



MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
WORTHINGTON ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
WORTHINGTON MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION
September 9, 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; Edwin Hofmann; and Susan Hinz. Also present were: Worthington City Council Representative Scott Myers; Lee Brown, Director of Planning & Building; Lynda Bitar, Development Coordinator; and Kenneth Ganter, Planning & Building Assistant. Board member Richard Schuster 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 22, 2021 meeting.

Mr. Reis 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. Condensing Unit – **6493 Bellbrook Pl.** (Alayna Nutter/Weinandy) **ARB 82-2021**
2. Roof Replacement & Chimney Repair – **137 E. Granville Rd.** (Mark Goyer/Sharon Memorial Hall) **ARB 84-2021**
3. Signs – **559 High St.** (Signarama Worthington/Eleventh Candle Co.) **ARB 85-2021**
4. Addition Modifications – **151 E. Granville Rd.** (SBA Studios/Witsken) **ARB 86-2021**
5. Fence – **131 W. South St.** (Rudy Wesalek) **ARB 89-2021**

6. Ramp – **825 High St.** (A-1 Concrete Leveling) **ARB 92-2021**
7. Mini-split – **6152 Maxton Pl.** (Hetter Heating & Cooling/Thaxton) **ARB 93-2021**
8. Shed & Fence – **570 Hartford St.** (Brant & Suzanne Gipson) **ARB 94-2021**
9. Awnings & String Lights – **644 High St.** (Columbus Awning/House Wine) **ARB 95-2021**
10. Exhaust Hood and Surround – **530 High St.** (Luis Munoz/Chapala Mexican Restaurant) **ARB 96-2021**

Mr. Coulter explained to the Board that there was a request to remove 570 Hartford St. (ARB 94-2021) for a fence and shed from the Consent Agenda. Mr. Reis moved to remove this item from the Consent Agenda, and Mrs. Holcombe seconded the motion. All Board members voted, “Aye,” and the motion was approved.

Mr. Foust moved to approve the items on the Consent Agenda, and Mr. Hofmann seconded the motion. All Board members voted, “Aye,” and the motion was approved.

8. Shed & Fence – **570 Hartford St.** (Brant & Suzanne Gipson) **ARB 94-2021**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This Bungalow was built in the early 1900’s and is a contributing building in the Worthington Historic District. The garage was added in 1981 and an addition was constructed in 2018. The house sits on a 0.58 acre parcel that is 100’ wide and 240’ deep.

Approval of this application would allow construction of a shed and a fence in the rear yard.

Project Details:

1. A 20’ x 10’ shed is proposed at the southeast corner of the property, 10’ from the rear property line and 8’ from the south side property line. A gabled roof with asphalt shingles and vertical Duratemp plank siding are proposed for the shed, which would have 2 windows and 2 doors. The colors would match the house.
2. A 4’ tall three board Kentucky horse fence with wire mesh is proposed to enclose the rear yard. The same style of fencing is used for other properties in the area.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

New outbuildings should use design cues from older nearby structures, including form, massing, roof shape, roof pitch and height, materials, window and door types and detailing. Try to create a new building compatible in appearance with the house it accompanies. Fencing should be open in style; constructed with traditional materials; 3’ to 4’ in height; in the back yard; and of simple design, appropriate for the house style. Design and materials should be compatible with the existing structure.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending approval of this application, as the proposed are appropriately designed for this property.

Discussion:

Mr. Brant Gipson, and Mrs. Suzanne Gipson, 570 Hartford St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Gipson said there is an alley located on the south side of their property which is used quite a bit in the community. There are multiple houses that currently have the same type of fencing that he has that are abutting to the alley. He said they were inspired by the neighbor on the east side of the property and what they have done with their yard. Mr. Coulter asked if the proposed shed's design was exactly like what they wanted and Mr. Gipson said the not exactly, the door would be in the middle of the shed and the windows would be located on the side, but the model of the shed was correct. Board members did not have any questions or concerns. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone that wanted to speak for or against this application.

There was one caller. Mr. Brown swore in Mr. Crawley, address unknown. Mr. Colley said he was supportive of the fence, and the shed, but made a suggestion that would allow children to walk through their property. Mr. Gipson said he spoke with his bank, and he was told if he built the fence in such a way, the additional space left open would be considered public property, and his bank was not supportive in building the fence the way the neighbor suggested. Mr. Gipson said he was open to the City purchasing land from him to create a thoroughfare, but he was not willing to give up 400 square feet of his property. Mr. Coulter asked for clarification about the alleged alleyway and Mr. Brown explained the north-south alley had been vacated. (The east-west alleyway is a publicly owned right-of-way.)

Mr. Gilbert Borlaza, 563 Morning St., Worthington, Ohio, said he wanted to speak in support of this proposal. He said he is Mr. Gipson's neighbor to the rear of the property, and they would share the fence line. Mr. Borlaza said he had his fence installed in 2013 and they did get the approval for their fence from the Architectural Review Board (ARB). Their rear fence line does go to the center of the vacated alley. Mr. Borlaza reiterated he was in support of the Gipsons proposal.

Mrs. Bitar read an email from Mr. Rob Huffman, 594 Hartford St., Worthington, Ohio, who was in support of the proposed fence, as an added security measure from the neighbor who is building a pool. There were no other speakers.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY BRANT & SUZANNE GIPSON FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO CONSTRUCT A SHED AND FENCE AT 570 HARTFORD ST., AS PER CASE NO. ARB 94-2021, DRAWINGS NO. ARB 94-2021, DATED AUGUST 27, 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. Hofmann, aye; Mr. Foust, aye; Mrs. Hinz, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; and Mr. Coulter, aye. The motion was approved.

C. Architectural Review Board – Old Business

Mr. Reis moved to take the following Agenda item off the table, and Mr. Foust seconded the motion. All Board members voted, “Aye,” and the motion was approved.

1. Signage Criteria – 5900 N. High St. – (Jarine Berrios/Robert Paquette) ARB 78-2021

Mrs. Bitar 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 was initially to add a sign panel to the existing freestanding sign for a new tenant in the building. After the ARB meeting, the building owner established criteria for future tenants to adhere to for sign panel design. Approval for those criteria is now sought.

Project Details:

1. The owner would like existing sign panels to be permitted to remain. The panels are 5’ wide and either 8” or 16” high. A variance would be needed to accommodate the existing conditions which include too many colors, sizes, styles, and a lighted background at the top.
2. Proposed Criteria:
 - Two Fonts Allowed – Garmond and Helvetica
 - Text Size – 3” – 7”
 - Colors – black, green, blue on a clear background panel
 - No phone numbers or web addresses allowed
 - Logos not larger than 10” x 10” allowed
3. The recently added panel for the original applicant “The Pedicure Couture” would comply with the new criteria.

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.

Recommendations:

Staff recommend approval of this application. Although replacement of the sign would be ideal, requiring coordination of sign panels would be an improvement.

Discussion:

Mr. Robert Paquette, said he is the owner of the building located at 5900 N. High St., Worthington,

Ohio. Mr. Paquette said one of his tenants was now leaving because she was intimidated by the process for signage. He said he would like to see the other tenants age out. When he looked at the signage criteria that he and Mr. Brown came up with, most of the tenants were already in compliance. Mrs. Bitar explained the Board members would be voting on the sign criteria going forward. The City is going to allow the current signage to remain, but moving forward new tenants would need to be in compliance with signage criteria. Mr. Paquette said his building has been inspected twice in the past three years and no one had ever mentioned the issue with sign, so he said he was completely shocked. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone who wanted to speak for or against this application but there were no speakers.

Motion:

Mr. Foust moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY JARINE BERRIOS AND BOB PAQUETTE FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO MODIFY THE FREESTANDING SIGN AT 5900 N. HIGH ST. AS PER CASE NO. ARB 78-2021, DRAWINGS NO. ARB 78-2021, DATED AUGUST 11, 2021, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING AND CLARIFIED TO INCLUDE EITHER TWO LETTERS SIZES AND A LOGO OR THREE LETTERS SIZES, WITH THE LETTER SIZES BEING 5” AND 7” INCHES AND ALSO CLARIFYING THAT THE CLEAR ON THE PROPOSAL IS A CREAM COLOR.

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

2. 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 – Old Business

1. **Amendment to Development Plan**

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

&

E. Municipal Planning Commission – New Business

Mr. Reis moved to take the following Agenda item off the table and Mr. Foust seconded the motion. All Board members voted, “Aye,” and the motion was approved. Mrs. Bitar explained the Amendment for Development Plan for this Agenda item would also need to be removed from the table. Mrs. Holcombe moved to remove ADP 07-2021 from the table and Mr. Foust seconded the

motion. All Board members voted, “Aye,” and the motion was approved.

1. Conditional Use Permit

- a. Drive-in Bank – **6700 N. High St.** (William R. Bily, Architect/LCNB National Bank) CU
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 Board approval, Amendment to Development Plan approval and a Conditional Use Permit 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.

After meeting with the ARB in July, the applicant made changes to the conceptual plans.

Project Details:

1. Site:

- The grass and tree area at the rear of the property would now remain as is.
- A walk is proposed to extend to the building from the public sidewalk and would have steps and a ramp to provide access at the northeast corner of the building.
- A mechanicals/trash enclosure is shown attached to the building on the south side.
- Two drive-thru and one ATM lane are proposed. Bank hours would be 8:30 am – 5:00 pm, Monday – Thursday; 8:30 am – 6:00 pm, Friday; and 8:30 am – 1:00 pm, Saturday. The ATM Lane would be available 24 hours per day, 7 days per week.
- Two options have now been submitted for the location of the proposed building:
 - 1) Building Setback 50’ – The plan shows parking and drive-thru lanes behind the building, including 16 parking spaces, 3 drive-thru lanes and a bypass lane. This option allows for parking along the rear of the building and a large open area between the parking on the north side and the drive-thru lanes on the south side.
 - 2) Building Setback 100’ - The plan shows parking and drive-thru lanes behind the building, including 16 parking spaces, 3 drive-thru lanes and a bypass lane. This option does not have parking along the rear of the building but rather 2 bays of parking would be on the north half. A smaller green space would be between the parking and drive-thru lanes on the south side.

2. Building:

- Rather than a series of hipped roofs on a one-story building, now proposed is a flat roofed building with a parapet that looks like a two story building in the front. A cast stone water table and retaining walls for the stairs, ramp and equipment/dumpster area are proposed. Tower elements are proposed at the front corners. The northwest corner would have a hipped roof in green standing seam metal and matching metal awnings above the first floor storefront systems which include the entry doors. The southwest corner would have a flat roof with a parapet and the same green standing seam metal awning above the storefront windows on both sides. A canopy would connect from the building over the drive-thru area.
- Larger 12 light windows are proposed for the first floor with smaller 9 light windows on the second floor. The storefront systems at the corner would have the look of divided light windows and doors with transoms above. The proportion of the lights at the corner are shown differently than the other windows. The windows would be framed in white.
- The proposed brick is Endicott “Medium Ironspot #77) and the cast stone elements would be Reading Rock Rockcast in “Charlotte Tan.” EIFS in light gray is proposed for the trim. The roof and awnings would be Berridge Evergreen standing seam metal.
- Two wall signs are shown on the northwest corner tower of the building; a variance would be needed. Information regarding size and material of signs has not been provided.
- Black gooseneck lights are proposed at the corners of the building to light signs and the walkways below and above the night depository at the rear of the building.
- A black railing with 5 horizontal rails is proposed along the ramp up to the entrance.

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.

Discussion 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 and potentially the front yard would need to be approved by City Council.

2. Whether the building is located at 50' or 100' from the front property line, having parking to the rear is preferable. The walkway from the public sidewalk is desirable and may get more use with the building at 50'.
3. Building:
 - The look of two-stories on the front of the building is an improvement although an actual two-story building would be preferable.
 - The large expanse of visible cast stone block seems out of character in Worthington.
 - Although other flat roof buildings have been approved in recent years, they are not recommended in the Design Guidelines and not as traditional in Worthington.
 - The proposed green standing seam metal roof and green awnings are also not traditional in Worthington.
 - Traditional proportions that are consistent throughout the building for windows and storefront systems would be more appropriate.
 - Horizontal railings seem out of character.
 - 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.* There appears to be enough stacking area for the drive-thru lanes. Bank hours are typical.
5. A landscape plan is needed.
6. *Utilities appear sufficient to serve a new building of this size.*
7. *Storm water and Fire Department reviews are needed.*

Discussion:

Mr. Eric Meilstrup, President of LCNB, 225 Dickens Ct., Lebanon, Ohio, and Mr. William Bily, Architect, 6361 Stockton Ct., Loveland, Ohio. Mr. Meilstrup said he appreciated all of the feedback from the previous meeting and their goal was to get back in front of the Board members as soon as they could. He understood there was a desire for them to have a much larger building with a possible multi-use tenant, but in order for them to do what they do best, they need to have their own building. Mr. Meilstrup said he felt a two- or three-story building would be awkward on a lot of that particular size, and they would not have enough room for parking to accommodate a larger building. They moved the drive-thru to around the back of the building, they cut down on parking so they would have less blacktop, they added square footage to give the building more mass, and they changed the green color of the awning to the City's approved color of green. Mr. Meilstrup said they also tried to make the site more pedestrian friendly. All the suggestions the Board made and were taken into consideration will make the project much more costly, adding an additional cost of a million dollars. This is a one floor plan that is made to look like a two-story building. Mr. Meilstrup asked how many more meetings would be necessary before the Board would be able to take a vote on this project. He also turned the discussion over to Mr. Bily for further details. Mr. Brown said there was a lot more information that is needed before the Board would be able to vote, such as the landscape plans, lighting cut sheets,, and signage before the Board could take a vote. Mr. Coulter explained they were not trying to intentionally delay the project, they just needed to see the full package of details of how the building would look before

giving their recommendation to move forward. Mr. Brown explained this would ultimately need to move forward to City Council for approval of the subdivision, which they are still waiting on, and the Amendment to Development Plan would require variances. City Staff will need to see all that information put together before moving forward.

Mr. Bily said regarding the cast stone issue, that is something they could work through by possibly getting more brick to soften the front façade. He also felt the setback would work at any range whether at 50, 75 or 100 feet. Mr. Bily said one thing he wanted to point out about the design of the building was the two-story in the front of the building. The height would be pretty close to a two-story because of they are going to have a white light well behind the front windows that would create a light well into the offices below. Those light wells would be illuminated at night, and they would look real. The front façade would have real clear glass and be open into the interior. As far as the rear of the building, they did bring up the height to be approximately one and a half stories, so the building does not look like a single-story building. They tried to give the feeling of more mass which was something the Board was looking for. Mr. Bily said if they were allowed to do the flat roof, they could move the mechanical yard from the side of the building to the top of the roof because there would be a pretty good size parapet around the whole roof. That would also help them with the setback issue.

Mr. Hofmann asked Mrs. Bitar to refer back to page six and asked if the building was rendered at fifty feet and Mr. Bily replied, "Yes." Mr. Hofmann said he agreed with Mr. Bily's statement that as the building was moved further back the grading became worse. Mr. Hofmann said he assumed Mr. Bily had already picked a ground point for the building based upon a balancing act of how much to excavate. Mr. Bily said they had to meet grade at their access drive. Mr. Hofmann said he felt Mr. Bily had several options to choose from such as materiality for the front façade such as adding brick to the walls, and maybe the caps could remain the lighter color and the surfaces could go darker, and landscaping would help a lot, such as planters. Mr. Hofmann said he did not like the rail, so he felt that part of the proposal needed more thought. He felt a planter wall, or partial planter wall, or maybe a style of railing that would be more appropriate for the district would look better. Mr. Hofmann said he would like to go on record of the setback being at fifty feet, he felt that would also help traffic slow down with the building being closer to High Street, and also make the location pedestrian friendly. Mr. Hofmann said he felt the proportions of the windows were fine, but felt the right side needed a little tweaking, on the faux second floor, if those became a better proportion to occupy that space similar to the proportions that are on the ground floor, just a slight tweak, and hopefully that would not be too difficult or add any more cost. He said he also felt one sign was plenty, probably the one facing High Street, and that would leave room to think about something different for the other end of the building. Mr. Hofmann was okay with the green, and felt the accents were an additive. He said his biggest beef was the water table and how that would be articulated.

Mr. Foust said on the plus side, landscaping could cover a lot of the stone out front, if it is hilly, and landscaped around the ramp. He said his biggest issues were one, if the applicant suggests a 100-foot setback, and the Board suggests the setback being at fifty feet, that may hear about that several times when the developers for the United Methodist Children's Home site (UMCH) come forward. Mr. Foust said the Board should be thinking in general about what setbacks they want up and down this section of High Street and make sure they have established a consistency that would

work well for the community. Mr. Foust said his personal preference would be 75 to 100-foot setbacks to be more consistent with the other buildings. He said when a project meets for the second time with revisions to the building, that is what they work with, and then they start fine tuning it. That is just the way this process seems to work. He said he had hoped that he would see something that would reflect New England character which is what the Board has tried to promote as opposed the strip centers seen along U.S. Route 23. Mr. Foust said he did not think the building was out of character but would rather see something with more New England style.

Mrs. Holcombe said she liked what Mr. Bily was doing with the windows, but she agreed with Mr. Hofmann that the plan needed to be tweaked a little bit. She liked how the second floor would be done and she was okay with the green accents. Mrs. Holcombe said the only problem she had with the proposal was the cast stone, and she felt brick would help soften the look. She also agreed with the fifty-foot setback. Mr. Reis said everything the applicant has heard from the other Board members was appropriate. Mrs. Hinz said she appreciated the effort of putting the parking behind the building and asked if the canopy had to be attached to the building. She felt that made it look like an entrance when it was not. Mr. Bily explained they had to make accommodations for putting the drive-thru in the back. Mrs. Hinz said she also echoed the comments Mr. Hofmann made about the ramp and the planter wall.

Mr. Coulter said he appreciated the efforts and changes that were made based upon the Board's comments from the previous meeting. He said he agreed with Mr. Hofmann's comments about possibly changing the heavy stone to brick to soften up the façade, and he also agreed with Mr. Foust's comment about the need for more detailing of what might be in the Design Guidelines that would not be significantly costly, just some simple detailing. Mr. Coulter said he was not concerned about the massing of the canopy in the back because it cannot be seen from the front. He said he also appreciated the two-story effect on the front of the building, and he also liked the idea of removing some of the mechanical equipment off the ground. Mr. Coulter said he did not have a problem with the flat roof because there are other buildings up and down High Street that have that kind of roof. If there was a way that made sense to add a gable to the roof that might be something interesting to see, but he would not vote no just because they did not have that. Mr. Coulter said he felt the comments about the proportion of the windows were valid and the landscaping plan would do a lot to soften up the whole building. He also liked the idea of the fifty-foot setback.

Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone in the audience who wanted to speak regarding this application, but no one came forward.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended tabling of these applications after discussion.

The applicant asked to table the application. Mr. Reis moved to table this application and Mr. Hofmann seconded the motion. All Board members voted, "Aye," and the motion was approved.

2. Amendment to Development Plan

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

- a. Signage – 733 Lakeview Plaza Blvd. (Morrison Sign/One Lakeview Plaza) ADP 08-2021

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This 14 acre development includes 5 buildings constructed in the late 1980's and early 1990's and roughly half of a retention pond. The uses on the site consist mainly of office, warehousing, and light manufacturing in suites that are roughly 2,000 – 5,000 square feet in area.

This request is for a freestanding sign for the property.

Project Details:

1. A freestanding sign is proposed at the northeast corner of the property at Worthington-Galena Rd. and Lakeview Plaza Blvd., 15' from each property.
2. A 5' high x 12' wide aluminum sign box set on a cobblestone base is proposed. The outside dimensions of the sign with base would be 18' x 8' for total area of 144 square feet/side or 288 square feet total.
3. The sign cabinet is proposed as blue, with a lighter blue area as part of the logo and cream colored push through graphics.
4. The sign would be internally illuminated with light shining only through the lettering, logo and address.
5. Another freestanding sign was removed due to construction of the streets.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Code Sections:

1170.04 Measurement.

(a) Sign area is calculated by totaling all display areas of a sign, including sign faces, molding and framing, but excluding supporting members less than or equal to twenty-four inches in width.

(b) Planters or other decorative supporting structures shall be excluded in the computation of sign area unless the structure exceeds two feet in height or eight feet in length, in which case the entire structure shall be included in the computation of sign area.

1170.05 Commercial and Industrial Requirements.

(e) C-3 and I-1 Zoning Districts – Integrated Institutional, Office or Industrial Uses.

Integrated Institutional, Office or Industrial Uses in the C-3 and I-1 zoning districts as provided for in Section 1175.02 shall be permitted a maximum of two freestanding signs per development. Each sign shall not be over fifteen feet in height and shall have a maximum total area of 60 square feet.

Recommendations:

The sign design was attractive and seemed somewhat complimentary to the property. Unfortunately, the size was quite a bit larger than the 60 square feet total allowed by the Code

which would make it out of character with other signs in the city. A smaller version of the same design was recommended.

Discussion:

Ms. Abby Freese, representing Morrison Sign, 2757 Scioto Parkway, Columbus, Ohio. Ms. Freese said the old sign was removed and measured, and the client wanted to keep the sign around the same size as they had before. Board members did not have any questions or concerns. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak regarding this application, but no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY MORRISON SIGN TO AMEND THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN AT 733 LAKEVIEW PLAZA BLVD., AS PER CASE NO. ADP 08-2021 DRAWINGS NO. ADP 08-2021, DATED AUGUST 16, 2021, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE PLANNING GOALS OF THE CITY, AS REFERENCED IN THE LAND USE PLANS AND FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

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

b. Signage – **6700 N. High St. (DaNite Sign Co.) ADP 09-2021**

&

F. Architectural Review Board – Regular Agenda – New Business

1. Signage – **6700 N. High St. (DaNite Sign Co.) ARB 90-2021**

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. Currently First Bank of Central Ohio is a tenant in the building.

The property owner would like to install a multi-tenant sign and 3 directional signs.

Project Details:

1. Location of the freestanding sign would be in front the building, perpendicular to the street and at least 10’ from the right-of-way. The freestanding sign cabinet is proposed suspended

between two 8' high x 16" wide x 4 1/4" deep black aluminum covers around poles with mirrored polished aluminum caps. The 4' high x 6' wide sign cabinet would be aluminum paint black.

2. The sign faces would be black aluminum with routed address, business names and logos being the only elements illuminated at night. The address is proposed at the top with push through acrylic with mirror polished aluminum faces and a 1/4" white border. Six tenant panels are proposed, with First Bank of Central Ohio being the only one currently represented on the sign. "FIRST BANK" would be in red with white trim; an outline of Ohio would be in blue with white trim; and "of Central Ohio" would be in white. No text style, size, logo or color information is available for the other panels.
3. Required freestanding sign variances:
 - Colors (4 allowed) – Black, white, polished aluminum, red, blue proposed
 - Business Listings (3 allowed) – Six panels shown
 - Lettering styles (2 + 1 logo allowed) – If other tenants wish to use other fonts or logos, a variance would be needed.
 - Lettering sizes (3 sizes, including logo size, allowed) - If other tenants wish to use other sizes, a variance would be needed.
4. Three double-faced directional signs are proposed to be placed 10' from the right-of-way at the entrances to the site. The signs would be 4' high with 2' high x 4' wide black panels suspended between 3" x 3" black aluminum tubes with mirror polished aluminum caps. Lettering and arrows proposed to be 1/4" thick white acrylic with mirror polished aluminum applied. "ENTRANCE" and "EXIT" signs with arrows would be at the two circular drive entrances, and "ENTRANCE REAR LOBBY" with arrows would be near the drive to the south.
5. Required directional sign variances:
 - Display area per sign (2' x 2' allowed/side) – 8 square feet/side proposed
 - Above grade height (3' allowed) – 4' proposed
 - Total directional sign area (20 square feet allowed) – 48 square feet proposed.

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. 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.

Worthington Code Sections:

1170.02 Definitions and Provisions.

- (f) "Directional sign" means a sign used to direct on-site traffic and identify services such as restrooms, hours of operation, etc., and of which no more than fifty-percent of the graphic area is non-directional information. The display area for such signs shall not exceed twenty-four inches in height or width, and the above grade height for freestanding directional signs shall

not exceed thirty-six inches. The total area for all such signage shall be no more than 20 square feet per parcel. Directional signs are excluded in the computation of sign area.

- (j) “Joint identification sign” means a sign displaying more than one business or listing more than one associate, partner, employee or agent of any business.
 - (1) Freestanding joint identification signs shall display no more than three businesses or listings.

1170.03 Design Requirements.

- (b) 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.
- (c) 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.
- (d) Colors. Not more than four colors, including black and white, shall be used on any sign.

1170.04 Measurement.

- (a) Sign area is calculated by totaling all display areas of a sign, including sign faces, molding and framing, but excluding supporting members less than or equal to twenty-four inches in width.

1170.05 Commercial and Industrial Requirements.

- (e) C-3 and I-1 Zoning Districts – Integrated Institutional, Office or Industrial Uses. Integrated Institutional, Office or Industrial Uses in the C-3 and I-1 zoning districts as provided for in Section 1175.02 shall be permitted a maximum of two freestanding signs per development. Each sign shall not be over fifteen feet in height and shall have a maximum total area of 60 square feet.

Staff Analysis:

1. The style and color of freestanding sign do not seem compatible with the building and the Architectural Review District. According to the Design Guidelines, free-standing signs should be of the “monument” type. They should be as low as possible with an appropriate base such as a brick planting area with appropriate landscaping. Also, colors for signs should be chosen for compatibility with the age, architecture and colors of the buildings they serve.
2. A set of criteria should be established for the tenant faces on the sign to minimize the number of colors, text styles and sizes used when the other panels are completed.
3. The basic post and panel design of the directional signs would be acceptable.

Recommendation:

Redesign of the signage and reduction in size for the directional signs is recommended.

Discussion:

Mr. Oliver Holtsberry, representing the Danite Sign Company, and Mr. Robert Meyers, owner of the property. Mr. Holtsberry said they would like signage for six tenants. He said the sign panel for First Bank would be all white. He said they were trying to bring a more modern feel to the sign and property. Mr. Holtsberry said they felt the size was necessary because of the size of the 200,000 square foot building. He said in terms of the directional signs they were asking for two more feet on the width, and he thought the city would prefer signs to be four square feet, but they were asking for eight square feet. He said they do all tie into the same look as the freestanding sign has. They are also asking for one foot in additional height to be four feet instead of three feet. Mr. Meyers said he felt they needed to establish a design that reflected the angular contemporary building but at the same time respecting the traditions of North High Street. Mr. Meyers said he felt it was important to get that balance between the traditional and the contemporary.

Mr. Reis said he believed the signs were fine, even though the signs were larger than what the Code would normally allow, he felt the signs reflected the size of the lot and the size of the building. Mr. Hofmann said he struggled with this, and he largely agreed with Mrs. Bitar's take on this. He said the building has a lot of character, is very interesting, and they greatly appreciate all the landscaping. Mr. Hofmann said he could not make the connection between the building and the sign and he felt they were entirely divorced from one another. He said he also struggled with the directional signs and would like to see something more that closely resembled the building instead of what was presented.

Mr. Foust said if they did end up with larger entrance signs you would want to be very careful about the placement so they would not block the view of someone trying to turn on the property. The signs would need to be far enough back so there would not be a problem.

Mrs. Hinz said agreed with Mr. Hofmann's comments about the sign not matching the building and she was concerned about the size of the directional signs.

Mr. Coulter said he was fine with the number of tenants for the sign, he did not have a problem with the six tenants they were proposing, but a variance would be needed, if the Board approved the sign. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone that wanted to speak either for or against this application, but no one came forward.

ARB Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY DANITE SIGN COMPANY FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL A NEW FREESTANDING SIGN AT 6700 N. HIGH ST. AS PER CASE NO. ARB 90-2021, DRAWINGS NO. ARB 90-2021, DATED AUGUST 26, 2021, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING AND AS REVISED AT TONIGHTS MEETING THAT ALL LETTERING SHALL BE WHITE AND OF THE

SAME FONT FOR ALL FUTURE TENANTS AS PRESENTED BY THE SIGNAGE FOR THE BANK THIS EVENING.

Mrs. Holcombe seconded the motion. Mr. Brown called the roll. Mr. Hofmann, nay, for the reasons he stated earlier; Mr. Foust, aye; Mrs. Hinz, nay, for the reasons she stated earlier; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; and Mr. Coulter, aye. The motion was approved.

MPC Motion:

Mr. Foust moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY DANITE SIGN COMPANY TO AMEND THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR 6700 N. HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. ADP 09-2021 DRAWINGS NO. ADP 09-2021, DATED AUGUST 26, 2021, BE RECOMMENDED TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL BASED ON THE PLANNING GOALS OF THE CITY, AS REFERENCED IN THE LAND USE PLANS AND FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

Mr. Reis seconded the motion. Mr. Brown called the roll. Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Hofmann, nay, based upon his ARB comments; Mr. Reis, aye; Mr. Foust, aye; and Mr. Coulter, aye. The motion was approved.

Mr. Brown said this would go forward to City Council's October 4th meeting.

Mr. Hofmann recused himself from hearing the following Agenda item. He said his wife was working on this project with his neighbor. Mr. Hofmann left the room during the discussion.

2. Attached Garage/Pool House Addition, Swimming Pool, Fence – **788 Evening St.** (New Avenue Architects & Engineers/Lane) **ARB 87-2021**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This property is 90' wide and 252' deep, with a cottage style house originally constructed in 1889 that is a contributing building in the Worthington Historic District. Additions have been constructed over the years, with the most recent being two-stories to the rear, including an attached garage, and completed in 2011.

This request would allow construction of a garage/pool house addition, a swimming pool and a fence.

Project Details:

1. Demolition:
Two rear patios, a stoop by the rear door, and a tree are proposed for removal to accomplish this plan.

2. Addition:

- A 22' x 22' two-story addition is proposed for the rear the garage which was attached in 2011. The west 12'9" of the first floor space would be a single bay garage and the rest a combination of a pool house and mechanical equipment room. An 8' x 8' concrete pad for pool equipment is proposed to the rear. A variance would be needed for total accessory structure area above 850 square feet.
- The second floor would connect to the space above the existing garage to create a suite with a bedroom, bathroom, closet, office, and coffee bar. On the side, a patio door would open to a second-floor deck that looks over the pool. Two single doors are proposed on the first floor, providing access to the double garage, and one to the locker room, restroom and shower for the pool house.
- The rear addition would have a gable extending to the rear with shed dormers in a style to mimic the rear of the house. A window is proposed in the gable that would match existing double-hung 16 over 1 windows in the house and existing garage.
- On the left side the dormer would have 3 matching windows in the dormer. A single garage door to match a new double door in the existing garage is proposed. At the east end a double door would provide access to the pool mechanical room. The driveway would be extended past the addition.
- Proposed siding and roofing materials would match the existing on the house and details of the deck railing, windows, doors and light fixtures have been provided.

3. Swimming Pool:

- The 14' wide x 40' long in ground swimming pool is shown with an 8' x 8' hot tub on the south side. Because the hot tub/spa would be 9' from the property line a variance would be required for placement, and for the surrounding patio area and accessory structures within 10' of the property line.
- Limestone coping is proposed around the pool, and the pool deck would be limestone.
- Other amenities shown include a stone counter with a grill and seating, a fire pit, and a seat wall. Landscape areas would be along the south side and seat wall.
- A new patio door is proposed on the rear of the house to provide access to the pool by way of limestone steps.

4. Fence:

- Currently there is a privacy fence on part of the property, a picket fence on part and no fence at the rear.
- The applicant would like approval to install a 5'8" high solid wood fence around the entire rear yard. The inside of the fence would have 3 horizontal supports and the outside would be just vertical boards.

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.

Decks and patios should be limited to the rear of buildings. Patios may be constructed of concrete, stone or brick. Consider the style of the house when designing decks and patios, since some styles and some designs are not compatible.

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

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

Compatibility of design and materials, exterior details and relationships are standards of review in the Architectural District ordinance.

Codified Ordinances

1149.08 Special Yard Requirements.

(b) In any "R" District the total area for accessory buildings shall be limited to 850 square feet and must be compatible in materials and appearance to the other buildings in the area.

1173.05 Portable and Nonportable Swimming Pools.

(c) Nonportable swimming pools may be allowed as an accessory use only in "R" and "AR" Districts provided that they comply with the following conditions and requirements:

- (1) The pool is intended and used solely for the enjoyment of the occupants of the principal use of the property on which it is located.
- (2) The pool may not be located, including any walks or paved areas or accessory structures adjacent thereto, closer than ten feet to any property line of the property on which it is located.
- (3) The swimming pool or the property as hereinafter defined on which it is located, shall have a barrier as required by Chapter [1305](#) to prevent uncontrolled access by children or other persons from the street or other adjacent properties.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended partial approval of this application. The proposed addition met the Design Guidelines being to the rear and appropriately sized and designed to be a good fit with the house. The pool and patio area were appropriate with a variance for setback granted by the BZA.

While the desire for a privacy fence is understood, the proposed fence would not conform to the Design Guidelines for the District. Another solution that included lower, more open style fencing combined with landscaping should be considered.

Discussion:

Mr. Greg Miller, representing New Avenue Architects & Engineers, on behalf of 788 Evening St., Worthington, Ohio. Mrs. Holcombe asked if there was any concern about runoff drainage and Mr. Miller said that the patio area would be designed with grading and drainage to be dealt with. Mr. Coulter asked if the cooking station could be rotated 90 degrees to get it further away from the property line, and Mr. Miller said that was something they could consider doing. Mr. Coulter said he would not be in favor of the fence because of the height. Mr. Miller said the existing privacy fence extends approximately 30 feet from the corner of the existing house and he asked for permission to extend the privacy fence 20 feet further, just past the pool area and then transition to a picket fence. Mr. Foust asked for clarification as to what the city requires regarding fencing around pools. Mr. Brown explained the Code requires either a four-foot fence around the pool or the pool needs to have an automatic locked cover. Mr. Coulter and Mr. Foust said they would be okay with the transitioning of the current fence to the new fence as long as the neighbors were okay with it. Mrs. Hinz said she would prefer to see a lower fence around the patio area along with vegetation for privacy screening. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone that wanted to speak for or against this application. Mr. Brown swore in the people who were wanting to speak.

Mrs. Heidi Anderson, 784 Evening St., Worthington, Ohio. Mrs. Anderson said the Board had already addressed most of her concerns. She said the existing fence belongs to her, and if the neighbors want to replace it, they can talk with her about that. She said she was fine with their proposal, she was just concerned about runoff. She said her house is close to the alleyway, and she said people that live in the area are aware that whenever it rains, the alleyway becomes a river. If she would walk into the alleyway when it rains, the water depth would cover her feet. Mrs. Anderson said she was concerned about the hardscaping causing runoff water to come onto her property. She wanted to make sure that issue was properly taken care of. Mrs. Anderson said her other concern was the outdoor kitchen. Where the outdoor kitchen is proposed would be close to her property and two large magnolia trees. She wanted to make sure nothing would happen to the trees and was in favor of Mr. Coulter's suggestion of flipping the kitchen 90 degrees.

Mr. Miller said in reference to the drainage issue, he had uploaded some other documents to be presented at the meeting. Mr. Miller showed the photographs of the limestone pavers which would have grass growing in between to help absorb potential drainage. He said they will take a look at sloping the area into a French drain.

Ms. Eugenia Martin, 148 E. North St., Worthington, Ohio. Ms. Martin said she was speaking on behalf of Heidi and Chris Anderson, of 784 Evening Street. She said the comments she wanted to make have been covered but she wanted to articulate that there needs to be mindfulness in regard to the drainage because they do not want there to be a condition created between the two houses where water would sit and create a condition for mosquitos to thrive, or to cause standing water in the basement. Ms. Martin said great care must be taken if Mr. Miller would be replacing the fence because the Anderson have two irreplaceable gorgeous Magnolia trees that are near the property line. Any time something is removed or replaced near the trees damaged could be caused to the roots. Ms. Martin agreed with Mr. Coulter's suggestion of flipping the outside kitchen 90 degrees. There were no other speakers.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY SEAN LANE FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO CONSTRUCT A GARAGE/POOL HOUSE ADDITION AND SWIMMING POOL AT 788 EVENING ST., AS PER CASE NO. ARB 87-2021, DRAWINGS NO. ARB 87-2021, DATED AUGUST 23, 2021, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING AND CONDITIONED ON APPROVAL OF SETBACK AND ACCESSORY STRUCTURE AREA VARIANCES GRANTED BY THE BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- **THAT ANY NEW FENCE PROPOSED BE DESIGNED TO MEET CITY CODE AND GUIDELINES HOWEVER ALLOWING THE OWNER TO EXTEND THE EXISTING STYLE OF FENCE JUST PASSED THE NEW POOL'S LOCATION;**
- **THAT THE OUTDOOR KITCHEN BE RELOCATED AND MOVED 90 DEGREES AND MOVED AS CLOSE TO THE EXISTING HOUSE AS POSSIBLE. THESE CHANGES SHALL BE REVIEWED WITH CITY STAFF PRIOR TO ANY CONSTRUCTION;**
- **THAT ANY EXCESS DRAINAGE AS A RESULT OF THE NEW DEVELOPMENT BE THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE OWNER AS NOT TO CAUSE ANY EXCESS RUNOFF TO THEIR NEIGHBORS PROPERTY.**

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

For the record, Mr. Hofmann returned to the meeting.

3. Landscape Modifications – **120 E. Stafford Ave.** (pH7 Architects/Stafford Village) **ARB 91-2021**

&

G. Municipal Planning Commission – New Business (continued)

3. **Planned Unit Development Modification**

a. Landscape Modifications – **120 E. Stafford Ave.** (pH7 Architects/Stafford Village) **PUD 03-2021**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

The Final Plan for the Planned Unit Development (PUD) rezoning request to re-develop Stafford Village was approved at the July 23, 2020 ARB/MPC meeting. The applicant is requesting approval to amend the approved tree preservation plan by removing 3 additional trees.

Project Details:

1. A 56” Pin Oak at the rear of the site was to be protected during construction and maintained long term per the previous approval. A new report has been submitted from the applicant’s arborist recommending removal of the tree due to safety concerns. Also, a City Arborist has concurred based on a report of a 4” crack in the tree.
2. Two trees on the north side are also slated for removal – a 50” Silver Maple and a 24” Norway Spruce - due to the nature of the trees and the necessity for underground utilities in the area. Reportedly the neighbor adjacent to the north has no objections to removal of the trees.
3. Trees and shrubs are proposed for planting in place of the Oak tree. New trees are also proposed along the north property line.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines

Planning for the development of a new site should include an inventory and evaluation of features, and the development should retain those that add scenic or historic value or that help integrate the new development into the existing cityscape. Maintain and nurture mature trees to prolong their lives.

Codified Ordinances:

1174.08 PUD Procedures.

(c) Final Plans.

- (2) Requested modifications to the approved Final Plans shall be reviewed according to the following:
 - A. City Staff. The City staff may authorize minor design modifications that are required to correct any undetected errors or that are consistent with the purpose of the approved Final Plan. Such modifications shall be limited to:
 1. Minor adjustments in lot lines provided no additional lots are created;
 2. Minor adjustments in location of Building footprints and parking lots, provided the perimeter required Yards remain in compliance;
 3. Minor adjustments in Building height;
 4. Minor modifications in Structure design and materials, and lighting provided there is the same general appearance; and
 5. Minor modifications of landscaping, including substitution of materials.
 - B. Municipal Planning Commission. The Municipal Planning Commission shall review modifications other than those listed in the above section, and any of the above modifications as recommended by City staff.
 1. Should the MPC find that such modification keeps the essential character of the approved PUD and does not require an amendment to the PUD Ordinance, the Municipal Planning Commission shall approve such modification.

2. Should the Municipal Planning Commission find that such modification requires an amendment to the PUD Ordinance, the Municipal Planning Commission shall forward a recommendation of approval or denial to the City Council for such amendment.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of this request based on the reports from the arborists.

Discussion:

Mr. Brad Pauling, representing pH7 Architects, 448 W. Nationwide Blvd., Loft 100, Columbus, Ohio, and Mr. George Tabit, representing National Church Residences, 2235 North Bank Dr., Columbus, Ohio. Mr. Pauling said unfortunately the crack in the Pin Oak has become larger since their initial report from two or three months ago, and now the tree poses a safety hazard. He said he had already been contacted by the neighbor whose yard was affected by the shade from the tree. Mr. Pauling said along the north property line there is an existing number of Serviceberry trees that are ornamental. Those trees were approved in the final development plan. They are extending that length when they remove a Silver Maple and putting in another two or three Serviceberry trees and a Viburnum. The species of the new trees will not be as tall as the Silver Maple tree was. Mr. Pauling said he would work through the neighbor's concerns.

Mr. Tabit said there were two White Swamp Oak trees on the little parking island and then a Yoshino Cherry to back fill that space and then they will add some annuals to add a little color. Along the south side of the Allman family parcel, they suggested there might be an opportunity to add a couple of Crimson Maple Trees. They took the opportunity to clear out a little of the overgrowth and cleaned up the property.

Mr. Brown said he had a chance, about six weeks ago, during the August recess, to go out with the City's Arborist, Shawn Daugherty, to walk the site and observe the trees on the north property line and look at the oak. Mr. Brown said earlier in the week, Mr. Daugherty went back out to the site and noticed the crack in the oak had grown in size. Mr. Brown explained the email he sent out earlier in the week about the removal of some of the trees. Mr. Coulter asked if there were any other speakers.

Mr. John Ament, 897 Morning St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Ament said he and his wife have lived in the area for the past twenty years and he said the crack in the tree did not exist until recently. He said he has already spoken with several people, and one of the responsibilities of the developer was protecting those two trees, the oak and the sycamore. Mr. Ament said for every inch of caliper there is a one-foot protection zone. Around the oak that splits the property, which is very valuable to him, there was initially no protection zone. There was an orange construction fence that draped behind his side of the tree from side to side when they initially installed their chain link. They could not chain link the area because of the root system. Mr. Ament said he moved the orange fence to the front of the tree to remind them to stay away from the tree. After some time and some communication, finally some sort of protection zone, which still exists today, was placed there. The tree measures 15.5 feet around, and the diameter is 57.33 inches. According to Mr. Ament's math, he said the tree needed at least a 57-foot protection zone. Right now, 27.6 inches on the left, 20 feet off of the center, and 16 feet off of the right, so that is half of the protection zone that that

tree needed. He said when they were digging in the area that he just described they dug down at least a foot below the existing elevation, and when they did that, the scoop dug across one of the main roots of the tree, damaging the root, and then requiring the tree to try to recover from that damage. At the edge of those measurements the elevation drops another one and a half to two feet and in that area there is a four-inch root which has been shredded through that belonged to that tree. There is also routinely heavy equipment parked underneath the trees and there is currently storage underneath the sycamore tree and the sycamore may also be in the same danger, even though the developer committed to protecting these two trees. Some of the digging has also damaged an oak tree on his property as well. Mr. Ament said he felt the construction company doing the work was not fulfilling the promises made by the developer.

Mr. Ament said he agreed with the City's Arborist, Shawn Daugherty, that the crack has increased in size, and it is in the best interest for safety reasons that the tree should be removed. Cabling and bracing are not an option at this point, and unfortunately, the tree must come down. He said this tree is irreplaceable and a traumatic loss to his family and the value of his property. Mr. Ament said the tree is what drew his interest to the property in the first place. He said he also felt strongly, while also tucked away for years, probably unknown to some, this tree is a loss to the community as well. There is no landscape plan or planning that will be of measurable replacement or benefit within their lifetimes. Mr. Ament showed a photograph of how the tree completely shaded his 200-foot back yard. New plantings would not replace that in his lifetime. He asked for this oak to be brought down in a meticulous manner, and to be harvested and possibly used by a mill to be turned into products that could possibly be used by Stafford Village or by the Worthington as a whole for any of the city buildings. There are mixed opinions on the age of the tree, but this tree could have possibly been in the community for over 200 years.

Mr. Ament said that he asked that the new oaks to be planted would be as large in caliper as possible to be planted into the ground so they can start with the biggest tree possible out of consideration for his property. He said it was also important to note that there is a small oak on the northwest corner of his property where they are digging, that has been compromised, and was asking that they take that tree down as well. The removal of that tree would also help the growth of the new replacement trees. Mr. Ament said he also spoke with Mr. Tabit about the removal of the trash trees and brush near the south side of the development that also need to be removed.

Mr. Foust asked Mr. Ament if there was anything else he would like to see in the new development. He said he would like to see the trees grow in such a way to create a canopy. In addition to the trees that will be planted in the back, he intends to grow Zebra grass along the fence, to reduce lighting coming from headlights. There will also be three maple trees planted at the south end of his fence.

Ms. Eugenia Martin, 148 E. North St., Worthington, Ohio. Ms. Martin said she wanted to echo Mr. Ament's discussion about root protection. She said everything that Mr. Ament outlined earlier as far as conditions and compaction, compromising the health of the trees, they can recover, but you cannot store material underneath the trees. There should be a tree protection plan to be abided by and enforced. In regard to the additional plantings going in on the site, the question she had for National Church Residences was if they were bring down a very large Silver Maple and a Norway along the north property line why were they not putting back additional large shade trees in order

to continue that whole canopy that everyone wants to have within that area. The proposed Serviceberry trees are small trees and would never get to the height of Silver Maple trees. She did not believe there were powerlines in the area, so there are larger species of trees that could be planted to help continue the character of the area. Mr. Brown said they did speak with the neighbor to the north, and she did not want shade. Mr. Hofmann asked Mr. Brown about the crack in the oak tree and if it was catastrophic and Mr. Brown explained the City Arborist's recommendation was to remove the tree, the tree was beyond repair. Mrs. Hinz said she felt strongly about the preservation of the trees and hoped they can take greater care of the existing sycamore tree that remained. Mr. Brown said he spoke with Mr. Tabit earlier in the week about the materials being stored under the tree, so the materials should be removed soon. Mr. Pauling said they have already spoken with the contractor several times about the tree protection, and he did not understand why some of those measures were not followed through, but they will continue to monitor the situation.

Mr. Coulter said the reason he purchased his property in Worthington was because of a tree. Unfortunately, the neighbor's house was foreclosed on and during the renovation process of the house and driveway, they killed a tree that was about the same size as the oak, by cutting into the root system. He said they need to make sure the root systems were protected. Mr. Tabit said they were currently speaking with several vendors about repurposing the wood and turning the oak into several items.

ARB Motion:

Mr. Foust moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY PH7 ARCHITECTS FOR APPROVAL TO MODIFY THE LANDSCAPE PLAN FOR 120 E. STAFFORD AVE., AS PER CASE NO. ARB 91-2021, DRAWINGS NO. ARB 91-2021, DATED AUGUST 27, 2021, 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. Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Hofmann, aye; Mrs. Hinz, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; Mr. Foust, aye; and Mr. Coulter, aye.

MPC Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY PH7 ARCHITECTS FOR APPROVAL TO MODIFY THE PUD FOR 120 E. STAFFORD AVE., AS PER CASE NO. PUD 03-2021, DRAWINGS NO. PUD 03-2021, DATED AUGUST 27, 2021, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE PLANNING GOALS OF THE CITY, AS REFERENCED IN THE LAND USE PLANS AND ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

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

H. Other

Mr. Brown updated the Board & Commission concerning legislation that City Council passed earlier in the week to permit hybrid meetings as a way to conduct City business during the pandemic. There will be some upcoming meetings that may draw interest of a larger number of people so we will likely go back to the virtual platform since we are currently restricted about the number of people that can attend the meetings in person.

Mr. Myers said in City Council's passage of the virtual meetings, they still want to strongly encourage in-person meetings. Unless the Covid variants become more pronounced, they have no intention of going back to virtual meetings.

I. Adjournment

Mr. Reis moved to adjourn the meeting and Mrs. Holcombe seconded the motion. All Board member voted, "Aye," and the meeting adjourned at 10:11 p.m.