



MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING  
WORTHINGTON ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD  
WORTHINGTON MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION  
January 28, 2021

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

**A. Call to Order – 7:00 p.m.**

1. Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Approval of the minutes of the January 14, 2021 meeting  
Minutes were not yet available for approval.
3. Affirmation/swearing in of witnesses

**B. Architecture Review Board**

1. Fence & Sauna – **1 Kenyon Brook Dr.** (Robert & Mary Best) **AR 10-2020**

Mr. Brown reviewed the following from the staff memo:

**Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

**Background & Request:**

This property is roughly 0.6 acres in area on the north side of Kenyon Brook Dr. and adjacent to N. High St. The 1 ½ story house was constructed in 1923 and was one of 3 original houses that were later part of the Kenyon Brook Dr. subdivision. The owners were previously approved by the Architectural Review Board and the Board of Zoning Appeals to construct a freestanding oversized 24' x 28' two-story two-car garage to the east of the house in November of 2018. In April of 2019, the Architectural Review Board approved modifications to the previously approved garage and to replace the siding and roofing on the house.

This application is a request to legalize the placement of a white vinyl fence that was installed without a Fence Permit and Architectural Review Board approval, the applicant would also like approval for the installation of a freestanding sauna.

This application was the result of a Code Enforcement case concerning the installation of the fence without a Fence Permit and Architectural Review Board approval. The applicant made application once they were notified of the violation.

### **Project Details:**

1. Installed four separate sections of white vinyl fence along the west side of the house to create a visual/sound barrier that is part of a proposed Japanese garden and outdoor sauna.
2. The fence sections are 96” wide and 72” high.
3. Barrette Privacy Vinyl Fence Kit – Full Privacy Fence
4. Proposed 8’x10’ sauna in the northwest corner of the site. ***Details were not submitted at the time of this report. The information that has been provided was not able to be included with the materials associated with this application.***
  - a. It appears that the applicant has already installed the footers for the sauna without approval.
  - b. A Variance will be needed from the Board of Zoning Appeals for Accessory Building area.
    - i. The applicant is currently 777 sq. ft. over the permitted Accessory Building Area of 850 sq. ft. The Board of Zoning Appeals approved the addition of a two-story garage with 1,344 sq. ft. for a total square footage of 1,627 on the site.
      1. The additional 80 sq. ft. will need to be approved by the Board of Zoning Appeals.
  - c. A Permit for electrical work will be required from the Division of Building Regulation along with a Certificate of Compliance if the sauna is approved by the Board and the Board of Zoning Appeals.
  - d. Details are needed related to the following:
    - i. Sauna location on the site with setbacks identified from the northern and eastern property lines.
    - ii. There is an existing 2” waterline in an easement that is approximately 12’ to 15’ from the northern property line.
    - iii. Roof material?
    - iv. Height?
    - v. Will the structure be painted, stained, or left natural?
      1. If painted or stained, what color?

### **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. Fences are not permitted in the front yard, with the goal of maintaining an open, friendly feel

and avoiding barriers between neighbors. However, there are many other kinds of fences, both natural and man-made, that can be used to protect and enhance a property.

Fencing should be appropriate for the house's period and style and should be open in style (avoid solid, opaque fences that block all views) and three to four feet in height. Consider using natural plant materials instead of fences.

**Recommendation:**

Staff recommend denial of fence portion of the application, as the proposed fencing material did not meet the Design Guidelines for style, openness, and material for fencing. Staff also recommended denial of the sauna portion of the application until additional materials could be provided.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Reis said he was surprised this homeowner did not get ARB approval before erecting the fence especially since they were just before the Board getting their addition approved. He said he did not have a problem with the sauna at all, and he understood that the house sits back further than most houses do, and the neighbors were okay with the fencing if they put landscaping in front of the fence. Mr. Reis said he would have preferred something like a natural cedar that would have blended better with the trees instead of stark white. The applicant had trouble signing on to the meeting. While waiting for the applicant to sign on to the meeting, his neighbor, Mr. Joe Foust, 30 Kenyon Brook Dr., Worthington, Ohio, was sworn in. Mr. Foust said he approved of the project.

Mr. Brown swore in the applicant, Mr. Robert Best, 1 Kenyon Brook Dr., Worthington, Ohio, apologized for moving forward on the fence before getting approval. He said they contacted the fencing company, and since there was already an existing fence, the fencing company told them they did not need a Permit and they found out later that was not true. Mr. Best said it was not their intention to start the fence without ARB approval. The fence was installed to block the noise coming from High Street and the foliage would mostly hide the fence. The foliage along was not blocking the noise so they decided both the foliage and the fence would be necessary to decrease the noise. Their intention was to build a Japanese meditation garden in the back, so noise has been an issue. The neighbors have approved of the fence.

Mr. Brown swore in the other neighbor, Mrs. Cindy Kuss from 90 Kenyon Brook Dr., Worthington, Ohio. She felt the fence was not consistent with other fences in the neighborhood. She said they recently spent \$7,000.00 dollars on a wooden fence that people can hardly see. She was shocked when she saw the fence panels and said they looked what apartment complexes use to surround garbage dumpsters. She was opposed to the fence panels and said there is an example of a Japanese meditation garden in the Medick Estates area that did not have any fencing. She was she was very opposed to having white vinyl fences on their street. Mrs. Kuss said they pass by the panels daily and she felt they gave the neighborhood a different feel when you look at them.

Mr. Best said he wanted to respond to the neighbor's opinion. He said the drop in the number of decibels is a real thing, and once the foliage grows it would obliterate the barrier. Mr. Best said he understood the panels looked stark now, but once the foliage is up it would hide the panels. He

said the people that would be most impacted would be his neighbors that live across the street and those neighbors were fine with the panels. Mrs. Kuss said the fence was plastic and did not belong in the neighborhood.

Mr. Coulter asked if there were any other emails or calls and Mrs. Bitar said yes there was someone who called in.

Mr. Brown swore in Mr. Omar Humeidan, 50 Kenyon Brook Dr., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Humeidan said the fence looked fine and would look even better after the bushes were planted. He said the garden in the back looked amazing and the landscaping that was done to the front of the home looked spectacular.

Mr. Foust said he agreed with Mr. Reis's earlier comments. He said when he looks at that property, the great house, the great landscaping, and the large stones that were placed out front, he was baffled why the decision was to choose white plastic fencing than something with more of a natural feel to it. He said he would struggle to approve putting in white plastic fencing anywhere when there were alternatives that would be much better. Mr. Hofmann said he understood there were neighbors with varying opinions, but the house is within the Architectural Review District, and the issue is being heard before the Board members. He said as Board members, they are asked to control materials for a reason, and if they allowed plastic fencing within the District then others would point to this example and that would make it harder to control having the same fencing in other places. He said he also struggled with the solid white fence panels. He said he would not approve the white panels, and at the least the vinyl needed to be painted to match the dark gray color of the house or a matt black to disappear as much as it can. There should be as much landscaping if not more than was already shown. Mr. Hofmann said the issue was more than just the neighbor's opinion, it was also about the precedent that was being set that the Board would be left to manage.

Mrs. Holcombe said she agreed with Mr. Hofmann, and white plastic was not the way to go. If this was approved as is, it would come back to the Board and other people would want the same thing, and she does not want to see the precedent set for white plastic fencing. Mrs. Holcombe said she was fine with the sauna, but felt the fence needed to be cedar or painted as Mr. Hofmann suggested. She said the foliage would probably cover the fence in a short period of time. Mr. Schuster said he echoed the same opinion as Mr. Hofmann and Mrs. Holcombe. Mr. Schuster asked city staff if the six-foot height was outside of the Design Guidelines, and Mr. Brown said yes, the Guidelines recommend three to four feet in height with an open style. Mr. Schuster said even with the amount of fantastic work that has been done on the home, the fence panels do not comply with the height or material guidelines for the District. Mrs. Best said when she read the Guidelines, for a side-yard, six-feet would be the maximum. Mr. Best said they chose white because the color matched the trim on the house. He said he did not have a problem painting the fence, the fence is meant to be a sound barrier. He would love to have an opinion from a sound engineer for other ideas, but he was happy to paint the fence. Mr. Coulter said if they chose to paint the fence, he suggested painting the entire fence the same color. Mr. Schuster asked city staff if the six-foot rule applied to the side yard and Mr. Brown said no, the area was quirky, and that side of the property was on a private lane, so the rule did not apply. Mr. Reis said every situation has a certain circumstance, and he was willing to accept the fence if the fence is painted to match the color of the home, and

to make sure landscaping will be provided; not only the landscaping shown but possibly some vertical landscaping such as evergreens that would be there year-round. He said they were trying to be reasonable under the circumstances. Mr. Best said that was fine. Mr. Foust asked to see a photograph showing the fence panels and he said they would want to make sure the foliage would be tall enough to cover since there was a large drop off under the panels. Ms. Hinz said she echoed everyone else's comments.

**Motion:**

Mr. Reis moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY ROBERT & MARY BEST FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL A SAUNA AT 1 KENYON BROOK DR., AS PER CASE NO. AR 10-2020, DRAWINGS NO. AR 10-2020, DATED NOVEMBER 30, 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. Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Hofmann, aye; Mr. Foust, aye; Ms. Hinz, aye; Mr. Schuster, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; and Mr. Coulter, aye. The motion was approved.

Mr. Brown suggested tabling the fence portion of the motion until the next meeting. Mr. Hofmann asked Mr. Best to consider Mr. Foust's suggestions because of the slope of the land around the fence panels. A proper bed will be necessary to help vegetation grow in that area. Mr. Best requested to table the application for the fence. Mr. Foust moved to table the application and Mr. Reis seconded the motion. All Board members voted, "Aye," and the application was tabled.

**2. Patio Railing – 6116 Huntley Rd. (Emilia Saka) AR 11-2020**

Mr. Brown 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. In November of 2020, the Architectural Review Board approved a sign package for the restaurant and the applicant would now like approval to install an outdoor patio surrounded by a wrought iron/aluminum railing in the location of a previous patio.

**Project Details:**

1. The proposed patio is in the location of the previous patio associated with the Monkey Bar.
2. The patio will accommodate up to 15 tables with a mix of 2-top and 4-top seating.
3. Access to the patio will be from within the restaurant with an approved emergency exit in the fencing along the southern portion of the patio.

4. Wrought iron or aluminum railing proposed.
  - a. Details needed on the material, height, and style of railing is still needed.
    - i. There are conflicting materials in the application concerning the type, style, and height of railing around the patio. Clarification needed.
5. Round black metal tables with chairs would be used and tan umbrellas are proposed with the tables.

**Land Use Plans:**

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

The Worthington Design Guidelines recognizes outdoor seating and tables for use by patrons as giving an open feel and being pedestrian-friendly. Fences and walls are traditionally used as boundary markers and security features. In commercial districts they often are used to separate a storefront or an outdoor seating area from the activity beyond. The Architectural District Ordinance calls for design and materials to be compatible.

**Recommendations:**

Staff recommended conditional approval of this application with the clarification on the style, material, and height of the railing. Outdoor seating in this location is desirable and replaces a previously approved patio in the same location.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Brown swore in the applicant, Ms. Emilia Saka, 6116 Huntley Rd., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Peter Lenz explained he is the architect representing Ms. Saka, and his address is 515 Hartford St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Lenz said someone, possibly the owner, cut the original metal fence down and left the holes filled with the remaining pieces of fence buried in concrete. He said their intention was to field weld the fence into the already existing holes so the fence would have support. They will not be able to use a premanufactured metal or plastic fence because the fence would have to be constructed to match the already existing post holes.

Mr. Coulter said he understood the predicament that Mr. Lenz was in coming in at the last minute. Mr. Coulter said he suggested tabling the application because no one knows what the fence would look like, nor what materials or what the height would be. He suggested that Mr. Lenz meet with his client and go through the list of possible recommendations based upon the existing conditions and get some cost estimates that Ms. Saka is comfortable with, put that information together and then come back to the Board in a couple of weeks. Mr. Hofmann said he would be okay with a darker style of fence like the previous fence that was once on the property. He said he did not believe the same exact post holes would have to be used. Mr. Lenz said there might be some security issues with the property, the last time he visited the location there was a homeless person sleeping on the patio. Mr. Coulter and Mr. Hofmann said they did not have any problems with the fence. Mr. Hofmann said the fence could be built without using the same post holes. Mr. Lenz asked for the application to be tabled. He said his client has been paying rent for a space that she cannot use yet, so he is trying his best to get her business up and running as soon as possible.

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

### 3. Windows, Door & Trim Paint – 882 High St. (Greg Geissler) AR 13-2020

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

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

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

Approval of this building was granted in 1986, and it was constructed in 1987. Modifications have been made over the years to give access to the entrances, create a patio and change signage. This application is a request to replace the windows and front door and paint the trim a different color.

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

1. Replacement of all the existing casement windows with two Pella Impervia double hung windows is proposed. The new windows would be fiberglass and have a black frame.
2. The first-floor window on the front of the building currently has casement windows at the sides of a large glass area and decorative trim around the window. Proposed is a fixed pane window, but it is not clear if the trim would remain and is proposed to be painted a darker color.
3. Replacement of the front door is proposed, being a Provia steel door in black with a 2/3 light with sidelights. It is not clear if the trim around the door would remain, and if it would be painted a darker color.
4. A dark color is proposed for the trim on the building, including the soffits, fascia, returns and gable vents. Three choices were given: Sherwin Williams SW7069 Iron Ore; Benjamin Moore Gray; and Sherwin Williams SW2848 Roycroft Pewter.

##### **Land Use Plans:**

##### **Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance**

There are recommendations in the Worthington Design Guidelines to use exterior materials traditionally used on commercial buildings in Worthington.

- Windows: If windows are missing or must be replaced, use new windows of the same size, design and profile (cross-section), to the greatest extent possible; wood windows are preferred. Use traditional sizes, proportions and spacing for first and upper floor windows.
- Entries: Doors and the entrances surrounding them are significant elements in a building design. Traditionally they were focal points of building facades, often located symmetrically and made easily visible so it was readily apparent where people should enter a building. More recent building designs often downplay the entry to the point that it becomes simply a slight variation in a continuous facade. Use simple door and trim designs compatible with both the building and with adjacent and nearby development.
- Building Color: As is the case with some of Worthington's houses, the use of white or cream-colored trim on brick commercial buildings is a long tradition.

##### **Recommendation:**

Staff recommended the following be considered:

- This is a newer building that was designed to look like it had always been in Worthington.

- Trim changes at the front door and window and the use of a darker trim color on the whole building would change the entire feel of the building, especially with the front facing gable.
- Although darker windows are not the most prevalent in Worthington, the change in color may be acceptable. The double hung look is probably more appropriate for the building than the existing casement windows.

**Discussion:**

Mrs. Bitar swore in the applicant, Mr. Greg Giessler, 882 High St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Giessler said in reference to the double hung windows, there was only one window per opening, not two. Mrs. Bitar said the form from Pella references double hung windows, so Mr. Giessler will need to double check the information with Pella. Mr. Giessler said the darker trim colors were inspired from the 25 W. New England building and he agreed the second color was too dark. Mr. Hofmann asked if there was anything wrong with the existing windows and if they were run down and not performing and needed replacement or did he just want to replace them for the aesthetics and Mr. Giessler said the windows were installed in 1988 and were no longer holding up and needed to be replaced. Mr. Hofmann said he liked the idea of the windows and trim being darker and felt it would make the building look more sophisticated, but he did not want to lose the division of the window in the main façade. Mr. Reis asked if the windows would be replaced as is, the same dimension and separation, and Mr. Hofmann said yes. Mr. Reis asked Mr. Giessler what type of door he planned to use and what the color would be. Mr. Giessler showed the sample of what door would be used. He said they are in the real estate business and felt the new door would be more inviting. Mr. Reis said he understood the side lights were being replaced in kind, but the new door looked more contemporary than what was there originally. He said he struggled with the style of the new door and would rather see something like what is already there. Mr. Reis said he was okay with the darker trim. Mr. Hofmann said he thought the glass on the commercial door was fine, there were plenty of other examples of glass doors in the area. Mrs. Holcombe said she liked the Iron Ore color and felt this would give an updated look to the building. Ms. Hinz said she liked the dark color for the trim and she also liked the door with the panels below the glass. She said she would also like to see the style of the window on the front of the building stay the same instead of one big window. Mr. Foust said he was struggling with the windows because the building does not really have a 19<sup>th</sup> century style. He said changing the windows to something different that does not fit the historic look would probably be a mistake. Mr. Foust suggested replacing the windows with the same type of window as Mr. Hofmann suggested earlier. Mr. Giessler said the existing windows are casement style and most of the other buildings in the downtown area had double hung windows. He said cost was another factor, the difference in cost would be \$160,000.00 vs. \$40,000.00 dollars. Mr. Giessler asked for clarification about the windows and Mr. Hofmann suggested leaving the front as a tripart window and that the other forty plus windows would remain divided with a single vertical mullion as shown today, but not prescriptive that they have to be two casement windows. They could simply be a divided window, whether non-operable, or such as a casement window with one side being operable, and one side fixed. He said the Board was making aesthetic suggestions. Mr. Hofmann did not agree with the window proposal that was submitted. Mr. Giessler said they had estimates from three window companies, and even the fixed casement window for the front was not economical. Mr. Hofmann said the windows do not have to be a casement style, he said they are asking for the windows to remain having a single mullion that divides the windows into two halves as they are today. Mr. Coulter said most of the Board members were comfortable with the color, but they are also more comfortable with keeping the aesthetics



of the look of window as they are now. He said how the windows open could be something Mr. Giessler works out with the window company, but Mr. Hofmann made a valid point. Perhaps the window could become a slider instead of a double hung, and a slider should be less expensive than a double hung window. Mr. Giessler said the slider was not cheaper and felt the aesthetics would not be the same with the slider because of the way they are made.

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

4. Sign Change for Service Building – **780 E. Granville Rd.** (Sign Smith LLC/Mark Wahlberg Chevrolet) **ARB 15-2020**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

**Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

**Background & Request:**

In December, Mark Wahlberg Chevrolet was approved to install a new wall sign on the main dealership building. Also, the name change from Jack Maxton on the freestanding signs was discussed with the agreement the background would be changed to opaque for the whole sign. The applicant was also told temporary signs and banners would need to be removed.

Signage for the quick service building at the corner of Huntley Rd. was removed from that application and is now presented with this application.

**Project Details:**

1. On the main dealership building new 22” blue individually mounted, internally illuminated letters spelling “MARK WAHLBERG” were approved in December. A variance granted in 1995 would cover the slight increase in area for this sign.
2. The same size and style of lettering is proposed for the quick service building (780 E. Granville Rd.) and would include “Certified Service” to the right. The sign would be 22” high by 45’ wide for total area of about 83 square feet. A variance would be needed as the existing freestanding sign is about 80 square feet in area, leaving only 20 square feet for a wall sign allowed by Code.
3. There is a window graphic in the largest bank of windows for the quick service building. The Code requires internal signs cover no more than 25% of window area.
4. The temporary flags across the site are not allowed.

**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.

(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.

#### **Recommendations:**

Staff recommended reduction of the sign size on the 780 E. Granville Rd. building. The building is much smaller than the main building to the west and should not need as much signage. Also, the freestanding sign on this property should suffice for advertising viewed off of the property. Removal or reduction in size of the window sign and removal of the flags on the entire site are needed.

#### **Discussion:**

Mr. Brown swore in Mr. Michael Smith, Sign Smith LLC, 2760 County Rd. 26, Marengo, Ohio. He said the staff at Wahlberg Chevrolet have been told about the sign and window issues. He said new faces have to be pressed for the new signs. Mr. Smith said he was just the sign installer; he did not have anything to do with the windows and the banners on the site. He said he only installs the illuminated signage.

Mr. Smith said the company is aware they need to make changes on the site before he can install signage. They are aware they need to get the stuff off of the windows and remove the banners. Mr. Coulter asked about Mrs. Bitar's question if the sign can just say "Quick Serve" and Mr. Smith said they would like to ask for a variance because they can no longer use "Quick Serve" anything related to service must say "Certified Service" now and the dealership will want Mr. Wahlberg's name on the building also. Mr. Coulter said they were fine with the verbiage it was more of an issue regarding the size of the sign that needs to come into compliance with the sign code. Mrs. Bitar asked if Mr. Smith looked at smaller lettering for the building and Mr. Smith said he did but

the dealership has asked for a variance to keep the same size of lettering they already have. Mr. Foust said he was okay with the size of the lettering for the building. Ms. Hinz said she was okay with the sign too. Mr. Reis said the sign was fine.

Mr. Coulter asked if there were any emails or calls and Mrs. Bitar said no.

**Motion:**

Mr. Foust moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY SIGN SMITH LLC ON BEHALF OF MARK WAHLBERG CHEVROLET FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL A NEW WALL SIGN AT 780 E. GRANVILLE RD. AS PER CASE NO. AR 15-2020, DRAWINGS NO. AR 15-2020, DATED DECEMBER 18, 2020, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING AND CONTINGENT UPON BRINGING THE OTHER SIGNS INTO COMPLIANCE AS DIRECTED PREVIOUSLY BY THE CITY OF WORTHINGTON.**

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

**5. New Patio Door – 5935 N. High St., Unit 306 (APCO Industries Inc.) ARB 16-2020**

Mr. Brown reviewed the following from the staff memo:

**Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

**Background & Request:**

Approval was granted in 1996 for the Residences of Worthington condominiums to be built, and construction was completed in 1997. There are 54 units in the building which can be occupied by people 55 and older.

Several residents in the building have already replaced the original patio doors with exterior muntins with patio doors that have muntins between the glass to match the existing windows on the building. The applicant is seeking approval to replace their patio door with no exterior muntins. Staff would request that this review also include the remaining patio doors for the entire building for consistency.

**Details:**

1. Proposed 6' x 6.8' fiberglass swing patio door with muntins between the glass.
2. The proposed replacement patio door is located on the south side of the building and is not visible from N. High St.

**Land Use Plans:**

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Be sure that window and door designs are appropriate for the style or time period of the house. Design and materials should be traditional, and compatible with the existing structure. Deteriorated or damaged elements should be replaced with new ones that match the originals as closely as possible.

**Staff Analysis:**

- According to the applicant the existing patio doors are in poor condition and difficult to clean, discolor, crack, and require ongoing finishing.
- Other units in the building have replaced their patio door in their individual unit with a patio door having muntins between the glass.
  - No approval was found for these units.
- Staff would request that the Board approve the future replacement of the patio doors with muntins between the glass on all patio doors that would match the existing windows on the building that have muntins between the glass.
  - This would alleviate the need for every unit to come before the Board for approval.
- The condominium board has approved this style of patio door and is also asking that this be considered for the entire building so that their residents do not need to individually come before the Board for approval.

**Recommendation:**

Staff recommended approval of this application as proposed.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Brown swore in the applicant, Mr. Mark Mason, representing 5935 N. High St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Mason said the owners would like to replace the door with grids between the glass which would be consistent with the windows. Board members did not have any questions or concerns. Mr. Coulter asked if there were any emails or calls and Mrs. Bitar said no.

**Motion:**

Mr. Foust moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY APCO INDUSTRIES INC. FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL A NEW PATIO DOOR AT 5935 N. HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. ARB 16-2020, DRAWINGS NO. ARB 16-2020, DATED DECEMBER 21, 2020 BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING AND AS SUGGESTED BY CITY STAFF THIS WOULD APPLY TO ANY FUTURE PATIO DOOR REPLACEMENTS ON THE BUILDING.**

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

6. Replace Porch & Deck Railing – **55/57 W. South St.** (Tina Jacobson) **ARB 17-2020**

Mr. Brown reviewed the following from the staff memo:

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

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

This American Foursquare is a duplex that was constructed in 1905 and is a contributing building in the Worthington Historic District. Additions to add a carport on the east side and a second story to the rear were approved in the 2000's. In 2019 the Board approved the replacement of sixteen windows on the house with Marvin aluminum glad wood windows, installation of a front retaining wall, steps and replacement of an existing shed on the site. The property owner would now like to replace the railings on the front porch and rear deck.

#### **Details:**

1. Replace existing wood railings and spindles with TimberTech Classic Composite Series/Radiance Rail.
2. Replacement rail and spindles would be white to match the existing railing on the porch and deck.
3. The proposed TimberTech railing and spindles would be the same size and shape as the existing.

#### **Land Use Plans:**

##### Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Original porch elements should be retained to the maximum extent possible and should be duplicated in the same design and materials if deteriorated or missing. Original elements such as turned columns, decorative elements, or tongue-and-groove ceilings should stay in place.

#### **Staff Analysis:**

- It is not uncommon to get a request to replace existing wood railings and spindles with a composite type product in Old Worthington.
- The proposed TimberTech material has the look of the existing wood, however it does not have the maintenance involved with wood.
- The applicant could replace the existing railings with treated lumber; however, the recommendation is to leave treated lumber unpainted for 1-year to allow it to cure before painting. The applicant believes the TimberTech approach may cost more, however believes in the end that it will be worth the additional expense.

#### **Recommendation:**

Staff recommended approval of this application as proposed.

#### **Discussion:**

Mr. Brown swore in the applicant, Ms. Tina Jacobson, 55/57 W. South St., Worthington, Ohio. Board members did not have any questions or concerns. Mr. Coulter asked if there were any emails or calls and Mrs. Bitar said no.

**Motion:**

Mr. Reis moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY TINA JACOBSON FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL NEW PORCH AND DECK RAILINGS AT 55/57 W. SOUTH ST., AS PER CASE NO. ARB 17-2020, DRAWINGS NO. ARB 17-2020, DATED DECEMBER 21, 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. Ms. Hinz, aye; Mr. Schuster, aye; Mr. Foust, aye; Mr. Hofmann, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; and Mr. Coulter, aye. The motion was approved.

**7. Wifi Expansion – 820 High St. (Worthington Public Library) ARB 18-2020**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

**Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

**Background & Request:**

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

The library would like approval to install the equipment necessary to expand Wifi coverage outside of the library building.

**Project Details:**

1. Eight wireless access points and antennas are proposed around the building.
2. The proposed equipment is white and relatively small and would be mounted mostly on or near the white trim of the building.

**Land Use Plans:**

**Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance**

Antennas should be placed in a location that minimizes the visual impact as seen from the right-of-way.

**Recommendation:**

Staff recommended approval of this application as the proposed equipment was small and should not be very noticeable.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Brown swore in the applicants, Ms. Monica Baughman, representing the Worthington Library, and their Network Administrator, Mr. Sam Lewis, 820 High St., Worthington, Ohio. Ms. Baughman said the additional Wi-Fi would reach the lawn and the cars parked along the street next to the Library. Board members did not have any questions or concerns. Mr. Coulter asked if there were any emails or calls and Mrs. Bitar said no.

**Motion:**

Mr. Schuster moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY THE WORTHINGTON PUBLIC LIBRARY FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL WIFI EQUIPMENT AT 820 HIGH ST. AS PER CASE NO. ARB 18-2020, DRAWINGS NO. ARB 18-2020, DATED DECEMBER 17, 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.

**8. New Building Lights – 5858 N. High St. (Matthew Jehn) ARB 19-2021**

Mr. Brown reviewed the following from the staff memo:

**Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

**Background & Request:**

In the late 1990’s, this building was significantly renovated to look and function as it does today. FC Bank was the occupant from 2006 until last year, and originally installed the existing freestanding sign. A variance was granted in 2006 to allow sign placement 2’ from the property line. Due to the width of the right-of-way in this area, the sign is 14’ from the back of the sidewalk. The Board approved a new sign cabinet on the existing base in 2017.

The applicant would like approval to legalize the installation of new lighting on the building without prior Board approval.

This application was the result of a Code Enforcement case concerning the installation of the exterior lighting without a Permit and Architectural Review Board approval. The applicant made application once they were notified of the violation.

**Details:**

1. Replaced five existing brass light fixtures with five matte black canister shaped light fixtures that direct the light up and down and are approximately 12-inches in height.
2. Wattage of the bulbs is unknown. Clarification is needed.

**Land Use Plans:**

## Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Lighting: Use of fairly small lighting fixtures, and as few as possible, is recommended. Fixtures should not be overly ornate. Simple and smaller usually is better. Avoid excessive brightness.

### **Staff Analysis:**

- The fixtures do not seem appropriate for the style of building.
- The Board has approved a similar style of fixture on the Worthington Inn, however in that situation it was to direct light down to the sidewalk and highlight the architectural elements of the historic building.
- The wattage of the fixture is unknown; however, it appears to be brighter than what is needed on the building.
- Staff also noticed that all the landscaping around building has been removed without approval or replacement. Clarification is needed concerning the landscaping.
  - There is a previously approved landscape plan from 2006 that would need to be matched, or a replacement plan would need to be approved by the Board.

### **Recommendation:**

Staff recommended denial of the proposed application.

### **Discussion:**

Mr. Reis said the lighting was abrasive and he was not sure what their intent was to highlight the architecture of the building or why the lighting was so bright. He said if the lighting could be lower at grade it would be more aesthetically pleasing. Mr. Reis said it looks like they are lighting it up for a 747 to land. Mr. Colter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Brown swore in Mr. Matthew Jehn, 5858 N. High St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Jehn said he did not feel the light was bright enough to land a 747, but the originally brass fixtures were eroded and a couple of the fixtures were not working any longer so that is what precipitated the change. Mr. Jehn said the FC bank down the street has the same light fixtures, and he thought they were decorative and illuminated the building a little bit. He said he was unaware that he had to ask for permission to install the lights, but once he learned about the issue, he filed the application for ARB approval. Mr. Jehn said when he purchased the building the pine trees were all crooked and laying up against the building. Mr. Foust said the Board spent a lot of time working with the building across from St. Michael Church for exterior lighting. He said they hid flood lamps in the landscaping bed, so you did not feel the lamps were in your face. Mr. Foust felt the softer lighting would be more appropriate for this building also. Mr. Jehn said he did not feel the lighting was abrasive, and there were many other buildings on High Street that have the same lighting fixtures. Mr. Foust explained the up and down lighting used on another building was a different situation and it was meant to light the building and the sidewalk in the downtown area.

Mr. Coulter said what would make this lighting more acceptable to him would be to lower the wattage of the lamps and change the color to something warmer, and not daylight. Mr. Hofmann agreed with the other Board members the lighting was way too bright and felt something with a lower wattage and warmer color as Mr. Coulter suggested would be more appropriate. He said the lighting should be more subtle as an accent, not so intense. Mr. Jehn requested to table the application.



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

## 9. Sign – 2245 W. Dublin-Granville Rd. (Jacob Kaelin) ARB 20-2021

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

#### **Background & Request**

In 2014 & 2015, the property owner of this land at the southwest corner of W. Dublin-Granville Rd. and Linworth Rd. annexed, rezoned, subdivided, created a Development Plan, and received Architectural Review Board approval to redevelop the property as a neighborhood commercial site. Final approval was given for Linworth Crossing in 2015, and Sign Criteria were developed and approved in 2016 (see Land Use Plans below). Inclusion of a logo as part of a tenant wall sign requires approval from the ARB.

Power Pet Dog Training is locating in Suite 104 and would like to install a logo as part of its sign.

#### **Project Details:**

1. The sign is proposed to have black letters consisting of 11” high “POWER PET” individually mounted letters above 8.75” high “DOG TRAINING” lettering.
2. To the left, a 38” high x 39” high logo consisting of a dog chasing a ball in a circle with “PP” in the middle is proposed.
3. Total sign area would be about 34 square feet.

#### **Land Use Plans:**

##### Linworth Crossing Development Plan

Approved Sign Criteria per the Development Plan:

- Tenants in a space with a smaller sign band are permitted 28 square feet of sign area.
- Maximum character height is 24”.
- Black gooseneck LED lights will be above all signs.
- All signs will consist of 1 ½” thick non-illuminated dimensional letters and logos, centered in the sign band area. The font style can vary.
- The proposed color palette for the signs is red (PMS #7621); blue (PMS #541); green (PMS #561); and PMS Black C.
- Proposed logos must be approved by the ARB.

#### **Recommendation:**

Staff recommended this application to be amended. Reduction of the size of the logo to 24” in height would meet the sign criteria for height and area. Also, the letters and logo should be 1 ½” thick characters.

#### **Discussion:**

Mrs. Bitar swore in the applicant, Mr. Jacob Kaelin, 2245 W. Dublin-Granville Rd. Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Kaelin said he could have the sign company shrink the logo smaller to match the letters. He said he planned to have the letters the same thickness as the Verizon sign, whose letters are a

half inch thick. Board members did not have any other questions or concerns. Mr. Coulter asked if there were any emails or callers and Mrs. Bitar said no.

**Motion:**

Mr. Reis moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY JACOB KAELIN ON BEHALF OF POWER PET DOG TRAINING FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO ADD A WALL SIGN AT 2245 W. DUBLIN-GRANVILLE RD. , SUITE 104, AS PER CASE NO. ARB 20-2021, DRAWINGS NO. ARB 20-2021, DATED JANUARY 7. 2021 BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING AND THAT THE 24” LETTERS ARE TO BE ½ INCH THICK.**

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

**10. Front Porch Remodel – 581 Oxford St. (Rob & Sabine Holub) ARB 23-2021**

Mr. Brown reviewed the following from the staff memo:

**Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

**Background & Request:**

This Farmhouse was originally constructed in 1857 and has been added onto over the years. The property is 97’ wide, which is larger than many lots in the neighborhood. The homeowners gained approval in 2014 and 2015 to construct a 3-season room addition and deck to the rear, and a breezeway between the garage and a side entrance. The applicant is requesting approval to make several modifications to the area under the front porch. The applicant would like to remove a door and replace it with an existing window and then install a new door that would center on the gable of the porch and install new board and batten siding on the first level only under the porch.

**Details:**

1. Install new Anderson full light door that would align with the existing gable on the front porch. *Details on the material information concerning the door was not provided at the time of this report.*
2. Repurpose existing window to the location of the previous front door.
3. Second entry door on the porch will be completely removed.
4. HardiBoard board and batten siding proposed on the first-floor porch exterior walls only.
  - a. Existing HardiBoard board and batten siding on the existing rear addition and second-story addition of the home.
  - b. The board and batten siding would be painted barn red to match the existing house.

**Land Use Plans:**Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Doors (and the entrances in which they often are placed) are major architectural elements that define the points at which one enters and leaves a building. It is important that any doors and the entrances in which they are set should be compatible with the style and period of a building.

Historic doors or entrance elements should not be removed, covered over or otherwise receive major alterations, since they can be important character-defining features of a building (refer to the style guide for more information). This is true for both primary and secondary entrances. Deteriorated or damaged elements should be replaced with new ones that match the originals as closely as possible.

If interior alterations make an existing entrance unnecessary, an appropriate approach is to leave the door and entrance intact on the exterior while covering it over with drywall or other material on the interior; avoid removing doors and entrances and placing siding over the opening.

Most of the older buildings have retained their original exterior materials. In some cases, original wood siding has been replaced with compatible new wood siding that has faithfully duplicated the appearance of the original. Older wood siding is found most commonly as beveled siding, but it appears in other forms such as shiplap, shingle and board-and-batten.

Existing historic wood siding should be retained and repaired as required. Such siding gives historic buildings a texture and appearance important to their character. Repairs to damaged siding should be done with new wood that exactly matches the appearance of the existing. Historic wood siding should not be covered over or removed if it is repairable.

If replacement siding is installed over or in place of wood siding, it should be located only where the original siding was used. Avoid removal of or damage to window and door surrounds, ornamental elements such as eave brackets, and decorative panels or shingled areas. The new siding should match the thickness and width of the old as closely as possible. Consider removal of existing replacement siding, including cement-asbestos, but only if the underlying original siding is in good condition or can be repaired.

**Staff Analysis:**

- There are existing wood shingles on the exterior of the home. Board and batten siding was added to the additions to the rear of the home and are not highly visible from the public right-of-way.
- The use of board and batten siding on the existing home is located on the new additions that have been added to the rear of the home as a way to differentiate between what was original and added.
- The realignment of the front entry is understandable; however, staff would suggest repurposing the existing door or a new door similar in style to the existing door.
- The Design Guidelines recommend against removing doors/entrance and placing siding over the openings and preserving existing siding or replacement with something similar.

**Recommendation:**

Staff recommended denial of the proposed application as it does not conform with the Design Guidelines.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Brown swore in the applicant, Mrs. Sabine Holub, 581 Oxford St., Worthington, Ohio. Mrs. Holub said the front door is not working properly and was told by her contractor that the door is not salvable and needed to be replaced. She liked the idea of having more light coming into her home and said she likes being able to look outside. Mrs. Holub felt the door looked more traditional with the sidelights, and she noticed that her neighbors down the street had similar doors. Mr. Reis said he had no problem closing off the second door to the left or moving the door underneath the gable. He said he had no problem with the board and batten siding, but he was concerned with the style of the proposed door. Mr. Reis felt they could find a similar door that would match the style and time of the home. He said he was fine with everything, but he would replicate the current door. Mr. Schuster said he had the same opinion as Mr. Reis, and said doors are very distinctive and he did not feel the proposed door was appropriate for the style of the house. Mrs. Holub asked if they could compromise and possibly just have the door with half glass, she did not like having a door that did not allow light to shine through. She said if she was not allowed to have the proposed door, she would have to install a storm door. Mr. Hofmann said he had a slightly different opinion. He said he liked the centering of the door on the porch, and he was okay with a single glass door, but did not feel there was enough room to do the sidelights without being cramped in the elevation, especially if trying to center the door on the porch. Mr. Foust said the house is a traditional style of farmhouse and if the doors were original, they were probably just solid paneled doors. Mr. Foust was of the opinion that an all-glass door would be out of character, but sidelights would be okay if the bottom panels were solid. There could be small lights across the top above the door and still keep it compatible with the style of the house. Mr. Foust said he disagreed with Mr. Hofmann and did not feel an all-glass door was appropriate for that location. He felt the door would be a massive change. Mrs. Holub said the change would not be massive because that is how the house looks most of the time when you drive by. Mr. Foust explained it was the Board's duty to protect and enhance the character of the historic home and he hoped they could find some middle ground. He said front doors have been a major discussion over the years. Mrs. Holub said the second door has always been the cause of confusion whenever anyone comes to visit because they do not know which door to go to. Mrs. Holub felt they could get rid of the second door and keep the Colonial look of the home. Mrs. Holcombe said the home is a farmhouse style and she did not believe that either of the doors were original, but they may have been replaced to match. She said she had in her basement a three quartered light door that must have been the original door to the back of her home. Mrs. Holcombe said she would not object for a farmhouse style of home to have a three quartered or almost full glass door. She said she was fine with the door moving, and having a window to replace the second door, and that there would be less confusion doing that. Mrs. Holub said a three quarter glass door would be acceptable. Ms. Hinz said she would be okay with the three quarter glass door and agreed there should not be sidelights. She said from the product information that was pulled up she did not like the blinds in the door. Mrs. Holub said the blinds could be fully retracted, and just be used for privacy in the evening. She said if the door was not fully glass then it would not matter anyway. Mr. Coulter said he was okay with getting rid of the

door on the left-hand side and he could see where that would cause confusion, but he has seen that style on his family's farmhouse in Minnesota. He said he agreed with Mr. Hofmann that the sidelights did not match the style of the house and agreed the sidelights would not dimensionally fit. Mr. Coulter said he was okay with the three-quarter glass door, the window, and the board and batten. He also agreed with Ms. Hinz and felt the blinds were not appropriate.

Mr. Coulter asked if there were any emails or calls and Mrs. Bitar said no.

**Motion:**

Mr. Reis moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY ROB & SABINE FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS FOR A FRONT PORCH REMODEL AND DOOR, AND THAT THE DOOR BE NO GREATER THAN THREE QUARTER LIGHT AND THAT THE PORCH FINISH CAN EITHER BE BOARD AND BATTEN OR LEFT AS IS AND PAINTED TO MATCH THE EXISTING HOUSE AT 581 OXFORD ST., AS PER CASE NO. ARB 23-2021, DRAWINGS NO. ARB 23-2021, DATED JANUARY 15, 2021, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING AND THAT CITY STAFF WILL REVIEW THE DOOR PRIOR TO INSTALLATION.**

Mr. Hofmann seconded the motion. Mr. Brown called the roll. Mr. Foust voted nay, because he felt the front door was a key to the style of the home and the door needs to match the style of the 19<sup>th</sup> century farmhouse; Mr. Schuster voted nay, for the same reasons as stated by Mr. Foust; Ms. Hinz, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Hofmann, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; and Mr. Coulter, aye. The motion was approved.

**11. Directional Signs – 6130 Linworth Rd. (Tushar Patel/Dunkin) ARB 24-2021**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

**Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

**Background & Request:**

This building was constructed by Wendy's International in 1985 and operated as a fast food restaurant with a drive-thru until earlier this year. The applicant received approval to transform the property into a restaurant that combines Dunkin (formerly Dunkin Donuts) and Baskin Robbins. Changes to the signage and building, and a request for a Conditional Use Permit were approved in September of 2020. As part of that approval the applicant was to reduce the size of the directional signs to no more than 24" wide and 4' high (per a previous variance). The applicant had a different understanding of that approval, so this application would clarify the proposed signage.

**Project Details:**

1. Internally illuminated directional signs are proposed at the two site entrances. The overall height was originally shown at 4'10", with the cabinets being 2'10 1/2" wide x 1'11" high. The height and width would exceed Code requirements and a previous variance, so

approval was granted to allow the signs to be no higher than 4' and 2' wide. The white backgrounds would need to be opaque.

2. Proposed now are sign boxes mounted on the existing brick bases that would be 24" x 24" with overall height of 4', so would meet Code requirements and the previously approved variance. The sign boxes are shown as internally illuminated with white backgrounds; "DD" in orange and pink; "DRIVE THRU" and arrows in black; and "SEE YOU SOON" in black on the west face of the sign on W. Dublin-Granville Rd.

**Land Use Plans:**

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

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. Signs must be distinctive enough to be readily visible, but avoid incompatible modern colors such as "fluorescent orange" and similar colors. Bright color shades generally are discouraged in favor more subtle and toned-down shades.

[Worthington Sign Code – Chapter 1170](#)

**Recommendation:**

Staff recommended approval of this application with the condition the sign background be opaque. Retention of the matching brick bases was appropriate.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Brown swore in the applicant, Mr. Tushar Patel, 6130 Linworth Rd., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Reis asked if the directional signs were in compliance and Mrs. Bitar said yes. He asked why they were changing what was originally approved and Mrs. Bitar explained that option two was originally approved at a previous meeting. Mr. Coulter suggested acid washing the brick to help the color blend better.

Mr. Coulter asked if there were any emails or calls and Mrs. Bitar said no.

**Motion:**

Mr. Reis moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY TUSHAR PATEL FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO MODIFY THE DIRECTIONAL SIGNS AT 6130 LINWORTH RD. AS PER CASE NO. ARB 24-2021, DRAWINGS NO. ARB 24-2021, JANUARY 7, 2021, 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. Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Hofmann, aye; Mr. Foust, aye; Mr. Schuster, aye; Ms. Hinz, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; and Mr. Coulter, aye. The motion was approved.

12. Landscaping Changes – **6699 N. High St.** (Schoedinger Funeral Home) **AR 12-2020**

&

## **B. Municipal Planning Commission**

### **1. Amendment to Development Plan**

a. Landscaping Changes – **6699 N. High St.** (Schoedinger Funeral Home) **ADP 01-2020**

Mr. Brown reviewed the following from the staff memo:

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

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

The current Schoedinger mortuary and parking was approved in 1993 and opened to the public in 1994. In July 2019, the Board approved a request to add an exterior deck that would connect to a remodeled interior space for use by families experiencing a loss. The applicant is requesting modifications to the original landscape plan for the site after removing the existing pines and installing new arborvitae adjacent to the rear parking lot.

#### **Details:**

1. Removed a mix of 36 Concolor White Fir, Colorado and Norway Spruce trees that were staggard along the mound along the rear property line.
2. Installed 60 Dark Green Arborvitae that are 6'-7' in height adjacent to the existing parking lot west of the main building that abuts the residential to the west.
3. Installing an additional 8 pine trees or similar in the area west of the arborvitae that will be a minimum of 6' in height.
  - a. The City Arborist made a recommendation for a mix of Limber Pine, Serbian Spruce and Tatarian Maple in this area.

#### **Land Use Plans:**

##### **Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance**

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

##### **Worthington Comprehensive Plan**

The 2005 Worthington Comprehensive Plan identifies the High Street Corridor (Extents Area) as a place where consistent site design should be encouraged such as landscape screening and interior planting of surface parking areas, and the location of large parking areas should be to the rear of the site. The corridor could accommodate redevelopment at a higher density, with such projects meeting the needs of the City, providing green setbacks and meeting the Architectural Design Guidelines.

##### **Worthington Development Plan Regulations**

Location and Character of Development: The following regulations, conditions and procedures shall apply to the development of institutional, office or industrial developments in "C- 3" or "I-1" Districts.

The proposed institutional, office or industrial development or combination thereof shall be located so that reasonably direct traffic access is supplied from major thoroughfares and where congestion will not likely be created by the proposed development; or where such congestion shall be alleviated by presently projected improvements of access thoroughfares, by properly arranged traffic and parking facilities and landscaping which shall be an attractive development and which shall fit harmoniously into and shall have no adverse effects upon the adjoining or surrounding development.

(c) Design Regulations. The following regulations shall apply to office, research and restricted industrial developments in "C-3" and "I-1" Districts.

- (1) Building heights. No building shall exceed three stories or forty-five feet in height, except as modified by Section 1149.04.
- (2) Yards. No building shall be less than thirty feet distant from any boundary of the tract on which the office, research or industrial development is located. Loading, parking and storage shall be permanently screened from all adjoining properties located in any "R" District by building walls, or a solid wall or compact evergreen hedge at least six feet in height. All intervening spaces between the street pavement and the right-of-way line and intervening spaces between buildings, drives, parking areas and improved areas shall be landscaped with trees and plantings and properly maintained at all times.
- (3) Tract coverage. The ground area occupied by all the buildings shall not exceed in the aggregate thirty-five percent (35%) of the total area of the lot or tract.
- (4) Parking space. Notwithstanding any other requirements of this Zoning Ordinance, there shall be provided at least one off-street space for each employee of the maximum working shift. Parking areas will not be located closer than twenty-five feet to any adjoining lot line in any "R" or "C" District and shall be set back at least thirty feet from the street right-of-way line. The parking area shall be graded for proper drainage and improved so as to provide a durable and dust-free surface.
- (5) Access drives and illumination of parking areas. Access drives shall be at a minimum interval of 300 feet, and illumination of parking areas shall be so arranged as to reflect the light away from adjoining premises in any "R" District.

A request for the change, adjustment, or rearrangement of buildings, parking areas, entrances, heights, or yards may require approval of the Municipal Planning Commission. The Commission can approve or disapprove the proposed amendment with no further review by Council if the amendment substantially conforms to the standards established by the final development plan and it complies with the Planning and Zoning Code. Otherwise, the request would be heard by Council.

**Staff Analysis:**

- There is a 25' wide utility easement for stormwater and sanitary sewer that runs along the rear of the property, 15' of that easement is located on the applicant's property.
- The applicant stated that the existing trees were in poor condition, and several of them were diseased.



- This was previously verified by the City Arborist in 2020 when the Board and Commission discussed removal of the pines associated with the Goddard School.
- The applicant is permitted to remove the existing vegetation without City approval; however, the replacement plantings would need to match with the original landscape plan approved as part of the original Development Plan from 1993.
- The Planning & Building staff asked for additional evergreens to be installed in addition to the arborvitae that have been planted today.
  - b. The City Arborist made a recommendation for a mix of Limber Pine, Serbian Spruce and Tatarian Maple in this area.
- The existing parking lot ranges from 25' to 60' from the property line to the west.
- Parking is permitted to be a minimum of 25' from to any lot line in any "R" District.
- Parking area shall be screened from all properties adjacent to any "R" District with an evergreen hedge at least 6' in height.

**Recommendation:**

Staff recommended approval of these applications.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Brown swore in the applicant, Mr. Randy Schoedinger, 6699 N. High St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Schoedinger said he was unaware that the plantings had to be in the same position as the plan in 1993, so with the help of city staff and the arborist they came up with a solution that would not interfere with the overhead power lines. Board members did not have any questions or concerns. Mr. Coulter asked if there were any emails or calls and Mrs. Bitar said there was one caller.

Mr. Brown swore in the caller, Mr. David Warner, 6690 Hayhurst St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Warner said he was not in agreement with the species of plantings that were designated. He said they did not match up to the original species such as the fir and evergreen trees that were in that space, in regard to both the height and the width that the plantings would mature to. Mr. Warner said the foliage would also be different because there would now be leaves instead of pine. He felt the Serbian Spruce and the Limber Pine would be more appropriate than the Tatarian Maple. Mr. Schoedinger said he was open to what finally gets planted. Mr. Warner said he would like to see the plantings be more like what was originally permitted.

**ARB Motion:**

Mr. Foust moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY SCHOEDINGER FUNERAL HOME FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO AMEND AR 65-93A FOR LANDSCAPING AT THE REAR OF 6699 N. HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 12-2020, DRAWINGS NO. AR 12-2020, DATED DECEMBER 8, 2020, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT**

**AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING AND AMENDED TO SUBSTITUTE EITHER SERBIAN SPRUCE OR LIMBER PINE TREES IN PLACE OF THE MAPLE TREES SHOWN AT THE SOUTHERN END OF THE SITE.**

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

**Amendment to Development Plan Motion:**

Mr. Foust moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY SCHOEDINGER FUNERAL HOME TO AMEND DP 16-93A FOR LANDSCAPING AT 6699 N. HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. ADP 01-2020, DRAWINGS NO. ADP 01-2020, DATED DECEMBER 8, 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 AND AMENDED TO SUBSTITUE EITHER SERBIAN SPRUCE OR LIMBER PINE TREES IN PLACE OF THE MAPLE TREES SHOWN AT THE SOUTHERN END OF THE SITE.**

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

13. Landscaping Changes – **6733 N. High St. (Schoedinger Funeral Home/Goddard School) AR 14-2020**

&

**C. Municipal Planning Commission**

**1. Amendment to Development Plan**

a. Landscaping Changes – **6733 N. High St. (Schoedinger Funeral Home/Goddard School) ADP 02-2020**

Mr. Brown reviewed the following from the staff memo:

**Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

**Background & Request:**

In 2019 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 Home and the Commission approved a Conditional Use Permit to operate a preschool in the C-3 Zoning District. In October 2020, the Board approved modifications to the previously approved

plans as it pertains to the existing vegetation along the western property line and fencing related to the expanded playground area. The applicant is now requesting approval to modify the previously approved landscape plan for landscaping along the northern portion of the site to leave the existing vegetation in place.

**Details:**

- The Board and Commission previously approved for a mix of Boxwoods, Feather Reed Grasses and Arborvitae along the northern property line.
- The applicant would like to leave the existing Burning Bushes and Yews along the northern property line.
  - Please see application & materials for pictures.

**Land Use Plans:**

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

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

Worthington Comprehensive Plan

The 2005 Worthington Comprehensive Plan identifies the High Street Corridor (Extents Area) as a place where consistent site design should be encouraged such as landscape screening and interior planting of surface parking areas, and the location of large parking areas should be to the rear of the site. The corridor could accommodate redevelopment at a higher density, with such projects meeting the needs of the City, providing green setbacks and meeting the Architectural Design Guidelines.

Worthington Development Plan Regulations

Location and Character of Development: The following regulations, conditions and procedures shall apply to the development of institutional, office or industrial developments in "C- 3" or "I-1" Districts.

The proposed institutional, office or industrial development or combination thereof shall be located so that reasonably direct traffic access is supplied from major thoroughfares and where congestion will not likely be created by the proposed development; or where such congestion shall be alleviated by presently projected improvements of access thoroughfares, by properly arranged traffic and parking facilities and landscaping which shall be an attractive development and which shall fit harmoniously into and shall have no adverse effects upon the adjoining or surrounding development.

- (c) Design Regulations. The following regulations shall apply to office, research and restricted industrial developments in "C-3" and "I-1" Districts.
- (1) Building heights. No building shall exceed three stories or forty-five feet in height, except as modified by Section 1149.04.
  - (2) Yards. No building shall be less than thirty feet distant from any boundary of the tract on which the office, research or industrial development is located. Loading, parking and storage shall be permanently screened from all adjoining properties located in any

- "R" District by building walls, or a solid wall or compact evergreen hedge at least six feet in height. All intervening spaces between the street pavement and the right-of-way line and intervening spaces between buildings, drives, parking areas and improved areas shall be landscaped with trees and plantings and properly maintained at all times.
- (3) Tract coverage. The ground area occupied by all the buildings shall not exceed in the aggregate thirty-five percent (35%) of the total area of the lot or tract.
  - (4) Parking space. Notwithstanding any other requirements of this Zoning Ordinance, there shall be provided at least one off-street space for each employee of the maximum working shift. Parking areas will not be located closer than twenty-five feet to any adjoining lot line in any "R" or "C" District and shall be set back at least thirty feet from the street right-of-way line. The parking area shall be graded for proper drainage and improved so as to provide a durable and dust-free surface.
  - (5) Access drives and illumination of parking areas. Access drives shall be at a minimum interval of 300 feet, and illumination of parking areas shall be so arranged as to reflect the light away from adjoining premises in any "R" District.

A request for the change, adjustment, or rearrangement of buildings, parking areas, entrances, heights, or yards may require approval of the Municipal Planning Commission. The Commission can approve or disapprove the proposed amendment with no further review by Council if the amendment substantially conforms to the standards established by the final development plan and it complies with the Planning and Zoning Code. Otherwise, the request would be heard by Council.

**Staff Analysis:**

- The existing shrubs along the northern property line appear to be well kept and healthy.
- The existing shrubs provide a better screening and buffer along the northern property line than the previously approved plants.
- Staff would ask that if the Burning Bushes ever need to be replaced that they be replaced with something other than Burning Bushes since they are now on the invasive species list.

**Discussion:**

The Board members did not have any questions or concerns. Mr. Coulter asked if there were any emails or callers and Mrs. Bitar said no.

**ARB Motion:**

Mr. Foust moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY SCHOEDINGER FUNERAL HOME ON BEHALF OF THE GODDARD SCHOOL TO AMEND AR 07-19 FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO MODIFY THE APPROVED LANDSCAPE PLAN AT 6733 N. HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 14-2020, DRAWINGS NO. AR 14-2020, DATED DECEMBER 11, 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.

**Amendment to Development Plan Motion:**

Mrs. Holcombe moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY SCHOEDINGER FUNERAL HOME ON BEHALF OF THE GODDARD SCHOOL TO AMEND ADP 02-19 FOR LANDSCAPING AT 6733 N. HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. ADP 02-2020, DRAWINGS NO. ADP 02-2020, DATED DECEMBER 11, 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. Reis seconded the motion. Mr. Brown called the roll. Mr. Foust, aye; Mr. Hofmann, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; and Mr. Coulter, aye. The motion was approved.

**D. Other**

There was no other business to discuss.

**E. Adjournment**

Mr. Reis moved to adjourn the meeting and Mr. Foust seconded the motion. All Board members voted, "Aye," and the meeting adjourned at 10:32 p.m.