



MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
WORTHINGTON ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
WORTHINGTON MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION
February 14, 2019

The regular meeting of the Worthington Architectural Review Board and the Worthington Municipal Planning Commission was called to order at 7:00 p.m. with the following members present: Mikel Coulter, Chair; Thomas Reis, Vice-Chair; Kathy Holcombe (arrived at 7:17 p.m.), Secretary; Edwin Hofmann; David Foust; Amy Lloyd; and Richard Schuster. Also present were: Scott Myers, Worthington City Council Representative to the Municipal Planning Commission; Lee Brown, Director of Planning & Building; and Lynda Bitar, Planning Coordinator and Clerk of the Municipal Planning Commission.

A. Call to Order – 7:00 p.m.

1. Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Approval of the minutes of the January 24, 2019 meeting

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

4. Affirmation of witnesses

Mr. Coulter acknowledge the large number of people in the audience for tonight’s meeting. He stated that he wanted to be upfront that there would not be a vote tonight, we are here to hear the presentation, testimony and discussion. We are going to try to limit the discussion related to Stafford Village redevelopment to 1.5-hours since we have such a long agenda. This does not mean that you will not have a chance to speak, this is just the first of several meetings that you will have the opportunity to provide comments. If someone has already spoken about particular items, you can agree with their comments, but try to limit your discussion to new points so that we can try to let everyone have a chance to speak.

B. Architecture Review Board – 7:00 p.m.

1. Stafford Village Redevelopment – **Northeast Corner of Hartford St. and Stafford Ave.**
(Brian Kent Jones Architects/National Church Residences) **AR 14-19**

&

C. Municipal Planning Commission

1. Planned Unit Development – Preliminary Plan

- a. Stafford Village Redevelopment – **Northeast Corner of Hartford St. and Stafford Ave.**
(Brian Kent Jones Architects/National Church Residences) **PUD 01-19**

Mrs. Bitar briefly reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

Stafford Village was developed in the early 1970's, and is entirely owned by National Church Residences, which according to its website "... is the nation's largest not-for-profit provider of affordable senior housing and services." The company's headquarters are in Upper Arlington. The main part of the apartment complex is at the northeast corner of Stafford Ave. and Hartford St. Other units are located further to the north, and at the southwest corner of North and Hartford Streets. Also, houses at 862, 868 and 874 Hartford St. were recently purchased by National Church Residences.

The Planned Unit Development (PUD) application is a rezoning request to re-develop the main portion of the complex, which is on ~3 acres and contains 58 dwelling units, as a new senior housing development with 85 dwelling units. Current zoning is a combination of AR 4.5, R-10 and R-6.5. All three of the single-family houses would also be part of the PUD and are contributing buildings in the Worthington Historic District. The southern two houses are proposed to remain and the northernmost house (874) is proposed to be demolished. An Architectural Review Board application is included with the request but should not be approved until such a time that the property is rezoned. Approval of a subdivision may be needed at some point in the future to combine the properties and alter property lines for the single-family houses.

Project Details:

Preliminary Plan Requirements:

- (1) *A legal description and vicinity map showing the property lines, streets, existing Zoning, and land uses within 300 feet of the area proposed for the PUD;*

A legal description of the 2.792 acres piece of land currently housing the apartments is included in the packet. The single-family house properties do not have legal descriptions. A vicinity map has been provided showing a combination of single- and multi-family units north of E. Stafford Ave. and east of Morning St., and Hartford Park and the library to the south.

- (2) *Names and addresses of owners, developers and the registered land surveyor, engineer or architect who made the plan;*
 - National Church Residences 2245 North Bank Dr., Columbus OH 43220 - Owner
 - Brian Kent Jones Architects, 448 W. Nationwide Blvd., Loft 100, Columbus, OH

43215

- pH7 Architects
- The Kleingers Group, PE Services – Civil Engineers
- David Hodge, Attorney

(3) *Date, north arrow and total acreage of the site;*

Provided.

(4) *A topographical survey of all land included in the application and such other land adjoining the subject property as may be reasonably required by the City. The topographical survey shall show two foot contours or contours at an interval as may be required by the Municipal Planning Commission to delineate the character of the land included in the application and such adjoining land as may be affected by the application. Elevations shall be based on North American Vertical Datum of 1988 (NAVD88). In lands contiguous to or adjacent to the flood plain of the Olentangy River, existing contours shall be shown in accordance with the elevations set forth in Chapter;*

Sheets A-2 & A-3

(5) *Existing Structures, parking and traffic facilities, Easements and public Rights-of-Way on the subject property as well as within 300 feet of the area proposed for PUD;*

Sheet A-3

(6) *Existing sewers, water mains, culverts and other underground facilities within the tract and in the vicinity, indicating pipe size, grades and exact locations;*

Sheet A-3

(7) *The location of Natural Features and provisions necessary to preserve and/or restore and maintain them to maintain the character of the surrounding neighborhood and community;*

Sheets A-3 and B-15

(8) *A tree preservation plan showing all existing trees 6" caliper or larger;*

Sheets B-15 and B-8: A list and plan are included showing trees 6" diameter at breast height (DBH) and larger, with species, condition, and recommendations. Many trees at the perimeter of the site are proposed to be retained, including a 56" Pin Oak at the rear of the site. The landscaping plan indicates 1006 caliper inches are being removed and would be replaced with 1006 caliper inches of new trees. Clarification is needed as to why two different measurement methods for trees are used.

(9) *A preliminary grading plan;*

Sheet B-7: The site is relatively flat and proposed grades would be similar to existing grades.

(10) *Preliminary design and location of Structures, Accessory Structures, streets, drives, traffic patterns, Sidewalks or Recreation Paths, parking, entry features, site lighting, landscaping, screening, Public Space Amenities and other features as required by the City;*

The project is designed as one large building with a façade that gives the look of many connected separate buildings with varying architectural styles, many of which are found in Worthington. A variety of roof shapes would hide the flat roof behind that would house mechanical equipment for the building. A roof plan is shown on Sheet B-11. The units along the street rights-of-way would have exterior entrances with walkways leading from the public sidewalk. Interior entrances are also proposed for those units, as well as the other units in the building. Walks are proposed around much of the perimeter of the building. Other entrances would be at various locations on the exterior and in the garage. Two courtyard areas are proposed on the E. Stafford Ave. frontage that would help to add relief to the south side of the building and add gathering areas for the residents. Walkways are proposed to connect to these areas from the public sidewalk.

Predominant building materials will be brick, cementitious fiberboard, stucco and asphalt shingles.

Along the street frontage of the site, the structure would be two stories, with placement about 17' from Hartford St. (excluding porches), and 20' from E. Stafford Ave. (excluding porches). The center section of the building is proposed as three stories, with the first floor being structured parking. Parking is also proposed on a surface lot at the northeast area of the site, in a lot south of the houses on Hartford St., and three parallel spaces are planned along E. Stafford Ave. Bicycle parking locations have not been identified. The entrance to the site would be from E. Stafford Ave., with an emergency access planned for Hartford St. on the parcel with the house that is proposed for demolition. For this access removable bollards and grass pavers are proposed. Details for this access, as well as whether the main drive and parking area can accommodate turning movements for Worthington's ladder truck must be worked out with the Worthington Fire Department. Also, a traffic study has not been presented.

In addition to parking lot trees, other trees and shrubs are proposed around the site. East of the drive and adjacent to the surface parking in the rear several sections of 3' high walls are proposed to screen cars from the residential neighbors. Confirmation from those property owners that the proposed screening is acceptable is needed. Proposed tract coverage for buildings is 41.5%.

Sheets B-12 & B-13 show the lighting plan for the site. A combination of pole lights and wall packs is proposed. The proposed 15' high pole lights are shown in the main parking lot and courtyards. The black poles and fixtures would have a 2'6" exposed concrete base if in the parking lot, and a near grade base in the courtyards. The proposed fixtures would have the light source in the top and an aluminum reflector. The brightness and color temperature of the LED lights is not identified on the plans. Rectangular LED Wall packs are proposed to be mounted around the building at 12' high in 11 locations. Included are lights proposed to illuminate the parking area on Hartford St. The brightness and color temperature have not been identified.

The applicant is citing the courtyards along E. Stafford Ave. as Public Space Amenities.

Monument signs are shown near both drive entrances and at the southwest corner of the property.

- (11) *The proposed provision of water, sanitary sewer and surface drainage facilities, including engineering feasibility studies or other evidence of reasonableness of such facilities;*

Existing utilities have been identified and proposed connections are shown. Locations of fire hydrants, FDCs and a fire flow analysis are needed for the Fire Department.

- (12) *Parcels of land intended to be dedicated or temporarily reserved for public use, or reserved by deed covenant, and the condition proposed for such covenants and for the dedications;*

No land would be dedicated.

- (13) *Proposed Easements;*

The need for utility easements has not been identified.

- (14) *Proposed number of Dwelling Units per acre;*

The applicant is proposing 85 dwelling units which is approximately 28 units/acre. The following types of units are proposed: 34 micro; 6 one-bedroom; 15 one-bedroom plus; 17 two-bedroom; and 13 two-bedroom plus. The size of each has not been stated.

- (15) *Proposed uses, including area of land devoted to each use;*

The only use would be "Senior residential" which means multi-family facilities with occupancy restricted to age fifty-five and over. Social rooms, limited staff and garages may be included. Unit sizes may vary and be as large as typical apartments. Facility programming space throughout the interior to accommodate a full range of congregate services, dining, health, and wellness.

- (16) *Proposed phasing of development of the site, including a schedule for construction of each phase;*

Information is needed.

- (17) *Homeowners or commercial owners' association materials;*

Information not needed.

- (18) *Development Standards Text; and*

Included in packet.

- (19) *Any additional information as required by the Municipal Planning Commission and the City Council.*

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Comprehensive Plan Update & 2005 Strategic Plan

Promote increased residential densities around Old Worthington provided it addresses targeted housing markets, meets the architectural design guidelines, does not significantly impact the historic fabric, and provides interior parking. This should occur primarily within the first block to each side of High Street.

Code Section 1174.05 PUD Development Standards and Development Standards Text

Development Standards Text shall be a comprehensive narrative detailing the Development Standards for the proposed development, including without limitation the following:

(a) Design Regulations:

(1) Character. The proposed PUD shall consist of an integrated and harmonious design with properly arranged traffic and parking facilities and landscaping. The PUD shall fit harmoniously into and shall not adversely affect adjoining and surrounding properties, Roadways & public facilities.

(2) Design. Site layout, Buildings, Accessory Structures, landscaping and lighting shall be compatible with or enhance the surrounding neighborhood and community.

(3) Screening. Commercial and industrial uses, including parking facilities and refuse containers, shall be permanently screened from all adjoining residential uses.

(4) Tract Coverage. The ground area occupied by all Buildings shall be balanced with green space to soften the appearance of the development. Total Lot/tract coverage shall be set forth in the PUD documents.

(b) Traffic and Parking:

(1) Traffic. Adequate ingress and egress shall be provided as part of the PUD. The proposed PUD shall be located so that reasonably direct traffic access is supplied from major thoroughfares and where congestion will not likely be created by the proposed development. Where potential congestion may be alleviated by installation of Improvements on streets abutting the development, the developer shall be required to pay the cost of the construction of Improvements and shall dedicate or deed lands necessary for

street widening purposes when so required by the City. A traffic study shall be provided by the applicant as required by the City.

(2) Parking. Parking shall adhere to the following standards:

A. Design. Parking and service areas shall be designed and located to protect the character of the area.

B. Non-residential Uses. Parking shall be adequate to serve the proposed uses, but shall in no case exceed one-hundred and twenty (120) percent of the parking requirement in Section 1171.01.

C. Residential Uses. There shall not be less than one parking space per Dwelling Unit.

D. Bicycle Parking. Bicycle parking should be adequate to serve the proposed uses.

(c) General Requirements:

(1) Environment. The City may request environmental studies for the property, and may request and receive reports and studies from any agency having jurisdiction over the property, indicating whether there are any environmental issues that would affect the property and/or surrounding properties with the proposed development.

(2) Natural Features.

A. The Municipal Planning Commission shall not recommend a PUD unless it finds that such development preserves, restores, maintains and/or enhances: (1) Natural Features and (2) the character of the surrounding neighborhood and community.

B. The Municipal Planning Commission shall not recommend a PUD if it finds that the Natural Features on such property have been or will be removed, damaged, altered or destroyed in anticipation of development until agreement is reached between the applicant and the Municipal Planning Commission on permanent restoration of Natural Features. All healthy trees 6" caliper or larger shall be retained, or replaced with total tree trunk equal in diameter to the removed tree, and this shall be documented as part of an approved Natural Features preservation plan and/or landscape plan. In the event the Municipal Planning Commission determines that full replacement would result in the unreasonable crowding of trees upon the Lot, or that such replacement is not feasible given site conditions, a fee of four hundred fifty dollars (\$450.00) per caliper inch of trees lost and not replaced on such property shall be paid in cash to the City for deposit in the Special Parks Fund. Such deposits shall be used for reforestation on public property.

(3) Public Area Payments.

A. The City Council shall determine whether a portion of such PUD should be dedicated on the plan to a public agency for park, playground or recreational uses. Such dedication may be required only if the City Council determines that there is a need for such property and that the dedication is related both in nature and extent to the impact that the proposed development will have on the parks and recreation system.

C. Whenever any new Dwelling Units are created as part of a PUD, then the developer or owner, as the case may be, shall make a cash payment to the City in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250.00) per each new Dwelling Unit created for deposit in the Special Parks Fund. Such deposits shall be used for costs associated with the City's parks, playground and recreation areas. This section shall not apply to any PUD for which a dedication of land to the City was required pursuant to subsection (A) hereof.

- D. The public area payment required by this section shall be made prior to the issuance of the building permit for the project.
- (4) Public Space Amenities. A minimum of one Public Space Amenity as approved by the Municipal Planning Commission shall be required for every five-thousand (5000) square feet of gross floor area of multiple family dwelling, commercial or industrial space that is new in the PUD. Public Space Amenities are elements that directly affect the quality and character of the public domain such as:
- A. An accessible plaza or courtyard designed for public use with a minimum area of two-hundred fifty (250) square feet;
 - B. Sitting space (e.g. dining area, benches, or ledges) which is a minimum of sixteen (16) inches in height and forty-eight (48) inches in width;
 - C. Public art;
 - D. Decorative planters;
 - E. Bicycle racks;
 - F. Permanent fountains or other Water Features;
 - G. Decorative waste receptacles;
 - H. Decorative pedestrian lighting; and

Worthington Design Guidelines

Planning for the development of a new site should include an inventory and evaluation of features, and the development should retain those that add scenic or historic value (historic buildings, topographical features, mature trees) or that help integrate the new development into the existing cityscape (existing landscaping, roads, paths, sidewalks). In Worthington, new developments should build upon the past excellence and successes of established neighborhoods.

Observe the form, massing and scale of existing nearby houses and neighborhoods. Note that not all buildings will have the same characteristics. Scale, in particular, can vary considerably within a single block. In any new development, try to have a range of form, massing and scale similar to that found nearby and typical of Worthington. Observe the setback of adjacent and nearby structures in the area where a new building or development will be placed. ...the most appropriate setback is one that matches the prevailing setback along the streetscape.

Roof shapes for new buildings should be appropriate to the style or design of the building. Contemporary materials that simulate traditional ones are appropriate, but the preferred option is to use true traditional materials such as wood siding. Incompatible contemporary materials should be avoided. These include rough-sawn siding, diagonal siding, plywood panel siding, and similar obviously modern materials. Brick has long been a traditional material in Worthington. For newly-constructed buildings, the contemporary practice of applying a brick veneer over a frame structure is appropriate in Worthington. Stuccoed surfaces generally are not typical of Worthington architecture and should be avoided. Also avoid coating foundations with stucco or using shaped stucco to simulate stone.

For new buildings, multiple-paned windows generally are not appropriate. The exception is a building being built in a particular style -- such as Federal, Greek Revival or Colonial Revival -- that would have employed this window type. When in doubt, simple 1 over 1 double-hung sash windows are usually the simplest, least expensive and most appropriate choice. When using

multiple-paned windows, avoid designs with horizontally-proportioned panes. This type of window had panes with vertical proportions -- taller than they are wide --and using panes that are wider than they are tall throws off the proportions of the entire window. Using the excellent precedents of Worthington's many historic structures, carefully design the pattern of window openings; window sizes and proportions (they must be appropriate for the size and proportions of the wall in which they are placed); pattern of window panes and muntins; and trim around the windows. Good quality wood windows are more readily available and more affordable than in the past. True wood windows are always the first preference. Aluminum- or vinyl-clad windows can be appropriate, but primarily on secondary facades and less conspicuous locations. All-aluminum or vinyl windows are not prohibited but are not encouraged.

Recommendations:

Use Considerations:

Senior Residential is an appropriate use for this site.

Design Considerations:

- Parking is typically desired to be screened from streets by buildings or landscaping. The proposed site plan generally reflects that notion, except for the lot along Hartford St. which may need additional landscape screening. The amount of proposed parking would likely be sufficient, however there may still be residents and guests that park along Hartford St. and E. Stafford Ave. near those unit entrances. The proposed spaces in the right-of-way along E. Stafford Ave. may be acceptable with the planting of additional vegetation. Bicycle parking should be included. Access issues, as stated previously, must be addressed with the Fire Department. A traffic study has been requested but not supplied.
- New construction in Old Worthington should employ scale, form, and massing similar to and compatible with existing building designs. Although there are other two-story structures in Old Worthington, the structures in the immediate vicinity of this project are at a much smaller scale than this building. Lower building heights and roof lines may be warranted. The proposed hipped roofs and cupolas on the three-story portion of the building seem out of proportion.
- The proposed pole light fixtures may allow a view of the light source at 15' high. The intensity and color of the lights are needed. Also, when exposed bases are used for light poles, coloring the base to match the poles is typically required. The proposed wall packs do not seem to compliment the building. Lighting parking areas with wall lighting, as is shown for the Hartford St. lot, is not preferred.
- The Public Area Payment should be made.
- Review of Public Space Amenities is needed. The proposed courtyards do not feel like something the public would use. Benches along Hartford St. and E. Stafford Ave. should be considered.
- The preliminary utility plans need further review. The Fire Department needs to access fire flow and hydrant access is adequate serve this building.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. George Tabit, Vice-President of Senior Housing Development for National Church Residences, said their business is headquartered in

Upper Arlington, Ohio. They are a national non-profit organization with 340 senior communities across the country. Their mission is to advance better living for seniors and help them stay home for life by developing affordable housing. Mr. Tabit said National Church Residences has been a member of the Worthington Community for fifty years at the Stafford Avenue complex. He clarified the difference between Stafford Court (Developed by NCR) and Stafford Village (Developed by Worthington Presbyterian Church). He said he wanted to take some time to clear up any misunderstandings that may have arisen over the past several weeks about the nature of their history in this location, where the affordability has been historically and how the community has been operated over the past fifty years.

Stafford Village was created in 1970 by the Worthington Presbyterian Church as an affordable apartment community for 65 seniors. The community was developed with assistance from National Church residences and then in 1972, National Church Residences built 23 Stafford Court apartments, which they have owned and operated since then. In 2016, the owner of Stafford Village, at the suggestion of many community members, asked them to help them with the fact that they could not longer continue to operate the affordable community as such without any continuing subsidy. Mr. Tabit said National Church Residences took the property over 2016 and put in writing that they would find a way to continue operating those 65 affordable apartments as affordable housing at the Stafford locations. There are 88 apartments there today. He said they made a promise if they ever did construction, the residents who live there today, would be welcomed back at the rent they pay today, and they put that in writing for the Worthington Presbyterian Church.

Mr. Tabit said he wanted to talk about the work that they have done since 2016 to keep these apartments affordable and sustainable for years to come. He said they have conducted 41 community meetings since beginning the process and he wanted to discuss the key priorities that he heard from the community out of those meetings and then he would show the designs that were developed after discussing those priorities.

Mr. Tabit said he wanted to discuss the history of Stafford Village and Stafford Court, and the churches legacy at that location.

National Church Residences started their relationship with Worthington Presbyterian Church in 1970 when they helped them build the Stafford Village community. He said while he was preparing for this meeting, he reviewed a few newspaper articles the library published from the 1970's that referred to Stafford Village as the informal senior center before the Worthington Griswold Center was available for residents. Mr. Tabit said he has heard many stories from people who had relatives or friends that lived in Stafford Village for the past fifty years. He also heard stories from neighbors who have been involved in the community by doing repairs, donating food, and just being neighborly. Mr. Tabit said he also heard from neighbors whose children were babysat by the residents of Stafford Village and Stafford Court.

Mr. Tabit also reflected a story about a resident who gave him a letter of support and provided a copy of the same to the city, telling about how this person grew up in Worthington and her father was a founding trustee of the Board of Directors for Stafford Village and today, her brother, who

is disabled, lives there and is a comfortable place for him. He would not be comfortable somewhere else.

Mr. Tabit said unfortunately, and he wanted to be very clear, they cannot continue with the way the buildings are set up today, which is why the church came to them, as suggested by others, with a request for help to find a way to operate affordable housing, preserve the property, and deal with the fact that the buildings are in disrepair. Mr. Tabit was told Roto Rooter is there on site several times a month to clean out the sanitary lines and the reason for that is the soil beneath the buildings is starting to subside, the sewer lines are bellying out which will eventually crack, and they will have to start cutting up the floors so they can make those repairs. They have already had to remove and replace the wiring in four units and eventually all the units will need to have the wiring removed and replaced. The recent polar vortex the city just experienced, the residents could not get warm in their units. They have old baseboard heaters that just do not work well and the air conditioners leak like sieves. He said there are 38 apartment units at the Stafford Village location, where they have proposed to redevelop, that are less than 385 square feet. Most people have family rooms that are bigger than that size.

With the subsidy gone, how do they find a way forward? He said they would do that by honoring the legacy that they have had over the past fifty years as a good neighbor and reaching out to the stakeholders which is what they have done over the past year. They have had two open houses with neighbors, conducted two resident surveys, and a 300-person telephonic survey with Worthington residents to get their thoughts and feelings about senior housing in Worthington. Mr. Tabit said there were numerous one on one discussions with City Council members, City staff, and they met with the Old Worthington Association. He said they conducted their surveys over an entire year. They started by listening, they did not have any plans, nor had they engaged an architect. They simply sat down with folks and asked them their thoughts and feelings about the need for senior housing and how Stafford Village fits into the community.

Mr. Tabit said after listening, they came back with plans and tweaked the plans and were ready to discuss those plans. Mr. Tabit said the architect would give a more in-depth overview. The first priority they heard from the telephone survey was that more needs to be done to provide senior housing and one out of three people said they knew of someone who had to move out of Worthington because senior housing was not available. He said they also heard 80% of those surveyed thought that the City of Worthington should do more to support senior housing. The next priority was parking and traffic. Residents, neighbors and stakeholders expressed concerns about ingress and egress on Hartford Street and the amount of on-street parking. Mr. Tabit said they have moved the parking, ingress and egress away from Hartford Street off to a smaller and narrower street with more houses on Stafford in front of the park. He said they have gone from a parking ration of one-half space per unit to more than one space per unit. Another concern was keeping the green space and trees and they kept a significant number of trees, but they could not keep them all. They saved a 56" Pin Oak located at the rear of the property and created two heavily landscaped pocket parks for residents and community members to enjoy.

Mr. Tabit said they also heard design would be a key element as they listened to all their stakeholders. The stakeholders said they wanted the look of a New England village and pedestrian scaled and he felt Mr. Brian Jones did a great job with the design. Mr. Tabit discussed some of

the elements of the design. Every first-floor apartment would have a working exterior door and a real porch. Affordability and diversity were the sixth criteria the stakeholders said needed to be incorporated into the re-design of Stafford Village. The residents of Worthington generally care about living in an age diverse and income diverse community. He said they figured out in order to continue operating 65 affordable apartments at the Stafford locations they would need a building that had 34 new construction affordable apartments and 51 market rate apartments that would create enough income to give the subsidy needed to operate the affordable apartments.

Mr. Tabit said they are committing to every resident as part of the project and bring them back at their current rent, and they will take care of them while they are away. They will get individualized care, one on one assistance from a relocation specialist who will organize property tours, assist with applications, and help with budgeting. They will provide ten thousand dollars to every resident in relocation assistance to make sure they have the resources to take care of extra expenses while they are away. Mr. Tabit reiterated they are determined to keep their promise to the church to maintain 65 affordable apartments at Stafford Village. He then turned the discussion over to Mr. Jones to talk about Stafford Village re-imagined.

Mr. Brian Jones, founder and owner of The Jones Studio, located in the Brewery District in Columbus, Ohio. Mr. Jones mentioned the other design team members that have been helping him with the project such as The Kleingers Group; Mr. Mike Healy of PH7 Architects; Mr. Tom _____ who has a historical architectural background; and Ms. Melinda Swan who spear headed the communication with the community.

Mr. Jones began the slide presentation to give an overview of the design elements. He discussed the objectives which were part of the process. He said one of the things that helped them with scale was the intersection of the town square. The park they were viewing was of a similar scale, which reminded him of having a civic presence. The beauty of the site can have longevity in a town where people can walk to the library and walk to the Farmer's Market. Mr. Jones discussed the pedestrian friendly component of the edges of the property. He said some of the feedback they received was to keep the area pedestrian friendly so students can walk back and forth and allow other residents to be able to walk through those edges. Mr. Jones continued his discussion about the design during his slide show presentation. He said the proposed project would solve the parking dilemma because there currently are not enough parking spaces now as there are residents and they plan to do more studying of the area to possibly include additional trees for the project. Mr. Jones said they have been working with an arborist and many of the trees are in a state of decline and have dead limbs. Half of the trees would be retained and preserved, and they will be adding more trees than they are taking away. Mr. Jones continued to discuss the elevation drawings during the slide presentation. In closing he said he wanted to re-iterate the priority, and the architecture, and historic place, but the ability to have a home for an aging population in a familiar walkable town is what has motivated their team. Mr. Coulter mentioned there would be a cut-off for the discussion at 8:30 p.m., and they would try to fit in as many people as possible who wanted to speak. Additional people who came in late to the meeting and wished to speak were sworn in.

Mr. David Hodge, a land use and zoning attorney with the law firm of Hill & Hodge, speaking on behalf of National Church Residences. Mr. Hodge summarized the importance of the

Comprehensive Plan and how their project would not impact the historic fabric of the community, and interior parking would be provided. He said they have worked hard to bring a package that met the long-term plan.

Mr. Coulter said City staff received letters from the past week with positive and negative feedback and Mrs. Bitar said the letters would be available on the City's website for review. Mr. Coulter asked if the Board members would like to ask questions or open it up to public discussion first. The Board agreed that they would like to first hear from the public. The Mr. Coulter asked for a show of hands of how many people wished to speak.

Mr. Blair Davis, 1 Hartford Ct., Worthington, Ohio, said he was celebrating his 72nd birthday at the meeting. He moved into his home when he was twenty-eight years old, and he loved his neighborhood and would like to maintain it. He felt the building was colossally too big at 112,000 square feet and would be larger than Home Depot. Mr. Blair felt the building did not fit well in the neighborhood. He felt the views of the park were lovely but the views from the other three sides were not. Mr. Blair said he lived directly across the street from the proposed project and would have to look at a 22' wall with a rooftop and parking lot vs. where I am now looking at 50 trees and unobtrusive buildings. This is twice the height of the Berlin Wall. This is decreasing my lifestyle. He felt his property would be significantly impacted and he would no longer be able to view the morning sunshine with this project. He stated that he has lived here for over 44 years and this is emotional for him. This is just the first, this just opens the door for more. There are only three houses to the north until they could get the entire block and do more construction. Hartford Court could be Phase IV if they kept moving forward with building more and more. Mr. Blair felt if this project was approved there would be more similar projects coming and he was concerned with the preservation of the historic district and downtown Worthington. He was also concerned with the elimination of 50 trees including a 100-year-old sycamore tree, and the mud, noise and two years' worth of construction. He was also concerned that there would be additional noise coming from heating and cooling units on the building because everyone would have their own system, which would mean the addition of 95 compressors. Mr. Blair said he slept with his windows open six months out of the year and he wanted to know what his recourse was if the units were not quiet. Mr. Blair felt this area was the ghetto of Worthington because the rest of the city was more affluent than the area he lived in. He said the neighborhood was nice and he liked living in Worthington and moved into the area because of what Worthington had to offer. Mr. Blair felt their motivation was good to provide affordable housing for seniors, but they are still monetizing the charm of Worthington and destroying the city in the process. He said he had attended several meetings with the developer and expressed he did not want one monolithic building. Mr. Blair felt they could keep the smaller buildings and the trees, but what is being proposed is one monolithic building with high ceilings. He said he hoped to spend the rest of his life in Worthington in the house he had hand built by himself with seven additions. He felt his property would decrease in value if the project moved forward and asked the Board members to take a long and hard look at the project.

Mr. Adam Rice, 901 Morning St., Worthington, Ohio, said he shared the eastern property line with the proposed project. He has lived in Worthington for about 30 years and his mother also still lived in the same house in Worthington since 1981. He said he had a unique prospective besides being an immediate neighbor because he has worked for another non-profit housing developer in

Franklin County for the past 12 years. Mr. Rice said he agreed with a lot of what has been said. If people want the project to be affordable you must look at how much the project will cost. He said upgraded materials would be required where the current homes are located. There either needs to be less debt or spread those costs out because some costs are fixed, and some costs are tied directly to the number of units. If there are more units you can spread out those fixed costs and lower the average rent. If you chop off a floor, and lose all those units, the rent would have to increase to match those costs. If nothing is done the property will continue to deteriorate and the costs will be higher to keep them going and they would eventually have to raise the rent or sell the property off. Mr. Rice encouraged everyone to think about what it means to have affordable housing in Worthington. He said to look at a beautiful community such as Grandview, but that city makes Worthington look like a bargain. Mr. Rice said he would love the opportunity for his mother to live in his backyard.

Mr. Jim Ventresca said he and his wife Jordy live at 72 E. Granville Rd., Worthington, Ohio, in the Travis Scott house. He has been restoring the house for 49 years and he is pro-restoration and pro-development and pro appropriate development when done the right way using quality materials. Mr. Ventresca said he had a special interest in Worthington's historic district listed on the National Register of Historic Places by the U.S. Department of the Interior in 2010. He said the project they are looking at contains many details but two stand out as particularly significant because their resolution would impact Worthington for the next one hundred years. The first is size which reminded him of the Giant Eagle grocery store that resulted in hundreds of protestors and that was on the forty acres of the Children's Home property that is not a historic district. The second significant detail is the number of units which is the factor that defines the size of the building. The more units, the greater the number of people, which brings more cars and congestion that need parking space. Then there are infrastructure costs which would be born by the taxpayers of Worthington. Mr. Ventresca said the proposed building precipitates the loss of the historic district. Even before any official action people will sense that something is wrong and lose interest and curiosity. The attraction that brings people to Worthington would decline and eventually the city would lose its official listing on the National Register of Historic Places because of the technical considerations of contributing and total properties. He asked if the developer would like for that to be their legacy. Mr. Ventresca asked the Board members to vote against this project. He would like to see something closer to the size and number of units that have served Worthington so well since 1970. It should be closer to what is onsite today. He said the survey of Stafford Village showed 93% of the resident voting yes when asked "Would you like NCR to cancel their project and simply maintain and improve what is in place?" Mr. Ventresca said please vote no to this Giant Eagle sized building in Worthington's historic district.

Mr. James Dover, of 895 Hartford St., Worthington, Ohio. He said his home is part of Stafford Court. He said his building is one of three buildings which are immediately behind the CVS drug store. Mr. Dover said he understood everyone's comments, but he said he had to respectfully disagree. He said this particular property is going to be re-developed in a matter of time. Whatever is going to be there would have to be economically feasible. None of the buildings in this area are historic they are just old houses. Mr. Dover said he loves the area and wants to remain living in this area and he pays market rent, but change is going to have come, and this is not 1970 anymore. He would like to suggest the consideration with this whole project of making Hartford Street one-way north from State Route 161 to North Street, and Morning Street one-way south. He said

neighbors mentioned that residents in the Stafford area drive too slow and people are in the way because of that. He said his response to that was other people drove too fast. He said he did not think people would find a better compromise than what National Church Residences has come up with and the architects have designed.

Ms. Eugenia Martin, 148 E. North St., Worthington, Ohio, said she lives just outside of the notification area, but she can see the location very well from her property. Ms. Martin said she would follow up with an email concerning comments made earlier in the meeting, but had other questions concerning the language of the Planned Unit Development (PUD), specifically on page 3, concerning Senior Citizen Development. Ms. Martin said she was not against senior citizen housing and felt this was a fantastic piece of the puzzle regarding the community, and how the residents interact with the community. Residents sit on their porches, patios and benches along the sidewalk, but she felt this proposal would eliminate that community interaction. Ms. Martin felt the pocket parks were laughable because they are only sixty feet away from the street, not friendly and inviting and would only be thirty by thirty feet wide. She felt the current proposal would eliminate the closeness of the community in that area. She was also offended by the reference to smaller homes because she felt her 1000 square foot home is perfect and just because a home is smaller, they should not be dismissed. Some people like having less stuff and enjoy having a smaller home to take care of. Ms. Martin said there are a lot of trees being eliminated from the area, but the plants that are being saved are weak wooded and storm damaged. The proposal would eliminate Sycamore and Tulip Poplar trees which are beautiful and hard to find in the city. In addition, she said there would not be any money put into the park fund and they cannot put all the trees back on the site and they have indicated such. They are seeking a waiver from having to put those trees back and money into the park fund which needs to be discussed. The screening along the backside was brought up earlier, there was nothing shown on the proposal. She said she would be before the Board shortly representing a client, and she felt this applicant should be held accountable for the same standard. The proposed development would not engage the residents the in the way the community does now.

Mr. Rick Zarnoch, 1193 Blind Brook Dr., Columbus, Ohio, said he has been in the Worthington community for 31 years, including attending the Worthington Presbyterian Church for 31 years. He said he was involved in the community in a variety of ways. Mr. Zarnoch said it was a blessing when National Church Residences came to the rescue of the church in terms of the long-term viability of the property. The church was not financially able to support it. Mr. Zarnoch said he lives in Worthington Hills and he recreates in downtown old Worthington and he goes to church in downtown Worthington and very proud of that. He said when he retires and moves out of his home in fifteen years he does not want to move to New Albany, Dublin, or Ashville, North Carolina, he would like to move right where this property will be built so he and his wife can walk to their church, Dairy Queen, CVS, and Fresh Thyme. This is his community and he said the Vice-Chairman knows him well from the business community and his relationship with National Church Residences dates back twenty-five years. Mr. Zarnoch said he is a banker and had personally financed several of their projects, but he had nothing to do with this project. He said when you look at best in class of providers, and people always want to find the best in class, you look up the street, there is Willowbrook Christian Communities which is an outstanding faith-based provider. If you look down the street there is the Methodist facility Wesley Glen who is an outstanding provider for senior living as is National Church Residences, but the difference is National Church

Residences main product is affordable senior housing. That is what they do and that is what they want to bring to this property. He said he hoped to be one of the market renters that can help subsidize for those that need a little bit of financial support.

Mr. John spoke, he referenced his wife Tammy Ament, 897 Morning St., Worthington, Ohio, said he has lived in Worthington for nineteen years and they have a relationship with the community. He and his family help run the local food pantry. His property is located near where the driveway will be for the proposed project, near the Pin Oak. They were thankful the tree will be saved. He said he has had many conversations with the developers, and they seemed to be receptive to their primary concerns about the flow of traffic, the grade level and how that will affect his property. They also seemed receptive to the residential level looking back down at their property. He said they have continued to discuss plantings and something that would provide natural screening and continue the community feel. He said he has heard a lot of very legitimate concerns about the size of the structure and he gets a little bit of anxiety about that but the thing he has enjoyed is that they are receptive to meeting and listening to others opinions to come up with a solution that will be cost effective for them and serve the community in a good way and also fit into the community. He said he agreed with one of the earlier speakers, the current structures are not going to work and are not sustainable. Change is coming it is just a matter of when.

Mrs. Amber Decker, 421 Crandall Dr., Worthington, Ohio, said her father-in-law is a resident of Stafford Village and she is a resident of Wilson Hill. She said moving the current residents will be problematic and there are details and challenges that her family would suffer because of the move. She said she had a lot of confidence that National Church Residences would help make the process as less painful as could be and was happy that her father-in-law would be able to move back to the same area. Her father-in-law currently pays \$400.00 dollars per month rent which is subsidized by National Church Residences and not subsidized by someone outside. The current residents would move back and pay the same rate which would be adjusted each year. Mrs. Decker said she had developed stronger concerns about affordable housing as a resident of Worthington. She mentioned a future rate for affordable housing was quoted at \$800.00 per month and there were questions about what would be the market rate price, but they were not given a firm number. Mrs. Decker said \$800.00 per month is far out of reach for senior citizens on fixed incomes. She said this is a great location, and her father-in-law goes to the library every day and other people should be able to also. Mrs. Decker said she heard a comment that the apartments would have to be affordable for a certain period of time and she tried to find out how long that period of time would be. She thought it was the C.E.O. that said possibly 10-15 years. Mrs. Decker said she is currently 42 years old and that would not help her out when looking for an affordable unit when she is older. She asked as a community member going forward, and if the developer was thinking about affordability for generations to come, why should that be only for the next 15 years?

Mrs. Decker said she did not know if that statement is true because she is still waiting for more information, and that information was not discussed at the meeting this evening. She did not want to give out misinformation but was very concerned this could become a high-income housing development and not affordable housing in the future, or even senior housing.

Ms. Sandy DiCenzo, 876 Hartford St., Worthington, Ohio, explained where her property was in proximity to the proposed development. Ms. DiCenzo said there is a proposed sewer line that is

supposed to go in through her backyard because this project is oversized. The project would take down a Dogwood tree, Magnolia tree, a Redbud tree and a native wildflower garden. Proposed in her front yard is a ramp. To the north of her property, Stafford Village has 99 feet of curb frontage, and to the south they have 300 or 400 feet so someone has decided to take her 35-foot lot and cut a ramp in it so that all the wheelchairs and all of the pedestrians will be directed to Sandy's house. She said if a ramp is cut in front of her house people are going to stop right in front of her home, stop their car and unload their family from the car so they can go home and that will completely block traffic on Hartford Street because the street is not that wide. Ms. DiCenzo said her lot line is 252 feet and she shares all 252 feet with Stafford Village and she is concerned. Ms. DiCenzo said there were no elevations available as to what the development would look like from the north and will probably not look very nice from where she is located, or for anyone driving north to south on Hartford Street. She said she appreciated that changes are going to be made but she wanted to point out one other thing. Ms. DiCenzo said she was disturbed when someone mentioned the movie, "Back To The Future." She said when she looks at her house she noticed her property is the only one without her name on it, and she felt like she was being ignored and she felt that it was misleading because from the website, it appears that Stafford Village owns her home. She said she hoped that was not intentional.

Ms. Ann Burk, 6840 Bowerman St. W., Worthington, Ohio, said she has been a Worthington resident for 32 years and she is also a member of Worthington Presbyterian Church and she has served on the Board of Trustees for Stafford Village. She said she wanted to read the mission that they developed 48 years ago, although she was not on the Board 48 years ago.

"The mission of Stafford Village Retirement Center is to provide housing facilities and services to the elderly, lower income, displaced and other disadvantaged persons that were specifically designed to meet those persons physical, social and psychological needs and to promote their health, security, happiness and usefulness and longer living. We are confident National Church Residence will be able to fulfill this obligation and the 65 units are not a 15-year minimum it is forever."

Mr. Coulter explained it was now 8:30 p.m. and this would not be the only time people can speak. He said he would ask the applicant to come forward to address the comments made earlier and then explain the process moving forward.

Mr. Brown wanted to add that they had been through 14+ meetings before the Holiday Inn was finally approved and he wanted to let the audience know this was only the first meeting and there will be many more meetings. The Holiday Inn project did evolve and change from what the Board originally saw to what was approved.

Mr. Tabit said he would like to respond to some of the comments that he heard. An observation was made by a member of the Old Worthington Association that 93% were surveyed but he was in opposition. He said he met with the Old Worthington Association on multiple occasions and they offered to meet with their members so they could explain the proposal to them, but they never heard back from them. Mr. Tabit said there was an observation about the concern they are going to take over the block, but they have a very long history in the community, and he felt the history has been exemplary in terms of being transparent and open with communication with the neighbors

and they heard numerous testimonials to that. He said anything moving forward will also be done with transparency, with engagement, and collaboration as many as the stakeholders have already spoken about.

Mr. Tabit referred to that statement that smaller apartments are okay, but he emphatically disagreed and senior citizens should not have to live in 360 square foot apartments that do not have adequate heating, nor 8-foot ceilings, and where they are at risk of the rents going up and being forced out if action is not taken today. The last thing he wanted to talk about was Mr. Ament's testimony that captured the challenges they are wrestling with. They are trying to reconcile some very challenging priorities, but they do not all work together. They want affordable housing, they also want to have great design. They want to have parking, and they want to have green space, but some of these things work against each other. He said they have to try to balance things as best as they could and from the testimony heard at the meeting from so many of the neighbors, stakeholders and even some of the people who have spoken against them and said they have met with developers five times, they have done everything they can to work with their stakeholders, neighbors just as they have for the past fifty years to come up with plan to save affordability at Stafford Village and move forward with a plan that will meet all of the community priorities they heard during the year long process of 41 meetings and counting. He offered the opportunity to their attorney, Mr. David Hodge; their architect Brian Jones; to have the opportunity to respond to comments.

Mr. Hodge said he looked forward to hearing from the Commission and felt there was a great turn out for the meeting. He appreciated people stood up on behalf of National Church Residences and acknowledged how hard they have worked to get the application together. Mr. Hodge explained there would be many more meetings in the future, and he would like to hear some of the comments from the Commission.

Mr. Reis said this proposal is a needed element in the City of Worthington and he felt most of everyone would agree with that. As to what form this takes or the density it takes or the character it takes will take some time. Mr. Reis how long affordable housing would be honored and if at some point would that change. He said he also wanted to know the answer if rent would stay at \$400.00 dollars or if that would be going up to \$800.00 dollars, or if that could be answered yet.

Mr. Tabit said every resident that is with them today, and they have residents that pay less than that per month, and that is one of the challenges that they face, they do not have enough revenue to cover the cost of operating the property. Every one of the residents would be brought back with their current rent and that is a commitment that they made. Mr. Tabit said moving forward, as those residents will move on, the affordability standard would be determined as approximately \$800.00 per month, maybe a little more, but that is a standard in the affordable housing world which is defined by a formula of 60% of area median income for someone who earns less than \$28,000.00 dollars per year. He reiterated their mission is affordable housing. Mr. Tabit said some of the government subsidy programs they have used to develop affordable housing have terms and when those terms expire, they apply for more affordable housing resources so they can continue to operate them as affordable housing. Mr. Tabit said the beauty of this project is the subsidy provider, as Mr. Zarnoch pointed out so well, is built into the community.

Mrs. Holcombe asked Mr. Tabit if they were going to put in writing that the residents will be able to come back at the same rent price. Mr. Tabit if the project goes forward as proposed, they would put it in writing for the residents because they want the residents to stay with them.

Mr. Foust said he had a comment about process and referred to what Mr. Brown said earlier that there will be multiple meetings. He said sometimes that works and sometimes that does not. He said he had thought about that the past few days and he wanted to identify two problems that commonly come up and wanted to offer suggestions. Mr. Foust said to go online and print out copies of these plans and make some sketches. He said he would authorize city staff to give out his cellular phone number so people could contact him with ideas and feedback. Mr. Foust said on the developer's side, the problem they seem to have there, he constantly hears is that they have had all these meetings, they have listened to people and taken their comments, and when they get to the final meeting, a lot of times those changes come back as people complained about the height so they lowered the roofline six inches, people complained about the setback, so they set it back and added a few trees. He said from the developer's side he asked the developer to listen closely to some of things that are said and proceed in that manner.

Mr. Coulter said if anyone had comments to give to the Board or Commission members to give those comments to Mr. Brown or Mrs. Bitar and that way it becomes a public record and public information and city staff can forward those comments to the Board and Commission members.

Mr. Brown said there is a project page which was created on the city's website and the site is functional so people can click on "notify me" and they will be informed about upcoming meetings.

Mr. Coulter said all the information is wide open and available to the public.

Mr. Tabit said he loved the comment about engaging the community and soliciting, but he said he would like to ask folks to consider how they do that and that would be to consider all the priorities that were identified to their extensive stakeholder process. He said it is easy to say, "I do not like the height of this building, but not address the affordable housing component." He said it is easy to say, "I am concerned about the lack of parking in the community today, and you are not doing enough to create affordable housing in the community." Mr. Tabit said this is incredibly difficult to balance those priorities. He said he felt his team did a great job and very proud of them.

Mr. Tabit requested to table the application.

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

Mr. Coulter stated that we would take a ten-minute break.

C. Municipal Planning Commission

1. Planned Unit Development – Preliminary Plan – 8:55 p.m.

- a. Stafford Village Redevelopment – **Northeast Corner of Hartford St. and Stafford Ave.** (Brian Kent Jones Architects/National Church Residences) **PUD 01-19**

Mrs. Holcombe moved to table the application, seconded by Mr. Reis. All Board members voted, “Aye,” and the application was tabled.

B. Architecture Review Board (continued)

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

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

Although this house is listed as a contributing building in the Worthington Historic District, there is a long history of neglect of this early 1900’s Vernacular style house. City records regarding the need for maintenance of the property and building date back to 2004, although the issues likely were present earlier but just not recorded in the City’s current record keeping system. Since 2004, trash, clutter and inoperable vehicles have been removed from the site. The structure, though, has reportedly fallen into disrepair from lack of utilities, infiltration by animals, and general lack of maintenance. The City condemned the property in 2017 shortly after the tenant moved out. Clarification of ownership finally led to the sale of the property in October of last year.

The new owner is seeking approval to demolish the house and construct a new dwelling.

Project Details:

1. Demolition of the existing house and attached garage is proposed. The owner refers to the dilapidated condition of the property and structure.
2. Proposed Site Plan:
 - The new house is proposed for placement about 23’ from the front property line, which is the prevailing setback based on the position of the neighboring houses. A walkway is proposed leading from the public sidewalk to the front steps of the house. The east setback is proposed as 6’, and the west side would be 12’. For Existing Lots of Record, 6’ is the required minimum for side yards. Thirty-five feet is proposed from the rear property line.
 - Window wells are shown on both sides of the house. Because the east side is proposed at the 6’ setback line, a variance is required for placement of those structures.
 - A detached 20’ x 20’ garage is proposed at the southeast corner of the site, 3’ from the rear property line and 6’ from the side property line. Variances are required for both setbacks.
 - The driveway appears to be two strips of pavement leading to a paved pad in front of the side loading garage. The materials need to be identified.
 - A landscape plan is included in the packet, showing retention of a maple tree at the

southwest corner of the site, and an existing street tree. New plantings would include:

- Serviceberry Tree at the northeast corner of the house
- Japanese Maple near the northwest corner of the house
- Viburnum bushes along the front
- Boxwoods and Dwarf Grass along the west side of the house
- Burning bush between the house and garage
- Periwinkle ground cover between the east side of the house and the existing fence on the property line
- Tall ornamental grasses along the rear property line adjacent to the garage and along the rear 35' of the west property line
- 4'-5' Arborvitae along the eastern portion of the rear property line
- Specifics regarding the size of plants is needed.
- A condensing unit is proposed at the southeast corner of the house, which would be screened by Viburnum. Also, the neighboring property's 6' high fence would screen the unit.

3. Proposed Building:

- The new house is proposed to be a two-story house modeled after the Greek Revival style. The structure is proposed with a three-bay façade, a gabled roof with the gabled end facing the street, an entrance with an entablature, pilasters and sidelights, cornice trim and corner boards. Building height would be 33' to the peak of the gable. Hardie 5" lap siding in dark blue with white trim is proposed for the house, and a black dimensional shingle roof would be used. Split faced block is proposed for the foundation.
- The front façade is proposed with 2 windows and an entrance in the center on the first floor; 3 windows on the second floor; and one window in the gable. The proposed windows are Windsor Next Dimension Classic vinyl double-hung in white, which would have 7/8" wide simulated divided light muntins. Hardie trim is proposed around the windows. Eighteen-inch-wide black shutters made of composite wood are proposed for the front windows and would be mounted on brackets. The recessed entrance would be detailed with crown molding and pilasters in white Hardie trim, and a fiberglass 6-panel door with sidelights is proposed. The door color has not been identified. A light fixture is proposed for the ceiling.
- For the rear elevation the same detailing is proposed for the gable, and there is a trim piece shown between the first and second floors. On the first floor 4 double hung windows are proposed grouped together and a door with 18 lights and a transom is included. A decorative wall light is proposed next to the door. Three double-hung windows would be on the second floor.
- The side elevations would include double-hung windows on the first and second floors, and 3 smaller windows near a fireplace and for the kitchen. A chimney is not proposed. Trim boards between the floors are proposed that would connect with the rear elevation.

4. Proposed Garage:

- The 17'9" high garage is proposed with a gable running east and west, with siding and trim similar to the house.
- The door would be double width resembling a carriage door, with windows at the top. The metal door would be white. A man door with 9 lights over 2 panels is shown on the north side, as is a double-hung window. A light matching the light adjacent to the

rear house entrance is proposed next to the door. A window is also included on the south side.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

A decision on whether a particular demolition is appropriate must be made in light of several factors, including whether the demolition is full or partial; the age of the structure; the level of integrity of the structure being demolished (has it been extensively altered?); the impact of the demolition on Worthington's character; and plans for the site following demolition (is the proposed replacement appropriate for Worthington? Does it follow the design guidelines for new structures?) Generally, demolition of pre-1950s buildings should be avoided. These tend to contribute the most to a community's character.

Infill sites should be developed in a way that is complementary to their neighborhoods and that integrates well with surrounding building designs and land uses. Compatibility with the neighborhood should be the primary consideration. New structures should complement the form, massing and scale of existing nearby structures. Also, building placement and orientation are important design considerations. Most main entrances should face the street and garages should avoid facing the street.

Building placement and orientation are important design considerations. There are two primary considerations: 1) most main entrances should face the street; and 2) garages should avoid facing the street. The City of Worthington wants to avoid new development that turns main entrances inward or away from the street, and it wants to avoid dominance of the streetscape by garage doors.

Greek Revival typical character-defining features are:

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

Roof: Roof shapes for new buildings should be appropriate to the style or design of the building. If a new building does not follow a particular style but is instead a vernacular design, then roof shapes and heights similar to those in the neighborhood or nearby would be most appropriate.

Materials: Contemporary materials that simulate traditional ones are appropriate, but the preferred option is to use true traditional materials such as wood siding. Incompatible contemporary materials should be avoided. Brick has long been a traditional material in Worthington. Prepare a sample board for review by the Architectural Review Board.

Windows: For new buildings, multiple-paned windows generally are not appropriate. The exception is a building being built in a particular style -- such as Federal, Greek Revival or Colonial Revival -- that would have employed this window type. When in doubt, simple 1 over 1 double-

hung sash windows are usually the simplest, least expensive and most appropriate choice. Using the excellent precedents of Worthington's many historic structures, carefully design the pattern of window openings; window sizes and proportions (they must be appropriate for the size and proportions of the wall in which they are placed); pattern of window panes and muntins; and trim around the windows. Good quality wood windows are readily available and more affordable than in the past. True wood windows are always the first preference. Aluminum- or vinyl-clad windows can be appropriate, but primarily on secondary facades and less conspicuous locations. All-aluminum or vinyl windows are not prohibited but are not encouraged. Avoid blank walls.

Entries: For newly-built buildings, simpler designs usually look better than more ornate ones. Avoid heavy ornamentation on doors and entrances. Observe entry placement on existing buildings. Whether located symmetrically or asymmetrically, entries usually are aligned with a window on the second floor so that a regular rhythm of openings is maintained on both floors. Entries should be located so they are easily visible, and they should be oriented toward the street.

Ornamentation: Observe Worthington's excellent historic architecture for information on the kinds and amounts of ornamentation employed on various building styles and periods. Use ornamentation conservatively. It will be most successful if used in traditional locations: around windows and doors; along a building's cornice or at the corners; in gables; or on gates and fences. Most ornamentation historically was made of simple forms built up to a desired level of complexity. When in doubt, follow the old rule that "less is more." Sometimes just a little ornamentation, well placed, can have a major impact without the need for more extensive (and expensive, and hard-to-maintain) ornamentation. Use compatible materials in ornamental elements. Frame houses should have wood ornamentation, although in cases where the ornamental elements are some distance from the viewer it may be possible to use substitute materials such as fiberglass.

Color: In general, avoid bright colors not typical in Worthington neighborhoods, such as various shades of purple or orange. For infill buildings being placed in an existing streetscape, select colors compatible with those already used along the streetscape. Many buildings follow a pattern of light colors for the building body and darker colors for the trim. Following this pattern is encouraged. In Worthington, the use of white or cream-colored trim also is common and would be appropriate for new construction. Avoid using too many colors. Usually one body color and one trim color are sufficient.

Landscaping: Worthington's mature shade trees are the primary landscaping feature throughout the community. They are a major contributor to its character and help define its neighborhoods as stable, desirable places to live. In general, lawns are generous but not overly large, which contributes to the sense of human scale that is one of Worthington's important attributes. Other landscaping elements tend to be properly scaled and well-tended, which also tends to enhance neighborhood character. Maintain and nurture mature trees to prolong their lives. Plant and maintain street trees in planting areas between the street and sidewalk. Paving can sometimes reduce water absorption of the soil so much that trees do not get the moisture they require.

The standards of review in the Architectural District ordinance are:

1. Height;
2. Building massing, which shall include the relationship of the building width to its height

- and depth, and its relationship to the viewer's and pedestrian's visual perspective;
3. Window treatment, which shall include the size, shape and materials of the individual window units and the overall harmonious relationship of window openings;
 4. Exterior detail and relationships, which shall include all projecting and receding elements of the exterior, including but not limited to, porches and overhangs and the horizontal or vertical expression which is conveyed by these elements;
 5. Roof shape, which shall include type, form and materials;
 6. Materials, texture and color, which shall include a consideration of material compatibility among various elements of the structure;
 7. Compatibility of design and materials, which shall include the appropriateness of the use of exterior design details;
 8. Landscape design and plant materials, which shall include, in addition to requirements of this Zoning Code, lighting and the use of landscape details to highlight architectural features or screen or soften undesirable views;
 9. Pedestrian environment, which shall include the provision of features which enhance pedestrian movement and environment, and which relate to the pedestrian's visual perspective;
 10. Signage, which shall include, in addition to requirements of Chapter 1170, the appropriateness of signage to the building;
 11. Sustainable Features, which shall include environmentally friendly details and conservation practices.

Staff Analysis:

- Typically, demolition of a house of this age is not desirable. The condition and unremarkable character of the existing structure, however, may mean the proposed demolition and new structure produce a better outcome than renovation of the existing.
- Although the structure appears more massive than the adjacent houses, there are other structures in that block and in Old Worthington that are of a similar massing.
- Many elements of the proposed house are in keeping with the Greek Revival style, which is found elsewhere in the District.
- The siding, trim and roofing materials are appropriate.
- All vinyl is not preferred for windows unless the proposed product appears to look like wood. It is not clear from the submission if the sashes have enough width to resemble a wood window. Being simulated divided light with 7/8" muntins on the inside and outside is a preferred feature of the proposed windows.
- Construction of a detached garage is appropriate for the neighborhood.
- Additional detail of plant sizes is needed.
- The addition of a chimney may be appropriate.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. James McAllister, 1307 Wyandot, Grandview Heights, Ohio, Mr. Sean McAllister, 708 Stonewood Ct. Mr. Foust said he thought there was a requirement for a combined side yard setback of twenty feet and Mrs. Bitar explained that was not for existing lots of record, just twelve feet, six feet on each side. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak for or against this application.

Ms. Deidre Serrano, 59 Short St., Worthington, Ohio, said she lived next door to this property on the corner of Short Street and Oxford Street. Ms. Serrano said her home has been in her family for over forty years and they plan to keep it in the family for another forty years so that have an interest in the community. She said Mr. McAllister has been very professional in terms of communicating with her and has shared copies of the design with her. Ms. Serrano felt anything that would be built on the site would be better than the eye sore that has been there for her entire lifetime. She had three points she wanted to discuss. The proposed structure in her opinion, was far too large for the lot size. She felt the size of the home was not proportionate to the houses on either side which are a story and a half, not two full stories. There are larger houses across the street, but those houses sit on larger lots. She said she understood it's to the builder's advantage to build the largest house possible but as a community member she wondered if the house would be appropriate for the lot size. Ms. Serrano said in old Worthington they take pride in the fact that they are not another new development with huge houses on small lots and if the proposed project was approved, she was concerned about setting a precedent for the other two adjacent lots which are similar in size. She felt the charm and character of the design was sacrificed in order to maximize the size and the home lacked architectural details. Ms. Serrano said her last point related to the landscaping of the lot. She said the current structure is an eye sore, but the lot does have mature trees, and from the way the drawings looked, only two mature trees would be saved. She hoped there would be further thought to save as many of the mature trees as possible and hoped additional trees could be planted. She said while everyone was excited to see a new home built on the lot, she questioned what type of home would be appropriate on such a small lot.

Mr. Alex Serrano, 59 Short St., Worthington, Ohio, said he made a drawing and referenced the guide book on how new construction should be added in an old area. He said the porch lines, the eave lines, and the type of building is considered with the structures next to it. Mr. Serrano said his home is 22 feet tall and the house on the other side is 22 feet tall and his neighbor is proposing a 33-foot building which seems like a two and a half story structure. He said it is a box which maximizes the square footage on the lot. Mr. Serrano felt the house was giant, and just too big for the small lot and the home stretches to the edge of the setback. He said the actual square footage was not accurate on the application, after doing some calculations, he determined the square footage was 2,816 square feet. The lot is 5,200 feet in size, which means most of the lot is the house which does not include the garage. He said if you look at the house next door, the house is 1,300 square feet on a 5,200 square foot lot. For historic context the current building on the lot is 1,060 square feet and a one-story structure. Mr. said the whole project is about money. He loves where he lives, and he does not want to see a bunch of giant houses on little lots by tearing down what was there. He said his house would be 6,000 square feet if he built the same house. Just because you can do it, does not mean that you should. Mr. Serrano asked the Board members to consider the height, consider the houses next door and for the applicant to go back to the drawing board and come up with something which is more appropriate.

Mr. Don Miesle, 54 Short St., Worthington, Ohio, said the property across the street has a lot of issues but the lot does have many trees. He was excited that someone bought the lot and improve the property because the house is not safe to live in. He was disappointed to see many of the trees would be removed and they were going to build a McMansion. Mr. Miesle said he grew up in a time where houses had yards but over time the yards have shrunk and the space between them has shrunk. He said their street still has houses with yards, although some are smaller than others, but

that is what it is. If the proposed house gets built the way it is, the lot would have no yard. Mr. Miesle said the proposed house is just too big for the lot and not consistent with the way the neighborhood is and all the other houses on the street has a porch including the condemned house and that is the character of the street. The proposed house does not have a porch. All the other houses on that side of the street have a front porch. On nice days, everyone sits on their porches and talk with neighbors and the proposed house does not seem consistent with the neighborhood. He would like to see the house scaled down to a reasonable size, maybe have a porch, and some outside space. Mr. Miesle said some of the trees do look a little dangerous and should be removed but not all of them.

Mr. Punit Agrawal, 40 Short St., said he lives across the street. He said they love the neighborhood. When they first moved in, they noticed the beautiful sycamore across the street, and beautiful surrounding homes. He said he is very proud of the historical nature of their community. Mr. Agrawal said the former resident of the home was a nice man, and he used to help him take care of this yard. He said over the years, they have lost several trees on the street. The maple trees on the property are in bad shape, but he felt it would be detrimental to the neighborhood to remove all the trees. He said he was also concerned about the size of the house.

Mr. Coulter asked the applicant to come forward. Mr. McAllister said they spent a lot of time on the design and materials following Worthington's guidelines. He said they had not heard of any objections concerning the size of the building prior to the meeting. Mr. McAllister said it would be difficult to imagine a viable property on such a lot that would not be two stories. He said he had not addressed landscaping yet. The height of the house would be two-story building. They have not determined the height of the first story because the grade drops off significantly from the neighbor on the left side. The house would not be any taller than the house across the street, but the house would stand a little closer to the street. He said for this to be a viable property the dwelling needed to be two stories. Mr. McAllister said he was open to ideas and keeping trees. The setback on the property now in the back is 1.6 feet from the back-property line. The variance of having the garage in the back of the lot would be similar to the adjacent properties. He said he was not opposed to planting additional maple trees of substantial size. Mr. McAllister said they took their lead from the City of Worthington to come up with the Greek Revival design. He said the two-dimensional designs do not show 3D. The front elevation is a lot more attractive. The drawings were not in color, but if approved, the color would be an attractive dark blue.

Mr. Coulter said he had a couple of questions regarding the trees on the street and asked if Mr. McAllister had spoken with the City's Arborist about looking at them. Mr. McAllister said there was one tree in the street lawn. Mr. Coulter suggested calling the City's Arborist to see if the tree is viable or not. Mr. Coulter said Mr. McAllister made a valid comment about the topography of the street sloping from the east to the river so the height of the house would be somewhat mitigated because the house will be lower than the home to the east, but not lower than the house to the west. Mr. Coulter asked if Mr. McAllister was going to be living in the home and Mr. McAllister said no, he will be selling the home. Mr. Coulter mentioned several variances will be required and Mr. McAllister would have to request those from the Board of Zoning Appeals.

Mr. Foust said he did not see the drawings until he received the packet of information from city staff. He said he loved Greek Revival houses and he was pleased with the concept as opposed to

what they normally see as a hodge podge of old styles with people trying to pick elements out of new tracked homes. He said if someone was driving the road and looked at the house could they tell how long the house had been there. He said in terms of height, there might be a couple a couple of things to look it. Mr. Foust said the house appeared to have 9' ceilings and suggested maybe 8' foot ceilings might be better. He said he had not studied the pitches on Greek Revival houses, but they tend to be shallow and there is a possibility the pitch on the roof could be changed a little bit. He said the floors could also be lowered a little bit. Mr. Foust said he was also concerned with the number of variances that would be required for this project and felt the house may be too large in proportion to the lot size.

Mrs. Holcombe said she agreed, she felt the massing was a little too much, but she was in favor of the Greek Revival look. She also expressed concerns about the trees and urged Mr. McAllister to get in touch with the City's Arborist to inquire about the health of the trees. She would like to see the house scaled down.

Mr. Foust said he had another thought, a twenty by twenty-foot garage does not allow much room for vehicles so he suggested placing the garage at the other end and that would allow for more green space. Mr. McAllister said if he did that, he would have to build a single car garage.

Mr. Schuster said he had the same concerns. He said one thing people in old Worthington really like is that fact that people have yards and the proposed house does not have much of a yard because they are trying to put too large of a house on a small lot.

Mr. Hofmann felt the house needed more sculptural details and he did not have a problem with the second floor. He felt the house could be scaled back to 2,500 square feet and still be plenty of room. Mr. Hofmann said he was not in favor of the proposed project the way it is now, he felt the house needed a lot more detail.

Mrs. Lloyd said contextually showing the Board members and the neighbors what exactly they want to build would be helpful. Mrs. Lloyd asked city staff if there was an issue with maximum lot coverage. Mrs. Bitar replied, "No." Mr. McAllister requested to table the application. Mr. Schuster moved to table the application, seconded by Mr. Hofmann. All Board members, voted, "Aye," and the application was tabled.

3. Retaining Wall Replacement – **956 High St.** (Worthington Historical Society) **AR 03-19**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

The oldest portion of the Orange Johnson House was built in 1811 by Arora Buttles. The six-room house was on thirty-five acres, and part of a farm lot next to the village. Many interior and exterior elements reflect the pioneer architecture of the day. In 1816 Orange Johnson, a hornsmith who specialized in comb-making, bought the property. He added a Federal-style addition in 1819 highlighted by the entry with its curved fanlight, sidelights and pilasters leading to a center hall.

The front door in the addition faced west toward the road that was becoming the main route (now High St.) between Columbus, the new state capital, and Lake Erie. In 1962 the house had been vacant for several years and the Worthington Historical Society purchased the property. The society spent 9 years restoring the house and opened it to the public as a museum in 1972. Other improvements have been made since that time, including the roof being replaced in 2010, the windows restored in 2018, and the front entrances restored in 2019.

The Orange Johnson House was used as a residence and the adjacent farmland was split off and developed over the years. The commercial property to the south was developed in 1962, and the condominiums to the north and east were built in 1964. When the Tollgate Square condominiums were developed, and likely when High St. was widened, a retaining wall was required to accommodate the change in grade. This is a request to replace the retaining wall which has deteriorated.

Project Details:

1. The existing wall is brick and about 4' high at the northwest corner of the property. The wall extends across the front of the property, tapering to about 6" at the south end, and includes steps to the south of the front door and accommodates a planting area and a ramp behind. On the north side, the brick wall extends to the northeast corner of the property, having an opening with steps to the side of the house that have retaining walls on both sides.
2. Limestone is proposed for construction of the new wall. The stone would be rectangular in a variety of sizes, connected with a thin layer of mortar to match the stone color. The Historical Society cites several examples of structures from the same period as the Orange Johnson house with similar retaining walls.
3. New steps with wrought iron handrails are proposed in front of the entrance, and planting beds would be behind the wall on both sides. To the south of the building, additional sidewalk is proposed to connect pedestrians from the public sidewalk and parking lot to the walkway leading to the entrance at the rear of the building.
4. The new wall is proposed to be about 1 ½' lower than the existing wall at the northwest corner of the property. Lowering the wall will allow the grade behind to be lower at the Orange Johnson house wall. Stucco that was placed on the brick to help protect the brick from the planting bed can be removed. The brick underneath is proposed to be tuckpointed. Two condensing units on the side would be lowered so they continue to be screened by the wall. The walls framing the side steps are proposed to be faced with matching stone veneer.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Many traditional fence and wall types are appropriate for use in Worthington. Earlier examples, typical of early- to mid-19th century homes, include rail fences, vertical board fences, and low masonry walls. Set aside a maintenance budget for fencing and walls so they do not become deteriorated and unsightly.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of the application as it seems to be a thoughtful solution to replacing the retaining wall.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Frank Shepherd, 600 Keyes Lane, Worthington, Ohio, and along with Mr. Shepherd was Steve Frazier, 24683 St. Rt. 37, Richwood, Ohio 43344, who was representing the Worthington Historical Society. Mr. Shepherd said the north wall is bowing out and falling over the driveway into the condominium. He said both walls have been tuck pointed over the years and they need to be replaced and if they are going to replace them, they should be historically correct. The walls should have been stone. Mr. Shepherd showed a limestone sample to the Board members and said the cap would be made of the same limestone. The wall will be about 14" wide because they will be installing a masonry reinforced wall with stone on both sides and on top so hopefully the wall will last forever. Mr. Shepherd thought this might be a good time to make the entryway more historically correct and he explained the changes that would be made. Mr. Coulter asked if Mr. Shepherd would be providing for drainage behind the wall and Mr. Shepherd yes, the same way the wall is now. Mr. Coulter asked for clarification and Mr. Shepherd said there would be weep holes through the wall. Mr. Shepherd said he did not have a landscape plan yet, he was still working with consultants on a plan that would be appropriate for the time period and they can use the plants as an educational tool, but they are not at that point yet. He said they are proposing some in-ground lighting that would wash the front so he can bring that back to the Board when he gets those details.

Mrs. Holcombe asked if the wrought iron would be the same as in the drawings and Mr. Shepherd said, "Yes." Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present to who wanted to speak for or against this application.

Ms. Angela Straus, 58 E. North St., Worthington, Ohio, said she lived behind Ace Hardware and she was in favor of the project. She felt the wall was historically appropriate and matched the wall the daycare center had on the other block north. She said as far as the railing, she suggested using solid stock instead of hollow stock.

Mr. Jim Ventresca, 72 E. Granville Rd., Worthington, Ohio, said the Orange Johnson House is a flagship building in Worthington. Mr. Ventresca thanked Mr. Shepherd for getting the building in the best shape possible.

Ms. Cindy Mild, Property Manager for 970 High Street, the properties to the north of the Orange Johnson House. She said she was in favor of the project. She said she met with the Worthington Historical Society this past fall when they were in the initial planning phase. She asked for the meeting to be table at the previous meeting because there are 20 condominiums along the drive, and she wanted the owners to have a chance to have their questions answered. Ms. Mild said several owners showed up for a meeting and had their questions answered and they were pleased with the design but concerned with the quantity of water which is distributed. She said the weep holes were currently clogged and once they are fixed that will help. Ms. Mild said the Worthington Historical Society would work with them on any issues. She said they condominium association was in favor of the design.

Ms. Eugenia Martin, 148 E. North St., Worthington, Ohio, said she wanted to make sure that the handrail does not extend into the path of the pedestrian walkway because there was not any

drawing to fully depict that. She was concerned about safety, and to make sure a purse, backpack, would not get caught and cause someone to stumble.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY THE WORTHINGTON HISTORICAL SOCIETY FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO REPLACE THE RETAINING WALL FOR THE ORANGE JOHNSON HOUSE AT 956 HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 03-19, DRAWINGS NO. AR 03-19, DATED JANUARY 11, 2019, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING AND AMENDED THAT THE LANDSCAPE AND LIGHTING PLAN BE REVIEWED BY CITY STAFF.

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

4. Window Removal – 550 Hartford St. (Brian Dressel) AR 08-19

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This property is a corner lot, with a 1961 Colonial Revival house facing Hartford St. and located approximately 14’ from the right-of-way line. The south side of the house is about 35’ from the South St. right-of-way. On the east side, the main part of the house is about 25’ from the property line; an addition is approximately 15’ from the property line; and a patio is closer.

This is a request to remove two windows on the rear of the house.

Project Details:

1. The windows proposed for removal are both in bathrooms. The owners have installed fans and vents and feel the windows are not needed, and apparently never were used, for ventilation. Also, the windows are not in convenient locations for the owners, as one is behind a shower wall and the other is in a location that limits the size of the vanity.
2. On the outside, the windows on the back of the house are different sizes and do not seem to follow a specific pattern.
3. In place of the windows, cedar shakes painted to match the existing would be installed.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Avoid permanent blocking in of windows; the original window pattern of a house is part of its overall design.

Staff Analysis:

The Design Guidelines recommend no permanent removal of windows. Although these windows are on the rear, they can be seen from South St. because this is a corner lot. It is not clear, though, whether the character of the house would change with this request, as the windows proposed for removal are somewhat awkwardly sized and placed.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Brian Dressel, 550 Hartford St., Worthington, Ohio, said the second-floor window was already enclosed. They did not realize the window was there until they decided to fix the main windows and were surprised. They are concerned about the wall behind the window. On the third floor of the split level they are trying to fit a vanity into a small space. Board members had no questions or concerns. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present to speak for or against this application, but no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Schuster moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY BRIAN DRESSEL FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO REMOVE WINDOWS AT 550 HARTFORD ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 08-19, DRAWINGS NO. AR 08-19, DATED JANUARY 22, 2019, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

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

5. Vegetative Screen – **42 E. Stafford Ave.** (CYP Studios/Worthington Public Library) **AR 10-19**

Mr. Brown reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of fact & Conclusions**Background & Request:**

The Worthington Public Library purchased the site on the north side of Stafford Avenue in December 1987 for the construction of an off-site parking area for 20-parking spaces for the Old Worthington Library. The property is in the R-10 District and has R-10 zoning to the north and east of the parking lot. There is commercial zoning, C-3 zoning to the west that is currently an existing parking area for the businesses located at 870 High Street. In October 1987, the Municipal Development Commission approved a detailed site plan for 20-parking spaces, landscaping and fencing along the northern and eastern portion of the parking lot. The original approval was the have a 6-foot high wood cedar fence 3-feet off the northern property line with vegetation between the northern property line and the fence and fencing along the eastern portion of the property on the property line. A revised site plan was approved in November 1987 that removed the fence along the east side of the parking lot at the neighbor's request to the east. The City received a

complaint from a neighboring property owner in October 2018 concerning the removal of the fence on the north side of the parking lot.

The applicant would like to install twenty-five (25) Yellow Ribbon Arborvitae that will be 5-feet high and spaced approximately 2'-6" on center at the time of planting instead of replacing the existing fence per the approved plans. The applicant has stated that the existing fence was hit multiple times by car bumpers as well as retained the weight of snow plowed against it and was rebuilt several times. The stability and integrity of the fence was a concern, and the fence was ultimately removed. No other changes to the site have been proposed at this time by the applicant.

Project Details:

1. Install twenty-five (25) Yellow Ribbon Arborvitae that will be 5-foot high and spaced approximately 2'-6" on center at the time of planting in the location of the previously removed wood fence north of the parking lot. The Yellow Ribbon Arborvitae grow to a height of 8-feet to 10-feet in height. No other changes to the landscape plan are proposed at this time.
2. The existing 6-foot high wood cedar fence was removed in September/October 2018.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

While the architecture is of prime importance in a commercial district such as Worthington's, landscaping of building sites is also important. Landscaping works with other site elements such as paving and street furniture to create the district's sense of high quality.

A small amount of landscaping can have a positive impact; this is already easy to see in the many well-landscaped spots in Worthington's commercial district. Small, well-executed and well-maintained landscaping is appropriate for the relatively small spaces here and provide relief from the "hardscape" of buildings, streets, and other man-made elements. Plant materials should be selected for appropriate size, shape, color, and "pedestrian friendliness" (avoid, for example, thorny species that can catch dresses or scratch children).

Parking is a critical issue in any commercial district. It is an important service any district must provide, but it can have a significant negative impact on the district's character if it is not handled well. This is particularly true in pedestrian-oriented areas such as Old Worthington.

Public spaces along streets have always been the primary source of parking in most commercial districts. Off-street spaces and lots are a fairly recent development, dating largely from the days when misguided "urban renewal" demolition of downtown buildings made street side lots available. Worthington, fortunately, has suffered very little of this in its historic downtown area.

Close spacing of buildings and lack of land in Worthington's commercial district mean that new parking lots cannot easily be created. In areas of the district where conditions will permit creation of parking, though, consider placing it at the rear of the site, or as far back along the side as possible. The most appropriate form of off-street parking is where buildings are used to screen the parking from view from public streets.

Avoid putting parking or curb cuts in front of a building at the sidewalk. Try to reach parking from a side street or an alley rather than from the main street and be sure that the availability of public parking is identified. Screen parking with landscaping such as low bushes, especially if site conditions require that you put parking near the front of the building. Historically and architecturally appropriate low fences or walls may also be effective.

Staff Analysis:

1. Section 1149.03(a) and Section 1149.03(b) Yards for Nonresidential Uses Abutting “R” Districts requires screening and landscaping of parking areas typically by a masonry wall or solid fence. Such wall or fence shall not be less than four 4-feet or more than 6-feet in height. The area between the wall or fence shall be 10-feet wide and landscaped with grass, hardy shrubs or evergreen ground cover and maintained. In lieu of such wall or fence, a strip of land not less than 10-feet in width and planted and maintained with an evergreen hedge of dense planting of evergreen shrubs not less than 4-feet in height, may be substituted.
 - (1) A Variance from Section 1149.03 will be required from the Board of Zoning Appeals to deviate from the setback and screening requirement if this is approved by the Board.
2. The combination of fencing and vegetation is typically preferred for parking areas that abut residential properties, taking into account the wishes of the neighboring property owners.
3. The site does not appear to be in compliance with the previously approved site plan from November 1987.
 - (1) Hemlocks were to be planted along the northern eastern property line to provide screening of the parking area to the property to the east and north. These shrubs have either been removed or have died since planting.
 - i. Additional screening needs to be provided along the northern and eastern edge of the parking area to be in compliance with the previously approved plans.
 - (2) A Honey Locust tree, Japanese Dogwood tree, Andorra Juniper shrub and Cranberry shrubs are missing from the site.
 - i. Missing trees and shrubs need to be replaced.
4. Honeysuckle seems to have taken over the northern and eastern portion of the site.
 - (1) Clarification is needed from the applicant on what they plan to do with the honeysuckle on the site.
 - i. Honeysuckle is typically discouraged since it is considered invasive and hard to control. However, honeysuckle can act as screening during the summer months.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended denial of this application based on the analysis above.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Ms. Eugenia Martin, 148 E. North St., Worthington, Ohio, said she was representing CYP Studios and along with her was Ms. Monica Baughman, representing Worthington Libraries. She discussed photographs of the area where the fence used to be located but replacing the fence would be difficult due to the utilities located

in the same location. What she proposed in lieu of the wood fence was a panel of closely planted arborvitae which are easier to replace if damaged by snow removal, or cars. The hemlocks which were planted in the 1980's are still there, but were no longer efficient for screening and need to be replaced by whatever would be efficient per Code.

Mr. Foust said he lived across from the City's parking lot and not a big fan of fences, but he also had to deal with headlights shining into his home seven nights a week, and if the homeowners were originally promised a fence then he would vote in favor of the fence. Mr. Coulter said the difference with Mr. Foust's property and the applicant's property was Mr. Foust's property was lower and the applicant's property was not. Mr. Foust said he did not believe there would be room enough for a double row of arborvitae to be staggered across. Ms. Martin said the proposed spacing of the arborvitae would create a solid wall because they were 3 feet in diameter. She said a fence would have to have some gaps to prevent wind from knocking the fence over and the arborvitae would provide more screening. Mr. Foust agreed arborvitae would provide a softer look than a fence, but the arborvitae would not block headlights. He said he would be okay with whatever the neighbors would like to have.

Mrs. Holcombe asked if the hemlocks would be removed, and Ms. Martin said yes, and the honeysuckle would be also be removed and replaced by arborvitae. Mrs. Holcombe said she personally liked the idea of the arborvitae. Mr. Brown said staff would work with the applicant regarding the east side of the property but the northern side, as to what was approved in 1987, there was a six-foot gap of landscaping, so there was a six-foot fence barrier from the residential lot against the parking lot. He said whatever was approved at the meeting, if not a solid fence, the applicant would have to go to the Board of Zoning Appeals to deviate from that section of the Code.

Mr. Foust said when the Griswold was originally built, the building was surrounded by a wall of arborvitae, and you could not see through the screening, but those shrubs only lasted for about a year or two. Mr. Hofmann asked if this matter had been discussed with the neighbors yet because they may have a point a view. He felt that a fence may also help with noise. Ms. Martin said, no, she had not spoken with the neighbors about installing arborvitae in lieu of the fence, but, as far as noise mitigation, plants would be better for absorbing sound as opposed to a wall. Mr. Hofmann said he would like to see a fence and arborvitae.

Mr. Blair Davis, 1 Hartford Ct., Worthington, Ohio, said if arborvitae were planted next to an area where there was a lot of snow removal, if the salt from the snow removal would harm the shrubs. Ms. Martin said as a landscape architect, arborvitae were very urban tolerant and she felt the arborvitae would hold up better than a solid wood fence.

Ms. Connie Yount, 7 Hartford Ct., Worthington, Ohio, said she was surprised one morning when the protective barrier between the parking lot and her home was gone. She said she did not receive any communication prior to that happening and that prompted her to contact the city. Ms. Yount said she was in favor of beautiful green arborvitae and she loved trees but was concerned about her privacy and the noise. She preferred to have the fence replaced since the fence was in place to begin with for screening and she would like to be included with communication in the future.

Ms. Monica Baughman, representing the Worthington Library, 2445 Black Rd. SW, in another county. Ms. Baughman said they did have a lot of trouble with the fence, it was dangling and every facility walk-thru which is done quarterly, the fence was always needing to be repaired. The fence has been a problem for the last few years and they were not sure how to fix the problem. They wanted to try to make the area look nicer and do something more sustainable and soften up the area. There were no other speakers.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY CYP STUDIOS ON BEHALF OF THE WORTHINGTON PUBLIC LIBRARY FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL VEGETATIVE SCREENING AS PER CASE NO. AR 10-19, DRAWINGS NO. AR 10-19, DATED JANUARY 25, 2019, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

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

2. ITM (Interactive Teller Machine) – **923 High St.** (DEI Incorporated/City National Bank) **AR 11-19**

a. Drive-in Bank in C-4 – **923 High St.** (DEI Incorporated) **CU 05-18**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This 1769 square foot building sits on just under ½ acre at the northwest corner of High and North Streets. Constructed in the early 1970’s, the building housed a gasoline service station for many years and then was converted into an oil change business, most recently operating as Sprint Lube. The property is zoned C-4, Highway and Automotive Services.

The property was purchased by City National Bank from West Virginia, and conversion of the existing building and site to a bank branch were approved last year. Part of the approval was for a Conditional Use Permit to allow a drive-thru ATM on the south side of the building. This application deals with the actual design of the unit.

Project Details:

1. Proposed is an Interactive Teller Machine (ITM) which includes the ability to interact visually with an actual teller in addition to traditional ATM functions.
2. A unit was already installed under the previously approved blue canopy (see “Existing”

photo in packet). In its place, the applicant is proposing to install a surround with a plain blue topper instead of the sign that is currently there. The new drawing indicates the topper would have an LED backlit sign at the top with task lighting at the bottom of the topper.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

The Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance recommend signs be efficient and compatible with the age and architecture of the building. Try to use as few and as small signs as are necessary to get the business message across to the public.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of this application, if the topper does not have a sign, and is not internally illuminated. The shown task lighting that illuminates the area below should be acceptable.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. J.P. Owens, representing City National Bank, 923 High St., Worthington, Ohio, said he did not approve of the sign either. Mrs. Bitar said a depository box was shown earlier. Mr. Foust said the original plan included a bench for the corner and he asked if that was still the plan. Mr. Brown replied that there was a revised plan showing a knee wall that would have been similar to the Village Green however the utilities that are a foot underground would have needed to be moved and would have escalated the costs beyond budget. There still might be a bench but no knee wall with landscaping. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak for or against this application, but no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Hofmann moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY DEI INCORPORATED ON BEHALF OF CITY NATIONAL BANK FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL A SURROUND FOR THE ITM AT 923 HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 11-19, DRAWINGS NO. AR 11-19, DATED JANUARY 28, 2019, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

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

6. Addition – **837 Oxford St.** (James Ross/Nelson) **AR 12-19**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This Colonial Revival style home was built in 1925 and has been well maintained over the decades. The house is a contributing building in the Worthington Historic District. The owners would like approval for a rear addition to accommodate a remodeled kitchen and a mudroom.

Project Details:

1. The proposed 16.3' wide by 6' deep addition would replace the existing entrance on the rear of the house. With this proposal, the door would move to the rear of the addition and wood steps would head down north and south from a landing. The exact railing style and material has not been specified.
2. Siding, windows, and roofing are proposed to match the existing, although details have not been provided. A picture of a Provia fiberglass door has been provided with 9 lights above 2 vertical panels. The door is planned to be white. The picture does not match the door style shown on the elevation. A Hinkley "Edgewater" light fixture is shown in the packet for location by the door.
3. New glass block windows are proposed for the basement to match others that are in the house. Approval of the existing glass block windows was not found.

Land Use Plan:Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Residential additions are recommended to maintain similar roof forms; be constructed as far to the rear and sides of the existing residence as possible; be subordinate; and have walls set back from the corners of the main house. Be sure that window designs are appropriate for the style or time period of the house. Avoid use of inappropriate window designs. Design and materials should be traditional, and compatible with the existing structure.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of the application with the verification of materials, as the addition is in keeping with the recommendations in the Design Guidelines. Although there are existing glass block windows, they are not a preferred style of window. Assurance that new landscaping will block the view of the windows should be requested.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Jim Ross, 6120 Crystal Valley Dr., Galena, Ohio, and Mr. Jeff Nelson, 837 Oxford St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Ross said the air conditioning system would be moved to the south towards the front porch but still behind the bushes. Board members had no questions or concerns. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present to speak for or against this application, but no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY JAMES ROSS ON BEHALF OF JEFF & CHERIE NELSON FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO CONSTRUCT A REAR ADDITION AT 837 OXFORD ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 12-19, DRAWINGS NO. AR 12-19, DATED FEBRUARY 1, 2019, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND

CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING AND THAT THE RELOCATION OF THE AIR CONDITIONING UNIT BE LANDSCAPED APPROPRIATELY.

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

7. Additions, Renovations & Garage – 5 Hartford Ct. (Roger Beck) AR 13-19

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

The house at 5 Hartford Ct. is a Cape Cod that was constructed in 1949 on a cul-de-sac of Cape Cod houses. The house across the street (6 Hartford Ct.) is the only building that varies, looking more like a salt box, having a true second story. The applicant is requesting approval to demolish the detached garage and add onto and renovate the house to result in more of a Craftsman looking structure.

Project Details:

1. Site layout:

The plan involves adding an 8' deep front porch that is 2' narrower than the 31' wide existing house. A variance would be required for the proximity to the front property line. To the rear, a 26' long one-story addition is proposed that would keep the east line of the existing house and be set in 1' on the west side; and an attached garage would be 2' wider (32') and extend back another 22'4". The rear wall of the garage is proposed to be 13' from the rear property line and would require a variance.

Driveway location and design are not shown on the plan, and a landscaping plan has not been submitted.

2. Building:

- The new front porch is proposed with a shed roof supported by columns with Provia river rock veneer on the bottom. The base of the porch is also proposed to be faced with river rock veneer. The material proposed for the remainder of the tapered columns and the material in the porch rail that would run between the columns have not been identified.
- A shed style front dormer is proposed with four small double hung windows. The existing dormer to the rear is proposed to be modified to match the pitch and size of the front dormer but may not have windows based on the location of the planned one-story gabled addition to the rear. A partial elevation showing the back of the main house would be helpful.
- The proposed garage would have a gabled roof running east and west with the same pitch as the main house but lower. A double garage door is shown but the elevation

shows a different design than a photograph included in the material. Clarification is needed.

- Mastic Carverwood white double 5” vinyl siding and GAF Timberline Williamsburg Gray dimensional shingles are proposed for the entire structure.
- New windows in a one over one pattern are proposed for the entire house, and are shown in different sizes and fenestration than in the existing house. The windows would be Marvin Ultrex Pulltruded fiberglass.
- A Therma Tru fiberglass “American Classic Craftsman” front door in Rustic Clay is proposed.
- Ten solar panels are proposed for the rear of the garage roof. Specifications are needed.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

- A decision on whether a particular demolition is appropriate must be made in light of several factors, including whether the demolition is full or partial; the age of the structure; the level of integrity of the structure being demolished (has it been extensively altered?); the impact of the demolition on Worthington’s character; and plans for the site following demolition (is the proposed replacement appropriate for Worthington? Does it follow the design guidelines for new structures?) Generally, demolition of pre-1950s buildings should be avoided. These tend to contribute the most to a community’s character. However, it may be desirable to avoid demolishing a newer building, depending on what is proposed to replace it.
- Residential additions are recommended to maintain similar roof forms; be constructed as far to the rear and sides of the existing residence as possible; be subordinate; and have walls set back from the corners of the main house. Design and materials should be traditional, and compatible with the existing structure.
- New structures should complement the form, massing and scale of existing nearby structures. Also, building placement and orientation are important design considerations. Most main entrances should face the street and garages should avoid facing the street.
- Roof: Roof shapes for new buildings should be appropriate to the style or design of the building. If a new building does not follow a particular style but is instead a vernacular design, then roof shapes and heights similar to those in the neighborhood or nearby would be most appropriate.
- Materials: Contemporary materials that simulate traditional ones are appropriate, but the preferred option is to use true traditional materials such as wood siding. Incompatible contemporary materials should be avoided. Brick has long been a traditional material in Worthington. Prepare a sample board for review by the Architectural Review Board.
- Windows: For new buildings, multiple-paned windows generally are not appropriate. The exception is a building being built in a particular style -- such as Federal, Greek Revival or Colonial Revival -- that would have employed this window type. When in doubt, simple 1 over 1 double-hung sash windows are usually the simplest, least expensive and most appropriate choice. Using the excellent precedents of Worthington’s many historic structures, carefully design the pattern of window openings; window sizes and proportions (they must be appropriate for the size and proportions of the wall in which they are placed); pattern of window panes and muntins; and trim around the windows. Good quality wood windows are readily available and more affordable than in the past. True wood windows are always the first

preference. Aluminum- or vinyl-clad windows can be appropriate, but primarily on secondary facades and less conspicuous locations. All-aluminum or vinyl windows are not prohibited but are not encouraged. Avoid blank walls.

- Entries: For newly-built buildings, simpler designs usually look better than more ornate ones. Avoid heavy ornamentation on doors and entrances. Observe entry placement on existing buildings. Whether located symmetrically or asymmetrically, entries usually are aligned with a window on the second floor so that a regular rhythm of openings is maintained on both floors. Entries should be located so they are easily visible, and they should be oriented toward the street.
- Ornamentation: Observe Worthington's excellent historic architecture for information on the kinds and amounts of ornamentation employed on various building styles and periods. Use ornamentation conservatively. It will be most successful if used in traditional locations: around windows and doors; along a building's cornice or at the corners; in gables; or on gates and fences. Most ornamentation historically was made of simple forms built up to a desired level of complexity. When in doubt, follow the old rule that "less is more." Sometimes just a little ornamentation, well placed, can have a major impact without the need for more extensive (and expensive, and hard-to-maintain) ornamentation. Use compatible materials in ornamental elements. Frame houses should have wood ornamentation, although in cases where the ornamental elements are some distance from the viewer it may be possible to use substitute materials such as fiberglass.
- Color: In general, avoid bright colors not typical in Worthington neighborhoods, such as various shades of purple or orange. For infill buildings being placed in an existing streetscape, select colors compatible with those already used along the streetscape. Many buildings follow a pattern of light colors for the building body and darker colors for the trim. Following this pattern is encouraged. In Worthington, the use of white or cream-colored trim also is common and would be appropriate for new construction. Avoid using too many colors. Usually one body color and one trim color are sufficient.
- Landscaping: Worthington's mature shade trees are the primary landscaping feature throughout the community. They are a major contributor to its character and help define its neighborhoods as stable, desirable places to live. In general, lawns are generous but not overly large, which contributes to the sense of human scale that is one of Worthington's important attributes. Other landscaping elements tend to be properly scaled and well-tended, which also tends to enhance neighborhood character. Maintain and nurture mature trees to prolong their lives. Plant and maintain street trees in planting areas between the street and sidewalk. Paving can sometimes reduce water absorption of the soil so much that trees do not get the moisture they require.

The standards of review in the Architectural District ordinance are:

1. Height;
2. Building massing, which shall include the relationship of the building width to its height and depth, and its relationship to the viewer's and pedestrian's visual perspective;
3. Window treatment, which shall include the size, shape and materials of the individual window units and the overall harmonious relationship of window openings;
4. Exterior detail and relationships, which shall include all projecting and receding elements of the exterior, including but not limited to, porches and overhangs and the horizontal or vertical expression which is conveyed by these elements;

5. Roof shape, which shall include type, form and materials;
6. Materials, texture and color, which shall include a consideration of material compatibility among various elements of the structure;
7. Compatibility of design and materials, which shall include the appropriateness of the use of exterior design details;
8. Landscape design and plant materials, which shall include, in addition to requirements of this Zoning Code, lighting and the use of landscape details to highlight architectural features or screen or soften undesirable views;
9. Pedestrian environment, which shall include the provision of features which enhance pedestrian movement and environment, and which relate to the pedestrian's visual perspective;
10. Signage, which shall include, in addition to requirements of Chapter 1170, the appropriateness of signage to the building;
11. Sustainable Features, which shall include environmentally friendly details and conservation practices.

Staff Analysis:

- Changing the style of a house does not meet the Design Guidelines. The addition of a front shed dormer and porch, expanding the first floor living area, constructing an attached garage, and using all new materials can be desirable modifications, but make it impossible to keep the character of the existing Cape Cod. The resultant structure would have characteristics similar to Craftsman style houses, which are also part of Old Worthington.
- Vinyl siding is not preferred.
- The proposed river rock veneer is not typical in Old Worthington and may not produce the desired effect. A sample is needed.
- Solar panels on the rear of the garage are appropriately located.
- Proposed plans for the driveway and landscaping are needed, as are window and solar panel specification sheets.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Roger Beck, 6695 Hayhurst St., Worthington, Ohio, said he has lived most of his life in Worthington, except for about ten years after college. He graduated from Worthington High School and this is his attempt to provide senior housing.

Mr. Beck plans to add a first-floor master suite, with a first-floor laundry and mud rooms to this home with an attached garage and that way they can live longer in Worthington Estates. He said he is a retired Worthington High School teacher and one of the things they did was developing a program for college bound high school seniors to end poverty housing for the working poor people and in ten years they built 11 homes. They built the first LEED affordable platinum house in Ohio, and the entire great lakes region. They placed solar cells on the home, and he would like to include some of the same sustainable and energy efficient features in this house that Worthington is going towards in the community and he also hoped to provide some open houses for the residents so they might be able to incorporate some of those features in their own homes.

Mr. Beck said they held an information session at his home and invited everyone in the court to stop by and they had three of the seven families stop by for information. The same presentation

shown by Mrs. Bitar at the meeting was what was shown to his neighbors and all who participated at that meeting were receptive and liked what was proposed. His garage would also help block some of the headlights from the parking lot. Mr. Coulter said the driveway was not shown on the drawing and asked Mr. Beck what he had planned for the driveway. Mr. Beck said he would pull in with a straight single 10' driveway and might be able to build in a turn similar to the drive that was shown for the property on Short Street.

Mr. Coulter said he noticed vinyl siding was planned for the project, and vinyl siding is a material the Architectural Review Board (ARB) does not prefer in the district. They would rather see something like Hardiplank and asked Mr. Beck if he would consider using that instead and he said that would be fine. He said they used Hardiplank on the last sustainable home that they built, and the materials were supposed to last 80 years so the homeowner would not have to do a lot of maintenance, but the house that was built in 2008 has already had to be repainted. He was told Hardiplank had a great warranty, but would have to caulk it, so he wanted to try the vinyl because the maintenance would be less, but he was willing to use Hardiplank. Mr. Coulter said he was not certain the stone sample provided would be approved and the Board may ask him to provide a different sample. Mr. Beck said he would forgo the river rock plan and just have tapered columns with balusters. Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Beck to discuss what types of windows he would be using. Mr. Beck said he would be using Marvin Integrity fiberglass double hung high quality windows which are about \$500.00 each without installation. The windows are energy efficient, and they will last and will not need to be painted. Mr. Coulter asked what type of shingles would be used. Mr. Beck said he would be using slate colored dimensional shingles.

Mr. Foust said he was struggling with the change of the design of the house. He said he was okay with the connector which was typical for this type of home. Mr. Foust said he is not sure if the applicant was doing the right thing, but he was not sure how to address that. Mr. Schuster asked Mr. Beck if he could accomplish what he was trying to do without changing the Cape Cod look? Mr. Beck said he was not sure. Mr. Coulter said the elevations show the front window being dressed up which the current house does not do. He said he is a big fan of front porches and he likes to see people on their front porches and the proposed house do not have a porch. Mr. Foust said he did not want to see the design of a contributing house changed. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present to speak for or against this application.

Ms. Wendy Cole, 3 Hartford Ct., Worthington, Ohio, said she lived directly to the east of 5 Hartford Ct. Her concerns were a lot of what Mrs. Bitar had already stated. She said the house appeared to look like a Craftsman style of house and would look good in Clintonville, but she would like to see a more Colonial style and felt the river rock was inappropriate. Since there was not a driveway on the drawing, she said the home reminded her of the house on Short Street which was discussed earlier. Ms. Cole said she has lived in her home for over twenty years now and the proposed project would be a very long row house and two existing trees would be removed and would significantly change what she looked at every day.

Ms. Cole said she had hesitation about the size of the house because the lot would be filled. She said the court felt small already and their street did not have curbs which is a problem. The water currently drains from the downspouts onto the curve which creates a muddy mess. Cars park halfway on the court and halfway in the yards. Ms. Cole said this is problematic especially during

school functions, library functions, festivals, and anything going on in downtown Worthington. She would like signs saying no parking in the court. They try to salvage their yards the best that they can. Ms. Cole said she wanted to be supportive of new neighbors but felt the proposed house was out of character with their court.

Mrs. Angela Strous, 58 E. North St., Worthington, Ohio, said in general, she was in favor of improving the home. She felt the home was small in comparison to the huge monster that would be built across the street. Mrs. Strous was supportive of anything that could be done to improve the properties of the homes in the neighborhood. She was pleased with the proposed project.

Mr. Blair Davis, 1 Hartford Ct., Worthington, Ohio, said he was pleased Mr. Beck wants to come in to their neighborhood and do something with the house. He said the additions to the house were junk and he wished the original owners would have asked for his opinion before building because he could have given them expert advice since he is a builder. Mr. Davis said he agreed he would like to see the house have two dormers to match the other homes on the court, but at the same time he appreciated Mr. Beck's vision and he appreciated the freedom of the individual to be able to do what they want to do. Mr. Davis said getting rid of the stone would make him feel better about the proposed project. He was also in favor of the porch addition.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY ROGER BECK FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO DEMOLISH THE GARAGE AND RENOVATE AND ADD ONTO THE HOUSE AT 5 HARTFORD CT., AS PER CASE NO. AR 13-19, DRAWINGS NO. AR 13-19, DATED FEBRUARY 1, 2019, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING AND AMENDED THAT THE SIDING BE HARDI-PLANK AND THE COLUMNS BE BROUGHT TO THE BASE OF THE NEW PORCH.

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

8. Entryway Modifications & Garage Door – **609 Oxford St.** (Christie Whisman & Jessica Steinbrink/Smullen) **AR 15-19**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

The house on this rear sloping property is a bungalow that was originally built in the early 1900's. In 2003, a two-story rear addition was constructed, and in 2011 the house was extended further to the rear. This is a request to modify the front entrance and replace the garage door.

Project Details:

1. Replacement of the front door is proposed. The existing door is almost full glass with 12 lights and is apparently shorter than desired. The new fiberglass door would have 12 vertically oriented lights in the top 2/3 of the door and a solid panel below. Wood looking stain is proposed for the 3' x 7' door. It is not clear how the trim would change.
2. Lantern style sconces that are 18.5" high by 7.5" wide are proposed next to the door. The fixtures would have 2 candle style 60-watt bulbs each. It is not clear if an existing ceiling fan with a light would remain.
3. The existing white double garage door has 8 windows across the top and 32 square recessed panels below. Proposed is a steel carriage style door with a woodgrain finish. The double wide door would have three panels across and hardware between the panels. Windows are shown separately, so it is not clear if they are proposed.

Land Use Plans:Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Classical detailing around the entrance is typical for Cape Cod style homes. In selecting new light fixtures, simple designs are usually the best. Avoid overly ornate fixtures and ones that are out of scale with the building. Design and materials should be traditional, and compatible with the existing structure.

For repair work on older outbuildings, use new materials that match the old as closely as possible. Avoid modern materials that are incompatible with the original designs of these structures. It is important that doors be compatible with the style and period of a building. Compatibility of design and materials and exterior detail and relationships are standards of review in the Architectural District ordinance.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of this application, as the proposed changes were in character with the house.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Ms. Jessica Steinbrink, 235 Longfellow Ave., Worthington, Ohio, said in regard to the front porch they plan to replace the existing fiberglass door with a wood stained door with two new sconces and the door hardware. They are going to remove the lighted ceiling fan from the front porch and make that go away. She said she was open to either making that light go away or change the fixture to be recessed. Ms. Steinbrink felt the sconces brought ambience to the front porch which the fan light did not offer. She would like to replace the garage door with one that is insulated and made of fiberglass, but with a finish that marries to the front door. Hardware would not have to go on the garage door, she believed that was just an option. The manufacturer did not offer glass lights as an option. Ms. Steinbrink suggested to the homeowner to replace the two coach lights with something similar to the front door so everything would match. Mr. Foust said he would like to see windows for the garage door if they were available. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak for or against this application, but no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY CHRISTIE WHISMAN & JESSICA STEINBRINK ON BEHALF OF TIM AND DIANE SMULLEN FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO REPLACE THE FRONT & GARAGE DOORS, AND ADD LIGHTING AT 609 OXFORD ST. AS PER CASE NUMBER AR 15-19, DRAWINGS NUMBER AR 15-19, DATED FEBRUARY 1, 2019 BE APPROVED, BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING AN AMENDED THAT THE LIGHTING ON THE GARAGE WILL MATCH THE LIGHTING FIXTURES OF THE FRONT PORCH AND THAT THE GARAGE MAY OR MAY NOT HAVE VISION PANELS.

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

C. Municipal Planning Commission (continued) – 11:00 p.m.

Mr. Brown reviewed the following from the staff memo:

2. Planned Unit Development – Preliminary & Final Plans

a. Worthington Gateway – **7007 N. High St.** (The Witness Group) **PUD 01-18**

&

3. Subdivision – Preliminary & Final Plats

a. Worthington Gateway – **7007 N. High St.** (The Witness Group) **SUB 02-19**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This roughly 7.5-acre parcel, currently zoned C-4, Highway and Automotive Services, has been home to a hotel since 1975. The Holiday Inn was demolished in December 2018 in anticipation of the upcoming redevelopment of the site.

In coordination with the City, the applicant has requested to rezone the property from the C-4 District (Highway & Automotive Services) to a PUD (Planned Unit Development). The applicant is also requesting Preliminary and Final Plat approval for a Subdivision to create three (3) lots.

The Architectural Review Board, Municipal Planning Commission and the Board of Zoning appeals approved the site for the following:

- One Hotel – 4 story & 111-room – Hampton Inn & Suites
- Four buildings along West Wilson Bridge Road

- Building #1 – Single story
- Building #2 – Single story
- Building #3 – 2-story
- Building #4 – 2-story
- Future development pad near High Street and Caren Avenue – Requires future approval
- Intersection improvement, realignment and new mast arms at the new entrance on West Wilson Bridge Road and the realignment of the access drive to the Shops at Worthington Place. Dedicated left turn lane on West Wilson Bridge Road to the site.
- Intersection improvements, new mast arms and streetscape improvements at High Street and Caren Avenue.
- Streetscape improvements along West Wilson Bridge Road and High Street, which includes street trees, lighting, landscaping, wider sidewalks and right-of-way dedication for improvements.
- Signage Package
- Stormwater Improvements
- Traffic & Access Improvements
- Landscape & Screening
- Architectural Design

History:

- February 4, 2016 – The applicant hosted a Town Hall meeting at the Holiday Inn for the general public to hear their plans for the proposed redevelopment of their site.
- March 10th, June 23rd, November 10th and December 8th of 2016 – Concepts for the site were discussed with the Architectural Review Board, and the applicant received feedback from the Board and the general public.
- October 12th and November 9, 2017 – Revised concepts for the site were discussed with the Board, and the applicant received additional feedback from the Board and the public.
- October 12, 2017 the Board saw a different version of the site plan, showing the reduction to one hotel on the site as well as other site details.
- November 9, 2017 the Board saw modifications to the other buildings on the site.
- February 22, 2018 – The Architectural Review Board approved the site for demolition of the existing hotel, and redevelopment of the overall site.
- April 5, 2018 – The Board of Board of Zoning Appeals approved the proposed development.
- April 26, 2018 – The Municipal Planning Commission approved a Conditional Use for Office in the C-4 District.
- June 14, 2018 – The Architectural Review District approved the signage package for the overall site.
- August 2, 1018 – The Board of Zoning Appeals approved the signage package for the overall site.

Project Details:

Development Standards from the PUD code are *italicized* and information specific to this plan are in standard text:

1. Allowable Uses:

The mix of uses allowed in a PUD shall meet changing economic and demographic demands; permit implementation of development standards, plans, studies and guidelines adopted by the City Council; and/or provide the opportunity to retain and enhance the character of the City, and the health, safety and general welfare of the inhabitants.

Allowable Uses:

- Offices – minimum amount – 18,000 sq. ft.
- Hotels
- Restaurants
- Breweries, Distilleries and Wineries
- Sale of goods at retail – limited to less than 10,000 sq. ft. in gross floor area per business with on-site food preparation permissible
- Personal services
- Accessory uses
- Banks, Drive-in banks
- Pet shops
- Arts and crafts
- Entertainment facilities
- Recreational facilities
- Public uses
- Essential services

2. Design Regulations:

- (a) Character & Design. *The proposed PUD shall consist of an integrated and harmonious design with properly arranged traffic and parking facilities and landscaping. The PUD shall fit harmoniously into and shall not adversely affect adjoining and surrounding properties, Roadways & public facilities. Site layout, buildings, accessory structures, landscaping and lighting shall be compatible with or enhance the surrounding neighborhood and community.*

The owner is proposing the redevelopment of the site with a mix of uses as the Hotel has been demolished. There are five (5) buildings proposed for the existing Holiday Inn site located at southwest corner of North High Street and West Wilson Bridge Road. The vacant lot located at the corner of Caren Avenue and North High Street will be separately submitted to the Architectural Review Board and the Board of Zoning Appeals for all necessary approvals under the Worthington Zoning Code. This submission is to provide detailed exterior elevations and building materials along with an overall a sense of scale, proportion, massing, and spacing of the buildings as it relates to the current site plan and grade changes.

Building #1 and #2 are single story, Buildings #3 and #4 are two story and Building #5 is proposed to be a four-story hotel with a lower level. All the buildings are designed as ‘four-sided architecture’. By using the same materials on all four sides

of each building, the design will not interrupt, and all parts are perceived as a unified whole. The elevations of the five (5) buildings are contained in this application as they have been reviewed and approved by the Architectural Review Board.

The architectural style of the proposed buildings is meant to complement the surrounding Worthington neighborhood and design standards while differentiating the buildings from one another. Traditional style design elements are incorporated into the design using brick facades, gabled roof lines, dormers, double-hung windows and entrances with transoms. The street level storefront facades are designed using pilasters, bulkheads, cornices, awnings and externally illuminated sign panels. The speculative 2-story office buildings at the western portion of the development utilize traditional rationale and detail while maintaining a more contemporary architectural style.

The proposed materials are consistent with the City of Worthington's design guidelines with brick masonry, siding, multi-panel windows, metal & shingled roof, paint finish and awning fabric.

- (b) Screening. *Commercial and industrial uses, including parking facilities and refuse containers, shall be permanently screened from all adjoining residential uses.*

Landscaping and screening shall be installed in compliance with the Landscaping Plan included in this PUD district application. Landscaping maybe added along the southwestern corner of the site and along the southern property boundary if deemed necessary by the City of Worthington.

- (c) Tract Coverage. *The ground area occupied by all Buildings shall be balanced with green space to soften the appearance of the development.*

Tract coverage for the hotel parcel and the Wilson Bridge Road parcels is shown on the site plan included with this PUD district application. The tract coverage for the vacant parcel will be determined upon submittal and approval as part of a separate review process.

- The site previously had 1.3-acres of greenspace
- Proposed to have 1.6-acres of greenspace

- (d) Lighting.

A lighting package has been submitted as a part of this application that indicates the location of the light poles, cut off fixtures and a photo metric plan that shows compliance with the adopted City guidelines on light impacts on abutting properties. No exposed concrete bases for the parking lot lights will be permitted.

- (e) Graphic/Signage.

A signage package is included in this submittal and has been approved by the

Architectural Review Board and the Board of Zoning Appeals. The submitted package includes all the wall signage, freestanding signage and directional sign for two of the three lots included in this application. The vacant lot will have to submit a signage package for review and approval by the appropriate boards.

- (f) *Traffic & Parking.* Adequate ingress and egress shall be provided as part of the PUD. Direct traffic access should be provided from major thoroughfares and where congestion will not likely be created by the proposed development. Offsite improvements and dedication of right-of-way may be required. Parking shall be designed and located to protect the character of the area. Parking shall be adequate to serve the proposed uses but shall in no case exceed 120% of the parking requirement found in Section 1171.01. Bicycle parking should be adequate to serve the proposed uses.

Access to the property will be depicted on the submitted site plan. Only two curb cuts will be utilized, and the other existing curb cuts will be eliminated. The curb cut on Wilson Bridge Road will be shifted slightly to the west to allow it to line up with the existing curb cut from the Shopping Center to the north. The relocation of the curb cut will allow for four (4) way traffic control and a safer flow of traffic on and off the site. The Caren Drive curb cut will be shifted slightly west away from High Street as shown on the site plan. New sidewalks and other amenities will be added to the site to improve pedestrian access to, through and off the site per the site plan.

A traffic impact study was commissioned by the applicant and it was reviewed and approved by the City as a part of the Architectural Review Board process.

The parking areas are shown on the site plan which provides for 342 parking spaces. The site plan provides for all the required setback and landscape areas. The 7± acre site will split into three (3) lots and easements will be provided for crossing parking between the new lots as well as ingress and egress provisions for vehicle and pedestrian access over the three (3) lots.

3. General Requirements:

(a) *Stormwater Drainage.*

Preliminary and final stormwater drainage studies have been conducted for the redevelopment of the site. The preliminary stormwater plan has been submitted as a part of this application and it will meet all regulations adopted by the City of Worthington for detaining the stormwater, mitigating run off on abutting properties and thereby meeting all City and EPA requirements.

(b) *Utilities & Facilities.*

The site will be served by existing water, sanitary sewer, stormwater sewer and electric lines that surround the property.

(c) *Natural Features.*

The subject property is without significant natural features other than a dropping slope

of the land from the east to the west that has proven difficult with laying out buildings on the site.

(d) Public Area Payments.

The applicant will comply with Code Section 1174.05(c)(3)(B) of the Worthington Zoning Code. The existing square footage of the Holiday Inn Hotel is 136,834 and the propose square footage of the new buildings is 136,195 so no payment is required under the above Code Section.

(e) Public Space Amenities.

The applicant will comply with Section 1174.05(c)(4) by providing a minimum of twenty-seven public space amenities in various locations on the Property. Public space amenities are provided and incorporated at various locations around the site.

The public amenities shall be:

- (1) Public Right-of-Way dedication
- (2) Decorative Street lighting
- (3) Bike Parking (4 total) for each building
- (4) New Pedestrian sidewalks
- (5) Wilson Bridge Road intersection improvements – Traffic lighting and configuration corrections
- (6) Plaza / Meeting area
- (7) Bio-Retention areas
- (8) New Corner treatments (Caren Ave & N. High St. & Wilson Bridge Rd.)
- (9) Street trees (along the rights-of-way)
- (10) Paver parking and maneuvering areas
- (11) Upgraded Landscaping
- (12) Decorative retaining walls
- (13) Patio areas (8 total)
- (14) New green lawn area along Wilson Bridge Road
- (15) Decorative planting areas along entry ways to site along Wilson Bridge Road
- (16) Decorative Trash Reception (10 total)

Rezoning Details:

1. The Preliminary & Final Plan information for the PUD has been presented as part of what was previously approved by the Architectural Review Board, Municipal Planning Commission and the Board of Zoning Appeals.
2. Uses:
 - One hotel, with 111 guest rooms is proposed. The old Holiday Inn had 232 guest rooms.
 - Other potential uses on the site are offices, restaurants and professional services.
3. Site Plan and Landscaping:
 - The proposed plan shows an entrance to the site from W. Wilson Bridge Rd. at the west end of the site that would be at an angle to line up with the mall entrance at that location. The realignment of the intersection will provide a dedicated left turn lane to the site and will improve pedestrian and bicycle connections between the two sites. The applicant has an agreement with the owner of the Shops at Worthington Place and Ville Charmante to permit the reconfiguration of the intersection.
 - The drive curves to the east to increase the distance from the adjacent residential property.

Also, an entrance is proposed on Caren Ave. just west of the existing entrance. Elimination of entrances toward the east end of the site on W. Wilson Bridge Rd. and on N. High St.

- One four story hotel is proposed ~77' from the south property line and ~234' from the west property line. The main entrance would be on the north side of the building.
- Two office/professional services buildings are proposed for the western part of the property along W. Wilson Bridge Rd.: R-3 (13, 680 square feet in area) & R-4 (10, 904 square feet in area). Two restaurant/professional services buildings are proposed to the east along W. Wilson Bridge Rd.: R-1 (6,786 square feet in area) & R-2 (6,826 square feet in area).
- The four buildings are proposed along W. Wilson Bridge Rd. are approximately 20' from the existing right-of-way line. The City has requested an additional 15' of right-of-way be dedicated, so the buildings would be about 5' from the new line. Sidewalks would be provided along the buildings, and a 5' sidewalk would be closer to the street in the right-of-way. Pedestrian access and patios would be between the buildings which would allow for restaurant seating areas.
- The footprint of a one-story, 11,620 square foot restaurant/professional services building is shown on the N. High St. frontage but the building has not been designed. The building would be about 25.5' from the existing right-of-way. Right-of-way dedication of 10' was requested.
- Sidewalks are shown throughout the site, with access to the public sidewalk at multiple locations.
- The applicant calculates 418 parking spaces would be required on the site based on the proposed uses, and 342 spaces are being provided. A shared parking analysis is part of the application and states the overall site would not need more than 342 parking spaces due to the mix of uses.
- 14 bike racks are proposed, with a total of 28 bicycle spaces being provided.
- Parking lot and street trees, as well as other plant material, are proposed. At the southwest corner of the site and along the west property line, existing vegetation would remain, with dead or dying materials being replaced, and new plantings would fill in any gaps. The landscape plan also shows trees and other plant materials along W. Wilson Bridge Rd., and between the buildings.
- A Traffic Impact Study has been completed and approved by the City Engineer and the City's traffic consultant, who have concluded no negative traffic impact would result from this development.
- A storm water study has been completed and a summary is included with the application, citing a reduction in impervious area and onsite retention and a decrease in discharge from the site. The current plan shows the use of an underground detention system, pervious pavement and a bio-retention area.

4. Architecture:

- Buildings R-1 & R-2 at the easternmost end of the site along W. Wilson Bridge Rd. are proposed as one-story buildings. Building R-1 has the look of five storefronts, with a two-story roofline on the north side at the west end. A mix of siding and roofing materials and storefront styles is proposed. Building R-2 has the look of a two-story roof on the north side for the whole building, and has a mix of siding and roofing materials and storefront styles.
- Buildings R-3 & R-4 are proposed as two-story buildings. Building R-3 is shown

as brick and cast stone with a hipped roof. Building R-4 would be a smaller version of the same style.

- The hotel building would be four-stories and finished with brick and 6” Hardieplank lap siding. The building is proposed with a gable roof in the middle and hipped roofs on the sides. Equipment would presumably be located and screened on the roof. Two chimneys are proposed and would have metal flashing in the same color as the brick. Divided light windows with brick soldier courses are proposed and traditional storefront glass would be on the north side by the main entrance.
 - Brick, Hardieplank, and cast stone are proposed for the building walls and asphalt shingles and standing seam metal roofing are proposed. Awnings are proposed on building R-1, R-2 and R-4. Samples of materials and colors would be needed.
 - Pella clad wood windows are proposed with 3/4” aluminum grills between the glass panes in Poplar White, Putty and Iron Ore.
 - Building #6 is shown as a one-story building along N. High St. Elevations of that building have not been provided and will be required to be approved at a future date.
5. A lighting plan is shown, including proposed site and building lighting. Traditional looking poles and fixtures are proposed, and the light level would not spill off of the property.
 6. Enclosures for trash receptacles and painting and screening of wall mechanicals are included in the plan.
 7. Signage criteria has been submitted that basically follows the Worthington Code and Design Guidelines, but further would allow specific sizes and styles of signs. Part One of the criteria includes general requirements from Chapter 1170 – Signs, of the Code. Part Two – Design Criteria includes provisions from the Code, as well as pertinent Design Guideline recommendations and development specific information. The applicant would like tenants that plan to meet the established criteria to be able to receive sign permits without returning to the ARB for approval.
 8. Following are some of the provisions for signage requested for the multi-tenanted buildings housing restaurants and personal and business services:
 - Tenants in the W. Wilson Bridge Rd. buildings would be allowed to have one wall sign facing the road and one sign facing the parking lot to the south.
 - The maximum sign area would be 1 ½ square feet per lineal foot of frontage as is a Code requirement. In addition, the maximum letter height would be 24” and the maximum width could be no more than 80% of the tenant’s storefront width. Signs would need to be at least 24” from the edge of the tenant space or from the corner of the building. In no case would a business be allowed more than 100 square feet of signage total.
 - Signs would be located at the tenant’s storefront, or above the primary entrance if the tenant occupies more than 1 space.
 - Maximum mounting height is proposed as 17’ above grade, or at a height appropriate to the building architecture.
 - Proposed signs would consist of internally illuminated channel letters only.

- Colors would be based on the Design Guidelines which say they should be compatible with the building architecture and subtle, toned-down shades are preferred.
9. Office tenants (in buildings #3&4) would have similar size and placement requirements but would only be allowed exterior signage if they occupy more than 50% of the designated office space for their floor.
 10. Blade signs would be permitted for each tenant in a color to match the tenant's primary sign. Lettering would be limited to 3" in height and a ¾" border painted black would be required. Each tenant would be allowed 1 blade sign, except tenants with end spaces would be allowed an additional sign on the end wall. A blade sign detail is included.
 11. Window signs identifying the tenant name and address would be allowed occupying not more than 25% of the window area.
 12. The applicant is proposing 2 freestanding signs, one east of the W. Wilson Bridge Rd. entrance, and one near the intersection of N. High St. and Caren Ave. Both signs are proposed with cast stone bases, brick and wood caps with trim. For both signs the panels would have matching opaque black backgrounds with white translucent letters. The style of text would match for the 4 tenants, but the hotel would use its own style. Placement would be 5' from the right-of-way.
 - The W. Wilson Bridge Rd. sign would be 8'4" wide and 12'4" tall, with internally illuminated tenant panels 6' wide x 7'6" high on both sides to allow for 5 tenant panels each. The top 3' of the panel is proposed for the hotel, and four 1'6" high panels would be below.
 - The N. High St. sign would be the same overall size but have a higher base and less tenant panel area. The hotel would have a 3' high panel regardless.
 13. The N. High St. building signs would come to the ARB for approval in the future.
 14. Hampton Inn & Suites signs are now included for consideration:
 - White internally illuminated 42" high stacked channel letters for total sign size of 16' 8" wide and 6' 5" high (~107 square feet in area) are proposed on a brick background in the gable.
 - A projection sign that is 2' 9 ¾" wide by 20' tall is proposed to be mounted on the east side of the building. The sign would be blue with white letters and red trim, and internally illuminated.
 - A directional sign is proposed. The sign would be 3' tall with a brick base and 15" high x 2' wide sign cabinet on top identifying "Hampton Inn & Suites by HILTON" in white on a blue background with red trim.
 - Another directional sign is shown, again with no location identified. This sign is shown as 5' high and 4'1" wide with a metal base.
 15. Non-illuminated blade signs are shown for the hotel.

Subdivision Details:

1. The Preliminary Plat & Final Plat information has been presented as part of the PUD. Copies of the pertinent plans have been included with this application such as plans showing existing and proposed conditions, utilities, grading, and landscaping.
2. New Lots:
 - a. Lot #1 – 3.33-acres – Located at the north end of the site along West Wilson Bridge Road in the area of the four (4) buildings and parking area.

- b. Lot #2 – 2.03-acres – Located in the area where the hotel is to be built.
- c. Lot #3 – 1.33-acres – Located at the intersection of North High Street and Caren Avenue.
- 3. Right-of-Way Dedication:
 - a. 0.62-acres along West Wilson Bridge Road
 - b. 0.29-acres along North High Street
- 4. Cross access and parking agreements are noted on the Final Plat and referenced in the PUD text.
- 5. Stormwater management easements have also been identified on the Final Plat.
- 6. Water and sanitary sewer easements have also been identified on the Final Plat.
- 7. Access points are limited to those approved at part of the PUD text with the main access on West Wilson Bridge Road, and a secondary access point to Caren Avenue. No direct access to North High Street is permitted as part of this proposal.
- 8. The Final Plat has been approved by the Franklin County and City of Worthington Service & Engineering Department.

Worthington Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. 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.
6. 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.

7. 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.
8. 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.
9. 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.
10. Sustainability: The City of Worthington and its Architectural Review Board are interested in encouraging sustainable design and building practices, while preserving the character and integrity of the Architectural Review District. Energy conservation methods are encouraged. Landscape concepts often complement energy conservation and should be maintained and replenished. Utilize indigenous plant materials, trees, and landscape features, especially those which perform passive solar energy functions such as sun shading and wind breaks. Preserve and enhance green/open spaces wherever practicable. Manage storm water run-off through the use of rain gardens, permeable forms of pavement, rain barrels and other such means that conserve water and filter pollutants. Bike racks and other methods of facilitating alternative transportation should be utilized. Streetscape elements should be of a human scale. Make use of recycled materials; rapidly renewable materials; and energy efficient materials. Use of natural and controlled light for interior spaces and natural ventilation is recommended. Minimize light pollution.

Wilson Bridge Corridor

Site Layout:

Setbacks: Buildings and parking should be set back to provide a buffer between the sidewalk and building, with some variations in the Building Setback Line encouraged throughout the WBC.

- Buildings 50,000 square feet in area or less shall be located between 5’ and 20’ from adjacent Right-of-Way Lines. Buildings greater than 50,000 square feet in area shall be located at least 20’ from adjacent Right-of-Way lines.
- Buildings on properties abutting properties in “R” districts shall not be located closer than 50’ to the property line. Parking facilities and access drives on

properties abutting properties in “R” districts shall not be located closer than 25’ to the property line.

- Setback areas in front of retail uses shall be primarily hardscaped and may be used for outdoor dining and other commercial activities.
- As building height increases, the buildings should consider the relationship between the setback, the street corridor, and the building height. A variety of techniques will be implemented to mitigate any potential “canyon/tunneling” effect along the corridor, such as the use of floor terracing, changes in building massing, insertion of a green commons, recessed seating and dining areas, and lush landscaping.

Right-of-Way Dedication: Dedication of Right-of-Way may be required to accommodate public improvements.

Screening: All development on parcels abutting properties in “R” districts shall be permanently screened in the setback area with the combination of a solid screen and landscape screening. The solid screen shall consist of a wall or fence at least 6’ in height and maintained in good condition without any advertising thereon. Supporting members for walls or fences shall be installed so as not to be visible from any other property which adjoins or faces the fences or walls. This shall not apply to walls or fences with vertical supporting members designed to be identical in appearance on both sides. Landscape screening shall consist of one of the following options at a minimum:

- One large evergreen tree with an ultimate height of 40’ or greater for every 20 linear feet, plus one medium evergreen tree with an ultimate height of 20’ to 40’ for every 10 linear feet. Evergreen trees shall be at least 6’ in height at the time of planting. Shrubs and ornamental grasses shall be incorporated into the setback area as to complement the tree plantings. A minimum of one shrub or ornamental grass, at least 24” in height, shall be provided for every 5 linear feet. Shrubs and grasses may be planted in clusters and do not need to be evenly spaced.
- One large deciduous tree with an ultimate height of 50’ or greater for every 25 linear feet, plus one medium deciduous tree with an ultimate height of 20’ to 40’ for every 15 linear feet. Shrubs and ornamental grasses shall be incorporated into the setback area as to complement the tree plantings. A minimum of one shrub or ornamental grass, at least 24” in height, shall be provided for every 5 linear feet. Shrubs and grasses may be planted in clusters and do not need to be evenly spaced.

Equipment: 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.

Tract Coverage: A maximum of 75% of the property shall be covered with impervious surfaces.

Pedestrian Access: Sidewalks with a minimum width of 5’, Recreation Paths with a minimum width of 10’, or a combination of both shall be provided along all Rights-of-Way. Pedestrian connections from Sidewalks, Recreation Paths and parking lots to building entrances shall be provided.

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.

Building Design:

- 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.
- The height of a building shall be a minimum of 18’ for flat roof buildings measured to the top of the parapet, or 12’ for pitched roof buildings measured to the eave.
- Extensive blank walls that detract from the experience and appearance of an active streetscape should be avoided.
- 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.
- Details and materials shall be varied horizontally to provide scale and three-dimensional qualities to the building.
- Entrances shall be well-marked to cue access and use, with public entrances to a building enhanced through compatible architectural or graphic treatment.
- When designing for different uses, an identifiable break between the building’s ground floors and upper floors shall be provided. This break may include a change in material, change in fenestration pattern or similar means.
- Where appropriate, shade and shadow created by reveals, surface changes, overhangs and sunshades to provide sustainable benefits and visual interest should be used.
- Roof-mounted mechanical equipment shall be screened from view on all four sides to the height of the equipment. The materials used in screening must be architecturally compatible with the rooftop and the aesthetic character of the building.

Materials:

- Any new building or redevelopment of a building façade should include, at a minimum, 75% of materials consisting of full set clay bricks, stone, cultured stone, wood or fiber cement board siding. Samples must be provided.
- Vinyl siding and other less durable materials should not be used.
- Long-lived and sustainable materials should be used.
- The material palette should provide variety and reinforce massing and changes in the horizontal or vertical plane.
- Especially durable materials on ground floor façades 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.
- For a primary building frontage of a commercial use, a minimum of 30% of the area between the height of 2' and 10' above grade shall be in clear window glass that permits a full, unobstructed view of the interior to a depth of at least 4'.

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.

Signs:

Exterior lighting fixtures are the preferred source of illumination.

1. Freestanding Signs

- There shall be no more than one freestanding sign on parcels less than 2 acres in size, and no more than two freestanding signs on parcels 2 acres in size or greater.
- Freestanding signs shall be monument style and no part of any freestanding sign shall exceed an above-grade height of 10'. Sign area shall not exceed 50 square feet per side, excluding the sign base. The sign base shall be integral to the overall sign design and complement the design of the building and landscape.
- Freestanding signs may include the names of up to eight tenants of that parcel.
- Light sources shall be screened from motorist view.

2. Wall-mounted Signs

- Each business occupying 25% or more of a building may have one wall sign and one projection sign. Wall-mounted signs shall not exceed 40 square feet in area, and projection signs shall not exceed 12 square feet in area per side.
- Wall-mounted and projection signs shall be designed appropriately for the building and shall not be constructed as cabinet box signs or have exposed raceways.

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.

Staff Analysis:

The applicant has worked diligently with City staff over the past several years to get to the point where we have an approved project that has evolved over multiple public meetings addressing staff comments, board and commission comments and comments from the community. The plan before you has evolved since it was first presented on February 4, 2016.

The proposed PUD matches exactly what has been approved by the Architectural Review Board, Municipal Planning Commission and the Board of Zoning Appeals.

Rezoning to a PUD gives the City and its citizens the assurance that what has been proposed will be built, maintained and that the mix of uses are agreed to in the future. The City is also working with the applicant on a Development Agreement and Tax Increment Financing Agreement that will go along with the PUD when it goes to City Council for final approval. Any modification to the PUD would require approval in the future.

Recommendations:

Staff recommended approval of the proposed rezoning as it is in compliance with what has been previously approved by the Architectural Review Board, Municipal Planning Commission and the Board of Zoning Appeals.

Staff recommended approval of the Preliminary and Final Plats for the creation of three lots as it met all the criteria outline for a Preliminary and Final Plat approval in the Codified Ordinances for the City of Worthington.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Jack Reynolds, an attorney with Smith & Hale, said they have been before the Board 15 times, the first time in 2017 because at the City's request they filed a rezoning application to rezone the property to WBC-3, and the Board voted at that time to recommend to City Council that it be rezoned. He said they subsequently withdrew that request at City Council and left the property zoned as C-4. Mr. Reynolds said once again, at the City's request, they are requesting to rezone the property to PUD and they are before the Board with exactly what they showed them in progressive meetings over the past three years so they are

basically going back and adopting what was approved. They will present the proposal to City Council as the Board had already approved during the past three years. Mr. Reynolds said what is different this time is the TIF and the Development Agreement that will go before City Council along the same time with the plat to split the lot. He said they need to split the lot because they will be developed separately through different lenders, so it did not make any sense to have all seven acres with different lenders trying to walk all over each other, so this was the easiest way to solve that problem.

Mr. Foust asked if one of the parcels could be sold to a different owner and if that would affect anything in the future such as cross easements or the community. Mr. Brown said no, once the lots are created, they can be sold off but the PUD text and with the Agreements that are on the plat for cross access and cross parking that will go forward whether five years from now or fifty years from now they have the teeth with the PUD text and with what is on the plat. Mr. Brown said the tentative date to go to City Council is Monday, March 18, 2019. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak for or against the application.

Mr. Steve Rosandich, 140 Caren Ave., Worthington, Ohio, said he had been abused by this property for seventeen years. He said he back to the third lot, they want to get separate financing for the third lot and the drawings still show the hotel on High Street. Mr. Rosandich said the building on High Street has not been confirmed yet, and Mr. Coulter said that was correct. He said whatever will be developed on the lot would have to come back for further discussion.

Rezoning Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY THE WITNESS GROUP TO REZONE 7007 N. HIGH ST. FROM C-4, HIGHWAY AND AUTOMOTIVE SERVICES TO A PUD, PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT, AS PER CASE NO. PUD 01-18, DRAWINGS NO. PUD 01-18, DATED AUGUST 31, 2018, BE RECOMMENDED TO CITY COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL BASED ON THE PLANNING GOALS OF THE CITY, AS REFERENCED IN THE LAND USE PLANS, AND ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

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

Mr. Jack Reynolds, attorney with Smith & Hale, reiterated they were seeking the lot split for financing purposes.

Subdivision Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST THE WITNESS GROUP FOR APPROVAL OF PRELIMINARY AND FINAL SUBDIVISION PLAT FOR 7007 N. HIGH ST. AS PER CASE NO. SUB 02-19, DRAWINGS NO. SUB 02-19 DATED FEBRUARY 1, 2019 BE RECOMMENDED TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL BASED ON THE PLANNING GOALS OF THE

CITY, AS REFERENCED IN THE LAND USE PLANS AND 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. Reis, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Hofmann, aye; and Mr. Foust, aye. The motion was approved.

D. Other

Mr. Brown updated the Board and Commission members with the latest approvals from City Council.

E. Adjournment

Mr. Schuster moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. Hofmann. All Board members voted, "Aye," and the meeting adjourned at 11:20 p.m.