



MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
WORTHINGTON ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
WORTHINGTON MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION
June 23, 2016

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: Michael Coulter, Chair; James Sauer, Vice-Chair; Kathy Holcombe, Secretary; Thomas Reis; Edwin Hofmann; Amy Lloyd; and David Foust. Also present were: Scott Myers, Worthington City Council Representative to the Municipal Planning Commission; Lee Brown, Director of Planning & Building; Lynda Bitar, Planning Coordinator and Clerk of the Municipal Planning Commission; and Melissa Cohan, Paralegal.

A. Call to Order – 7:00 p.m.

1. Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Approval of minutes of the June 9, 2016 meeting.

Mr. Reis moved to approve the minutes and Mr. Hofmann seconded the motion. All Board members voted, "Aye." The minutes were approved.

4. Affirmation/swearing in of witnesses – Members of the audience were sworn in by Mrs. Bitar.

B. Architectural Review Board

Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Foust to describe items shown on the projection screens. Mr. Foust said the bottom piece is a party invitation to a 4th of July ball held at Ezra Griswold's Inn in 1815, signed by Arora Buttles, George Harland Griswold, and Orange Johnson. The photograph was of the Griswold Inn as seen from the Village Green looking north, where the Huntington Bank now sits. The picture shows the last addition of the inn which extended along High Street. The addition was built in 1810 or 1811 and included a ball room on the second floor. Mr. Foust said the building was typical federal style architecture. The windows had been replaced by the time the photograph was taken in 1900. There was no air conditioning.

1. New

a. Room Renovation – 669 Evening St. (David Griffin) AR 81-16

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This 0.29 acre property has a split level house with a two-car garage. It was built in 1951 and is not a contributing property in the Worthington Historic District. The owners would like to renovate the three-season room to the rear.

Project Details:

1. The existing room has fixed, single-pane storms for windows, so there is no way to control the temperature.
2. This project would involve replacing the existing windows and transoms above with single-hung insulated vinyl windows. The bottom of the new windows would be 30” above the floor, which would be 7” higher than the existing. Removal of 1 window on the north side of the room is proposed.
3. New siding is proposed for the structure which would extend down to cover the foundation. It would match the board and batten siding on the front of the house in style, and the material would be LP SmartSide composite material. The siding and trim would be painted white to match part of the house until the entire house is repainted.
4. Replacement of the doors (interior and exterior) is also proposed, with the exterior door proposed as a full glass steel entry door with a transom above.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

There are recommendations in the Worthington Design Guidelines for use of traditional design and materials when renovating structures in the District. Compatibility of design and materials, exterior detail and relationships, and window treatment are standards of review in the Architectural District ordinance.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending *approval* of this application, as the proposed changes to the three-season room are appropriate for this house.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. David Griffin stated his address is 669 Evening St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Griffin said the current storm windows are fixed and cannot be opened so the room has been useless. It is cold in the winter and hot in the summer. He feels the change will make the room useful. Mr. Sauer asked if the windows on the front of the house are divided into panes. Mr. Griffin said yes, except for a bay window and another window near the garage,

and there are no panes on the window in the back that faces west. They feel the new windows should maximize light and present a different look for the 3-season room. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY DAVID GRIFFIN FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO RENOVATE THE THREE-SEASON ROOM AT 669 EVENING ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 81-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 81-16, DATED JUNE 1, 2016, 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; Mr. Sauer, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; Mr. Hofmann, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye and Mr. Foust, aye. The motion was approved.

- b. Modifications to Previous Approval – **6851 N. High St.** (Lusk Architecture/Telhio Credit Union) **AR 82-16** (Amendment to AR 52-16)

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This parcel is 1.63 acres in size, and located in the C-2, Community Shopping Center Zoning District. The existing 5949 square foot building was originally constructed as a Bill Knapp's restaurant in the early 1970's. In the early 2000's, Prospect bank purchased the site and added the front entry feature and drive-thru lanes to the south. The property was most recently home to a Huntington Bank branch. Telhio Credit Union purchased the property at the end of 2014 and was approved to renovate the building and site at the December 10, 2015 ARB/MPC meeting. Amendments to that plan were approved at the March 10 and April 14, 2016 ARB meetings.

This application is a request mainly for a modification to the window glass, but points out other minor changes that were made since the last approval. An informal discussion took place at the June 9th meeting, but a sample of the glass was needed for the ARB to view.

Project Details:

1. Lighting & Security Cameras:
 - The photometric plan indicates light levels would be at or near 0 footcandles at the front, rear and north side property lines, and about 2.5 footcandles on the south side

near the drive through. The light level under the drive through canopy is now shown about 15 footcandles on average, as was approved by the ARB in April.

- Nine security cameras are now shown on the building and canopy.
2. Signage:
 - The proposed freestanding sign would be a monument style sign, with a brick base (2' high x 8' wide) and an aluminum cabinet (3'9" high x 8' wide = 30 square feet per side). The brick for the base would match the building, and the cabinet would have a black frame with white faces. Proposed graphics include the circular logo in 3 sections (blue, green, and orange), and "Telhio Credit Union" in blue, individually mounted, 3" deep aluminum channel letters. The graphics would have clear acrylic backers to allow halo illumination.
 - The correct sign size is now shown on the architectural drawings.
 3. Building:
 - The building fascia was approved as cast stone, and then a modified request for EIFS was submitted but not approved. The ARB approved metal instead. Now, the applicant plans to go back to using cast stone.
 4. Windows:
 - The windows were approved to have clear glass. This applicant is requesting approval for "Grey Lite" Solar Ban 60 glass which would have a gray tint to control glare from the sun. The affected windows would be in the front portion of the building.
 - Two windows in the rear teller area would be full windows with black-out film on the inside of the glass surface for the bottom half of the windows, as was approved by the ARB.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

- On long facades, consider breaking the composition down into smaller "storefront" units, with some variation in first and upper floor window design. Use traditional sizes, proportions and spacing for first and upper floor windows. Doing so will help link Old Worthington and newer areas through consistent design elements. Avoid permanent blocking in of windows.

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. Redevelopment projects should meet the needs of the City, providing green setbacks and meeting the Architectural Design Guidelines.
- The plan recommends promoting a high quality physical environment, encouraging the City to continue to emphasize strong physical and aesthetic design, and high-quality development.

Recommendation:

If the glass can still be seen through, some tinting may be acceptable. A sample is key, though, to determining if they will be all right. Shades or film on the inside could be an alternative. The other modifications are compatible with the previous approvals.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Jim McDonald stated he is representing Lusk Architecture, and his address is 2011 Riverside Dr., Columbus, Ohio. Mr. McDonald apologized for not getting pictures in the morning when the lighting was better because the afternoon photographs appeared somewhat dark. He said the last photograph shows what the glass will look like. The glass will not have a mirrored look. Mr. Sauer asked why the credit union wants this type of glass. Mr. McDonald said the main reason is to help with glare in the self-service area of the bank where customers use computers, and the other reason is for security. He explained Telhio does not want people driving by the bank to be able to see who is sitting near the window. Mr. Sauer explained there are dozens of window treatments and asked why Telhio wants to use dark glass to control the windows. Mr. McDonald said this particular window was chosen because Telhio has used this type of window in the past and is a style they like. Mr. McDonald said there is a gray tinted window that is available if that is something the Board prefers, but he has not had the opportunity to ask his client yet.

Mr. Hofmann asked Mrs. Bitar to go back to the photograph that showed the front door area. Mr. Hofmann said he agreed with Mr. Sauer, and would like to see the same type of glass for the doors. He feels that privacy is a non-issue in this situation because in the evening a person will be able to see inside both types of glass. Mr. Hofmann explained that Worthington prefers to stay away from tinted glass.

Mrs. Holcombe asked if the glass on the doors now have a slight tint and Mr. McDonald said yes, there is a slight tint because of the Low-e glass. Mrs. Lloyd asked if the glass was the same as the sample that was distributed to the Board members and Mr. McDonald said yes. Mr. Hofmann suggested a louver type of shade that someone can open or close. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Sauer moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY LUSK ARCHITECTURE FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO AMEND PREVIOUS APPROVALS WITH TINTED GLASS AT 6851 N. HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 82-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 82-16, DATED JUNE 2, 2016, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING WITH THE EXCEPTION THAT THE DARK TINTED GLASS PRESENTED WILL NOT BE USED AND ALL OF THE GLASS WILL BE THE SAME LIGHTER LOW E GLASS.

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

c. Satellite Dish – **54 Short St.** (Donald F. Miesle) **AR 83-16**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This house was built in the early 1900's and is a two-story Homestead style house. The most recent ARB approval was for replacement of the windows late last year. With this application, approval is sought for an existing satellite dish.

Project Details:

1. A satellite dish was installed at the northeast corner of the second-story roof before the current owner purchased the house. The dish was in place when replacement of the windows was reviewed by the ARB last year.
2. Existing mature trees and the dish's rear location make it not easily seen from the right-of-way.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Satellite dish placement should be in a location that minimizes the visual impact as seen from the right-of-way.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending approval of the application, as the dish is not easily seen from the right-of-way.

Discussion:

The applicant was unavailable for discussion. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward. The Board members had no questions or concerns and moved forward with the following motion.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST DONALD MIESLE FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO RETAIN A SATELLITE DISH AT 54 SHORT ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 83-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 83-16, DATED JUNE 8, 2016, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

Page 6 of 32

ARB/MPC Meeting June 23, 2016

Minutes

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

d. Shed – 138 W. Clearview Ave. (Brian & Margaret Heffernan) AR 84-16

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This approximately 2300 square foot, two-story house was constructed in 2015. A roughly 400 square foot two-car garage detached garage sits north of the house and rear patio. This is a request to add a shed.

Project Details:

1. An 8' x 10' shed was originally proposed about 7' from the rear property line and 15' from the west (Evening St.) property line. The required setback along Evening St. is 20', so a variance would have been needed for placement in that location. Upon learning of the requirement, the owners submitted a revised plan showing an 8' x 8' shed in the northeast corner of the property, 5' from the rear and side property lines as is required by Code. Both the original and revised plans are included in the packet
2. The proposed shed is a wood-framed structure with 6'6" high walls and a gabled roof. Gray asphalt shingles are proposed for the roof, and vertically oriented Duratemp plywood siding is proposed for the walls. The shed would have a 60" barn style double door with a transom above, and double 30" x 36" windows with shutters. The shed would be painted avocado green with Navajo white trim to match the house.
3. Landscaping is proposed around the shed and along the rear of the property and garage.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

New outbuildings should use design cues from older nearby structures, including form, massing, roof shape, roof pitch and height, materials, window and door types and detailing. Try to create a new building compatible in appearance with the house it accompanies.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending *approval* of the shed in the revised location at the northeast corner of the property. The shed would be complimentary to the house, and the location and landscaping are appropriate for a corner lot.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mrs. Margaret Heffernan stated her address is 138 W. Clearview Ave., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Foust moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY BRIAN & MARGARET HEFFERNAN FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL A SHED AT 138 CLEARVIEW AVE., AS PER CASE NO. AR 84-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 84-16, DATED JUNE 9, 2016, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

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

- e. Modifications to Previous Approval for Driveway – **135 W. Clearview Ave.** (Brett Holland) **AR 85-16** (Amend AR 50-12)

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This Colonial Revival house was originally built in 1934, with a major addition and renovation constructed in 2013. The approval of the recent work included site improvements, some of which were never constructed. Proposed with this application are minor changes to the site and landscaping plan, with the expected completion date for the project September of 2016.

Project Details:

1. The proposed driveway would now be narrower and shorter, with the turnaround around extending about 5’ past the end of the garage. The concrete drive would have a broom finish rather than exposed aggregate. A French drain is proposed on the east side of the drive to take water to the street.
2. A patio area to the rear has now been reduced in size, as has a walk in the front. The material is proposed as pavers or decorative concrete. Additional plantings are proposed in the front.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Compatibility of design and materials, and exterior details and relationships are standards of review in the Architectural District ordinance.

Recommendations:

Staff is recommending *approval* of this application. The proposed reduction of pervious surfaces is preferable, and the design keeps the character of the original approval.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Brett Holland stated his address is 135 W. Clearview Ave., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Holland said the exposed aggregate was more than they could afford. They will be moving forward with the accent on the walkway, and using pavers or a reddish colored concrete. Board members had no questions or concerns. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY BRETT HOLLAND TO AMEND THE PREVIOUSLY APPROVED CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS WITH CHANGES TO THE DRIVEWAY AND PATIO AT 135 W. CLEARVIEW AVE., AS PER CASE NO. AR 85-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 85-16, DATED JUNE 10, 2016, 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; Mr. Sauer, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; Mr. Hofmann, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye and Mr. Foust, aye. The motion was approved.

f. Hot Tub – **788 Evening St.** (Sean Lane) **AR 86-16**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This property is 90’ wide and 252’ deep, with a cottage style house originally constructed in 1889. Additions have been constructed over the years, with the most recent being two-stories to the rear, including an attached garage, and completed in 2011. This is an application for installation of a hot tub.

Project Details:

1. The hot tub is proposed to the rear of the garage, surrounded by a 10’ x 15’ area with pavers. The pavers would be Earth colored, and match the existing stamped concrete patio to the rear of the house. An existing condensing unit behind the garage would remain.
2. The hot tub is proposed to have 6 seats and be 7’5” x 7’5” x 36” high. The interior would be shell colored and the exterior would be mahogany.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Compatibility of design and materials, exterior details and relationships are standards of review in the Architectural District ordinance.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending approval of this application, as the proposed hot tub is appropriate for this location.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Ms. Alisa Vidulich stated she would be representing her boss this evening. Board members had no questions or concerns. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Sauer moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY SEAN LANE FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL A HOT TUB AT 788 EVENING ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 86-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 86-16, DATED JUNE 10, 2016, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

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

g. Color Changes – **6767 N. High St.** (Lehman Daman/Ethan Allen) **AR 87-16**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This 2 acre property was developed as a furniture store in 1972. In 1995, Ethan Allen made changes to the building and signage which are reflected in the current design. Approval of this request would keep the design, but allow for a change to the color scheme in line with corporate rebranding.

Project Details:

1. The existing color for the awnings and signage is blue. Proposed are new black awnings with no logo; black paint for the wall sign letters; black paint for the freestanding sign frame; and white backgrounds with black lettering for the freestanding sign faces, which are externally illuminated.
2. Tan brick with darker accents and lighter trim and windows make up the building. The

applicant is proposing to paint the brick Sherwin Williams “Tony Taupe” and the accents “Dovetail” (gray shade). The window frames, trim and muntins are proposed to be painted black. A color board has been submitted.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Compatibility of design and materials, exterior details and relationships are standards of review in the Architectural District ordinance. For historic structures, unpainted brick walls that were not painted before should not be painted, however, it may be acceptable to paint newer brick walls. Generally, lighter colors should be used for this purpose, with darker colors for trim. Prepare a color board showing proposed colors.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending approval of this application, as the color changes seem appropriate for this building and the District.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Jim Daman stated he is the President of Lehman Daman Construction 727 Taylor Ave., Columbus, Ohio. Mr. Daman explained that Ethan Allen is going through rebranding nationwide with their new stores and altering their existing stores. Mr. Daman said the channel letters on the building will not be painted, the letter faces will be changed to black. He said he would also like permission to paint the side of the channel frames, black if desired.

Mr. Daman explained he would like to paint the siding on the rear of the building the same color as the brick is to be painted, and he would like to replace the damaged siding before he begins painting.

Mrs. Bitar said she noticed the windows at the rear are in need of some attention and Mr. Daman said he is aware of the condition of the windows. Mr. Daman said if he can get approval, he would replace the windows with exactly the same size and configuration of the original windows.

Mr. Daman said his client mentioned that the burning bushes in the front are getting too large and too big to maintain and the taxis bushes are very deep and old, so they would like to replace them with boxwood. Mr. Coulter asked if the all the shrubs would be replaced with boxwood and Mr. Daman said yes. Mr. Coulter said the boxwood would have to be something comparable in size.

Mr. Daman said the structure of the monument sign will be painted black. The blue panel will be changed to white with the new Ethan Allen black lettering. The awnings will be removed and the frames will be reconditioned. The building and window frames will also be painted.

Mr. Sauer noticed there is a different font on the freestanding sign than the building sign. Mr. Daman said the channel letters have a slight tail to them. Ethan Allen wants to reuse the wall sign letters, but feels they should use the new font on the freestanding sign. Mr. Coulter said he did not

have a problem with that. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY JIM DAMAN ON BEHALF LEHMAN CONSTRUCTION FOR ETHAN ALLEN FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO CHANGE THE COLOR SCHEME AT 6767 N. HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 87-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 87-16, DATED JUNE 10, 2016, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING WITH THE AMENDMENT THAT THE SIDES OF THE CHANNEL LETTERING ON THE MAIN BUILDING CAN BE PAINTED BLACK; THE SIDING ON THE REAR OF THE BUILDING MATCH THE FIELD COLOR OF THE MAIN BUILDING; AND THAT THE EXISTING BURNING BUSHES AND TAXIS WILL BE REMOVED AND REPLACED WITH BOXWOOD PLANTS WITH A MINIMUM SIZE OF 18-24” POTS AND THAT STAFF SHALL REVIEW THE PLANTINGS PRIOR TO INSTALLATION; AND THE REAR WINDOWS CAN BE REPLACED TO LOOK LIKE THE EXISTING.

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

h. Lighting Changes – **820 High St.** (Worthington Public Library) **AR 88-16**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

The Worthington Public Library purchased the site at the southwest corner of E. Stafford Ave. and Hartford St. in 1973, and received approval to construct a new library in 1977 & 78. The library moved from 752 High St. to 805 Hartford St. in 1979. In 1993, the library purchased the office building adjacent to the west at 820 High St. That site was home to a gas station starting in the 1930’s, with the current building being constructed in 1977 as a First Federal Savings and Loan. In 1996, the buildings were combined and renovated for use by the Worthington Libraries. Additional modifications were made in 2007.

This application is a request to change the light fixtures on the western part of the building and at the northern entrance.

Project Details:

1. The existing fixtures on the western portion of the building are lantern style fixtures that

were installed when the buildings were combined, and replaced larger fixtures. Proposed are similarly styled patina colored LED fixtures with white lenses. The proposed fixtures are sized close to the existing, only without the decorative top and bottom pieces.

2. At the north entrance, replacement of a light above the door is proposed with a fixture that would be flush with the ceiling. Also, replacement of the 2 bollards next to the entrance with pole-mounted fixtures is proposed. The poles and luminaires on top would be similar to the existing in the library's north parking lot, and those used in Old Worthington, but would be only 10' high. The metal poles would be green and the fixtures LED.
3. Photometric information has been submitted for the fixtures.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Use of fairly small lighting fixtures, and as few as possible, is recommended. Fixtures should not be overly ornate. Avoid excessive brightness. Design and materials should be compatible with the existing structure.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending approval of this application, as the proposed lighting is compatible with the existing structure and appropriate for the District.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Ms. Margaret Doone stated she is representing the Worthington Library at 820 High St., Worthington, Ohio. Ms. Doone said Mrs. Bitar did a good job with the presentation and that people could see in the photographs of how deteriorated the old carriage style lanterns are. Some of the fixtures have loose or missing parts and some have not weathered well and need to be replaced. The light that is above the door now is just an emergency light and they would like to replace the fixture with a dual purpose light that would function as a regular light and an emergency light.

Mr. Coulter said the only light fixture they have seen shows the light having white glass. He asked Ms. Doone if the light was available with clear glass. Ms. Doone said she did not know the answer to Mr. Coulter's question but she would check to see if clear glass is an option. Mr. Coulter said for aesthetics he prefers the clear glass and that would closely match what is on the building now. Mr. Sauer suggested the lamps for the fixtures be on the warm side rather than the cool side, no lower than 3000k. Mr. Foust asked if there was a range of wattage. Due to the residences that are nearby he believed the neighboring properties might complain if the lights are too bright. He would like the Board to reserve the option to look at different wattage if necessary. Mr. Reis asked how the Board would test that. Mr. Foust said that if no one complains that everything is good. If neighbors complain, then the Board may have to consider suggesting bulbs that are not so bright. Mr. Coulter suggested buying a couple of samples and testing out the brightness instead of buying a whole buildings worth of bulbs, and have a few members of the ARB take a look at the brightness.

Mr. Sauer asked about the pole lamps buy the front entrance. He said he noticed two bollards on each side of the tower. Ms. Doone said the pole lamp would replace the bollards. There are two

other bollards which help light up the walkway. Mr. Sauer suggested placing the pole lamps further away from the tower because he believes that the pole lamps crowd the tower. Mr. Coulter said if the library is trying to get more lighting towards the entrance, then the pole lamps should be closer to the entrance versus having the pole lamps further away. Mr. Coulter wondered what the library's largest concern is regarding security. Mr. Reis asked if a second light could be placed on the brick column and Ms. Doone said no because there is no electricity in the brick columns. Mr. Hofmann said he believes that the new dual purpose light at the front entrance should help light up the doorway. Mr. Hofmann also agreed the pole lamps could move a bit further away to avoid crowding, possibly putting the pole lamp closer to the bench where someone might be waiting for a ride. Mr. Sauer agreed the new light in the soffit area will add brightness to the front entrance.

Mrs. Holcombe asked how many lights are on the east side of the building and why are the rest of the lights not being changed. Ms. Doone said those lights do not need to be replaced right now. Mrs. Holcombe suggested adding language to the motion so that the library could change out the lights when the existing lights no longer work. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Hofmann moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY THE WORTHINGTON PUBLIC LIBRARY FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO REPLACE LIGHTING AT 820 HIGH ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 88-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 88-16, DATED JUNE 10, 2016, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING WITH THE FOLLOWING AMENDMENTS:

- That the light fixtures will have a clear glass;
- That the light bulb temperature will be a warm style LED of 3000k or lower;
- The ARB will have the opportunity to see the brightness of the bulb with one of the first installs of the new fixture in order to change the bulb if the bulb is too bright;
- That the pole lamps be located 4' – 6' away from the tower on both sides;
- That the east side light fixtures be changed to match the proposed lamps in the future when needed.

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

i. Fence – **653 Oxford St.** (Nathan & Emma Lindholm) **AR 89-16**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This farmhouse was originally constructed in 1850, and has had minor modifications and additions over the years. The house is at the northwest corner of Oxford St. and W. New England Ave. In May approval was granted for a new porch roof to be constructed, and brick was to be installed at grade to help with storm water issues.

In 2008, the previous owners installed a fence to enclose a portion of the rear yard, which is also adjacent to W. New England Ave. A variance was granted to allow the fence in the required side yard adjacent to the right-of-way. In 2011, the previous owners extended the fencing north and east to connect to the house, and on the south side between the garage and house. The current homeowners would like to extend the fence to the west to enlarge the enclosed area.

Project Details:

1. The owners would like to extend the fence 12' to the west, approximately to the property line. There is existing vegetation including trees in that area, but it is not clear where the fence would be in relation to those plantings. The fence is proposed in line with the existing, which is about 4' from the right-of-way line. Because the fence would be closer than 20' to the W. New England Ave. property line, a variance would be required for the extension.
2. The proposed additional fencing would match the existing, being wood painted white, 42" high, with ~3/4" pickets spaced at 4" apart.
3. Existing fencing would be repaired and replaced as needed, and re-painted white.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

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

Recommendation:

If the fence would still be partially screened from view from the west by the trees and other plantings, extension may be acceptable.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Nathan Lindholm stated his address is 653 Oxford St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Coulter thanked Mr. Lindholm for everything he is doing to save the home and protect the foundation. Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Lindholm if any trees would be removed and Mr. Lindholm said no, the trees are on his property, so the fence will be enclosing the trees. Mr. Reis asked Mrs. Bitar if the picket spacing will remain the same and Mrs. Bitar said

yes, the additional fencing will match what is already there. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

Motion:

Mrs. Holcombe moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY NATHAN & EMMA LINDHOLM FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO EXTEND THE FENCING AT 653 OXFORD ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 89-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 89-16, DATED JUNE 10, 2016, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING WITH THE CONDITION THAT NEW FENCE WILL MATCH THE EXISTING FENCE AND NO TREES WILL BE REMOVED.

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

Mrs. Bitar swore in additional people that arrived late to the meeting.

2. Unfinished

a. Holiday Inn Site Redevelopment – **7007 N. High St.** (Alliance Hospitality, Inc.) **AR 32-16**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This roughly 7.5 acre parcel, zoned C-4, Highway and Automotive Services, has been home to a hotel since 1975. The original approval was for a Hilton Inn. The brand has changed several times over the years with the most recent being the conversion to a Holiday Inn in 2007, which included many upgrades to the building and site. The owner is proposing demolition of the existing hotel, and redevelopment of the site with a mix of uses.

At the March 10, 2016 meeting, the ARB reviewed a site design and architectural renderings that gave an idea of the look of the proposed development. Feedback from the Board and the public led to changes to the plans now included with the application. The applicant would like feedback on the current concept before moving forward with additional details.

Project Details:

1. Uses:

- Two hotels, identified as a Hampton Inn with 110 guest rooms and a Holiday Inn Express with 95 guest rooms, are proposed. The existing Holiday Inn has 232 guest rooms.

- Other potential uses are describe as restaurants and professional services.
- In the C-4 Zoning District, professional services and hotels are Permitted Uses. Restaurants are Conditional Uses needing approval from the MPC.

2. Site Plan and Landscaping:

- The proposed plan shows an entrance to the site from each of the adjacent rights-of-way. On W. Wilson Bridge Rd., the entrance is proposed at the west end; on Caren Ave. the proposed entrance is toward the middle of the site but on the eastern half; and on N. High St. the entrance is proposed near the middle of the site. All three entrances would be situated similarly to existing site entrances. Elimination of an entrance toward the east end of the site adjacent to W. Wilson Bridge Rd. is proposed.
- The Hampton Inn was previously shown about 195' from the western property line and about 83' from the southern property line. Now, the Hampton Inn is shown at the northeast corner of the site, with a 3000 square foot restaurant adjacent to the west. The Holiday Inn Express would be southwest of the Hampton, 153' from the south property line and about 294' from the west property line. A 5400 square foot restaurant would be adjacent to the west of the Holiday Inn.
- Along the remainder of the Wilson Bridge Rd. frontage would be two single story buildings: a 7200 square foot professional services building to the west; and a 10,000 square foot building with 2 restaurants in the center. A two-story 17,000 square foot professional services building is now proposed at corner of Caren Ave. and High St., with a 5500 square foot single story restaurant to the north.
- The single level parking deck previously proposed has been eliminated, and replaced with surface parking. A combination of evergreen and deciduous trees and shrubs are proposed to be densely planted along the west and south property lines adjacent to the existing residential properties.
- Two pedestrian plazas would lead from a sidewalk adjacent to Wilson Bridge Rd. between the buildings to a drive and traffic circle called a "Town Square". The plazas and square would include restaurant seating areas and planting islands.
- The property at 120 Caren Ave., which is the easternmost residential property on the north side of Caren was purchased by the hotel property owner. The intent is to demolish the house and add plants and trees to the remaining trees to create a natural looking area.
- Walkways are proposed on the south side of the site to the Caren Ave. sidewalk and on the west side of the site to the sidewalk that connects Greenglade Ave. to W. Wilson Bridge Rd.
- Along Wilson Bridge Rd., the City has planned for future improvements, and has asked the property owner for the dedication of right-of-way. The exact amount is being determined.
- Consideration should be given to burying overhead utility lines at the south property line.
- A storm water plan will be required.

3. Buildings:
 - The proposed hotel buildings are four stories; the existing hotel is three stories. Architectural renderings are not included with this submittal.
 - While the perimeter buildings would have one story of usable space, the plan is to have them designed to look like 1 ½ and 2 story buildings.
 - Previously, a mix of design and materials was shown for the buildings, with four sided architecture. Detailed elevations and material samples would be expected later in the process.
4. Lighting and Signage:
 - As design progresses, a detailed site and building lighting plan would be required. The expectation is for light to not be overly bright, and to not extend over any of the property lines.
 - Signage review will be required.
5. Traffic:
 - Once the uses and building areas have been determined, the traffic study can be completed. The City has contracted with a traffic consultant to review the study and make recommendations.
6. Variances:
 - Application to the Board of Zoning Appeals would be required to approve any variances requested for the site.
 - The applicant is applying as part of the C-4 Zoning District, but is also trying to meet the requirements for the Wilson Bridge Corridor. Variances would likely be needed for setback, building height and parking not meeting the C-4 regulations.

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: On long facades, consider breaking the composition down into smaller “storefront” units, with some variation in first and upper floor window design. Use traditional sizes, proportions and spacing for first and upper floor 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.

Wilson Bridge Corridor

Building Design:

Page 19 of 32

ARB/MPC Meeting June 23, 2016

Minutes

- A principal building shall be oriented parallel to Wilson Bridge Road (or High Street), or as parallel as the site permits, and should have an operational entry facing the street.
- Building Frontage that exceeds a width of 50' shall incorporate articulation and offset of the wall plane to prevent a large span of blank wall and add interest to the facade.
- Entrances shall be well-marked to cue access and use, with public entrances to a building enhanced through compatible architectural or graphic treatment.

Materials:

- Long-lived and sustainable materials should be used.
- Generally, exterior insulation finishing systems (EIFS), are not preferred material types.
- A variety of textures that bear a direct relationship to the building's massing and structural elements to provide visual variety and depth should be provided.
- The color palette shall be designed to reinforce building identity and complement changes in the horizontal or vertical plane.

Windows and Doors:

- Ground-floor window and door glazing shall be transparent and non-reflective. Above the ground floor, both curtain wall and window/door glazing shall have the minimum reflectivity needed to achieve energy efficiency standards. Non-reflective coating or tints are preferred.
- Windows and doors shall be recessed from the exterior building wall, except where inappropriate to the building's architectural style.

Landscaping: There shall be landscaping that complements other site features and creates relief from buildings, parking areas and other man-made elements.

- Drought tolerant, salt tolerant, non-invasive, low maintenance trees and shrubs should be utilized.
- Deciduous trees shall be a minimum of 2" caliper at the time of installation; evergreen trees shall be a minimum of 6' in height at the time of installation; and shrubs shall be a minimum of 24" in height at the time of installation.
- Parking lot landscaping shall be required per the provisions in Chapter 1171.
- Seasonal plantings should be incorporated into the landscape plan.
- The approved landscape plan must be maintained across the life of the development.

Screening: Exterior service, utility, trash, and mechanical equipment shall be located to the rear of buildings if possible and screened from view with a wall, fence or landscaping. Such equipment shall be completely screened from view. Materials shall be consistent with those used in the building and/or site. Equipment located on buildings shall match the color of the building.

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

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

- The height of parking lot lighting shall not exceed 15' above grade and shall direct light downward. Parking lot lighting shall be accomplished from poles within the lot, and not building-mounted lights.
- For pedestrian walkways, decorative low light level fixtures shall be used and the height of the fixture shall not exceed 12' above grade.
- Security lighting shall be full cut-off type fixtures, shielded and aimed so that illumination is directed to the designated areas with the lowest possible illumination level to effectively allow surveillance.

Parking:

- Non-residential Uses. Parking shall be adequate to serve the proposed uses, but shall in no case exceed 125% of the parking requirement in Section 1171.01.
- Bicycle Parking. Bicycle parking should be provided and adequate to serve the proposed uses.

Public Spaces: A minimum of one Public Space Amenity as approved by the Municipal Planning Commission shall be required for every 5,000 square feet of gross floor area of multi-family dwellings, commercial or industrial space that is new in the WBC. Public Space Amenities are elements that directly affect the quality and character of the public domain such as:

- An accessible plaza or courtyard designed for public use with a minimum area of 250 square feet;
- Sitting space (e.g. dining area, benches, or ledges) which is a minimum of 16 inches in height and 48 inches in width;
- Public art;
- Decorative planters;
- Bicycle racks;
- Permanent fountains or other Water Features;
- Decorative waste receptacles;
- Decorative pedestrian lighting; and
- Other items approved by the Municipal Planning Commission.

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. The plan recommends promoting a high quality physical environment, encouraging the City to continue to emphasize strong physical and aesthetic design, and high-quality development. Also recommended is encouraging the private market to add additional commercial office space within the City.

Staff Analysis and Recommendation:

1. The proposed plan generally reflects the recommendations made at the last ARB meeting. The structures were moved further away from the adjacent residential and the parking deck was eliminated.
2. Right-of-way vacation along both streets is still requested. Exact location of sidewalks, plantings and buildings in relation to the rights-of-way needs to be reviewed and modified as necessary.
3. Exact design of the entrance to the site from Wilson Bridge Rd. may need to be modified for better traffic flow.
4. Building and site details would be expected to follow the Worthington Design Guidelines and Wilson Bridge Corridor Development Standards.
5. Staff is recommending *tabling* of this application after discussion, to allow the applicant to make modifications and add detail based on the guidelines and any recommendations made at the meeting.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter explained the Board would not be taking a vote regarding this application, the presentation is to hear about the changes that have been made to the plan. Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Ohm Patel stated his address is 600 Enterprise Dr., Lewis Center, Ohio. Mr. Patel said over the past six months they have tried to get as much feedback as possible, and based on that information they have moved forward with the project. He said as they have gone through this process, they have gone from a really dense site to a less dense site, however they feel from an economic and performance standpoint the development is still well supported in terms of projected cash flows, revenues and the cost of development based on this plan. Mr. Patel said he realizes this plan might not be absolutely perfect and is still in the conceptual stage, but at the same time they also feel they are ready to move forward with details. He said they had a traffic study done, but needed to modify it based on the proposed plan. They will take action after hearing comments from the ARB this evening.

Mr. Patel said they removed the parking deck because they felt it was going to be a sore topic that would have multiple issues on multiple fronts. The issues were not just about the height of the structure, the issues were about lighting, safety, the look of the structure, and too many unknowns. He said the deck is a costly item and was too risky of an investment, so they took a different approach. Mr. Patel said as far as the buildings are concerned they have placed the buildings in what they feel is a better state than what the existing property is today in terms of taking the buildings further away from the neighborhood and allowing there to be more grandeur in the approach coming off of Interstate 270. He said this will dwarf the gas station but will not affect the neighborhood because the buildings will be so close to West Wilson Bridge Road and High Street. Mr. Patel said they did not want to lose the town square because they still want the community feel and pedestrian pathways from Wilson Bridge Road. He said the town square is not as elegantly done as the previous plan but at the same time there were some compromises that they had to make. Mr. Patel said that they have vetted what can come to the site from a tenant standpoint and they did understand they needed to decrease the amount of food on the development so they have reduced the square footages of the buildings and changed some of the uses. He said

he has had some office space interest, which was initially taken off the table because of the low rent that office space normally attracts, but they have had some interest in the space from businesses that would be a nice fit for the area. Mr. Patel said he would like to get some final feedback so they can make final tweaks and push forward with the formal traffic study and the formal application.

Mr. Patel said the ownership has spent well over \$200,000.00 dollars on the project already and they are still in the conceptual phase. He said they are getting pressure to move forward and if they cannot move forward as swiftly as possible then they will run into issues with the Holiday Inn flog. Mr. Patel said this is a crunch time for them and they really want to push the project forward.

Mr. Coulter said he is having a hard time conceptualizing where the service areas would be for the restaurants and the professional building along West Wilson Bridge Road, whether trash, or grease, or delivery of foods and things like that. Mr. Coulter also asked Mr. Patel whether he has had additional follow up with the neighbors since the last meeting before the Board. Mr. Patel said he has had discussions with the home owners that live on Caren Avenue about the possibility of the purchase of their homes as a part of the re-development, but once they decided that the parking garage was not going to be in play, there was no change in the condition as the property is today, and he was instructed by the ownership to leave that area as it is today. Mr. Patel said if the buildings were going to be closer to the residential area and there was going to be a deck they would have done the prudent thing and possibly have purchased the homes to reduce the impact, but the new plan betters the condition of the area, so there is no need to purchase the homes.

Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Patel about their time frame. Mr. Patel said they would like to start demolition in July or August of 2017 and then start site work and go from there. He said between now and then he would like to go through the process of getting all the approvals. Mr. Coulter said with that time frame in mind, Mr. Patel will need to take back anything he learns tonight at the meeting to discuss with his team. Mr. Coulter continued to say that architecture is going to be very important to every person on the ARB and MPC, the neighbors and the city in its entirety, and it will not be just a one or two meeting process. He urged Mr. Patel to give himself ample time to make the public presentations and hear the comments back before expecting approvals and work backwards and see where that schedule fits. Mr. Patel said he has already had the same discussion with City staff and they have advised him how to allow for additional time. Mr. Patel said they have put together a general timeline. They understand the need for refined focused architectural plans and elevations. Mr. Patel said they want to start off on the right foot. He said their architects are already well aware of the issues. He said they did not really do much between the last meeting and this meeting in terms of dollars because they want their team to get a consensus of where they are.

Mr. Reis said he would second Mr. Coulter's comments. He said he would prefer to see moving the driving entrance to the west because coming out where they are now might be a disaster. He has meetings there every month and exiting out onto West Wilson Bridge is like shooting the gap. He also said the offset traffic light might also be important for the entryway. Mr. Reis continued

to say, as a thought, depending on cost, he would like to see the walkway carry all the way through to Caren Avenue so neighbors and other pedestrians can circulate through the area.

Mrs. Lloyd said she agreed with Mr. Reis and that was one of the comments she was going to make. She said the pedestrian connection to Caren Avenue seems like it is not really there yet. Mrs. Lloyd asked the Board members if they were okay with the Hampton Inn being so close to the BP Station and if the BP Station ever decided to re-develop would there be enough room on the site? Mr. Coulter believed the property that BP owns would be large enough to re-develop. He said he knew that BP was asked to sell their property, but at the time, the cost was not economically affordable. Mr. Patel said there is a grade change between the BP Station and where the Hampton Inn will be. Mr. Patel said they could extend small uses from the fast casual to the corner and then make an "L" over to the Hampton Inn. He said they would try to create a corner piece with a crown, and the parking lot would extend right on through. That is the plan if they were ever to acquire the additional property. Mr. Patel said that even if a different developer acquired the property the same opportunity would still be there. He said that they would work with the new developer on a cross easement.

Mr. Sauer asked Mrs. Bitar what variances might be needed. Mrs. Bitar explained they would need setback variances for along West Wilson Bridge Road and High Street, and possibly a parking variance. She said currently under the Code the buildings would only be allowed to be three stories and the two hotels are proposed at four stories. If they were to rezone the property to the Wilson Bridge Corridor District they would not need these variances, but the property is still zoned C-4. Mrs. Bitar explained the developer does have a choice because they made application before the Wilson Bridge Corridor (WBC) Code was adopted. Mr. Brown explained the Code language just went into effect Monday, June 20th, 2016.

Mr. Sauer said he was concerned with how close the buildings are on High Street, he felt the buildings were too tall. He thought the WBC called for setbacks that were greater than what is seen in the proposed plans. Mr. Brown stated Council approved the setbacks north of Wilson Bridge Road to fifty feet, but there is still the flexible five to twenty feet around the corner on Caren Avenue and High Street. Mr. Hofmann explained he liked seeing the buildings closer to the road and Mr. Sauer said he does not.

Mr. Hofmann explained he understood the plan is less eloquent because the loss of the parking garage will mean the area will gain a lot more surface parking. He said because the site is so spread out the area looks less like a plan, but he feels that Mr. Patel has maintained some very nice ideas. He said he would second the idea of having a walkway through the site, like a boulevard all the way through to Caren Avenue. Mr. Hofmann said he could envision this area becoming an extension of a Farmer's Market area. He asked if there was any thought to creating a walkway that would bring in people from across the street because trying to cross the intersection now is horrifying. Mr. Coulter said he liked the idea but did not see the practicality.

Mr. Brown said when they were doing the Wilson Bridge Corridor study, a lot of the things they looked at were better ways to serve the pedestrian community throughout the corridor. Mr. Brown continued to say they have spoken with the traffic consultant and the previous City Engineer and

Mr. Patel's engineer about a way to do that, but because of the close proximity to the intersection they did not feel that such an idea would be possible.

Mr. Patel said he had met with the ownership across the street and did not the two sites were competition for each other because the offerings would be different. Plus, the Shops owner has secured long term leases whose stores will be happy to have a higher demographic of the population to cross the street and enjoy what they have to offer. Mr. Patel said the ownership is working with them on the development of an offset light.

Mr. Myers asked Mr. Patel if the front doors of the hotel are located off of the town square and Mr. Patel said yes. He said the direction they are going is that the drop offs will be at the front main entrance but they will make the side entrances larger than what you would typically see at most hotels with automatic doors, but you would need a key to get into those side doors. Customers will be able to get into the building from more than one entrance if they have a key card. Mr. Myers was disappointed that Mr. Patel had to compress things and move the buildings to the northeast and said, "You kind of lose that gathering place", and so instead of becoming a pedestrian gathering area this will become an automobile gathering area. Mr. Patel said they could flip that portion with the Holiday Inn Express and put that area in the back. Mr. Myers said he wished the town square area could be twice as big. Mr. Hofmann said there is a lot that can be done with design and finish choices and the town square area could be designed as a cobblestone area and cars will naturally slow down when they come across a textured area and close to buildings, which is why he likes buildings closer to High Street.

Mr. Patel said what you see now of the parking lot is seventy three to seventy four percent of the required parking. He feels parking needs of the uses will be complimentary: offices will have less need in the evening and hotels and restaurants will need more parking spaces in the evening.

Mr. Foust asked Mr. Patel to explain the seventy three to seventy four percent parking. Mr. Patel said his parking lot is twenty seven percent short of what is needed for required parking per the Worthington Code. Mrs. Bitar explained that staff has not checked the numbers. She said because of the time of the uses, though, she does not feel this area will be over parked. Mr. Patel said generally there should be enough room for parking due to the mix of office, hotel and restaurant.

Mr. Reis asked how this change will affect the number of hotel rooms that they have now. Mr. Patel said that there will be twenty less rooms than what they currently have now.

Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and a couple of people raised their hands.

Mr. Scott Kyser stated his address is 6917 Hayhurst St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Kiser said he was confused about the traffic study and wanted to know who is responsible for doing the traffic study and how the study gets approved. Mr. Brown explained the developer is required to do the traffic study and the City has hired an outside consultant to review their information and make modifications that will be presented to staff and the Board for review. Mr. Kyser said he heard

Mr. Patel state demolition is scheduled for July 2017 and wanted to know if he could get a copy of the complete construction schedule. Mr. Patel said he can publish something further down the road but at this point there are still a number of moving parts based on the architecture and building drawings as to what will be feasible. He will share the information with the public as soon as available.

Mr. Kyser asked if there will be any parking restrictions on the side streets or any plans to add parking meters. Mrs. Bitar explained with this type of project, side street parking would probably not be looked at beforehand, but if parking becomes a problem, the City can always add signs. She said the Code requirement is very high and parking is excessive for the time of the uses. Mrs. Bitar further stated that as part of the parking variance the City can require the developer to have a parking agreement with the office properties to the south or the mall to the north. She said as the project develops staff will take a look at the parking a little more closely. Mrs. Bitar said typically the city would not want to put up no parking signs on streets that have residences because the City does not have a permitting system, and if people want to have a party they are going to want their friends and families members to be able to park near their house.

Mr. Kyser said he appreciated the removal of the parking garage, and asked if the grade of the land will be changed. Mr. Jack Reynolds stated he is an attorney for Smith & Hale, and his client has not engineered the site yet. He said this is just the conceptual phase, but the information will be available as soon as they get to that point. Mr. Kyser asked if the house next to the property will still be demolished and Mrs. Bitar explained the home was purchased by the hotel owners and they have already obtained a demolition permit and can proceed at any time. The applicant has shown what landscaping would be added with this submittal. Mr. Kyser said he is looking forward to the new development and believes this will be an improvement from what is there now.

Mr. Lee Evans stated his address 6888 Hayhurst St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Evans said he has been at most of the meetings regarding this project and wanted to commend the developers because he believes the latest drawings are a huge step in the right direction. He was happy to see things moved further away from the neighborhood. Mr. Evans asked if the service entrance for trucks would be off of Caren Ave. Mr. Coulter said he asked a similar question earlier that had not been answer yet, but believed that the answer might not be known yet. He also said he shares the concern about trucks entering from Caren Ave. during early morning hours. Mr. Coulter believes that trucks should enter the area from High St.

There were no other speakers. Mr. Coulter said the developer should continue with their plan and as soon as more information becomes available to give Mrs. Bitar a call and she can have the information put on the City's website for people to view at their convenience.

Mr. Myers asked the Board members if they were comfortable with the developer moving forward with their plans to spend money on traffic, architects and leasing, etc., and the Board members said yes.

Mrs. Holcombe moved to table this application and Mr. Hofmann seconded the motion. All Board members voted, "Aye". The motion was approved.

C. Municipal Planning Commission

1. Conditional Use

- a. Wholesale Business in I-1 – **7200 Huntley Rd., Suite B** (Peter White) **CU 11-16**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This property is a 2.3 acre lot at the northern end on the east side of Huntley Rd. The building has an office across the front and 2 separate wings extending to the east. A Conditional Use Permit was issued for a wholesale automobile business in the north side of the building last year. The MPC allowed the use conditioned on cars for sale being parked inside the fenced-in area. This applicant moved his business into the southern part of the building. Like the other business, this business initially displayed cars for sale in front of the building until told that was not allowed. The business also advertised as “Wholesale Open to the Public” initially. Automotive Sales are not allowed in the I-1 Zoning District, so operation as a wholesale business is the only option.

Project Details:

1. The business can use the office space and park the vehicles in the existing fenced-in area south and east of the building. No outward signs of retail sales is allowed.
2. Numerous signs have been installed, none of which has been permitted. Only 1 wall sign and 1 freestanding sign are allowed by Code. Also, an occupancy permit has not yet been issued.
3. Operating hours are cited as normal business hours with occasional extra hours as necessary.

Land Use Plans:

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.

Worthington Comprehensive Plan Update & 2005 Strategic Plan

An area plan focusing on the Proprietors/Huntley Road corridor should be developed that makes recommendations for repositioning it in the market place to make it attractive and competitive in the region. Because of the age and types of uses located here, this compact area is experiencing

significant change and has the opportunity to reinvent itself. Issues such as building renovation, aesthetics, and possible road and infrastructure improvements should be addressed.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending *approval* of this application with the following conditions:

- The signage be reduced to 1 wall and 1 freestanding sign to meet Code requirements
- The business may not park vehicles to be sold in front of the fence or building, and may not display signage in/on any vehicles on the property
- The business may not advertise being open to the public.

Otherwise, the site has ample room to store vehicles so operation as a wholesale business should not affect the surrounding properties or the area.

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar pointed out a neon open sign hanging on the building that would not be allowed, and showed the multiple wall signs, only one of which could remain to comply with the Code. Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Peter White stated his address is 7200 Huntley Rd., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Sauer asked if there was one business at this location or two, and Mr. White said there are two separate businesses. Mr. Sauer asked if both businesses are the same kind of business and Mr. White said yes. Mr. White said they have taken care of most of the issues as far as the signs, and cars parked out front, but they are strictly there to just wholesale cars. Mr. Coulter asked Mr. White if he was one hundred percent compliant with the issues and Mr. White said yes. Mr. Coulter asked if the request for French doors was to be able to get cars inside the business and Mr. White said no, the French doors are needed so they can see outside. He said a drunk driver recently crashed into their building and took out their window so now they cannot see outside. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY PETER WHITE FOR A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO OPERATE A WHOLESALE BUSINESS AT 7200 HUNTLEY RD., SUITE A, AS PER CASE NO. CU 11-16, DRAWINGS NO. CU 11-16, DATED JUNE 1, 2016, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING WITH THE AMENDMENT THAT ALL SIGNAGE BE IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE CITY'S CODE, AND THE USE WILL BE SPECIFICALLY FOR PETER WHITE NOT THE LOCATION PERMANENTLY.

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

2. Amendment to Development Plan

- a. Signage – **7099 Huntley Rd., Unit 101** (Sign Vision Co./Columbus Fasteners) **ADP 04-16**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This property is located at the southwest corner of Huntley and Worthington-Galena Roads, and houses a 38,000 square foot multi-tenanted building that was constructed in 1974. Columbus Fasteners is located in the northwest part of the building, with the entrance being on the west side. The applicant would like to install additional wall signs for Columbus Fasteners.

Project Details:

1. There is an existing wall sign on the north side of the building identifying Columbus Fasteners. The sign is at the top of the warehouse wall, which is at second story level, and appears to be internally illuminated.
2. Two 3' x 6' non-illuminated signs are proposed at the lower level office portion of the building on the west side. One would be on the north side and the other on the west side near the entry door. The sign on the west side would just barely fit between the window and eave. Variances are needed for having more than 1 wall sign.
3. The signs would be made of 3 mm aluminum composite material. The signs are proposed with white backgrounds and silver borders, red and black lettering and a screw logo in silver.
4. There is an internal sign on the glass entry door.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Sign Code:

Each business is permitted a maximum of 100 square feet of signage, but is only allowed to have 1 wall mounted sign.

Worthington Comprehensive Plan Update & 2005 Strategic Plan

An area plan focusing on the Proprietors/Huntley Road corridor should be developed that makes recommendations for repositioning it in the market place to make it attractive and competitive in the region. Because of the age and types of uses located here, this compact area is experiencing significant change and has the opportunity to reinvent itself. Issues such as building renovation, aesthetics, and possible road and infrastructure improvements should be addressed.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending approval of only one of the signs. The proposed sign on the north side seems redundant with retention of the existing wall sign. If the sign by the entrance is desired, the size should be reduced to fit better on the wall allowing space between architectural elements, and should possibly be moved to be centered on the window.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Ms. Bri Bailey stated her address is 987 Claycraft Rd., Columbus, Ohio. Ms. Bailey said the business is concerned with bringing in more traffic from the public. The business believes that people are not aware that they are there. Mr. Coulter said he is fine with the idea that the sign at the entrance door should help people know where to go. He also said he agrees with Mrs. Bitar that the sign above the window is too large and needs to be scaled down and needs to be centered above the window.

Mr. Sauer asked if there is another tenant in the building. Mrs. Bitar said there are a number of other tenants in the building. Mr. Coulter asked what was on the inside of the windows. Ms. Bailey said she was just there at the business last week and those signs were not in the window. Mrs. Bitar said she just took the photograph yesterday so she believes the signs are still there. Mrs. Bitar said only 25% of the window area could be covered with signs, so once a permanent sign is placed the internal sign area should be reduced.

Mrs. Holcombe thought placement of the sign above the window did not look right and felt it should be next to the door. Mr. Reis felt the size of the sign needed to be adjusted. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY SIGN VISION CO. INC. ON BEHALF OF COLUMBUS FASTENERS FOR APPROVAL OF AN AMENDMENT TO DEVELOPMENT PLAN TO ADD A WALL SIGN AT 7099 HUNTLEY RD. AS PER CASE NO. ADP 04-16, DRAWINGS NO. ADP 04-16, DATED JUNE 9, 2016, 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 AMENDMENT THAT ONLY ONE NEW SURFACE SIGN BE LOCATED AT THE ENTRANCE AND THE FINAL SIZE, SCALE AND LOCATION MUST BE REVIEWED BY STAFF BEFORE GOING TO COUNCIL.

Mrs. Holcombe seconded the motion and Mrs. Bitar called the role: Mr. Coulter, aye; Mr. Sauer, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; and Mr. Hofmann, aye. The motion was approved.

- b. Transformer Locations – **2245 & 2285 W. Dublin-Granville Rd.** (Tom Hayer/ Linworth Plaza, LLC) **ADP 05-16**

Findings of fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request

In 2014 & 2015, the property owner of this land at the southwest corner of W. Dublin-Granville Rd. and Linworth Rd. annexed, rezoned, subdivided, created a Development Plan, and received Architectural Review Board approval to redevelop the property as a neighborhood commercial site. Construction of Linworth Crossing is progressing, and as the project moves forward approval of amendments is needed. This application addresses transformer placement.

Project Details:

1. Two transformers were originally proposed toward the rear of the site, next to proposed dumpsters. AEP has determined final location must be south of the previously approved areas due to the location of the sanitary sewer. Because proximity to the south property line is closer than before, variances are needed for placement.
2. The transformers would sit on concrete pads about 7' from the property line. Existing and previously proposed vegetation would be supplemented with evergreen shrubs to screen the equipment from the park to the south.
3. Parking blocks and bollards have been added for protection.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Keep functional items such as trash containers, transformers and electrical boxes orderly and well screened.

Development Plan Amendment Ordinance

If an amendment does not conflict with the character or integrity of the development, but an additional variance is required, the approval must be by City Council.

Recommendations:

Staff is recommending approval of this application, as the location is similar to what was previously approved, and landscape screening is proposed. The applicant committed to painting the transformers green, and the bollards should also be green or black.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Dan Cline stated his address is 112 S. Parkview, Columbus, Ohio. Mr. Cline said he ran into a bit of a glitch because they thought they had good locations for the pads but AEP did not like the location of the pads because the sanitary system is twelve feet below. He said they tried for three months to get AEP to approve of the location of the pads but AEP feared if the sanitary system needed repair there would too much conduit in the way to get to the system. Mr. Cline said he is proposing to move the transformer pads about eight feet back from where they were going to be. He said they will be straightening out the arborvitae that is behind one of the pads and viburnum will be in front of the pad so the transformer pad will be screened, but the other pad will be more difficult to screen due to the large arborvitae in that location. He proposed planting smaller arborvitae and viburnum to screen that pad. Board members had no questions or concerns. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Sauer moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY TOM HAYER ON BEHALF OF LINWORTH PLAZA LLC TO AMEND THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR 2245 & 2285 W. DUBLIN-GRANVILLE RD. WITH AMENDED TRANSFORMER LOCATIONS, AS PER CASE NO. ADP 05-16, DRAWINGS NO. DP 05-16, DATED JUNE 10, 2016 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. Coulter, aye; Mr. Sauer, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; and Mr. Hofmann, aye. The motion was approved.

D. Other

Mr. Brown said that on Monday, 60 days had passed after City Council approved the Wilson Bridge Road Corridor rezoning. No referendums were filed. Mrs. Bitar said there will be a new type of application that the Board will see on the agendas in the future.

Mr. Brown said one of the things they are working on is scheduling outreach to the residents that live on the south side of East Wilson Bridge Road. To have a one on one meeting with those that are directly impacted by the area City Council discussed about rezoning. He said the City will be sending out mailers to each of the property owners.

Mr. Coulter informed Board members the sign for the Sharon Memorial Township was appealed to City Council. Mr. Myers explained that there are no standards in the city's code as to why you should hear an appeal or not. He said there was no reason to deny hearing the appeal so they made the decision to go ahead and hear the appeal. Mr. Myers said the appellant has the burden to prove to City Council the decision was wrong. Mr. Foust said he was glad that City Council was hearing the appeal because the ARB does have an appeal process and any citizen can appeal any decision. This very rarely ever comes up, but this sends a good message to the community that City Council is willing to listen to the appeal. In the long run, he felt that acquaints City Council with something the Board has done and gives the Board some direction as to handling similar situations in the future. Mr. Myers said the discussion about the Memorial Hall was more about the character of the building. Should the building stay as a Memorial Hall or should the building be more commercialized. The discussion was not about whether or not the sign looked good. Mr. Brown said the appeal will be on City Council's Agenda for July 11th, 2016.

E. Adjournment

Mrs. Holcombe moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:35 p.m. Mr. Reis seconded the motion. All Board members voted, "Aye." The meeting was adjourned.