



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

October 23, 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; James Sauer, Vice Chair; 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. Commission member Kathy Holcombe, Secretary, was absent.

A. Call to Order – 7:30 p.m.

1. Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Approval of minutes of the October 9, 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

B. Architectural Review Board

1. New

- a. Glass Block Windows – **617 Hartford St.** (Jim & Lindsay Roop) **AR 59-14**

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Jim Roop approached the microphone and stated his address is 617 Hartford St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Roop said he and his wife just bought this house and have three small children. The basement windows are very old and do not latch properly. Several of the windows are broken in many places, and one of his children almost fell through one of the windows. The windows are irreparable and need to be replaced. Mr. Roop said they are in the process of

ripping out the old landscaping and plan to screen the new glass block windows with new landscaping. He said three of his five direct neighbors already have similar glass block windows for their basements. Mr. Coulter said typically when glass block windows are installed, the vents tend to be on one or two of the windows and not on all of the windows. Mr. Roop said he was planning to have two vented windows on the driveway side of the house, to have some air flow through the basement.

Mr. Coulter said glass block is available in many textures, and the wavy glass style of block would be more indicative of the time period of the home. Mr. Roop said that is the style of glass block he plans to use. Mr. Hunter said he was not certain about dates but he does know that glass block has been around for a very long time. He said glass block can almost mimic the grill bars of the existing mullions. Mrs. Rodgers said she would feel better if the style of glass block was changed to match the existing window, versus the cut up style with the vent in the window. Mr. Roop said he was open to recommendations as to where to find that style of window, but he does not believe the style still exists. Mr. Roop said he believes a storm window would just add more expense, especially since they are planning to landscape in front of the windows that can be seen from the street.

Mrs. Rodgers said there is often extra expense that goes along with maintaining a historical house. Mr. Coulter suggested avoiding the use of white grout and use gray instead to bring less attention to the windows. Mr. Roop said that would be fine. Mr. Coulter said he believes the Board has approved glass block before and Mr. Hunter agreed, but was not certain when. Mrs. Bitar said she believes that the glass block was approved as part of a larger project. Mr. Hunter suggested when planting landscaping to cover the windows, to use something similar to boxwood or evergreens that would be year round screen rather than deciduous. Mr. Roop said that would be fine.

Mr. Sauer said he liked the wood frame around the window. Mr. Hunter asked Mr. Roop if he would be keeping the wood frame. Mr. Roop said he would be willing to keep the wood frame, and that he has not made his purchase yet. Mr. Coulter said the wood frame would have a tendency to rot. Mr. Reis said he believes less attention would be drawn to the window if the wood frame was taken out, and gray grout was used. Mr. Roop said there is an option to use no grout at all, but he thought the white grout looked a little more historical. He said if gray is more appropriate that is fine. Mr. Sauer suggested staying away from the white grout. 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:

The homeowners recently purchased this Homestead style home built in the early 1930's, and would like to replace 9 basement windows with glass block.

Project Details:

1. Five of the windows are on the south side of the home; four are on the north side. The existing windows are divided vertically into 6 lights. The homeowners report the existing windows are in poor condition and not secure.
2. There is existing vegetation to help screen the windows, and the homeowner has indicated new landscaping would be planted over the next couple of years.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

The Worthington Design Guidelines recommend if historic windows are too deteriorated to repair cost-effectively and replacement is justified, the preferred option is an in-kind replacement in the same material and design. New windows made of substitute materials such as aluminum, vinyl, or clad wood can be acceptable if they provide a reasonably good match for the windows being replaced. Be sure that window designs are appropriate for the style or time period of the house. Avoid use of inappropriate window designs. Avoid enlarging or downsizing window openings to accommodate stock sizes of replacements. Also avoid permanent blocking in of windows.

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

Recommendation:

Glass block is generally not appropriate for historic homes; the material would not have been typical for the time period this home was constructed. Because the opening is sealed with the installation of glass block, much needed ventilation in this older basement would be blocked. Vents added to glass block destroy the symmetry of the glazing and add a second inconsistent feature.

The following measures may lessen the impact:

1. Recessing the glass block as deeply as possible in the foundation wall;
2. Using block sizes and glazing patterns to follow as closely as possible the original basement window style, or other window styles in the structure;
3. Placing a screen or storm window over the basement windows to obscure the glass block;
4. Leaving one or more openings with original windows or like replacements to allow for adequate ventilation; and
5. Arranging landscaping to lessen the visibility of the glass block.

There is a partial view from the right-of-way, and the applicant has mentioned the addition of landscaping. If the blocks can be recessed and/or obscured with screens or storm windows that would also be helpful.

Retention and repair of existing windows, or replacement with a modern version of the same style window is preferred, but replacement with glass block could be acceptable if the windows are hidden and/or camouflaged appropriately.

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY JIM AND LINDSAY RUPP FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO REPLACE BASEMENT WINDOWS WITH GLASS BLOCK AT 617 HARTFORD ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 59-14, DRAWINGS NO. AR 59-14, DATED SEPTEMBER 30, 2014, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING AND AMENDED THAT THE WINDOWS ARE TO BE SCREENED WITH LANDSCAPING THAT IS EVERGREEN PLANTING; AND THE GROUT IS TO BE GRAY IN COLOR.

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

b. Signage – **547 High St.** (Triangle Sign Co./First Financial Bank) **AR 60-14**

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts of the application. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Tim Hoskins approached the microphone and stated he is the sign contractor for First Financial Bank, and his address is 649 Shultz Dr., Hamilton, Ohio 45013. Also in attendance at the meeting was Mr. Jeff Hartley from First Financial Bank. Mr. Hartley stated his address is 255 E. 5th St., Suite 700, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202. Mr. Hoskins said the bank is new to this area and they want to get as much exposure as they can. He said the wall-mounted letters proposed for the front of the building are non-illuminated, one inch deep fabricated aluminum, and painted black. Mr. Hunter said he is not certain that the motion will pass with the front wall sign. Mr. Coulter said that removing the vent from the front of the building will cause moisture problems with the roof and attic space.

Mr. Sauer asked if the existing freestanding sign could be used. He said the existing sign matches the style of the building and looks proportionate; the sign is taller than wider. Mr. Hoskins said no because their style would not work on a taller sign.

Mr. Coulter suggested removing the front wall sign from the application in order to get the freestanding sign approved. Mr. Myers said he wanted to go one step further. Mr. Myers asked Mr. Hartley if he was present at an earlier meeting when signs were being discussed for Insight Bank, and Mr. Hartley said yes, and he understands that the sign needs to be appropriate for the area. Mr. Myers said the wall sign on High Street will probably not be approved by City Council. Mr. Hartley asked if building signs are allowable in the current guidelines. Mr. Hunter said the Architectural Review District has very specific guidelines, and building signs are allowed, but must be reviewed by the Board. Mr. Myers said there is no question; everyone would like to see the new bank be successful. He said subtlety is the norm in the District. He feels the pedestal sign will be very effective, especially with the logo and color as presented. The color alone will attract attention. Mr. Myers said he is protecting the integrity of the district.

Mr. Sauer said the community also values the trees along the street, and there are some very nice trees in front of the building. The wall sign would not be visible to all people driving past the building because of the trees, so there is no need for the additional signage.

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:

Guernsey Bank was constructed in 1999 along with the signage, which was designed to complement the building. The face of the freestanding sign was changed in 2007. First Financial bank has purchased Guernsey Bank, and would like to change the signage to reflect its name as it did earlier this year with Insight Bank on W. Wilson Bridge Rd.

Project Details:

1. The proposal involves replacement of the freestanding and directional signs.
2. The proposed freestanding sign would have a 96” wide x 24” tall base, constructed of brick to match the building with a stone cap. Mounted on the base would be a 92” wide x 45” high (28.8 square feet per side) aluminum rectangular sign with arched trim pieces at the top, and straight trim pieces at the bottom. The proposed double-sided sign would have a yellow background, with 2” deep individually mounted letters: 17.3” high black spelling “first” and 6.2” high blue spelling “first financial bank”. External illumination is proposed for the sign.
3. Twenty-three inch high black individually mounted letters were proposed for the east face of the building, but were withdrawn during the ARB hearing. A vent would have been removed with the wall filled in with brick to accommodate placement of this sign.
4. Replacement of the directional signs with aluminum post and panel non-illuminated signs is proposed. The signs would be 36” above grade, with the display area being 24” wide x 13” high. An arch is proposed for the top.
5. One new accessible parking sign in silver with a yellow stripe is proposed to replace the existing blue and white sign.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Guideline recommendations for signage include:

- Be efficient in using signs. Try to use as few and as small signs as are necessary to get the business message across to the public.
- Use traditional sign materials and lighting. Painted wood, or material that looks like painted wood, is the most appropriate material for signs, with external lighting.
- Colors for signs in Old Worthington should be chosen for compatibility with the age, architecture and colors of the buildings with which they are associated. Signs must be distinctive enough to be readily visible but should avoid incompatible modern colors. Bright color shades generally are discouraged in favor of more subtle and toned-down shades.

Signage, including the appropriateness of signage to the building, is a standard of review per the Architectural District ordinance.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended arched tops for the signage to tie in with the building. Also recommended was elimination of the wall sign, and that removal of the vent was not acceptable.

Mr. Coulter moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY TRIANGLE SIGN CO. FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO REPLACE SIGNAGE AT 547 HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 60-14, DRAWINGS NO. AR 60-14, AND THAT THE REVISED (ARCHED) SIGN PACKAGE AS SUBMITTED BE APPROVED, AND THAT THE WALL SIGN ON THE EAST SIDE OF THE BUILDING ALONG HIGH STREET IS DELETED FROM THIS APPLICATION, DATED OCTOBER 10, 2014, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

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

c. New House & Garage – **138 W. Cleaview Ave.** (Hal Lieberman) **AR 61-14**

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Sauer asked if there was a choice of having to cut down trees to install sidewalks or not. Mrs. Bitar said that decision would have to go back to City Council because it already approved the sidewalks. Mrs. Bitar said this area is in very close proximity to an elementary school and a high school and City Council felt the sidewalks were more important to ensure the safety of the students. New street trees could be planted that would grow over time, and hopefully the sidewalk would be continued down the rest of the block at some point. Mr. Sauer asked what would spark the extension of the sidewalks along the residential streets now where they do not exist. Mrs. Bitar said in the future there could be various sidewalk programs, especially with creating safe routes to schools, and in conjunction with the forthcoming bike and pedestrian plan. Mr. Myers explained that Council members Doug Smith and Rachael Dorothy are both on the Bike and Pedestrian Committee and are very adamant about having sidewalks. Mr. Coulter said he would be disappointed in losing the trees, but there are so many adults and children that walk along that area, and sidewalks are a necessary safety feature.

Mr. Sauer asked if there is a creative way to save the trees, such as having the sidewalks meander around the trees. Mr. Coulter said the developer would need to come back with a detailed site plan and landscaping.

Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Hal Lieberman approached the microphone and stated he is representing Fairfax Homes Inc. Mr. Lieberman said he has discovered some things that were not disclosed by the seller. He said he was not informed about the removing of the trees, and having to go through the process of Architectural Review. The seller also did not disclose that sidewalks would have to be added. He said he was surprised that he would have to remove all of the trees along Evening Street, and the Spruce tree that sits along Clearview Avenue. Mr. Lieberman said had he known in advance about these details he would have reviewed and revised his offer to the seller. Mr. Hunter asked Mr. Lieberman if he wished to table the application at this point and Mr. Lieberman said no, he would like to ask some questions about the process.

Mr. Lieberman said because of the grading of the property, the sidewalks would not be able to meander around the trees. Within a very short distance, about fourteen or fifteen feet, there is a four foot grade difference from the top of the curb to the building pad.

Mr. Lieberman said when he originally put the lot in contract, and looked around at the neighborhood, he felt that a twenty-six hundred square foot home would be appropriate. He showed a photograph of a similar house he just built in the Bexley area. Mr. Lieberman said he does not want to take down the big tree either, but felt there really is no good place for the garage, especially with the forty foot prevailing setback in the front. Mr. Lieberman said his arborist told him if he wanted to keep the tree, it would be necessary to stay at least twenty feet away from the trunk. In order to stay away from the tree, you greatly reduce the size of the home. He said the base of the garage would have to move, and the house would be reduced to sixteen or seventeen hundred square feet, which changes the economics.

Mr. Lieberman said coming off of Clearview Street will not work. He said you would have to start forty feet from the rear of the property to start the garage. Twenty-five feet would be needed for the garage and thirty to thirty-five feet would be needed for maneuverability and a forty foot front setback, leaving twenty-four feet for a house. Mr. Sauer asked if Mr. Lieberman could attach the garage to the back of the house. Mr. Lieberman said from his point of view that is not a marketable product. He said the house would no longer have a back yard. Bexley has several of those homes and they are always the slowest to sell, much less dollar per square foot.

Mr. Coulter asked Mrs. Bitar if the setback is thirty or forty feet. Mrs. Bitar said the required setback is thirty feet, but the prevailing setback along that side of Clearview Avenue is closer to forty feet. Mr. Lieberman said that he does not want to build a house closer to the street than the adjacent houses. He said if the details he knows about now had been disclosed up front he would have come in to talk to about massing and space. Mrs. Rodgers said those are issues with that piece of property. She said one of the justifications given for the lot split, was that there are many lots the same size as this one throughout the city. She said she lives on one this size, and her home is twelve hundred square feet. Mrs. Rodgers said she does not have an issue with an appropriate size house going in on this lot, but a twenty-six hundred square foot home on a half lot will not work. She said a half lot needs a half house, and there may be a market for that, but probably not at the price point Mr. Lieberman was hoping for. Mr. Hunter said as a Realtor, he agrees with Mrs. Rodgers completely. He also said a detached garage is not a deal breaker for

people that want to live in Worthington. Mr. Lieberman said he does not dispute that, but at a different price point.

Mr. Myers asked Mr. Lieberman when he was doing his due diligence on this property, if he was made aware of the recent lot split. Mr. Lieberman said he was aware of the lot split but he was not aware of the lack of removal of the trees, the sidewalks and the whole process of Architectural Review. Mr. Myers said this property was discussed at two meetings by this Board and one meeting at City Council, and there is an extensive amount of minutes. Mr. Lieberman said he did not want to waste more time because he understands he will not be able to get approval for what he wants to do. Mr. Coulter suggested tabling the application and having Mrs. Bitar set up a meeting with a couple of the Board members to sit down and review some of the options.

Mr. Hunter asked Mr. Lieberman if he wanted the Board to vote on this matter and Mr. Lieberman said no, he would like to table this application.

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This 50' wide lot was a separate buildable parcel from the time it was originally platted in 1928 until it was combined with 130 W. Clearview Ave. in 2004. It became a separate lot again earlier this year when the City Council approved a subdivision to allow its separation. Sidewalks were required as part of the approval. Removal of trees was not part of the approval. The plat showing the trees is included with the application.

Project Details:

1. The applicant is purchasing the property, which now has the address of 138 W. Clearview Ave., and would like to construct a single-family house on the site.
2. Proposed is a two-story, 2640 square foot house with a cross-gabled roof. The front gable would be parallel to Clearview Ave. and the rear would run perpendicular, extending to the north. The height to the peak of the front gable is proposed at approximately 30'.
3. Horizontal siding, seal-tab shingles, double-hung windows, shutters, columns and other trim are proposed. Details regarding all materials and samples are needed.
4. A detached two-car garage is proposed at the north end of the lot, with access to Evening St. Removal of 60" tree would be required for this placement. With the subdivision, it was recommended access to the proposed lot may be best from Clearview Ave.
5. The shown placement of the condensing unit would need a variance, and screening would be required regardless of location on the site.

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. Building placement and orientation are

important design considerations. There are two primary considerations: 1) main entrances should face the street; and 2) garages should avoid facing the street. Various site features such as landscaping may make it desirable to locate a building in a way that takes advantage of these features.

Form, Massing & Scale: In designing new residential development in Worthington, it is important to keep the elements of form, massing, and scale in mind to ensure a final product that is as compatible as possible with what already exists in the community. When building a single house in an existing streetscape, note the general level of complexity of form and massing along the street; try to achieve a similar complexity in the new building. The same approach should be used in establishing the new building's scale. If there is great diversity in the streetscape, a successful design could use as inspiration an average of the complexity level and scale of the whole street; or a particular existing building could be used as a model.

Setback: Observe the setback of adjacent and nearby structures in the area where a new building will be placed. Garages should be as far to the rear as possible.

Roof: Roof shapes for new buildings should be appropriate to the style or design of the building. If a new building does not follow a particular style but is instead a vernacular design, then roof shapes and heights similar to those in the neighborhood or nearby would be most appropriate.

Materials: Contemporary materials that simulate traditional ones are appropriate, but the preferred option is to use true traditional materials such as wood siding. Incompatible contemporary materials should be avoided. Brick has long been a traditional material in Worthington. Prepare a sample board for review by the Architectural Review Board.

Windows: For new buildings, multiple-paned windows generally are not appropriate. The exception is a building being built in a particular style -- such as Federal, Greek Revival or Colonial Revival -- that would have employed this window type. When in doubt, simple 1 over 1 double-hung sash windows are usually the simplest, least expensive and most appropriate choice. Using the excellent precedents of Worthington's many historic structures, carefully design the pattern of window openings; window sizes and proportions (they must be appropriate for the size and proportions of the wall in which they are placed); pattern of window panes and muntins; and trim around the windows. Good quality wood windows are readily available and more affordable than in the past. True wood windows are always the first preference. Aluminum- or vinyl-clad windows can be appropriate, but primarily on secondary facades and less conspicuous locations. All-aluminum or vinyl windows are not prohibited but are not encouraged. Avoid blank walls.

Entries: As with other design considerations, study Worthington's rich collection of 19th and 20th century architecture for design ideas for entrances and doors. For newly-built buildings, simpler designs usually look better than more ornate ones. Avoid heavy ornamentation on doors and entrances. Observe entry placement on existing buildings. Whether located symmetrically or asymmetrically, entries usually are aligned with a window on the second floor so that a regular

rhythm of openings is maintained on both floors. Entries should be located so they are easily visible, and they should be oriented toward the street.

Ornamentation: Observe Worthington's excellent historic architecture for information on the kinds and amounts of ornamentation employed on various building styles and periods. Use ornamentation conservatively. It will be most successful if used in traditional locations: around windows and doors; along a building's cornice or at the corners; in gables; or on gates and fences. Most ornamentation historically was made of simple forms built up to a desired level of complexity. When in doubt, follow the old rule that "less is more." Sometimes just a little ornamentation, well placed, can have a major impact without the need for more extensive (and expensive, and hard-to-maintain) ornamentation. Use compatible materials in ornamental elements. Frame houses should have wood ornamentation, although in cases where the ornamental elements are some distance from the viewer it may be possible to use substitute materials such as fiberglass.

Color: In general, avoid bright colors not typical in Worthington neighborhoods, such as various shades of purple or orange. For infill buildings being placed in an existing streetscape, select colors compatible with those already used along the streetscape. Many buildings follow a pattern of light colors for the building body and darker colors for the trim. Following this pattern is encouraged. In Worthington, the use of white or cream-colored trim also is common and would be appropriate for new construction. Avoid using too many colors. Usually one body color and one trim color are sufficient.

Landscaping: Worthington's mature shade trees are the primary landscaping feature throughout the community. They are a major contributor to its character and help define its neighborhoods as stable, desirable places to live. In general, lawns are generous but not overly large, which contributes to the sense of human scale that is one of Worthington's important attributes. Other landscaping elements tend to be properly scaled and well-tended, which also tends to enhance neighborhood character. Maintain and nurture mature trees to prolong their lives. Plant and maintain street trees in planting areas between the street and sidewalk. Paving can sometimes reduce water absorption of the soil so much that trees do not get the moisture they require.

The standards of review in the Architectural District ordinance are:

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

7. Compatibility of design and materials, which shall include the appropriateness of the use of exterior design details;
8. Landscape design and plant materials, which shall include, in addition to requirements of this Zoning Code, lighting and the use of landscape details to highlight architectural features or screen or soften undesirable views;
9. Pedestrian environment, which shall include the provision of features which enhance pedestrian movement and environment and which relate to the pedestrian's visual perspective;

Recommendation:

Staff recommended *denial* of this application, or *tabling* until changes were made, for the following reasons: Removal of a 60” tree to locate the proposed garage is not acceptable. A comparison of the style, massing & scale of the proposed structure with others in the neighborhood would be helpful to determine the appropriateness of this structure. A smaller footprint would allow more flexibility with placement on the site and retention of trees. Materials have not been identified, and samples would be needed for approval. A landscaping plan showing the required sidewalks, what plants would be removed, and what plants would be added is necessary. New trees planted between the sidewalk and street would be desired.

Mr. Coulter moved to table this application and Mr. Sauer seconded the motion. All members voted, “Aye”. The motion was tabled.

d. Sign – 7227 N. High St. (Signcom Inc./Cookie Dough Creamery) AR 62-14/ADP 10-14

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Bruce Sommerfelt approached the microphone and stated his address is 527 W. Rich St., Columbus, Ohio, and he is representing the owner. Mr. Hunter asked Mr. Sommerfelt when the business would be opening and Mr. Sommerfelt said he was not sure, but possibly sometime around the holidays. Mrs. Rodgers said she is okay with the sign but thought the balance seemed off. She thought the signs should be even with each other. Mr. Coulter said he thought the sign needed to be raised a bit. Mr. Reis said he liked the way the signs were graphically laid out. 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:

The Cookie Dough Creamery is proposing to open adjacent to the Pies & Pints space in the Shops at Worthington Place. A business called Naticakes was previously approved at this location but never opened. In September, the Architectural Review Board approved new signage for Pies and Pints, which included the sign on the corner element only taking up space on the left half rather than the full width of the wall. The new Cookie Dough Creamery sign is proposed for the east half of the south face of the corner feature.

Project Details:

1. The proposed wall sign would be 7’ 3.5” wide x 5’ 6” high, for total area of 40.1 square feet. The approved Pies & Pints sign is 11’ 1.5” wide x 5’ 5.5” high, and is proposed slightly higher on the wall than the Cookie Dough Creamery sign.
2. The sign is designed with the business name, Cookie Dough Creamery, below a swirling cupcake design, all stud mounted with the hardware concealed. The proposed colors are brown and blue. Halo illumination is proposed for the lettering, with the power units mounted behind the wall.

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; and 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 recommended approval of this application. The proposed sign meets the guidelines for The Shops at Worthington Place.

ARB Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY SIGNCOM FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL A NEW SIGN AT 7227 N. HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 62-14, DRAWINGS NO. AR 62-14, DATED OCTOBER 10, 2014, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

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

MPC Motion:

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 10-14, DRAWINGS NO. ADP 10-14, DATED OCTOBER 10, 2014, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

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

D. Other

There was no other business to discuss.

E. Adjournment

Mr. Reis moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:51 p.m., and Mr. Coulter seconded the motion. All members voted, "Aye". The meeting was adjourned.