thirty years ago. She felt the playground area was a critical part of the learning experience and there needed to be clear site lines for teachers and make sure the playground space is not divided and keep the children together. Ms. Kuhnell said she appreciated the work the Board members do to keep the district aesthetically pleasing but the safety of the children should be the top priority.

Mr. Chrisman state that he felt the building could be rotated 90 degrees so the building would be moved thirty feet away from the street and the entrance way would be located directly across from the doors so the air conditioning units would not be visible from the streets. Mrs. Bitar asked Mr. Eble if he has asked the parent and teacher community about that change and he said no. Mr. Hofmann felt the application would be best tabled to give the surround community a chance to give more input because the Board has been receiving many letters concerning the positioning of the modules.

Ms. Brandi Ferris, 210 W. South St., Worthington, Ohio, said she preferred the modules not rotated and approve the original proposed plan because the play space behind is used for a soccer field and is used daily. She said the school is already overcrowded, and they do not have enough play equipment for the number of children attending the school so taking away a soccer field would be a huge deal.

Ms. Jenna Scholl-Reik, 802 Evening St., Worthington, Ohio, said she lives across the street from the concrete structure that will be demolished. She and her husband are huge supporters of the schools and understand the need for more space, but she was shocked at the location on the corner of Evening Street because the street is highly visible. She said she had three main concerns. First, the temporary nature of the project, she would like to see a plan that would withstand the test of time, and whatever the length of time, she knew those decisions would be made by the school board, but she wanted to see a plan that would make everyone happy. Secondly, she referred to the landscape screening, and she wanted to know more about what was planned for screening because she felt she would be looking at structures when the trees lose their leaves. If the structure was rotated, she would like to see more thought put towards the landscaping plan, and a compromise to make everyone happy. She realized that would up the cost but added landscaping would mean a lot to the neighbors. Lastly, Ms. Scholl said she had to compromise a lot on the way she remodeled her home to meet the guidelines and that is simply what she was asking for was just a little bit of compromise. She did not want to listen to humming air conditioners for the next ten years.

Mr. Seth Cramer, 806 Evening St., Worthington, Ohio, said he appreciated the school Principal talking with the neighbors about the upcoming project. He said he and his wife were very supportive of what was going on in the community and agreed safety was a top concern. Mr. Cramer said he did not care if the fence stayed or not but felt the fence did give some control when the children were playing outside. Mr. Cramer said he agreed with Mr. Hofmann's concerns about the closeness to the street, but he also had concerns about the site lines and felt the unit should be pushed back. He said everyone is held to the guidelines, and there was some flexibility for the schools but he also felt there should be some compromise as well because from October to March there would be no leaves on the trees. Mr. Cramer said he would like to know the height of the trees to be installed and if there would be any lighting on east or west ends of the building. Mrs. Bitar said not unless the building is rotated and the lights would be above the entrances. Mr. Cramer said he liked the idea of downlighting because they have had issues with lights before. He said he agreed 100 percent safety is a top concern, and that is why he was not opposed to the fence. Mr. Cramer said they all bought into the historic district which is held to certain standards and he wanted to see the addition fit in the area as best possible with compromise.

Mr. John Bryan Shields, 794 Evening St., Worthington, Ohio, said his 9-month-old daughter would be going to school in the near future so safety was a concern to his family also. He shared a short-prepared statement with the Board members and said their home is down the street from Evening Street Elementary School. He said they moved to the area a few years ago because they knew how special the area was. He was not in favor of the proposed plan and discussed those reasons. Mr. Shields said he understood the Architectural Review Board (ARB) would be involved with their home decisions should they decide to remodel, and they asked that the schools be held to the same standards in which the houses and businesses are held. He said the precedent of having modules in a highly visible area of the historic district would not be inline with purpose of the ARB. If the ARB supports the use of the trailers on the site, they should be placed elsewhere on Evening Street Elementary School property so it is not visible from the street and the neighbors. He felt landscaping was not a solution since the unit would be visible from all directions. Mr. Shields asked the Board members to deny the proposal and find an area that fits within the bounds of the ARB's rules and purpose.

Mr. Foust said they were talking about an application which would not be considered for a residence or a business. They are looking at something for the schools because everyone understands the importance, and they sometimes bend over backwards to make things work for special situations. He said he wanted to be clear and this was not something that would be setting a precedent for every home owner or business. Mr. Foust said if the application is tabled, the Board members and staff would be looking at considerations for the location of the building, and screening. He said the only way he would be in favor of the proposal would be with a four year limitation in the motion.

Mr. Eble requested to table the application.

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

6. Window & Door Modifications – **569 Oxford St.** (Simplified Living Architecture & Design/Siroskey) **AR 25-19**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

The house at 569 Oxford St. is an American Foursquare that was built in 1915 and is a contributing building in the Worthington Historic District. A rear addition was constructed in the early 1980's. The owners would like to renovate the house and are asking for approval to modify the windows and rear door, and add skylights.

Project Details:

1. Most of the proposed changes would involve the 1980's addition. On the rear elevation, removal of a sliding glass door, installation of two windows and a light fixture, and replacement of the door are proposed. The door would be fiberglass that is finished to look like wood with 15 lights. A 17" high wall lantern is proposed to the right of the door. Two different sizes of double hung windows are proposed that are vinyl replacement windows. Window sizes have not been identified.
2. The right (north) elevation shows removal of three windows, and installation of three different windows. Although sizes are not on the plans, the two westernmost windows are larger than the smaller window by the side door.
3. On the left (south) side, removal of the only window (picture style) on that wall is proposed. Placement of two velux 21 1/2" high x 46 1/4" wide skylights is shown. The color has not been identified.
4. A spec sheet is included in the packet for a flood light, but the proposed location is not clear.

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. Avoid enlarging or downsizing window openings to accommodate stock sizes of replacements. Also avoid permanent blocking in of windows; the

original window pattern of a house is part of its overall design. Be sure that window and door designs are appropriate for the style or time period of the house.

Roofline additions such as skylights and dormers can be appropriate on rear elevations of existing buildings but generally should be avoided on sides and front elevations. Design and materials should be compatible with the existing structure.

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. Use as few fixtures as are necessary to provide adequate light for walks, yards and driveways. Avoid overly bright lights. Locate and orient fixtures to minimize light "spill" onto adjacent properties. Compatibility of design and materials, exterior details and relationships are standards of review in the Architectural District ordinance.

Staff Analysis:

- The applicant has not provided reasoning for the proposed changes to the windows and doors, or information about existing materials on the house. Based on what is presented, staff presumes the new floor plan is driving the exterior changes. Also, it seems the existing openings on the addition were not designed to be in character with the existing house. The use of replacement windows is questionable because existing openings are not being used. The proposed window material does not seem in character with a 1915 house, except that the addition was constructed in the 1980's. Verification that the proposed windows are similar to the windows in the front older portion of the house is needed.
- The proposed skylights are appropriately placed on a rear roof that cannot be viewed from the front. Removing openings from the wall below is not desirable, but the existing picture window seems out of character.
- Placement of a flood light needs identified, and assurance that new lights would not shine on neighboring properties or have light sources visible from off the property is needed.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Ms. Heidi Bolyard, representing Simplified Living Architecture; and Mr. Michael Siroskey, 569 Oxford St., Worthington, Ohio. Ms. Bolyard said all of the windows were replaced with vinyl windows before her client, Mr. Siroskey, purchased the home. Mr. Foust said he was never in favor of skylights, but unless the neighbors have a concern, the skylights did not appear visible from the street. Mrs. Holcombe felt the windows were appropriate for the home. Mr. Schuster asked for clarification on the flood light. Mr. Siroskey said the lights would be switch activated whenever the yard or patio was used, the same way they already exist. Mr. Siroskey said the lights would be 3000 kelvin and positioned to light up just the back of the lot. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present to speak for or against this application.

Mr. Don Overmyer, 573 Oxford St., Worthington, Ohio, said he shared a driveway with Mr. Siroskey and was in support of the project. He felt the windows were an amazing improvement.

Motion:

Mr. Schuster moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY HEIDI BOLYARD OF SIMPLIFIED LIVING ARCHITECTURE AND DESIGN ON BEHALF OF MICHAEL SIROSKEY FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO REMOVE AND PLACE NEW WINDOWS AND A DOOR AT 569 OXFORD ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 25-19, DRAWINGS NO. AR 25-19, DATED MARCH 15, 2019, 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; and Mr. Schuster, aye. The motion was approved.

7. Chimney Removal – **700 High St.** (Theodore Dziemianowicz/St. John’s Episcopal Church)
AR 26-19

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

St. John’s Episcopal Church is the oldest church building in Worthington. The first service was held in 1831 in the original building at the northwest corner of the southeast Village Green. Additions were added at various times over the decades, but the original part of the church is still in the same location. There is a non-functioning chimney on the north side of the original part of the church that has been causing water damage for many years, and approval is requested for removal. The chimney was reportedly added in the 20th century, although a different version of the chimney may have been in place in the 19th century.

Project Details:

1. The church has tried to fixed this chimney for many years with no success, so would like to remove it at this point.
2. The roof would be restored to match the existing, which has slate shingles.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Chimneys are a defining feature of a building and should be repaired and maintained.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of this application. It was unfortunate that the chimney cannot be repaired, so removal at this point seems like the only solution. It is clear the brick does not match the church wall, so the chimney is not original to the building.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Ted Dziemianowicz, 84 Glen Dr., Worthington, Ohio, on behalf of St. John’s Episcopal Church said they were very fond of their building, both from the point of view of the significance to the spiritual history of the congregation but also for the historical significance in Worthington. He said they have had a problem taking care of the leakage issue and have spent quite a bit of money trying to remediate the problem. They are hopeful they are able to move forward and get on to the next things that need to be fixed. Mr. Hofmann asked if the chimney serviced anything right now and Mr. Dziemianowicz said no. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present to speak for or against this application, but no one came forward.

Motion:

Mrs. Holcombe moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY THEODORE DZIEMIANOWICZ ON BEHALF OF ST. JOHN’S EPISCOPAL CHURCH FOR APPROVAL OF A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO REMOVE THE CHIMNEY AT 700 HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 26-19, DRAWINGS NO. AR 26-19, DATED MARCH 15, 2019, 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; and Mr. Schuster, aye. The motion was approved.

- 8. Condensing Unit; Deck Stair Modification; & Lights – **665 Oxford St.** (Lloyd Depew) **AR 27-19** (Amendment to AR 83-18)

Mr. Coulter stated Mr. Foust recused himself from hearing this application and left the room. Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

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 was approved to be renovated and additions were allowed to expand the house in 2017 and 2018.

The applicant is now requesting approval of some modifications.

Project Details:

- 1. Condensing Unit:
 - A condensing unit is proposed on the north side of the house, located about 35’ back from the front addition. The unit would be about 9’ from the north property line. The applicant indicates the unit would have a high SEER rating so would minimize sound.
 - Landscape screening is required to screen the unit completely from the front and side

- but has not been identified.
2. Deck Stairs:
 - This proposal shows the deck stairs heading down to the south rather than to the west to provide steps that were not as steep.
 - Also, the original location would have been in front of basement windows.
 3. Lights:
 - Lantern style lights are proposed for the house.
 - On the front, light fixtures would be dangling from the porch roof, next to the front door, and on both sides of the garage.
 - On the back, five lights are proposed across the main level, and one light would be on the ground level wall.
 4. The site plan originally showed and was approved with a sidewalk leading straight to the public sidewalk, and with a connection to the drive. The walk to the public sidewalk was removed from this site plan.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

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

Decks and patios should be limited to the rear of buildings.

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. Use as few fixtures as are necessary to provide adequate light for walks, yards and driveways. Avoid overly bright lights. Locate and orient fixtures to minimize light "spill" onto adjacent properties. Compatibility of design and materials, exterior details and relationships are standards of review in the Architectural District ordinance.

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 considerations:

- Most modern condensing units are pretty quiet, but specific information has not been presented about the proposed unit. Also, screening material needs to be identified.
- The deck stairs seem appropriately placed with this proposal.
- Low wattage, warm color bulbs should be used with these fixtures because of the visibility of the light source. There may be too many fixtures on the rear elevation.
- There should be sidewalk from the front door to the public sidewalk as was previously approved.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Lloyd DePew, 665 Oxford St., Worthington, Ohio, said the original stone could not be used so the builder picked out a cultured stone as close

to the original as he could find. Mr. Coulter asked why the original stone could not be used and Mr. DePew said because of the differing sizes of the thickness of the stone and it could not be used according to the specs of the architectural plans. Mr. Coulter asked why dark gray was chosen and Mr. DePew said he was told the color would lighten up in about a month or so. Mrs. Holcombe asked how long the stone had been up and Mr. DePew said approximately three weeks. Mr. DePew said he was told the mortar would lighten up as it dried and secondly, the cultured stone itself would weather. Mr. Coulter asked Mr. DePew for clarification on the sidewalk and why he did not want the original design. Mr. DePew said the sidewalk to the street would break up the yard and secondly, the original house did not have a sidewalk going from the front door to the public sidewalk, it went from the driveway to the porch. He said he was not opposed from having a sidewalk from the driveway to the porch. Mr. DePew said of all of the homes on Oxford Street, half of them have sidewalks going from the front door to the public sidewalk while the other half of the homes do not. The sidewalks go to the driveway or they do not have a sidewalk at all. He felt the yard would look better without having a sidewalk. Mrs. Holcombe asked if the tree would be staying or cut down. Mr. DePew said the tree would be coming down because most of the roots have been cut because of the concrete poured for the porch foundation. The tree is noticeably leaning toward the house now.

Ms. Bitar commented that the sidewalks to front porches add a pedestrian friendliness to the community and was recommended in the Bike and Pedestrian Plan.

Mr. DePew said he picked out lights that were as close the original as possible. Mr. Coulter said he was okay with the lights on either side of the door, but he did not understand the hanging light. Mr. DePew said because of the gable the hanging light would not be visible. Mr. Coulter said he was okay with the stairs on the back of the house, but he did not want to see bright white lights. Mr. DePew said there was a safety issue and they need a light for the stairs but planned to use a low 30-watt bulb. All the bulbs would have soft candescent light. Mr. Coulter said he was okay with LED bulbs if the bulbs were of warm light. Mr. Hofmann asked if a lighter color of grout could be used since it would take too long for the grout and stone to weather. Mr. DePew said if the grout does not lighten up in a month like the builder told him it would, he planned to use a lighter shade of grout. Mr. DePew said the wrong door was installed but he was okay with the look. He said if the Board does not like the garage door, he would have the door removed and replaced with the correct door. Mr. Coulter and Mrs. Holcombe were both okay with the garage door that is in place. Mrs. Holcombe and Mr. Schuster were okay without a sidewalk connecting from the front door to the street. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present to speak for or against this application.

Mr. Patrick Porter, 659 Oxford St., Worthington, Ohio, said he lives in the house adjacent, across the street to the south, and he has been in support of the project since day one. Mr. Porter said this property had been neglected for fifteen years and he was fully supportive of the project and had no concerns about the stairs in the backyard.

Mr. Don Overmyer, 573 Oxford St., Worthington, Ohio, said he lived near this house for the past twenty years and he was in support of the project and felt Mr. DePew had done a great job. He said he also agreed the yard was small and would look odd with a sidewalk running through the middle of the yard.

Mr. Brown said he understood that things pop up during construction, however over the past five years we have seen dramatic changes occurring to the plans that the Board had not approved first, and that it then puts staff and the Board in an awkward position to approve plans that have been modified that could potentially change the entire character of the project. Mr. Coulter and Mrs. Holcombe both agreed that a lot that has been going on. Mr. DePew said he appreciated the comments and said he truly appreciated the work the ARB does because he has lived in the community since 1980. He said he installed a brick sidewalk at 118 E. New England Avenue from bricks that were torn up from Morning Street and he also pushed forward the burying of the green thumb electrical boxes all along New England Avenue when they should not have been there and they were buried.

Motion:

Mr. Hofmann moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY LLOYD DEPEW TO AMEND CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS NO. AR 83-18 WITH MODIFICATIONS TO THE PREVIOUSLY APPROVED PLANS FOR 665 OXFORD ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 27-19, DRAWINGS NO. AR 27-19, DATED MARCH 15, 2019, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING AND AMENDED WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- **THAT IF WITHIN 30 DAYS THE CURRENT GROUT COLOR DOES NOT LIGHTEN TO A MORE ACCEPTABLE CONTRAST TO THE STONE THAT WAS USED ON THE FAÇADE OF WHICH STAFF CAN HELP MAKE THAT JUDGEMENT;**
- **THAT THE SHADOWING CREATED BECAUSE OF A DEEPER JOINT IN THE STONE FAÇADE EITHER BE LIGHTENED OR LESSONED WITH MORE POINTING;**
- **THAT THERE DOES NOT NEED TO BE SIDEWALK IN FRONT OF THE HOME GIVEN THE PROXIMITY OF THE DRIVEWAY TO THE EXISTING PORCH.**
- **THAT ANY LIGHTING ON THE HOME WILL BE BETWEEN 3-4000 KEVLIN OF A WARM RANGE;**
- **THAT THERE WILL BE ONE LIGHT FOR THE ROTATED STAIRS;**
- **THAT THE AC COMPRESSOR BE FULLY LANDSCAPED AND SCREENED FROM BOTH THE STREET AND THE NEIGHBORS;**

Mrs. Holcombe seconded the motion. Mrs. Bitar called the roll.

B. Architecture Review Board – Unfinished (continued)

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

9. New Preschool – **6699 N. High St.** (Samantha Elliot/The Goddard School) **AR 07-19**

&

C. Municipal Planning Commission

1. Conditional Use Permit

- a. Preschool in C-3 Zoning District– **6699 N. High St.** (Samantha Elliot/The Goddard School) **CU 02-19**

&

2. Amendment to Development Plan

- a. New Preschool – **6699 N. High St.** (Samantha Elliot/The Goddard School) **ADP 02-19**

&

3. Subdivision

- a. Preliminary & Final Plats – **6699 N. High St.** (Samantha Elliot/The Goddard School) **SUB 01-19**

These applications were tabled at the March 14, 2019 meeting without discussion because the applicant could not be there.

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This is a request to construct a new Goddard School on the northern part of the 4-acre parcel owned and operated by Schoedinger Funeral and Cremation Services. Although the land still shows as 3 separate taxing parcels, the city views the land as all one parcel because the lots were combined through a platting process in 1993. Approval is requested from the Architectural Review Board for site and building design. The Municipal Planning Commission is being asked for the following approvals: a Conditional Use Permit to operate a preschool in the C-3 Zoning District; to amend the development plan for the property; and to allow a new parcel to be created through the Subdivision process.

Project Details:

1. Site:

- The request involves splitting 1.013 acres of land from the northern part of the 4-acre Schoedinger parcel for development of a preschool. This land is currently used as an area for excess parking by the funeral home. Lot Width (measured at the 100' required setback) for the new parcel would be ~120'. The new building would be located at the west end of the parcel, with parking retained to the east. Reuse of the existing drive entrance is proposed. An Access and Parking Easement Agreement would be put in place to give rights to both parcels.
- The 80' wide by 105'4" deep building would be located about 202' west of the N. High St. right-of-way line. The building is proposed about 15' south of the north property line, and 15' north of the proposed property line.

- Dimensional requirements for lots and buildings in the C-3 Zoning District are as follows:

District	Minimum Lot Width	Minimum Lot Area	Front Yard (N. High St.)	Rear Yard	Minimum Width Each Side Yard	Maximum Percent of Lot Coverage	Maximum Height of Building Stories	Feet
"C-3"	100'	20,000 sq. ft.	100'	30'	15'	35	3	45

- The Schoedinger site was developed based on Chapter 1175, Special Provisions for Commercial and Industrial Uses, which requires buildings be located at least 30' from adjacent property lines.
- A play area is proposed west of the building which would have separate play equipment for toddler and preschool ages. The design of the play structures, including size and color, has not been presented.
- Fencing is proposed around the building and play area which would be 6' high and picket style. A detail of the steel fence is shown on Sheet A1.02, and a separate page discusses minimum requirements for such fencing which contradicts some of the details. It is not clear if there is additional fencing in the play areas.
- Bollards are proposed along three sides of the building. Details have not been provided regarding the exact style, color, number and placement.
- Four trees near the front of the proposed lot are proposed to remain, and four are proposed for removal further to the west. Existing evergreen screening at the rear of the site would stay in place. Proposed evergreens, grasses, and ground cover would be along the north and south sides of the building and playground, and at the front of the building on both sides of the entrance. Two Celebration Maple trees are proposed on the north side of the existing parking area and would be 2" caliper trees.
- Retention of three light poles toward the front of the existing lot is proposed. One of the poles is shown in the drive pavement on the site plan, so clarification is needed. Other poles are to be relocated, but details of the bases, color and fixtures (if being replaced) are needed.

2. Building:

- A one-story brick building with a hipped roof is proposed for the site. A vinyl railing system would be at the top edges of the asphalt shingle roof to screen mechanical equipment. Dimensional asphalt shingles in black pearl are proposed for the roof. Two dormers each would be on the north and south sides of the building. The gabled dormers would have Arctic White fiber cement siding and two six over six windows with the interiors painted black. Glen-Gery Ravenna Heritage modular brick is proposed for the walls, and fiber cement board in Arctic White would be used for the trim. A watercourse brick row is proposed.
- A gabled roof structure is shown over the front entrance that would be supported by four columns. The gable is proposed to be finished with fiber cement board in Arctic White and the round columns would be Endura with brick bases. The capitals

of the columns appear to be recessed under the roof structure. The front door is shown with sidelights and pilasters. Recessed lighting is proposed in the roof structure.

- Six over six Andersen 100 Series single-hung white windows are proposed throughout the building. This style of window is constructed of Fibrex composite material and would have exterior grilles. Doors are proposed as insulated metal clad and would be white with a hollow frame. The windows and doors are proposed with a soldier course of brick above. A cross-section of a wall showing the window treatment would be helpful.
- A wall sign is proposed on the front gable. The desired style seems to consist of individually mounted blue HDU letters spelling “THE GODDARD SCHOOL” and a round routed logo with a horse head. The sign style shown on the elevations is different, and the entire Goddard sign package was included with the application which identifies a range of sizes and materials. Clarification is needed.

3. Use:

- The equivalent of 175 full-time students/families is expected at this facility, which would reportedly translates into 75 cars between 7:00 am and 9:00 am, and 4:00 pm and 6:00 pm. The applicant feels the gradual arrival of these cars would have minimal or no impact on N. High St. traffic.
 - Outdoor play for the children would be between 10:00 am and 12:00 pm and 3:30 pm and 5:30 pm.
 - Employee arrival/departure time and number of employees has not been identified.
 - Ample parking would exist due to a REA with Schoedinger.
4. A survey and part of a preliminary plat are part of the packet, but the entire site needs to be included.
5. Storm water management is discussed in a memo from E.P. Ferris and Associates, Inc, but has not been reviewed by the City Engineer. Other utilities would be accessed from N. High St.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Scale, Form & Massing: Simple geometric forms and uncomplicated massing tend to make buildings more user-friendly and help to extend the character of Old Worthington into the newer development areas. Inclusion of sidewalks, pedestrian-scaled signage, and planting and lawn areas will help communicate a sense of a walkable pedestrian scale. Carefully designed building facades that employ traditional storefronts -- or similarly-sized windows on the first floor -- will help make new buildings more pedestrian-friendly.

Setbacks: Parking areas should be located toward the rear and not in the front setbacks if at all possible. Unimpeded pedestrian access to the front building facade from the sidewalk should be a primary goal. Building up to the required setback is desirable as a means of getting pedestrians closer to the building and into the main entrance as easily as possible.

Roof Shape: Generally, a traditional roof shape such as gable or hip is preferable to a flat roof on a new building. Roof shapes should be in scale with the buildings on which they are placed. Study

traditional building designs in Old Worthington to get a sense of how much of the facade composition is wall surface and how much is roof.

Materials: Traditional materials such as wood and brick are desirable in newer areas, but other materials are also acceptable. These include various metals and plastics; poured concrete and concrete block should be confined primarily to foundation walls. Avoid any use of glass with highly reflective coatings. Some of these may have a blue, orange, or silver color and can be as reflective as mirrors; they generally are not compatible with other development in Worthington. Before making a final selection of materials, prepare a sample board with preferred and optional materials.

Windows: Use traditional sizes, proportions and spacing for windows. Doing so will help link Old Worthington and newer areas through consistent design elements.

Entries: Primary building entrances should be on the street-facing principal facade. Rear or side entries from parking lots are desirable, but primary emphasis should be given to the street entry. Use simple door and trim designs compatible with both the building and with adjacent and nearby development.

Ornamentation: Use ornamentation sparingly in new developments. Decorative treatments at entries, windows and cornices can work well in distinguishing a building and giving it character, but only a few such elements can achieve the desired effect. Traditional wood ornamentation is the simplest to build, but on new buildings it is possible to use substitute materials such as metal and fiberglass. On brick buildings substitute materials can be used to resemble the stone or metal ornamental elements traditionally found on older brick buildings. As with all ornamentation, simple designs and limited quantities give the best results.

Color: For new brick buildings, consider letting the natural brick color be the body color, and select trim colors that are compatible with the color of the bricks. Prepare a color board showing proposed colors.

Signage: 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. Free-standing signs should be of the “monument” type; they should be as low as possible. Such signs should have an appropriate base such as a brick planting area with appropriate landscaping or no lighting. Colors for signs should be chosen for compatibility with the age, architecture and colors of the buildings they serve, whether placed on the ground or mounted on the building. 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.

Worthington Comprehensive Plan

The 2005 Worthington Comprehensive Plan identifies the High Street Corridor (Extents Area) as a place where consistent site design should be encouraged such as landscape screening and interior planting of surface parking areas, and the location of large parking areas should be to the rear of the site. The corridor could accommodate redevelopment at a higher density, with such projects

meeting the needs of the City, providing green setbacks and meeting the Architectural Design Guidelines.

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.

Conditional Use Permit 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 Development Plan Regulations

Location and Character of Development: The following regulations, conditions and procedures shall apply to the development of institutional, office or industrial developments in "C- 3" or "I-1" Districts.

(b) The proposed institutional, office or industrial development or combination thereof 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; or where such congestion shall be alleviated by presently projected improvements of access thoroughfares, by properly arranged traffic and parking facilities and landscaping which shall be an attractive development and which shall fit harmoniously into and shall have no adverse effects upon the adjoining or surrounding development.

(c) Design Regulations. The following regulations shall apply to office, research and restricted industrial developments in "C-3" and "I-1" Districts.

- (1) Building heights. No building shall exceed three stories or forty-five feet in height, except as modified by Section 1149.04.
- (2) Yards. No building shall be less than thirty feet distant from any boundary of the tract on which the office, research or industrial development is located. Loading, parking and storage shall be permanently screened from all adjoining properties located in any "R" District by building walls, or a solid wall or compact evergreen hedge at least six feet in height. All intervening spaces between the street pavement and the right-of-way

- line and intervening spaces between buildings, drives, parking areas and improved areas shall be landscaped with trees and plantings and properly maintained at all times.
- (3) Tract coverage. The ground area occupied by all the buildings shall not exceed in the aggregate thirty-five percent (35%) of the total area of the lot or tract.
 - (4) Parking space. Notwithstanding any other requirements of this Zoning Ordinance, there shall be provided at least one off-street space for each employee of the maximum working shift. Parking areas will not be located closer than twenty-five feet to any adjoining lot line in any "R" or "C" District and shall be set back at least thirty feet from the street right-of-way line. The parking area shall be graded for proper drainage and improved so as to provide a durable and dust-free surface.
 - (5) Access drives and illumination of parking areas. Access drives shall be at a minimum interval of 300 feet, and illumination of parking areas shall be so arranged as to reflect the light away from adjoining premises in any "R" District.

A request for the change, adjustment, or rearrangement of buildings, parking areas, entrances, heights, or yards may require approval of the Municipal Planning Commission. The Commission can approve or disapprove the proposed amendment with no further review by Council if the amendment substantially conforms to the standards established by the final development plan and it complies with the Planning and Zoning Code. Otherwise, the request would be heard by Council.

Worthington Subdivision Regulations

“Subdivision” means the division or combination of any parcel or parcels of land shown as a unit or as contiguous units on the latest tax roll.

1101.03 Traffic and Environmental Impact of Subdivisions

- (a) The Municipal Planning Commission shall not recommend nor shall Council approve a Subdivision Plat unless they find that such Subdivision Plat provides adequate ingress and egress and does not adversely impact traffic patterns. The Commission may request a traffic study be provided by the applicant.
- (b) Frontage on major thoroughfares or Freeways shall be provided with a parallel service street or an arrangement of Lots keeping vehicular points of access to the major thoroughfare or Freeway at a minimum distance of 800 feet.
- (c) The Municipal Planning Commission may request environmental impact studies for the property to be subdivided, and may request and receive reports and studies from any agency having jurisdiction over the property, indicating whether any issues relating to or involving hazardous substances or environmental laws exist which may impact or affect the Subdivision.
- (d) The Municipal Planning Commission shall not recommend a Subdivision Plat unless it finds that such Subdivision preserves, restores, maintains and/or enhances:
 - (1) Natural features, and
 - (2) The character of the surrounding neighborhood as delineated by the Commission.
- (e) The Municipal Planning Commission shall not recommend a Subdivision Plat unless it finds that such Subdivision provides for the retention of Water Features which are Natural Features rather than encasement in conduit.
- (f) The Municipal Planning Commission shall not recommend a Subdivision Plat if it finds

that the Natural Features on such property have been removed, damaged, altered or destroyed in anticipation of development until agreement is reached between the applicant and the Commission on permanent restoration of Natural Features.

1101.05 Lot and Block Standards.

Every Lot shall abut on a street, and double frontage Lots shall be avoided. Lot sizes shall conform to the Zoning Ordinance. Side lines of Lots shall be approximately at right angles with the street line. Lots shall be of adequate size and shape to accommodate the off-street parking areas required by the Zoning Ordinance.

Staff Analysis:

1. The proposed parcel would meet dimensional requirements for the C-3 Zoning District, but would not be consistent with the existing pattern of development on N. High St. If the split is approved, the entire property should remain subject to Development Plan approval as per Chapter 1175 of the Code to allow a more comprehensive review of current and future proposed changes. Variances for placement of the new building in the required side yards are needed.
2. The proposed location of the building over 200' from the property line is not desirable for new buildings along N. High St., as it would not enhance the pedestrian environment.
3. Clarification is needed regarding fencing details.
4. Retained and relocated light poles should be painted, including the base, unless it is possible to install a new base that is close to grade level. The location on the site plans needs clarification.
5. The proposed bollards in such a great number may have a negative impact on the look of the building and site. An alternate way to protect the building should be found.
6. Building:
 - Review of the brick color in relation to other buildings in the District is needed.
 - Extension of the eaves should be considered.
 - More substantial windows (i.e. wider frames, sashes) may improve the look.
 - The front porch column capitals should project out beyond the roof structure.
 - Pilasters with the front door may not be appropriate. More detail is needed.
 - Specifics regarding sign size, material, and style are needed and should be shown on the front building elevation.
7. Although traffic would increase with this use, the amount should not disrupt the flow of traffic on N. High St.
8. Utilities appear sufficient to serve a new building of this size.
9. Subdivision drawings are needed that show the entire site, including the existing building, and fulfill the requirements in Chapter 1101 of the Code.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended tabling of these applications until such a time when all necessary information has been received and evaluated.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Jonathan Grubb, Lead Designer for the project, 49 E. Third Ave., Columbus, Ohio; Mr. Andy English, Landscape Architect, 500 W. Wilson

Bridge Rd., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Grubb said they would be taking over a lot that was mainly used for overflow parking and putting the land to good use without adding a curb cut to High Street. He said the use would be complimentary to the High Street Corridor and there would be shared parking with no intention of overlap. There should not be any concerns as far as parking. The architecture and massing would be simple and inline with Worthington's Design Guidelines. Mr. Grubb said he had already spoken with a brick supplier who had red brick available that had been used in old Worthington. He clarified the trim would be white all of the way around the building and the bollard issue was actually a fence line. Mrs. Bitar asked if there would be bollards in the front of the building and Mr. Grubb said Goddard would like bollards across the front for safety reasons. There was an incident in California where someone hit the accelerator instead of the brake pedal and went through the building. Mr. Grubb said the bollards would not have to be yellow they could be more tastefully decorative. Mr. Foust said when Mr. Grubb came back to the Board, they would like to know what the bollards would look like and what the spacing would be and the exact locations. Mr. Grubb asked if the Board members would prefer to see decorative planters instead of bollards and Mr. Coulter said whatever would look more in character with the building.

Mr. Grubb gave an overview for the signage to be used and there were several samples in the packet that was presented. Mr. Foust asked Mr. Grubb where the nearest Goddard School was located if the Board members wanted to drive by and take a look at the details. Mr. Grubb said he would do some research to see where the nearest location was for a Goddard School with the new prototype.

Mr. Andy Mills, 2563 Berwyn Rd., Columbus, Ohio, said he was a Realtor for the franchise operator, and there is a new prototype off of Morse Road in New Albany, Ohio. Mr. Mills said he would send photographs and information to Mrs. Bitar.

Mr. Coulter asked what type of material would be used on top of the roof to screen the mechanical equipment and Mr. Grubb said white vinyl fencing would be used to match the rest of the trim. Mr. Hofmann said he would like to see more details and felt there could be more consideration around the proportion. He felt there was an awful lot of roof and there seemed to be other details that would help so much façade. The proportion of the dormers on the side elevations, maybe the size and positioning of the windows. He said it was not a dramatic change but did not feel as elegant as it could be. Mr. Hofmann said he agreed with the canopy above and there could be more details to help the roof of the building.

Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Grubb to discuss the type of windows that would be used. Mr. Grubb explained the muntins would be between the glass but they will be added exterior material to add architectural depth and they will be white to match the trim. The metal fence will be black steel and the fence will have 3" spacing per Goddard Prototype. Mrs. Bitar said what they would ask is the only things the Board would need to consider because too much information would confuse the application.

Mr. Coulter asked if Mr. Grubb would be proposing to use any pole lights and Mr. Grubb said they would be using the exiting lights. Mrs. Bitar asked if the lights would be painted and Mr. Grubb said he was not sure, but he felt the lights were already in pretty good shape. Mr. Coulter said if

the lights needed to be addressed and cleaned up to look nice with the new building then they would want that taken care of, but if the lights were already in good shape then they would be okay with that.

Mrs. Bitar asked if the Morse Road location was bigger, but no answer was given. The new building square footage would be 8500 square feet. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak for or against the application.

Mr. Grubb requested to table the application. Mr. Hofmann moved to table the application, seconded by Mr. Foust. All Board members voted, "Aye," and the application was tabled.

Mr. Coulter explained the Board members would next discuss the Conditional Use portion of the application. Mr. Coulter said he did not have a problem with the Conditional Use. Mr. Foust said most of Mr. Grubb's clients would be coming and going at rush hour and it might be difficult for them to turn left onto High Street during that time period. Mr. Grubb said he had built twelve other daycare centers and was aware of the issues surrounding traffic but he did not think it would be a problem. Mr. Coulter said he did not have other comments regarding the Amendment to the Development Plan nor the Subdivision because his questions were answered earlier by Mrs. Bitar's presentation. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak for or against this application, but no one came forward.

Mr. Foust moved to table the Amendment to the Development Plan and the Subdivision application, seconded by Mr. Hofmann. All Board members voted, "Aye," and the application was tabled.

4. Code Change

To Amend Sections 1301.05, 1301.06, 1305.01, 1305.06, 1305.07, 1305.08, 1305.09, 1311.01, 1311.02, 1311.07, 1125.02, 1129.05, 1173.05, 1301.05, 1301.06, 1125.02, 1129.05, 1173.05 and Enacting Section 1301.07 of the Codified Ordinances of the City of Worthington Related to the Coordination with the State of Ohio Building codes, the Establishment of Demolition Standards, and Adjusting Fees.

Discussion:

Mr. Brown overviewed the updates that were needed within Worthington's Codified City Ordinances to reflect the changes in the Ohio Building Code.

Staff Analysis:

The Planning & Building Department staff has been working on several updates to Part 13 – Building Code for the City of Worthington related to the State of Ohio adopting a new residential building code effective July 1, 2019 that will also require some minor modifications to Part 11 – Planning & Zoning Code for the City of Worthington.

The 2019 Residential Code of Ohio, Ohio Administrative Code 4101:8 Board of Building Standards; Residential Code of Ohio is effective statewide on July 1, 2019. The state

residential code does not address building demolition and the commercial code has minimal requirements, so staff has proposed regulations to handle these types of situations.

Staff is proposing to update Chapters 1301, 1305 and 1311 of the Codified Ordinances to coordinate with the new state building code and provide new requirements for building demolition for residential and commercial structures. The ordinance also includes lowering the barrier requirements for residential swimming pools to be the same height as most other jurisdictions in the United States and match code requirements for commercial swimming pools in Ohio. These changes will require some minor modifications of Chapters 1125, 1129 and 1173 to the Planning & Zoning Code.

Attached to the memo is a summary of the proposed changes in the ordinance including the changes from the 2009 to the 2018 International Property Maintenance Code.

Amendments to the Building Code are effective 20-days after approval and notification, however any change or modification to the Planning & Zoning Code now requires 60-days after approval and notification before it is effective.

Board members discussed the changes to the height of fences surrounding pools and the current conflict with no fencing with a locking cover/alarm, 4' fencing and 6' fencing and how these can conflict with Design Guidelines and zoning. The Board discussed the need for a timeline related to demolition of structures and the need for a timeline for restoration of the site. The Board agreed that the duties of the Board of Zoning Appeals should be amended to give them the review authority if an applicant was not able to meet the proposed timeline outline in the Code. All Board members agreed with the recommendations to City Council. Mr. Foust moved to approve the recommendations to City Council, seconded by Mr. Hofmann. All Board members voted, "Aye," and the motion was approved.

E. Other

Mr. Brown asked the Board members if they would like to attend a Planning & Zoning Workshop in May and reminded them to keep using their city email addresses.

F. Adjournment

Mr. Hofmann moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. Foust. All Board members voted, "Aye," and the meeting adjourned at 10:40 p.m.