

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING  
WORTHINGTON ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD  
WORTHINGTON MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION  
VIRTUAL MEETING  
November 12, 2020**

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; Edwin Hofmann; David Foust; Richard Schuster; and Susan Hinz. Also present were Scott Myers, Worthington City Council Representative; Lee Brown, Director of Planning & Building; and Lynda Bitar, Planning Coordinator. Commission member Kathy Holcombe, Secretary, was absent.

**A. Call to Order - 7:00 pm**

1. Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance – Tom Reis
3. Approval of minutes of the October 22, 2020 meeting

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

Mr. Coulter stated for the record that the applications for the redevelopment of the Worthington Mall (High North) by DRP Worthington LP would remain tabled.

**B. Architecture Review Board – Unfinished**

**C. Architectural Review Board - Unfinished**

1. 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.

**A request was heard at the last meeting that did not meet Code requirements. This is an amended application.**

### **Project Details:**

1. Signage is proposed on the gable above the front door of the new building. **The previous submittal showed the logo being at the top and lettering near the bottom, which would have resulted in more signage than allowed by the Code. The current proposal has a smaller logo to the left of the lettering. The 1’9” high x 19’10” wide (~35 square feet) sign would consist of individually mounted blue HDU letters and a blue and white round logo with a horse head design. The address is proposed in 9” numbers on the fascia of the front gable.**
2. The proposed freestanding sign would consist of a double faced HDU 8” deep cabinet painted white with blue lettering and a logo etched into the background. The bottom ~8” would be a blue band with **the address in white vinyl. The size of the sign has been reduced to 27 square feet per side and a cap is now shown at the top. An 8’ wide x 2’ high base would be finished with brick to match the building. Location is appropriate.**

### **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. 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.

**Recommendation:**

Staff recommended approval of the proposed signs as the amended versions were appropriate.

**Discussion:**

Mrs. Bitar swore in the applicant, Sam Baker, on behalf of 6733 N. High St., Worthington, Ohio. Board members did not have any questions or concerns. Mr. Coulter asked if there were any outside calls or emails regarding this application and Mrs. Bitar said no.

**ARB Motion:**

Mr. Reis moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY SAMANTHA ELLIOT FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO ADD SIGNAGE FOR THE GODDARD SCHOOL AT 6733 N. HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 72-2020, DRAWINGS NO. AR 72-2020, DATED OCTOBER 30, 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. Schuster, aye; Mr. Hofmann, aye; Mr. Foust, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; and Mr. Coulter, aye. The motion was approved.

2. Redevelopment – 7227 N. High St. (DRP Worthington LP) AR 66-2020

**To Remain Tabled**

**C. Municipal Planning Commission – Unfinished**

**1. Planned Unit Development**

a. Redevelopment – 7227 N. High St. (DRP Worthington LP) PUD 02-2020

**To Remain Tabled**

**D. Architectural Review Board – New**

1. Fence – 227 W. Dublin-Granville Rd. (James Scarfpin) AR 78-2020

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

**Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

**Background & Request:**

This ¼ acre Kilbourne Village lot is 80’ wide x ~136’ deep along the W. Dublin-Granville Rd. access drive across from Thomas Worthington High School. The house is one and one-half stories

and was constructed in 1958. There is existing split rail fencing along the east property line that the owner would like to replace.

**Project Details:**

1. The property owners are proposing a 6' high solid Cedar fence along the east side, lining up with the front of the house and heading south for 87'.
2. Approval is also sought to construct the fence with the supporting members facing the property to the east. A variance would be required to construct the finished side of the fence facing toward the applicant's property.
3. The reason for the requested fence is stated as an attempt to deal with overgrown vegetation on the property to the east.

**Land Use Plans:**

Worthington Design Guidelines and 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. Various bushes and shrubs can be used to mark property lines or to set off private areas such as rear patios. Some of these may be evergreens; some may lose their leaves in the fall. Get good advice from a nursery or professional arborist about plant size, shape, rate of growth and care before choosing a natural fencing material. Whether natural or man-made, all fencing materials require maintenance. Do not let plants get overgrown or full of litter; keep wood fences painted or coated with opaque stain; keep metal fences from rusting; and watch for mortar loss and other deterioration in masonry walls.

**Recommendation:**

Staff recommending denial of this application as presented, as the proposed fence did not meet the recommendations found in the Design Guidelines. Any fence should be no higher than 4' and open in style. It was not clear if an attempt had been made to work with the neighbor to take care of the overgrown vegetation.

**Discussion:**

Mrs. Bitar swore in the applicant, Mrs. Amy Scarfpin, 227 W. Dublin-Granville Rd., Worthington, Ohio. Mrs. Scarfpin said this overgrown vegetation issue has been a problem for years, and she can no longer keep the overgrown vegetation from spilling over into her yard. She said she tried to get the previous owner to clean up the property and offered to help, but the owner would not do anything. Mrs. Scarfpin said she was excited when new owners moved in, but the problem has gotten worse. She said the neighboring property on the other side has a six-foot privacy fence, and she never thought that her request for the same would be denied. Mrs. Scarfpin said she saw the recommendations for more shrubbery, but that would not fix the problem. She said she never wanted to be a cantankerous neighbor, and has tried to be a cordial, but decided this is her problem, and she can no longer keep up with the weeds spilling into her yard. Mrs. Scarfpin said she has spent thousands of dollars in landscaping over the years. She said the fence would not completely

solve the problem but would help. She said her husband had already applied for a variance and that issue would be heard at the next BZA meeting, but the reason they were asking for the fence to have the internal members facing outward is because the fence installer said due to the overgrown vegetation, they would not be able to build the fence from the other side of the property.

Mr. Reis said he could appreciate Mrs. Scarfpin's view. He said we all have had neighbors we wished did things the way we did, but that is not the way the world turns, and if Mrs. Scarfpin would like to have a fence it should be within the Design Guidelines. He felt there should be a type of fence that would help along with some vegetation to help break it up.

Mr. Hofmann asked for clarification of the issue and if Mrs. Scarfpin was having trouble with the neighbor's vegetation spilling over on to her property and that is why she wanted the fence. Mrs. Scarfpin said yes, the fence would help. Mr. Hofmann asked if she asked the neighbor to prune back the vegetation and Mrs. Scarfpin said yes, they tried to communicate with the neighbor about three or four years ago when he moved in. Mr. Hofmann said he had concerns with the six-foot height and felt maybe a layering type of fence would be more aesthetically pleasing, a style that would be within the City's Guidelines. He said he could possibly see a four-foot solid fence that would help keep the vegetation back. He was not sure about the neighbor's six-foot solid fence or if the fence was installed legally or not. Mrs. Scarfpin said this problem has been going on since 2000, and you cannot stay ahead of the overgrowth. She said there is also a poisonous chalk berry shrub that continues to spill over to her yard.

Mr. Coulter said typically, the only time the Board has approved of a solid six-foot high fence in the Architectural Review District is when a home abuts a commercial property, or church, or school, where headlights become a problem. Mr. Hofmann asked Mrs. Bitar if there was anything the City could do to get the neighbor to get rid of the poisonous plant and she said yes, she could talk with staff about the noxious weeds and the homeowner would be asked to remove the weeds. Mr. Hofmann said a four-foot picket style of fencing would be more appropriate for the area, and they could approve an additional material, such as a mesh liner, that would help hold back the vegetation. Mrs. Scarfpin said a landscaper told her about a year ago that it would cost approximately \$20,000 to \$25,000 dollars to remove the vegetation and she could not afford to do that. She said there was not any viewpoint past this year because of the dense vegetation. Mr. Hofmann clarified he meant maybe thinning the vegetation along the shared property line, not clearing the neighbor's yard. Mrs. Scarfpin said she contacted the City about a decade ago and they came out to look at the property and said yes, the yard was bad, but there was not anything they could do. Mr. Coulter said he understood her desire to have a six-foot privacy fence, but he agreed with Mr. Hofmann and said he could approve a four-foot fence. Mrs. Scarfpin became very frustrated and said she had a long day, her husband underwent triple bypass surgery earlier in the day, and she chose to hang up.

Mr. Coulter said he would like to continue the discussion. He said he was okay with a four-foot fence and asked what the other Board members thought. Mr. Foust said he also agreed with Mr. Hofmann's suggestion, but they should table the application until the applicant was present. Mr. Foust said he would like to walk the property to get a better perspective.

Mr. Brown read an email into the record, from Katherine Crane, who said the neighbor was a

hoarder and she urged the Board to approve the privacy fence. Ms. Hinz asked if this situation would fall into the same category of noxious weeds, such as the bamboo. Mr. Brown said he would talk about the issue with the Public Service Department. He said the Bamboo was a completely separate Ordinance.

Mrs. Bitar said there was someone who called who wanted to speak.

Mr. Tom Burns, 1006 Kilbourne Dr., Worthington, Ohio, said he was surprised there was another issue that was more of a civil issue between two neighbors, and he understood the difficulty the Board was having with a decision. He said he did not know what the solution was, but he could bring up the issue with the Board he serves with which is the Community Relations Commission. Mr. Burns said if the Board would like additional help with these types of issues, he would be happy to help them.

The applicant exited the meeting prior to the Board voting. Staff recommended that the Board consider tabling 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.

## 2. New House – **591 Hartford St.** (Gino Fantozzi Builders, LLC/Simon) **AR 79-2020**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

### **Findings of fact & Conclusions**

#### **Background & Request:**

This parcel was established in 1924, being part of lot 139 of the original plat of Worthington, and is adjacent to the parking and drive from Hartford St. to the Worthington United Methodist Church. The lot is 55.28' wide x 138.5' deep (7656 square feet in area) and is considered an existing lot of record which can accommodate a single-family dwelling per the Code. The applicant is proposing construction of a new house.

#### **Project Details:**

##### 1. Site Plan:

- The proposed house would be constructed 30' from the front and rear property lines; 6' from the south property line; and 14' 3 3/8" from the north property line. The driveway is proposed on the north side of the house and would extend beyond the end of the rear attached garage to provide a turn around area. The driveway material has not been identified.
- A landscaping plan has not been included with the application but would be needed.
- The location and screening for a condensing unit is also needed.

##### 2. Building:

- The applicant refers to the house as a 1 ½ story Colonial style which is about 35' wide x 78' 6" deep.

- The main gable of the house is proposed to be north/south, with a cross gable extending to the rear; a large gable dormer to the front; a gabled roof over the front entrance; and two small dormer windows above the front porch. Gable trim and return details are needed.
- The first floor would house a master suite; great room, kitchen and dining area; a lanai; laundry facilities; and a 2 car attached garage at the rear that loads on the north side.
- Two additional bedrooms, a shared bath, and mechanical/storage space would make up the second floor.
- Proposed materials:
  - Everlast composite lap siding either in Polar White or Slate (width not identified)
  - Asphalt shingle roof (color not identified)
  - 6 over 6 double-hung windows and 6 light windows (fixed, awning, casement?) – material and manufacturer have not been provided
  - House door with 2/3 lights and panel below (material not known)
  - Garage door – Specifications needed
  - Unidentified masonry for the fireplace.

### **Land Use Plans:**

#### Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

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.

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: As with other design considerations, study Worthington's rich collection of 19th and 20th century architecture for design ideas for entrances and doors. 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.

**Recommendation:**

The size, massing and style of the proposed house seemed appropriate for this location. Additional information as mentioned in the project details above was needed before project approval should be granted.

**Discussion:**

Mrs. Bitar swore in the applicant, Mr. Gino Fantozzi, representing his client for 591 Hartford St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Fantozzi said he could have the landscape plan available by the next Architectural Review Board meeting scheduled for December 10<sup>th</sup>, 2020. Mr. Fantozzi asked for clarification about the dormers and if the dormers should go away. Mr. Coulter said the dormers did not need to go away, but they would prefer something in a style that would be more appropriate for a Colonial style of home. Mr. Foust suggested switching to a roofline similar to the gables on the front of the house. Mr. Fantozzi said he has been designing homes since the 1970's and he could picture the home without the dormers and the house would look just as good. He said switching the stone to brick would not be a problem. The tree that is in the tree line is 17 feet away from the property line but there is a telephone pole that is on the property line. Mr. Fantozzi said he might be able to squeeze the driveway in between, but he would have to check with an arborist to see if that might be damaging to the tree's root system. In regard to the north end of the property, he felt a type of fence that would look good on both sides would be best. He said he would like to see plantings that would not overtake the area, such as the problem discussed earlier by the applicant wanting a six-foot privacy fence to keep out overgrown vegetation. Mr. Fantozzi would like to get a landscaper's opinion to plant something that would not overtake down the road.

Mr. Hofmann said he had a couple of questions for Mr. Fantozzi. He said he agreed with Mr. Foust's comments about the roofline and asked Mr. Fantozzi if he was intending to use glass block for the window in the center for the bathroom. Mr. Fantozzi said yes, but he was open to suggestions. Mr. Hofmann suggested the six over six windows with film on the interior side of the

window for screening. He said for Mr. Fantozzi to be careful about staying within the Code requirements for the chimney because the chimney appeared to be close to the ridge. Mr. Fantozzi said his clients preferred gray siding with white trim which is similar to a house on Stafford Avenue.

Mr. Reis said after listening to the architect and Mr. Hofmann's comments, he felt the Board could approve the design to allow the architect to move forward with construction documents based on the comments at the meeting which addressed the original concerns. He could move forward and then come back with the landscape plan. Mrs. Bitar said she mentioned to the applicant earlier that the Board could give him a good feel as to whether this is approvable and that would be just as easy if not easier than separating out the landscape plan and just tabling the application knowing that the Board was generally okay with the structure other than the few changes he was going to make. He can come back with the revisions and the landscape plan and the fence if it was going to be included and he could still get started on the drawings. Mr. Reis said he was in favor of that. He felt the architecture was in line with old Worthington, and that way Mr. Fantozzi could move forward with working on the construction drawings. Mr. Fantozzi said he would get the fence design together so the Board could see what the fence would look like from either side. Mr. Coulter asked if there any calls or emails and Mrs. Bitar said no. Mr. Fantozzi 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.

### 3. Sign – **6116 Huntley Rd.** (Emelia Saka/Elnas African Delights) **AR 81-2020**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

#### **Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

##### **Background & Request:**

This commercial building was constructed in 1965 and is mainly in the City of Columbus. The northwestern suite is in Worthington and part of the Architectural Review District due to the property's adjacency to E. Granville Rd. Former home of the Monkey Bar, a new restaurant called Elnas African Delights is proposed in this space and would like to install a sign.

##### **Project Details:**

1. The proposed wall sign is a 23' wide x 3' high aluminum panel with red, green and yellow vinyl graphics that would be mounted on the sign band above the storefront for the restaurant.
2. The sign would have a white background with 12.5" block letters in red reading "ELNAS AFRICAN DELIGHTS"; green "Restaurant and Catering Services" 10" letters below; and read 5" phone numbers at the bottom corners of the sign.
3. The other businesses in the shopping center have backgrounds to match the building's burnt orange color, and white lettering.

**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. 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.

**Recommendation:**

Staff recommended denial of this application as the sign should match the colors and style of the others in the building.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Brown said he received revised drawings prior to the meeting from the architect, Mr. Hawkins. Mr. Hawkins revised drawings were more in line with the existing signage for the shopping center, even though the rest of the center is within the City of Columbus. The applicant will come back with information for the patio enclosure, rails and furniture at a future meeting. Mr. Brown forwarded the new drawing to the Board members. Mr. Brown confirmed the new sign met the City’s Sign Code. Mr. Brown swore in the applicant, Ms. Emelia Saka, 6116 Huntley Rd., Worthington, Ohio. She did not have any additional comments, and the Board members did not have any questions or concerns. Mr. Coulter asked if there were any calls or emails and Mrs. Bitar said no.

**Motion:**

Mr. Schuster moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY EMELIA SAKA FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL A NEW SIGN AS PRESENTED AT THE MEETING ON NOVEMBER 12<sup>TH</sup>, 2020, AT 6116 HUNTLEY RD., AS PER CASE NO. AR 81-2020, DRAWINGS NO. AR 81-2020, DATED NOVEMBER 2, 2020, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.**

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

**4. Porch Roofs – 810 Oxford St. (Louis C. Flocken) AR 82-2020**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

**Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

**Background & Request:**

This well-maintained vernacular style house was constructed in 1939 and is a contributing building in the Worthington Historic District. The owner would like to construct porch roofs over the front and side entrances.

**Project Details:**

1. The front gabled roof is proposed to extend over the stoop and steps and be supported by wood columns. The roof would be an extension from the gable when viewing from the side of the house. New metal railings are proposed.
2. On the side, the proposed gable would take the place of an existing awning.
3. Both are shown with wood fascia and columns to match the existing house trim. Siding and roofing would also match the existing.

**Land Use Plans:**

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

From about 1915 on, porches generally were simplified and more integrated into the design of the house. Simple square or tapered columns were common. New porches (located where one is missing or there has not been a porch in the past) should be built in a simple design. Look at original porches on similar buildings -- height, materials, roof slope, and width -- and use these to develop a design. Avoid ornamentation such as spindles and scrollwork unless they were traditionally used on the porches of similar buildings. Design and materials should be traditional, and compatible with the existing structure.

**Recommendations:**

Staff recommended approval of this application, as the proposed porch roofs were appropriate for the house.

**Discussion:**

Mrs. Bitar swore in the applicant, Mr. Louis Flocken, 810 Oxford St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Flocken said the side of the doorway area may need to be a little bigger in regard to what needed to be done with the footers. He said it would be a very modest change if needed. Board members did not have any questions or concerns. There were no additional calls or emails.

**Motion:**

Mr. Reis moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY LOUIS C. FLOCKEN FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO ADD PORCH ROOFS AT 810 OXFORD ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 82-2020, DRAWINGS NO. AR 82-2020, DATED NOVEMBER 3, 2020, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.**

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

5. Redevelopment – **649 High St.** (649 High LLC/Worthington Inn) **AR 80-2020**

Mr. Brown reviewed the following from the staff memo:

&

#### **D. Municipal Planning Commission - New**

##### **1. Conditional Use Permit**

- a. Residential & Restaurant in C-5 – **649 High St.** (649 High LLC/Worthington Inn) **CU 09-2020**

#### **Findings of fact & Conclusions**

##### **Background & Request:**

The Worthington Inn was first used as a commercial building in the mid 1800's, after being constructed as a residence in 1834. In the 1980's, the original building was restored and an addition was constructed to house guests. In 2005, approval was given to convert the inn rooms to residential condominiums. At the time, balconies and carports were added at the rear of the site to make those units more marketable. Garage doors were approved in 2015 to enclose four of the carport parking spaces. Exterior building lighting was added in 2017. The Worthington Inn is a contributing building in the Worthington Historic District.

The Worthington Inn closed operations in January 2019. The applicant would now like to convert a portion of the building to five residential units that are a mix of one and two bedrooms that range in size from 1,131 sq. ft to 1,595 sq. ft. in size. As part of the conversion the applicant will be undergoing several renovations to the interior and several improvements to the exterior of the building. The five residential units will comprise approximately 6,000 sq. ft. of the 15,000 sq. ft. remaining in the building. The area being converted to residential is the former banquet space on the second and third floor, while also including approximately 1,000 sq. ft. of the first floor of the former restaurant. The remaining square footage would continue to be utilized for a future restaurant use.

These applications request exterior modifications and a Conditional Use Permit for five residential units in the C-5 District.

##### **Project Details:**

1. Creating five residential units on the first, second and third floor of the building.
  - a. First Floor – One unit – One bedroom
  - b. Second Floor – Two units – one and two bedrooms
  - c. Third Floor – Two units – one and two bedrooms
2. Exterior changes:
  - a. Windows –
    - i. Replacing all the windows in the building on the portion of the building that is currently painted. These are not the original windows and are replacement windows by Pella.
    - ii. The windows are to be 8 over 8 to match the existing windows that are

- currently 8 over 8.
- iii. The casement windows on the third-floor on the southern elevation will be replaced with casement windows that will be Pella or Marvin windows.
- iv. The lower level windows along the W. New England Ave. elevation are proposed to be replaced with Pella or Marvin windows and will match the existing windows.
- v. The windows in the condominium portion of the building will remain the same.
- vi. Proposing Pella Reserve or Marvin aluminum glad wood windows with exterior muntins for the windows that currently have muntins.
- vii. Color – Similar to what is currently on the building.
  - 1. Pella – Poplar White
  - 2. Marvin – Sierra White
- viii. One small additional window will be added on the northern elevation on the second floor that will match with an existing smaller window on the northern elevation near the stair tower.
- ix. The windows on the third-floor addition are proposed to be 1 over 1.
  - 1. The Board should discuss these new windows matching the existing 8 over 8 windows on this portion of the building.
- b. Doors –
  - i. New entrance door to the ground floor unit on the north side of the building near the existing stair tower.
    - 1. Proposing Pella or Marvin solid 6-panel solid wood door or aluminum glad wood door. Optional ½ light glass on the top half.
    - 2. Painted green to match the existing doors facing High St.
  - ii. New sliding patio door added to the third-floor balcony.
    - 1. Proposing Pella or Marvin patio door.
  - iii. Existing door on the east elevation to be replaced on the third-floor balcony with a full light door that will be Pella or Marvin.
- c. Addition –
  - i. A portion of the covered patio on the third floor on the north side of the building will be converted to living space.
    - 1. Hardi lap siding will be used.
      - a. Siding color needs to be clarified.
    - 2. Existing railings will be reused.
    - 3. New flat roof will be installed to cover the addition and balcony.
    - 4. Installing three new windows that are one over one.
      - a. The Board should discuss these windows matching the existing 8 over 8 windows on this portion of the building.
- d. Lighting –
  - i. Darlana lanterns are proposed on the third-floor balcony.

**Conditional Use:**

- 1. Effect on traffic pattern – Should decrease. The C-5 District does not have a required parking requirement per unit, however there is existing parking on the north side of the building.

2. Effect on public facilities – Should decrease.
3. Effect on sewerage and drainage facilities – Should not be an impact.
4. Utilities required – Existing utilities should be adequate to handle the additional units.
5. Safety and health considerations – N/A
6. Noise, odors and other noxious elements, including hazardous substances and other environmental hazards – N/A
7. Hours of use – Residential Units – 24/7
8. Shielding or screening considerations for neighbors – N/A
9. Appearance and compatibility with the general neighborhood – Existing building to remain with a few exterior modifications and improvements. The main modification is on the northern elevation, which is hidden by the existing stair tower. There are eight existing residential units in the rear of the building.

### **Land Use Plans:**

#### Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

On the upper floors of commercial buildings two or more stories in height, windows played both a functional and an aesthetic role, providing natural light but also playing an important role in the overall architectural design. Their size, spacing and proportions were carefully keyed to the design of the building and its storefronts.

Early commercial buildings usually had multiple-paned double-hung windows on their upper floors. Though many are of recent date, such windows are widely used in Worthington's commercial district. As in residential buildings, later commercial structures had 4-over-4 or 2-over-2 windows, and eventually, in the late 19th century, 1-over-1 window sash became almost standard. This continued into the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, although some buildings had 6-over-1, 3-over-1, or other window designs for variety.

Doors should not be “dressed up” with heavy moldings, ornate carving, paneling, or other added decoration. On both 19th and early 20th century commercial buildings, doors generally were not highly ornamented and tended to be very plain. For new replacement doors, if needed, wood is the preferred material, and the design should be simple, perhaps with one or two lower panels and a window in the upper half.

Older upper floor windows should be retained rather than replaced; often repair of an existing window is less expensive than a new replacement window. Window openings should not be enlarged or downsized; maintaining their original size is an important part of preserving a building's character.

If windows are missing or must be replaced due to extensive deterioration, use new windows of the same size, design and profile (cross-section), to the greatest extent possible; wood windows are preferred. This means that if the old windows were 1-over-1 double-hung sash, the replacements should look the same. The new windows should fit the window openings exactly, without requiring extra wood or metal infill panels to fill the opening; and the dimensions of the framing, sash members, and other elements should match the old dimensions.

Construction of an addition to a commercial or institutional building should be approached in the same way as one for an existing home. Such a project involves important design considerations, since an addition can have a major impact on neighboring properties.

Use exterior materials traditionally used on commercial and institutional buildings in Worthington. These most commonly include brick; frame construction is less common. New materials used on an addition do not necessarily have to match the original materials of an older building -- a frame addition with beveled siding, for example, could be appropriate on a masonry building -- but starkly modern materials such as rough-cut siding, plastics, metal surfaces or painted concrete block should be avoided.

The addition should be subordinate to the main building. This does not necessarily mean that the addition must be smaller than the original, but it should be designed in a way that it does not overwhelm and dominate the original.

Generally, additions should be located as far as possible to the rear of the original building. There may be some instances, however, where building an addition on the front of the original building may be a preferable option.

Commercial storefronts play a very large role in determining the character of Worthington's Central Business District. They line the streets, and for both pedestrians and people passing in cars the district's storefronts are the primary environmental feature. Well-maintained storefronts containing attractive visual displays are typical of Worthington and are a major part of its appeal.

#### Worthington Conditional Use Permit Regulations

The following basic standards apply to conditional uses in any "C" or "I" District: the location, size, nature and intensity of the use, operations involved in or conducted in connection with it, its site layout and its relation to streets giving access to it, shall be such that both pedestrian and vehicular traffic to and from it will not be hazardous, both at the time and as the same may be expected to increase with increasing development of the Municipality. The provisions for parking, screening, setback, lighting, loading and service areas and sign location and area shall also be specified by the applicant and considered by the Commission.

Worthington Code Basic Standards and Review Elements The following general elements are to be considered when hearing applications for Conditional Use Permits:

1. Effect on traffic pattern
2. Effect on public facilities
3. Effect on sewerage and drainage facilities
4. Utilities required
5. Safety and health considerations
6. Noise, odors and other noxious elements, including hazardous substances and other environmental hazards
7. Hours of use
8. Shielding or screening considerations for neighbors
9. Appearance and compatibility with the general neighborhood



### Worthington Comprehensive Plan Update & 2005 Strategic Plan

Village centers like Old Worthington are logical places to add residential density in and behind the main corridor. Such residential development adds more pedestrian activity, increases the market base for the retail stores, and can be designed as a product that is attractive to young professionals and empty nesters. In Worthington, redeveloping residential lots within the first High Street block requires expertise to prevent it from tearing into the historic fabric of the City. Such development must be evaluated on a case-by-case basis, but it would be critical to be appropriate for the site in scale and design while at the same time creating a continuous street front. One of the most effective methods for adding residential units in this area is to rediscover and recapture the upper floor spaces in existing and new development along the corridor.

The pedestrian-friendly, mixed-use nature of Old Worthington is historically appropriate. Its success indicates that there are significant land use lessons to be applied to redevelopment efforts in Worthington. It appears there may be new opportunities for mixed-use development in appropriate locations. The history of the High Street corridor indicates long-term success for a linear commercial development approach.

#### **Old Worthington – Residential:**

Encourage redevelopment that creates a life-span community. This includes creating housing products that will attract young professionals and maturing adults so they can “live in place” in Worthington. Well-designed housing products catering to these groups should be sought and supported. Any new housing development should be well integrated and connected with the community.

The renovation and use of upper stories for residential living should be permitted and encouraged where possible – particularly in areas such as Old Worthington. Such uses provide additional urban village-type living. Furthermore, the increased residential density along High Street will create an additional customer base for service/retail uses located in the corridor. Tax incentives could even be considered to spark renovation of upper floor residential space in targeted areas.

#### **Old Worthington – Retail & Office:**

Focus retail and office uses to the High Street corridor with particular attention on retail for first floors in Old Worthington and the Old Worthington Transition Area. Do not let retail uses spread outside of this corridor here. Market to desired retail users that are targeting the authentic town center with pedestrian oriented store plans and products.

#### **Staff Analysis:**

1. The proposed windows for the third-floor addition should be discussed by the Board.
2. Clarification needed on the color of the hardi plank siding for the addition.
3. The conversion of first floor commercial space with High St. frontage is not recommended.
  - a. Residential is recommended for upper stories above first floor commercial space, however the conversion of prime commercial space should be discouraged. There is a focus on retail and office uses along the High St. corridor with particular attention on retail on the first floors in Old Worthington.

#### **ARB Recommendation:**

Staff recommended approval of this application if the Board felt comfortable with the applicant's responses to the windows on the third-floor addition and the color of the siding. The proposed changes were in keeping with the Design Guidelines as it pertains to windows, doors and additions.

**MPC Recommendation:**

Staff recommended partial approval of this application with the removal of the residential unit on the first floor. The first floor should be retained for commercial use as per the Worthington Comprehensive Plan Update & 2005 Strategic Plan.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Brown swore in the applicant, Mr. Kevin Royans, 649 High St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Royans thanked Mr. Brown and Mrs. Bitar, and the Board members for their time. He said they have only received about a half dozen of offers for the property, but none were ever pursued. Mr. Royans said the building was renovated in the 1980's and there is a reason for the one over one and eight over eight windows. The eight over eight windows were original for the building at that time. The painted brick was the pre-1980's addition. The newer construction has the one over one windows. Mr. Foust said he did not think the windows for the building were originally eight over eight, but possibly six over six. He said the Worthington Historical Society may have one of the early photographs of the Inn. Mr. Foust said if it did not interfere with Mr. Royans plans, he would like to see the replacement windows as six over six to get the windows closer to what they originally were. Mr. Coulter said he would like to see the fabric of the first floor stay somewhat the same. Mr. Reis said everyone all has their own opinion, but he would also like to see a restaurant take up the first floor and be a gem. He said whether it would be all restaurant or office or another unit, he had no opinion one way or another. Mr. Hofmann asked if the restaurant intends to be a restaurant again and Mr. Royans said yes. He said he could see the second-floor area being used for retail or some commercial use, but not as an apartment. Mr. Foust asked Mr. Royans if the first-floor space was tied into the second-floor space over it and Mr. Royans said yes.

Mrs. Bitar said there was a caller waiting to speak. Mr. Tom Burns, 1006 Kilbourne Dr., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Burns referred to Mr. Reis's comment that Worthington's downtown area is the "gem" of Worthington, and he referred to the Worthington Inn as the Crown Jewel of the city and said it was one of the most important buildings in the City. He said this is an area that needs to remain vibrant and for that reason he said he was fully supportive of the application. There were no other speakers. Mr. Schuster asked if the window issue was resolved and Mr. Brown said it was okay to have the six over six window as an option.

**ARB Motion:**

Mr. Reis moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY THE 649 HIGH LLC/WORTHINGTON INN FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO MAKE EXTERIOR MODIFICATIONS AT 649 HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 80-2020, DRAWINGS NO. AR 80-2020, DATED OCTOBER 30, 2020, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.**

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

Mr. Reis said Mr. Royans was somewhat amenable to hold off on the first-floor unit. He said he got a sense from most of the Board members that the first floor should remain commercial for office space or a restaurant that would take the whole floor. Mr. Coulter said the first floor could still be subdivided. There were no additional calls or emails.

**MPC Motion:**

Mr. Reis moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY THE 649 HIGH LLC/WORTHINGTON INN FOR A CONDITIONAL USE FOR FIVE RESIDENTIAL UNITS (MODIFIED TO FOUR UNITS) IN THE C-5 DISTRICT AT 649 HIGH ST., AND THAT THE FIRST FLOOR REMAIN FOR COMMERCIAL USE, AS PER CASE NO. CU 09-2020, DRAWINGS NO. CU 09-2020, DATED OCTOBER 30, 2020, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE PLANNING GOALS OF THE CITY, AS REFERENCED IN THE LAND USE PLANS AND THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.**

Mr. Hofmann seconded the motion. Mr. Brown called the roll. Mr. Foust, aye; Mr. Hofmann, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; and Mr. Coulter, aye. The motion was approved.

- b. Recreational Facility in I-1 – **406 E. Wilson Bridge Rd.** (Burn Bootcamp – Worthington)  
**CU 08-2020**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

**Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

**Background & Request:**

Burn Bootcamp – Worthington is currently operating on the west side of the Shops at Worthington Place. Relocation is necessary with the proposed redevelopment of the mall and the business is now requesting approval to operate in this building that was constructed in the late 1980's. The building is currently vacant but on a parcel with three other multi-tenant buildings. Because the new location is in the I-1 Zoning District, a Conditional Use Permit is required.

**Project Details:**

1. The business offers group fitness classes.
2. Hours of operation would typically be 5:00 am to 6:30 pm daily.
3. Parking is available in the lot adjacent to the building.
4. The suite consists mainly of open floor space, with some office space and restrooms in the

balance of the space.

**Land Use Plans:**

Worthington Conditional Use Permit Regulations

The following basic standards apply to conditional uses in any "C" or "I" District: the location, size, nature and intensity of the use, operations involved in or conducted in connection with it, its site layout and its relation to streets giving access to it, shall be such that both pedestrian and vehicular traffic to and from it will not be hazardous, both at the time and as the same may be expected to increase with increasing development of the Municipality. The provisions for parking, screening, setback, lighting, loading and service areas and sign location and area shall also be specified by the applicant and considered by the Commission.

Worthington Code Basic Standards and Review Elements The following general elements are to be considered when hearing applications for Conditional Use Permits:

1. Effect on traffic pattern
2. Effect on public facilities
3. Effect on sewerage and drainage facilities
4. Utilities required
5. Safety and health considerations
6. Noise, odors and other noxious elements, including hazardous substances and other environmental hazards
7. Hours of use
8. Shielding or screening considerations for neighbors
9. Appearance and compatibility with the general neighborhood

**Recommendation:**

Staff recommended approval of this application as the proposed use is appropriate for this space.

**Discussion:**

Mrs. Bitar swore in the applicant, Mr. Mike Krehnbrink, 406 E. Wilson Bridge Rd., Worthington, Ohio. Board members had no questions or concerns. There were no outside calls or emails.

**Motion:**

Mr. Reis moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY BURN BOOTCAMP - WORTHINGTON FOR A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO OPERATE A RECREATIONAL FACILITY AT 406 E. WILSON BRIDGE RD., SUITE D, AS PER CASE NO. CU 08-2020, DRAWINGS NO. CU 08-2020, DATED OCTOBER 28, 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. Mr. Hofmann, aye; Mr. Foust, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; and Mr. Coulter, aye. The motion was approved.

**D. Other**

Mr. Brown explained the next ARB-MPC meeting in December would be very long. There could possibly be discussions for the United Methodist Children's Home (UMCH), the Worthington Mall, and the Holiday Inn Site.

#### **E. Adjournment**

Mr. Hofmann moved to adjourn the meeting, and Mr. Foust seconded the motion. All Board members voted, "Aye," and the meeting adjourned at 9:20 p.m.