



MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
WORTHINGTON ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
WORTHINGTON MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION
November 10, 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; Thomas Reis; Amy Lloyd; and Doug 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. Commission members Kathy Holcombe and Edwin Hofmann were absent.

A. Call to Order – 7:00 p.m.

1. Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Approval of minutes of the October 27, 2016 meeting.

Mr. Sauer moved to approve the minutes and Mrs. Lloyd 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.

Mr. Foust discussed the photograph on display. He said the photograph was taken approximately in the 1890's which was the same time 324 E. Granville Rd. was built. Mr. Foust wanted to compare the 1-over-1 wavy glass window from the 1890's photograph to the home on Granville Rd. to show the window was typical for the time period.

B. Architectural Review Board

1. New

- a. Windows – **324 E. Granville Rd.** (APCO Industries/Zack) **AR 127-16**

Findings of fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This house was constructed around 1900, and is two-stories with a clipped gable on the front and a cross gable at the rear. There is a one-story sunroom in the front (southeast corner), and a one-story gabled area extends to the rear. The lap siding on the house is wood, and is being replaced as necessary. A variety of window sizes and styles is in place, with many appearing to be original to the house and some having been replaced. Most of the windows have sashes that are tan in color.

The new owner is remodeling the house and would like to replace 12 of the original windows.

Project Details:

1. All of the new windows are proposed to be Jeld-Wen, wood clad in “Desert Sand” colored aluminum with simulated divided light mullions. The wood trim on the exterior would remain.
2. On the front of the house, only the first floor window to the west is proposed for replacement. The window is double hung, and tall and narrow with “wavy” glass. The applicant indicates a pair of double-hung windows on the second floor was replaced with clad wood windows in recent years, before the purchase by the current owner. The windows do not have divided lights, but the owner indicates grids could be made. The other front windows are part the sunroom on the east side of the first floor. Those windows are double-hung wood windows with 6 over 6 lights.
3. In the rear part of the house there is a narrow window facing south that is likely proposed for replacement. It is also wood with “wavy” glass.
4. On the west side, the first floor windows are proposed for replacement. The windows are also tall and narrow, and likely have “wavy” glass although it is difficult to tell due to the existing storm windows and screens. The window on the second floor was replaced as stated above.
5. The rear elevation has one first floor window and two smaller second floor windows that are proposed for replacement. There is also a window on the east side of the rear one-story part of the house that would be replaced.
6. The east side of the east-west gable has 2 windows proposed for replacement, 1 upstairs and 1 downstairs. There is also a second floor window in the front part of the north-south gable that would be replaced.

Land Use Plans:Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Retention and repair of existing historic windows is always preferable to replacement. Because they usually comprise so much of a building’s exterior surface, windows are a major part of its character. Keeping them is one of the most important ways to protect that character. Even non-original windows may be of sufficient age and design quality to warrant their retention.

If energy efficiency is a concern, interior or exterior storm windows can greatly increase the insulating quality of windows. Some interior storm windows are held in place by magnetic strips and are easy to remove for cleaning and maintenance; many exterior storm windows slide in tracks and include screens so windows can be opened in warm weather. In some thicker window sashes

it may be possible to re-glaze with insulated panes -- but avoid removing historic “wavy” glass to do so; use storm windows instead. If these measures do not provide adequate energy efficiency, new replacement windows may be appropriate.

If historic windows are too deteriorated to repair cost effectively and replacement is justified, the preferred option is an in-kind replacement in the same material and design. This usually means real wood windows with true through-the glass muntins (if appropriate) in dimensions and profiles that duplicate the originals.

Refer to the style guide and be sure that window designs are appropriate for the style or time period of the house. Multiple-paned windows, for example, are not appropriate for a Four-Square house or a Ranch, but they are fine for a Colonial Revival style house. Avoid use of inappropriate window designs.

Some earlier houses may have been re-done with later windows. In general, it is better to retain the older non-original windows (since they probably are quite old themselves, even if not original) than to replace them with new ones. If the non-original windows are deteriorated and require replacement, it would be appropriate either to return to an original window design (with true muntins; refer to the style guide) or to install new 1-over-1 windows.

Recommendations:

As the Guidelines suggest, retention and repair of existing historic windows is always preferable to replacement. Retention of “wavy” glass is important to honor the history and character of structures. At the very least, retention of the historic windows that face south should be required. If the other windows are too deteriorated to repair, replacement with wood windows to match the existing is preferred. The addition of muntins to create a divided light look is not appropriate for the style and age of this house. Having divided light windows in the sunroom and garage does not warrant adding that look to the rest of the house.

Discussion:

In addition to the comments from the memo, Mrs. Bitar mentioned the window restoration project at the Township Hall. She said they restored the sashes and trim using wood and original glazing where possible. Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Tom Zack, of 324 E. Granville Rd., Worthington, Ohio, said he tried to save the windows but a couple are falling apart. The window representative said the windows were all shot, but Mr. Zack said he would do whatever the Board recommends. Mr. Sauer said it would be nice to save the windows, but he understood trying to save the windows at this point would be a really tough job.

Mr. Foust said he understood the upper windows had already been replaced, and Mr. Zack said the second story front windows were replaced before he purchased the home as well as one window on the west side of the home. Mr. Zack said he was not sure if he should add the grids to the other windows like the grids on the windows in the sunroom in order to make the windows look as if they were built at the same time. He said he painted all of the wood windows and took the storms off, but when he put the storms back on the wavy glass was no longer visible and the window

became drafty. Mr. Zack said he worked on the window in the front, but he is not sure he can get the window to open and be sealed properly. Mr. Zack would like to replace the window in the front to match the window above on the second floor.

Mr. Foust said if the house had all original windows he would be much more emphatic about the need to maintain the windows because there are so few nineteenth century homes in Worthington which still retain the original windows. He said the Historical Society has been dealing with a similar issue about how to install the storm windows on the older homes. Mr. Foust said he took a close look at the 6-over-6 windows in the sunroom and believed the windows were original from the same time period but salvaged from an even older house. Mr. Foust said the foundation under the porch was made of red clay tile block which was from the 1920's and he guessed someone from the 1920's must have added or enclosed the porch. He said under historic preservation guidelines the windows would have been considered a prominent feature of the house and the 6-over-6 windows should remain. Mr. Foust said the front 1-over-1 first floor window is in worse shape than the others but he would like to see it repaired as it is the prominent window on the house. He also would like to have the others in the front room kept. Mr. Foust did not think grids should be added to the other windows.

Mrs. Lloyd asked for clarification from Mr. Zack about his intentions to not replace the windows in the sunroom and he said she was correct. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY APCO INDUSTRIES ON BEHALF OF THOMAS ZACK FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO REPLACE WINDOWS AT 324 E. GRANVILLE RD., AS PER CASE NO. AR 127-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 127-16, DATED OCTOBER 26, 2016, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING WITH THE AMENDMENT THE FIRST FLOOR 1-OVER-1 WINDOW IN THE FRONT FACING E. GRANVILLE RD. WILL BE RESTORED AND RETAINED.

Mr. Sauer asked if saving the window could be an option, and Mr. Foust expressed the desire for it not to be optional, and felt he could support the proposal if the front windows and the others in the front of the house could be restored. Mr. Zack pointed out the sills are rotted and said the contractor intended to wrap the wood trim around the windows with aluminum. Mr. Foust thought the trim on the outside was to remain the same – just the sashes were being replaced. Mr. Coulter said the wood sill could be replaced if that is damaged. Mr. Foust agreed it was possible to replace the wood rather than cover it, understanding for someone that just is trying fix up and sell the property that may not be economically feasible. He felt this house was old enough and in a prominent enough location that at the least the front window should be restored. Mr. Foust thought it would not be out of character to save the window even though the window above was replaced. Mr. Sauer understood, but was concerned with the cost to the homeowner. Mr. Foust felt the cost

of the labor to restore was probably about the same as the cost of a new window, and worried if we feel everything that is worn out should be replaced at the lowest cost to the homeowner we would have a lot more vinyl siding in Worthington. He said City staff and the ARB have worked hard to maintain the types of materials that are characteristic of how the buildings were originally. Mr. Foust reiterated he would be in favor of the proposal with restoring the front window.

Mr. Reis repeated the motion with the amendment.

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

C. Municipal Planning Commission

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

1. Amendment to Development Plan - Unfinished

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

Findings of fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

The Heights at Worthington Place was approved and constructed between 2012 and 2015, and the residential units are substantially occupied. The Ohio State University Wexner Medical Center is planning to move offices into the first floor commercial space. The future second floor tenant has not been identified.

As part of the previous Development Plan approvals, 2 wall signs were approved to be painted on the building. One sign is on the back of the building facing the Shops, and one is above the parking garage entrance along Corporate Hill Dr. Also, address numbers were approved at both locations. Temporary signs have been installed in the windows and on the building over the last couple of years.

This request is to allow permanent wall, freestanding and directional signs for both the residential and commercial tenants of the building.

Project Details:

1. The proposed freestanding sign (A) would be located near the intersection of W. Wilson Bridge Rd. and Corporate Hill Dr. The proposed sign would be 6'8" high x 7'6" wide (50 square feet in area per side), and sit on a 3' high x 7'6" wide x 18" deep stone base in the same material as the building. The base would be built into the slope of the ground in front of the building.

The sign is proposed with 3 roughly equal tenant spaces, and an address in a pediment on top. The top panel would identify "The Heights Luxury Apartments"; in the middle would

be “The Ohio State University Wexner Medical Center”; and the future office tenant for the second floor is proposed at the bottom.

Construction would be with aluminum, with graphics routed thru and internally illuminated. The apartments would have 1” thick acrylic for the lettering and logo, and the others would use acrylic flush with the sign. The proposed background color is dark gray, and the cap and reveals would be silver. All graphics would be white, but the medical office logo would have black, red and white, and would illuminate white at night.

2. A directional sign (B) is proposed along Corporate Hill Dr. beside the entrance to the parking garage. The proposed sign would 3’3” high x 2’4” wide with the framing, and the above grade height would be 4’. A variance would be needed for sign size and height. The aluminum sign would have red framing, and the brushed aluminum panels would identify “The Ohio State University Wexner Medical Center” with the logo; “Patient Drop-Off” with an arrow in black and a blue icon; and “Parking” with an arrow in black and a blue icon.
3. Wall signs identifying the 2 commercial tenants are proposed on the sides of the building above the windows. Sign C is proposed on the northwestern side and would be up to 40 sf for a future tenant. Sign D is proposed on the southeastern side and would be a 40 sf sign for The Ohio State University Wexner Medical Center. The lettering would consist of 4” deep aluminum channel letters, underscore and logo with acrylic faces. The internally illuminated lettering would be black and illuminate white. The block “O” logo would be red and black.
4. Sign E was a sign for the apartments above the main office entrance, but is now non-illuminated, 23.25”, dark gray address numbers.
5. Two matching aluminum projection signs (F) are proposed to be mounted on the brick upstairs of the building to advertise the apartments. The signs would be approximately 23 square feet in area, and line up with the bottom and top edges of the adjacent windows. The background panels would be dark gray, the lettering white, and the mounting supports are proposed as brushed silver. Variances would be needed for the size of the signs.

Land Use Plans:

Wilson Bridge Corridor - Signs

Exterior lighting fixtures are the preferred source of illumination.

- Freestanding Signs
 - There shall be no more than one freestanding sign on parcels less than 2 acres in size, and no more 2 acres in size or greater.
 - Freestanding signs shall be monument style and no part of any freestanding sign shall exceed an above-grade height of 10’. Sign area shall not exceed 50 square feet per side, excluding the sign base. The sign base shall be integral to the overall sign design and complement the design of the building and landscape.
 - Freestanding signs may include the names of up to eight tenants of that parcel.
 - Light sources shall be screened from motorist view.
- Wall-mounted Signs
 - Each business occupying 25% or more of a building may have one wall sign and one projection sign. Wall-mounted signs shall not exceed 40 square feet in area, and projection signs shall not exceed 12 square feet in area per side.

- Wall-mounted and projection signs shall be designed appropriately for the building, and shall not be constructed as cabinet box signs or have exposed raceways.

Worthington Planning and Zoning Code

“Directional sign” means a sign used to direct on-site traffic and identify services such as restrooms, hours of operation, etc., and of which no more than fifty-percent of the graphic area is non-directional information. The display area for such signs shall not exceed twenty-four inches in height or width, and the above grade height for freestanding directional signs shall not exceed thirty-six inches. The total area for all such signage shall be no more than 20 square feet per parcel. Directional signs are excluded in the computation of sign area.

Development Plan Amendment Ordinance

When an applicant wishes to make modifications following approval of a Final Development Plan, and variances are included, the modification must be approved by the City Council.

Staff Analysis:

Staff is recommending *approval* of this application with the following considerations:

- The directional sign should be reduced in height, with the text centered vertically on the sign.
- External illumination or possibly halo illumination should be considered.

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar explained she needed clarification as to how the block “O” would be illuminated at night. She said the corridor Code language including the preference for external illumination. Mrs. Bitar continued to say what has been proposed are all internal illuminated signs, but are not offensive and are similar in character to the nearby mall property. She said originally a sign for “The Heights” apartments was proposed above the Wilson Bridge Rd. entrance but staff did not feel the sign was appropriate because that is only the office entrance. The applicant decided the address number “160” would be used instead, with the numbers being twenty-three inches in height. Mrs. Bitar said the applicant would still like signage for The Heights on the front of the building, so they have proposed matching projection signs which would be dark gray with white lettering. Originally smaller signs were proposed which would have met the Code requirement but would have been on the first floor. Staff felt they should be upstairs at the apartment location so felt they could be larger. Mrs. Bitar explained banners were used in the beginning to advertise the apartments, but the banners were not rigid signs as are now proposed and did not stay smooth. The proposed would line up with the top and bottom of the windows. Mrs. Bitar felt the signs were appropriate for the building.

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Philip Philippou stated he represented Worthington Square Acquisitions. Mr. Sauer said he understood why Ohio State wanted signage on the east side of the building but had concerns the new tenant may want signage on the south side of the building because the west side is not as visible. Mr. Sauer said he liked the pylon sign but was not sure why two additional signs were needed on the building for The Heights, and he is

not in favor of having those additional projection signs on the building. He felt that the signs for both office tenants would be more appropriate on the south side of the building.

Mr. Phillipou felt they needed the signs because he believes people drive past the building and do not know the building has apartments because of its commercial design in the front. Mr. Sauer asked about the occupancy rate and Mr. Phillipou said it is good right now because they slashed rents for a couple of months as an incentive. Mr. Sauer felt people know there are apartments in the building, especially since you can see furniture on the balconies and Mr. Phillipou said he did not disagree. Mr. Sauer reiterated he did not see the need for additional signage on the building. Mr. Reis ask if there was already signage for The Heights, and Mrs. Bitar said there are painted wall signs facing Corporate Hill Dr. and The Shops.

Mr. Foust asked if the purpose of the signage is to fill the apartments and if the signage can be temporary. Mr. Coulter explained the building originally had temporary signage. Mr. Brown said when the temporary banners were up, staff received complaints that the banners were not always taut and looked temporary. Mrs. Bitar said even if the signs had a more permanent look there would be difficulty in determining when the signage was needed. Mr. Phillipou said they have a very high turnover rate for tenants and the number one way people notice the building is by driving by, so roadside visibility is extremely important. He said they have performed case studies which support the importance of roadside visibility and renting to new to tenants. He said the location is great in many ways but leasing is a challenge. Mr. Sauer said he felt the pylon sign would fulfill the leasing goals but Mr. Phillipou disagreed. Mrs. Lloyd asked if the Board could approve the pylon sign and discuss the blade signs at a future date because she did not see the need for those either, but she understood the leasing perspective. Mr. Phillipou asked for clarification if it was the blade sign style or just additional signage in general.

Mr. Coulter explained the pylon sign was fine; the directional sign should be cut down to three feet instead of four feet; and the two tenant signs, one for Ohio State and the one for the future tenant should stay in the proposed location and not be on the south side. Mr. Sauer reiterated he would like the office signs better on the south side of the building. Mrs. Lloyd thought the office signs were better where proposed. Mr. Coulter said he likes the idea of the signs being internally illuminated because of their height and they would be less likely to shine light inside the tenants' apartments. Mr. Coulter asked for opinions about the blade signs. Mr. Foust said the blade signs are in character with what he has seen in Grandview and Upper Arlington, but he has always thought that when you have a multi-tenant building you should name the building and not all of the businesses. Mr. Reis said he did not have a problem with the sign at grade or the directional sign as long as it meets the Code requirements. He was not in favor of additional signs for The Heights. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak either for or against this application and one person came forward. Mr. Tom Zack, of 324 E. Granville Rd., Worthington, Ohio, said he believed the apartment buildings did not need flag signs and the apartments would look better without them. There were no other speakers.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

Page 8 of 22

ARB/MPC Meeting November 10, 2016

Minutes

THAT THE REQUEST BY WORTHINGTON SQUARE ACQUISITION, LLC TO AMEND THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN BY ADDING SIGNS AT 160 W. WILSON BRIDGE RD. AS PER CASE NO. ADP 08-16, DRAWINGS NO. ADP 08-16, DATED NOVEMBER 1, 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 WITH THE EXCEPTION THAT THE DIRECTIONAL SIGN WILL CONFORM TO THE CITY'S SIGNAGE CODE AND THAT THE BLADE SIGNS ARE NOT APPROVED.

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

Mr. Coulter explained to Mr. Phillipou he can come back at a later date to apply for other signage and Mr. Phillipou asked if he could apply for temporary signs during leasing season. Mrs. Bitar said temporary signage has been approved before at other locations. Mrs. Bitar said if the signs were aluminum or some other rigid material, they could be part of an Amendment to the Development Plan, and City Council could grant a variance request for the temporary nature of the signage. Mr. Sauer asked how long leasing season was and Mr. Phillipou said the normal leasing season extends from Memorial Day to Labor Day. Mr. Sauer was not in favor of having the signs for that long of a time period. Mr. Coulter suggested Mr. Phillipou talk with City staff about his future proposal.

2. Subdivision without Plat

- a. Lot Split – **6069 Olentangy River Rd. (Jamie & Katy Burrier/Chase) SWOP 02-16**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

The property at 6069 Olentangy River Rd. is 1.43 acres in area and has been vacant since the demolition of a house in 2011-2012. The parcel is adjacent to the south of Rau Lane, which is a private drive that provides access to 5 homes, and south of Congregation Beth Tikvah. Under the same ownership as 6069 is a 0.14 acre parcel to the south fronting on Clayton Dr. that is "Reserve A" of the Clayton Dr. subdivision, reserved for storm water drainage facilities. All of the properties in this area are in the R-10 Zoning District.

The applicants would like to purchase these properties, and split the northern parcel into 2 lots.

Project Details:

1. Division of the parcel would be by way of a new east to west property line. The resultant lot to the north would have 80' of frontage along Olentangy River Rd.; the resultant lot to

the south would have 133.34' of frontage along Olentangy River Rd. Both lots would exceed the minimum required lot size of 10,400 square feet for the R-10 Zoning District. One single-family home would be allowed on each parcel. The applicant indicates the homes would each be at least 2000 square feet in area.

2. As required for the Olentangy River Rd. Corridor Overlay District, the setback from the right-of-way would be 50'; and the setback from adjacent existing lots to the north, west and south would be 40'. The side setback from the new property line would be 8' to meet the R-10 zoning requirements.
3. A recreation path exists along the front of the property.
4. The applicant has committed to planting new trees at least equal in size to what is being removed, which has been identified as 164" total – 72" on the south lot and 92" on the north lot.
5. The portion of the property shown to the centerline of Olentangy River Rd. would need to be dedicated as right-of-way.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Subdivision Regulations

"Subdivision" means the division or combination of any parcel or parcels of land shown as a unit or as contiguous units on the latest tax roll. A proposed Subdivision of a parcel of land along an existing Public Street in any R-16 or R-10 Zoning District, not involving the opening, widening or extension of any street, road or access point and involving a tract of land from which no more than five Lots can be created after the original tract has been completely subdivided may be submitted to the Municipal Planning Commission for approval without Plat. If the commission is satisfied that such proposed Subdivision complies with applicable Zoning requirements, it may direct the Director of Planning and Building to stamp conveyances for Lots within the Subdivision "Approved by Municipal Planning Commission, No Plat Required." The Commission may also establish reasonable necessary procedures and requirements to be met by the owner desiring to subdivide property pursuant to this section.

Olentangy River Road Corridor Overlay District

The following standards are applicable to all new Subdivisions and Planned Unit Developments within the District:

(a) Setback: All Structures shall be the following distances from the property line:

- (1) Olentangy River Road - 50'
- (2) Side and Rear Yards abutting existing Lots - 40'

Within the Setback area: retention of existing native vegetation and planting of new vegetation is expected. Fences may be appropriate in required Side and Rear Yards but shall not be placed in Front Yards or within the Olentangy River Road required setback. Accessory Structures and/or parking areas shall not be placed within the Olentangy River Road required setback.

(b) Dwelling Units: The allowable number of Dwelling Units shall be no greater than 3.5 per acre. Dwelling Units may not be built above one another (i.e. stacked so that there are different Dwelling Units on different floors of the same Structure). The minimum living space for each Dwelling Unit shall be 1600 square feet.

(c) Grade: Grade shall not be raised or lowered more than 2' except otherwise provided in the approved Subdivision or Planned Unit Development.

(d) Recreation Paths and Sidewalks: Recreation Paths or Sidewalks shall be required in the Right-of Way along Olentangy River Road, except such Recreation Paths and Sidewalks may be placed in the Setback area where needed or required. All such Recreation Paths and Sidewalks shall follow the existing grade as closely as possible, and be constructed around trees 6" caliper or larger.

(e) Trees: All healthy trees 6" caliper or larger shall be retained, or replaced with total tree trunk equal in diameter to the removed tree.

Code Section 1101.06:

Whenever any new single-family lots are created in accordance with the provisions of this Code in any residential zoning district, then the subdivider, developer or owner, as the case may be, shall make a cash payment to the City of five hundred dollars (\$500.00) per each new Lot created for deposit in the Special Parks Fund. Such deposits shall be used for the capital costs associated with the City's parks, playground and recreation areas.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending approval of this application, with the following items being required as part of the subdivision:

- Access and utility easements be defined
- Right-of-way dedication be finalized
- A public area payment of \$500 be made to the City for the Special Parks Fund.

Discussion:

In addition to the comments in the staff memo, Mrs. Bitar mentioned there may have been an additional 10' of right-of-way dedicated as part of a storm water improvement project in the early 1990's that staff is still working to verify. Mrs. Bitar explained the motion will need the language to reflect the change if the right-of-way has been dedicated. If the extra ten feet of right-of-way is dedicated then the setback line will be adjusted ten feet to the west. Mr. Sauer asked if the utilities could come from Clayton Dr. and Mrs. Bitar said possibly, but there is a steep change in grade. She said that access could not be from Clayton Dr. because of the separate parcel with the storm water reserve. Mrs. Bitar showed drawings of a home that could be built, but mentioned the design was not part of the application.

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicants were present. Mrs. Katy Burrier and Mr. James Burrier stated their address was 855 Edgecliff Dr., Columbus, Ohio. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak either for or against this application and two people raised their hands.

Mr. William Cooper stated his address was 6083 Olentangy River Rd., Worthington, Ohio, which is at the end of Rau Lane behind Beth Tikvah. Mr. Cooper said he is really happy something is finally happening with the land. He believed this will be a great project for the area and he supports the project one hundred percent.

Mr. Scott Whitlock stated his address is 6081 Olentangy River Rd., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Whitlock said the Burriers have gone to great lengths to come up with a sound development plan and he strongly supported their proposal.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY JAMIE & KATY BURRIER FOR APPROVAL OF SUBDIVISION WITHOUT PLAT TO SPLIT THE PROPERTY AT 6069 OLENTANGY RIVER ROAD INTO TWO LOTS, AS PER CASE NO. SWOP 02-16, DRAWINGS NO. SWOP 02-16, DATED OCTOBER 28, 2016, AND THAT IF AN ADDITIONAL TEN FEET OF RIGHT-OF-WAY IS NEEDED THE SETBACK SHALL BE ADJUSTED ACCORDINGLY TEN FEET AND 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; and Mr. Reis, aye. The motion was approved.

B. Architectural Review Board (continued)

1. Unfinished

- a. Holiday Inn Site Redevelopment – **7007 N. High St.** (Alliance Hospitality, Inc.) **AR 32-16**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This roughly 7.5 acre parcel, zoned C-4, Highway and Automotive Services, has been home to a hotel since 1975. The original approval was for a Hilton Inn. The brand has changed several times over the years with the most recent being the conversion to a Holiday Inn in 2007, which included many upgrades to the building and site.

The owner is now proposing demolition of the existing hotel, and redevelopment of the site with a mix of uses. Concepts for the site were discussed at the March 10th and June 23rd ARB meetings, and the applicant received feedback from the Board and the public. The application was tabled without discussion at the October 13th meeting so the applicant could revise the drawings. This submittal contains more detail of the proposal.

Project Details:

- 1. Uses:

- Two hotels, with 110 guest rooms and 95 guest rooms, are proposed. The existing Holiday Inn has 232 guest rooms.
 - Other potential uses on the site are describe as restaurants and professional services.
 - In the C-4 Zoning District, personal and business services and hotels are Permitted Uses. Restaurants and offices (professional services) are Conditional Uses needing approval from the MPC.
2. Site Plan and Landscaping:
- The proposed plan shows an entrance to the site from each of the adjacent rights-of-way. All three entrances would be situated similarly to existing site entrances. On W. Wilson Bridge Rd., the entrance is proposed at the west end; on Caren Ave. the proposed entrance is toward the middle of the site but on the eastern half; and on N. High St. the entrance would be near the middle of the site. Elimination of an existing entrance toward the east end of the site on W. Wilson Bridge Rd. is proposed.
 - The buildings are laid out as in the last submission, concentrated to the north and east sides of the site, being further away from the adjacent residential than the existing hotel.
 - W. Wilson Bridge Rd. - Three building are proposed along W. Wilson Bridge Rd. about 36' from the roadway and 20' from the existing right-of-way line. The City has requested an additional 15' of right-of-way be dedicated, so the building would be 5' from the new line. In addition to the existing grass strip and sidewalk in the right-of-way, an area to plant street trees and a sidewalk adjacent to the buildings are proposed. Two pedestrian access points would be provided between the buildings which would also allow for restaurant seating areas.
 - At the west end of the site would be the drive entrance with one lane in and two lanes out, separate by an island with trees.
 - A small parking area with a screen wall would be adjacent to the east. Included is a service area that apparently leads to interior storage of trash, etc. Clarification of how service areas work is needed for the entire site.
 - Building #1 – This building would be about 158' from the west property line, and 95' wide. The building is designated for professional services.
 - Building #2 - A 140' wide restaurant is proposed 40' west of Building #1 with a pedestrian access, planting and seating area between the buildings.
 - Building #3 - At the east end would be a 131' wide building housing a 95 key hotel, and a restaurant on the first floor. Between Buildings #2 and #3 would be a 51' wide pedestrian access, planting and seating area. Building #3 would be 17' from the east property, at the rear of the BP site.
 - Building #4 – This building would be a 110 key hotel located about 153' from the south property line and 225' from the west property line. A 3987 square foot restaurant would be on the first floor at the west end of the hotel.
 - A traffic circle denoted as the “Village Square” is proposed between Buildings #2, 3 & 4, with a fountain in the middle. The areas adjacent to the traffic lanes would provide pedestrian access, planting and seating opportunities. The road leading to the “Village Square” from the W. Wilson Bridge Rd. entrance would be tree-lined, and have sidewalks and parallel parking. From the south entrance off of Caren Ave., there would also be tree islands and a sidewalk to accommodate pedestrians.

- N. High St. – Two buildings are proposed along the N. High St. frontage with a drive entrance between. The buildings are proposed 15’ from the existing right-of-way. Additional right-of-way dedication was discussed along N. High St. but is not shown on the plan. There would be sidewalks extending from both N. High St. and Caren Ave. to these buildings, with a pedestrian connection between the buildings.
 - Building #5 – This building is shown 16’ from the BP property line and 69’ in width. It is designated as a restaurant.
 - Building # 6 – Designated as a professional service building, this building would be 71’ wide along N. High St. and 128’ wide along Caren Ave.
- A sidewalk is shown along the southern edge of the site, with access to the public sidewalk east of the Caren Ave. entrance, and at the southwest corner of Building #6.
- Stairs to the existing sidewalk west of the site are planned to allow pedestrian access for the residents.
- The remainder of the site would be surface parking with tree islands added. The applicant calculates 524 parking spaces would be required on the site based on the proposed uses, and 388 spaces are being provided. Should there be any times the site could not accommodate all of the guests, parking agreements with property owners to the south may be possible. Any parking agreements obtained would be subject to approval by the Board of Zoning Appeals with the variance request.
- A combination of evergreen and deciduous trees and shrubs are proposed to be densely planted along the west and south property lines adjacent to the existing residential properties.
- The Arbor Advisory Committee reviewed the plans and made the following comments:
 - Pyrus Calleryana (Cleveland Select) Pear trees can hybridize and are now being considered an invasive species by some, and should not be used.
 - Street trees species recommendations: Exclamation London Plane; Espresso Kentucky Coffeetree; Nyssa Sylvatica “Red Rage” or “Wildfire” – Not Tupelo Tower
 - Low shrubs (Taxus?) should be added along Caren Ave.
 - Only native species should be used in Caren lot (not sure if that is already the case).
 - Diversify screen planting around BP station – add arborvitae, etc.
 - West/southwest screening recommendations – Viburnum Prunifolium, Canadian hemlock, Cornelian Cherry Dogwood, Arborvitae, Serbian Spruce, Winterberry and ilex x meserveae Holly. The Committee thought the Blue Spruce, which needs full sun, may not be ideal for that planting in the quantities shown.
 - Need to see specs for planting (not sure what ODOT specs are)
 - Need appropriate bed depth and type of fill in parking islands
 - Why are there not any foundation plantings?
- Consideration should be given to burying overhead utility lines at the south property line.
- A storm water plan will be required.
- A preliminary traffic study has been submitted, but additional information will be needed to determine the viability of installation of a traffic signal at the W. Wilson Bridge Rd. entrance.

3. Buildings:

- The buildings are all shown as having four-sided architecture that is described as Colonial style. A variety of building heights, roof forms, materials and details are proposed across the site. A sheet with a large variety of proposed materials is included in the packet. The renderings do not necessarily reflect the exact color and materials. Storage of mechanical equipment on the roof would likely be possible on all buildings.
- Building #1 –
 - One-story; 6967 square feet (sf); professional services
 - Combination of different gabled roof lines to give the look of many different 1 ½ story buildings; asphalt shingles, standing seam metal roofing
 - South side entrance only; service door on west with screen wall at service area adjacent to parking
 - Bricks, lap siding, divided light windows, chimneys
- Building #2 –
 - One story; 10,099 sf; restaurant
 - Combination of different roof lines to give the look of many different 1½ and 2 story buildings; asphalt shingles, standing seam metal roofing
 - Entrances on the south, east and west sides; service entrances on the north side
 - Bricks, lap siding, divided light windows on first and second floors, storefront windows, chimneys, dormers, awnings
- Building #3 –
 - Four story hotel with 3264 sf restaurant space on first floor (northwest corner)
 - Look of hipped roof with standing seam metal and asphalt shingles
 - Main hotel entrance on west side, fitness center entrance on north side; restaurant entrances on west and south sides
 - Combination of bricks, lap siding
 - Divided light windows with shutters, store front windows, chimneys, trellis, brick detailing, “Widow’s Walk” at entrance roof
- Building #4 –
 - Four story hotel with 3987 sf restaurant space on first floor (west end)
 - Look of hipped and mansard roofs; asphalt shingles, standing seam metal
 - Main hotel entrance on north side; restaurant entrances on west and north sides
 - Combination of bricks, lap siding
 - Divided light windows with and without shutters, store front windows, dormers, brick detailing, arched entry for hotel and passageway between hotel and restaurant
- Building #5 –
 - One story; 5134 sf; restaurant space
 - Combination of gables to give the look of 1 ½ and 2 story building; standing seam metal
 - Entrance on the south sides; service entrance on the west side
 - Brick, lap siding, divided light windows on first and second floors, storefront windows, two-story features, awnings
- Building #6 –
 - Two story; 16,292 sf; professional services space

- Combination of mansard, gable and barrel roof lines; standing seam metal
 - Entrance on the north side; service entrance on the west side
 - Brick, lap siding, divided light windows on first and second floors, two-story features
4. Lighting:
 - A lighting plan has been submitted, and includes photometrics and catalogue cuts of fixtures. The photometric plan shows some light level spilling onto adjacent properties.
 - A variety of light fixtures are proposed for the buildings.
 5. Signage:
 - Signage review will be required.
 6. Variances:
 - Application to the Board of Zoning Appeals would be required to approve any variances requested for the site.
 - The applicant is applying as part of the C-4 Zoning District, but is also trying to meet the requirements for the Wilson Bridge Corridor. Variances would likely be needed for setback, building height and parking not meeting the C-4 regulations.
 7. Conditional Use Permits:
 - Needed for restaurants and offices

Staff Analysis and Recommendation:

1. The proposed site plan generally reflects the discussions at the ARB meetings, and is appropriate for the site. Consideration should be given to eliminating the sidewalk near Wilson Bridge Rd., and instead running the sidewalk up to and along the buildings. The sidewalk would then lead pedestrians to the site and be better protected from traffic, and a wider, more prominent planting area would be created adjacent to the street.
2. Right-of-way vacation along both streets is still requested, but has only been shown along W. Wilson Bridge Rd.
3. The following comments relate to the Worthington Design Guidelines and Wilson Bridge Corridor Development Standards regarding the buildings:
 - While the effort to have the development look like a village that has developed over time is honorable, some of the resultant buildings may be too complicated in their massing and form. The roof lines that are especially complex may not feel as authentic as intended. Some design elements seem out of character with the community.
 - A simpler mix of materials and colors may be warranted. The extensive use of lap siding, bright colors and metal roofing, especially on the larger buildings, does not seem appropriate. A simpler, more subtle use of colors could provide a development that fits in better with Worthington. The shades of yellow shown in the renderings appear particularly vibrant and out of character with the community. Clarification is needed regarding the proposed materials for siding and roofing. Vinyl siding should not be used.
 - Entrances face the interior roads but do not face the public streets.
4. The Arbor Advisory Committee comments about the landscaping plan should be addressed.

5. Lighting should not spill onto neighboring properties. A different style of pole lights may be needed, especially adjacent to residential properties. LED lighting color above 2700 K is not appropriate.
6. Staff is recommending *tabling* of this application after discussion, to allow the applicant to make modifications and add detail based on the guidelines and any recommendations made at the meeting.

Discussion:

In addition to the material in the staff memo, Mrs. Bitar said the Board members may want to take a look at the lights next door at FC Bank which were recently approved. The lights are unobtrusive and may be a good choice for the new hotel project because they do not spill over onto neighboring properties. Mrs. Bitar said the architectural renderings show a mixture of a number of different styles and materials and colors. Sample material boards were shown to the Board members and audience, but there has not been a designation of a particular style or material to a specific building. She said they have to fine tune what building materials will be used and would like input from the Board about which materials are preferred. Mrs. Bitar showed the drawings and spoke briefly about building design and materials. Mrs. Bitar explained the developer has shown outdoor seating on the drawings but not along the Wilson Bridge Rd. frontage. She said having building entrances and outdoor seating areas along the W. Wilson Bridge Rd. and N. High St. rights-of-way would match the recommendations in the Design Guidelines and Wilson Bridge Rd. Corridor Code language.

Mr. Brown explained to the Board and audience that the focus on the meeting was the architecture this evening. At the first few meetings the site plan, layout, and landscaping were reviewed and the thought was to come full circle again in the future and address any storm water, lighting, site conditions, and traffic concerns. Mr. Coulter asked Mrs. Bitar if the number of parking spots shown would require a variance and Mrs. Bitar said yes, the matter would go to the Board of Zoning Appeals for approval. She explained the property owners were to have discussions with the nearby office property owners to the south about using additional parking spaces if needed. Mr. Coulter asked if there would be an opportunity to add more green space. Mrs. Bitar said staff has encouraged the property owners to determine how much parking would actually be needed for the development instead of just trying to meet Code. She said this type of mixed use facility would have vehicles there at different times of the day based on the uses and excessive on-site parking would not be wanted in an effort to have additional green space, trees, plants, etc.

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Jack Reynolds said he is an attorney with Smith & Hale and representing his client Mr. Ohm Patel who could not attend the meeting. Mr. Reynolds introduced one of the architects with Cooper Carey, who was responsible for the presentation. Mr. Steve Jackson, the Design Architect for the project, said his address is 6 East Rosemont Ave., Alexandria, Virginia. Mr. Jackson introduced the sample material boards and said they have not picked out any specific materials yet for the buildings, the samples were merely a generality of the materials to be considered. He offered a historical color palette which would be good for all of the buildings and said eventually they will determine the materials for each specific building, but for the meeting this evening they wanted to just give an overview of what

materials were being considered. Mrs. Bitar explained the audience was welcome to come up and view the materials. Mr. Jackson said he has a great resource of historical buildings to look at in Alexandria, Virginia. He wanted to develop a palette that created a sense of interest throughout all of the different buildings, and not just look like one big development. Mr. Jackson said he was trying to create a look like there were several buildings accrued over time with an authentic look because that is key when trying to create villages and town centers. The buildings have to appear like they reflect a historic time period and be much more meaningful than something that was just built in a retail strip center. He said they are trying to pay attention to what the materials are and how they are used.

Mr. Jackson displayed photographs of similar buildings using the different types of brick and said there are several hundred types of brick available, but diligence is needed to find the brick with the right character for the project. They currently have picked out six different types of brick but may come back with more choices at the next meeting. Mr. Jackson also reviewed the siding materials, and said they plan to use pre-colored Hardiplank Cedarmill lap siding. He felt this was a good material because it is a great product that will last forever, is developer friendly and affordable, and is available in a variety of colors that would work well for the community. Mr. Jackson said he has been looking at the Williamsburg palette of colors as a guiding principle. The yellow color in the renderings was a computer glitch and the actual color is much more subdued. Paint chips were distributed to the Board members for review. He said he is not only looking at horizontal lap siding but also shingle style which would give a different character. The material was not listed on the drawings yet, but is something that is being considered.

Mr. Jackson presented types of roofing: standing seam which was prevalent in historic time periods, and available in a variety of colors; and composite products that look like slate shingles; Mr. Coulter mentioned the U.S. Bank in downtown Worthington used this type of material on their roof replacement project. Mr. Jackson discussed the samples of the stone veneer he brought with him and said he liked the idea of using stone with this project because there will be a lot of masonry and this would look like the kind of foundation you would see on an old farmhouse. Mr. Jackson said the stone look will give the building a sense of grounding like the building has been there forever. Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Jackson if he was referring to thin set stone and Mr. Jackson said it would be a 4" veneer. The stone will be used sparingly to create something special throughout the architecture. Mr. Jackson indicated there would also be some precast elements for durability such as low planter walls which will be capped, and window lintels and sills.

Mr. Jackson said he understood the comments about the rooflines being complex and welcomes other comments. They want the design to be right as the buildings will be around for quite a while.

Mr. Reis said he liked the samples of the brick, stone and roofing materials but was not keen on the variety of colors of siding. He said he would rather see the hotel be constructed of one type of material and not a mixture of brick colors with the yellow siding. Mr. Reis said he liked the way the site lays out, the massing of the buildings, the planters and walls. He felt it creates an urban feel and has a soft relationship with the neighborhood. He wondered about having seating facing Caren Ave. Mr. Reis felt the outbuildings looked too busy, he was not in favor of the mixture of

colors and materials. He believed there needs to be a little more consistency in the look and it should be a bit more subdued.

Mr. Jackson discussed the northern restaurant building and explained the idea was to have the look of townhouses marching up the hill, and the roof lines, fenestration, and other features change as the townhouses go up the hill. Mr. Reis asked about tenants and Mr. Jackson said he was not sure how many tenants there would be, but believes the building style could work for any tenant because it is all colonial architecture.

Mr. Sauer said he interprets the concept as lots of little pieces thrown together to make this look like the project was assembled over a long period of time, but said he is not buying the premise. He said the scale of the development does not fit and the mix of various colors, materials and multiple roof lines make the buildings look complicated. Mr. Sauer felt people will not know how to enter the restaurant because the plan looks confusing and people will have difficulty finding the door. He feels the restaurant looks more like a hodge-podge than having a specific image. Mr. Sauer said aluminum storefronts do not look right and Mr. Jackson said they were just placeholders. Mr. Sauer said when he thinks of Colonial architecture he thinks of simple forms but the proposed plans are not clear and simple. He thought the west hotel looked like a fortress. He also believed there should be some plantings along the pedestrian walkway for variety because the buildings are too close to the streets. He thought the buildings along N. High St. were weird and did not fit into the community.

Mr. Coulter said he thought all of the members would feel that way about the buildings on N. High St. He said he loves the village concept which is similar to downtown Worthington, and compared it to The Continent. He said these two buildings on N. High St. just do not fit in with anything in Worthington.

Mr. Sauer said he is concerned this project might be the new thing for the next five years, but wondered what would happen if this area becomes obsolete like The Continent. Mr. Myers asked Mr. Sauer for clarification about what he did not like and Mr. Sauer explained he thought the drawings looked too busy and he did not like the row of townhomes. Mr. Sauer said he would like to see the drawings simplified, but Mr. Myers disagreed. He felt the townhomes looked very authentic, and similar to what would be found on the east coast. Mr. Sauer said he feels the project is out of scale. Mr. Jackson said they are trying to develop quaint new experiences within a suburban island surrounded by four, five and six lane roads. There will be smaller roads with quaint benches within the area similar to what the old town used to be like, with flower pots and sandwich board signs. Mr. Coulter spoke about four-sided architecture, which does not mean it has to be same on all sides, but each side needs to relate. Also, the Shops need to be considered.

Mrs. Lloyd said her biggest concern was the massing of the outbuildings, feeling like the scale was broken down too much. Also, as the project moves forward she would like to see street level renderings that are more developed. She felt the scale of some of the elements looked a bit deceiving. Mr. Coulter felt the chimneys were too tall, but Mr. Foust thought the chimneys had the style of Colonial Virginia.

Mr. Foust said he agreed with staff in that he would like to see wider sidewalks along Wilson Bridge Rd., similar to those of downtown Worthington, which would allow room for outdoor restaurant seating if the street is not too noisy. Mr. Foust mentioned there have been problems with street lighting in the past where even though there were zero footcandles at the lot line, the light still seemed to spill over onto the nearby neighborhoods. He felt the street lighting used for the perimeter of the project needs to be totally enclosed, with shielded fixtures so the neighbors will not have to look at light bulbs. Mr. Foust said he liked the village look of the buildings along Wilson Bridge Rd. He said while talking with some City Council members, trying to define what the Worthington look is, they all felt the look was more New England style rather than Colonial. Mr. Foust said the proposed reminded him of the European style with the four story buildings and narrow streets, but if the buildings are to look like they are separate, they will need to have clean cuts and actually look like they are separate buildings without a shared foundation. Mr. Jackson said he understood. Mr. Foust also felt pieces of the east hotel did not fit together well, and cautioned Mr. Jackson about the amount of standing seam metal roof used. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present that would like to speak.

Mrs. Jayne Rosandich, of 140 Caren Ave., Worthington, Ohio, asked if this site plan is the actual plan of what is being built. Mr. Coulter explained this was the current plan, but will be subject to some minor changes. Mrs. Rosandich said she is concerned with the side which borders High St. and Caren Ave. and cannot imagine the buildings being so close to the curb while there will be a lot of space for parking in between. She was also concerned with parking and people using Caren Ave. as a main entrance. Mrs. Rosandich wanted to see the existing hotel on a plan in relation to the proposed buildings. Mr. Brown explained the parking deck was eliminated because of the neighbors' concerns the deck so the site plan changed. Mrs. Rosandich said she did not want headlights shining into her home and expressed her concerns about the height of the hotel buildings. Mr. Brown, Mr. Coulter and Mr. Foust explained how the developer moved the buildings closer to High St. so there would not be as much of an impact on the nearby residential properties.

Ms. Heather Monroe, of 135 Greenglade Ave., Worthington, Ohio, said she does not want to encourage people coming into her neighborhood and does not want to see any outdoor seating near the neighborhood. She liked the hotels moving closer to High St. and isolating the nearby neighborhood. Ms. Monroe reiterated the concern about headlights and would like to make sure there is a buffer from the lights. She also liked the idea of the City's arborist reviewing the vegetation that would grow in the area.

Ms. Carol Meehan, of 130 Caren Ave., Worthington, Ohio, said she was also concerned about too many building materials with too many colors and wondered if one style of architectures would be chosen. Ms. Meehan said she looks forward to the new project and getting rid of what is there now. Mr. Jackson explained they are going with the New England/Colonial style. Mr. Reis said he would like to see something in the drawings showing how the adjacent properties will look after the project is completed to make sure the headlights do not shine into the neighbors' property. Mrs. Bitar said she had several photographs of the neighboring property but Mr. Reis said he would rather see the site lines where people are pulling in and out of the property. Mrs. Bitar thought a

fence for screening had been discussed, but has not seen a fence on the drawings yet. There is a fence there now, and a fence is appropriate when residential property is adjacent to a commercial development.

Mrs. Janet Wharton, 490 Olenwood Ave., Worthington, Ohio, said she lived in the New England area for twenty years and did not feel the buildings looked like New England architecture. She was concerned about the tunneling effect along Wilson Bridge Rd., the loss of the green look that Worthington is known for, and she was not sure this is the right image for the property. Mrs. Wharton is also concerned about noise coming across from the parking lot, as well as light pollution. She believed the project looked similar to The Heights apartments across the street and asked what the developer is trying to match, the apartments across the street or the character of the rest of Worthington.

Mr. Sauer asked what the dotted line was along High St. and Mr. Brown said a waterline easement. Mr. Sauer said he was not sure if his site plan drawings were correct, but it looked as if the buildings overlap the easement. Mr. Brown said the right-of-way dedication requirements along N. High St. will push those buildings out of the easement. The City will not allow the buildings to encroach into the easement regardless. Mr. Sauer asked if it would be appropriate to start showing the service areas on the plan. Mrs. Bitar explained there was some discussion about having interior service areas, and there were some shown on the plans, but clarification is needed. Mr. Sauer said he wants to make sure the buildings look just as inviting on both sides, not just the north side.

Mr. Jack Reynolds requested the application to be tabled.

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

D. Other

Mr. Brown explained the Worthington Municipal Planning Commission must appoint a representative to the Community Reinvestment Area Housing Council for a three-year term. Mrs. Holcombe has been the designee for the past three years and has expressed interest in being reappointed. Mr. Brown explained a motion is needed for the appointment. Mr. Sauer moved to reappoint Mrs. Holcombe to another three year term and Mr. Reis seconded the motion. All Board members voted, "Aye." The motion was approved.

Mr. Brown said he needs all of the Board members to check their City email addresses. He also discussed training in the budget, and mentioned the ED411 program.

Mr. Brown said the MK&K proposal for the new buildings south of CVS on High St. was approved by City Council with no concerns or objections.

E. Adjournment

Mr. Reis moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:40 p.m. Mr. Sauer seconded the motion. All Board members voted, "Aye." The meeting was adjourned.