



MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
WORTHINGTON ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
WORTHINGTON MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION
July 22, 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; David Foust; Richard Schuster; and Susan Hinz. Also present were: Worthington City Council Representative Scott Myers; Lee Brown, Director of Planning & Building; and Lynda Bitar, Development Coordinator. Commission member Edwin Hofmann was absent.

A. Call to Order – 7:00 p.m.

1. Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Approval of the minutes of the July 8, 2021 meeting.

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

B. Architectural Review Board – Consent Agenda

There will be no separate discussion of Consent Agenda items as they are considered to be routine by the Board and Commission and will be adopted by one motion. If a member of the Board & Commission, staff, or public requests discussion on a particular item, that item will be removed from the Consent Agenda and considered separately on the agenda.

1. Shed – **226 E. Granville Rd.** (Keith Johnson) **ARB 75-2021**
2. Signs & Building Color – **661 High St. B** (AR Workshop Worthington) **ARB 76-2021**
3. Shelter – **885 Evening St.** (Worthington Schools/Evening Street Elementary School) **ARB 81-2021**

Mr. Reis moved to approve the Consent Agenda and Mrs. Holcombe seconded the motion. All Board members voted, “Aye,” and the motion was approved.

C. Architectural Review Board – Regular Agenda

1. Additions & Renovations – 662 Hartford St. (Lucas & Lindsay McComas) ARB 77-2021

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This Farmhouse was built in 1906 and is a contributing building in the Worthington Historic District. The house was remodeled and added onto in the late 1970's and early 1980's. The owners were approved to replace and expand the rear patio and add a seat wall in 2019, and to install a fence in 2020.

This request involves additions and renovations to the house.

Project Details:

1. A second story (530 square feet) addition is proposed above the 1981 rear one-story addition. A gable roof would extend to the rear from the gable over the main part of the house. At the new gable's highest point, the roof heights would match. On the north side, new kitchen windows are proposed on the first floor of the existing house, and the addition would have 2 windows on the first floor and 1 on the second floor. The south side would not have any windows on the second floor. One double hung window is proposed on the portion of the addition facing front. The rear elevation is missing.
2. A 17' x 14' screened porch is proposed on the south side of the house. The porch would have 10" square columns with screen panels between and be 9' from the side property line. A low sloped roof would be used for the structure.
3. A shed roof supported by four 10" square columns is proposed above the front porch. Because the roof is shown closer than 30' to the front property line a variance would be needed. Removal of an existing double hung window on the second floor and replacement with 2 smaller casement windows is proposed to allow room for the roof. A small gable is proposed above the front door, which would be replaced with a wood door having 8 lights above 1 panel. A new light fixture is proposed for the ceiling.
4. The existing vinyl siding on the house is proposed to be removed and replaced with Southern Yellow Pine 2" Dutch Lap Siding painted Benjamin Moore Copley Gray. The proposed siding style reportedly matches the original siding. Trim for the house would be Benjamin Moore Cloud White. Windows on the front façade would be restored. New windows are proposed as Andersen 400 series in white. Light fixtures on the garage and side of the house are proposed for restoration and placement where needed.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Residential additions are recommended to maintain similar roof forms; be constructed as far to the rear and sides of the existing residence as possible; be subordinate; and have walls set back from the corners of the main house. New siding should match the thickness and width of the old as

closely as possible. Design and materials should be traditional, and compatible with the existing structure.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of this application. Although the rear and screened porch additions would be seen from the street, they are set back from the front of the house enough to be subordinate to the main house.

Discussion:

Mr. Dominic Luppino, representing Residential Design Solutions, and Mr. Lucas McComas, 662 Hartford St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Luppino said the project is composed of three components. They are looking to put a cover over the existing front stoop, a screened porch would replace the current patio, and the living addition is over an existing portion of the house which was an addition originally built in 1981. The family needs a little more living space, and the second floor contains a new master suite. A six-foot sliding glass door would be added to the back of the house. Board members did not have any questions or concerns. There were no emails or calls regarding this application.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY LUCAS & LINDSAY MCCOMAS FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO CONSTRUCT ADDITIONS AND RENOVATE THE HOUSE AT 662 HARTFORD ST. AS PER CASE NO. ARB 77-2021, DRAWINGS NO. ARB 77-2021, DATED JULY 9, 2021, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

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

2. Sign – 5900 N. High St. – (Jarine Berrios/The Pedicure Couture) ARB 78-2021

Mr. Brown reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This 2-story 5,200 sq. ft. commercial building was constructed in 1965 as a multi-tenant office building with a freestanding multi-tenant sign. In 1998 the Architectural Review Board approved the installation of a satellite dish on the rear of the building. In 2001 the Municipal Planning Commission approved a Conditional Use to operate an instructional institution (computer training) in the C-3 District.

This request is to add additional signage to the existing freestanding sign for a new tenant in the building.

Project Details:

1. 6 sq. ft. clear plexiglass panel insert. The insert is approximately 14.5-inches in height by 56-inches in width.
2. The height of the letters on the sign were requested by staff, however the height has not been provided at this time.
 - a. A variety of heights appear to be proposed.
3. 5 colors are proposed for the plexiglass insert. Colors were not provided; however, they appear to be white, black, turquoise, red and blue. The red appears to be two different shades of red for possibly 6 total colors.
4. 2 to 3 fonts appear to be used on the sign. Details were not provided.
5. Appears to have seven different sizes of lettering on the sign. Details were not provided.
6. Proposed logo to be used.
7. Business phone number has also been included.
8. Utilizing the existing internally illuminated cabinet.

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, architecture and color of 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.

Planning & Zoning Code - [Chapter 1170 - Signs](#)

The purpose of these sign regulations is to encourage the proper development and use of signage and to permit and regulate signs in such a way as to support and complement land-use objectives set forth in the Zoning Ordinance. In addition to protecting from distractions and obstructions that can contribute to traffic and pedestrian accidents, it is the intent of these regulations to control and regulate signs to prevent them from becoming a nuisance factor to adjacent properties and the community in general. To protect the general health, safety and welfare, and to protect and encourage a more attractive economic, business and overall physical appearance of the community, all signage is subject to the regulations that follow in this chapter

Definitions & Provisions:

“Freestanding” means a sign having a support structure that is embedded in the ground.

“Joint identification sign” means a sign displaying more than one business or listing more than one associate, partner, employee or agent of any business.

- Freestanding joint identification signs shall display no more than three businesses or listings.
- Wall-mounted joint identification signs may advertise more than three businesses or listings.

Design Requirements:

Illumination - Internally illuminated signs shall be constructed so as to allow the illumination of only letters, numbers or other identifying symbols on the display surface. No light shall pass through the background. Internally illuminated signs shall not exceed the equivalent of an 800

milliamper fluorescent tube mounted not closer than twelve inches on center. External illumination shall be installed so that the light source is not visible from adjoining premises and does not illuminate such premises. No external light source shall be located or arranged so as to cause confusion or a hazard to traffic or conflict with traffic control signals. Flashing signs shall not be permitted.

Styles - Signs shall be comprised of not more than two styles of lettering plus one logo. A logo is an emblem, character, pictograph, trademark or symbol used alone to represent a business, organization, entity or product. There shall be not more than three sizes of all such lettering, including a logo.

Colors - Not more than four colors, including black and white, shall be used on any sign.

Staff Analysis:

1. The existing sign is a non-conforming sign in size, location and number of businesses that are permitted to be displayed on the sign, however it was originally approved with the letters all being black and in the same letter type, style and size for uniformity. The sign was originally approved to display twelve businesses to be identified on the sign.
2. The existing joint identification sign is internally illuminated and is 8-feet by 5-feet Lexan white plastic with die-cut pressure sensitive vinyl letters affixed.
 - a. The internally illuminated background would not be permitted today, only the letters, numbers and logo would be permitted to be illuminated today.
3. There are only two permits on file for signage from 1984 and 1985. There are no permits or Architectural Review Board approval for the current tenant signage.
 - a. The current tenant signage is a variety of letter types, styles, size, color and logos that do not meet the City's Sign Code or the Worthington Design Guidelines.
4. The existing tenant signage does not meet Code requirements or the Design Guidelines as it relates to the number of colors, fonts, sizes, logos and that no light shall pass through the background of the sign.
5. The Architectural Review Board typically does not approve phone numbers and web addresses on signage as a way to minimize visual clutter on signage and be in the Architectural Review District.
6. The Board of Zoning Appeals would need to approve the expansion of the non-conforming use of the sign and would need to approve variances for the number letter types, styles, colors, sizes, and logos.
7. A comprehensive sign package should be reviewed and discussed as a way to clean up the unpermitted signage that does not meet Code requirements or Design Guidelines recommendations.
8. Since the current tenants do not have a Sign Permit or a Certificate of Appropriateness from the Board, City staff will be reaching out to the individual tenants to discuss the need to be in compliance with the approved guidelines and options to move forward.

Recommendations:

Staff recommended denial of this application. The proposed sign did not meet the Design Guidelines and the requirements found in the Chapter 1170 of the Planning & Zoning Code. A comprehensive sign package is recommended for the site.

Discussion:

Ms. Jarine Argula Berrios, 5900 N. High St., Worthington, Ohio, said because the background is white, she would only be using three other colors. Mr. Foust said part of the reasoning behind limiting the amount of text, is because people are driving down the road at 35 m.p.h. and they do not want to get in an accident trying to read a sign. The sign should just identify the name of the business, not include telephone numbers. Ms. Berrios said she modified the sign and showed the

Mr. Brown said he spoke with the property owner about the Boards and Commissions taking an August recess and the meetings would not resume until the September meeting, but City staff has the ability to issue a Temporary Use Permit, up to a maximum of 90 days, so they could issue a Temporary Use Permit from the staff level, with a caveat the sign package does need to be approved by the Board no later than 90 days if they want to be able to keep the sign. Mr. Brown said the city does not want to penalize the applicant that was before the Board, but there have only been two prior applications in 1984 and 1985, and now would be a good time to bring the whole sign into compliance. The process would be more seamless if the applicants could meet the design standards and have staff administratively approve the sign first instead of having to come before the Board. Mr. Foust explained the sign has to be opaque, the light cannot shine through the letters. Mrs. Bitar said the applicant could ask the Board of Zoning Appeals to approve a variance for the nonconforming sign. The applicant asked for the application to be tabled.

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

3. Addition – 119 E. Granville Rd. (J.S. Brown & Co./J.C. Rice) ARB 80-2021

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

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

This property is about ¼ acre at the southwest corner of Morning St. and E. Granville Rd. The farmhouse was originally constructed in the late 1800's and has been added onto over the years. The owner would like to replace the screened porch with an addition to house office space.

Project Details:

1. A 12' x 13' screened porch is located at the southeast corner of the house. Removal is necessary in order to construct a proper foundation for the new addition.
2. The proposed addition would be 14.7' wide x 12.7' deep and in line with the eastern wall of the house which is 15.6' from the east property line. A variance is needed to construct an addition in the required side yard of a corner lot.
3. A one-story structure similar in form to the existing screened porch is proposed. A 24" high decorative railing is proposed around the edges of the roof.
4. The addition would be sided with Cedar shingles and painted to match the rest of the house. Marvin double hung clad wood windows are proposed that appear larger than the windows on the original house.
5. A light fixture similar to others on the house is proposed next to the door on the west

side of the addition.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

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

Recommendations:

- The addition may be more appropriate if set in from the side of the house rather than on the same plane as the existing wall. Although the addition cannot be hidden due to the corner lot, stepping it in could give it the appearance of being subordinate.
- Windows of the same size as the existing or smaller rather than larger may be more complementary to the existing house.
- The railing on the roof seems out of character.
- Approval of this application would be conditioned on approval from the Board of Zoning Appeals.

Discussion:

Ms. J.C. Rice, 119 E. Granville Rd., Worthington, Ohio, and Ms. Wendy Sorenson, representing J.S. Brown and Company, 197 High Meadow Dr., Gahanna, Ohio. Ms. Rice said she preferred the drawing without the railing on top and she also preferred the two windows on the one side of the house because she planned to use that room as a home office and that would allow her more furniture choices. Mr. Schuster asked if the windows would be the same and Ms. Sorenson said the windows would be slightly wider, but they would be the same height. The Board members had no other questions or concerns. Mr. Coulter asked if there were any emails or additional calls and Mrs. Bitar said no.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY J.S. BROWN & CO. ON BEHALF OF J.C. RICE FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO REMOVE A SCREENED PORCH AND CONSTRUCT AN ADDITION AT 119 E. GRANVILLE RD. AS PER CASE NO. ARB 80-2021, DRAWINGS NO. ARB 80-2021, DATED JULY 12, 2021, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING AND THAT THE ELEVATION AS PRESENTED AT THE MEETING WITH THE REVISED TWO WINDOWS BE APPROVED AND THAT THE RAILING BE REMOVED.

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

4. New Building – **6700 N. High St.** – Former Anthem Site – Southern Lot – (William R. Bily, Architect/LCNB National Bank) **ARB 79-2021**

&

D. Municipal Planning Commission – Regular Agenda

1. Amendment to Development Plan

- i. New Building – **6700 N. High St.** – Former Anthem Site – Southern Lot – (William R. Bily, Architect/LCNB National Bank) **ADP 07-2021**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This property was originally developed in the late 1960's as an office for Ohio Medical Indemnity, which was most recently Anthem Blue Cross and Blue Shield. The property is made up of 9 parcels totaling 19 acres of land and houses a 200,000 square foot building and many acres of parking. Although the land still shows as 9 separate taxing parcels, the city views the land as all one parcel because the lots were under common ownership in 1971 when the Planning and Zoning Code was adopted.

This is a request to construct a new 3570 square foot branch bank for LCNB on the southern ~1.3 acres of this site. Applications for Architectural Review Boards approval and Amendment to Development Plan approval have been submitted. In addition, the 2 parcels of land designated for this development (~140' x ~410') would need to be split from the larger parcel by way of a subdivision; and the proposed drive-thru would need a Conditional Use Permit.

This is a preliminary review so tabling of these applications after discussion is requested.

Project Details:

1. Site:

- The proposed layout includes bank building at the 100' required building setback.
- A drive aisle and accessible parking are shown to about 50' from the N. High St. right-of-way and a walk is proposed to extend from the building to the public sidewalk.
- The south side of the site would be used for 2 drive-thru lanes and a bypass lane.
- Twenty-eight parking spaces would be on the north side.
- At the rear, a drive aisle to exit and a freestanding ATM are proposed.
- A trash enclosure is shown on the east side of the parking spaces behind the building.
- A 10' landscape buffer is indicated along the rear of the property. Details of the buffer and other landscaping on the site, including tree removal would be needed prior to any approval.

- Location of mechanicals has not been identified.
2. Building:
- A one-story brick building with hipped roofs and a tower at the northwest corner is proposed for the site. The proposed brick is Endicott “Medium Ironspot #77) and cast stone accent bands would be Reading Rock Rockcast in” Charlotte Tan.” A limestone block water table is proposed around the building.
 - Two entry doors would be at the northwest corner framed with EIFS in light gray. Cast stone arches would be at the top with clerestory windows. The windows and doors would be comprised of storefront systems framed in black metal and the glass would have what appears to be a green finish. A green metal band is proposed at the top of the tower that would have internally illuminated channel letters on 2 sides.
 - The roof would be Berridge Evergreen standing seam metal.
 - Black cannister light fixtures are proposed that would illuminate up and down.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Scale, Form & Massing: Simple geometric forms and uncomplicated massing tend to make buildings more user-friendly and help to extend the character of Old Worthington into the newer development areas. Inclusion of sidewalks, pedestrian-scaled signage, and planting and lawn areas will help communicate a sense of a walkable pedestrian scale. Carefully designed building facades that employ traditional storefronts -- or similarly-sized windows on the first floor -- will help make new buildings more pedestrian-friendly.

Setbacks: Parking areas should be located toward the rear and not in the front setbacks if at all possible. Unimpeded pedestrian access to the front building facade from the sidewalk should be a primary goal. Building up to the required setback is desirable as a means of getting pedestrians closer to the building and into the main entrance as easily as possible.

Roof Shape: Generally, a traditional roof shape such as gable or hip is preferable to a flat roof on a new building. Roof shapes should be in scale with the buildings on which they are placed. Study traditional building designs in Old Worthington to get a sense of how much of the facade composition is wall surface and how much is roof.

Materials: Traditional materials such as wood and brick are desirable in newer areas, but other materials are also acceptable. These include various metals and plastics; poured concrete and concrete block should be confined primarily to foundation walls. Avoid any use of glass with highly reflective coatings. Some of these may have a blue, orange, or silver color and can be as reflective as mirrors; they generally are not compatible with other development in Worthington. Before making a final selection of materials, prepare a sample board with preferred and optional materials.

Windows: Use traditional sizes, proportions and spacing for windows. Doing so will help link Old Worthington and newer areas through consistent design elements.

Entries: Primary building entrances should be on the street-facing principal facade. Rear or side entries from parking lots are desirable, but primary emphasis should be given to the street entry.

Use simple door and trim designs compatible with both the building and with adjacent and nearby development.

Ornamentation: Use ornamentation sparingly in new developments. Decorative treatments at entries, windows and cornices can work well in distinguishing a building and giving it character, but only a few such elements can achieve the desired effect. Traditional wood ornamentation is the simplest to build, but on new buildings it is possible to use substitute materials such as metal and fiberglass. On brick buildings substitute materials can be used to resemble the stone or metal ornamental elements traditionally found on older brick buildings. As with all ornamentation, simple designs and limited quantities give the best results.

Color: For new brick buildings, consider letting the natural brick color be the body color, and select trim colors that are compatible with the color of the bricks. Prepare a color board showing proposed colors.

Signage: While the regulations permit a certain maximum square footage of signs for a business, try to minimize the size and number of signs. Place only basic names and graphics on signs along the street so that drive-by traffic is not bombarded with too much information. Free-standing signs should be of the “monument” type; they should be as low as possible. Such signs should have an appropriate base such as a brick planting area with appropriate landscaping or no lighting. Colors for signs should be chosen for compatibility with the age, architecture and colors of the buildings they serve, whether placed on the ground or mounted on the building. Signs must be distinctive enough to be readily visible but avoid incompatible modern colors such as “fluorescent orange” and similar colors. Bright color shades generally are discouraged in favor more subtle and toned-down shades.

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.

Dicussion Points:

1. Although subdivision approval has not yet been requested, the proposed parcel would meet dimensional requirements for the C-3 Zoning District. Once the split is approved, the entire property should remain subject to Development Plan approval as per Chapter 1175 of the Code to allow a more comprehensive review of current and future proposed changes. Variance for placement of the new building in the required side yard would need to be approved by City Council.
2. The proposed location of the building 100' from the right-of-way line may not be as desirable as placement closer to N. High St., which could enhance the pedestrian environment. Inclusion of a walkway from the public sidewalk is important, however.
3. Building:
 - A two-story building may be more desirable on this site. The roof shape does help to increase the massing of the building but does not represent a traditional style of architecture.
 - The proposed green standing seam metal roof and green sign band do not seem

- appropriate for this location.
- The clerestory windows should be clear.
 - Two wall signs are not appropriate.
4. Although traffic would increase with this use, the amount should not disrupt the flow of traffic on N. High St.
 5. Utilities appear sufficient to serve a new building of this size.
 6. Storm water and Fire Department reviews are needed.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended tabling these applications after discussion.

Discussion:

Mr. Eric Meilstrup, President of LCNB National Bank, 2 North Broadway, Lebanon, Ohio and Mr. Sean Twomey, 5226 Pernod Ave., St. Louis, Missouri, said he represents the design and build contractor that LCNB has retained. Mr. Meilstrup said they engaged with New Ground because they design bank buildings and financial institutions. They make sure they have a business model and a building that is very useful. He said they were excited to be in Worthington because they pride themselves on being a community bank, and their employees helping in the community. Mr. Meilstrup said LCNB is currently in a three-story building that does not set well for a business model. He said the bank has a large commercial which takes care of other businesses, but they also want to help the residents. Mr. Meilstrup said the building that they were looking at is larger than what a more traditional branch would be because they are trying to establish a hub that not only allows them to have the jobs they have now, but they anticipate additional jobs coming down the road also. The project itself must work with their business model. If they are going to spend two and a half or three million dollars for their project, it must make sense for them and the community. Mr. Twomey said he brought samples of the materials they plan to use for the building. Mr. Coulter explained to Mr. Twomey that the City of Worthington has a set of Design Guidelines for the Architectural Review Corridor and that would be a good starting point to look at, especially if Mr. Twomey was not familiar with the area. Mr. Twomey said their Design Architect could not be present at the meeting but has already met with the City's Planners a couple of weeks ago and has already downloaded the Design Guidelines.

Mr. Brown stated that they were happy to be working with an existing Worthington business to stay in Worthington, however felt that this was a missed opportunity for the site and a missed opportunity from an economic standpoint for the City. He stated that City staff has had numerous conversations over the past three years concerning a variety of development proposals on the site, and that this option was never really discussed until LCNB National Bank decided to move forward. He said that there needs to be a look at the entire site, not just a piecemeal approach to development. He said that staff and the Board are typically pushing for a decrease in height and massing, however this time felt that there needed to be a more substantial building on the site. Mr. Brown discussed the push for more square footage and a second story. He referenced CF Bank at the southeast corner of N. High St. and Highland Ave. as an example of a bank that constructed a two-story building, however they only finished off the first floor until they needed additional space years later and then at that time finished off the second story into usable space. Overall the proposal seemed a little underwhelming for the site.

Mr. Foust said the building as presented, resembled the bank building that sits next to City Hall, and they had to alter several things. He said the building itself was not unattractive, and he understood they needed to build something to represent their image and corporate standing. Mr. Foust said as you drive north on U.S. Rt. 23, towards Delaware, Ohio, the presented building looks very similar to every strip center that is along that route, and they tend to put a little end cap on the towers of the buildings. He said the design was not consistent with what their goal has been which is in the Design Guidelines. In talking with the general public, people would like to see something that enhances the New England character of Worthington. He would like to see more details towards that direction regardless of the size of the building. Mrs. Holcombe asked Mr. Meilstrup if they were opposed to a two-story building and Mr. Meilstrup said yes, because that would mean spending unnecessary money and that would not make economic sense. The one-story floor plan already allows for room for growth. If they put a second story there, they could consider it, but the space would not be used in the future. He said that would mean extra costs that would not be necessary. Mrs. Holcombe said she felt the massing was one of the biggest issues, especially where the building would be sitting between the two larger buildings. Mr. Meilstrup said they are not interested in sharing space with another business because they want to focus on what they do best. Mr. Reis said he would echo some of the comments that have already been made. He said when he first saw the design he did not have a problem with the idea of a bank being there in that location, but the architectural character needs some work, but it does bother him a bit with the Anthem building to the north and the large building to the south. This building seems like a pimple between two much larger scaled buildings. Mr. Reis said he did not know if they could work the building to make it look like it had a second story or if Mr. Meilstrup decides to have a little larger building and have a second tenant, he was uncertain, and felt the scale of the building was too small. Mr. Meilstrup said he disagreed with Mr. Reis and did not feel the building looked like a pimple, but he understood what the Board meant about the massing. Mr. Meilstrup said there was a lot of space between his building and the Anthem building. Mr. Coulter said he agreed he felt there was an issue with the scale of the proposed building. He was not opposed to the bank being in that location, the Board members would like for Mr. Meilstrup to stay in Worthington. Mr. Coulter asked why the ATM would be so far back on the lot. Mr. Meilstrup said they put the ATM on the back of the building to keep the building as narrow as possible, but also so they could have a drive thru. Mr. Meilstrup said having the ATM on the back of the building would allow easy access and people could drive up to it in their cars and not interrupt anything else. Mrs. Hinz said she understood the comments about the massing, but also felt there was a lot of pavement in comparison to the building and Mr. Meilstrup said they needed the drive isles to go all the way around the building for traffic flow. Mr. Twomey said the way they lay out the drive thru is for pedestrian safety. They base the flow of the traffic by how they anticipate the customer will interact, and what is best for them, because the bank is a retail operation. Mr. Meilstrup said they were open for discussion of how far back the building should be and open to more discussion about the parking. He said if the goal is to get the building closer to the front they could still work with that.

Mr. Myers explained that City Council has adopted a policy approximately ten years ago that they have tried to eliminate as much asphalt on the front of the building as possible and push it to the back, such as the example of the Fresh Thyme building. Mr. Myers suggested taking a look at the Masonic Lodge for an example of the New England style.

Mr. Brown said they will already be needing a variance for the southern setback anyway, and what was done for the FC Bank, they allowed them to come up closer to the street, as a variance and that helped with their maneuverability on the site with their drive thru being at the rear of the building. Mr. Coulter said they understand what they did, they are suggesting some options. Mr. Schuster said he would like to see them come up with more detail and likeness of the New England style.

Mr. Twomey should sample materials to the Board members. He explained all of the glass on the building would be clear except for the spandrel glass which would have a ceramic opaque coating on the foreface. Mrs. Bitar said there seemed to be more parking for this building than what would be needed. She asked them to clarify why they needed that many parking spaces. Mr. Meilstrup said they could play with then number of parking spaces. Mr. Myers asked how jobs would be created at this branch. Mr. Meilstrup said they currently have eleven or twelve assigned and as they grow the wealth group up that will force them to hire more employees. He said maybe somewhere down the road there could be eighteen to twenty-two people working inside the building. Mr. Twomey asked for clarification about the parking. Mrs. Bitar explained that fourteen spaces would be required based upon the building's size, and the current plan calls for twenty-eight spaces. She said they could cut the parking in half and still meet the Code, and if they went below fourteen spaces, the city would okay with that too.

ARB 79-2021

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

ADP 07-2021

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

E. Other

There will be no meetings in the month of August. The next meeting will be held on September 9, 2021. Mr. Brown updated the Board members about what was discussed at the previous City Council meeting regarding Super Games.

F. Adjournment

Mr. Reis moved to adjourn the meeting, and Mr. Foust seconded the motion. All Board members voted, "Aye," and the meeting adjourned at 8:32 p.m.