

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

March 28, 2013

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; James Sauer, Vice Chair; Kathy Holcombe, Secretary; Mikel Coulter; and Amy Lloyd. 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. Chris Hermann and Jo Rodgers were absent.

A. Call to Order – 7:30 p.m.

1. Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Approval of minutes of the meeting of March 14, 2013

Mr. Coulter said that there was one correction to the motion needed in the minutes on page 17. There was some confusion as to when the apartment buildings were to be built. For the record, Mr. Coulter stated that both apartment buildings are to be built in the same time frame, and not separated by a period of years.

Mr. Coulter moved to approve the minutes. Mrs. Holcombe seconded the motion. All members said, “Aye”.

4. Affirmation/swearing in of witnesses

B. Architectural Review Board

1. New

- a. Deck – **59 W. New England Ave.** (Adam Moore) **AR 14-13** (Amendment to AR 101-12)

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. The Board already approved rear addition to the home a while back and construction is underway. The home owner has decided that they would like to have a deck rather than a covered patio. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Adam Moore approached the microphone and stated his address is 59 W. New England Ave., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Moore said that he just changed the design. He felt with

the elevation in the back dropping all the way down to a patio level would be a drastic change, so they added in the deck for a transition. Board members had no other questions.

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. As part of an addition to this house, a covered patio was proposed to the rear (south). The homeowner would now like approval for a deck in that location instead of a patio.
2. The proposed deck will have 3' x 3' planters built in at the corners, and will wrap to the east side of the house where there is an entrance to the mud room. A 6' planter and an area to store trash cans are proposed along the east side, and will include a low fence to screen both.
3. Application has been made to the Board of Zoning Appeals for side yard setback variances.

Conclusion:

1. The proposed change is appropriate for the house.

Mr. Sauer moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY THE ADAM MOORE FOR APPROVAL TO AMEND CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS #AR 101-12 BY CONSTRUCTING A DECK INSTEAD OF A PATIO AT 59 W. NEW ENGLAND AVE. AS PER CASE NO. AR 14-13, DRAWINGS NO. AR 14-13, DATED MARCH 11, 2013, 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; Mr. Sauer, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Coulter, aye; and Mrs. Lloyd, aye. Mr. Hunter said it has been approved.

b. Signage – **5633 N. High St.** (DaNite Sign/Key Bank) **AR 15-13**

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. The applicant had their original proposal sent out to the Board members last week, and then earlier this week a revised proposal was sent based on some staff concerns. The applicant is proposing a new sign on the south side of the building that has not been there, replacement of the sign on the front, and on the north side of the drive through canopy. New sign faces for the freestanding sign, new directional signs, and new signage on the ATM and around the property. Variances may be needed depending on what the Architectural Review Board approves. Mrs. Bitar displayed the photograph of what the new sign face would look like. The initial concern was that the background would not be opaque and they

have sent something saying they would make the background opaque with light only shining through the letters. Next pictures were shown as to what is existing on the front of the building. There are individual letters mounted that are not illuminated. What they had originally proposed was internally illuminated sign, a much larger sign than the letters that are there and had exposed raceways.

Mrs. Bitar said staff felt exposed raceways are not desirable. Raceways behind the actual face of the building wall is what staff had in mind, not mounting it on a panel. The new signs would be reverse lit, back lit, reverse channel letters, which would be good, but not mounted in that manner which covers up the detail of the building. The same sign is also proposed on the north side of the drive thru canopy. Right now it is a choice between the exposed raceway or having the panel behind the sign. Staff feels neither of the options are appropriate.

Mrs. Bitar said on the south side, they were painting the background of the raceway to match the brick so it would blend in. The drive thru currently just has a key on it and now they are proposing to put Key Bank and a key. The surround would be a bright red color. They have proposed to add some additional signs or replace what is there. Mrs. Bitar said there was some confusion about the open and closed sign. The applicant said the light bulbs are not exposed but there is some sort of panel over them. It has the appearance of exposed lights which is typically not allowed in the city.

Mrs. Bitar said she believes there is more directional signage area than would be allowed by the code. It seems a bit excessive, and the bright red color draws more attention to the additional signage which is proposed. Mrs. Bitar said the non-illuminated signs appear to be okay, however they do not meet the Code requirement for the size of the face of the sign. A variance would be needed if those were approved. She said it seems they are trying to brand the entire sight with their colors and typically that has not been allowed.

The signs proposed for the door are not within the Boards purview as long as they are on the inside. Photos of the ATM show that it just says ATM now. She was not sure if it is illuminated. Mr. Hunter said in the second packet of documents that were sent out the ATM is just shown as blank.

Mr. Hunter asked the applicant to state his name and address for the record. Mr. Robert Schorr, II, said his address is 3818 Kinsey Dr., Columbus, Ohio. Mr. Hunter asked Mrs. Bitar to go through what signage would be allowed by Code at this location. Mrs. Bitar said they do have a variance in place to have a sign on the front of the building and a sign on the drive thru canopy on the north side, the proposed signs are larger so a new variance would be needed. Mrs. Bitar said they will only be allowed to have one sign until they get a variance for the larger signs. Mr. Sauer said they would need variances for more signs and for larger signs and Mrs. Bitar said correct.

Mr. Hunter said he is only one of the votes on Board, but felt the signage was way over the top. Mr. Schorr said it was just a standard package for Key Bank. Mr. Hunter said the monument sign out front is fine, but he did not understand how black letters are illuminated at night. Mrs. Bitar said the black letters illuminate white at night, and there are other examples in the City.

Mr. Shorr asked for permission to table the application so he could consult with his client. Mr. Sauer moved to table the application. Mr. Coulter seconded the motion. Mrs. Bitar called the roll. All members said, "Aye".

c. Screen Wall Alteration – **6650 N. High St.** (Christopher Jolley/AT&T) **AR 16-13**

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. She said the applicant needs to put some new cooling equipment to the rear of the building in an enclosed area where they have an existing condensing unit. They will now have two condensing units instead of one. The applicant would like permission to move their existing brick screening wall out further to accommodate the second condensing unit and allow room for air flow. There is a solid screen wall because of their proximity to a residential neighborhood. A few bollards will have to be removed and two parking spaces will be taken up but there will still be plenty of parking. Mrs. Bitar thanked the applicant for screening the units and the noise from the nearby neighborhood.

Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Chris Jolley approached the microphone and stated his address is 150 E. Gay St., Suite 1510, Columbus, Ohio. Mr. Hunter said that is one of the best screening walls in the city. Mr. Jolley shared material samples with the Board members. They will be using a bronze colored door to match. Board members had no other questions. 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. AT&T must replace an existing condensing unit at the southeast corner of the building, which is not sized properly to cool the equipment housed inside the building. The current screening consists of a brick wall, which is apparently too close to the unit to allow for adequate air flow.
2. Proposed are two new condensing units and extension of the brick screen wall 10' to the east to allow adequate airflow. The style and color of the new brick wall will be matched as closely as possible to the existing.
3. Two parking spaces and three bollards are proposed for removal to accommodate the installation.

Conclusion:

1. The proposed addition of equipment and enlargement of the screen wall are appropriate for this property.

Mr. Coulter moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY THE CHRISTOPHER JOLLEY FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS EXTEND THE EXISTING SCREEN WALL AROUND REPLACEMENT CONDENSING UNITS AT 6650 N. HIGH ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 16-13, DRAWINGS NO. AR 16-13, DATED MARCH 15, 2013, 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. Hunter, aye; Mr. Sauer, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Coulter, aye; and Mrs. Lloyd, aye. Mr. Hunter said it has been approved.

There was no other business to discuss. Mr. Coulter moved to adjourn the meeting. Mrs. Holcombe seconded the motion. All members said, "Aye". The meeting adjourned at 7:58 p.m.