

- A sign package, including the May 8, 2012 retail design standards previously approved for the mall are now included as part of the package. This outlines the guidelines for new signage on the buildings.
- The project would be completed in two phases with Phase I being completed within approximately 30-months from approval.

Staff Comments & Items Needing to be Discussed:

The applicant has been working diligently with City staff over the past several months on their application and materials. The list below appears to be a lot of items that need to be corrected, however many are minor items to be corrected and many are required at the PUD Final Plan and Architectural Review Board approval stage in the development process.

- Sheet C-1 needs to be corrected to reflect the removal of the garage entrance on the southern elevation of the new office building in Phase I.
- Exhibit D1 needs to show the setback along Old West Wilson Bridge as 25-feet.
- Exhibit D1 needs to identify the drive on the eastern side of the mall as northbound only.
- Exhibit D1 and other exhibits show conflicting access points. Some show the removal of the existing access point to Old West Wilson Bridge Road behind the Kroger. Clarification needed.
- Exhibit D2 needs to identify the drive on the eastern side of the mall as northbound only.
- Exhibit D2 and other exhibits show conflicting access points. Some show the removal of the existing access point to Old West Wilson Bridge Road behind the Kroger. Clarification needed.
- Exhibit D3 needs to be updated to reflect the realignment of the Mall Drive with the improvements associated with the redevelopment of the Holiday Inn site.
- The elevations for the new Class A office buildings depict a floor height for the Phase I building as 15-feet, however the floor height for the Phase II building is shown as 14' feet. Both show a garage height of 10-feet. Is there a reason for the different heights?
- Exhibit E-10B & E-10C reference proposed garage parking spaces. Is the parking referenced at 100,000 sq. ft. of office or 125,000 sq. ft. of office?
- Exhibit D6A references existing sidewalks along West Wilson Bridge Road and along Old West Wilson Bridge Road. The legend does not match what is shown on the site plan.
 - The site plan also references an existing sidewalk in front of First Financial Bank. There is not an existing sidewalk in this location.
- Exhibit D6A – any future sidewalks along West Wilson Bridge Road and Old West Wilson Bridge Road will need to be a minimum of 5-feet in width.
- A future exhibit showing the location of all proposed stop signs and crosswalk locations will be required.
- Possible sidewalk installation as part of this project in the area in front of First Financial Bank should be discussed.
- Exhibit D6B and the PUD text reference a future east/west access drive in Phase II on the southern end of the property. The footprint of the office building in Phase II may be reduced, however a discussion on how traffic may flow east/west on this portion of the site should be discussed.
- Exhibit D8 – Exhibit D10 conflict in the roadway and crosswalk materials proposed on the site. Clarification is needed.

- Exhibit D8 & Exhibit D10 shows the removal of the existing access point behind Kroger and a new access point to Old West Wilson Bridge Road being inline with the northbound movement of traffic on the eastern side of the mall. Clarification needed.
- Exhibit D15 & E5A reference future onsite and offsite improvements as part of this proposal. Further discussion with the City will be needed on these offsite improvements.
- Exhibit E1 – Phase I building elevation should be updated to reflect a 10-story option with heights.
- Exhibit E1 – Phase I building elevation - possible additional rooftop space if possible, depending on the tenant.
- Exhibit E-1 – Phase I – better understanding of the proposed green wall.
- Exhibit E1 – Phase II building elevation should be updated to reflect a 10-story option with heights. Clarification needed on the difference of 15-feet and 14-feet for office floor heights between Phase I and Phase II office buildings.
- Exhibit E1 – Phase II building has perforated metal screens on the western elevation. Why does this not match with the other elevations of the building?
- Exhibit E1 – Phase II building depicts the building height towards West Wilson Bridge Road, however Exhibit D10 depicts the upper portion of the office building to be setback from West Wilson Bridge Road with just the parking garage part of the structure out by the street. Clarification needed.
- Exhibit E1 – Phase I & Phase II buildings – better idea of what the metal panels and metal louvers will look like.
- Exhibit E2 references a Brick_04 that appears to be a solid blue/gray. Where is this brick proposed to be used on the site?
- Exhibit E3 shows a small green planting strip between the new north/south connector and the pedestrian sidewalks. What is proposed for this area, and do we believe it will be able to survive?
- Exhibit E3 depicts new materials for the roadway and crosswalks. Clarification needed on what this will be once installed.
- Exhibit E3 needs corrected to correctly show the realignment of Mall Drive with the Holiday Inn site.
- Exhibit E3 depicts two access points between the Kroger and the new office building in Phase I. Clarification needed.
- Exhibit E3 depicts a concrete area between Old West Wilson Bridge Road and the new office building in Phase I. Clarification needed.
- Exhibit E3 needs to identify proposed crosswalks on the site to match Exhibit D10.
- Exhibit E3 – all mechanical equipment will need to be adequately screened when each building requests ARB approval.
- Exhibit E4 depicts the Phase II office building setback from the main body of the parking garage. The previous elevations do not match. Clarification needed.
- Exhibit E4 – a better understanding of what the existing portions of the mall will look like once the roof is removed and the east/west pedestrian connector is installed.
- Exhibit E4 shows what appears to be the old copula from the mall as a focal point by the southern edge of the Phase I office building. Clarification needed.
- Exhibit E4 shows the proposed hotel. Additional information is needed to the overall architectural character of this building and the associated heights.

- Additional renderings are needed.
- Additional 3-D renderings are needed showing what the site would look like coming from the west to east along West Wilson Bridge Road and along the western part of the site in the location of the proposed hotel.
- Exhibit E4 – Phase II building depicts ground floor commercial space along the northern portion of the first floor of the parking garage. Clarification needed.
- Exhibit E4 – discussion needed on the proposed materials for the streets, crosswalks and public plaza areas.
- Exhibit E4 depicts the opening of the east/west pedestrian connector, however information is needed on what this area will look like once the roof and cupola are removed.
- Exhibit E4 – a better understanding of the interior walkway that will run parallel to the new north/south connector.
- Exhibit E4 also depicts the greenspace area between the new roadway and the pedestrian walkways. A better understanding of what this will be and how it will be maintained should be discussed.
- Exhibit E4 shows multiple locations for possible public art as focal points on the site in the public area. Discussion around possible public art should be discussed at some point in the overall process.
- Exhibit E5A – additional discussion around offsite improvements should be discussed. Several of the proposed images match with previous plans that have been adopted by City Council, however City funding has not been available. Discussion with the City should continue on these offsite improvements and any grant opportunities to cover the cost of these improvements should be explored.
 - City staff will continue to work with the applicant on any offsite improvements associated with the redevelopment of the site.
- Exhibit E-7A, E-7B, E-8A and E-8B needs to be revised to reflect the removal of the drive access to the new parking garage from the new north/south connector.
- Exhibit E-10B & E-10C needs to be revised to reflect the removal of the drive access to the new parking garage from the new north/south connector.
- ULI Shared Parking Analysis – Exhibit E-10A & E-10B – The Phase I ULI peak ratio references 3.36 for office space, whereas Phase II references 3.21 for office space. Clarification needed.
- There is the possible scenario of a future restriping of the 348 parking spaces in front of Kroger that may provided an additional 40+ parking spaces and/or room for an actual north/south 2-way drive along the eastern side of the mall.
 - There may be an opportunity to add additional tree islands throughout this area of the parking lot, however it may not be realistic. This should be discussed; however, it can be addressed with future applications.
- Traffic Study – Still needed and is underway by the applicant.
 - This will be required to be reviewed and approved prior to MPC making a formal recommendation to City Council. The Traffic Study may influence the amount of office/commercial space permitted in Phase II of the redevelopment.
- Signage Package – Clarification needed on whether the proposed sign package is just for the new buildings or just the office buildings to be constructed on the site.

- Is there a proposed maximum size? The Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Guidelines reference a maximum size of 200 sq. ft. for businesses occupying more than 25% of a building facing I-270.
 - The HN & HIGH NORTH logos on the buildings are considered signs.
- Clarification needed concerning dumpster locations on the site. All dumpsters will be required to be completely screened from view.
- Additional information is needed concerning the removal of the roof and cupola in Phase II to create an open air east/west connector. How will this fit with the overall architecture of the mall. Conceptual information related to how the eastern elevation of the mall will be modified during Phase II would be appropriate. Any future modification or change will still require ARB approval; however, this may help everyone better understand how the different phases will interact with each other on the site.
- Screening and landscaping throughout the site.
- Lighting
- Stormwater will continue to be addressed by detention faults under the parking garage ramps in each phase that will then connect to the existing storm sewer lines on the site.
 - All stormwater will be required to be reviewed and approved by the City and MS Consultants to be in compliance with all local, state and federal requirements for water quantity and quality.
 - An Operation & Maintenance Plan will be required and will be required to be recorded with the Franklin County Recorder.
- Discussion related to possible sustainable practices that might be able to be incorporated into each phase of the redevelopment of the site.
- Discussion related to the overall architectural character and design of the entire site.
 - There have been previous discussions that the Wilson Bridge Road corridor is an area that could deviate from the Worthington Design Guidelines. The majority of the Wilson Bridge Road corridor is located outside of the Architectural Review District. Just the parcels that front on High Street are located in the District. We have previously deviated from the Design Guidelines as it pertains to the mall site, however a greater discussion should occur.
- Proposed Public Space Amenities – Locations to be determined
 - Park Benches
 - Trash Receptacles
 - Bicycle Racks
 - Pet Waste Receptacles
 - Shade Structures
 - Public Art/Sculptures
 - Lighting
 - Seating Areas
 - Enhanced Crosswalks & Pathways
 - Decorative Landscaping
- Discussion related to offsite improvements along Old West Wilson Bridge Road, North High Street and West Wilson Bridge Road.
 - The applicant is in discussion with City staff on possible improvements that would complement the redevelopment of the site and be in compliance with existing plans.

- The City has a Corridor Enhancement Plan that was adopted by City Council in 2015 giving direction for streetscape improvements.
- Locations of fire hydrants, FDCs and a fire flow analysis will eventually be needed for the Division of Fire & EMS Division.
- A travel exhibit will be required to show that the City's Division of Fire & EMS equipment can navigate the site.
- Additional 3D renderings that provide an objective sense of what the topography will look and feel like from multiple directions has been requested.
- An animated version of what the perspective would feel like as a pedestrian or those traveling to the site has been requested.
 - The applicant may have something to share at the time of the meeting.

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 of 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 Road Corridor Study

The Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Study, adopted in 2011, makes recommendations for the Wilson Bridge Road corridor from the Olentangy River to the west to the Railroad Crossing to the east. The Study recommends the need to promote the redevelopment of the Wilson Bridge Road Corridor into a mixed-use area that will generate new economic growth within the City. These requirements are intended to foster development that strengthens land use and economic value; encourage a mix of uses; enhance livability of the area; to augment pedestrian and bicycle connections; and to promote construction of high-quality buildings and public spaces that create and sustain long-term economic vitality.

The 2011 Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Study identifies this area as Mixed-Use with a mix of retail and office and a recommended height of 5-6 stories in height in the area.

Wilson Bridge Corridor Districts

Chapter 1181 was adopted by City Council in 2016 to facilitate implementation of the Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Study, which promotes the redevelopment of the Wilson Bridge Road Corridor into a mixed-use area that will generate new economic growth within the City. These requirements are intended to foster development that strengthens land use and economic value; to encourage a mix of uses; enhance the livability of the area; to augment pedestrian and bicycle connections; and to promote construction of high-quality buildings and public spaces that help create and sustain long-term economic vitality.

The area was recommended for WBC-3 Mixed Use that would allow for a mix of retail and office uses both vertically and horizontally with a maximum height of 4-stories. Retail uses are encouraged on the first floor of multi-floor developments. Pedestrian and public spaces are encouraged. Some residential uses may be appropriate in this area.

Comprehensive Plan Update & 2005 Strategic Plan for Worthington

States that retail development trends appear to be shifting toward mixed-use, adaptive reuse, and entertainment-oriented uses.

Increase Commercial Office Space:

Worthington's office space currently consists of 4% of the total land use. Because the income taxes generated from these office uses are crucial to the City's financial stability, great efforts should be made to encourage the private market to add additional commercial office space within the City. This can be accomplished by converting some land to office use and by allowing increased densities on office sites. This can also be accomplished by keeping vacancy rates low and by encouraging home-based offices and telecommuting in the City. Recommendations include:

- Encourage the renovation and redevelopment of the existing highway office properties to make them more competitive and attractive in the market. Increased densities through expansion and use of structured parking (parking garage) should be promoted.
- Support and work to meet the needs of companies in the business incubators, such as the Worthington Commerce Center.
- Promote the addition of amenities and services around the existing commercial areas to make their location more attractive.
- Work to attract work-at-home employees but develop a system to monitor/capture the income tax from these home office locations.

Freeway Commercial Area:

- Promote the improvement of the Worthington Square area, including redevelopment of the west side. Encourage a mix of uses including urban village residential development based on a town center design with streets that create synergy with the mall and street level retail. New development in this location will improve this retail node and return regional focus to the mall and highway commercial area.
- Consider allowing phased redevelopment of existing office space – such that new structures are placed on the site adding to or replacing the existing building. This will be facilitated by the inclusion and integration of structured parking. Phasing may create situations where the site does not meet parking code, but this is acceptable on a temporary basis.

Chapter 1174 - Planned Unit District - PUD

The purpose of Planned Unit Development is to promote variety, flexibility and quality for the development of properties in the City of Worthington. Planned Unit Development allows for more creative planning and design and enables a greater range of uses than traditional Zoning regulations. Planned Unit Development allows for the design and mix of uses necessary to meet changing economic and demographic demands; permits implementation of development standards, plans, studies, and guidelines adopted by the City Council; and provides the opportunity to retain and enhance the character of the City, and the health, safety and general welfare of the inhabitants.

City Initiatives

The City has been evaluating the Old West Wilson Bridge Road and Corporate Hill intersections for quite some time and are in the process of designing improvements in this area. This includes the possible extension of Corporate Hill Drive to Old West Wilson Bridge Road. Additionally, as part of our continued efforts to look at traffic in this area, we have our traffic consultant Carpenter Marty evaluating short, medium- and long-term opportunities to improving traffic flow at the Wilson Bridge and High Street intersection. We expect this study to be completed during the project review and will help inform and guide decision making.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended tabling of these applications to give the applicant time to address staff comments and gather additional input from the Board & Commission members and the community.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter reminded those who were listening that this meeting was for informational purposes only, and there would be several more meetings for discussion before the Board would take a vote. The applicant, David Watson, said some of the changes included a suggestion made by Mr. Hofmann about the streetscape area near Kroger. Mr. Watson showed example photos of the same size spaces and how the area could look. The second change they made was because of the comments they heard about the building height on West Wilson Bridge Road. Mr. Watson said they were proposing an eight-story building which caused some people to pause. In an effort to address that concern, they moved the building north on the four-story garage where it is no longer right on Wilson Bridge Road. The existing multi-family would hide most of that building. Mr. Watson said the third thing they wanted to discuss, since they would be tearing out the central corridor of the mall out, and making it available to vehicles one-way northbound, was the western elevations of the retailers on the east side of the mall would now be exposed to weather, so what could they do to change that side of the promenade to be most appealing to pedestrians, but practical for those retailers that only front the western elevation.

Mr. Watson said they must be very attentive to the western side because it violates some of the basic retail and restaurant rules. It does not have any convenient parking other than the garage. There is no convenient at-grade parking, and that area cannot be seen from the lot or from the anchor store, Kroger. Mr. Watson said they need to create real activation, real engagement, a sense of openness to get the consumer to come from the eastern side to the western side of the mall.

He said in the paranoia in the design process of making sure that the restaurants and the retail space in the plaza are fully activated and fully successful in a place where people really want to gravitate to, they feel there needs to be some at-grade parking, so they changed the two-way road to a one-way northbound road with forty-five degree parking that would service those retailers that are immediately adjacent to it on the east side. They felt it was important to have some at-grade parking for those retailers. Mr. Watson said they were successful with discussions with Kroger and they exchanged site plans, and ideas, and they were also encouraged to fix what they see is a difficult ingress/egress access. They proposed eliminating the short curb as you drive north into the mall area. Instead of having to turn immediately left or right when turning into the mall, you would be able to drive straight through which would help the traffic from West Wilson Bridge Road. Restriping Kroger's parking spaces to 90-degree angles instead of 45 degrees would allow them to pick up 38 spaces. He said with the east and west passageway being created at Kroger would change the way people choose to move around the shopping center. They believe the western movement, with Kroger's drive to the west, which would take you to Corporate Hill Drive and take you back to the signal which would be more convenient than the signal that already exists now. Mr. Watson discussed the rendering which gave an overview of connectivity and would include the current bus stop. There would be a two-way road on the eastern side of the mall to make it easier to navigate the site.

Mr. Watson continued his presentation and showed photographs of what they would like the entrance to Worthington to look like, using Worthington's style of brickwork in front of a black wrought iron fence. They want people to feel that they have arrived and want to be competitive with other Class A Office markets. They plan to use the same brick and stone cast features to make the architectural elements complimentary and they plan to carry the look around to West Wilson Bridge Road so it frames the entrance to the City of Worthington. Mr. Coulter asked Mrs. Bitar is there were any callers or emails, and she said there was a caller waiting to speak.

Mr. Tom Burns, 1006 Kilbourne Dr., Worthington, Ohio, said he wanted to thank both city staff members and the applicants for all their hard work addressing the concerns that had been raised. Mr. Burns felt they did a great job of minimizing the impact and maximizing the benefits of this project. He also felt this location was the perfect spot for this type of project. There were no other speakers.

Mr. Reis said he wanted to applaud Retail Partners for their interest in things he felt were important to the residents of Worthington and their attention to the things they want as part of the community, such as the green space, and a space for gathering. He liked the idea of the drive being able to be closed for holidays and weekends so special events like the farmers market could be held there. Mr. Reis said he also liked their attention to vehicular circulation, and he looked forward to hearing more details about that.

Mrs. Bitar read an email from Mr. Mick Ball, who said it was good to see the plans to accommodate traffic and pedestrians, and the drives to the retail shops and great to see the collaboration with Kroger. He appreciated the hard work done by the developer and the City for this exciting project.

Mr. Hofmann thanked Mr. Watson and his team for listening he felt the plans were getting better. He said he strongly urged pulling in an expert to address the negative space. He believed Retail Partners has done a great job so far but said there were experts that specialized in certain areas that could really help in terms of circulation. Mr. Hofmann felt there could be a little more thinking about how the east and west sections would work. He said he greatly appreciated what was done for the north and south corridor. Mr. Hofmann said he was not bothered by the thought of parking in that zone if the parking was camouflaged such as paving the area to feel more pedestrian but also striping the pavers for when you need them.

Mr. Coulter said he had questions about Phase II and if that building became a hotel, how people working from home, and traveling would affect the hotel.

Mrs. Holcombe asked what the site would look like if you were driving south on High Street from the Crosswoods area. She wants to see what people will see as they enter Worthington. Mr. Watson said he could do that.

Mr. Eric Fisher, 256 Caren Ave., Worthington, Ohio, felt the building along West Wilson Bridge Road would be too tall for Phase II of the development.

Mr. Watson showed a two-minute fly through video.

Mr. Brown said he would like to have the discussion that was outlined in the staff memo. He said a lot of the things in the staff memo were little things that may seem more overwhelming than they really are. Some of the items have already been tweaked since the staff memo went out and evolved since the meeting on September 24, 2020. Mr. Brown said a lot of things would come back for discussion for the Final Plan of the PUD and Architectural Review Board approval if City Council were to rezone this to a PUD. This would still have to go from the Municipal Planning Commission to City Council for approval in some form whether approval, or approval with modifications or denial. Mr. Brown said the applicant has been able to hit on a lot of the comments, questions and concerns that city staff has had related to the circulation on the site, and their due diligence of working with Kroger. Mr. Brown said staff still had some concerns with the east and west circulation in Phase II and he would also like to hear more discussion about the hotel proportion of the project for Phase II. He believed Worthington would like a hotel within the city limits. They were hopeful for what would have happened on the Holiday Inn site, but then the modifications, Covid, and then the loss of funding for the project. Worthington still desires to have a hotel but a lot of that depends on the evolution of what has happened to the hotel industry in the Crosswoods area. City staff still believes with this development and redevelopment of the mall site that will spur interest in a Worthington hotel. He said it was in the text the hotel could be 8 to 10 stories in height and has the option after two years to have a residential component of up to 100 units. Mr. Brown said staff still had reservations on the apartment component and the time frame of the conversion associated with that. They felt maybe there should be a longer time frame associated with that to give Phase I enough time to get up and running. Mr. Brown said maybe they see how Phase I does and they look at the hotel site being a hotel or future office but if they wanted to do some type of apartments they would then need to come back and amend their PUD in the future. Mr. Coulter said obviously if the hotel did not work out they would not want it sitting there not being used they would rather see it creatively re-developed and that is something

they could work out later on down the road in a positive light. He said the advantage of doing this as a PUD is what that allows them to do as a Board and Commission. Mr. Brown said what you have on the current site is the C-2 Community Shopping Center zoning and you also have a development plan on the site and then you throw another layer of architectural review on top of that. He said with the PUD, what is going to go forward is the development plan, and the text, go hand in hand with the ARB-MPC and then onto City Council. What would typically happen is any modification or change to that would require MPC approval and/or can cause City Council to revisit the PUD to amend it.

Mrs. Bitar said there was an additional email from Michael Bates who wanted to know if they could get a perspective from West Wilson Bridge Road buildings looking north and comparing the Phase II building to the OSU Wexner medical offices building. Mr. Bates said he supported the project but believed modifications were still needed.

Mr. Watson requested to table the application. Mr. Reis moved to table the application and Mr. Foust seconded the motion. All Board members voted, "Aye," and the application was tabled.

Mr. Coulter wanted to make sure for the next meeting they discuss the traffic patterns along the east and north sides and how traffic will enter and exit along West Wilson Bridge Road, and signaling, and lighting. Mr. Coulter said he was comfortable with the over parking for the office space in Phase I and asked if there had been any studies for drainage and Mr. Brown said they had and the information was in the back of the packet of information. Mr. Brown said they were still working on a traffic study with E.M.H.&T. They have looked at stormwater and the study was reviewed by the City's Engineer. The tentative proposal is to have vaults in the parking garage that would be able to take the stormwater in and then gradually release it in our system, and it would be all federal, state, and local guidelines for water quality and water quantity. Mr. Coulter asked if any Agreements would be needed by the developer with Kroger and Mr. Watson said they were working with Kroger for an Easement Agreement. Ms. Hinz said she looked forward to more detailed drawings.

Mr. Myers said he had a difficult time trying to locate where they intend the bike path to be along the far eastern north and south road. How would the multi-use trail be incorporated into this site? Mr. Brown explained this proposal would not interfere with the multi-use trail.

Mr. Watson requested to table the PUD application. Mr. Reis moved to table the application and Mr. Foust seconded the motion. All Board members voted, "Aye," and the application was tabled.

D. Architectural Review Board - New

1. Garage Addition Roof – **690 Evening St.** (Chad Kiner) **AR 69-2020** (Amendment to AR 04 & 45-2020)

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This house was built in the early 1900's and is a two-story Colonial Revival style house. Approval was granted in 2015 and 2016 by the ARB to allow renovation of the house and replacement of the garage. Earlier this year the ARB approved plans to construct an addition at the rear of the garage that would function as an enclosed sport court.

This application would change the roofing on the addition.

Project Details:

1. The garage addition was approved to be 33' wide, and ~31.6' deep, located 10.2' from the rear property line.
2. The roof was supposed to match the asphalt shingles on the house and garage, but that roofing is no longer available. Instead, the owner would like to install standing seam metal roofing that is 16" wide and would be Charcoal gray.

Land Use Plans:Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

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

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of this application. Rather than trying to match the asphalt shingles with a different product, the proposed roofing should be compatible and was appropriate for this type of structure in the District.

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar swore in the applicant, Caitlyn Miller, 690 Evening St., Worthington, Ohio. Ms. Miller said there would be space between the new roof and the existing roofline. Mr. Foust said he does not like the roof at Lennonheads due to the intermediate ridgelines/channels between the seams. He said he would want to make sure the roof was a truer standing seam metal roof. Mr. Coulter said he would ask the applicant to see a sample of the material. Ms. Miller said the product did not have ridge lines. Mr. Hofmann said the height of the seam and the dimension between the seams were also important elements in determining acceptability from his point of view. He said he agreed with Mr. Foust, and felt the ridges between the seams were not desirable. Mrs. Bitar asked Ms. Miller to show her sample, would agreed there were some ridges between seams rather than being flat. Mr. Foust said he would prefer City Staff to take a look at the sample in person, so Ms. Miller said she would provide the sample. Mr. Coulter asked if there were any callers or emails and Mrs. Bitar said no. Mrs. Hinz said in looking on the manufacturer's website she found roofing that was flat between seams in addition to the version with striations.

Motion:

Mr. Foust moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY CHAD KINER FOR APPROVAL TO AMEND CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS NOS. AR 04 & 45-2020 WITH A CHANGE TO THE ROOFING ON THE GARAGE ADDITION AT 690 EVENING ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 69-2020, DRAWINGS NO. AR 69-2020, DATED OCTOBER 1, 2020, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING AND WITH THE CLARIFICATION THAT THE SAMPLE WOULD BE PROVIDED TO CITY STAFF FOR FINAL APPROVAL.

Mr. Reis seconded the motion. Mr. Brown called the roll. Ms. Hinz, aye; Mr. Schuster, aye; Mr. Hoffman, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; Mr. Foust, aye; and Mr. Coulter, aye. The motion was approved.

2. New ATMs – 800 High St. (Powerhouse Retail Services/Huntington National Bank) AR 71-2020

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

The signage and ATMs (with signage) for the Huntington Bank site were changed in 2011 to reflect the new brand for the bank. With this application new drive-thru and walk-up ATMs are proposed and the applicant would like to modify the signage.

Project Details:

1. The walk-up ATM is on the south side of the building. The new surround would be of a similar size to the existing. Non-illuminated push through acrylic lime green logo and white lettering are proposed at the top of the surround, with a curved lime green line and “Welcome” in white below. Lime green is also proposed around the remainder of the surround. The drawing indicates the green is non-illuminated but then goes on to say they would be lit with LEDs. It is unclear what is intended. Also, it is not clear if the black awning would remain.
2. For the drive-thru, the cabinet appears to be smaller than the existing. The topper is proposed with the same logo and lettering and a green line and “Welcome” below, however, internal illumination is proposed for those elements. In addition, green logos are proposed on both sides.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Guideline recommendations for signage include being efficient in using signs. Try to use as few and as small signs as are necessary to get the business message across to the public. Signage,

including the appropriateness of signage to the building, is a standard of review per the Architectural District ordinance.

Staff Analysis:

- The proposed ATMs incorporate a lot of the lime green color that was not approved in 2011. The extensive use of color is not appropriate in Old Worthington.
- The walk-up unit should not have green around the outside.
- Internal illumination is not necessary on the drive-thru unit. Also, the logos on the sides should not be allowed – variances would be necessary for additional wall signs.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended modification of this application to allow only what was approved in 2011 which was basic signage on the front of the toppers and no additional lime green or logos. Basic signage was acceptable for ATMs but additional signage in the way of bright colors and illumination is not necessary or appropriate in the District. Once people are on the bank site it is not difficult to find the ATMs so it seems the proposed is meant to advertise off site.

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar swore in the applicant, Ms. Jennifer Tiner, on behalf of 800 High St., Worthington, Ohio. Ms. Tiner said regarding the bollards, the company would like the bollards to be green because that is the company color. She said she would check with the manufacture to see if the signage along side the ATM could be removed for the drive-up unit. Mr. Hofmann said he agreed with Mrs. Bitar about most of the comments. He said banks sometime tend to overbrand and people going to the bank will already know this is Huntington Bank. He said the Board would appreciate toning down as much of the signage and green as possible. Mr. Hofmann said he understood the branding and that the ATM's were produced to go everywhere but he hoped Huntington would still be able to make a few adjustments. Mr. Coulter explained they had a similar issue with Chase Bank and they asked them to do the same thing. Ms. Tiner said it was probably possible to remove the illumination part of the sign, but what would happen if the manufacturer was unable to remove the signage. Mr. Coulter said they would ask that a flat cover or panel be placed over the sign. That was nothing would be left open or exposed. Mr. Coulter asked if there were any additional callers or emails and Mrs. Bitar said no.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY POWERHOUSE RETAIL SERVICES FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL NEW ATMS AT 800 HIGH ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 71-2020, DRAWINGS NO. AR 72-2020, DATED OCTOBER 5, 2020, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING AND AMENDED THAT THE SIGNS COLOR AND LIGHTING BE REVIEWED BY CITY STAFF PRIOR TO ANY OTHER FURTHER INSTALLATION.

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

3. Signage – **6733 N. High St.** (Samantha Elliot/Goddard School) **AR 72-2020**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

The Architectural Review Board, Municipal Planning Commission and ultimately City Council approved the construction of a new 8,565 sq. ft. Goddard School on a newly created 1.013-acre parcel that was originally part of the 4-acre lot owned and operated by Schoedinger Funeral and Cremation Services and the Commission approved a Conditional Use Permit to operate a preschool in the C-3 Zoning District. The building is currently being constructed and the owner is now requesting approval of wall and freestanding signs.

Project Details:

1. Signage is proposed on the gable above the front door of the new building. A 3' x 3' round HDU logo with a blue background and a white horse head design applied to the front would be in the peak of the gable. At the bottom of the gable, "THE GODDARD SCHOOL" in individual 15" high blue HDU letters is proposed.
 - The sign areas would be 9 square feet for the logo and 26 square feet for the lettering but would constitute two wall signs where only one sign is allowed.
 - If measured as one sign, the Code requires measurement by use of a rectangle around the outside limits of a sign. Such sign would be about 140 square feet in area which is larger than would be allowed.
2. The proposed freestanding sign would consist of a double faced 8' wide x 3'4" high HDU 8" wide cabinet painted white with blue lettering and a logo etched into the background. The bottom ~8" would be a blue band with a white vinyl phone number and web address stuck to the background. On the side of the sign, which would face N. High St., address numbers are proposed. The plan indicates an 8.7' wide x 2'2" high stone base with a stone cap. Location shows the sign foundation being 1' from the right-of-way. The Code requires signs be 10' from the right-of-way.
 - The proposed sign is about 26.6 square feet per side for a total of 53.3 square feet of sign area. If the decorative supporting structure were no wider than 8' and no higher than 2' its area would not have to count toward sign area. Because it is larger, total sign area would be ~48 square feet per side for a total of 96 square feet of sign area.
3. Allowable sign area:
 - Total = 100 square feet
 - Freestanding sign = 60 square feet (or 30 square feet per side)
 - Wall sign = 100 minus freestanding sign area

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Page 23 of 33

ARB/MPC October 22, 2020

Minutes

The Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance recommend signs be efficient and compatible with the age and architecture of the building. 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. Exposed raceways or wiring are not desirable. The Architectural District Ordinance calls for design and materials to be compatible.

Worthington Sign Code – Chapter 1170

1170.04 MEASUREMENT.

- (a) Sign area is calculated by totaling all display areas of a sign, including sign faces, molding and framing, but excluding supporting members less than or equal to twenty-four inches in width.
- (b) Planters or other decorative supporting structures shall be excluded in the computation of sign area unless the structure exceeds two feet in height or eight feet in length, in which case the entire structure shall be included in the computation of sign area.
- (c) The area for wall-mounted signs which consist of individually mounted letters, numbers or other symbols on a fascia or wall shall be the area of a rectangle circumscribed around the letters, numbers or other symbols.

1170.05 COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT REQUIREMENTS.

- (a) Sign area. Allowable permanent sign area for any single business shall be limited according to the widths of the building or part of the building occupied by such enterprise. For the purposes of this section, width shall be measured along the building face nearest parallel to the street line. In the case of a corner lot, either frontage may be used in determining maximum area for signage. The area of all permanent signs for any single business shall be equivalent to one and one-half square feet of sign area for each lineal foot of width of the building or part of the building, but shall not exceed a maximum area of 100 square feet per business.
- (b) Wall-mounted signage. Each business shall be permitted one wall-mounted sign.
- (c) Freestanding Signage. There shall be no more than one freestanding sign per parcel. No part of any freestanding sign shall exceed an above-grade height of fifteen feet. Freestanding signs shall not be larger than sixty percent (60%) of the total sign area allowed for under Section [1170.05](#) (a). Freestanding signs shall be located not closer than ten feet to a public right of way or thirty-five feet to an adjoining property line.

Staff Analysis:

1. An effort should be made to conform to all Code requirements. If the applicant feels that is not possible, variances would be needed by way of an Amendment to Development Plan.
2. Rather than include the phone number and website on the freestanding sign, the address should be in the bottom blue band rather than on the edge of the sign.
3. The decorative base should be constructed with brick to match the building rather than stone.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended modification of the proposed signs based on the above analysis.

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar swore in the applicant, Sam Baker, on behalf of 6733 N. High St., Worthington, Ohio. Mrs. Bitar said she received an email from the sign company with several questions. Mr. Baker said the sign would not be in the easement. He said the owners wanted to make sure the City was approving of the signs. Reduction of sign size was discussed. Mr. Baker requested to table the application.

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

4. Fencing – **5750 N. High St.** (Meyers + Associates Architecture/St. Michael) **AR 73-2020**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

St. Michael Catholic Church has operated an elementary school for many years and would like to partially enclose the site with fencing for the safety of the children.

Project Details:

1. The proposed fencing would be along the eastern property line to the Selby Blvd. parking lot; along the 135’ wide northern edge of that parking lot; and returning south to the eastern wall of the building.
2. A 6’ high black wrought iron picket fence is proposed with two horizontal rails at the top and one at the bottom. A green semi-transparent wind screen would be added to the 220’ of fencing along the east property line, which also is lined with existing vegetation. The 45’ section that returns to the building would include a 24’ wide mechanical sliding gate with “Saint Michael” lettering and a depiction of the saint between the words. Also, a section of fencing that is collapsible for fire and emergency access would be included.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Architectural District Ordinance

Fences have long been used to mark property boundaries, to restrict access to properties by people and animals and for decorative purposes. They serve these traditional purposes in Worthington and can add to the character of a neighborhood when they are well executed and properly cared for. Fencing should be open in style; constructed with traditional materials; 3’ to 4’ in height; in the back yard; and of simple design, appropriate for the house style. Consider using natural plant materials instead of fences.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of this application. Although fencing is recommended to be no higher than 4’ in the Architectural Review District, exceptions have been made for school uses. The proposed style is very open except for the stretch with the wind screen, which is the least visible section of fencing from the right of way.

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar swore in the applicant, Chris Meyers, representing Meyers & Associates Architects, on behalf of 5750 N. High St., Worthington, Ohio. He said he is on the St. Michael School Advisory Board. Mr. Meyers said they were not proposing any chain link style of fencing. Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Meyers why the wind screening was necessary, and Mr. Meyers said the children’s play area backed up to a row of apartments. The screening was privacy for not only the school, but also for the residents of the apartments. Mr. Foust asked if there had been any discussions with the neighbors about the windscreen and Mr. Meyers said no, it was all rental property. There were no other callers or emails.

Motion:

Mr. Foust moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY ST. MICHAEL CHURCH FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL NEW FENCING AT 5750 N. HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 73-2020, DRAWINGS NO. AR 73-2020, DATED OCTOBER 9, 2020, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

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

- 5. New Deck, Addition and Driveway Modifications – **151 E. Granville Rd.** (SBA Studios/Witsken) **AR 75-2020** (Amendment to AR 42-2020)

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

The two-story house on this property was constructed in 1880 on a 66’ wide x ~345’ deep property that is adjacent to the Sharon Memorial Hall and the American Legion. A request to construct a new rear addition, paint the house, and modify the front porch was approved at the Boards meeting on July 9th.

This request involves the addition of a rear deck, and door, window and driveway modifications.

Project Details:

- 1. A deck is now proposed to the rear of the house and west of the addition. The existing covered steps would be removed, and the door would be changed to a window. Two existing double-hung windows to the rear are now shown as replaced with patio doors providing access to the deck. The windows, siding and door styles would match those on the existing house. Steps are proposed on the rear and west sides of the deck, which would be constructed of Timbertech material.

2. Expansion of the driveway to the south to line up with the garage, and east to line up with the house is proposed.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Decks and patios should be limited to the rear of buildings. Decks should be built of wood and kept low to the ground. Finishes should be either paint or an opaque stain to match the color of the building or its trim. Patios may be constructed of concrete, stone or brick. Consider the style of the house when designing decks and patios, since some styles and some designs are not compatible.

Parking areas should be located as far to the rear of a property as possible. Avoid locating parking in front yard areas. Side yards may be appropriate for parking, but it should be located as far to the rear as possible and screened from the street with landscaping, fencing or walls. Consider small-sized “pea” gravel, brick or simulated brick or stone as paving materials.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of this application as the proposed plans were appropriate for the District.

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar swore in the applicant, Scott Baker from SBA Studios, for 151 E. Granville Rd., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Baker clarified they would be removing the back porch and stoop and replace with the deck. Board members had no questions or concerns. Mr. Coulter asked if there were any callers or emails and Mrs. Bitar said no.

Motion:

Mr. Schuster moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY SBA STUDIOS ON BEHALF OF ANNE WITSKEN TO MODIFY CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS AR 42-2020 BY ADDING A DECK AND MODIFYING THE HOUSE AND DRIVEWAY AT 151 E. GRANVILLE RD. AS PER CASE NO. AR 75-2020 DRAWINGS NO. AR 75-2020, DATED OCTOBER 9, 2020, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

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

6. Addition & Renovation Modifications – **50 E. Granville Rd.** (Schorr Architects/ Kilbourne Middle School) **AR 76-2020** (Amendment to AR 01-2020)

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

(James) Kilbourne Middle School was constructed in 1938 and is a contributing building in the Worthington Historic District. The two-story brick building has many decorative features that contribute to the Georgian styling of the building. The eastern portion of the building was added in 1965 and an addition to the gym was constructed on the east side in 1994. Other than those additions, the approved projects over the years have involved maintenance of the building and site.

The ARB approved an addition on the east side of the building to accommodate additional classroom and cafeteria space, and a new location for the school office at its February 27, 2020 meeting.

This application is a request to modify the windows and add a door.

Project Details:

1. The shape and basic style of the proposed windows still match those on the existing school. All windows are proposed with a stone sill, a brick soldier course above, and a keystone. The windows are now proposed to be fixed with two-planes rather than double-hung.
2. A door is needed on the west façade of the addition for roof access to mechanical units.

Land Use Plans:Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Observe the size, proportions, and spacing of windows on Old Worthington buildings. Use these as a guide in developing a new building design to enhance the new structure's compatibility with existing buildings.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of this application as the proposed changes were appropriate. Although they would be fixed, the proposed windows being offset would still give the look of windows that would open.

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar swore in the applicant, Nathan Gammella representing Schorr Architects, on behalf of the Worthington Schools. He said they were currently investigating the pricing option for the fixed window. He said this application was not necessarily go to all in and switch to a fixed window at this time, they are asking for pre-approval if they find a fixed window that is substantially less expensive than the operable window that the Board felt would be acceptable for the district. Mr. Coulter asked if this was a cost issue or a safety issues and the applicant said it was a cost issue. Mr. Coulter said he was okay with the proposal either way. Mr. Schuster asked if the window example that was shown was the actual window or if they would have to come back with the specific window. The applicant said the window in the rendering was a fixed window that was a Graham window. He said they would make sure the look would be the same, but possibly not the Graham brand. Mr. Coulter said he was familiar with the brand and that those windows were probably one of the better brands available. He said the company does a wonderful job of matching historical windows. Ms. Hinz said she was concerned about operability because of the current pandemic situation and the schools are operating now with open windows letting in fresh air. She

had concerns with fixed windows. The applicant said they were still looking at options and it would have to be a drastic reduction in costs for them to make the change.

Motion:

Mr. Schuster moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY SCHORR ARCHITECTS ON BEHALF OF THE WORTHINGTON SCHOOLS TO AMEND THE PREVIOUS CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS FOR AN ADDITION AT KILBOURNE MIDDLE SCHOOL AT 50 E. GRANVILLE RD., AS PER CASE NO. AR 76-2020, DRAWINGS NO. AR 76-2020, DATED OCTOBER 9, 2020, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

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

7. Fence Modifications – **184 E. Granville Rd.** (Ellen Bloch) **AR 77-2020** (Amendment to AR 30-2020)

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This house was originally built in 1930 and is two-stories with a gabled roof and a one-story addition to the rear. In June of 2015, approval was granted to construct a 9' x 9' addition with a deck at the northeast corner of the house, and amendments were approved later that year and in March of 2016. In September of 2018 the Board approved a planter on the eastern edge of the deck, and string lighting for the deck. In 2019 a shed was approved in July; retaining walls in the front, a patio to the rear, and painting were approved in September; and a railing for the front porch was approved in October. The painting project led to replacement of the siding. In December a proposed rear yard fence was denied. Not all of the approved projects were constructed, and the house was sold. The new owner received approval in May to install fencing around a portion of the rear yard.

This is a request to modify that approval by allowing the fence to extend further to the rear.

Project Details:

1. A fence to enclose the rear yard is proposed that would extend to the 30' rear setback.

2. The proposed style continues to be a 48" high black metal picket fence.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

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

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of this application. The proposed fence complies with the Design Guidelines.

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar said she received 8 emails that were opposed to this request and they cited reasons such as the wide open green space in the back; this would change the character of the neighborhood; they like the historic open area; they felt this is a unique area; and the fence would not help with water issues the property was experiencing. She said they also received 5 emails in support of the fence. A couple of the emails were from former owners of the property that said this area warrants the need for a fence if you have small children and/or pets because of the proximity to the dangerous road. Mrs. Bitar said there were also neighbors in the area that sent in supportive emails. She said City staff felt the black metal fence was not obtrusive.

Mrs. Bitar swore in the applicant, Ellen Bloch, 184 E. Granville Rd., Worthington, Ohio. Ms. Bloch said she does need to come up with a solution for the standing water issues that occur on her property three or four times a year. Ms. Bloch said she discussed the issue with professional landscapers, and excavators to evaluate what her options were, but she learned if she fixed her issues that would create issues for someone else. She said she also explored the option of a rain garden that would absorb the water. Ms. Bloch said the area had not flooded since May, but the grass was still stained, and you could still see the damage. She was hoping to extend the fence back to include the area which floods so she could properly landscape the area.

Mr. Foust asked if was possible to landscape without having a fence to mark the edge of the landscaping. Ms. Bloch said she wanted the fence because she has small children and a small dog, and she would have more landscaping options if the fence was back further. Mr. Coulter asked if the rain garden could be placed on either side of the fence that was already approved without trying to move the fence back. He felt there was a lot of work to reach the previous compromise. Ms. Bloch said when she accepted that compromise she did not understand how big the rain garden would need to be. She wanted to maximize the use of her yard. Mr. Foust said both parties are typically unhappy with a good compromise. Ms. Bloch said the only impact the fence would have on the neighboring properties would be the view from the back yard which the neighbors do not own. The impact to her was so much greater. She said she has followed the City's Design Guidelines, and as a homeowner, she would like to use her property the way she wants to, which includes having a fence.

Mr. Coulter asked how many additional feet the fence would be extended, and Ms. Bloch said approximately forty feet. Mr. Coulter asked Mrs. Bitar if the fence would still be thirty feet back from the setback and Mrs. Bitar said yes.

Ms. Hinz said she was struggling with this because of the previous compromise, but she also understood this is her property, and she has followed the Design Guidelines. Ms. Hinz said she would have liked to see more information about the rain garden as the reason to move the fence line back further. She said she drove past the property earlier in the day and noticed the neighbors on Franklin Street had a privacy fence just a few doors down. Ms. Hinz said she would like to see the rain garden as part of the plan if that is the justification for moving the fence. Ms. Bloch thought she should note have to show the rain garden. Mr. Coulter felt showing it would help to justify the fenced in area. Mr. Hofmann said he understood the issues concerning water and asked if there were other options such as a French drain. Ms. Bloch said she was told a French drain would not work for her situation because the distance from storm sewer and the proximity of the neighboring property already has one. She said she also felt she was compromising by not elevating her property which would cause the water problems for the neighbors. Mrs. Holcombe said she understood the issue of living on Granville Road the need for a fence. She said she liked Mrs. Hinz's suggestion of tabling the application and coming back with a landscape plan. Mrs. Holcombe said she felt a landscape plan would explain the need to extend the fence and that was what the Board was looking for. Mr. Schuster said another thing they were struggling with was how the neighbors were feeling about their area of the community and he felt it was important to be considerate of the neighbors.

Mr. Reis said he felt bad for Ms. Bloch. She owns a piece of property, she has followed the Design Guidelines, and she has the right to have a fence. He said as Ms. Hinz mentioned earlier, there is another fence in the area. She wants to enclose her yard for the safety of her children, and pets, and he felt the issue about needing information about the rain garden was absurd. She can build the garden and build the fence and he is in support of her proposal. He said this matter has been beat to death and he said he was sorry. Mr. Coulter said he agreed with what Mr. Reis said and understood his frustration. Ms. Hinz said what she was looking for with the rain garden drawing is a reason to overturn precedent in this scenario because this is going back to what was requested before. She felt once they see the plan it may be easier to say no to the neighbors, and also suggested maybe cutting the fence down to three feet.

Mrs. Bitar said there were several callers waiting to speak.

Mr. Tom Burns, 1006 Kilbourne Dr., Worthington, Ohio, said he agreed with Mr. Reis. He said he did not understand why there was a problem with a homeowner, who has followed the design guidelines, wants a rain garden and a fence for the security of her children. He said the Design Guidelines are not supposed to consider whether or not you are a good neighbor. The Guidelines spell out how your neighbors would not be impacted. He felt the Guidelines should also take into account safety and he fully supported the application. Mr. Burns said if his neighbors did not want him having a fence and a rain garden, then he would elevate his yard and let his neighbors deal with water issues.

Ms. Tracy Hartwick, said she lives west of 184 E. Granville Rd., Worthington, Ohio, and she sits on her back patio every morning and has her coffee. She said she made no hesitation when her neighbors put up a shed which blocked her view. Ms. Hartwick said another neighbor has a beautiful garden. She said she opposed the fence because it hinders her view. There were no other speakers.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY ELLEN BLOCH TO AMEND CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS AR 30-2020 BY CHANGING THE EXTENT OF PROPOSED FENCING AT 184 E. GRANVILLE RD. AS PER CASE NO. AR 77-2020, DRAWINGS NO. AR 77-2020, DATED OCTOBER 9, 2020, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

Mrs. Holcombe seconded the motion. Mr. Brown called the roll. Mr. Schuster, nay; Mr. Foust, nay; Ms. Hinz, aye; Mr. Hofmann, nay; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; and Mr. Coulter, nay. The motion was denied.

8. New Roof & Windows – 686 Evening St. (Mikel Coulter) AR 74-2020

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This house was constructed in 1955 and is a contributing property in the Worthington Historic District. The garage also contributes to the District. This request is for approval to change part of the roof and the garage windows.

Project Details:

1. The main gable of the house runs north-south, and there is a shed roof dormer on the northern two-thirds of the rear of the roof. The entire roof consists of asphalt shingles. The owner would like to change the roofing on the shallower dormer roof to black EPDM, which is a synthetic rubber roofing membrane.
2. The garage has sliding windows on the north and east sides of the garage. White double-hung windows are proposed in their place.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Repair and retain existing traditional roofs such as wood shingle or slate. Compatibility of design and materials, exterior detail and relationships, and window treatment are standards of review in the Architectural District ordinance. Older outbuildings, sheds, and garages should be retained and repaired. They add variety and visual interest to the streetscape and are part of Worthington's character.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of this application as the shallow roof in the rear could not be easily seen. New windows would not change the character of the garage.

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar swore in the applicant, Mr. Mikel Coulter, 686 Evening St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Coulter said their roof is leaking and has damaged the interior of his home. Board members had no questions or concerns. There were no calls or emails.

Motion:

Mr. Foust moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY MIKEL COULTER FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL A NEW ROOF ON THE REAR OF THE HOUSE AND REPLACE THE GARAGE WINDOWS AT 686 EVENING ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 74-2020 DRAWINGS NO. AR 74-2020, DATED OCTOBER 9, 2020, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

Mrs. Holcombe seconded the motion. Mr. Brown called the roll. Mr. Schuster, aye; Ms. Hinz, aye; Mr. Hofmann, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Foust, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; and Mr. Coulter, abstained. The motion was approved.

E. Other

There was no other business to discuss.

F. Adjournment

Mr. Hofmann moved to adjourn the meeting, and Mr. Foust seconded the motion. All Board members voted, "Aye," and the meeting adjourned at 10:34 p.m.