



MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
WORTHINGTON ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
WORTHINGTON MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION
March 26, 2015

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; and Amy Lloyd. 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, and Edwin Hofmann were absent.

A. Call to Order – 7:30 p.m.

1. Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Approval of the minutes of the March 26, 2015 meeting

Mr. Coulter moved to approve the minutes and Mr. Reis seconded the motion. All members voted, “Aye”. The motion was approved.

4. Affirmation of the witnesses

B. Architectural Review Board

1. Unfinished

- a. Sign – **800 High St.** (Custom Sign Center, Inc./Huntington) **AR 10-15**

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. John Gavin approached the microphone and stated he is representing the Custom Sign Center and his address is 3200 Valleyview Dr., Columbus, Ohio. Mr. Hunter said he noticed the landscaping around the sign will eventually cover up the lower panel. Mr. Gavin said he has already suggested the bank plant low growing ground cover around the sign. Board members had no other 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:

The signage for the Huntington Bank site was changed in 2011 to reflect the new brand for the bank. After installation of the main freestanding identification sign, it was realized that other tenants identified on the previous sign were not on the new sign and still wanted signage. In 2012 an application was approved to add a panel below the main sign face for those tenants, and a variance was approved by the Board of Zoning Appeals for additional sign area. This request is to add another panel below the main sign to identify the Huntington Private Client Group.

Project Details:

1. The applicant initially submitted a proposal for the March 12th agenda. The additional sign panel was shown with text in a different font than the existing panel and in all capital letters. The applicant asked the application be tabled until revisions could be made.
2. A revised drawing was submitted, showing the new panel with the same font used in the existing panel, and with upper and lower case letters. The panel would be the same gray color as the existing with white lettering.
3. The current sign was approved with plants in the base, which may obscure the lower panel.
4. A variance is needed to add the additional sign area.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Guideline recommendations for signage include being 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. Signage, including the appropriateness of signage to the building, is a standard of review per the Architectural District ordinance.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending approval of this application. The addition of a panel would not change the character of the sign.

Mrs. Lloyd moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY CUSTOM SIGN CENTER INC. FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL A SIGN PANEL AT 800 HIGH ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 10-15, DRAWINGS NO. AR 10-15, DATED FEBRUARY 26, 2015, 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. Mr. Hunter, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Coulter, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; and Mrs. Lloyd, aye. The motion was approved.

2. New

Page 2 of 30

ARB/MPC Meeting March 26, 2015

Minutes

- a. Patio Furniture – **7227 N. High St., Space 106** (George T. VIII/Aladdin’s Eatery) **AR 13-15**
(Amendment to AR 24-14)

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application, explaining for the 2 panels, one would be a wall sign and the other decoration. The sign on the entry feature is a projection sign, so a variance would not be needed. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Ms. Vickie Angelo said she is representing Aladdin’s corporate office from Lakewood, Ohio. Ms. Angelo said if umbrellas are used, they would be the same color of red that is used for the awning. Board members had no other 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:

Approval for Aladdin’s Eatery to create a new entrance and a patio for seating in a portion of the service courtyard between Kenneth’s and First Watch at the Shops at Worthington Place was granted in June of 2014. The business is now looking for approval of patio furniture.

Project Details:

1. Fifteen aluminum colored square tables with 40 chairs are proposed for the space, as are 2 wooden benches.
2. Red umbrellas would be used as needed.
3. Wood paneled pieces of art are proposed for the wall.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

The Board should review the exterior detail and relationship of the changes to existing site and building. Furniture should be simple and unobtrusive in character.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending *approval* of this application. The proposed furniture and signage is appropriate for the Shops at Worthington Place.

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY GEORGE T. VIII, LLC FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS FOR PATIO FURNITURE AT 7227 N. HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 13-15, DRAWINGS NO. AR 13-15, DATED MARCH 13, 2015, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING WITH THE AMENDMENT THAT AT THE OPTION OF THE TENANT TO HAVE UMBRELLAS AT THE TABLES IF NEEDED,

AND IF UMBRELLAS ARE USED THEY WILL BE THE SAME COLOR OF RED AS THE AWNING.

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

b. Alterations – **752 High St.** (City of Worthington) **AR 14-15**

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application, and said clarification is needed about whether the applicant is replacing existing vents or if additional vents are being added. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Jeff Harris approached the microphone and stated he is the Economic Development Manager for the City of Worthington. Mr. Harris introduced the members of his project team, Law Director Pam Fox, Architect Jack Hedge, and Assistant City Manager Robyn Stewart. Mr. Harris said they updating this building in preparation to lease the building for private commercial use.

Mr. Hunter said although the applicant would like to proceed rapidly, this application will not be treated any differently than any other project. He said he does not like to see a piece meal approach to projects. The Board likes to see a full plan. Mr. Hunter said he realizes Mr. Harris is in a time table crunch due to grant deadlines set by the State of Ohio, but the Board must be informed in the process along the way, not just presenting materials they should have had a week ago. Mr. Harris apologized for the piece meal nature of the application. He said they have been given a very aggressive time frame for state grant funds that must be fully expended by June 30. Mr. Harris said the project team has been working together since January but it has been a challenge to get things done.

Mr. Hunter said he would like to discuss the doors, specifically the front doors and the fire door on the side. He said the fire door is a very visible piece of the building. Mr. Harris said the driving force to remove the door is because of the removal of the mezzanine inside the building. Since there will not be a second floor, there will no longer be a need for a second level exit door.

Mr. Reis asked about the mechanical units and asked why there are eight small units versus four larger units. From a maintenance perspective, four larger units would be easier to maintain. Mr. Harris said his project team discussed that subject with engineers and given the layout of this building, and there are three confined areas that need to be heated and cooled, the engineering team figured that quasi-residential units would work best. Mr. Harris said the condensing units would be realigned but they cannot be moved north of the bump out because a prospective tenant would like to use that area as a loading dock.

Mr. Coulter said he stopped by the building and school earlier this evening and walked around the area. He believes that four units could be split around the bump out where the existing unit is now, and the other four units could be located around the corner and screened with landscaping.

Mr. Coulter cautioned Mr. Harris about allowing the use of the alleyway as a loading dock because the school has an emergency exit in the same location. Mr. Coulter suggested that Mr. Harris talk with the school officials about that idea because the children will need to be taught which way to turn if they need to exit that door, and prevent them from being trapped by the truck.

Mrs. Bitar stated a variance will be needed for placement of the condensing units because they would be located in the rear yard setback.

Mrs. Holcombe would like to see the front doors saved and restored if possible. She said she disagrees with the new door. Mr. Harris said the project team suggested new doors because the current doors are very hard to open. Only one of the two doors is operable. Mr. Coulter said he agrees with Mrs. Holcombe's comments and that the current matches the windows better, but in terms of the entry doors, if they have to be replaced, then replace with doors that will match with what is already there. Mr. Coulter said there are several manufacturers in town that could replicate the doors, and in fact, may even be cheaper to replace the doors versus repairing them. Mr. Harris said there will be no changes to the back door.

Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Harris to address Mrs. Bitar's comments about the vents. Mr. Harris said the engineering team suggested the louvered air vents would be needed, based upon mechanicals that were drawn up about two weeks ago, but those drawings have already been changed due to lease negotiations for the southern portion of the building. Mr. Harris said he would like to bring that portion of this project back to the Board for further discussion because he does not have enough information yet. Mr. Hunter said he would like to see the doors come back too. Mr. Coulter suggested if the doors need to be replaced then replace the doors to match what is there now. Mr. Hunter felt the broken windows in the basement should be repaired. Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application.

Mr. Jack Bellay, of 6750 Schreiner St. E., Worthington, Ohio, asked for more details about the lift that would be installed in the front of the building. Mr. Hunter explained the lift is required for ADA purposes and will be located behind the new door that is added to the building. The lift will be inside the building. There were no other speakers.

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

The Kilbourne Building was built in 1927, with additions constructed in 1932 and 1956. The building was originally the library, and more recently used as the Worthington City Schools administrative offices. The City of Worthington took possession of the building in 2006. In an ongoing effort to preserve the building, and provide leasable space to prospective commercial tenants, the Community Improvement Corporation is proposing various alterations to address accessibility, HVAC, and removal of the fire escape in conjunction with the interior removal of the mezzanine.

Project Details:

1. On the west elevation the following changes are proposed:
 - New front doors are proposed to match the existing. Detail has not been provided regarding the new doors.
 - Front steps would be repaired and the handrail would be replaced with an ADA compliant version of similar design. The exact design has not been shown.
 - Installation of a new door at grade, north of the entry steps is proposed. The top portion of the window would be retained; a new wood decorative panel would be placed below the window; and the door would be below the panel. The door would be divided with 18 lights, but specifications for the material and style have not been submitted. This new entry is proposed to provide an accessible entry, as it would connect to an elevator inside the building. It appears concrete would need to be extended in front of the new door.
 - The round window north of the entrance is proposed to be “closed in”. No detail has been provided.
2. On the north elevation, removal of the fire escape and access door is proposed. The hole would be filled with a window to match the other upper level windows and trim; salvaged brick; a new wood cornice; and new standing seam metal roofing to match the existing, which was installed in 2009. No detail has been provided.
3. The addition of 8 condensing units is proposed for the east elevation. A variance is needed to place the units in the rear setback. Screening will be provided.
4. Flush-mounted louvers are proposed on the east side of the building. No detail has been provided.

Land Use Plans:Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Older doors should be retained instead of replaced. If they are in poor condition, they can usually be repaired; damaged or non-functional hardware can be repaired or replaced. For new doors, wood is the preferred material, and the design should be simple, perhaps with one or two lower panels and a window in the upper half. If windows will be installed, use new windows of the same size, design and profile (cross-section), to the greatest extent possible. Avoid permanent blocking in of windows; the window pattern is part of the building’s overall design. Design and materials should be traditional, and compatible with the existing structure.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending *approval* of this application once the following concerns are addressed:

1. The existing front doors should be repaired rather than replaced.
2. The round front window should not be removed or altered on the exterior.
3. Screening is necessary for the condensing units.

Mr. Coulter moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY THE WORTHINGTON COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT CORPORATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO MAKE

ALTERATIONS AT 752 HIGH ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 14-15, DRAWINGS NO. AR 14-15, DATED MARCH 13, 2015, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING WITH THE FOLLOWING AMENDMENTS:

- **THAT THE ELEVATOR DOOR AT THE LOBBY AS PRESENTED TONIGHT WILL REMAIN AS SHOWN, AND IF THE FRONT DOORS CANNOT BE REPAIRED THEN WILL BE REPLACED WITH DOORS TO MATCH EXISTING**
- **THAT THE CONDENSING UNITS AT THE BACK OF THE BUILDING AS SHOWN TONIGHT BE ADJUSTED TO ALLOW FOR THE EXIT DOOR TO BE MAINTAINED AND THAT FOUR OR FIVE UNITS COULD BE LOCATED WHERE THE GREEN COVER IS AND THAT THE OTHERS CAN BE LOCATED NEAR THE ALLEY WAY**
- **THE MECHANICAL LOUVER VENTS AS SHOWN ON THE BUILDING TONIGHT BE BROUGHT BACK FOR FURTHER REVIEW**
- **THAT THE WINDOW TO THE LEFT OF THE ENTRY DOOR WILL STAY AS IS BUT WILL BE BLACKED OUT ON THE INSIDE OF THE BUILDING AND THAT THE BROKEN BASEMENT WINDOWS WILL BE REPAIRED AT THE APPROPRIATE TIME DURING CONSTRUCTION**
- **PROPER LANDSCAPING WILL BE ADDED TO SCREEN THE CONDENSING UNITS, AND THE BOARD WOULD LIKE TO SEE THAT COME BACK AS PART OF THE LANDSCAPING PLAN WHEN DEVELOPED**

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

c. **Addition – 802 Evening St. (John & Jenna (Scholl) Reik) AR 15-15**

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mrs. Jenna Scholl Reik approached the microphone and stated her address is 802 Evening St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Hunter said he has magazine cuts from the 1950's era that show very similar houses as the one proposed this evening. This is not an uncommon original build.

Mrs. Holcombe asked if the height of the home addition would be similar to the neighboring house to the north and Mrs. Reik said yes. Mrs. Reik's contractor approached the microphone and stated his name is James Ross of 6120 Crystal Valley Dr., Galena, Ohio. Mr. Coulter wanted to know why one of the windows in the master bedroom was taken out. Mrs. Reik said the window was taken out to make room for a larger master closet. The window in the corner was deleted to make more wall space for furniture. Mr. Coulter asked Mrs. Reik if she would be using the same colors that exist on the house today and Mrs. Reik said the original portion of the house will remain with white siding and the second story will have light gray siding. Mrs. Reik distributed building material samples to the Board members and staff.

Mrs. Lloyd had a question about the vertical siding and asked if the board and batten spacing could be narrower. Mr. Ross said the product is eight inches on center, the drawing is off. Mrs. Lloyd asked about the profile of the horizontal siding and Mr. Ross said the siding is five inches. Mrs. Lloyd said the second story window above the bay window should be centered above the bay window. Mrs. Holcombe thought there should be more windows on the south side of the home.

Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and a few people raised their hands.

The first speaker was Mr. Jack Bellay of 6750 Schreiner St. E., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Bellay did not like the proposed addition to this home, feeling the two types of siding clashed and suggested this application be denied.

The next speaker was Mrs. Jo Rodgers, of 575 Evening St., Worthington, Ohio. Mrs. Rodgers said she feels that the house is attractive but she wanted to speak to the fact that this is one of the contributing properties in the historical district. She said Mr. Ventresca has been in front of this Board many times before talking about how the first time Worthington tried to get historic recognition for the city they were rejected because the city did not have enough historic buildings left. She said the buildings there were referencing were the grand homes, very neat old buildings that people instantly recognized. Mrs. Rodgers said the proposed house does not fall into that category, however this house is exactly what got the city historic district recognition. Mrs. Rodgers read a paragraph from the historic district document: "The Worthington Historic District developed over one hundred and fifty years period of significance and its architecture reflects this extended period of development. Buildings from the first decade of the nineteenth century still stand along with houses, commercial and public buildings from the late nineteenth and first half of the twentieth century with the most recent of the contributing structures in the district dating from the immediate post World War II period. The architecture of the proposed historic district reflects growth and change in the community from 1803 to the early 1960's. A period that saw it evolve from a frontier village to a market village for surrounding farms and then to a residential and commercial suburb of metropolitan Columbus." Mrs. Rodgers encouraged the Board members to refer to the Design Guidelines when granting approval for home additions, and that would help preserve the historical nature of the structures.

The next speaker was Mr. Seth Cramer of 806 Evening St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Cramer said one of the joys of old Worthington is that the Board does a good job of keeping the character of the neighborhood. He believes the proposed home fits the character of the neighborhood. Mr. Cramer said he fully supports the applicants. He is very happy his neighbors have decided to stay in old Worthington, and he knows their parents live in old Worthington also, and they fully respect the character of the historic neighborhood.

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This single-story house sits on a property that is 50' wide and 150' deep, located across from the Evening Street Elementary School playground. The existing Colonial Revival Influence house was constructed in 1950 and is approximately 1300 square feet in area. The house is a contributing property in the Worthington Historic District. The homeowners are requesting approval to add a second story to the house, taking the area to approximately 2600 square feet.

Project Details:

1. The existing house is of simple form, with a main gable running north and south, and smaller matching gables extending east and west from the northern portion of the house. The plan is to extend the walls straight up from the existing. A site plan or survey has not been submitted, so it is not clear if the existing house is at least 6' from the north property line. If that wall is closer than 6', a variance would be required to add a second story.
2. The same basic roof form would carry to the second floor, except the front gable would have a higher roof pitch than the rear gable and the eaves would be lower. On the left elevation, the gable would extend to the eave but is not shown that way.
3. Retention of the vinyl lap siding and most of the existing windows on the first floor is proposed. The second floor would have vertically oriented vinyl siding and new windows. Details of the windows and samples of the siding and roofing have been requested.
4. A second story was added to the house to the north about 10 years ago.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Residential additions are recommended to maintain similar roof forms; be constructed as far to the rear and sides of the existing residence as possible; be subordinate; and have walls set back from the corners of the main house. Design and materials should be traditional, and compatible with the existing structure.

Recommendation:

Although the design elements are compatible with the existing house, the proposed addition of a second story would alter the character of the house, and the District. The proposal would, however, represent a significant investment in the property.

Mr. Coulter moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY JOHN & JENNA REIK FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO CONSTRUCT A SECOND STORY ADDITION AT 802 EVENING ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 15-15, DRAWINGS NO. AR 15-15, DATED MARCH 13, 2015, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING WITH THE FOLLOWING CHANGES:

- **THAT THE VERTICAL SIDING ON THE SECOND FLOOR WILL BE 8" WIDE AS THE SAMPLE THAT WAS PRESENTED AT THE MEETING**
- **THAT THE SECOND FLOOR WINDOW IN THE SOUTH BEDROOM BE CENTERED ON THE WINDOW BELOW**

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

- d. Revisions to Alterations – **673 High St.** (Harold C. Baker) **AR 16-15** (Amendment to AR 29-14)

&

C. Municipal Planning Commission

1. Conditional Use Permit

- a. Restaurant in C-5 – **673 High St.** (Harold C. Baker) **CU 04-15** (Amendment to CU 05-14)

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mr. Baker approached the microphone and stated his address is 673 High St., Suite 204, Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Baker said while working with AEP, they requested moving the rear door because of the closeness of where the utilities would be coming into the building. Subsequent to that, a new engineer became involved and he requested moving the utilities to the rear of the building, to be closer to AEP's transformer. Mr. Baker said when he was working on the original addition to the building, he became ill, and ended up in the hospital so his brother came up from Florida to help frame the addition. Since AEP requested moving the door, his brother went ahead and moved the door because he did not realize he would have to come before the Board. Mr. Baker said in terms of lights outside, he plans to use goose neck fixtures with LED's to make the area look a bit more traditional. Mr. Baker said he is aware that he will have to apply for a variance for additional signage. He said he will be coming back to the City to submit his plans for ingress and egress to make sure that they comply with the Building Code. Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Baker what type of material is being used for the railing and Mr. Baker said he will be using either wood or pvc which will be painted white to match the building.

Mr. Coulter asked Mrs. Bitar to discuss the sign that would be located in the rear of the building. Mrs. Bitar explained the exact design of the sign will need to come back before the Board for approval but she showed the Board members where the proposed sign will be located. The sign will need to be approved by the Board of Zoning Appeals because there will be two wall mounted signs, one in the front and one in the rear of the building. There are other businesses in the area that have entrances on both sides of the building and a wall sign at each entrance. Staff had no concerns. Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone else that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This vernacular style commercial building was constructed in the 1800's, and additions/new construction occurred in the 1900's. Paint and signage have been the main updates to the building in recent years. This space was occupied by Damsels in this Dress for many years, but has been vacant for a couple of years.

Architectural Review Board approval was granted to change the appearance to accommodate a restaurant in June of 2014. The owner is now proposing some minor changes.

A Conditional Use Permit was originally granted for the concept of a restaurant in July of 2012. A detailed Conditional Use Permit was granted in June of 2014. Now the owner would like to amend that permit.

Project Details:

1. The exterior changes proposed are on the rear of the building. The access door would move to the south and not have the proposed trim. One small window is now proposed rather than 2 larger windows.
2. Lighting cuts are mentioned in the supporting statement but not shown on the drawing.
3. Interior seating is now proposed to be 87 rather than 72 seats. The exterior number would be 22 rather than 16. Outdoor seating is proposed in the front as before.
4. The general description of the restaurant as a sit-down, casual dining restaurant featuring sustainable menu items, local fare and items from Worthington Farmer's Market vendors has not changed.
5. As previously approved, expected hours of operation are 11:00 am to 11:00 pm Monday – Thursday; 11:00 am to Midnight Friday and Saturday; and 11:00 am to 10:00 pm on Sunday. Breakfast hours may be added on the weekends, especially during the Farmer's Market.
6. An increase in evening traffic vs. the previous retail use would be expected.
7. The effect on public facilities, sewerage and drainage facilities, and utilities is expected to be minimal.
8. All of the items that extend out from or are in front of the building will be approved by the Director of Service of Engineering because they will be above or in the right-of-way.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

- There are recommendations in the Worthington Design Guidelines to use exterior materials traditionally used on commercial building in Worthington.
- Small, well-executed and well-maintained landscaping is appropriate for the Central Business District to provide relief from the "hardscape" of buildings, streets, and other man-made elements.
- Compatibility of design and materials and exterior detail and relationships are standards of review in the Architectural District ordinance.

Comprehensive Plan

A good mix of retail and restaurant in the Central Business District is recommended.

Conditional Use Permit Basic Standards and Review Elements

- A. Effect on traffic pattern
- B. Effect on public facilities
- C. Effect on sewerage and drainage facilities
- D. Utilities required
- E. Safety and health considerations
- F. Noise, odors and other noxious elements, including hazardous substances and other environmental hazards
- G. Hours of use
- H. Shielding or screening considerations for neighbors
- I. Appearance and compatibility with the general neighborhood.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending approval of this application. The proposed changes do not significantly alter the previous approvals.

Mr. Coulter moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY HAROLD C. BAKER TO AMEND CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS NO. AR 29-14 BY MODIFYING THE REAR OF THE BUILDING AT 673 HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 16-15, DRAWINGS NO. AR 16-15, DATED MARCH 13, 2015, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING WITH THE FOLLOWING AMENDMENTS:

- **THE RAILING AT THE STAIRS WILL BE PAINTED WHITE**
- **THE SIZE OF THE SIGN AS PROPOSED THIS EVENING IS ACCEPTABLE BUT THE LAYOUT OF THE DESIGN WILL NEED TO BE REVIEWED BY THE ARB FOR FINAL APPROVAL AS WELL AS GO THROUGH THE BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS**
- **THE SIDING ON THE BUILDING WILL BE PAINTED WHITE**
- **THE CEMENTITIOUS MATERIAL ON THE SECOND FLOOR WILL BE PAINTED TO MATCH THE ADJACENT BRICK COLOR**

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

Mr. Coulter moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY HAROLD C. BAKER TO AMEND CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CU 05-14 TO OPERATE A RESTAURANT AT 673 HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. CU 04-15, DRAWINGS NO. CU 04-15, DATED MARCH 13, 2015, BE APPROVED

BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

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

B. Architectural Review Board (continued)

1. New (continued)

e. New Storefront – **661 B High St.** (Brian Seitz, Ten Penny Design, LLC) **AR 17-15**

&

C. Municipal Planning Commission (continued)

1. Conditional Use Permit (continued)

b. Printing & Publishing in C-5 – **661 B High St.** (Igloo Letterpress/Allison Chapman)
CU 05-15

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Brian Seitz approached the microphone and stated his address is 232 N. 3rd St., Columbus, Ohio. Mr. Reis said he liked the plan to make the building more individual. Mr. Hunter said he was very happy to see Igloo Letterpress staying in Worthington. Mrs. Holcombe said she wanted to go on record as stating she is disappointed to see the divided lights (muntins) going away. Mr. Seitz said when he first met with City Staff, his intention was to keep the muntins, but when he actually went inside the building and saw how bad of shape the muntins were in he felt they should be removed. The muntins are not part of the original building. There were no other 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:

The owners of this building are creating separate tenant spaces in the former Worthington Hardware location. The building currently houses Sassafras Bakery, the proposed Grid Furnishings and the Old Bag of Nails. The building was originally constructed in 1875 and remodeled in the late 1900's. The tenant space in this application would be in the one story middle portion of the building, and 4500 square feet in area. The proposed tenant is Igloo Letterpress, which would move from its current location at 39 W. New England Ave.

Project Details:

1. Exterior changes to create the new tenant space would involve installation of a recessed single wood door and window to the north side of the storefront. The existing window on the south portion of the space would remain, with the muntins being removed.
2. Decorative pilasters are proposed on the sides of the storefront and scalloped trim is proposed to run under the eave. Paint is proposed for the currently all white storefront, white the background being Aquatint; and various trim elements being Enticing Red, Honorable Blue and Synergy. A color rendering is included in the packet and will be presented at the meeting.
3. Signage size and locations are shown on the storefront elevation. A wall sign is proposed on the shingled roof structure that would be 2'6" x 12'0", or 30 square feet in area, and include goose neck light fixtures above. A projection sign would be located to the right of the door and be 1'6" x 1'6", or 2.25 square feet in area. The actual signage has not been designed, so would come back for approval at a later date. An existing plaque is on the building that would be moved slightly.
4. The business would have a retail component in the front, and the printing and publishing business behind. This space would more than double the square footage for the business, allowing more opportunity for hands on experiences for its customers, while filling print orders at the same time. The hours of operation would match the other retail businesses in Old Worthington. No effect on traffic patterns or utilities is expected. Negative impacts have not been identified.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

- There are recommendations in the Worthington Design Guidelines to use exterior materials traditionally used on commercial buildings in Worthington.
- Real or simulated multiple-paned storefronts can be found in many Worthington commercial buildings. This type of window is common in pre-Civil War buildings, when smaller glass panes were typical. Later storefronts usually had large single panes of glass. In such buildings, the large panes should be retained and not replaced with multiple panes.
- Avoid using too many colors on a building. Late 19th century buildings should have a maximum of three different colors (the body color and two trim colors); those from earlier and later periods should have no more than two. Consider using light and dark shades of the same color when choosing body and trim colors.
- Compatibility of design and materials and exterior detail and relationships are standards of review in the Architectural District ordinance.

Comprehensive Plan

A good mix of retail and restaurant in the Central Business District is recommended.

Conditional Use Permit Basic Standards and Review Elements

- A. Effect on traffic pattern
- B. Effect on public facilities
- C. Effect on sewerage and drainage facilities

- D. Utilities required
- E. Safety and health considerations
- F. Noise, odors and other noxious elements, including hazardous substances and other environmental hazards
- G. Hours of use
- H. Shielding or screening considerations for neighbors
- I. Appearance and compatibility with the general neighborhood.

Recommendations:

Staff is recommending *approval* of the applications. The proposed changes to the storefront would distinguish the space as a separate business. There are other storefronts that are painted and/or have painted trim in the Central Business District. Because the painted area is limited, the proposed colors should not appear excessive. The business is appropriately located in Old Worthington, which has a long history of printing businesses.

Mr. Coulter moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY BRIAN SEITZ FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO CHANGE THE STOREFRONT AT 661 B HIGH ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 17-15, DRAWINGS NO. AR 17-15, DATED MARCH 13, 2015, 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. Mr. Hunter, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Coulter, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; and Mrs. Lloyd, aye. The motion was approved.

Mrs. Holcombe moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY IGLOO LETTERPRESS FOR A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO OPERATE A PRINTING AND PUBLISHING BUSINESS IN THE C-5 ZONING DISTRICT AT 661 B HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. CU 05-15, DRAWINGS NO. CU 05-15, DATED MARCH 13, 2015, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

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.

c. Semipublic Use in R-10 – **6238 Linworth Rd.** (Linworth Baptist Church/Fuller) **CU 03-15**

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Donald Plank approached the microphone and explained he is representing his client, the applicant, and along with Mr. Plank were Mr. Paul Ward who is a representative from

the church, and the Landscape Architect, Mr. Todd Foley. Mr. Plank said the site plan developed by Mr. Foley will become the development of the site. Mr. Plank reviewed the highlights of the new site plan, which Mrs. Bitar previously discussed. The primary purchase of the lot is for the expansion of the church parking area. The neighboring property to the south is United Dairy Farmers (UDF). UDF is donating a small portion of its lot to the church in an exchange for a storm sewer easement that will run across the church property. UDF and the church have entered into an agreement where UDF is engineering the line, which will include the church's storm water.

Mr. Todd Foley approached the microphone and said he works for POD Design, 100 Northwoods Blvd., Suite A, Columbus, Ohio. Mr. Foley said one of the key points for bringing this plan back for review is the shifting of the actual access point into the new proposed parking lot. They will be striping the lot, and creating a safer path for people to get into the building safely. Mr. Foley said he met with the City's Arborist, Mr. Sean Daugherty, and has agreed to Mr. Daugherty's suggestion of tree species and number of plantings. He does not intend to make any changes to the stone walls near Linworth Road. The other change relative to the site plan is the circulation of traffic through the area. The one way drive to the east is so they can get the flow of traffic to the back part of the site so people can loop around and exit on the south side of the building. They will be providing an evergreen hedge along the property, and will try to screen as much as they can from people driving down Linworth Road. They will also be clearing all of the honeysuckle and dead brush from the area.

Mr. Coulter asked if anyone has had any conversation with the homeowner that lives to the north of this area. Mr. Plank said yes, and that homeowner is present at the meeting. The plants along the northern portion of the lot should screen the headlights, and most of the storm water will be captured back into the storm water system. Mrs. Holcombe asked Mr. Plank if his client agreed to planting Sawtooth Oak Trees, and Mr. Plank said yes. Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and one person came forward.

Mr. Jay Zollars approached the microphone and stated his address is 6280 Linworth Rd., Worthington, Ohio. He said he would like to see any tree of six inch caliper replaced with trees of similar size. Mr. Zollars said getting rid of the honeysuckle and clearing the view of Linworth Road will be beneficial and make the area safer for school busses. He said storm water has been a problem in the past but this plan should help solve that issue. Mr. Zollars said he would like to make sure that lights from the parking lot will not be shining into his bedroom windows. He is supportive of the proposed plan. Mrs. Bitar explained the trees that are proposed are of two inch caliper, which is a pretty good size. If you plant trees larger than that the trees will be slower growing.

Mrs. Holcombe asked how many trees over six inches will be taken out. Mr. Foley said a formal tree survey has not been performed yet.

Mr. Brown asked Mr. Plank if he was proposing to put any light poles in the parking lot and Mr. Plank said no. The churches services are during the day and there will not be any lights needed for the parking lot. There were no other speakers.

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This is a single-family residential property abutting the north side of the Linworth Baptist Church, situated on the east side of Linworth Rd. north of W. Dublin-Granville Rd. The church made application to rezone the property to S-1, Special, in order to use the existing structure for church activities, use the existing garage for storage, and construct additional parking for church use. At the January 22, 2015 meeting of the Municipal Planning Commission, the Commission felt the changes should be approved by way of a Conditional Use Permit rather than rezoning the property so access and screening could be reviewed. The applicant intends to withdraw the rezoning application with approval of the Conditional Use Permit.

Project Details:

1. The parcel in question is approximately 192' wide and 1.176 acres in area. It is the intention of the church to combine this parcel with its other 3 parcels.
2. The property is separated from the property to the north and Linworth Rd. by way of a significant grade difference and existing landscaping.
3. The proposed site plan shows parking spaces mainly in the front of the property, as close as 10' from the right-of-way line. A variance would be needed from the Board of Zoning Appeals for extension into the required 50' front yard setback. The plan calls for 74 new spaces and the removal of 5 on the existing lot for creation of drive aisles. The existing driveway to the residential property would be closed, with all traffic entering through the drive north of the church. The entrance to the new parking area would then be approximately 110' from Linworth Rd. The exit for the new parking would be at the east end of the site, through the existing parking, and out of the lot by way of the existing drive at the south end of the site.
4. Proposed landscaping would include the addition of 100 Sea Green Junipers (30" high) along the north, west and part of the south side of the parking lot; and 10 Alea Lacebark Elm Trees (2.5" caliper each) around the proposed parking, which would meet the Code requirement for in lot landscaping. A Worthington arborist has suggested the use of Sawtooth Oak trees as an alternative along the western edge of the parking. The retention of as much existing vegetation as possible around the proposed parking is proposed.
5. The existing house and garage would be retained for church use.

Conditional Use Permits – Basic Standards & Review Elements:

1. General elements are to be considered when reviewing applications:
 - a. Effect on traffic pattern
 - i. Additional cars would enter and exit the church, and make use of the special duty officers and church members directing traffic during Sunday services.
 - b. Effect on public facilities
 - i. No impact
 - c. Effect on sewerage and drainage facilities

- i. The plan would involve temporary on site retention and connection with the new system being installed by United Dairy Farmers. Storm drainage plans must be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer.
- d. Utilities required
 - i. No impact
- e. Safety and health considerations
 - i. The new parking facility should allow more congregants safe and convenient access to the church during services.
- f. Noise, odors and other noxious elements, including hazardous substances and other environmental hazards
 - i. N/A
- g. Hours of use
 - i. The parking lot would primarily be used during religious services and the building would be used throughout the year for various activities.
- h. Shielding or screening considerations for neighbors
 - i. A landscape plan was submitted and along with the existing grade differences and vegetation, should effectively screen the parking.
- i. Appearance and compatibility with the general neighborhood
 - i. The proposed screening would help keep the current look of a wooded lot.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Conditional Use Permit Regulations

The following basic standards apply to conditional uses in any "R" 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 the use will not be hazardous, inconvenient or conflict with the normal traffic on residential streets, taking into account the relation to main traffic thoroughfares and to street intersections, parking, screening and the general character and intensity of development of the area. The provisions for parking and screening shall be specified by the applicant and considered by the Commission.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending approval of this application. The proposed Conditional Use is an appropriate extension of the existing semipublic use and should not have an impact on the neighborhood.

Mr. Coulter moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY LINWORTH BAPTIST CHURCH FOR A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO EXTEND THE SEMIPUBLIC USE ONTO THE PROPERTY AT 6238 LINWORTH RD. , AS PER CASE NO. CU 03-15, DRAWINGS NO. CU 03-15, DATED FEBRUARY 27, 2015, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING WITH THE AMENDMENT THAT THE LANDSCAPE PLAN AS PROPOSED BY THE CITY ARBORIST BE ADOPTED IN LIEU OF WHAT WAS PRESENTED BY THE

APPLICANT AND THAT THE NUMBER OF TREES THAT ARE ON THE NORTH PROPERTY LINE THAT WOULD BE REMOVED BE REPLACED IN KIND WITH THE PROPER QUANTITY TO PROVIDE NO LESS THAN THE AMOUNT OF SCREENING THAN WHAT THE PROPERTY TO THE NORTH ALREADY HAD.

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.

2. Planned Unit Development

- a. Final Plan – **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 asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Chris Peterson approached the microphone and stated his address is 45 N. Fourth St., Suite 200, Columbus, Ohio. Board members had no other 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:

The applicant is requesting PUD Final Plan approval to allow for the conversion of the Masonic Lodge to 6 residential condominium units; and the construction of new residential units, consisting of 2 townhomes and a single condominium unit along East New England Avenue.

This request assumes the area east of the access drive will have a residential unit on the site. If the City decides to purchase the area east of the access drive, the applicant would be required to return to the Municipal Planning Commission to amend the Final Plan for the PUD. The amended language added by City Council permits the site to be used as a residential unit if it is not purchased by the City of Worthington for an agreed upon amount negotiated between the developer and the City within 120 days from the date of City Council's approval, which would be May 19, 2015. This request does not give the applicant the right to start construction on the area east of the access drive until after that date.

The Architectural Review Board approved the request at the March 12, 2015 meeting, as amended to include additional screening for the transformer and condensing unit on the lot east of the access drive.

History:

City Council:

The property was rezoned on January 20, 2015 as a PUD per Ordinance 01-2015, effective February 11, 2015. City Council amended the language in the approved PUD to allow the City 120 days to explore the option of purchasing the area east of the access drive.

The Subdivision and Development Agreement were also approved on January 20, 2015 per Ordinance 02-2015, effective February 11, 2015.

Municipal Planning Commission:

Municipal Planning Commission reviewed and unanimously recommended *approval* to City Council of the Ordinance to rezone 634 High Street & 41 East New England Avenue (PUD 03-14) at its meeting on December 11, 2014.

Project Details:

Development Standards and requirements from the PUD code are *italicized* and information specific to this plan are in standard text:

1. Allowable Uses:

The mix of uses allowed in a PUD shall meet changing economic and demographic demands; permit implementation of development standards, plans, studies and guidelines adopted by the City Council; and/or provide the opportunity to retain and enhance the character of the City, and the health, safety and general welfare of the inhabitants.

The allowable uses with this application are all residential uses. All C-5 District (Central Commercial) permitted uses are permitted on the property without a modification to the zoning. All C-5 District Uses are permitted on the property without a modification to the zoning except for the area that is currently zoned R-10 (Low Density Residential).

The area that is currently zoned R-10, can be used for residential use, and only residential use, if purchase of the area east of the access drive by the City is not documented in a letter of understanding within 120 days of the date of the PUD approval by City Council.

2. 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 access drive entrance to the Worthington United Methodist Church parking lot, and adds a 5' wide pedestrian walkway and lighting from the lot to E. New England Ave. The proposed single unit 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 access 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: Parking for the Lodge residential units is proposed in garages in place of the current Lodge parking. The access drive to the parking lot would remain in the same location, and a sidewalk with lighting is proposed on the west side of the drive. The units west of the drive are proposed 13' from the E. New England Ave. right-of-way line. The single unit east of the drive is proposed 30.5' from the right-of-way line.

Buildings: The existing historic buildings are proposed to house 6 units, 1 in the older part of the building, 3 on the ground floor of the newer part of the building and 2 on the top floor of the newer part of the building. The existing elevator will be rehabilitated for use and will provide accessibility to 3 units and the lower level. The exterior changes planned involve the replacement of the exterior stairs on the older part of the building; the replacement and addition of windows on the north and south elevations of the newer part of the building; the addition of stairs and entrances to access the units on the north and east sides; and installation of a door in place of a window on the front of the connector between the buildings. The size of the dwelling units in the lodge range from 1,346 square feet to 2,933 square feet in area.

West of the access drive from E. New England Ave. to the parking lot, a two-story structure with 2 townhomes is proposed. The units would each have a two-car garage with access from the access drive to the parking lot. The northern unit, ML #1 would have its entrance facing New England Ave.; the southern unit, ML #2, would have its entrance facing east. Both townhomes would have a private patio area on the west side of the structure. The new structure is proposed as a two-story structure finished with a cultured stone veneer on the main living units and 6" Hardieplank lap siding between the units. Weathered Zinc standing seam metal is proposed for the roofing. Wood columns and trim; single hung 6 over 6 Andersen vinyl windows; and Carolina Lanterns coach lamps are also proposed. The proposed townhomes would each be 2,204 square feet in area.

East of the access drive from E. New England Ave. to the parking lot, a 2,230 square foot two-story single unit condominium 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 vinyl windows; and Carolina Lanterns coach lamps are also proposed. The two-car garage would be attached with the second floor of the house extending above part of the garage. A patio area is proposed west of the structure.

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; a pergola; privacy fencing and gates; and a raised planter wall. The cedar privacy fencing is proposed as 6' high, with the top foot being open style vertical slats.

Lighting: The only lighting would be the coach lamps on the buildings, and 10 proposed bollard lights along the new sidewalk west of the access drive. A catalogue cut of the Era Lantern Bollard is included in the packet.

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

The only residential lot this property adjoins are east of the proposed single-family unit. Shrubs and trees are proposed on that lot. Mechanical equipment, including condensing units, is shown on the plans. Proposed screening is with 24" Wintergreen Littleleaf Boxwood on the lot east of the access drive, and a variety of plant material and fencing on the rest of the site. Trash containers would be stored individually in the garages.

- 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 67% of the site would be covered with impervious surface. If this property were in the C-5 Zoning District, 80% would be the maximum lot coverage. Installation of a surface water management facility will be necessary.

3. Traffic and Parking:

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

The applicant will utilize the existing access drive from E. New England and is negotiating an easement with the Worthington United Methodist Church to cross a small portion of their property, adequate ingress and egress will 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.*

Garages would enclose any cars on the site. The townhomes and single unit condominium would have additional room for parking in the driveways.

- 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.*

Residents would have room to store bicycles in the units.

4. 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.*

Municipal Planning Commission reviewed and recommended approval to City Council, finding the project met the natural features requirements.

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 was submitted and reviewed. No fee is required.

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 \$2,250; this would adjust to \$2,000 if the area east of the access drive is purchased by the City.

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.

The applicant has agreed to enter into a lease agreement to provide public access from E. New England Avenue to the Worthington United Methodist Church parking lot. This access will include the existing access drive, a new 5' wide concrete sidewalk, new lighting and landscaping.

The condominium owners would be responsible for snow removal on the 5' wide sidewalk per the lease agreement with the City.

5. Per Chapter 1174 of the Codified Ordinances, the Final Plan submittal shall include the following:

a. An exhibit showing which phases of the Preliminary Plan are part of the proposed Final Plan, with all phases annotated as to the as-built conditions

There is one phase for the project.

b. An updated construction schedule

A construction schedule has been submitted showing completion by December 2016.

c. All items of Preliminary Plan, revised to meet approved PUD Ordinance.

A copy of the approved PUD Development Text has been included in your packet.

d. Final design and location of structures, accessory structures, drives, sidewalks, lighting, landscaping and screening.

All information has been submitted and included in your packet.

e. Evidence that the applicant has sufficient control over the land.

The applicant is currently in contract with the Worthington Masonic Association, LLC to purchase the property.

f. Covenants and other restrictions.

A condominium association would be created to handle all common elements and exterior maintenance 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. 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.

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;
10. Signage, which shall include, in addition to requirements of Chapter 1170, the appropriateness of signage to the building;
11. Sustainable Features, which shall include environmentally friendly details and conservation practices.

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 Area 360° Community Strategic Plan

With an historic community at its core, Worthington offers 21st century opportunities and global ties. Neighbors work together, support each other, appreciate diverse opinions and connect across all ages, cultures and beliefs. Strong public institutions foster and invest in infrastructure, technology, economic development and public services that unite our community.

Vision:

- Housing – Worthington needs to develop a broad range of quality housing that meets the needs of all people, of all ages, with a diversity of incomes.
 - Strong neighborhoods with a variety of housing options
 - Implement higher density housing downtown
 - Density can be positive when handled correctly
 - Develop walkable, dense, mixed-use housing
 - Create different residential choices
 - Create opportunities for infill development
 - Address aging housing stock

- Downtown – Reflects Worthington’s values and becomes a place where people connect to live, learn, have fun, worship, dine, shop, visit and enjoy a distinctive Worthington experience.
 - Pedestrian friendly
 - Hub of activity
 - Higher density, without impacting the feel
 - Mix of uses (residential, retail and office)
 - Sense of place
 - Heart of the community

Final Plan - Municipal Planning Commission’s Role:

Municipal Planning Commission shall review Final Plans for compliance with the approved PUD Ordinance and shall:

- Approve the Final Plan as requested;
- Approve the Final Plan with modifications as agreed by the applicant which do not change the essential character of the approved PUD and do not need to be reviewed by Council;
- Recommend the Final Plan to the City Council with changes that require an amendment to the PUD Ordinance; or
- Disapprove the proposed Final Plan when said plan does not meet the requirements of the PUD.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending *approval* of the PUD application for the Final Plan. Staff believes the proposed development is in keeping with the approved PUD Development Text, Development Plan, and Comprehensive Plan; and will assist in the redevelopment of the site while preserving the existing Masonic Lodge.

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY SHOWE WORTHINGTON LLC FOR APPROVAL OF A FINAL PLAN FOR A PUD TO REDEVELOP THE PROPERTY AT 634 HIGH ST. AND 41 E. NEW ENGLAND AVE. AS PER CASE NO. PUD 03-14, DRAWINGS NO. PUD 03-14, DATED FEBRUARY 13, 2015, 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. Mr. Hunter, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Coulter, aye; and Mr. Reis, aye. The motion was approved.

3. Rezoning

- a. C-1, Neighborhood Commercial to C-2, Community Shopping Center – **5596 N. High St.**
(David Creighton) **REZ 02-15**

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mr. Hunter asked about the parking and Mrs. Bitar said if the property were subject to Development Plan review in C-2, the available parking would exceed the required by about 30 spaces. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. David Creighton approached the microphone and stated his address is 5596 N. High St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Creighton did not have any additional comments nor did the Board members.

Background & Request:

The applicant has requested to rezone 5596 North High Street to the C-2 (Community Commercial) District. The site has a total acreage of approximately 0.278-acres. The site is located on the southeast corner of North High Street and Selby Boulevard.

City Staff has been working with the applicant (David Creighton), to occupy two spaces in the Sharon Square Shopping Center for a hair salon and a restaurant.

The property is currently located in the C-1 (Neighborhood Commercial) District. Permitted uses in C-1 District include personal services, public uses, semipublic uses, essential services, accessory uses and neighborhood commercial uses, which are defined as retail, personal or repair service establishments which cater to and can be located in close proximity to residential districts. The C-1 District is intended to apply to establishments that employ less than ten persons on the maximum work shift and are less than 10,000 square feet in floor area. As the proposed restaurant use has been described to us, it would fit these characteristics; however, restaurants are not a permitted use in the C-1 District.

The permitted uses in the C-2 (Community Commercial) District include a variety of retail and service establishments which are currently located in the community or within the population they serve, having adequate parking and direct access to major thoroughfares, being screened or fenced from surrounding residential uses, and serving the day-to-day needs of the whole community.

The building on the site is in one of those unique locations where part of the structure is in Worthington and part is in the City of Columbus, and the proposed restaurant space straddles the corporate line. The southern portion of Sharon Square Shopping Center is situated in the Columbus zoning category C-4, which is one of the highest commercial zoning districts in the City of Columbus, incorporating all uses from the less intensive commercial districts (C-1, C-2 and C-3). Restaurants are permitted uses in the Columbus portion of this building.

To the east, the Sharon Square Shopping Center property owner also owns two parcels that are currently used for parking for the center but which are actually in the R-10 zoning district. Also in the R-10 district along Selby Boulevard are multi-family units. The parking lot is screened on the east and south by vegetation.

Surrounding Zoning & Land Use:

Direction	Zoning	Land Use
North	S-1 – Special	Saint Michael Catholic Church
East	R-10 – Low Density Residence	Parking Lot for Sharon Square Shopping Center
South	C4 – Regional Scale Commercial – City of Columbus	Sharon Square Shopping Center (Computer Lab, State Liquor Agency and European Styled Tailoring)
Southeast	R2 – Residential District – City of Columbus	Single-family homes
West	C-2 – Community Commercial	Verizon Wireless, The Vet Clinic and Natalie’s)

Recommendations:

Staff is recommending *approval* of the proposed rezoning to the C-2 (Community Commercial) District. Staff believes rezoning this site to the C-2 District is consistent with the zoning in the area, both within the Worthington limits and with adjacent and nearby uses along the same side of the street in the City of Columbus and would not adversely impact the surrounding properties.

Mr. Coulter moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY DAVID CREIGHTON TO REZONE THE PROPERTY AT 5596 N. HIGH ST. FROM C-1 TO C-2 AS PER CASE NO. REZ 02-15, DATED MARCH 10, 2015, AND ORDINANCE NO. 11-2015, BE RECOMMENDED TO CITY COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

Mrs. Holcombe 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.

D. Other

There was no other business to discuss.

E. Adjournment

Mrs. Holcombe moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:43 p.m. Mr. Reis seconded the motion. All members voted, “Aye”. The meeting was adjourned.