



MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING  
WORTHINGTON ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD  
WORTHINGTON MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION

September 25, 2014

The regular meeting of the Worthington Architectural Review Board and the Worthington Municipal Planning Commission was called to order at 7:30 p.m. with the following members present: Richard Hunter, Chair; Kathy Holcombe, Secretary; Mikel Coulter; Thomas Reis; Amy Lloyd; and Jo Rodgers. Also present were: Scott Myers, Worthington City Council Representative for the Municipal Planning Commission; Lee Brown, Director of Planning & Building; Lynda Bitar, Planning Coordinator and Clerk of the Municipal Planning Commission; and Melissa Cohan, Paralegal. James Sauer, Vice Chair, was absent.

**A. Call to Order – 7:30 p.m.**

1. Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Approval of minutes of the September 11, 2014 meeting

Mr. Coulter moved to approve the minutes, and Mr. Reis seconded the motion. All members voted, "Aye".

4. Affirmation/swearing in of witnesses

Mr. Hunter explained that the order of the Agenda would be changed this evening due to discussion items that will take up a large amount of time. New business under ARB and MPC will be heard first and unfinished business will follow.

**B. Architectural Review Board**

**2. New**

- a. Column Replacement – **529 High St.** (Classic Exteriors/Lennonheads) **AR 43-14**

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application, explaining the proposed columns would be the support rather than a post with a wrap as described in the memo. Mr. Hunter asked for the

applicant and Mr. Tim Cody approached the microphone. He stated he was representing Classic Exteriors. Board members did not have any comments or questions. Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

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

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

This 3400 square foot classically detailed commercial structure was constructed in the early 1970's, and is currently home to Lennonheads Salon & Spa. Recently a car struck a couple of support columns for the arcade along the north side of the building. This is a request to replace the damaged columns as well as the remainder of the existing square columns across the entire arcade with round columns.

#### **Project Details:**

1. There are 9 columns that would be replaced, all of which are currently 9" square.
2. The new columns would be 8" round fiberglass in white to match the existing trim on the building.
3. Repair to the other minor damage to the overhang and trim board as a result of the accident is planned.

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

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

The Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance recommend design elements like columns be compatible with the building and District.

#### **Recommendation:**

Staff is recommending *approval* of this application. The proposed columns are appropriate for this building.

Mrs. Rodgers moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY CLASSIC EXTERIORS OF WORTHINGTON FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO REPLACE THE COLUMNS AT 529 HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 43-14, DRAWINGS NO. AR 43-14, DATED AUGUST 11, 2014, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.**

Mrs. Lloyd seconded the motion. Mrs. Bitar called the roll and all members voted aye. The motion was approved.

## **B. Architectural Review Board**

### **2. New**

- b. Signage – **7227 N. High St.** (Signcom/Pies & Pints) **AR 53-14**

## **C. Municipal Planning Commission**

### **2. Amendment to Development Plan**

- a. Signage – **7227 N. High St.** (Signcom/Pies & Pints) **ADP 09-14**

#### Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Kenny Harper approached the microphone and stated his address is 727 Worthington Woods Blvd., Columbus, Ohio. Mr. Harper said he is willing to make adjustments. Mrs. Bitar said staff wondered if an internal sign on the door would be effective rather than the additional external sign. She said one less variance would be required. Mr. Coulter asked if the glass was clear or smoky. Mr. Harper said the glass is clear. Mr. Coulter said it would be reasonable to have the sign on the inside of the door. Mrs. Bitar said the internal sign would probably need to be larger than what was shown on the drawing. Mr. Harper said customers walk up to that door and realize that they cannot get in. He said customers do not see the directional sign until they are right next to it. Mr. Hunter said the proposed sign looks like the front door sign, and he agreed that some type of directional sign should instead be on the inside of the door instead. Mr. Tom Carter approached the microphone and stated his address is 7227 N. High St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Carter agreed with the suggestion of putting the directional sign on the door instead of the wall.

Mrs. Rodgers said she believes the new blade sign is very attractive. Board members had no other comments or questions. Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

## **Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

### **Background & Request:**

Pies & Pints originally received approval for signage and exterior improvements at this location in September and October of 2012. Currently there is a 60 square foot wall sign on the corner feature near the restaurant and a projection sign above the entrance (5.5 square feet per side/11 square feet total area). Replacement of both signs is proposed.

### **Project Details:**

1. The proposed wall sign would be approximately the same total area as the current wall sign, but would be displayed on only the west half of the corner feature. A second sign will be proposed for the east half of that feature but is not part of this application.

The proposed sign would measure 11' 1.5" wide x 5' 5.5" high. Twelve and one-half inch high channel lettering spelling Pies & Pints is proposed horizontally with the logo being in the middle. The logo would consist of an elephant standing on a pizza with a pint

between the legs. The individual lettering and logo would be pin mounted and halo illuminated, and with light shining through the holes in the pizza, the pint and the “&”. The proposed colors are yellow, black, white and amber.

2. The projection sign is proposed as a 4’ wide x 5’2” high (41 square feet in area) oval shaped internally illuminated cabinet, with the name, elephant logo, “CRAFT PIZZA & BEER” on a banner and “EST. 2003” at the bottom.
3. A third sign proposed on the east end of the patio enclosure was withdrawn, and will now be an internal sign.
4. Variances would be required for exceeding allowable sign area; the size of the projection sign; and an internally illuminated sign with the background illuminated for the projection sign.

**Land Use Plans:**

Worthington Design Guidelines, Architectural District Ordinance, Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Study and The Shops at Worthington Place Development Plan

Signs should be efficient and compatible with the age and architecture of the building. The design guidelines recommend minimizing the size of signs; using traditional sign materials; and external or halo illumination. Individually mounted lettering is preferred. Tenants at the Shops are permitted 1 wall and 1 projection sign. No exposed conduit, tubing or raceways are permitted.

**Recommendation:**

Staff is recommending *approval* of this application. The change to the signage is acceptable.

Mrs. Rodgers moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY SIGNCOM FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL NEW SIGNAGE AT 7227 N. HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 53-14, DRAWINGS NO. AR 53-14, DATED SEPTEMBER 10, 2014, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING WITH THE CONDITION THAT THE DIRECTIONAL SIGN ON THE OUTSIDE PATIO WALL WILL NOT BE PLACED.**

Mr. Coulter seconded the motion. Mrs. Bitar called the roll and all members voted aye. The motion was approved.

Mr. Hunter said the Board would address the MPC application for this address now. Mrs. Bitar did not have any additional information to add. Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

Mr. Reis moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY SIGNCOM FOR APPROVAL TO AMEND THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR 7227 N. HIGH ST. BY INSTALLING NEW SIGNAGE FOR PIES AND PINTS, AS PER CASE NO. ADP 09-14, DRAWINGS NO. ADP 09-14, DATED SEPTEMBER 10, 2014, BE RECOMMENDED TO CITY COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING WITH THE CONDITION THAT THE DIRECTIONAL SIGN ON THE OUTSIDE PATIO WALL WILL NOT BE PLACED.**

Mrs. Holcombe seconded the motion. Mrs. Bitar called the roll and all members voted aye. The motion was approved.

**B. Architectural Review Board**

**2. New**

- c. Awning, Signage & Door – **666 High St.** (David B. Meleca Architects LLC) **AR 52-14**

**C. Municipal Planning Commission**

**1. Conditional Use Permit - New**

- a. Restaurant in C-5 Zoning District **666 High St.** (David B. Meleca Architects LLC) **CU 10-14**

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Ms. Elizabeth Evanoo approached the microphone and stated her address is 144 E. State St., Columbus, Ohio. Mr. Hunter asked Ms. Evanoo if she had any questions or comments and Ms. Evanoo said no. Board members did not have any questions or concerns. Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

**Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

**Background & Request:**

This commercial building was constructed in 1964, with the first floor for shops and restaurants and the second floor for offices. Kerbler’s Restaurant was a long-time tenant on the first floor. P.K. O’Ryan’s opened a pub in the rear in the early 2000’s, later expanding to the Kerbler’s space in the front of the building, and operating until June of this year. This proposal involves renovating the space for a new restaurant called The Whitney House.

**Project Details:**

- 1. New awning material is proposed for placement on the existing hardware, which would be raised on the building, hiding the old sign panel. The existing sign is slated for removal. The new black awning material would have “The Whitney House” printed in cream on the front panel, and a logo, also in cream, on the slanted part of the awning.

2. On the north side toward the east end of the building, an exterior entry door would be removed with two doors installed in its places. The door style would match the door being removed. Cream (Polite White) is the proposed color for the doors and trim. The entry addition toward the west end of the building would be removed to allow proper egress.
3. The anticipated hours of operation are: Monday – Saturday 9:00 am – 2:00 am; and Sunday 10:00 am – 11:00 pm.
4. Outdoor seating as for the previous restaurants in this location is proposed.

**Land Use Plans:**

Worthington Design Guidelines, Architectural District Ordinance and Comprehensive Plan

The Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance recommend signs be efficient and compatible with the age and architecture of the building. The design guidelines recommend minimizing the size of signs. Fabric awnings are appropriate but should have a matte rather than a glossy surface. Use traditional flat, sloping awnings. On both 19th and early 20th century commercial buildings, doors generally were not highly ornamented and tended to be very plain. A good mix of restaurant and niche retail shops is appropriate for Old Worthington.

**Recommendation:**

Staff is recommending *approval* of these applications. The proposed awning with signage and entry changes are appropriate. The restaurant use is suitable for this site, which has been a restaurant for many years. No change in traffic patterns, public facilities, or utilities have been identified.

Mrs. Holcombe moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY DAVID B. MELECA ARCHITECTS LLC FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO CHANGE THE AWNING, SIGN AND DOORS AT 666 HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 52-14, DRAWINGS NO. AR 52-14, DATED SEPTEMBER 9, 2014, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.**

Mr. Coulter seconded the motion. Mrs. Bitar called the roll and all members voted aye. The motion was approved.

Mr. Hunter explained the Board would now discuss the Conditional Use Permit for the same property. Mrs. Bitar did not have any additional comments. Board members did not have any comments or questions. Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

Mrs. Holcombe moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY DAVID B. MELECA ARCHITECTS LLC FOR A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO OPERATE A RESTAURANT IN THE C-5 ZONING DISTRICT AT 666 HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. CU 10-14, DRAWINGS NO. CU 10-14, DATED SEPTEMBER 9, 2014, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.**

Mr. Coulter seconded the motion. Mrs. Bitar called the roll and all members voted aye. The motion was approved.

Mr. Hunter said the Board will now discuss agenda item C, 2, b, before moving back to the Architectural Review Board agenda.

### **C. Municipal Planning Commission**

#### **2. Amendment to Development Plan**

##### **b. Exterior Renovations – 6950 Worthington-Galena Rd. (Bret Racer) ADP 08-14**

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. The applicant was not present. Mr. Hunter said in order to be fair to the applicant he suggested this matter be tabled. Mrs. Bitar said the changes are very minor and the Commission may want to move ahead without the applicant present unless there are concerns. Mrs. Holcombe agreed with Mrs. Bitar to move forward. Members had no questions or concerns. Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

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

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

This building is approximately 63,000 square feet in area and was constructed in 1967. The current tenant is Liquibox, which is preparing to move to a location on Schrock Rd. The new property owner for this building is preparing the space to be leased after Liquibox's departure to accommodate 1 to 3 new tenants. This property is in the I-1 Zoning District.

#### **Project Details:**

1. Several sets of new windows are proposed along the front of the building.
2. New landscaping is also proposed.
3. The other changes involve upgrading the interior space.

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

##### Worthington Comprehensive Plan

The Worthington Comprehensive Plan and 2005 Strategic Plan Update recommends upgrading the industrial corridor's aesthetics is important in attracting professional employees. Allowing the conversion of portions of the corridor to office or mixed office/industrial use may be beneficial.

**Recommendation:**

Staff is recommending *approval* of this application. The change is an enhancement and should make the property more leasable.

Mr. Reis moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY BRENT RACER FOR APPROVAL OF AN AMENDMENT TO DEVELOP PLAN TO MAKE CHANGES AT 6950 WORTHINGTON GALENA RD. AS PER CASE NO. ADP 08-14, DRAWINGS NO. ADP 08-14, DATED AUGUST 25, 2014, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.**

Mr. Coulter seconded the motion. Mrs. Bitar called the roll and all members voted aye. The motion was approved.

Mr. Hunter said the Board would now go back to the Unfinished Business of the Architectural Review Board agenda.

**B. Architectural Review Board**

**1. Unfinished**

- a. Demolition and New Gasoline/Convenience Store Station – **2182 W. Dublin-Granville Rd.** (UDF) **AR 45-14/ CU 08-14**

**C. Municipal Planning Commission**

**3. Conditional Use Permit - Unfinished**

- a. Gasoline/Convenience Store Station in C-4 Zoning District – **2182 W. Dublin-Granville Rd.** (UDF) **CU 08-14**

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Donald Plank approached the microphone and stated his address is 145 E. Rich St., Columbus, Ohio, and along with him was the Architect for UDF, Mr. John Johnston of 3955 Montgomery Rd., Cincinnati, Ohio. Mr. Plank said he found out today that staff had met with the Strathaven Condominium neighbors and they are no longer asking for the sidewalk to their side. Mr. Plank said that makes sense from a practical standpoint because the right-of-way adjustments would be significant. If that is the case, then the request to build the fence all the way to the end of the property is acceptable. Mr. Plank said that may be problematic because they are giving that land to the church. He said they can commit to build the fence, but unless they can work something out with the church, he cannot guarantee that the fence will always be there. Mr. Plank does not believe that the church will take down the fence once the fence has been installed. He said that matter still needs to be worked out. He said in addition to the fence, they were asked to take a look at the south side of St. Rt. 161, and apparently the sidewalk does not go to St. Rt. 161. Mr. Plank said that since they will not be putting in a sidewalk to Strathaven, they can take a look at that area, and commit to that provided there are no guy wires

or poles in the way. Mrs. Bitar said in order to do that there needs to be a ramp installed on the south side that would connect to the crosswalk. Mr. Plank asked if Mrs. Bitar meant the handicap ramp and Mrs. Bitar said yes. Mr. Plank said they will take a look at that and be prepared to make that commitment provided there is not anything extraordinary they do not anticipate at this time.

Mr. Plank said both pole signs will be eliminated and they will put one monument sign in the front. He said he believed the Wendy's sign across the street had more than four colors in their sign. Mr. Plank said he wanted to point out a grading issue concerning the height of the building. He said when the site has been graded, because of the elevation change between the Bank's site and UDF's site, UDF will be reducing their elevation by about three and one half feet. Mrs. Bitar asked what would happen to the corner of the lot and if the corner would be lower than the intersection. Mr. John Johnston said the corner will be lower, and towards the east side of the property, the elevation will be higher. Mr. Johnson said there will be some chiseling of the pavement areas as the property works itself up around the elevation of the intersection.

Mr. Reis asked what Mr. Johnston's position was on moving the St. Rt. 161 entry drive that currently cuts across the adjacent land owners property. Mr. Johnston said an adjustment can be made to the west a little bit. Mr. Hunter explained that both areas, Linworth Road and St. Rt. 161, need crosswalks, especially with Linworth Alternative High School nearby. Mr. Myers explained that was his point, and he has received many telephone calls about putting in sidewalks. Linworth Alternative High School has no food service, and parents are concerned about their kids going to UDF. Mr. Myers asked Mr. Johnston for a firm commitment for a sidewalk. Mr. Plank explained that is already an obligation being required by the City of Columbus, as a part of their zoning approval process. He said he has already spoken with their City Engineer, and he will do that for Worthington as well. Mr. Brown pointed out there is a handicap ramp that goes to the Segna property across the street, but no ramp going the other way, which is one of the reasons that staff brought that issue up to the applicant.

Mr. Myers asked Mr. Brown if there is anything that can be done now about signaling that crossing, and Mr. Brown said no, that will be up to the Ohio Department of Transportation to make signal changes. Mr. Brown said there is a south bound left turn lane required from Linworth Rd. to St. Rt. 161 as part of the applicant's approval.

Mr. Coulter said he appreciated all the changes that were made. He asked if Mr. Johnston had a sample of the alternative material for the horizontal banding on the canopy. Mr. Johnston said he did not have a sample with him, but he did send a copy of the brochure about the material to Mrs. Bitar, who displayed it on the screen. Mr. Coulter asked if the material was similar to aluminum siding, and Mr. Johnston said the material is basically a pre-finished metal siding. The color will be off white. Mr. Johnston showed the color sample to the Board members.

Mrs. Holcombe asked Mr. Johnston if that was the color he intended to paint the door and he said no. Mr. Johnston showed the material samples that he intended to use.

Mr. Coulter asked Mrs. Bitar how the sign issue should be handled. Mrs. Bitar said if the Board feels that more changes to the sign are needed then the sign portion of the motion could be brought back under the Worthington address if the applicant would agree to that. Mr. Plank said the City of Columbus does not approve their graphics as part of their zoning process. Applicants are required to go before the Graphics Commission for sign approvals. Mrs. Bitar asked Mr. Plank if tabling the freestanding sign from this proposal was okay, and Mr. Plank said he would also include Worthington's conditions in his proposal with the City of Columbus.

Mr. Johnston said he wanted to make a couple of comments about the colors on the sign. He said the sign only has four colors because he does not consider white or black a color. Mr. Johnston said three of the colors are the main logo for United Dairy Farmers which has been in business for almost seventy-five years. He said the sign looks clean and he would not want to lose those colors, or lose the opportunity to illuminate those colors at night. Mr. Johnston said the sign sits about fifty to fifty-five feet away from the pavement area because of the thirty additional feet given in right-of-way, so the sign feels appropriate for this site in the community. He said he has no idea when the roads would ever be improved.

Mrs. Rodgers asked Mrs. Bitar to display the proposed sign photographs. Mrs. Rodgers made a suggestion to minimize the colors by using the same red color behind "Farmers" for the "Unleaded" panel; and using the same orange color behind "United", for the "Diesel" panel. Mr. Johnston said he put the yellow behind "Diesel" because that is a standard color to identify that type of gas. He said that is a good suggestion, though. Mrs. Rodgers said she likes the pedestal, and the way the sign is offset on the pedestal.

Mr. Hunter said the only other request he would have is to have the address added to the monument sign, and Mr. Johnston said the address numbers will be added horizontally on the pier.

Mrs. Holcombe asked Mrs. Bitar if she wanted to discuss the lighting and Mrs. Bitar said yes, the lighting needs to be a part of the motion. Mr. Johnston asked if the photometric details that BP Oil used were available, and Mrs. Bitar said she was not sure if those details were available. Mr. Hunter explained the BP Oil is located on the corner of Wilson Bridge Rd., and N. High St. He said BP Oil originally started out with bright LED lights and they were told to tone down the lights to a maximum of 30 footcandles. Mr. Hunter explained that can be a condition of the motion. Mrs. Holcombe asked about the landscaping details for the east side of the property. Mrs. Bitar said the landscaping is sufficient but she wanted to point out that the photometric drawing shows 0.1 footcandles at the property line.

Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application.

Mr. Lloyd Fisher approached the microphone and stated he represents the forty-eight condominium units at Strathaven which are all owner occupied. He said Strathaven was built thirty years ago and is located on the eastern edge of the proposed development. Mr. Fisher said if this development is approved then they are particularly concerned about the increased amount

of light and sound from activity. He said they would prefer the 30 footcandle maximum, shielding as much as possible on the east side of the property, and the fence extension.

Mr. Hunter said he believes all of those items have already been agreed to, for the record.

Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone else that would like to speak either for or against this application and no one else came forward.

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

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

This property is an unusually shaped lot of approximately 1.03-acres in size with frontage on Dublin-Granville Road and Linworth Road. The lot currently surrounds an existing UDF that is located in the City of Columbus at the intersection of West Dublin-Granville Road and Linworth Road. The existing UDF lot is approximately 0.84-acres in size. To allow for the redevelopment of the site the applicant would like to utilize the 1.03-acre parcel in the City of Worthington.

The total lot size after right-of-way dedication and transferring a small portion of the lot to Linworth Baptist Church will result in a total lot size of 0.894-acres. The applicant would like to demolish the vacant bank (1,519 sq. ft.) in the City of Worthington and the existing UDF (3,138 sq. ft.), including pumps and canopy to construct a new 4,480 sq. ft. convenience store, gasoline pumps, ice cream parlor and outdoor patio area for customers as part of the redevelopment of the two parcels.

The applicant is being required to dedicate additional right-of-way along West Dublin-Granville Road and Linworth Road as part of the redevelopment of these two lots. The applicant is being required to dedicate approximately 30 feet of frontage along West Dublin-Granville Road and approximately 5 feet of frontage along Linworth Road to allow for offsite improvements related to the redevelopment of the site.

The applicant will only be permitted a right-in/right-out on West Dublin Granville Road with a full access point on Linworth Road. The applicant will also be required to install a southbound left turn lane on Linworth Road at the intersection. The applicant will be required to install sidewalks along their frontage on both roadways, this will allow pedestrians to move about the area safely. This portion of West Dublin-Granville Road does not have sidewalks along the north side of the roadway.

#### **Architectural Review Details:**

1. Approval is needed to demolish the bank building.
2. The new building is proposed as all brick. The applicant is proposing a brick water table in a basket weave pattern around the entire building. A color rendering has been submitted, with a black and white detail of the brick pattern. The 7/12 roof pitch would remain the same with this submittal, but the applicant is proposing to shorten the roof height by 3'8". The proposed storefront is anodized aluminum, extending across most of the front of the building. A horizontally articulated prefinished flush metal panel system is now proposed for the gables and on the canopy. Other elements include: wall sconces,

fiberglass columns with brick bases; louvered gable vents; wood trim; fiberglass roof shingles; and roof vents. Decorative trim is now proposed around the rear service doors. Screening for the mechanical on the rear of the roof is proposed.

3. A brick enclosure is proposed for the dumpster. The former chain link gates have been changed to high impact PVC with a horizontal panel design to look like wood.
4. The east side outdoor seating area would have a pergola, and metal tables for seating. Photographs are included in the packet.
5. Material samples were and will be presented at the meeting.
6. The applicant is proposing 2 wall signs, one on the canopy and one on the building, and a freestanding sign. The wall signs would consist of internally illuminated channel letters with white faces. The "UDF" initials on the front of canopy would be the only sign on the Worthington side of the property; however, the other signage is typical of what is approved in the District. The proposed freestanding monument sign was approved per the drawing presented at the meeting, as modified by the ARB.
7. The poles are proposed to have a ground to fixture height of 15', including a 2' exposed concrete base. No more than 30 footcandles of light are permitted at any location. In addition to the building lights, pole lights and canopy lights are proposed. Photographs are included in the packet.
8. Bollards near the pumps were originally proposed to be yellow, but have been changed to white.

Conditional Use Requirements:

1. Basic Standards & Review Elements:
  - a. Effect on traffic patterns-
    - 1) The applicant has submitted a traffic study that has been reviewed and approved by all jurisdictions involved. The UDF and vacant bank currently have 4 curb cuts, the number of curb cuts will be reduced to 2 for the site. The applicant will have a right-in/right-out only on West Dublin Granville Road and a full access point to Linworth Road.
  - b. Effect on public facilities-
    - 1) The two sites will operate as one. There should not be a negative impact.
  - c. Effect of sewerage and drainage facilities-
    - 1) Central water and sewer serves both sites today; this will continue with the redevelopment of the site.
    - 2) Stormwater should improve with the redevelopment of the two lots with improvements in drainage requirements since the sites were developed. The redevelopment will be required to meet the stormwater management manual for the City.
  - d. Safety and health considerations-

- 1) Traffic issues should be improved with the redevelopment of the site, limiting access to West Dublin-Granville Road and by the installation of sidewalks. The layout of the site will also improve the safety of the pedestrians and vehicles on the site. Installation by the applicant of an accessible ramp at the southeast corner of Linworth and Dublin-Granville Roads and a crosswalk to the northeast corner have been agreed to by the applicant.
- e. Noise, odors and other noxious elements, including hazardous substances and other environmental hazards-
  - 1) The applicant will replace the existing underground storage tanks with new underground storage tanks and up-to-date gas pumps.
- f. Hours of use-
  - 1) No restrictions have been proposed at this time. Staff believes that this is a 24 hour operation.
- g. Shielding or screening considerations for neighbors-
  - 1) The neighboring condominium owners at Strathaven of Worthington have agreed to the additional vegetation and fencing along the eastern boundary of the site. The applicant has moved the trash dumpster enclosure from the east side of the building to the west side of the building and added an outdoor patio area on the east side of the building as a result of meetings with the neighbors.
- h. Appearance and compatibility with general neighborhood-
  - 1) The area is a node of commercial development at the intersection of Linworth Road and West Dublin-Granville Road. There is existing residential development along the north side of West Dublin-Granville Road east of the proposed redevelopment. The applicant states the proposed design has been used in other residential communities.
2. The Commission has the power to give due regard to the nature and condition of all adjacent uses and structures, and may impose additional requirements and conditions as necessary for the protection of the neighboring properties and the public interest.
  - a. The applicant has been in discussion with the property owners to the business owner directly to the north to ultimately share a common access point to both properties as part of this redevelopment.
3. Additional requirements for Conditional Uses in any "C" District as it pertains to the site layout and relationship to the street. Both pedestrians and vehicular traffic to and from the site shall not be hazardous. Parking, screening, setback, lighting, loading and service areas and sign locations shall be considered.
  - a. The applicant has provided sidewalks along both roadways in addition to sidewalks connecting the sidewalks to their site. The applicant has also provided crosswalk locations to direct pedestrians on the site to the sidewalks and the store. A crosswalk across St. Rt. 161 to the south is proposed, connecting to a new ramp provided by the applicant.
  - b. The applicant will be providing additional vegetation and fencing along the eastern property line in addition to the landscaping that will be added along the frontage screening the parking area from the roadway.
  - c. Lighting will be required to be at low levels at the property lines, and no more than 30 footcandles beneath the canopy.

- d. The delivery area will be on the north side of the building.

Rezoning:

Rezoning from C-3, Institutions and Offices to C-4, Highway and Automotive Services was recommended to City Council for approval at the September 11, 2014 meeting. An Ordinance will be introduced on October 6, 2014 with public hearing on October 20, 2014. Approval of the Conditional Use Permit and Certificate of Appropriateness must be contingent on approval of the rezoning and variances. Granting variances as part of the rezoning was discussed, however, it has been determined the variances must be granted by the Board of Zoning Appeals. The BZA will hear the request on October 2, 2014.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Conditional Use Permit Regulations

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

Worthington Comprehensive Plan Update & 2005 Strategic Plan

Recommends that a neighborhood retail service center be established at the West Dublin-Granville Road and Linworth Road intersection to create a commercial node for the community.

Worthington Design Guidelines

The site is located in the Architectural Review District for the City of Worthington. There are recommendations in the Worthington Design Guidelines to extend the pedestrian scale and walkability of the city's commercial heart. The Guidelines call for extension of the pleasant scale of Old Worthington into new areas; use of simple geometric forms and uncomplicated massing; parking areas located toward the rear; use of traditional materials, avoiding any use of glass with reflective coatings; and traditional design. Use traditional sizes, proportions and spacing for first and upper floor windows. The standards of review in the Architectural District ordinance are:

1. Height;
2. Building massing, which shall include the relationship of the building width to its height and depth, and its relationship to the viewer's and pedestrian's visual perspective;
3. Window treatment, which shall include the size, shape and materials of the individual window units and the overall harmonious relationship of window openings;
4. Exterior detail and relationships, which shall include all projecting and receding elements of the exterior, including but not limited to, porches and overhangs and the horizontal or vertical expression which is conveyed by these elements;
5. Roof shape, which shall include type, form and materials;

6. Materials, texture and color, which shall include a consideration of material compatibility among various elements of the structure;
7. Compatibility of design and materials, which shall include the appropriateness of the use of exterior design details;
8. Landscape design and plant materials, which shall include, in addition to requirements of this Zoning Code, lighting and the use of landscape details to highlight architectural features or screen or soften undesirable views;
9. Pedestrian environment, which shall include the provision of features which enhance pedestrian movement and environment and which relate to the pedestrian's visual perspective;
10. Signage, which shall include, in addition to requirements of Chapter 1170, the appropriateness of signage to the building.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending *approval* of these applications, once all comments and concerns have been addressed. This project allows for the redevelopment of a key intersection in the City of Worthington and the City of Columbus.

Mr. Coulter moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY UDF FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO DEMOLISH A BUILDING AND CONSTRUCT A NEW GASOLINE/CONVENIENCE STORE STATION AT 2182 WEST DUBLIN-GRANVILLE RD., AS PER CASE NO. AR 45-14, DRAWINGS NO. AR 45-14, DATED AUGUST 22 AND SEPTEMBER 15, 2014, BE APPROVED CONTINGENT ON APPROVAL TO REZONE THE PROPERTY FROM C-3 TO C-4, AND FOR APPROVAL OF REQUESTED VARIANCES, AND BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:**

- **THAT THE SITE LIGHTING WILL NOT EXCEED 30 FOOT CANDLES AT ANY LOCATION ON THE PROPERTY AND THAT THE EAST SIDE OF THE PROPERTY WILL HAVE CUTOFFS SO THAT THERE IS NO LIGHT SPILLAGE ONTO THE STRATHAVEN PROPERTY;**
- **THAT THE FREESTANDING SIGN BACKGROUND COLORS BE ADJUSTED TO MATCH THE UDF COLORS AS DISCUSSED;**
- **THAT THE FENCE ON THE EAST SIDE WILL BE BUILT ALL THE WAY TO THE BACK PROPERTY LINE;**
- **THAT A CROSSWALK BE CONSTRUCTED ACROSS STATE ROUTE 161 ON THE EAST SIDE AND THAT BOTH SIDES OF STATE ROUTE 161 WILL BE ADA ACCESSIBLE;**
- **THAT THE DRIVE ALONG STATE ROUTE 161, ON THE EAST SIDE OF THE PROPERTY WILL BE MOVED FAR ENOUGH WEST TO AVOID CROSSING THE STRATHAVEN PROPERTY.**

Mr. Reis seconded the motion. Mrs. Bitar called the roll. Mr. Hunter, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Coulter, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye and Mrs. Rodgers, aye. The motion was approved.

Mr. Hunter explained that the Municipal Planning Commission would now vote on the Conditional Use Permit for this same location. Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

Mr. Coulter moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY UDF FOR A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO OPERATE A GASOLINE/CONVENIENCE STORE STATION AT 2182 WEST DUBLIN-GRANVILLE RD., AS PER CASE NO. CU 08-14, DRAWINGS NO. CU 08-14, DATED AUGUST 22 AND SEPTEMBER 15, 2014, BE APPROVED CONTINGENT ON APPROVAL TO REZONE THE PROPERTY FROM C-3 TO C-4, AND FOR APPROVAL OF REQUESTED VARIANCES, AND BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:**

- **THAT THE SITE LIGHTING WILL NOT EXCEED 30 FOOT CANDLES AT ANY LOCATION ON THE PROPERTY AND THAT THE EAST SIDE OF THE PROPERTY WILL HAVE CUTOFFS SO THAT THERE IS NO LIGHT SPILLAGE ONTO THE STRATHAVEN PROPERTY;**
- **THAT THE FREESTANDING SIGN BACKGROUND COLORS BE ADJUSTED TO MATCH THE UDF COLORS AS DISCUSSED;**
- **THAT THE FENCE ON THE EAST SIDE WILL BE BUILT ALL THE WAY TO THE BACK PROPERTY LINE;**
- **THAT A CROSSWALK BE CONSTRUCTED ACROSS STATE ROUTE 161 ON THE EAST SIDE AND THAT BOTH SIDES OF STATE ROUTE 161 WILL BE ADA ACCESSIBLE;**
- **THAT THE DRIVE ALONG STATE ROUTE 161, ON THE EAST SIDE OF THE PROPERTY WILL BE MOVED FAR ENOUGH WEST TO AVOID CROSSING THE STRATHAVEN PROPERTY.**

Mr. Reis seconded the motion. Mrs. Bitar called the roll. Mr. Hunter, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Coulter, aye and Mr. Reis, aye. The motion was approved.

Mr. Hunter stated the Board would resume back to the Architectural Review Board Agenda.

## **B. Architectural Review Board**

### **1. Unfinished**

- b. **Multi-Family Dwellings – 39 & 41 W. New England Ave. (Showe Worthington LLC/ Snow House) AR 51-14**

### **C. Municipal Planning Commission**

#### **3. Conditional Use Permit - Unfinished**

- b. Residential in C-5 Zoning District – **39 & 41 W. New England Ave.** (Showe Worthington LLC/Snow House) **CU 09-14**

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Chris Peterson approached the microphone and stated his address is 45 N. Fourth St., Columbus, Ohio. Mr. Peterson said this presentation will address many of the comments discussed at the last meeting, but he has not had a chance to respond to the most recent letters that were submitted. Mr. Carter Bean approached the microphone and stated his address is 4400 N. High St., Columbus, Ohio 43214. Mr. Bean said most of the concerns at the last meeting were about the massing of the buildings and their relationship to the Snow House. He said they have now proposed more of a salt box type of form so they can drop the eave line on the north side of the structures next to the Snow House. Mr. Bean said this form is known throughout the community, and exists on the Bond House which is the residence that the Showe family owns to the west. Mr. Bean showed before and after drawings to compare how the roof lines had been changed. The roof lines were sloped to soften the presence of the porch elements. He said they have reduced the pitch on all of the roof tops so they are lower.

Mr. Bean explained they have introduced a third color palette. He said in their previous submission they had all one color palette on that particular site and two on the Lodge site. Mr. Bean said they have introduced a pale yellow with white trim to give some variation. He said the three buildings that wrap around the west and south side of the Snow House are pale yellow and the two other buildings maintain the slate bluish-green color. The next image was the house next door which is the Bond House, and the color of that house is red. The Bond House also shares the same salt box type of form as does the house which is two doors down the street.

Mr. Peterson returned to the microphone and stated he would like to address the concerns on a project by project basis. He said what he understood primarily from the last meeting was color palette; reduce the density in terms of the look against the Snow House; and garages. Mr. Bean said they did take a look at garage structures, but for every two spaces of the carport, they would have to extend an additional foot to accommodate the rails and so forth. He said that would push into the refuse area and they would have to find another site for that which would probably be in the middle of the parking area.

Mr. Reis said he was happy to see the Board's concern about scale addressed, and that he likes the new look of the apartments. He believes they are now more in scale with the adjacent residences and fit with the neighborhood.

Mrs. Holcombe asked about the second story windows on the house to the west of the Snow House, the two windows that were side by side, and how those would make sense on the second floor. Mr. Bean said that is a bedroom. He said in the previous submission they had single windows instead of joining them together. By reducing the eave line, they will end up with a

knee wall and a sloped ceiling, and to have individual dormers made less sense than to put the two windows together and combine that space to make the area more useable. Mr. Peterson said they have also included some brick elements to each of the sides near the Snow House. Photographs of the brick treatments were shown. Mr. Bean said the common areas are brick also. Mr. Brown asked if the porch stoops would be concrete and Mr. Bean said yes.

Mr. Coulter said he appreciated what has been done with the roof lines. He asked if Mr. Bean took a look at using brick for the two structures that are next to the Snow House, at least on the façade to pull those materials together since they are near the commercial brick building. Mr. Coulter said he likes the brick paving on the sidewalks and common areas. Mr. Bean said he did take a look at upgrading to brick but said to himself, "Where do we stop this?" He said he was uncomfortable at seeing brick on just one side of the structure, or brick used as a water table that is covered up by landscaping. Mr. Bean said at a minimum, he would have to wrap the entire elements that are on the front. He said he wondered if the balance would then feel odd. Mr. Bean said to add brick to the structures would be an extremely major commitment to do it properly. He said there is a pretty prevalent distinction with residential buildings versus commercial buildings as far as what is masonry and what is siding. Mr. Peterson said he drove around the area surrounding the intersection and took a look at the number of houses that were fully brick, or had some brick elements. He said he counted twelve single family homes that were fully brick. Mr. Peterson said there were a few homes that had brick elements, but most homes had frame and siding.

Mr. Coulter asked Mrs. Bitar to go to the rendering that showed the elevation of the interior courtyard. Mr. Coulter said what bothers him is the sameness, and not much variety between the structures. He said if you drive around Worthington, one of the really nice things is the uniqueness of the homes. Mr. Coulter said he understood the discussion about the garages, and wider space being needed, and he was okay with that.

Mrs. Lloyd said she agreed with Mr. Coulter's comment about the interior courtyard and the detailing. She said she did like the contrast of the materials and feels that will help make the Snow House stand out. Mrs. Lloyd said she liked the contrast as you go down each street, and you do see the different materials, as opposed to all brick.

Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Bean if he took a look at the lighting levels to see what could be done to decrease those levels to zero at the property lines. Mr. Bean said he did and they tortured their electrical engineer over the issue. He said what his electrical engineer came back with was that zero footcandles at the property line were more of a theoretical possibility than an actual possibility. Mr. Bean said if he put any light on the site they will be getting 0.1-.02 footcandles at the property line and ten feet beyond. His electrical engineer felt that was a respectable level. Mr. Bean said they will be using pole/lantern types of fixtures which are LED in technology. The light will shine up into a concave reflective surface at the top and shines most of the light down, but because the light is a lantern, some of the light is carried out. He said unless they go with pure cutoff down light types of fixtures, zero footcandles at the property line will be impossible to achieve.

Mr. Coulter said the Board members like the use of LED's, but what he would not want to see are the cold white LEDs. He said LED's are now made with warm light. Mr. Bean said he completely agrees. He said they are creating pedestrian areas and they want the residents to be comfortable utilizing those in the evening.

Mr. Coulter asked if the paving was standard asphalt, or if Mr. Bean plans to use the impervious type of paving. Mr. Bean said they would use the standard asphalt paving. He said that impervious paving makes it nearly impossible to control the management of storm water. Mr. Bean said they are using the standard asphalt paving in order to capture the storm water and move the water away.

Mrs. Rodgers said if she understands correctly, the only lighting will be coming from the porch lights. Mr. Bean said in addition to the porch lights are pole lights that are not depicted in the rendering. The porch lights will be controlled by the residents. Mr. Bean explained where the three pole lights will be located, and said the pole lights will provide constant lighting of the drive aisle and parking spaces, plus there will be down lights that will be recessed into the carports.

Mr. Coulter asked Mrs. Bitar as she was looking at the photometrics if the light pole on the west side was the most problematic. Mrs. Bitar said yes, with that style of lighting, the pole would have to be located further away from the property line, or a different style of lighting would be needed at the property line. Mr. Peterson said the position of the light pole could be re-thought within some boundaries to maintain security for the parking area.

Mr. Hunter explained the Board members will not be voting on this application this evening because there is still a lot of work that needs to be done. Mr. Peterson agreed and said they are already anticipating the work that needs to be done.

Mr. Hunter explained that all of the letters received are part of the record. He said this is a developer invested in the community, and cares about the community. Mr. Hunter asked for a show of hands of how many people would like to speak.

The first speaker was Mr. Roger Hoover, of 345 Selby Blvd., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Hoover said he liked the change of the profile of the buildings next to the Snow House, but he feels the building west of the Snow House is still too close to the street, and overshadows the Bond House. Mr. Hoover said he realizes the Snow House was built before there were setbacks required but he would still like to see the western house moved back a little.

The next speaker was Mrs. Steffanie Haueisen of 587 Fox Lane, Worthington, Ohio. Mrs. Haueisen said she was wondering why Worthington residents would have to pay for a new sewer. Mrs. Bitar explained the developer would be responsible for building the storm sewer and dedicating it as a public sewer.

The next speaker was Ms. Kay Warren of 6657 Evening St., Worthington, Ohio. She said she is concerned about losing the integrity of the city. Ms. Warren said Worthington is known for its

green space. She said as she looks at the proposed development she wonders why more apartments are needed since new apartments are being built near the Worthington Mall. She feels the integrity of Old Worthington is being lost. Ms. Warren said she remembers a song by Joni Mitchell about paving paradise to put up a parking lot. She said the area may not be paradise to everyone, but for the residents that live in the area, they view the area as paradise. Ms. Warren said she hopes the developer keeps the integrity of the city in mind while working on this project and making decisions.

Ms. Sharon Sachs of 59 W. Short St., Worthington, Ohio spoke next. She said she lives within the block of the proposed development. Ms. Sachs said she had intended to just listen this evening, but decided she wanted to say a few words. She understood the original proposal included apartments and condominiums. Ms. Sachs said she and her husband have lived in old Worthington for thirty years and would like to continue living in old Worthington, but in alternative housing other than their current home. She said she and her husband are very excited to hear about this development and she encourages the Board to be concerned about whatever design concerns they have, and give a vote of confidence to the developer to create some alternative housing for people who have lived in the area and want to continue living in the area, but in something different than houses they already live in.

Dr. Margaret Real of 72 E. North St., Worthington, Ohio approached the microphone. Dr. Real said she was speaking this evening on behalf of the Old Worthington Association (OWA). She said the OWA had already submitted a letter but she wanted to go over the highlights included in that letter. Dr. Real said the OWA supports this project and believes this project is good, but could be better. The OWA feels the density is too high, and is concerned about the lack of green space. The architecture is also a concern. One of the attractive features of Worthington is the diversity of housing and architectural styles. The OWA feels a softer presentation is needed. The setback from the street is also a concern.

Mr. John Marsh of 115 W. New England Ave., Worthington, Ohio spoke next. Mr. Marsh said he and his family live about a block away from the proposed development. He said his primary concern is traffic. Mr. Marsh said they have lived in the area for about nine years, and each year W. New England Avenue has become a busier and busier street. He said they no longer allow their children to play in the front yard because of traffic congestion, and cars traveling quickly down New England Avenue. Mr. Marsh wanted to know how fifteen units with possibly thirty cars will fit into the traffic congestion that is already there. He said he would like to respectfully request that a traffic study be done.

The next speaker was Ms. Suzanne Seals of 123 E. New England Ave., Worthington, Ohio. Ms. Seals said she lives at the corner of New England Avenue and Morning Street, and she has spoken with about three dozen of their neighbors, old and young, who are concerned about losing the feel of their two hundred year old village. Ms. Seals said she believes the look of the apartments are institutionalized and not unique. She said one hundred percent of the people she spoke with did not like the look of the apartments. Ms. Seals said what she read in the Strategic Plan was the mention that urban village housing needed to be appropriate in scale and size for the site. She feels there is an issue with density at this site that is not consistent with Old

Worthington. Mrs. Seals said she wanted to read a couple of sentences from the Strategic Plan that are pertinent to the conversation this evening. “This core area captures people with its vibrant yet quaint and authentic presence. This is the community experience so many people seek.” We must not lose our authenticity and we must not lose what brings people to Worthington.

Ms. Judy Haager of 305 E. New England Ave., Worthington, Ohio, said she has lived in the area for forty-five years. She said if you want to see what a carport looks like, and what is in a carport, take a look at the open carports that are in the Rush Creek area and see if you think that is something that is attractive to you. Mr. Hunter said the carports are appropriate for the Rush Creek area, and Frank Lloyd Wright liked carports, but he does not, and he does not believe that carports are attractive. Ms. Haager said people that live in these types of dwellings do not come alone. Her neighbor had a meeting and there were ten extra cars parked along the street. Ms. Haager said people like to invite over friends and family, and asked where people will find places to park.

Elizabeth Cooksey of 93 E. New England Ave., Worthington, Ohio said she has lived in the area for almost twenty-five years. Ms. Cooksey said Worthington is known as “Tree City USA”. She said she was very interested to see the presentation. Ms. Cooksey said one of the areas was referred to as “the wooded site”. Roof masses were also shown that were obscured by trees. She said there is a lot to recommend some of this development but the way in which it is currently being presented, and the density and the massing means that Worthington will no longer be “Tree City USA” in downtown Worthington. Ms. Cooksey said she would also like to see garages, but there is not enough space. She said if there were fewer dwellings, more green space, more trees, perhaps there would be more space for garages.

The next speaker was Mr. Mike Clevenger of 46 W. New England Ave., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Clevenger asked Mrs. Bitar to display the photograph of the Snow House that was in Mr. Bean’s presentation. He said the picture is the view from his front yard and he has lived in the area for almost twenty years. Mr. Clevenger asked Mrs. Bitar to display the rendering. He said once again this view will be the perspective from his yard. He said his wife has lived in Worthington her entire life. She was brought up in a family who was strongly entrenched in the historic preservation of Worthington. Mr. Clevenger said he has a unique perspective on Worthington even though he was not born and raised here. He understands the importance of the character of Worthington and deeply respects that. He said if his wife was at the meeting she would have said they never should have gotten rid of the Griswold Inn. He said his wife deeply respects what the other residents are saying.

Mr. Clevenger referred back to the photograph and said what he will see disappear are the ugly red steps in the front. He said the treed lot is partially covered in gravel. He and his wife like the new renderings much better than what is currently there. Mr. Clevenger said the long range and strategic planning session done in 2010 expressed what the City of Worthington community leaders, business leaders, ordinary citizens, and community organizations wanted to see as a vision for Worthington. They wanted to create something bold. At the Strategic Planning session he heard there was a need to develop high density housing or people would move out of

Worthington. Mr. Clevenger said the action plan was to implement high density housing downtown. He said he is a businessman in Worthington also, and he knows many of the business owners. Green space does not put food on the table for a small business person. People coming to your store or business will put food on the table. Mr. Clevenger said a project such as this will generate business for downtown merchants. He sees this project as a big plus for the merchants of Worthington. Mr. Clevenger said he and his wife both like the new drawings. He said he and his wife both respect history, but they also want to see Worthington grow and prosper.

The next speaker was Mr. Jim Seals of 123 E. New England Ave., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Seals said he agreed with Mr. Clevenger about the fact that the Clevengers living across the street from the proposed development should not make their opinions weigh any heavier than anyone else's opinion. Mr. Seals also agreed that the view of proposed development is very nice, but he does not believe this development belongs in downtown Worthington. He did not feel that other brick houses in the area are relevant to residences being built in this location. Mr. Seals said downtown Worthington is the face of Worthington, and just because these apartments look nice, does not mean the community wants to have this proposed development on Worthington's face. He does not believe the apartments belong next to the Snow House.

Mr. Mike Clevenger said he wanted to make some additional comments. Mr. Clevenger said the proposed area is already zoned commercial, and a commercial development could go into that location, and not become what the Strategic Plan calls for, which is something the area residents do not want to see. The area could be worse, if the property is developed commercially. He prefers the area to remain residential.

The next speaker was Mr. Jim Ventresca of 72 E. Granville Rd., Worthington, Ohio. Mrs. Bitar swore in Mr. Ventresca. Mr. Ventresca said he wanted to thank the Board for their dedication to Worthington and for hearing this project. He said two hundred and ten years ago, James Kilbourne with the Scioto Company came across the Allegheny with a drawing that Mr. Ventresca referred to as 19<sup>th</sup> Century architecture of houses being built in the New England states. He said Worthington was privileged to have that kind of beginning. In 1999, the Worthington Historic District committee held their first meeting. Mr. Ventresca said they reviewed all of the 450 properties in the district including the Snow House and the Masonic Lodge. They are the last remaining early buildings in the center of town. After a 60 page application, and a decade of negotiations, the Worthington Historic District was listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Mr. Ventresca said the district is bounded by North, South, Morning and Evening Streets. He said Worthington residents have a historic district if they can keep it. Mr. Ventresca said the OWA had a special session last Monday night, and they unanimously approved the letter submitted by Dr. Real earlier that evening. He urged each Board member to study the letter seriously and discuss the five points before making a decision, a decision that will affect "ourselves and our posterity".

Kristin Lampe of 93 E. New England Ave., Worthington, Ohio was sworn in by Mrs. Bitar. Ms. Lampe said she was dog sitting this past week in the New Albany, Ohio area, so she was able to walk in their neighborhood quite a bit. She said she does not want to see Worthington turn into

“New Albany”. Ms. Lampe said she likes Worthington because of the diversity. She said she understands the business perspective, and she wants to see people coming into Worthington, and keeping the area attractive. What makes the area attractive is that Worthington is different. Ms. Lampe said she heard a couple of times this evening about “the next generation”, and she believes she is the youngest one at the meeting. She wants to see Worthington hold on to the history. Just because new people want to move in, she wants to make sure the treasured past is not lost. Ms. Lampe said she has lived in Worthington her entire life and she does appreciate the history. She said you do not have to live in Worthington for a long period of time to be able to appreciate the history.

Mr. Hunter said there is a lot of work that still has to be done on the property. Mr. Peterson agreed, and said he would like the opportunity to take a look at some other architectural types. Mr. Peterson said he would like to work with staff over the next few weeks, and get more feedback from the Board. Mr. Coulter explained that Mr. Peterson could request a meeting with city staff and two members from the Board to go over ideas to see if a common consensus can be arrived.

## **Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

### **Background & Request:**

This site includes two structures, the Snow House and a commercial structure. The Snow was built in 1814 by John Snow, who was an influential leader of the Masonic Lodge and held early lodge meetings at the house. The Federal style house features a symmetrical five-bay façade, and is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. It was used as a residence until approximately 1930; was an annex to the Worthington Inn; and most recently has housed an expansion of Igloo Letter Press. The commercial structure was constructed around 1920, likely as a garage/carriage house/utility shed, and was converted for commercial use. Most recently the Candle Lab and Igloo Letter Press have been located in the building.

The request, called the Snow House Apartments, involves conversion of the entire property into a multi-family dwelling development. No façade changes are proposed for the Snow House; demolition of the commercial structure is proposed. The Snow House would be converted back to a single dwelling unit, and 7 townhouses would be constructed on the remainder of the site.

### **Project Details:**

1. Three townhomes are proposed west and south of the Snow House, with shared parking to the south. Four more townhomes are proposed to the east of the property, with a drive separating them from the Snow House and other units. The roof lines of the new townhomes have been lowered, and the design has been changed. The proposed structures are still higher than the Snow House but now have a more modest roof pitch. The townhome to the east would be 17.6’ from the right-of-way; the townhome to the west would be 6.1’ from the right-of-way. The Snow House extends approximately 3’ into the right-of-way. The areas above the front windows on the second floor of townhouses facing New England Ave. seem awkward. A carport for 8 vehicles is proposed at the southwest corner of the property. The applicant feels the carport will be

screened from view by the buildings. A mixture of landscape and hardscape elements is proposed between and around the units including: ornamental and shade trees; shrubs; perennials; sidewalk and patio surfaces of brick, concrete and stone; seating areas; ornamental fencing and gates; fire features (pits); grills; and benches. Incorporation of as much brick as possible in these areas, especially in close proximity to New England Ave., has been requested by a group of Old Worthington residents.

2. The two-story Snow House would retain its all brick façade. The new structures are proposed as two-story structures with 6” Hardieplank lap siding in Duxbury Gray, with Monterey White trim and Arroyo Red accents. Variation in colors between buildings may be appropriate, but has not been proposed. Charcoal Gray standing seam metal is proposed for gable trim and the porch roof above the rear entrances to units SH 4 & 5. Antique Slate asphalt shingles are proposed for the roofs. Wood columns and trim; single hung 6 over 6 Andersen windows; and Carolina Lanterns coach lamps are also proposed.
3. The size of the dwelling units range from the Snow House at 1225 square feet to 1648 square feet in area.
4. Surface parking for 8 vehicles is proposed adjacent to the units south of the Snow House, and the proposed carport would be south of the parking. The proposed parking would provide 2 vehicle spaces per dwelling unit. The three-sided carport would be finished to match the dwellings, and include lighting in the ceiling to illuminate the area below, and false windows. Additional lighting would be provided in the parking area and near the dumpster by way of poles with decorative fixtures. The height shown on the photometric plan is 15’ ¾”. The fixture is slightly different than is shown on the cut sheets. The color of the poles and fixtures would be black. Typically, light that spills onto neighboring properties is not permitted. Also, exposed concrete bases are not preferred for the light poles. The photometric plan continues to show light spilling over the adjacent property lines.
5. A public storm sewer will need to be installed to handle runoff from the site.
6. Details regarding screening of the dumpster, transformers and condensing units are needed. Placement of fencing elsewhere has not been identified.

### **Land Use Plans:**

#### Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Infill sites should be developed in a way that is complementary to their neighborhoods and that integrates well with surrounding building designs and land uses. Compatibility with the neighborhood should be the primary consideration. New structures should complement the form, massing and scale of existing nearby structures. Also, building placement and orientation are important design considerations. Most main entrances should face the street and garages should avoid facing the street.

These sites often have features -- sometimes man made and sometimes natural -- that can serve as unique enhancements to a development; or that can help a new development blend in well with the existing character of the city. Man-made features might include fences, stone walls, gardens and plantings, and historic buildings. Natural features might include watercourses, distinct topography, and mature trees. Planning for the development of a site should include an

inventory and evaluation of features, and the development should retain those that add scenic or historic value (historic buildings, topographical features, mature trees) or that help integrate the new development into the existing cityscape (existing landscaping, roads, paths, sidewalks).

#### Worthington Comprehensive Plan

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

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

#### Worthington Conditional Use Permit Regulations

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

#### **Recommendation:**

Staff feels the project is generally in line with the Comprehensive Plan recommendations and would have a positive impact. Details still need to be finalized.

Mr. Coulter moved to table the ARB application and Mrs. Holcombe seconded the motion. All members voted, "Aye".

Mr. Coulter moved to table the MPC application and Mrs. Holcombe seconded the motion. All members voted, "Aye".

Mr. Hunter explained the next agenda item is AR 50-14. Mr. Coulter moved to take this application off the table, and Mr. Reis seconded the motion. All members voted, "Aye".

Mr. Hunter explained at 9:45 pm the Board would take a five minute break.

## **B. Architectural Review Board**

### **1. Unfinished**

- c. Multi-Family Dwellings – **634 High St. and 41 W. New England Ave.** (Showe Worthington LLC/Masonic Lodge) **AR 50-14**

## **C. Municipal Planning Commission**

### **4. Rezoning - Unfinished**

- a. Planned Unit Development – **634 High St. & 41 E. New England Ave.** (Showe Worthington LLC/Masonic Lodge) **PUD 03-14**

#### Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mr. Hunter explained that all of the comments and letters received will become part of this application and the application that was just heard. Mr. Peterson said he has read the letters and heard the comments, and will try to address them in the future.

Mr. Bean discussed the four townhomes on the west side of the alley, and the single unit on the east side that was designed to act as a transition to the true single family residences on the property to the east. He discussed the initial plan for west of the alley included a larger 6 unit building, which was ultimately reduced to 4 with an internal courtyard. Mr. Bean discussed the potential to combine the building to pull it further away from the street.

Mr. Peterson said he has tried to address the concerns about the green space. He said that when he originally spoke with city staff, he had planned to develop twenty-two units on this property, and he has now made the units more generous in size, and plans to develop fifteen units instead.

Mr. Peterson said he understands proximity to the right-of-way is of concern to some people. He said when they began looking at this project six months ago they attempted to do their research, came across the Comprehensive & Strategic Plans, and ultimately determined the urban village concept seems to make sense. He said he thought the timing was right to help accomplish this goal. Mr. Peterson said having the townhomes close to the right-of-way was an intentional move to have a streetscape that is essentially an urban village. That area goes immediately into an access drive that will become a public easement, then leading to the single family home.

Mr. Coulter said he likes having the separate buildings, but felt you could take a foot out of each of those four units you, moving everything back four feet and add a little bit more green space on the front. Mr. Peterson said they will discuss that idea. Mrs. Rodgers said she definitely does not want to see two identical roof lines, colors or features as she looks from the corner intersection.

Mr. Bean wanted to show how little they intend to change the frontage of the building along High Street. The three significant changes are new landscaping, the connector between the old and new structure, they would finish the area intended to be private patio space, and the third

change is in front of the 1955 building, where they will introduce a light well that has very little impact from the street, but allows them to bring daylight down into that lower unit.

Mrs. Rodgers noticed an umbrella on top of the connector unit. She wanted to know if that area is to become a patio and Mr. Bean said it is behind the connector. He said they are adding some entry elements to get into the various units and providing some elevated outdoor porch space for the upper units. These units will all be flats; there will not be internal stairs. Mr. Bean said they will be using the existing window openings, and extend them downward for the purpose of letting in additional light. Nine out of the ten units will have their own private patio space, and then collectively they are proposing an outdoor space for all the residents of the building.

Mr. Peterson said nothing will be done to the exterior of the older building, except the outdoor fire stairs need to be brought up to code, but the stairs are not historical to begin with. On the newer building, nothing changes on the High Street elevation other than what Mr. Bean has already discussed, keeping the design that is there, but providing for some functionality that currently is not. He said the main changes to any of the elevations happen on the north side and the north side will be pretty well obscured. There are also changes proposed to the east side of the newer part of the building.

Mr. Bean said they have painstakingly gone through many maturations of the interior layouts of these units and they are doing everything they can to maintain the unique characteristics of the inside of the buildings. Where there is unique woodworking, millwork, wainscoting and doorways that will all be maintained. They are not gutting out the structures and putting in all new, they are doing their best to maintain what is already there.

Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak about this application and several people raised their hands.

The first speaker was Kristin Lampe of 93 E. New England Ave., Worthington, Ohio. Ms. Lampe said she wanted to compliment what the developer is doing to repurpose the existing space because she believes the building will be put to good use. Ms. Lampe said that walking behind the church now is not the prettiest view, so she likes what is being proposed. She feels the front corner of E. New England is imposing. Ms. Lampe said she agreed with the Board members about breaking up the roof line of the buildings. She said the drawings make the area seem like two giant blocks were put there and she would like to see something else done to break up the space more. If the buildings are pushed back a little off the street she would like to see more trees planted. Ms. Lampe also agrees with Mr. Hunter about the need for garages instead of carports. She is also concerned about the congestion of traffic.

The next speaker was Ms. Judy Haager of 305 E. New England Ave., Worthington, Ohio. Ms. Haager asked Mrs. Bitar to bring up the photograph of Dewey's Pizza with all the trees and green space behind the restaurant. She noted the green space behind the restaurant and said she objects to the passage way to the Methodist Church being called an alley off of New England. Ms. Haager said that is a driveway. There are fifty-two to sixty-five families that use the childcare center, and twenty employees that use that drive every day, and twice per day. When

you increase the number of units, you increase the amount of traffic to that area. Ms. Haager wants the developer to realize this is already a busy driveway.

The next speaker was Ms. Suzanne Seals of 123 E. New England Ave., Worthington, Ohio. Ms. Seals said she fully supports the OWA's five main points that were discussed earlier, and supports the idea of the City purchasing the left lot next to the driveway, and turning that area into a pocket park. She said that would be a great way of preserving the green space and making this whole project a little bit easier for the community to live with. Ms. Seals wanted to say that out of the thirty-six neighbors that she spoke with about the project one hundred percent of those people had a problem with the development on East New England Avenue, concerning the right of the driveway. Ms. Seals said she also feels the area looks too institutionalized right now, but she does like the fact that the Masonic Lodge is being repurposed. She believes that the second floors of the area businesses should be developed for urban living space similar to Europe development. Ms. Seals said that would be a great way to not expand the footprint of hard surface but use what already exists.

Ms. Ellen Scherer, 112 E. New England Ave., Worthington, Ohio. She said she and a few others gathered signatures from Worthington residents and the surrounding area and want to express their collective concern for the proposal to create a dense urban community in downtown Old Worthington. Their concern is in regard to the scale, the design and the need for community input when many in the community are just now hearing about the project. They are encouraging thoughtful review and planning that abides with existing residential code so they can get the best result for this proposal, one that would connect the business district, which is High Street, with the residential areas behind it. The City of Worthington's future attractiveness and livability is worthy of the community getting this right, and she too supports the OWA's five point proposal. Ms. Scherer said the signatures she is submitting, and the comments that have been made echo what the OWA has already stated. She feels the massing of the project is a big issue, and the density goes with it. Ms. Scherer submitted her signatures to Mrs. Bitar for the record.

Ms. Sunny Allen of 665 Hartford St., Worthington, Ohio said since she moved into her house in 1967, the Masonic Lodge has been a wonderful neighbor. She was happy when they sold their two rental properties to Mr. Jim Smith to turn the property into one single family home. Ms. Allen said the Lodge did a great job taking care of the green space, including the forsythia and lilac shrubs. She would like to see this area continue on as open green space. She also mentioned she is concerned about the safety and security of the children at the childcare center being operated by the Methodist Church.

The next speaker was Mr. Mike Clevenger of 46 W. New England Ave., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Clevenger said he was wearing several hats this evening as he was also representing the Masonic Lodge property. He wanted to reiterate it was not the desire of the Lodge to put this property on the market. Mr. Clevenger said it was a gut wrenching decision. He wanted to tell everyone how carefully they considered ways to keep control of the property. Mr. Clevenger said this large property is only used about fifty times per year. After determining the Lodge could no longer own the building, they had to put the building up for sale. As a 500 member

organization that has been there since 1803, they came up with three objectives if the building had to be sold. The first goal if sold, the original 1820's Lodge building must be preserved and the New England Lodge will retain either an ownership interest or receive an agreement for perpetual use. The second objective was that they would endeavor to find a meeting place for the Lodge, and find a developer that would encompass the need for meeting space and build that into the development plan. Thirdly, and most importantly, he said, "New England Lodge has been an integral part of Worthington since its beginning and therefore has a deep sense of responsibility to ensure that any intended use of the property meets with the approval of neighboring property owners, the City of Worthington and becomes an attractive addition to our community". Mr. Clevenger said this was a three page document that became a statement of position given to potential buyers. He said the last sentence was part of their value system of their fraternity, and they are responsible to not only themselves and their neighbors but also the general community in which they live. Mr. Clevenger explained the building was shown eighteen times while on the market.

He said there were a great number of people walking through the building that had high thoughts about the building, but when confronted with the goals for the sale of the property, it was unacceptable. Mr. Clevenger said he has heard several comments about the need for green space and the green space that the Lodge owned on New England Avenue, but the area was never intended to be a public park. Mr. Clevenger said they spoke with experienced real estate developers and brokers, and a prominent real estate attorney who advised them along the way about what to expect, and what the City of Worthington understood. He said that early on city officials were invited inside the building to see what they envisioned the building could be. Mr. Clevenger said they asked for everybody's help. The "For Sale" sign has been up for two years and no one from the community has offered to help them stay in the building. He said they have exhausted every means possible to do that.

Mr. Clevenger said that fortunately the Showe organization showed up and said they were interested. From the first meeting and through several additional meetings, with Mr. Kevin Showe, Mr. Peterson, and Mr. Bean, and the team they put together, all of the sudden this went from a negotiation to a buyer and a seller. Two organizations that shared equal values about what is important and a respect for each others' position, they shared a vision of what could be done with this property and give to the City of Worthington. Mr. Clevenger said the Lodge's three objectives for selling the property became a reality within about a three week period. Mr. Showe came to Mr. Clevenger and said they could do it all. The Showe organization said they could find a spot for the Lodge's meetings at one of their other properties and they will also preserve the original Lodge building. The Showe family has already deeply invested in Worthington already. He said they could not have found a better partner that would respect the history of what they have. Mr. Clevenger said the members of the Lodge are very proud of the partnership that has been created. He said they have expended money to make this the best thing they could for Worthington.

The next speaker was Mr. John Haueisen of 587 Fox Lane, Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Haueisen said he has lived his entire life within two or three miles of where he is now standing. He has also spent many years serving on Worthington's Convention and Visitors Bureau and the

observation that he would make is that Worthington is very unique. What people come to Worthington for as visitors or residents is unusual, historic, quaint New England appearance and atmosphere. Mr. Haueisen said he has written three books about the history of Worthington, and several pages about James Kilbourne who was not only the founder of Worthington but also a Mason and the founder of the New England Lodge. Kilbourne practiced the Masonic Motto of “making good men better”. He frequently gave speeches in which he encouraged people to be the highest they could be which was being good neighbors to their other neighbors. James Kilbourne would have sold the shirt off of his back before he would do anything that would harm his community. Mr. Haueisen said he does not object to a developer making money and he does not object to the Lodge selling its property and getting out of town, but not at the expense of what the people of Worthington hold dearest. He said the Architectural Review Board, along with City Council are the guardians of what the people of Worthington value most, the place where they live, the appearance, the atmosphere, and the way they feel about it. He said although the Board has a tough task of making decisions about the architecture do not let that damage what matters most to the people of Worthington.

Mrs. Bitar swore in the next speaker, Ms. Natalie McCarthy, of 100 E. New England Ave., Worthington, Ohio. Ms. McCarthy said she has only lived in Worthington for two years, but she and her husband chose to live in Worthington because of the charming atmosphere, not because of urban living. They wanted what they have now in Worthington. When she looks at the proposed development, behind Dewey’s restaurant, with all the green space and trees, she wants Worthington to be her forever home. She does not want to see changes that will take away what they fell in love with.

The next speaker was Mrs. Steffanie Haueisen of 587 Fox Lane, Worthington, Ohio. Mrs. Haueisen said she thinks there are some other creative things the public could come up with, like splitting the property up into various parcels and for different uses. She was urging the formation of a committee that involves the public, and includes the Worthington Historical Society in any discussions. Mrs. Haueisen believes that people could come up with creative ideas of how to address the issues that so many citizens are concerned about.

Mrs. Bitar swore in Ms. Bonnie Guthrie of 573 Hartford St., Worthington, Ohio. Ms. Guthrie said she has lived in the community for thirty years. Ms. Guthrie wanted to know if anybody had discussed splitting up the lots. She believes if they split the lot that someone would buy the space and build a single family home like the river rock house. Ms. Guthrie was pleased to hear the Masonic Lodge will not be torn down, and repurposed, but would like to see the lot split off. Ms. Guthrie said she also did not like the idea of carports. She asked the developer if they had thought about the idea of a carriage house where the house is above the garage space.

Mr. Peterson said they will go back to the drawing board and talk with city staff about some of the issues that were discussed this evening.

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

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

The applicant is in contract to purchase the Masonic Lodge property, which consists of 3 parcels:

1. The original two-story brick building constructed in 1820, which most recently served as the Ohio Masonic Museum; on the National Register of Historic Places
2. An addition to the south constructed in 1957 with parking behind, which most recently housed the offices and meeting space for the Lodge
3. An “L” shaped parcel with ~143’ of frontage along E. New England Ave. (a.k.a. 41 E. New England Ave.), extending to the rear of the 1820 building, and including the existing drive to the Worthington United Methodist Church parking lot.

This request involves combining the three parcels; rezoning the resultant parcel as a PUD to allow conversion of the Lodge buildings to residential and construction of new multi-family residential, consisting of 4 townhouses and a single-family dwelling unit along E. New England Ave.; and ARB approval for the changes to the site.

**Project Details:**

1. Design Regulations:

- a. Character. *The proposed PUD shall consist of an integrated and harmonious design with properly arranged traffic and parking facilities and landscaping. The PUD shall fit harmoniously into and shall not adversely affect adjoining and surrounding properties, Roadways & public facilities.*

The project makes use of the historic lodge buildings, provides infill development along E. New England Ave., maintains and formalizes the drive entrance to the Worthington United Methodist Church/Municipal parking lot, and adds a pedestrian walkway from the lot to E. New England Ave. The proposed single-family structure on the east side of the drive is intended to buffer the existing single-family residential property from the proposed townhouses on the west side of the drive. The additional residential units should not adversely affect the surrounding properties.

- b. Design. *Site layout, Buildings, Accessory Structures, landscaping and lighting shall be compatible with or enhance the surrounding neighborhood and community.*

Site layout: The layout of the site would not substantially change with this proposal. Parking for the Lodge residential units is proposed in place of the current Lodge parking, and behind the older buildings, with the addition of carports in both areas. The access drive to the parking lot would remain in the same location, and a sidewalk is proposed on the east side of the drive.

Buildings: The existing historic buildings are proposed to house 10 units, 1 in the older part of the building and 3 on each of the 3 floors in the newer part of the building. The exterior changes planned involve the replacement of windows and the addition of balconies and stairs to access the units on the north and east sides; the addition and replacement of windows on the south side; and installation of a door in place of a window on the front of the connector between the buildings. New

window/door wells are proposed but the details are not provided. The size of the dwelling units in the lodge range from 1163 square feet to 2997 square feet in area.

West of the drive from E. New England Ave. to the parking lot, 2 two-story structures with 2 townhomes each are proposed. Each unit would have a garage and drive from the access drive to the parking lot. Building entrances are proposed on the north and south of the northern building; on the north face of the southern building; and on the east face at the southern end for unit ML4. All 4 townhomes would have a western door leading to a patio area. The new structures are proposed as two-story structures with 6" Hardieplank lap siding in Fairview Taupe, with Almira White trim and Space Black accents. Charcoal Gray standing seam metal is proposed for gable trim and the porch roofs above the rear patios and ML4 entrance. Variation in colors between buildings may be appropriate, but has not been proposed. Antique Slate asphalt shingles are proposed for the roofs. Wood columns and trim; single hung 6 over 6 Andersen windows; and Carolina Lanterns coach lamps are also proposed. The size of the dwelling units in the lodge range from 2164 square feet to 2222 square feet in area.

East of the drive from E. New England Ave. to the parking lot, a 1776 square foot two-story single-family unit is proposed. The new structure is proposed with 6" Hardieplank lap siding in Duxbury Gray, with Monterey White trim and Arroyo Red accents. Charcoal Gray standing seam metal is proposed for the gable trim and porch roofs. Antique Slate asphalt shingles are proposed for the roof. Wood columns and trim; single hung 6 over 6 Andersen windows; and Carolina Lanterns coach lamps are also proposed. A freestanding 22' x 22.5' garage is proposed south of the house, with access to the public drive. The garage should be moved east to allow parking in the drive that will not interfere with the sidewalk.

Two three-sided carports, 7 & 10 stalls, are proposed. They would be finished to match the townhomes, and include lighting in the ceiling to illuminate the area below and false windows. Details are needed for the windows. Brick for the carports should be explored. Brick is now proposed for the carports, with bricked in windows. With this treatment, less false windows may be appropriate. A discussion of construction of carports versus garages has been included in the packet. The architect feels not as many spaces could be provided with garages.

Landscaping: A mixture of landscape and hardscape elements is proposed between and around the units including: ornamental and shade trees; shrubs; perennials; sidewalk and patio surfaces of brick, concrete and stone; seating areas; ornamental fencing and gates; fire features (pits); grills; and benches. Incorporation of as much brick as possible, especially in close proximity to New England Ave., has been requested by a group of Old Worthington residents. This could include brick incorporated with any fencing.

Lighting: In addition to the coach lamps on the structures and the fixtures inside the carports, light poles are proposed in the parking area and pedestrian walkways. The height shown on the photometric plan is 15' ¾". The fixture is slightly different than is shown on the cut sheets. The color of the poles and fixtures would be black. Eight foot high poles are discussed in the text for pedestrian walkways. Typically, light that spills onto neighboring properties is not permitted. Also, exposed concrete bases are not preferred for the light poles. The photometric plan continues to show light spilling over the adjacent property lines.

- c. Screening. *Parking facilities and refuse containers shall be permanently screened from all adjoining residential uses.*

The only residential lots this property adjoins are east of the single-family unit. Shrubs and trees are proposed on that lot. Screening is proposed for the dumpster. Mechanical equipment, including condensing units, must be shown on the plans and screened. Details for the exact placement of fencing and other screening will be needed for ARB and Final Plan approval. Additional screening is needed along the east side of the single-family dwelling.

- d. Tract Coverage. *The ground area occupied by all Buildings shall be balanced with green space to soften the appearance of the development. Total Lot/tract coverage shall be set forth in the PUD documents.*

The applicant is representing that 77% of the site would be covered with this proposal. If this property were in the C-5 Zoning District, 80% would be the maximum lot coverage.

2. Traffic and Parking:

- a. Traffic. *Adequate ingress and egress shall be provided as part of the PUD.*

With dedication of the drive easement, and an easement from the church, adequate ingress and egress would be provided.

- b. Parking. *Parking shall adhere to the following standards:*

- A. Design. *Parking and service areas shall be designed and located to protect the character of the area.*

The parking is designed behind the buildings, partially screened by landscaping and carport.

- B. Residential Uses. *There shall not be less than one parking space per Dwelling Unit.*

Two spaces per dwelling unit are proposed.

C. Bicycle Parking. *Bicycle parking should be adequate to serve the proposed uses.*

Public bike racks are not shown. Residents would have room to store bicycles in the units.

3. General Requirements:

- a. Environment. *The City may request environmental studies for the property, and may request and receive reports and studies from any agency having jurisdiction over the property, indicating whether there are any environmental issues that would affect the property and/or surrounding properties with the proposed development.*

A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment revealed no recognized environmental conditions.

b. Natural Features.

A. *The Municipal Planning Commission shall not recommend a PUD unless it finds that such development preserves, restores, maintains and/or enhances: (1) Natural Features and (2) the character of the surrounding neighborhood and community.*

B. *The Municipal Planning Commission shall not recommend a PUD if it finds that the Natural Features on such property have been or will be removed, damaged, altered or destroyed in anticipation of development until agreement is reached between the applicant and the Municipal Planning Commission on permanent restoration of Natural Features. All healthy trees 6" caliper or larger shall be retained, or replaced with total tree trunk equal in diameter to the removed tree, and this shall be documented as part of an approved Natural Features preservation plan and/or landscape plan. In the event the Municipal Planning Commission determines that full replacement would result in the unreasonable crowding of trees upon the Lot, or that such replacement is not feasible given site conditions, a fee of four hundred fifty dollars (\$450.00) per caliper inch of trees lost and not replaced on such property shall be paid in cash to the City for deposit in the Special Parks Fund. Such deposits shall be used for reforestation on public property.*

A Tree Preservation Plan has been submitted, but the applicant is still determining the status of the trees.

- C. Public Area Payments. *Whenever any new Dwelling Units are created as part of a PUD, then the developer or owner, as the case may be, shall make a cash payment to the City in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250.00) per each new Dwelling Unit created for deposit in the Special Parks Fund. Such deposits shall be used for costs associated with the City's parks, playground and recreation areas. The public area payment required by this section shall be made prior to the issuance of the building permit for the project.*

The required Public Area Payment would be \$3750.

- D. Public Space Amenities. *A minimum of one Public Space Amenity as approved by the Municipal Planning Commission shall be required for every five-thousand (5000) square feet of gross floor area of multiple family dwelling, commercial or industrial space that is new in the PUD. Public Space Amenities are elements that directly affect the quality and character of the public domain such as: An accessible plaza or courtyard designed for public use with a minimum area of two-hundred fifty (250) square feet; Sitting space (e.g. dining area, benches, or ledges) which is a minimum of sixteen (16) inches in height and forty-eight (48) inches in width; Public art; Decorative planters; Bicycle racks; Permanent fountains or other Water Features; Decorative waste receptacles; Decorative pedestrian lighting; and Other items approved by the Municipal Planning Commission.*

Six Public Space Amenities would be required. The permanent easement for the driveway, the sidewalk and associated lighting and landscaping may suffice.

4. Other
  - a. A Final Plat is needed, with Proposed Easements shown
  - b. Proposed uses for the site should be in line with C-5 Zoning District uses, except that Residential Uses would be permitted.
  - c. Proposed phasing of development of the site, including a schedule for construction of each phase is needed.

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

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

Infill sites should be developed in a way that is complementary to their neighborhoods and that integrates well with surrounding building designs and land uses. Compatibility with the neighborhood should be the primary consideration. New structures should complement the form, massing and scale of existing nearby structures. Also, building placement and orientation are important design considerations. Most main entrances should face the street and garages should avoid facing the street.

These sites often have features -- sometimes man made and sometimes natural -- that can serve as unique enhancements to a development; or that can help a new development blend in well with the existing character of the city. Man-made features might include fences, stone walls, gardens and plantings, and historic buildings. Natural features might include watercourses, distinct topography, and mature trees. Planning for the development of a site should include an inventory and evaluation of features, and the development should retain those that add scenic or historic value (historic buildings, topographical features, mature trees) or that help integrate the new development into the existing cityscape (existing landscaping, roads, paths, sidewalks).

##### Worthington Comprehensive Plan

Page 35 of 36

ARB/MPC Meeting September 25, 2014

Minutes

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

The pedestrian-friendly, mixed-use nature of Old Worthington is historically appropriate. Its success indicates that there are significant land use lessons to be applied to redevelopment efforts in Worthington. It appears there may be new opportunities for mixed-use development in appropriate locations.

**Recommendation:**

Staff feels the project is generally in line with the Comprehensive Plan recommendations and would have a positive impact. Details still need to be finalized for the ARB and Final Plan approval. The Preliminary PUD application could be recommended to City Council for rezoning, with the inclusion of a plat and construction schedule.

Mr. Coulter moved to table the ARB application. Mrs. Holcombe seconded the motion. All members voted, “Aye”.

Mr. Coulter moved to table MPC the application. Mrs. Holcombe seconded the motion. All members voted, “Aye”.

**D. Other**

There was no other business to discuss.

**E. Adjournment**

Mrs. Holcombe moved to adjourn the meeting at 10:53 p.m. and Mr. Coulter seconded the motion. All members voted, “Aye”. The meeting was adjourned.