October 5, 2012

To: Members of the Municipal Planning Commission
Members of the Architectural Review Board

From: Lynda Bitar, Development Coordinator

Subject: Staff Memo for the Meeting of October 11, 2012

B. Architectural Review Board

1. Unfinished

a. Directional Signage – **300 W. Dublin-Granville Rd.** (Worthington Schools/TWHS)
AR 64-12

Findings of fact:

1. This request is for approval of new directional signage at Thomas Worthington High School. Eight signs are proposed: two at the W. Dublin-Granville Rd. entrances and six internal to the site. All signs are proposed to be constructed of medium density overlay (MDO) panels mounted between 3" x 3" white posts with chamfered tops, and with the bottom of the signs about 2' from the ground.

2. The signs proposed at the site entrances are 50" high x 36" wide and double sided. Both have white lettering saying "Thomas Worthington High School" and the Cardinal logo on a red background at the top part of the sign. The bottom consists of a blue background with white directional information.

3. The other six signs are proposed with blue backgrounds and white lettering. Placement is proposed at the parking lot and drives on the northern portion of the property.

4. Removal of existing directional signage, both permanent and temporary, is assumed with this proposal.

5. Variances have been approved by the Board of Zoning Appeals to allow excess directional signage area, and for design elements that do not meet Code requirements.

Conclusions:

1. New directional signage will be beneficial to the site.

2. Use of the school name and logo is appropriate for the main entrances to the site.

3. The proposed coordinated design for the signs is appropriate.

Approval of the following motion is recommended:

THAT THE REQUEST BY WORTHINGTON SCHOOLS FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL DIRECTIONAL SIGNAGE AT 300 W. DUBLIN-GRANVILLE RD. AS PER CASE NO. AR 64-12, DRAWINGS NO. AR 64-12, DATED SEPTEMBER 26, 2012, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

b. Building and Site Changes – **940 High St.** (Shawn McAllister/Ace Hardware) **AR 79-12**

Findings of fact:

1. An Ace hardware store is proposed in the space south of FedEx Kinko's, formerly occupied by CVS.

2. Previously the application was only for approval of a new double door on the south side of the building, and a new overhead door on the east (rear) side of the building. Both doors were proposed to be metal, and painted to match the adjacent walls. Additional information about site and building changes were requested by the Architectural Review Board before approval of the doors would be granted.

3. The application now includes the following:

   - Re-painting the front metal roof across the entire building
   - Re-painting the entire back building wall
   - Installing a 6' high black aluminum picket fence to enclose a 25' x 100' area on the south side of the building for a garden area; installing dark bronze light fixtures and electric outlets with covers along the south wall
   - Sealing and restriping the entire parking lot; re-arranging the parking in the south lot to allow for the garden center
   - Planting street trees along the south property line
   - Installing a new storefront system similar to the existing, except with a sliding door
   - Installing a new wall sign above the entrance
   - Adding the store name to the existing freestanding sign; re-landscaping the area around the freestanding sign.

4. A variance would be needed for reduction in parking from 83 to 71 spaces. The application would go to the Board of Zoning Appeals for approval.

Conclusions:

1. The proposed changes will be an enhancement to the building and site.

2. The small reduction in the number of parking spaces should not be a problem at this location.

Approval of the following motion is recommended:

THAT THE REQUEST BY SHAWN MCALLISTER FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO MAKE CHANGES TO THE BUILDING AND SITE AT 940 HIGH ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 79-12, DRAWINGS NO. AR 79-12, DATED OCTOBER 4, 2012, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

2. New

a. New Roof – **688 High St.** (Sheppard Development Group/US Bank) **AR 99-12** (Extension of AR 65-10, 10/14/10)

Findings of fact:

1. In October of 2010, approval was gained to replace the slate roof on US Bank with a synthetic product, and re-roof the rest of the building and the drive-through with dimensional asphalt shingles. The minutes from that meeting are included with the application. The work has apparently been completed on the rear of the roof, but the front of the building and drive-through were not done. Certificates of Appropriateness are valid for 18 months.

2. This request would allow replacement of the slate roof with a synthetic product made to resemble slate. The product, Ecostar Majestic Slate, is made of recycled rubber and plastic.

3. It is not clear if the drive-through roof will be replaced at this time.

Conclusion:

1. The previous approval should be extended.

Approval of the following motion is recommended:

THAT THE REQUEST BY SHEPPARD DEVELOPMENT GROUP TO EXTEND CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS NUMBER AR 65-10 TO INSTALL A NEW ROOF AT 688 HIGH ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 99-12, DRAWINGS NO. AR 99-12, DATED SEPTEMBER 17, 2012, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

b. Garage Door & Window Removal – **58 E. North St.** (Michael E. Jones /Strous) **AR 100-12**

Findings of fact:

1. The homeowners would like to convert the existing two-car attached garage into living space. A detached garage was constructed in 2007.

2. Removal of two single garage doors on the east side of the house is proposed. In their place, vinyl siding to match the siding on the freestanding garage will be placed. Also, two sets of two double-hung vinyl windows to match those on the front of the house are proposed.

3. On the front of the house, an existing rectangular window is proposed for removal. The plan shows filling the opening with salvaged brick removed from the side of the house.

Conclusion:

1. The proposed changes are appropriate.

Approval of the following motion is recommended:

THAT THE REQUEST BY MICHAEL E. JONES FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO ALTER THE HOUSE AT 58 E. NORTH ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 100-12, DRAWINGS NO. AR 100-12, DATED SEPTEMBER 26, 2012, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

c. Front Porch & Rear Additions – **59 W. New England Ave.** (Adam Moore) **AR 101-12**

Findings of fact:

1. This application is a request for approval of a new porch in the front, and a two-story addition and covered porch in the rear.

2. The proposed front porch will have a gable roof with decorative wood brackets. Brick piers are proposed adjacent to the stoop and steps. The proposed materials and colors will match the existing house.

3. In the rear removal of a one-story addition, and replacement with a two-story gabled addition with dormers is proposed. The addition will extend from the east-west gable of the house. Materials, including windows, are proposed to match the existing. On the east side a porch with a railing is proposed as an entrance to a mudroom. It appears a sidewalk will connect this entrance to the garage.

4. At the rear of the addition, a porch with a sloped metal roof is proposed. Roof color has not been identified. Wood columns with brick bases are proposed to support the roof. Coach lamps are also proposed.

Conclusion:

1. The proposed changes are in character with the house and neighborhood.

Approval of the following motion is recommended:

THAT THE REQUEST BY ADAM MOORE FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO CONSTRUCT ADDITIONS AT 59 W. NEW ENGLAND AVE. AS PER CASE NO. AR 101-12, DRAWINGS NO. AR 101-12, DATED SEPTEMBER 26, 2012, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

d. Retaining Wall – **849 Oxford St.** (Terry Boling/McGarry) **AR 102-12** (Amendment to AR 84-10, 2/10/11)

Findings of fact:

1. The retaining wall along the north property line was originally proposed with a continually sloping cap.

2. This amendment is a request for approval to place a precast charcoal colored cap that steps down with the slope of the land in 8" increments.

Conclusion:

1. The proposed change is not substantial

Approval of the following motion is recommended:

THAT THE REQUEST BY TERRY BOLING TO AMEND CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS AR 84-10 BY MODIFYING A RETAINDING WALL CAP AT 849 OXFORD ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 102-12, DRAWINGS NO. AR 102-12, DATED SEPTEMBER 28, 2012, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

e. Signage – **7227 N. High St., Space 84** (Carter Bean Architect/Pies & Pints) **AR 104-12**

Findings of fact:

1. Two signs are proposed for Pies & Pints – a wall sign and a projection sign.

2. The wall sign is proposed to be on the south side of the corner feature, which has a sign for FrontRunner on the east side. The sign is proposed with an oval non-illuminated PVC background, including a slice of pizza and tag line "HANDCRAFTED PIZZA & PREMIUM BEER". Mounted on the oval, internally illuminated channel letters are proposed - "Pies & Pints."

   As shown, there are 5 solid colors plus gradation of shades in the background. A variance would be required for the sign as proposed.

3. The projection sign is an internally illuminated oval-shaped sign, in the same design as the wall sign but without the slice of pizza. Because black does not appear to be used in the sign, a variance would not be necessary with only 4 colors, assuming the gradation in the background is not considered different colors.

Conclusions:

1. Although the proposed wall sign may be appropriate above the storefront, it does not seem appropriate for the corner feature. A sign without a background, and similar in size to the FrontRunner sign may provide more balance for that corner.

2. The projection sign is appropriate.

The following motion should be utilized:

THAT THE REQUEST BY J. CARTER BEAN ARCHITECT, LLC FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL SIGNAGE AT 7227 H. HIGH ST., SPACE 84 AS PER CASE NO. AR 104-12, DRAWINGS NO. AR 104 -12, DATED OCTOBER 1, 2012, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

f. Storefront, Awning & Signage – **7227 N. High St., Space 85** (Carter Bean Architect/ Naticakes) **AR 105-12**

Findings of fact:

1. Naticakes, a cupcake and frozen yogurt shop, is proposed for the space adjacent to Pies & Pints on the east side. The business will have two entrances, one on the south face and one on the east face beneath the corner element. The proposed storefront system consists of glass framed in black aluminum.

2. A canvas awning is proposed above the storefront. A material sample has not been received, but the colored rendering seems to show a lavender shade.

3. Three signs are proposed:

   - Awning sign with a cupcake logo and text "frozen yogurt & cupcake shop"
   - Wall sign above the awning with internally illuminated cupcake logo and "naticakes"
   - Internally illuminated projection sign with cupcake logo and "naticakes"

Conclusions:

1. The storefront system is appropriate.

2. Displaying the cupcake logo three times seems unnecessary. Removal of the cupcake from the wall sign may be appropriate, given the cupcake on the awning below.

The following motion should be utilized:

THAT THE REQUEST BY J. CARTER BEAN ARCHITECT, LLC FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO CONSTRUCT A STOREFRONT AT 7227 H. HIGH ST., SPACE 85 AS PER CASE NO. AR 105-12, DRAWINGS NO. AR 105 -12, DATED OCTOBER 1, 2012, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

C. Municipal Planning Commission

1. Amendment to Development Plan

a. Unfinished - New Building – **805 Proprietors Rd.** (Carter Bean/Simsbury Investments LLC) **ADP 09-12**

Findings of fact:

1. Background:

   In March, the property owner gained approval to build the second building at Simsbury Place, but did not go forward to City Council for final approval. The building would have been similar to the existing three-story structure with 16 units, but did not have parking on the first floor. After determining construction costs, the property owner did not feel the project was feasible.

2. Current Request:

   The current proposal is for approval of a building with 10 townhouses. When Simsbury Place was originally approved, a variance was granted to allow 32 units on the site. Also, a variance was granted for exceeding the maximum percentage of lot coverage for buildings.

3. Building:

   The proposed building is similar in design to the existing three-story structure, with use of a hipped roof, gables, the same roof vents, windows and materials. The proposed townhouses will be finished with Hardieplank siding and brick. The garages were originally proposed in the front of the building, but have been moved to the rear with this submittal. It is assumed that roof shingles, trim, colors, windows, doors, railings and ridge vents are proposed in the same style as those on the existing building. Each townhouse has two floors. Wall mounted light fixtures resembling lanterns are proposed on all sides of the building. A photometric plan shows no light spilling over to adjacent properties.

4. Parking:

   Twenty parking spaces are proposed 8’2” from the rear property line. The Code requirement for off-street parking spaces and access drives abutting single family districts is 25’, so a variance would be required. Each townhouse has a one-car garage.

5. Landscaping /Site Plan:

   Cleveland Select Pear trees are proposed in the tree lawn and in islands in the rear parking area. Between the parking in the rear and a proposed 6' high shadowbox fence, Shubert Cherry trees are proposed. Other plant material is proposed in beds along the front and rear of the units, and condensing units are in the rear beds.

6. Variances:

   a. Structure in the side and front yard setback
   b. Parking in the rear setback; screening with a solid fence

Conclusions:

1. Placement of the structure closer to the street, with garages and parking to the rear is more consistent with the desired development pattern along Proprietors Rd.

2. A solid fence could be used along the rear property line to help mitigate any negative effects on the residential properties to the west.

The following motion should be utilized:

THAT THE REQUEST BY J. CARTER BEAN ARCHITECT, LLC TO AMEND THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR 805 PROPRIETORS RD. AS PER CASE NO. ADP 09-12, DRAWINGS NO. ADP 09-12, DATED OCTOBER 1, 2012, BE RECOMMENDED TO CITY COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

2. Subdivision

a. Final Plat – **6520, 6530, 6540 Huntley Rd.** (Taylor Property Development, Ltd. & RTZ Industrial Group, LTD.) **SUB 02-12**

Findings of fact:

1. The applicants are proposing division of an existing parcel with three buildings in the I-2 Zoning District into three separate parcels. Following are dimensional requirements and existing and proposed lot characteristics:

	I-2 Requirements	Existing Parcel	Proposed Lot #1	Proposed Lot#2	Proposed Lot#3
Lot Width	200' min.	286.80'	107.76	97.00	82.00'
Lot Area	2 acres	2 acres	0.752 acre	0.673 acre	0.574 acre
Minimum Width Each Side Yard	20'	20.2' & 24.2'	20.1' & 15.4'	15.4' & 8.6'	10.5' & 23.8'
Maximum % of Lot Coverage	40%	31%	26%	29%	38%

With this request, the individual lot widths, areas, and some side yard setback minimums would no longer meet Code requirements and therefore require variances.

2. Access will continue to be provided through two drive entrances – on the south side of the southernmost building; and between the northern two buildings. An easement has been defined. The north drive does not meet the Code requirement for width, so a variance would be necessary.

3. The applicants indicate the Code requirements for parking will be met for all three parcels. A variance is needed to allow a gravel parking area to remain at the rear of all three proposed parcels.

4. The front and rear setbacks, building heights, and uses on the site will not change. The proposed manufacturing use is a permitted use in the District, and similar to the business previously located in the 6530 building.

5. Competition and retention of businesses/income tax generation are mentioned in the supporting statement, with citations from the Worthington Economic Development Plan and the Comprehensive Plan Update and 2005 Strategic Plan for Worthington.

6. Variances may be granted when it is determined that practical difficulty exists based on the following factors:

   a) Whether the property in question will yield a reasonable return or whether there can be any beneficial use of the property without the variance;
   b) Whether the variance is substantial;
   c) Whether the essential character of the neighborhood would be substantially altered or whether adjoining properties would suffer a substantial detriment as a result of the variance;
   d) Whether the variance would adversely affect the delivery of governmental services (e.g. water, sewer, garbage);
   e) Whether the property owner purchased the property with knowledge of the zoning restriction;

f) Whether the property owner's predicament feasibly can be obviated through some method other than a variance; and,
g) Whether the spirit and intent behind the zoning requirement would be observed and substantial justice done by granting the variance.

Conclusion:

1. The result of this subdivision is the creation of three lots that are substandard per the Code in size, area and required side yards. In order for the site to function as it does now, an easement has been provided for access, parking, maintenance, etc.

The following motion should be utilized:

THAT THE REQUEST BY TAYLOR PROPERTY DEVELOPMENT, LTD. & RTZ INDUSTRIAL GROUP, LTD. FOR APPROVAL OF A FINAL PLAT TO SUBDIVIDE THE PROPERTY AT 6520, 6530, 6540 HUNTLEY RD. AS PER CASE NO. SUB 02-12, DRAWINGS NO. SUB 02-12, DATED SEPTEMBER 28, 2012, BE RECOMMENDED TO CITY COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

D. Other

1. Review and Recommendation of Master Plan

As per Worthington's Planning and Zoning Code and City Charter, the Municipal Planning commission has the duty to undertake a review and recommend appropriate revision of the master plan to City Council at least every five years. Although area planning work has been embarked on more recently based on recommendations from the master plan, the last master plan update (Comprehensive Plan Update & 2005 Strategic Plan for Worthington) was completed in 2005. Review of that work with a recommendation to City Council is requested at this time.