



MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING  
WORTHINGTON ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD  
WORTHINGTON MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION  
October 27, 2016

The regular meeting of the Worthington Architectural Review Board and the Worthington Municipal Planning Commission was called to order at 7:00 p.m. with the following members present: Michael Coulter, Chair; James Sauer, Vice-Chair; Kathy Holcombe, Secretary; Thomas Reis; Edwin Hofmann; Amy Lloyd; and David Foust. Also present were: Scott Myers, Worthington City Council Representative to 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.

**A. Call to Order – 7:00 p.m.**

1. Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Approval of minutes of the October 13, 2016 meeting.

Mr. Foust moved to approve the minutes and Mrs. Holcombe seconded the motion. All Board members voted, "Aye." The minutes were approved.

4. Affirmation/swearing in of witnesses – Members of the audience were sworn in by Mrs. Bitar.

**B. Architectural Review Board**

**1. New**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

- a. New Buildings – **890 & 910 High St.**; Demolition - **33 E. North St.** (Plank Law Firm, LPA)  
**AR 119-16**

**&**

**C. Municipal Planning Commission (continued)**

**1. Amendment to Development Plan**

- a. New Buildings – **890 & 910 High St.**; Demolition - **33 E. North St.** (Plank Law Firm, LPA)  
**ADP 07-16**

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

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

Two buildings were approved at this location south of the CVS building in 2007 when CVS was approved. The buildings were planned with second floors in the front portion of building to accommodate 4 residential units for a total of 4960 sf of upstairs building area. In the larger building to the south (“B”), the units would have been 1417 sf each; in the smaller building to the north (“A”), the units would have been 1063 sf each. At the July 2012 meeting, the Board and Commission approved a modified version of the two buildings, which were proposed without usable second floors. The City Council denied the Amendment to Development plan application because it did not include usable second floors.

With the new applications, the property owner is requesting approval of 2 buildings that are similar in footprint and design to the previously approved, but now 6402 sf of office space is proposed above Building “B” to the south. Building “A” would not have a usable second floor. Also, demolition of the office building at 33 E. North St. and construction of additional parking is proposed.

At the October 13<sup>th</sup> ARB/MPC meeting, the Board and Commission discussed the project, and asked the applicant to consider changes to the scale of the dormers on Building A; the front pediment, rear office entrance, and chimney width on Building B; adding windows to both buildings where possible; and eliminating wall pack lighting. See changes below in bold.

#### **Project Details:**

1. Site: The buildings are proposed further from High St. than was originally approved, with Building “A” shown 18’ 1/2” from the property line (~42’ from the roadway), and Building “B” shown 19’ 5/8” from the property line (~43’ from the roadway). Previously, the buildings were at 11’ and 16.3’ from the property line. Brick paver patios are proposed in front of each building, as are curbed planter beds, benches, waste receptacles and bike racks. These items would match those previously approved for the site, except the owner is willing to modify the color from the existing green to black. The existing sidewalk and tree lawn would stay.

Early this year the City Council approved the division of the CVS property from the rest of the parcel, with the lot line being along the south end of the CVS building. A variance would be needed to construct Building “A” in the proposed location, which is 8’ from the newly created property line. Building “A” was 8’ from the CVS building in the previously approved plans, so the only change is due to the lot split.

The access drive located between the buildings sites would remain, as would the existing parking behind CVS and Building “A”. The asphalt parking lot would be extended into

the area behind Building “B” as was previously approved, and 13 spaces and a drive aisle are proposed in place of the building at 33 E. North St.

The three dumpsters with enclosures near the back of the site would remain.

Lighting for the site would include the addition of three poles to match the existing, with the fixtures at 14’, the pole top at 16’6”, and the pole base at grade so the concrete foundation is not exposed. The poles and fixtures would be black, with the lamps being 250 watt metal halide. The fixtures at the east corners of the rear parking would have shields on the rear so light would not spill onto the adjacent residential properties and the light source would not be seen. The photometrics show 0 footcandles at the property lines.

## 2. Buildings:

Building “A” is proposed as 4272 sf in area, with a gabled asphalt roof and dormers over the front part of the building. The rear part of the building would have a flat roof with a solid rail around the edge to screen equipment. A brick veneer finish is proposed for the building with a combination of wood and metal trim in off-white. Although proposed to be occupied by a single retail tenant, PetPeople, the building façade would have the look of three storefronts, and could be divided if necessary in the future. Columns would be placed between the storefronts, and would support a narrow roof structure. The window systems are proposed with clad casement windows with integral muntins and wood trim. The three dormers would be centered on the storefronts below, and finished with Hardi lap siding, wood trim, standing seam metal roofing, and 6 over 6 windows. On the south side, there would be 4 double-hung windows with transoms, brick soldier courses, awnings and lights above. At the rear of the south side and at the rear of the building, herringbone patterned brick accent panels with a soldier course above are proposed instead of windows. The north side would have brick panels instead of windows.

### Building “A”:

- The dormers were made larger, which necessitated an increase in the roof pitch, and shortening of the gable depth.
- Interior blinds with lights behind were used in the upstairs windows with the CVS project, but that has not been mentioned in this application.
- On the north and south elevations, wall packs were replaced with gooseneck lamps.
- Windows were added and the service door was removed on the south elevation.
- Glass was added to the service door on the rear elevation.

Building “B” is proposed to be a full two story brick building with 6402 sf of area per floor. The first floor would likely be retail or restaurant, with the second floor being office space. Like “A”, “B” would have a gable across the front part of the building, but would then have a hipped roof extending to the rear. Two chimneys are proposed at the ends of the front gable. The first floor could accommodate 1-3 tenants, and would have 3 storefront elements across the front. The center element is proposed with a gable above and extends

out further than the sides. The side elevations show columns framing the center, but the front elevation and renderings do not. Clarification is needed.

The storefront windows would have wood trim with sign bands above. Three double-hung windows are proposed for the second floor centered on each of the storefronts. The sides would have 9 over 6 double hung windows with transoms, brick soldier courses, awnings and lights above at the front, and herringbone patterned brick accent panels with a soldier course above to the rear. On the south elevation a double door is proposed that would provide access to the front stairs. The second floors would have nine 6 over 6 double hung windows lined up with the windows or brick panels below. At the rear, three doors would be accessed from a raised walkway with steps at one end and a ramp at the other end. The wall of the walk would be faced with brick to match the building. A small canopy with a standing seam metal roof is proposed above each entrance. The building is proposed with interior stairwells in the northeast and southwest corners of the building, and would have an elevator at the northeast corner.

#### Building "B":

- The size and scale of the center pediment was increased, as was the chimney width. Chimney width is only shown correctly on the west elevation, not the east.
- The storefront entrances were slightly modified, centering the doors. The doors appear as a different color.
- Windows were added on the north and south elevations.
- The plane of the rear wall is now proposed to recess in the middle, and hipped roofs are proposed above the outside sections of the building. The rear office entrance now would have a double door, and lanterns are proposed on the sides of the entrance. Also, an area above the entrance has been identified for signage.
- Gable vents are no longer shown on the north and south gables.
- On the north and south elevations, wall packs were replaced with gooseneck lamps.

#### Materials for the buildings are as follows:

- Dimensional Asphalt Shingles – Owens Corning - Estate Gray
- Fabric Awnings – Sunbrella – Toast for "A"; Navy for "B"
- Brick – Glen-Gery – Rustic Burgundy; Mortar – Cemex 40A
- Windows & Doors – Pella Architect Series Double Hung and Casment Windows – Putty (integral muntins – on inside and outside of glass)
- Metal Fascia, Downspouts & Gutters – Sandstone for "A"; Classic Bronze for "B" (prefinished color)
- Paint – Benjamin Moore
  - Monterey White - Railing/fence on back of "A"
  - Lenox Tan - Fascia, rake, frieze and trim boards
  - Hodley Red – Window and door head, sill & surrounds for "A" first floor
  - Old Navy – Window and door head, sill & surrounds for "B"

- 6” Hardieplank Lap Siding – “A” dormers
- Vinyl, PVC or Clear Cedar - Fascia, rake, frieze and trim boards; window and door head, sill & surrounds; pilasters; roof canopies

Lighting for the buildings would consist of small gooseneck lamps above the sign bands and awnings, and wall packs along the sides and rear of the buildings. All fixtures would be black, and made by LSI Industries.

Gooseneck lamps would now replace most of the wall packs, except on the rear of the buildings. The proposed wall pack fixture is now proposed as a more decorative style.

33 E. North St. from the applicant: “...was constructed in 1965 and purchased by M.K. & K. Realty, Inc. in 1986. The building is a two story building with the first floor being more of a basement due the majority of it being subsurface. The building was poorly designed in a long and narrow configuration that results in inefficient tenant space layouts. The second floor and basement each consist of approximately 3,750 s.f. The basement is not desirable tenant space and is further made worse by the structural block walls throughout the floor limiting the useable space and possibilities for tenants. The first floor of the building has also been historically difficult to lease due to the long and narrow construction of the building and only containing 3,750 s.f. Demolishing this old office building will allow for additional parking and construction of the two story building depicted on the site plan as Building “B” with 6,402 s.f. of new, better useable, second floor office space fronting N. High St.” The building at 33 E. North St. is not a contributing structure in the Worthington Historic District.

3. Landscaping/Screening: The street trees across the High St. frontage are well established and will remain. Also, existing vegetation along the south property line would be preserved. Shrubs and trees are proposed along the south property line to fill in gaps toward the rear, and shrubs would continue around the corner to the north. Also, shrubs are proposed for the northeast corner of the rear parking lot. A wood shadowbox fence is in place along the property line that borders residential to the rear, but needs to be repaired and/or replaced in some areas.

New trees, perennials and shrubs are proposed in front of each building, and on the south and east sides of Building “B”.

A planting area consisting of Spartan Junipers, Winter Gem Boxwoods, Shenandoah Switchgrass, Little Spire Russian Sage, Gracillimus Maiden Grass and Dense Yews is proposed to screen the new parking area from North St.

**Land Use Plans:**

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Scale, Form & Massing: New construction should take special care to employ scale, form, and massing that are similar to and compatible with existing building designs.

Simple geometric forms and uncomplicated massing tend to make buildings more user-friendly and help to extend the character of Old Worthington. 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.

**Materials:** New buildings should employ only traditional wood and brick. Contemporary materials that simulate wood can be acceptable if done well, and brick veneer construction over a wood frame also is acceptable. 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:** 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. 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.

**Sustainability:**

Sustainability can be achieved by ensuring the economic, environmental and social concerns of Worthington are addressed in a balanced manner. The City of Worthington and its Architectural Review Board are interested in encouraging sustainable design and building practices, while preserving the character and integrity of the Architectural Review District. Recommendations include: encouraging energy conservation methods; using landscape concepts to preserve energy; managing storm water run-off in an environmentally friendly way; using solar panels in locations that minimize the visual impact as seen from the right-of-way and surrounding properties; adding bike racks; using streetscape elements that are of a human scale; making use of recycled, renewable and energy efficient materials; using natural and controlled light and natural ventilation; and minimizing light pollution.

Worthington Comprehensive Plan

Buildings at North St. and High St. should frame the pedestrian space and street, invite browsing, create second story-office or residential opportunities, and locate and screen the parking in the rear of the site

**Recommendation:**

Staff is recommending *approval* of this application. The site and building design are in character with the Design Guidelines and the previous Development Plan for this property. Demolition of an obsolete office building and the addition of new office space in Old Worthington is desirable.

The increased dormer size proposed for Building “A” seems disproportionate on the building, with the windows being a size similar to the storefront entrances below. The same treatment with blinds and lights to make the dormers look like part of a true second story would be appropriate. The increase in roof pitch and shortening of the gable may be desirable whether or not the dormer size increases.

The changes proposed for Building “B” seem appropriate and in line with the Board and Commission comments from the last meeting.

**Discussion:**

Mrs. Bitar presented a new drawing showing a steeper roof pitch for Building A, with the originally proposed dormer size.

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Donald Plank stated he is an attorney representing the applicant for this matter. He said he believed that most of the development plan issues were resolved at the previous meeting and so they came back this evening to discuss some architectural changes. Mr. Mark Ford stated he is with Ford & Associates Architects, 1500 W. 1<sup>st</sup> Ave., Columbus, Ohio. Mr. Ford said in order to make the pediment on Building B on the front elevation slightly larger they made the element wider so there would be a longer run of the gable

to fit in with the masonry proportions of that element. He said they also increased the width of the chimneys as was requested. Mr. Ford said the rear of the building, was divided into three sections with a step in the façade to create hipped roof sections at each of the north and south corners of the building. It was an attempt to define the vertical element above the office entry. Mr. Ford said they increased the number of windows on the ground floor level as well as added gooseneck light fixtures in lieu of wall packs.

Mr. Ford said on Building A they got rid of the elevated ramp and stair in the corner along the entry drive. Mr. Ford said the tenant will need to determine how they will use the space, as there will need to be some back of the house function. Mr. Ford said windows were added on east end the ground floor and they got rid of the wall pack fixtures. He said the tenant has been encouraged to have glass on the rear doors and to use them for customer entry due to the proximity of the parking area. Mr. Ford said there are still a few wall pack light fixtures because they are trying to provide proper illumination and could not with the gooseneck light fixtures. Mr. Ford said the west elevation is primarily the same. He said tried to find a formula for dormer size based on roof size, but could not find a specific reference. Mr. Ford explained why a larger dormer would not work properly and said a larger dormer also made the roof look top heavy. He said they prefer to use the original dormer that was proposed and the steeper roof pitch because of the overall proportions of the building. Mr. Ford said the decision is subjective and he also welcomed comments from the Board members.

Mr. Ford said that in regards to Building B they really do not know who the tenant will be at this time. He said they will be using coach lights at the office entrance area. He said they are recommending the east side doors remain metal because he does not know what type of abuse those doors will endure, and the tenant may also prefer metal doors.

Mr. Coulter explained the motion could be crafted in such a way that either type of door could be used so the new tenant could have a choice. Mr. Ford said the glass door change on the other building was welcomed by the new tenant.

Mr. Sauer felt the buildings had been well detailed, very well crafted and fit nicely into the community. Mr. Sauer realized this is not an inexpensive building and he is pleased with the investment that is being made. He wondered if the wall pack lights would be blocked due to the canopies below. Mr. Ford said that typically they would have can lights underneath the doorway roofs but he will take a second look. Mr. Sauer said the drive aisle in the new parking area looks too tight and suggested shutting down that drive aisle. Mr. Sauer said the fence on the north side of the property is not in very good shape and asked if there were plans to do anything with that fence. Mr. Plank said the fence was discussed at the previous meeting and will be replaced to match the other fence.

Mrs. Holcombe said Mr. Ford has done an extremely good job and thanked him for listening to the Board's suggestions. She thinks the buildings are beautiful.

Mrs. Lloyd also thanked Mr. Ford for taking a look at the issue with the dormer windows and said she preferred the last option with the steeper rooftop. She also expressed concerns with the drive aisle. Mr. Ford said they would look at it more closely with construction design.

Mr. Coulter asked Mrs. Bitar if the landscaping plan is sufficient for what is required and Mrs. Bitar said yes.

Mr. Foust said he liked the steeper roof also because the steeper style is similar to that of a Federal style of building which would originally have had dormers. He said the way the rooftop was presented before was more in the Greek Revival style.

Mr. Coulter asked if there was a bike rack on the property and Mr. Ford said yes, there will be 2 total. Mrs. Bitar confirmed the existing would be painted black.. Mrs. Bitar asked about the dumpster at the back of the property. Mr. Chris Kessler stated he is an attorney with the Plank Law Firm, 411 E. Town St., Columbus, Ohio, and also the owner of the property. Mr. Kessler said the dumpster will go away because it is used for the office building. There will be a light pole in its place. Mrs. Bitar asked if the current dumpsters will be enough to service the new buildings and CVS and Mr. Kessler said yes. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

**ARB Motion:**

Mr. Hofmann moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY PLANK LAW FIRM, LPA ON BEHALF OF M.K.&K. REALTY, INC. FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO DEMOLISH THE BUILDING AT 33 E. NORTH ST. AND CONSTRUCT NEW BUILDINGS AT 890 AND 910 HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 119-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 119-16, DATED OCTOBER 19, 2016, 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 tenant doors on the east elevation of Building B can be detailed as either glass or panelized metal depending on the tenant needs;
- That the pack lights on the east elevation of Building B can be repositioned to minimize shadows;
- That the Building A roof line will have a steeper pitch and the dormer windows will remain the same as originally presented.

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

**MPC Motion:**

Mr. Reis moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY PLANK LAW FIRM, LPA ON BEHALF OF M.K.&K. REALTY, INC. TO AMEND THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR THE PROPERTY AT 890, 910 AND 918 HIGH ST. BY DEMOLISHING THE BUILDING AT 33 E. NORTH ST. AND CONSTRUCTING NEW BUILDINGS AT 890 AND 910 HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. ADP 07-16, DRAWINGS NO. ADP 07-16, DATED OCTOBER 19, 2016, BE RECOMMENDED TO CITY COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING, AND INCLUDING THE AMENDMENTS IN THE ARB MOTION.**

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

**B. Architectural Review Board** (continued)

**2. New**

- a. Deck Material Replacement – **806 Evening St.** (Seth Cramer) **AR 121-16**

**Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

**Background & Request:**

Constructed in 1940, this Vernacular style house in a contributing building in the Worthington Historic District. The house was originally a single story, but in 2005 a second story was added. Included was a screened porch with a roof deck, accessed by double doors from the house, on the rear (east side). This is a request to change the deck materials.

**Project Details:**

1. The deck and railing were originally constructed with cedar. The homeowner has had difficulty with paint staying on the wood.
2. Proposed are Timbertech composite materials. The flooring would be Sandy Birch, and the rail system would be white.

**Land Use Plans:**

Design and materials should be compatible with the existing structure.

**Recommendation:**

Staff is recommending approval of this application. The proposed materials are similar to the original wood decking and should be appropriate.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Seth Cramer stated his address is 806 Evening St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Coulter 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 SETH CRAMER FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO REPLACE THE DECK AND RAIL MATERIALS AT 806 EVENING ST. AS PER CASE NUMBER AR 121-16, DRAWINGS NUMBER AR 121-16, DATED OCTOBER 6, 2016 BE APPROVED, BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND/OR PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.**

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

b. Fence & Arbor – **96 W. North St.** (Robert & Cynthia Kington) **AR 122-16**

**Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

**Background & Request:**

This house is of Colonial Revival influence and is a contributing building in the Worthington Historic District. The house was originally constructed in 1939 and has been added onto over the years. It sits on a parcel that is 75' wide x 413' deep. Approval was granted by the ARB in 2015 for the owners to convert an exterior rear porch into indoor living space, construct a new garage and add a roof over the front stoop.

This request is for approval to add a fence and arbor at the rear of the house.

**Project Details:**

1. The proposed cedar fence would be 4' high with 4" pickets and 4" spacing between pickets. Picket tops would be dog-eared, and the wood is proposed to weather naturally. The fence is proposed to extend 36' back from the rear of the garage, enclosing just a portion of the rear yard. Two gates would be installed. The fence will essentially look like the fence at 86 W. North St., a picture of which is included in the packet.
2. An arbor is proposed at the north end of the fence which would be supported by 4 posts and have a curved top. The arbor would be cedar.

**Land Use Plans:**

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Page 11 of 16

ARB/MPC Meeting October 27, 2016

Minutes

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

**Recommendation:**

Staff is recommending *approval* of this application, as the proposed fence and arbor are appropriate in this location and compatible with the District.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Robert Kington stated his address was 96 W. North St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Foust asked if the fence was going to be pre-fabricated and Mr. Kington said no, he hired the Mae Fence Company to do the installation. Mr. Foust said to make sure the picket spacing meets the requirement and Mr. Kington said he would. Board members had no other questions or concerns. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

**Motion:**

Mr. Reis moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY ROBERT & CYNTHIA KINGTON FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO CONSTRUCT A FENCE AND ARBOR AT 96 W. NORTH ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 122-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 122-16, DATED OCTOBER 11, 2016, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.**

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

c. Sign – **752 High St.** (Sew To Speak LLC) **AR 125-16**

**Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

**Background & Request:**

The James Kilbourne Memorial Library was built in 1927, with additions constructed in 1932 and 1956, and is a contributing building in the Worthington Historic District. The building was originally the library, and was more recently used as the Worthington Schools administrative offices. The City of Worthington took possession of the building in 2006. In an ongoing effort to preserve the Colonial Revival style building, and provide leasable space to prospective commercial tenants, various alterations were approved and have been constructed. In 2009, the City Council rezoned the property to the C-5 Zoning District to allow leasing of the space to a variety of users.

Sew to Speak is a commercial tenant located in the northern part of the building. The business is an arts and crafts business, which is a permitted use in the District.

This is a request for approval to install a projection sign.

**Project Details:**

1. The proposed sign would be located north of the main entry on the west side of the building. It is to be hung from a decorative black metal bracket that is curved to match the shape of the sign.
2. The sign would be shaped like a quotation bubble, being roughly 34” wide and 27” high, with the background being PMS #612 (bright yellow/gold – a color sample is needed) and the text being white. The sign would be made of aluminum, and have ¾” thick PVC letters spelling “Sew” and smaller ¼” thick PVC letters spelling “to speak”.

**Land Use Plans:**

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

The Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance recommend signs be efficient and compatible with the age and architecture of the building. Use of traditional sign materials such as painted wood, or material that looks like painted wood, is the most appropriate material for projecting and wall signs. 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.

**Recommendation:**

Staff is recommending *approval* of the proposed sign, if the color sample is acceptable. Although the material is not wood it has the thickness of wood, and this era of building could have had a metal sign. The sign is sized appropriately. Although the color may be bright, it does not appear as a neon or fluorescent shade.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Ms. Anita Gastaldo stated she is the owner of Sew to Speak. Mr. Coulter said he liked the bracket that Ms. Gastaldo picked out for her sign, and that the bracket adds style. He also said he likes the color of the sign. Mr. Sauer said he also liked the color, and asked if the other sign was staying and Ms. Gastaldo said no, that was just a temporary sign. Ms. Gastaldo said the sign color on the overhead screen looked more orange and that is not the true color of the sign. The true color is called Kingdom Gold and the color is a bit more chartreus. She had a sample to show to the Board members. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

**Motion:**

Mr. Reis moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY SEW TO SPEAK LLC FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL A PROJECTION SIGN AT 752 HIGH ST. WITH THE COLOR THAT WAS PRESENTED AT THE MEETING, AS PER CASE NO. AR 125-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 125-16, DATED OCTOBER 14, 2016, BE APPROVED 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. Coulter, aye; Mr. Sauer, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; Mr. Hofmann, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye; and Mr. Foust, aye. The motion was approved.

d. Front Porch, Door & Gate – **132 E. Granville Rd.** (Jeff DeVille) **AR 126-16** (Extension of COA #83-10)

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

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

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

This Farmhouse was constructed in 1885 and is a contributing building in the Worthington Historic District. The owner was approved for a renovation project in 2005 that included replacing the windows and doors, constructing a fence, reworking the driveway, and modifying the front porch. In 2010, the owner received approval to construct a pergola, replace the roof, modify the front porch as was approved before but never completed, and add a gate to the front yard. The pergola, porch and gate projects were never completed, so now the homeowner would like to extend the previous approval to allow the porch and gates projects to proceed.

#### **Project Details:**

1. The front porch floor was completed as concrete wrapped in brick. The applicant still plans to add a roof with a railing. The area is 10' x 14'. The roof is proposed as wood framing with wood columns, a tongue and groove ceiling and rubber roof. A railing with decorative spindles is proposed around the roof. The exact spindle style has not been identified. Also mentioned in the drawing is the possibility to add a ceiling fan, can lights and speakers.
2. The 3 ½' – 4' high wooden gate is proposed to be 6' behind the sidewalk, across the walkway to the front door. It would be wood painted white and have black hardware.
3. Variances were granted for the gate and porch to be constructed in the required setbacks.

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

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

New porches should be built in a simple design. Look at original porches on similar buildings -- height, materials, roof slope, and width -- and use these to develop a design. Simple square or tapered columns were common. Avoid ornamentation such as spindles and scrollwork unless they were traditionally used on the porches of similar buildings. Design and materials should be

traditional, and compatible with the existing structure. Select fencing appropriate for the house's period and style.

**Recommendation:**

Staff is recommending approval of this application. The front porch alterations should enhance the house, and the door is appropriate. The spindles should be of a simple design. Although a bit uncommon, the gate may enhance the look of the front yard.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Jeff DeVille stated his address is 132 E. Granville Rd., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. DeVille said he is just trying to add a little more curb appeal. Mr. Sauer said the drawings talk about a porch slab and asked if the slab is already complete and Mr. DeVille said yes, and that the City Inspector has already performed the inspection and the slab was approved. Mr. Coulter asked if the cable in the photograph was for the new lighting and Mr. DeVille said yes and to the right of that is speaker wire to put up a few speakers. There will be a tongue and groove ceiling underneath. Mrs. Holcombe asked if Mr. DeVille would be changing the lighting on the porch and Mr. DeVille said no, and that the light just went up about two weeks ago because the light bulb was out. He will also be replacing the front door with something that will have a wood antique look. Mr. Sauer asked if Mr. DeVille would be putting a ceiling fan on the front porch and Mr. DeVille said not at this time because he is not sure how much clearance he will have. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

**Motion:**

Mrs. Holcombe moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY JEFF DEVILLE FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO ALTER THE FRONT PORCH, AND DOOR AND ADD A GATE AT 132 E. GRANVILLE RD. AS PER CASE NO. AR 126-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 126-16, DATED OCTOBER 14, 2016, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING AND THAT THE PICKETS WILL BE 2" BY 2".**

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

**C. Municipal Planning Commission (continued)**

**2. Amendment to Development Plan - New**

- a. Signage – **160 W. Wilson Bridge Rd.** (Worthington Square Acquisition, LLC) **ADP 08-16**

Mr. Coulter explained the applicant has requested to table this application. Mrs. Holcombe moved to table and Mr. Hofmann seconded the motion. All Board members voted, "Aye." The application was tabled.

**D. Other**

There was no other business to discuss.

**E. Adjournment**

Mr. Hofmann moved to table the meeting at 7:52 p.m. and Mr. Reis seconded the motion. All Board members voted, "Aye." The meeting was adjourned.