



MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
WORTHINGTON ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
WORTHINGTON MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION
April 23, 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; James Sauer, Vice Chair; Kathy Holcombe, Secretary; Mikel Coulter; Thomas Reis; Amy Lloyd and Edwin Hofmann. Also present were: Lee Brown, Director of Planning & Building; Lynda Bitar, Planning Coordinator and Clerk of the Municipal Planning Commission; and Melissa Cohan, Paralegal. Scott Myers, Worthington City Council Representative for the Municipal Planning Commission was absent.

A. Call to Order – 7:30 p.m.

1. Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Approval of the minutes of the April 9, 2015 meeting

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

4. Affirmation of the witnesses

B. Architectural Review Board

1. Unfinished

- a. Projection Sign – **693 ½ High St.** (Neda Taghavi) **AR 19-15**

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar said the applicant has indicated she is looking for a manufacturer and will return to the Board when she finds one. Until that time, the application should remain tabled.

- b. House Additions & Alterations; New Garage – **571 Evening St.** (Adam & Gary Moore) **AR 20-15**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following information from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

At the last meeting, the ARB tabled this request, asking to see a proposal that more in character with the existing house, and not as massive. The applicant submitted new drawings with 2 options that are included in the packet

The existing house was constructed in 1954, and is a contributing property to the Worthington Historic District. Total renovation is proposed for this house, which is a one story vernacular house with a walk out lower level.

Project Details:

1. The applicant is now proposing to change the house into a Cape Cod style. The height of the roof in the front would be increased (the height difference has not been identified), and dormers would be added. The front door is proposed to move from the side to the middle with a roof added over the front stoop. One double-hung window is proposed on each side of the front door. The sides of the front gable would have a shake siding, as would the front and side porch roofs. The material has not been identified.
2. A new gable is proposed to extend rear from the new front gable. Two options are presented: Option 3 has a gable that runs straight back; Option 4 would provide a gable with dormers. It appears the second floor would keep the footprint of the existing house. The total square footage has not been identified.
3. The windows have been identified as Pella, but the material is not clear.
4. Retention of the existing lower level garage door is shown, but vehicular access would be block with placement of a new freestanding garage. It is not clear if one or both of the trees near the rear property line would be retained with the proposed garage placement.

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.

For Cape Cod style homes, the character defining features are described as:

- Three-bay facade
- Rectangular form
- Gabled roofline with roof dormers
- Brick or wood siding
- Central entrance
- Multiple-paned windows with shutters
- Classical detailing around entrance and in cornice

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending denial or tabling of the application. The changes do not meet the Design

Guideline recommendations for additions to existing structures, and some detail is still needed.

Meeting Discussion:

Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Adam Moore approached the microphone and stated his address is 59 W. New England Ave., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Moore said after hearing comments from the Board members and concerned neighbors at the last meeting, he wanted to address the biggest concerns. The Board members stated this project is a house without an identity. After hearing those comments Mr. Moore said he went back to the drawing board and came up with a specific style of home that is prevalent in the Worthington area today. He said he gave the house an identity by designing a Cape Cod style of home which is commonly seen in numerous locations throughout the city. Cape Cod homes were prevalent from the 1920's to the 1950's which is a perfect fit for a house built in 1954. The Board was also concerned with the size of the addition. Mr. Moore has now reduced the design from a two-story down to a one and a half story by adding dormers to break up the structure. He has also varied the siding and trim materials to downplay the height of the house. Mr. Moore said he has removed the full front porch to decrease the mass and the front of the home. The overall height of the house was lowered by one and a half feet by changing the pitch of the roof. The house is now lower than the homes to the south. At the highest point the house would now stand twenty-three feet eight inches tall. In comparison, a recently approved similar renovation at 802 Evening Street stands twenty-eight feet tall. Mr. Moore said he was told his project was too large for the size of the property. He showed an aerial photograph to the Board members and audience and explained his property is located within the middle of the image. He said he will be building onto the existing footprint of 571 Evening Street. While looking at the photograph and understanding his proposed plan he encouraged the Board members to consider whether his addition would be too massive. The neighboring property to the north has much more density. With the two structures combined this leaves little to no green space on the same forty-two by one hundred and fifty foot lot. Mr. Moore then asked the question, which property is too massive?

Mr. Moore said he realizes this home is a contributing property according to the Worthington guidelines. He said he looked at several different additions and renovations that were recently approved by the Architectural Review Board (ARB) to help guide them in their re-design. He said he felt that the recently approved projects would be a great place to start when trying to conform to Worthington's Design Guidelines. Although the proposed plan does change the facade of the house there are numerous other examples in historic old Worthington where other contributing properties facades have been significantly altered. On March 26, 2015, the ARB approved a second story addition at 802 Evening Street, approximately two blocks away from 571 Evening Street. Mr. Moore said his plan is very similar. He is taking a twelve hundred square foot ranch and adding a similar sized second floor. Mr. Moore said while looking at the pictures of 802 Evening street you can see significant changes to the property and façade. All of this work has taken place on a fifty by one hundred and fifty foot lot. He said he understands that a fifty foot lot is eight feet wider than his lot but one must consider that the house on the fifty foot lot has a total combined yard setback that is less than 571 Evening Street. When talking about mass, 802 Evening Street takes up more space on their lot than 571 Evening Street will. If you take a look at 571 Evening Street as the house currently sits, the façade does little to contribute to the character and charm of Old Worthington.

Mr. Coulter said he appreciated the roof being lowered. He said he liked the porch going all the way across better than what is shown now, but that is a personal choice. Mr. Coulter also said he liked the breakup of materials on the sides, and believes that adds to the style of the house. He said he is still concerned with the height of the house and how the house will reflect towards the north. Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Moore how the placement of the garage would affect the two trees in the back and Mr. Moore said he would only be losing one tree.

Mrs. Lloyd asked Mr. Moore what the height difference is between the house next door and what he is proposing to build. Mr. Moore said there will be a seven foot difference. He is proposing the front gable to be a ten twelve pitch. The rear gable will be a four twelve pitch. The house to the north is a one story ranch with a hip roof and is two feet taller than his house at the moment. The house as proposed would be five feet taller than the house to the north, but lower than the three homes that are to the south from an overall height standpoint.

Mr. Hoffman said the mass of the home as compared to the lot is still a problem for him, along with the proximity to the house to the north. Mr. Hoffman said he can tell from the aerial photograph that there is more distance from the house to the south than there is from the house to the north. Mr. Hoffman was also concerned that the original façade of the house is being replaced.

Mr. Hunter said what bothers him most is the amount of change that is happening to this property. He said at this moment in time, there is too much change to the property itself, but that is just one particular opinion and vote.

Mrs. Holcombe said she agreed with Mr. Hunter. She said the picture window from the 1950's is repeated throughout the area, and she would like to see the front façade remain in place since this is one of the contributing properties for historical designation. Mrs. Holcombe also stated that she would be okay with higher trusses for the roof, and adding on to the back of the house. She would like the front of the house to stay the same.

Mr. Sauer said the drawings that were recently submitted were an improvement over what was submitted last time. He said his main concern is that there is still too much house for that particular property, and the proximity to the neighboring property.

Mr. Reis said he was not in attendance at the last meeting when this application was discussed. He said he personally likes the Cape Cod style, and agrees with the other members that the square footage for the house is a little overbearing for the size of the property. He would like to see the original door and front window be incorporated into the new design.

Mrs. Lloyd said she agrees with the others comments about keeping the front façade. She said some of the other concepts could probably be implemented while adding a second a floor. She said the advantage of this property is there is a walkout basement that could be utilized for living space. Mr. Moore said he would like to keep the basement as a recreational space for children instead of a bedroom. Board members had no other comments.

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

The first speaker was Mrs. Jo Rodgers of 575 Evening St., Worthington, Ohio. Mrs. Rodgers said the difference between her property and 802 Evening Street is the property in question has a house that sits approximately fourteen feet from her house. She said the latest proposal for renovations to flip the property at 571 Evening Street definitely shows an improvement in the visual appearance of the massing of the home. She said she appreciates those changes particularly with the addition of some character and design relief on the sides of the home. However, ultimately the massing did not change much beyond the portion of the second floor that would have been above the porch in the first drawings. Mrs. Rodgers said the problem for her and her family is the desire to want to build an entire second floor. She feels that such a large addition would be out of character with other homes in the area. If a full second story is allowed she will have to move her gardens further back in her yard in order to get full sun. She would also have to make arrangements to have water run out to that area, creating an expense for planters and plumbing. She would also no longer be able to have natural sunlight in her master bedroom and bathroom. Mrs. Rodgers said the only way she would be able to get natural sunlight into her home would be if she added a second story also, which would be a major expense, and she does not want to incur either of those major expenses. She said she strongly believes that a major renovation should not be allowed that would have such a direct negative impact to her family and the use of their property. Mrs. Rodgers said she and her family do not approve of a second story of any kind, but would fully support the current design if the design only involved the addition of the front north to south gable. She and her family understand the desire for the additional living space in the home and that north to south gable at the front of the home would be an ideal area to add a master suite or a couple of additional bedrooms. However, the proposed east to west gable would extend to the rear of the home, and put her and her family in a position of losing most of their direct sunlight into their master bedroom and bathroom. She said her raised beds and gardens would be useless because of the lack of sunlight. Mrs. Rodgers said she is excited to see the appearance and value of 571 Evening Street enhanced. She and her family are fully supportive of a Cape Cod style of gable in the front of the home, they just do not want to see their gardens fully shadowed and devalued by a full second story. She also explained that the shadow line that comes on to her property is from the edge of the first story. Mrs. Rodgers believes that the shadow comes from the side of the home, and not the extending gable.

The next speaker was Mr. Martin Raupple of 55 W. New England Ave., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Raupple said in regards to Mrs. Rodgers gardens, people do not own the sun, nor do people own trees on their neighbors' lots. Mr. Raupple believes Mrs. Rodgers footprint on her lot is larger than what Mr. Moore is proposing. Mr. Raupple suggested that Mrs. Rodgers should grow a vegetable garden at the community center. He also believes that Mr. Moore's proposed rooftop would be consistent with the homes to the south. Mr. Raupple asked the Board members how Mr. Moore could make the house less massive when he is following the footprint of the house now.

Mr. Sauer said he wanted to comment in regards to Mr. Raupple's statement about sunlight, and said he totally disagrees. Mr. Sauer said that is why there is space between homes so each home owner can enjoy sunlight. He feels that letting someone add a second story and telling someone else to go garden elsewhere is unacceptable. Mr. Coulter explained they are trying to come up with a solution that works for everybody.

The next speaker was Mr. Romano Klepec of 565 Evening St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Klepec said he likes to keep things simple. He would like to ask a couple of questions so that everyone can enjoy the improvements of the proposed home. Mr. Klepec said there are basically two options. One option is to go up, which is what the current home owner wants to do, but regardless of what he does, the sun issue is always going to be an issue if he builds up. He asked if the Board would approve of a second story. Mr. Hunter explained that there are several other items to consider such as the total square footage as compared to the lot size, and there must be at least four positive votes from the seven Board members. Mr. Moore said he would like to table this application.

Motion:

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

b. Fence – **915 Oxford St.** (Mae Fence/Cermak) **AR 22-15**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following information from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This application was tabled at the last meeting due to Board concerns with grade changes, treatment at the driveway, and fence style. The homeowner has submitted additional information, including photographs and a landscape plan.

This 1938 Cape Cod style home is at the southwest corner of Oxford and North Streets. A variance was granted in the late 1980's to have a fence along the North St. side of the property at the property line. This proposal involves replacing the existing fence, which is wood with a lattice pattern.

Project Details:

1. The proposed fence is 4' high aluminum picket, pewter in color. The picket size would be 5/8" square with 3" spacing on the top and closer spacing on the bottom to help contain pets.
2. A double gate is proposed at the driveway.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Fencing should be open in style; constructed with traditional materials; 3' to 4' in height; in the back yard; and of simple design, appropriate for the house style. Design and materials should be compatible with the existing structure.

Recommendations:

Staff is recommending approval of the application. The proposed fencing is appropriate for this property.

Meeting Discussion:

Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mrs. Kay Cermak approached the microphone and stated her address is 915 Oxford St., Worthington, Ohio. Mrs. Cermak had her fence contractor bring an actual piece of the fencing material to show what color and style the fence will be. The purpose of the puppy fence is to keep their small dog contained in their yard. Mrs. Holcombe asked Mrs. Cermak if her dogs were small enough to get through the upper portion of the fence and Mrs. Cermak said yes. Mr. Coulter asked why Mrs. Cermak is not using a white fence since her house is white. Mrs. Cermak said a white fence is very hard to keep clean. The fence will be close to her deck which matches the pewter color, plus the shutters on the house will also match. Mr. Hofmann asked if consideration had been given to plant anything on the other side of the fence near the street and Mrs. Cermak said a large shrub will be removed and she will consider other plantings. She said in the summertime hydrangeas will come up, and then they will be trimmed back in the fall.

Mr. Reis asked if the balusters could be moved closer together and the fence contractor said yes. Mr. Reis said if the balusters were moved closer together then there would not be a need for the puppy fence. Mrs. Cermak's husband nodded in approval. Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Coulter moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY MAE FENCE FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL FENCING AT 915 OXFORD ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 22-15, DRAWINGS NO. AR 22-15, DATED MARCH 30, 2015, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING AND AMENDED THAT THE BALUSTERS WILL BE SPACED 2 ½ INCHES APART.

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

2. New

- a. Site Improvements & Garage Door - **550 Hartford St.** (Brian Dressel & Jennifer Rieman)

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following information from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This property is a corner lot, with a 1961 Colonial Revival house facing Hartford St. and located approximately 14' from the right-of-way line. The south side of the house is about 35' from the South St. right-of-way. On the east side, the main part of the house is about 25' from the property line; an addition is approximately 15' from the property line; and a patio is closer. The homeowners would like to replace and add wood fencing, hardscaping and landscaping to the property, and replace the garage door.

Project Details:

1. Along the east property line there is a 4' high cedar picket fence and a 5' high shadowbox fence. The property owners would like to replace the shadowbox with a 4' high picket fence to match the existing picket fence, and install new 4' high picket fencing to the north and south to enclose the area east of the house. The new fencing would be cedar with 4" wide pickets and 4" spacing between pickets. The supporting members would be on the inside.
2. Also proposed for the east side of the property is removal of the existing brick patio, wood stairs, concrete slab, and wood retaining wall, and installation of a champagne color paver patio with a gray seat wall, and a gray retaining wall. Limestone caps are proposed for both walls as are limestone steps. New landscaping is proposed for the area.
3. In the front of the house the owners plan to remove the existing walkway and install a new walk from the driveway to the front door. Replacement of the front stoop and the addition of landscaping is also proposed.
4. A new garage door in a similar style to the existing is proposed. The new door would be steel rather than wood.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Fencing should be open in style; constructed with traditional materials; 3' to 4' in height; in the back yard; and of simple design, appropriate for the house style. Design and materials should be compatible with the existing structure.

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

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending approval of the application. The proposed improvements are appropriate for the site.

Meeting Discussion:

Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Brian Dressel approached the microphone and stated his address is 550 Hartford St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Dressel said they would like to add a walkway from the driveway to the front of the house. Currently there is no parking allowed on the west or south side of their home. The existing walkway does not get used by anyone, and is not very well maintained. They plan to grow grass where the old walkway is now, add some patio to the back of their house, and continue the existing fence with a similar style. They will be removing the privacy portion of the fence. The fence will be painted white. Board members had no questions or concerns. Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and one person came forward.

Mr. Rob Bruno, of 4459 Carroll Southern Rd., Carroll, Ohio, approached the microphone and stated he is representing the Ace Fence & Deck Co. One thing he would like to mention is that the fence in the photograph is a four inch picket space and they would like to install spacing of two to two and a half inches. The fence will remain four feet in height. Mrs. Holcombe asked how wide the picket is and Mr. Bruno said the picket is three and a half inches. Mrs. Bitar explained in the Architectural Review District the Board has typically approved equal spacing to the picket width. Instead of two and a half inch spacing the three and a half inch pickets would need to be spaced three and a half inches apart. Mr. Bruno asked his client if that would be a problem with his pet and Mr. Dressel said no, that would not be a problem. There were no other speakers.

Motion:

Mr. Coulter moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY BRIAN DRESSEL & JENNIFER RIEMAN FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL NEW LANDSCAPING, HARDSCAPING AND A GARAGE DOOR AT 550 HARTFORD ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 23-14, DRAWINGS NO. AR 23-14, DATED APRIL 9, 2015, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING AND AMENDED THAT THE PICKETS WILL BE 3 ½ INCHES WIDE WITH 3 ½ INCH SPACING AND PAINTED WHITE.

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

- b. Changes to Drive-in Bank – **50 W. Wilson Bridge Rd.** (FMS Architects/Chase)
AR 24-15
&

C. Municipal Planning Commission

1. Conditional Use

- a. Changes to Drive-in Bank in C-2 – **50 W. Wilson Bridge Rd.** (FMS Architects/Chase) **CU 08-15**

&

2. Amendment to Development Plan

- a. Changes to Drive-in Bank – **50 W. Wilson Bridge Rd.** (FMS Architects/Chase) **ADP 02-15**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following information from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This property has housed a bank since 1968. In 1991, a drive-thru lane was added at the north end for installation of an ATM accessible by motor vehicles. Now, the property owner has taken the drive-thru lanes that accessed a teller out of service, and would like to add another drive-up ATM. The property is subject to Conditional Use Permit approval for changes to the drive-thru, and Amendment to Development Plan approval due to the size of the site, as well as being located in the Architectural Review District.

Project Details:

1. There are four lanes in the drive-thru area. As proposed, the lane closest to the building would be for through traffic; the second lane would be blocked with a bollard and sign; and the third and fourth lanes would have ATMs. Currently, 2 lanes are blocked with bollards and signs saying “Please use our 24-Hour Drive-Up ATM” and with the logo. The same sign is on the vacuum tube by the building. As part of the change, 1 vacuum tube would be removed and 2 others would be decommissioned.
2. Additional directional signage is proposed, and the new ATM topper would have signage which would be considered wall mounted. Although the drawing shows signs on the front, back and sides of the topper, the current ATM was only approved to have one sign on the front. Variances for an additional wall mounted signage, and more than the allowable directional signage would be needed as part of the Amendment to Development Plan application. The last approval allowed 24 square feet of Directional Signage. This application would add approximately 6 square feet. Signage on the canopy is proposed to change to reflect the appropriate lane designations, and has already been accounted for as directional signage.

Land Use Plans:

Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Study

The 2011 Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Study recommends this site include a mix of uses to ensure the corridor is economically competitive in the region. The purpose of the plan is to guide the redevelopment of the corridor, creating a safe, welcoming environment for shoppers, workers and residents. Enhancement of storefronts, public spaces, buildings, streetscapes, signage, public art, and landscaping plays an important role in the redevelopment of the corridor.

Worthington Comprehensive Plan

The 2005 Worthington Comprehensive Plan states that careful consideration should be taken for the redevelopment of The Shops at Worthington Place; including the site's edges as a means of enhancing the attractiveness and success of the site and the corridor.

Recommendations:

Staff is recommending approval of this project with the following modifications:
Only one sign be allowed on the front of the topper for the ATM.

Meeting Discussion:

Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Andy Johnson approached the microphone and stated he is representing FMS Architects on behalf of Chase Bank. Mr. Johnson said he has already spoken with Chase about the topper and the additional signage that is currently on the ATM and they are willing to remove that. The issue with the signage on the existing window, Chase Bank can work to provide a solution for that. Mr. Johnson said Chase Bank may want to ask for a variance to leave the window as is, and if not granted they would come up with some solution for a signage package. The existing bollard is currently installed in the lane adjacent to where the new ATM machine is going. There are two bollards also installed and one of those will be removed when the new ATM machine arrives. The night drop signage will remain. Mrs. Holcombe asked Mr. Johnson if the bank is using the windows and Mr. Johnson said no. She asked why the bank does not want to board up the windows. Mr. Johnson said the messages on the windows are to tell their customers about new technology and they are no longer using tellers. Mr. Hunter said he does not like advertising signs, there is already enough signage in place. He does not feel there needs to be signage on the second ATM. Mr. Hunter said Chase customers already know they are at a Chase Bank. He asked why there would be a bollard in a lane that could be used as an exit. Mr. Johnson said there will be one lane used as a bypass.

Mr. Sauer said he agrees with Mr. Hunter about there being too many signs up at the bank. He said the signage is really getting out of hand, and there is no reason to have any signage in those windows. Mrs. Holcombe believes if the windows are not being used then the windows should go away. Mr. Sauer suggested using an opaque film for the windows. Mr. Hunter said he would like to see some new designs to remodel the building if the drive-thru is no longer being used because right now the area looks like a bunch of band-aids. Mr. Reis said he seconds everything that has been said. He also feels the signage on the windows looks very tacky. Mr. Reis said that Chase customers already know where the bank is located and the building does not need sixteen signs all around the building. Mr. Coulter said he would like to go over a few things, including a things that were previously approved:

- That the existing ATM be changed to reflect the original approval;
- That the new ATM match the original proposed;
- That the drive-thru window signage be revised to be opaque, no signage;
- That the ATM sign be added above the new direct ATM line;
- That the bollard with sign be removed from the non-functioning lanes;
- Remove the sign from the tube against the building;
- Non-functioning tube to be removed from the roof.

Mr. Johnson said the individuals that can make decisions are at the meeting this evening and asked one of them to come up to the microphone to speak. Mr. Brad Cothorn, of 1111 Polaris Parkway said he is also representing Chase Bank. Mr. Cothorn said they agreed to all of the stipulations mentioned by the Board with the exception of removing the bollard. He said the bollard is really needed because the lane is being reduced in size to make room for the ATM. Cars will not physically be able to get through the lane. Mr. Cothorn said he would like to have one topper sign on the new ATM to match the already existing ATM as it was approved. Mr. Sauer asked if some of the tubing on the roof would disappear and Mr. Cothorn said yes. Board members had no other questions. Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone else present that would like to speak for or against this application and no one came forward.

ARB Motion:

Mr. Coulter moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY ANDY JOHNSON OF FMS ARCHITECTS FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO MODIFY THE DRIVE-IN BANK AT 50 W. WILSON BRIDGE RD., AS PER CASE NO. AR 24-15, DRAWINGS NO. AR 24-15, DATED APRIL 10, 2015, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING AND AMENDED WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- THAT THE EXISTING ATM BE CHANGED TO REFLECT THE ORIGINAL APPROVAL;
- THAT THE NEW ATM MATCH THE ORIGINAL PROPOSED WITH ONE SIGN FACING THE DRIVEWAY;
- THAT THE DRIVE-THRU WINDOW SIGNAGE BE REVISED TO BE OPAQUE WITH NO SIGNAGE;
- THAT THE ATM SIGN BE ADDED ABOVE THE NEW DIRECT ATM LINE;
- THAT THE BLUE BOLLARD BE REMOVED FROM THE NON-FUNCTIONING LANE AND REPLACED WITH TWO BOLLARDS;
- REMOVE THE SIGN FROM THE TUBE AGAINST THE BUILDING;
- NON-FUNCTIONING TUBES TO BE REMOVED FROM THE ROOF.

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

Conditional Use Motion:

Mr. Coulter moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY ANDY JOHNSON OF FMS ARCHITECTS FOR A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO MODIFY THE DRIVE-IN BANK AT 50 W. WILSON BRIDGE RD., AS PER CASE NO. CU 08-15, DRAWINGS NO. CU 08-15, DATED APRIL 10, 2015, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE ARB APPROVAL, AND 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; Mr. Sauer, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Coulter, aye; and Mr. Reis, aye. The motion was approved.

Amendment to Development Plan Motion:

Mr. Coulter moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY ANDY JOHNSON OF FMS ARCHITECTS FOR APPROVAL TO AMEND THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN AT 50 W. WILSON BRIDGE RD. BY MODIFYING THE DRIVE-IN BANK AS PER CASE NO. ADP 02-15, DRAWINGS NO. ADP 02-15, DATED APRIL 10, 2015, BE RECOMMENDED TO CITY COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL BASED ON THE ARB APPROVAL AND ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

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

B. Architectural Review Board (cont.)

2. New

c. Demolition & New Building – **6600 N. High St.** (Carney Ranker Architects/FC Bank)

AR 25-15

&

C. Municipal Planning Commission (cont.)

1. Conditional Use

b. Drive-in Bank in C-3 – **6600 N. High St.** (Carney Ranker Architects/FC Bank) **CU 07-15**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following information from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This parcel, zoned C-3, Institutions and Offices, has three commercial buildings. The central use on the site, which includes an approximately 2800 square foot building and 2300 square foot canopy, was formerly a Shell gas station and has housed Tilton's Automotive Service since 2004. To the north is a roughly 4300 square foot building that was most recently a chiropractic office, and was formerly a convenience store. At the southeast corner of the site is a 2800 square foot office building with the current user of the building offering musical lessons.

This proposal involves demolition of the existing structures and construction of a new building for FC Bank. The new two-story building would act as a branch as well as a corporate office for the bank. In addition to Architectural Review Board approval for the demolition and new building and site improvements, a Conditional Use Permit is needed for the Drive-in Bank.

Project Details:

1. Site Plan & Landscaping:

- Location of the 110' 6" wide building is proposed 50' from the High St. right-of-way and north of the center of the site, with a grass lawn in front of the building, and parking/drive aisles north, east and south of the building. Two access points are proposed for the site, to the north and south. On the south side, parking would run 5' from the property line, extending to about 12' from the right-of-way line. Parking is also proposed north of the south drive aisle, extending from the back of the building to the same location 12' from the right-of-way line. The Code requires parking be at least 50' from the right-of-way and buildings at least 100' from the right-of-way for this stretch of N. High St.
- Directly east of the building 4 lanes are proposed for drive-in banking. The lane closest to the building appears to have an ATM, with the other 3 having access to a teller. Adjacent to the drive-thru area would be an island with shrubs and 2 trees at the ends. East of the island would be 2 bays of head-in parking separated by a drive aisle, with the pavement extending to 35' from the east property line.
- Sixty parking spaces are proposed for the site; 75 would be required by Code. A variance for number of parking spaces would be required.
- The drive aisles appear to be 24' in width; 22' wide aisles are required by Code.
- In addition to the trees mention in the parking lot islands, trees are proposed at the southwest corner of the building and of the site; along the east end of the pavement; and in the tree lawn. Shrubs are proposed to screen the parking from the street, adjacent to the building on the front and south sides, and in the island as previously mentioned.
- A freestanding sign is shown centered on the building, 10' from the right-of-way. The sign is shown with a brick veneer base and side columns, and cast stone face and caps. Back lit lettering is proposed. Shrubs are proposed around the new sign.
- A dumpster with enclosure would be located at the northeast corner of the site.
- Location of a utility pad is proposed east of the northern end of the building, and would include landscape screening. The mechanical equipment for this pad has not been identified.

2. Building:

- A 110' 6" wide x 58' 2" deep two-story brick building is proposed, and would include an attached canopy for the drive-thru area to the rear. The main entrance would be facing south at the southwest corner of the building, which would be the location of lobby/teller area. The remainder of the first floor would be mainly offices. The second floor would be made up of offices, work spaces and conference rooms. Stairs are proposed at the northeast and southeast corners of the building, with interior and exterior entrances to those stairwells. An elevator and restrooms are shown near the center of the building.

- The building is proposed with a flat roof and parapet. A hipped roof feature is proposed at the southwest corner with a Hartford Green standing seam metal roof. The corner element includes a header, two smaller windows on the second floor, and 2 larger windows below. That feature is repeated in the middle and at the north end of the building, except a higher parapet takes the place of the hipped roof, and 4 larger windows are shown at the lower level. The proposed windows have fixed internal muntins (Dark Bronze), with the glass being Solar Bronze in color. Materials for the building include: Glen-Gery Brick veneer (Olde Detroit color); and cast stone coping, veneer trim and water table, and headers for the windows (Satin Suede). The drive-thru canopy is proposed with Sandstone colored metal wall panels and coping with brick veneer columns. The employee entrances would be Sand Beach colored hollow metal.
- A Hartford Green metal canopy is shown at the southwest corner of the building, extending around the corner in a circular path. An internally illuminated 40 square foot sign is proposed on the canopy facing west.
- An additional wall sign is proposed in the center of the building. That sign would consist of cast stone veneer with a relief of the bank's logo. A variance would be needed for a second wall sign.

3. Lighting:

- Site lighting is proposed for the site that would provide 1.7 footcandles on average around the site. Seventeen 12' high poles are proposed on 30" concrete bases, with LED oblong shaped fixtures above (13 single fixtures; 4 double fixtures.) Near the south end of the building, 4 "decorative" fixtures on 84" high poles with no exposed base are proposed. On the back of the building, 3 LED quarter sphere luminaires are proposed. The light levels at the north, west and south property lines are between 0.1 and 1.2 footcandles.
- Cylindrical light fixtures are proposed on brick piers around the building, mounted at 84" above grade.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

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

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

Roof Shape: Generally, a traditional roof shape such as gable or hip is preferable to a flat roof on a new building. Roof shapes should be in scale with the buildings on which they are placed.

Study traditional building designs in Old Worthington to get a sense of how much of the facade composition is wall surface and how much is roof.

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

Windows: On long facades, consider breaking the composition down into smaller “storefront” units, with some variation in first and upper floor window design. Use traditional sizes, proportions and spacing for first and upper floor windows. Doing so will help link Old Worthington and newer areas through consistent design elements.

Entries: Primary building entrances should be on the street-facing principal facade. Rear or side entries from parking lots are desirable, but primary emphasis should be given to the street entry. Use simple door and trim designs compatible with both the building and with adjacent and nearby development.

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

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

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

Worthington Comprehensive Plan

The 2005 Worthington Comprehensive Plan identifies the High Street Corridor (Extents Area) as a place where consistent site design should be encouraged such as landscape screening and interior planting of surface parking areas, and the location of large parking areas should be to the rear of the site. The corridor could accommodate redevelopment at a higher density, with such projects meeting the needs of the City, providing green setbacks and meeting the Architectural Design Guidelines.

The plan recommends promoting a high quality physical environment, encouraging the City to continue to emphasize strong physical and aesthetic design, and high-quality development. Also recommended is encouraging the private market to add additional commercial office space within the City

Staff Analysis:

1. Extending as close as 50' to the right-of-way with the building would be acceptable, but moving the building back a little further may be appropriate given the 100' setback of City Hall to the south and the building to the north. The parking should not be in front of the building and should not extend closer than 50' to the right-of-way, but could be moved closer than the proposed 35' from the rear property line.
2. The variance to reduce the parking requirement from 75 spaces needed would be appropriate. Parking could be shared with the City lot to the south. Connection by way of a sidewalk would be helpful.
3. Storm water could be handled by use of a bioswale in the island to the rear of the building.
4. Trees should be planted along the south property line. Drive aisles could be narrowed to 22' to provide enough space.
5. The design of the building should be more in line with the City administration building and the planned development across the street. Traditional styling, as outlined in the above guidelines, would be appropriate. For example, the roofline, fenestration, window materials, drive-thru canopy materials, light fixtures and the lack of an entrance facing the street should be reviewed.

Recommendations:

Staff is recommending tabling of these applications after discussion to allow the applicant to make modifications based on the guidelines and any recommendations made by the Board.

Meeting Discussion:

Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Ms. Jennifer Carney, of Carney Ranker Architects stated her address is 5980 Wilcox Place, Suite J, Dublin, Ohio 43016. Ms. Ranker said in previous designs they had the building oriented in a different direction, but since there is a retail component to this bank they need to maximize the parking space, and they would like to get as much parking up front as they can.

Mr. Coulter asked Mrs. Bitar if the number parking spaces shown on the drawing were more than what is required or less than and Mrs. Bitar responded the number of spaces shown were fifteen spaces less than what is required. Mr. Coulter said he agreed with Mrs. Bitar in that four drive-

thru lanes would be excessive. He said with all of the technology that is available today people do not use the drive-thru at banks as much as they used to. Mr. Coulter asked Ms. Carney to consider moving all of the parking back five or ten feet, and drop one of the drive thru lanes in order to allow for double side parking. He said he also agreed with Mrs. Bitar about dropping the eight parking spaces that are in front of the fifty foot line, and shift some of those to the back. Mr. Coulter also said he liked the idea of a cut-through to the City's parking lot.

Mr. Hunter said he absolutely loved seeing the bank making such a major commitment to the City of Worthington. He also said as a customer of Mr. Tilton's Automotive he is hoping his business will stay in the community as well. Mr. Hunter said he too would like to see more green space up front.

Mr. Sauer said he drove around the community today and could not find a bank in town that used four drive-thru lanes. He also likes the idea of moving the parking and the building back. Tilton's Automotive is currently about eighty feet back from the street. Mr. Sauer said if the proposed building is to be built at fifty feet, and given the size of the building, the building will not look right that close to the street. He also likes the idea of shared parking and gave the example of the bank up the street that shares parking with a restaurant.

Mr. Hofmann asked Ms. Carney what the setback is for in back of the building and if the plan was to a retaining wall and Ms. Carney said yes. She said there is a significant grade change.

Mr. Reis asked Mrs. Bitar what the minimum setback requirement is for parking, and Mrs. Bitar said there is no setback requirement for parking.

Mr. Andy Dale approached the microphone and stated he is the President of FC Bank. Mr. Coulter suggested leaving the bank in the proposed location and removing the extra drive-thru lane for extra green space. Mr. Dale said the fourth lane is for through traffic, not for banking. Mr. Hunter asked if Mr. Dale approved of the cut-through to the City's parking lot and Mr. Dale said he would like to be good neighbors and he will let the Engineers work out those details. Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Dale what size the retail space will be. Mr. Dale said the building will be just for banking and corporate offices, there will be no other retail business within the bank.

Mr. Brown said he wanted to make a comment about the site plan. Since the site is a little over an acre, they will be required to do some onsite Best Management Practices (BMPs) to control the storm water volume. Mr. Michael Pistolis approached the microphone and said he is the landscape architect for the project. Mr. Hunter asked Mr. Pistolis if he had been sworn in yet and Mr. Pistolis said no. Mrs. Bitar swore in Mr. Pistolis. He said the existing site is highly impermeable. What they are proposing has more open space on the site. There is a ten foot fall from the back of the site to the front and a large green space in the back. Mr. Pistolis said he has heard some discussion about bio-swales, and they understand there will be some quality and quantity control issues that will need to be taken care of. They have completed some studies but they will be doing more as they get into the project.

Mr. Coulter said he did not have a problem with the entrance being on the side of the building where the parking lot is, but the design seems to be very similar to the Fresh Thyme grocery store, and does not look appropriate sitting next to the municipal and fire station buildings. Mr. Coulter suggested looking at the architecture of both of those buildings and the Worthington Design Guidelines for the city and come back with something that reflects more of what is inside the document. He said the windows on the second floor are way too small, they are under scale and resemble a prison. Mr. Coulter referred to Mrs. Bitar's comments about window style and asked Ms. Carney to come in to compliance with that issue. He strongly suggested taking another look at the design guidelines to see how Ms. Carney can amend her design. He also suggested having Ms. Carney come up with a couple of sketches and possibly meet with a few of the Board members before coming back to the next meeting.

Ms. Carney said she does know the design guidelines allow for flat roof and asked if this building will ever be allowed to have a flat roof. Mr. Coulter said he is not opposed to a flat roof as long as the roof fits in with the architecture. Mr. Hunter said there is some room for compromise, but he does not like a flat roof on this size building. He feels a hipped roof or gable would be more appropriate, and help soften the building. Mr. Reis felt the building needs more colonial style. Mrs. Holcombe agreed, and said the building would look more appropriate with a colonial style. Mr. Coulter and Mr. Hunter both liked the design of the monument sign. Mrs. Bitar said the sign may need a variance.

Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and one speaker came forward. Mr. Andy Tilton approached the microphone and stated his address is 580 Hartford St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Tilton said he wanted to give his approval for this project and he plans to keep his business in Worthington. He said this bank's current location is difficult to get to. He said there is more grass in the picture than has been at this High Street property in years and looks really nice. Mr. Tilton said as a business owner, one of the things he looks for is prominence. He understands why this building wants to be closer to High Street to let customers know where they are, use their service, and become a prosperous business in the community. There were no other speakers.

ARB Motion:

Ms. Carney requested to table this application. Mr. Coulter moved to table this application. Mr. Sauer seconded the motion. All members voted, "Aye". The application was tabled.

Conditional Use Motion:

Mr. Coulter moved to table the application. Mrs. Holcombe seconded the motion. All members voted, "Aye". The application was tabled.

c. Wholesale Business in I-1 – **7200 Huntley Rd., Suite A (Boyles) CU 06-15**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following information from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This property is a 2.3 acre lot at the northern end on the east side of Huntley Rd. The building has an office across the front and 2 separate wings extending to the east. Initially this business appeared to be conducting retail sales of vehicles on the site. Now the business owner is asking approval to conduct a wholesale business. Wholesale businesses are conditional uses in the I-1 Zoning District, allowing the MPC to review the effect the business will have on the neighborhood.

Project Details:

1. The business is a wholesale car business so retail sales would not be happening on the site.
2. The business would use the office space and park the vehicles in an existing fenced-in area at the north end of the site. No changes to the building or site are planned.
3. Operating hours are cited as normal business hours with occasional extra hours as necessary.

Land Use Plans:Worthington Conditional Use Permit Regulations

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

Worthington Comprehensive Plan Update & 2005 Strategic Plan

An area plan focusing on the Proprietors/Huntley Road corridor should be developed that makes recommendations for repositioning it in the market place to make it attractive and competitive in the region. Because of the age and types of uses located here, this compact area is experiencing significant change and has the opportunity to reinvent itself. Issues such as building renovation, aesthetics, and possible road and infrastructure improvements should be addressed.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending *approval* of this application. The business seems appropriate on this site, which appears to have ample room to park any vehicles that may be stored.

Meeting Discussion:

Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Chad Boyles approached the microphone and stated his address is 7200 Huntley Rd., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Boyles said he has been running a business for about nineteen years and said would like to start a wholesale automotive business. He will not be open to the public. Mr. Boyles said the only reason there is a sign up is due to the rules of having a Dealer's License. The only cars coming to this lot will be the ones that need repairs or cosmetic work. In order for him to keep his Dealer's License he needs to maintain 3500 square feet of parking, an office and chair and a few other necessities. Mr. Boyles will be

occupying the northern portion of the building. There is a fence company that will remain in the other portion of the building. Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Sauer moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY CHAD BOYLES FOR A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO OPERATE A WHOLESALE BUSINESS AT 7200 HUNTLEY RD., SUITE A, AS PER CASE NO. CU 06-15, DRAWINGS NO. CU 06-15, DATED APRIL 10, 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; Mr. Sauer, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; and Mr. Reis, aye. The motion was approved.

D. Other

Mr. Brown discussed there will be a tour of the new apartment building, The Heights at Worthington Place, Building #1, on Monday, May 11th, 2015, from 3:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. The invitees included the Architectural Review Board, the Municipal Planning Commission, Board of Zoning Appeals, and Worthington City Council. This meeting has been advertised as a public meeting. Mr. Hunter asked about the parking garage lights and Mr. Brown said that topic will be brought up at the tour. Mr. Sauer asked if there was supposed to be screening around the transformers and Mrs. Bitar said yes.

E. Adjournment

Mr. Reis moved to adjourn the meeting at 10:10 p.m. Mrs. Holcombe seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned.