

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

October 25, 2012

The regular meeting of the Worthington Architectural Review Board and the Worthington Municipal Planning Commission was called to order at 7:30 p.m. with the following members present: Richard Hunter, Chair; Kathy Holcombe, Secretary; Commission members Chris Hermann and Mikel Coulter; and Board members Amy Lloyd and Jo Rodgers. Also present were: Scott Myers, Worthington City Council Representative for the Municipal Planning Commission; Lynda Bitar, Development Coordinator and Clerk of the Municipal Planning Commission, and Melissa Cohan, Paralegal. Commission member James Sauer, Vice Chair, was absent.

A. Call to Order – 7:30 p.m.

1. Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Approval of the minutes of the meetings of October 11, 2012.

Mr. Coulter moved to approve the minutes, and Mr. Hermann seconded the motion. All members said “aye”.

4. Affirmation/swearing in of witnesses

B. Architectural Review Board

1. Unfinished

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

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application, adding this application was heard at the previous meeting and members of the Board that were present were concerned about the applicant using vinyl instead of brick to replace the garage door. There were not enough positive votes to approve the use of the vinyl so the applicant asked the Board to table the application until more of the Board members were present.

Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Tom Strous approached the microphone and stated he lives at 58 E. North St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Strous said he found some salvaged brick, but it would not match the house, and the salvaged bricks are larger than the original

bricks. Mr. Strous said the house was built in 1955 and the bricks would be very difficult to match, and they would have to be hand painted because only one base color of brick was available. Mrs. Strous said she considered installing glass block in the front window instead of closing it up. Mr. Hermann said he was not in favor of using glass block for windows, and still felt that brick was more appropriate than vinyl siding. He did not feel it was necessary to match all the brick.

Mrs. Lloyd said she understood the cost factor in trying to match the brick. Mr. Strous said the vinyl siding will not be visible from North St. because it is hidden behind the tall shrubs.

Mr. Hunter felt that using a newer element such as vinyl siding was okay because there are other houses in the neighborhood that use vinyl siding. He understood it is difficult to match bricks on older buildings. He used the example of newer elements that were added to the McConnell Arts Center. Mr. Coulter suggested keeping the window and possibly blacking out the window from the inside using dark drapery materials. The Strous' said they plan to have a viewing screen on the other side of the window. Mr. Coulter said that roll down screens work well inside and may solve the problem.

Mrs. Lloyd asked if the brick pillar would be taken out when the new vinyl siding was installed and the applicant said yes, the brick pillar will be taken out, but the support pillar behind it will be staying. It will be covered with vinyl siding. Mr. Hunter said the shrubs will help soften the outside of the vinyl siding. Mr. Coulter agreed that vinyl siding would be okay since it matches the other houses in the neighborhood. Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

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 will be replaced with a like window, and blacked out from the inside.

Conclusion:

1. The proposed changes are appropriate.

Mr. Coulter moved:

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 AS AMENDED THAT THE EXISTING WINDOW ON THE FRONT OF THE HOUSE STAY THE SAME STYLE, BUT CAN BE REPLACED WITH A NEW INSULATED WINDOW.

Mrs. Rodgers seconded the motion. Mrs. Bitar called the roll. Mr. Hunter, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Hermann, nay; Mr. Coulter, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye and Mrs. Rodgers, aye. Mr. Hunter said it has been approved.

2. New

a. Fencing – 675 Oxford St. (David G. Foust) AR 107-12

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. The applicant would like to install replacement fencing and add additional fencing to contain his dogs. It is an antique style of fencing that is age appropriate for the house and looks very complimentary. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present.

Mr. David Foust approached the microphone and stated his address is 675 Oxford St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Foust said the tops of the fence are blunt, so will not harm anyone. The fence was created in the 1880's and is appropriate for the house that was constructed in 1892.

Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

Findings of fact:

1. The applicant is proposing the replacement and addition of fencing on the property to enclose a portion of the rear yard for the containment of dogs. The enclosed area will be from the rear of the house to the barn.
2. Antique decorative black wrought iron fencing is proposed between the rear of the house and the north and south property lines. The fence is 42" high and will be installed 6" from the ground.
3. Along the side property lines, replacement of existing wire fencing is proposed. The new double loop wire fencing will be 4' high and placed to blend in with existing vegetation along the property lines.
4. Toward the rear of the barn on the south side a new section of decorative black steel fencing is proposed to connect to the wire fencing on the south side.

Conclusion:

1. The proposed fencing is appropriate for this property and the District.

Mrs. Holcombe moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY DAVID G. FOUST FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO REPLACE AND ADD NEW FENCING AT 675 OXFORD ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 107-12, DRAWINGS NO. AR 107-12, DATED OCTOBER 12, 2012, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

Mrs. Lloyd seconded the motion. Mrs. Bitar called the roll. Mr. Hunter, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Hermann, aye; Mr. Coulter, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye and Mrs. Rodgers, aye. Mr. Hunter said it has been approved.

b. Garage – **93 E. New England Ave.** (Residential Designed Solutions Inc./Cooksey)
AR 109-12

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present.

Mr. James Wright approached the microphone and stated his address is 7844 Flint Rd., Columbus, Ohio. Mr. Wright said he was representing the owner. Mr. Coulter said the staircase will be much more useful than pull down stairs. Mr. Hunter agreed with Mr. Coulter and said that pull down stairs are awful. Mrs. Rodgers asked Mr. Wright if the columns were going to be more decorative and Mr. Wright said no, it was just a sketch, and that everything will match the house. Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

Findings of fact:

1. A freestanding garage was on this property previously, but was removed after destruction by a fallen tree. A new freestanding garage is proposed in the same location, which is accessed from a gravel alley on the west side of the property. A new gravel turnaround area is proposed in front of the new garage.
2. The proposed garage is 30' x 28', which is larger than the former garage. A staircase leading to an attic storage area is proposed, which would cause the total accessory structure area to exceed the 850 square foot limit. The applicant will either need to apply for a variance, or change the design to a pull down staircase.
3. The proposed garage is designed to match the existing house in style and materials, with use of the same style columns, windows and trim style. Two single garage doors are proposed.

Conclusion:

1. The proposed garage is complimentary to the house and appropriate for the District.

Mr. Hermann moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY RESIDENTIAL DESIGNED SOLUTIONS, INC. FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO CONSTRUCT A GARAGE AT 93 E. NEW ENGLAND AVE. AS PER CASE NO. AR 109-12, DRAWINGS NO. AR 109-12, DATED OCTOBER 12, 2012, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING AND THAT THE COLUMNS WILL MATCH THE HOUSE.

Mrs. Lloyd seconded the motion. Mrs. Bitar called the roll. Mr. Hunter, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Hermann, aye; Mr. Coulter, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye and Mrs. Rodgers, aye. Mr. Hunter said it has been approved.

- c. Awnings – **7227 N. High St., Space 79** (M&A Architects, Inc./Kenneth’s) **AR 106-12**

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Tom Carter approached the microphone and stated his address is 7227 N. High St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Carter said he liked the way the awnings look with the metal brackets and did not feel the logos on the awnings were excessive. Mr. Coulter asked if the “K” wall sign was previously approved and Mrs. Bitar said yes. Mr. Coulter did not feel the awnings were excessive; he said it was easy for a shopper to be able to tell what was down the alley. Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

Findings of fact:

1. The storefront and wall sign for Kenneth’s was approved previously; this application adds awnings.
2. A black fabric awning is proposed above every window. Each awning is proposed to have the Kenneth’s “K” logo in white. Also, silver metal brackets with the “K” logo are proposed for support on both sides of the awnings.

Conclusions:

1. The basic awnings and brackets are appropriate.
2. Application of the “K” logo in white on all of the awnings is appropriate.

Mrs. Rodgers moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY M&A ARCHITECTS, INC. FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL SIGNAGE AND AWNINGS AT 7227 N. HIGH ST., SPACE 79 AS PER CASE NO. AR 106-12, DRAWINGS NO. AR 106-12, DATED OCTOBER 5, 2012, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

Mr. Coulter seconded the motion. Mrs. Bitar called the roll. Mr. Hunter, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Hermann, aye; Mr. Coulter, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye and Mrs. Rodgers, aye. Mr. Hunter said it has been approved.

d. Signage – 7227 N. High St., Space 1 (Worthington Dental Group) AR 108-12

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present.

Mr. Andy VonDerau approached the microphone and stated his address is 1018 Harrison Park Pl., Columbus, Ohio. Mr. VonDerau presented a new drawing which was shown on the screens. Mr. Tom Carter also approached the microphone and stated his address is 7227 N. High St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Carter said they would prefer the Worthington Dental letters be black and reverse halo lit. Mr. Coulter and Mr. Hermann said the black halo lit letters were fine, but they did not care for the new logo with multiple colors. Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

Findings of fact:

1. Worthington Dental Group received approval for its storefront previously, and would now like approval for a wall sign.
2. Proposed are 8 ½” black halo letters spelling the business name.
3. The sign area above the new storefront is divided with trim into 3 areas, lining up with the door below. The proposed sign will be placed in the center panel.

Conclusions:

1. The sign proposed at the meeting is appropriate.
2. The new storefront design with clear glass would give a good opportunity for effective window signage.

Mr. Coulter moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY WORTHINGTON DENTAL FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL SIGNAGE AT 7227 N. HIGH ST., SPACE 001 AS

PER CASE NO. AR 108-12, DRAWINGS NO. AR 108-12, DATED OCTOBER 25, 2012, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING BASED THE NEW DRAWING PRESENTED TONIGHT.

Mr. Hermann seconded the motion. Mrs. Bitar called the roll. Mr. Hunter, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Hermann, aye; Mr. Coulter, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye and Mrs. Rodgers, aye. Mr. Hunter said it has been approved.

e. New Residential Buildings – **7227 N. High St.** (M&A Architects/Crawford Hoying Development Partners) **AR 110-12**

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application and said the developer's intentions are to get feedback from the ARB/MPC members. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Nelson Yoder approached the microphone and stated he was in attendance on behalf of the Developer Crawford Hoying, and his address is 555 Metro Place S., Dublin, Ohio. Mr. Yoder said they have come up with a revised number of units since receiving feedback earlier (source unidentified) about the desire for larger units. The modified plan would include 10 3-bedroom units of approximately 1,350 sq. ft., 98 two-bedroom units, 40 one-bedroom units, and 2 efficiencies. The apartment building will be five stories high, with a parking garage beneath the structure, and storage space to be available in the underground area. New drawings were distributed to the members.

The members of the ARB/MPC voiced several concerns about the following topics:

1. Adequate infrastructure capacity for the buildings
2. Change in traffic flow and the possible need for a new traffic signal (Traffic Study)
3. Parking
4. Lack of Landscaping
5. Details of the outside common area and depth of the pool
6. Architecture and landscaping details on east side of project facing Amano's Restaurant
7. Architectural materials in general
8. Lighting
9. Subdivision of the parcel
10. Bike path and pedestrian friendly details

Staff recommended that snow removal of the parking spaces in the right-of-way be part of the apartment management's responsibility.

Mrs. Bitar mentioned the importance of using quality materials, and having nice amenities, and larger apartments instead of a bunch of small units. These units are to be built with the same quality standards that condominiums would be built with. Mr. Coulter said that he was concerned with the traffic that would be generated from the area. He said it may be necessary to re-route the traffic from the nearby office buildings. Mrs. Bitar mentioned that a new traffic signal might be necessary, and staff is waiting to see the results of the traffic study which was commissioned by the mall developer.

Mr. Yoder explained the interior photographs that were shown at the meeting were actual photographs of apartments that are being built near the new Lane Avenue development in Upper Arlington, Ohio. He said the interior design plans for the Worthington project are not ready yet, but they will be similar to the apartments that are being built in Upper Arlington.

Mr. Hermann addressed a few points. He would like the developer to figure out a way to make it look like the apartments "fit in" with the neighborhood. He said it was important to create great spaces. He wants to know how this site will look ten years down the road. Mr. Hermann said that the parking study does not address parking locations and he wants to make sure the existing tenants on the north and west sides do not suffer. He was also concerned with the evening traffic flow and parking.

Mrs. Lloyd said she was excited to see this residential project but she is also concerned about the traffic flow and a lot of parallel parking versus head in parking. She is concerned about people backing out into the street to get out. Mrs. Rodgers said she would like to hear more details about the pool and how deep it will be. Mr. Hunter said that it might be better to have angled parking. He said they have hired EMH&T to help them.

Mr. Hunter also stated he wanted to make sure that everyone is committed to making this project happen and that it is fully completed. He asked Mr. Yoder when they plan to begin construction. Mr. Yoder said they plan to begin construction on April 2, 2013. Mr. Hermann said he would like to see a street connection through the mall area. Mr. Carter said it is important not to have trucks going through where pedestrians will be for safety reasons.

Mr. Myers said he would like to see more landscaping details with an inviting environment. He asked if the apartments will have working balconies. Mr. Yoder said yes, the balconies should have enough room for a small table and couple of chairs. Mr. Myers asked if there would be room for grills. Mr. Yoder said it would be a safety issue on the balconies, but there might be the potential to have a grill in the common area. The townhomes will be able to have grills. Mr. Yoder said he would pass along the concerns about the pool to their structural engineer. Mr. Yoder said the plan is to use materials such as veneer brick, and hardiplank that will still look good twenty years from now.

Mrs. Holcombe felt the drawings that were presented seemed to match the mall but she would also like to see more color renderings. Mr. Hermann he liked the flatter roof style interspersed with the gables, feeling it broke up the massive amount of roofing. Mr. Yoder requested the Board table the application until further details are available. Mr. Coulter moved to table the application and Mrs. Holcombe seconded the motion. All members voted “aye” and Mr. Hunter said this matter has been tabled.

C. Municipal Planning Commission

1. Amendment to Development Plan – Unfinished Business

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

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Carter Bean approached the microphone and stated his address is 4400 N. High St., Columbus, Ohio. Mr. Bean said these units will be rental units, but built with the quality standards for condominiums. Each unit will either have its own private porch. Mr. Hunter asked how many parking spaces were needed and Mr. Bean said 32. There are sixteen units being proposed, and each until will be allowed two parking spaces. Mr. Coulter said he was okay with the rotation of the building but felt it is necessary to fix the front elevation.

Mr. Hermann would like to see the sidewalks extend out to the public sidewalk, and he had concerns about the roof’s massing. He said he would like to see it be more compatible with the existing building. He asked if Mr. Bean could add a hipped gable to the roof in the center and Mr. Bean said that would be fine. Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

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.

Mr. Coulter moved:

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 WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- **THE THREE (3) EYEBROW VENTS ON THE UPPER ROOF BE DELETED**

- **A HIPPED ROOF WILL BE ADDED TO THE CENTER SIMILAR TO THE FIRST BUILDING**
- **THE NEW SIDEWALK AS SHOWN WILL BE DELETED AND THE WALKS FROM THE FRONT OF THE UNITS BE EXTENDED TO THE PUBLIC WALK**
- **A LARGER CALIPER OF TREES BE USED**
- **AND THAT A MORE DENSE LANDSCAPE BE ADDED ALONG WITH A SOLID FENCE AT THE WEST SIDE OF THE PROPERTY.**

Mrs. Rodgers seconded the motion. Mrs. Bitar called the roll. Mr. Hunter, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Hermann, aye; Mr. Coulter, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye and Mrs. Rodgers, aye. Mr. Hunter said it has been approved.

2. Amendment to Development Plan – New Business

a. Signage – 7227 N. High St. (M&A Architects) ADP 12-12

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar said this application was based on the Worthington Dental Group sign, which originally needed a variance. Due to the redesign, a variance was no longer needed, so she asked it be withdrawn.

b. New Buildings – 7227 N. High St. (M&A Architects/Crawford Hoying Development) ADP 11-12

Discussion:

The applicant has requested to table the application. Mr. Coulter moved to table the application and Mr. Hermann seconded the motion. All members voted “aye” and Mr. Hunter said this matter has been tabled.

2. Subdivision

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

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Ms. Rebecca Mott approached the microphone and stated her address is 41 S. High St., Columbus, Ohio. Ms. Mott said she would like to have the Board members recommend their application to City Council. Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

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.

Conclusions:

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, but the reasonable return for the property cannot be met without the Subdivision.
2. The essential character of the neighborhood would not be altered with this subdivision. In order for the site to function as it does now, an easement for ingress-egress, access, and maneuverability and an agreement for maintenance have been provided.
3. The delivery of governmental services should not be affected.

Mr. Coulter moved:

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.

Mrs. Holcombe seconded the motion. Mrs. Bitar called the roll. Mr. Hunter, nay; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Hermann, aye; and Mr. Coulter, aye. Mr. Hunter said this matter has been approved.

- b. Preliminary Plat – **7227 N. High St.** (M&A Architects/Crawford Hoying Development) **SUB 03-12**

Discussion:

The applicant has asked for this matter to be tabled. Mr. Coulter moved to table this application and Mr. Hermann seconded the motion. All members voted “aye” and Mr. Hunter said this matter has been tabled.

D. Other

1. Review and Recommendation of Master Plan

Discussion:

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.

Mrs. Bitar said staff did not feel any revisions to the Master Plan were necessary and Commission members concurred. They unanimously recommended that City Council reaffirm the plan with no changes. Mrs. Holcombe moved to approve the recommendation to City Council and Mr. Coulter seconded the motion. Mrs. Bitar called the roll. Mr. Hunter, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Hermann, aye; and Mr. Coulter, aye. Mr. Hunter said this matter has been approved.

There was no other business to discuss. Mrs. Holcombe moved to adjourn the meeting at 10:30 p.m., and Mr. Coulter seconded the motion. All members said, "aye". The meeting adjourned at 10:30 p.m.