



MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
WORTHINGTON ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
WORTHINGTON MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION
December 8, 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: Mikel 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 November 10, 2016 meeting.

Mr. Reis moved to approve the minutes and Mr. Sauer 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. Municipal Planning Commission

1. Conditional Use

- a. Recreational Facility in C-5 Zoning District – **679-D High St.** (Shoma Jha/Centered Yoga & Movement) **CU 17-16**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This commercial building was constructed in the mid-1980's, and has housed a mixture of retail businesses, offices, personal services and entertainment facilities over the years. This request is

for approval to operate a yoga studio on the second floor at the west end of the building. The space was most recently occupied by Cut, Color, Style.

Project Details:

1. Centered Yoga and Movement would operate in the roughly 36' x 28' second floor space, which would also include a small office area. The first floor entrance is accessed from the courtyard at the back of the building, and leads not only to stairs but also a coatroom and restroom on the first floor. Other than the addition of the business name to the signage, no other exterior modifications are proposed.
2. The owner expects to have 10-12 people per each class, starting with a couple of classes a day. A variety of yoga and movement classes would be offered to clients of all ages.

Basic Standards and Review Elements: The following general elements are to be considered when hearing applications for Conditional Use Permits:

1. Effect on traffic pattern – Parking would be shared with the other Old Worthington businesses in the municipal parking lot. Clients should park in locations other than the spaces on High St.
2. Effect on public facilities – No effect has been identified.
3. Effect on sewerage and drainage facilities – The effect would be minimal.
4. Utilities required – No new utilities would be required.
5. Safety and health considerations – None have been identified.
6. Noise, odors and other noxious elements, including hazardous substances and other environmental hazards – None have been identified.
7. Hours of use – Varied times daily between 7:00 am to 9:00 pm.
8. Shielding or screening considerations for neighbors – Not applicable.
9. Appearance and compatibility with the general neighborhood – Signage would match the previously approved.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Conditional Use Permit Regulations

The following basic standards apply to conditional uses in any "C" or "I" District: the location, size, nature and intensity of the use, operations involved in or conducted in connection with it, its site layout and its relation to streets giving access to it, shall be such that both pedestrian and vehicular traffic to and from it will not be hazardous, both at the time and as the same may be expected to increase with increasing development of the Municipality. The provisions for parking, screening, setback, lighting, loading and service areas and sign location and area shall also be specified by the applicant and considered by the Commission. Recreational Facilities are a conditionally permitted use in the C-5 Zoning District.

Worthington Design Guidelines, Architectural District Ordinance and Comprehensive Plan

A good mix of restaurant and niche retail shops are appropriate for Old Worthington according to the Comprehensive Plan. Old Worthington is the heart and symbol of the Worthington community and it is one of the most successful original town centers in Ohio. Focus retail uses to the High Street corridor with particular attention on retail for first floors in Old Worthington.

Recommendations:

Staff is recommending approval of the application, with a commitment by the business owner to direct clients away from the parking spaces on High St. as they should be reserved for retail and restaurant customers. The proposed use is appropriate for the second floor in this location, and meets the basic standards for conditional uses.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Ms. Shoma Jha, of 45 W. Stafford Ave., Worthington, Ohio, said she has lived in the area for over a decade and looks forward to providing this service to the community. Board members had no 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. Sauer moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY SHOMA JHA FOR A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO OPERATE A RECREATIONAL FACILITY ON THE SECOND FLOOR AT 679-D HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. CU 17-16 DRAWINGS NO. CU 17-16, DATED NOVEMBER 23, 2016, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE PLANNING GOALS OF THE CITY, AS REFERENCED IN THE LAND USE PLANS AND FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

Mr. Hofmann 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.

C. Architectural Review Board**1. Unfinished**

- a. Freestanding Sign Modification – **882 High St.** (Greg & Phil Giessler/Cam Taylor) **AR 101-16**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the staff memo and explained the applicant had originally proposed a sign that did not comply with the sign code so staff asked the applicant to simplify their design to be more in compliance. The sign will have an opaque background which is required by code, but will still require a variance for the number of font styles and sizes. The same sign box will be utilized, but the color needs to be clarified.

Background & Request:

This building was constructed in 1987 and the property owners recently made improvements to the front entry of the building. This application is a request for approval to modify the freestanding sign. The request was originally on the September 8, 2016 agenda, but was tabled without discussion.

Project Details:

1. The plan involves replacement of the sign faces in the existing sign, and possibly repainting the sign box and post.
2. For the sign faces, three sections are proposed. The top would have Cam Taylor in bold red lettering and the web address in blue on a white background. In the middle would be the relocation network for the business, saying “Leading Real Estate Companies of the World” in 2 fonts and 3 sizes of white lettering on a red background. At the bottom, another logo comprised of white lettering on a blue background saying “Love your house; Love your neighborhood; Love Columbus” is proposed with 2 realtor symbols.
3. The sign is internally illuminated and the background, lettering and logos would be illuminated.
4. Once the graphic portion of a sign is replaced, it is supposed to be in conformance with the Code. Variances would be needed for the number of letter styles and sizes, and for having an internally illuminated background.

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

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending *modification* of this application. Basic business names, graphics and addresses on signs provide a simpler and clearer view for motorists. At the very least, matching as many fonts and sizes of lettering as possible would help to simplify the look of the sign.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Greg Giessler, of 882 High St., Worthington, Ohio, said he wanted to simplify their freestanding sign. Mr. Reis asked if the telephone number will remain on the sign and Mr. Giessler said no. Mr. Sauer asked what the color of the frame and

base of the sign will be and Mr. Giessler said the frame and base will remain white, but he would be willing to change the color based upon the Board's recommendations. Mr. Hofmann asked if the sign will be internally illuminated and Mr. Giessler said yes, but only the lettering will be illuminated. Mrs. Holcombe asked why the word "Realtor" was eliminated from the sign and Mr. Giessler explained that as his company transitions to the next generation of family, they would like to turn the name "Cam Taylor" into a brand instead of just a person. Mr. Sauer asked if the address numbers were on the sign and Mr. Giessler said no, the address numbers are above the doorway. 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 GREG AND PHIL GIESSLER FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO MODIFY THE FREESTANDING SIGN AT 882 HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 101-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 101-16, DATED JULY 15, 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.

b. 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 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, June 23rd, and November 10th ARB meetings, at which the applicant received feedback from the Board and the public. This submittal contains revisions of the architectural drawings; a drawing with the proposed buildings and the existing building together; and minor changes to the site plan. Changes to the lighting and landscaping have not been submitted.

Project Details:

1. Uses:

Page 5 of 29

ARB/MPC Meeting December 8, 2016

Minutes

- 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 now proposed about 20’ from the existing right-of-way, which is an additional 5’ from the last proposal. Right-of-way dedication of 15’ is now shown on the plan. Both buildings would be lower than the street due to the dramatic change in grade west from N. High St. 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; 68’ in width; and 72’ deep. The building was reduced in size to accommodate the additional setback while retaining parking. It is designated as a restaurant. Additional accessible parking may be required in closer proximity to the building.
 - Building # 6 – Designated as a professional service building, this building would be 73’ 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 517 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. Specific material and color combinations have been added to the submittal. The siding would be cementitious, and the proposed slate roof would be a manufactured material. 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; Weathered Green slate and Weathered Zinc standing seam metal roofing
 - South side entrance only; service door on west with screen wall at service area adjacent to parking
 - Four bricks Redburn, Battlecreek, Illini Commons and Ridgeland; beaded lap siding in Moir Gold, Bassett Hall Green and Chesapeake Blue; 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; Weathered Green and Slate Gray slate roofing, Medium Bronze and Colonial Red standing seam metal roofing
 - Entrances on the south, east and west sides; service entrances on the north side
 - Three bricks Redburn, Celtic Grey, Ellsworth; lap siding in Ewing Blue, Greenhow Vermillion, and Governor’s Gold; 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 Weathered Green slate roofing, Aged Copper standing seam metal roofing
 - Main hotel entrance on west side, fitness center entrance on north side; restaurant entrances on west and south sides
 - Four bricks Aberdeen, Celtic Grey, Rustic Burgundy, and Ashland; lap siding in Governor’s Gold; stone veneer – Bucks Country Limestone
 - Divided light windows with and without shutters, store front windows, trellis, brick detailing
 - Building #4 –
 - Four story hotel with 3987 sf restaurant space on first floor (west end)
 - Look of hipped and mansard roofs; with Weathered Green slate roofing, Weathered Zinc standing seam metal roofing

- Main hotel entrance on north side; restaurant entrances on west and north sides
 - Three bricks Redburn, Celtic Grey, and Ellsworth; lap siding in Moir Gold, Bassett Hall Green, and Dragons Blood; stone veneer – Southern Ledgestone Aspen
 - 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
 - Two gabled roofs with Weathered Green slate roofing running east and west, connected with a flat roof with Aged Copper standing seam metal roofing
 - Entrances on the west side
 - Ellsworth brick, Tavern Charcoal lap siding, divided light windows on second floors, storefront windows, awnings
 - Building #6 –
 - Two story; 16,292 sf; professional services space
 - Combination of mansard and gabled with Weathered Zinc standing seam metal
 - Entrance on the north side; service entrance on the west side
 - Illini Commons brick, Chesapeake Blue 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 offices

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

1. Scale, Form & Massing: Simple geometric forms and uncomplicated massing tend to make buildings more user-friendly and help to extend the character of Old Worthington into the newer development areas. Inclusion of sidewalks, pedestrian-scaled signage, and planting and lawn areas will help communicate a sense of a walkable pedestrian scale. Carefully designed building facades that employ traditional storefronts -- or similarly-sized windows on the first floor -- will help make new buildings more pedestrian-friendly.
2. 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.

3. **Roof Shape:** Generally, a traditional roof shape such as gable or hip is preferable to a flat roof on a new building. Roof shapes should be in scale with the buildings on which they are placed. Study traditional building designs in Old Worthington to get a sense of how much of the facade composition is wall surface and how much is roof.
4. **Materials:** Traditional materials such as wood and brick are desirable in newer areas, but other materials are also acceptable. These include various metals and plastics; poured concrete and concrete block should be confined primarily to foundation walls. Avoid any use of glass with highly reflective coatings. Some of these may have a blue, orange, or silver color and can be as reflective as mirrors; they generally are not compatible with other development in Worthington. Before making a final selection of materials, prepare a sample board with preferred and optional materials.
5. **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.
6. **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.
7. **Ornamentation:** Use ornamentation sparingly in new developments. Decorative treatments at entries, windows and cornices can work well in distinguishing a building and giving it character, but only a few such elements can achieve the desired effect. Traditional wood ornamentation is the simplest to build, but on new buildings it is possible to use substitute materials such as metal and fiberglass. On brick buildings substitute materials can be used to resemble the stone or metal ornamental elements traditionally found on older brick buildings. As with all ornamentation, simple designs and limited quantities give the best results.
8. **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.
9. **Signage:** While the regulations permit a certain maximum square footage of signs for a business, try to minimize the size and number of signs. Place only basic names and graphics on signs along the street so that drive-by traffic is not bombarded with too much information. Free-standing signs should be of the “monument” type; they should be as low as possible. Such signs should have an appropriate base such as a brick planting area with appropriate landscaping or no lighting. Colors for signs should be chosen for compatibility with the age, architecture and colors of the buildings they serve, whether placed on the ground or mounted on the building. Signs must be distinctive enough to be readily visible, but avoid incompatible modern colors such as “fluorescent orange” and similar colors. Bright color shades generally are discouraged in favor more subtle and toned-down shades.
10. **Sustainability:** 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. Energy conservation methods are encouraged. Landscape concepts often complement energy conservation and should be maintained and replenished. Utilize indigenous plant materials, trees, and landscape features, especially those which perform passive solar energy functions such as sun shading and wind breaks. Preserve and enhance green/open spaces wherever practicable. Manage storm water run-off through the use of rain gardens, permeable forms of pavement, rain barrels and other such means that conserve water and filter pollutants. Bike racks and other methods of facilitating alternative transportation should be utilized. Streetscape elements should be of a human scale. Make use of recycled materials; rapidly renewable materials; and energy efficient materials. Use of natural and controlled light for interior spaces and natural ventilation is recommended. Minimize light pollution.

Wilson Bridge Corridor

Site Layout:

Setbacks: Buildings and parking should be set back to provide a buffer between the sidewalk and building, with some variations in the Building Setback Line encouraged throughout the WBC.

- Buildings 50,000 square feet in area or less shall be located between 5' and 20' from adjacent Right-of-Way Lines. Buildings greater than 50,000 square feet in area shall be located at least 20' from adjacent Right-of-Way lines.
- Buildings on properties abutting properties in "R" districts shall not be located closer than 50' to the property line. Parking facilities and access drives on properties abutting properties in "R" districts shall not be located closer than 25' to the property line.
- Setback areas in front of retail uses shall be primarily hardscaped, and may be used for outdoor dining and other commercial activities.
- As building height increases, the buildings should consider the relationship between the setback, the street corridor, and the building height. A variety of techniques will be implemented to mitigate any potential "canyon/tunneling" effect along the corridor, such as the use of floor terracing, changes in building massing, insertion of a green commons, recessed seating and dining areas, and lush landscaping.

Right-of-Way Dedication: Dedication of Right-of-Way may be required to accommodate public improvements.

Screening: All development on parcels abutting properties in "R" districts shall be permanently screened in the setback area with the combination of a solid screen and landscape screening. The solid screen shall consist of a wall or fence at least 6' in height and maintained in good condition without any advertising thereon. Supporting members for walls or fences shall be installed so as not to be visible from any other property which adjoins or faces the fences or walls. This shall not apply to walls or fences with vertical supporting members designed to be identical in appearance on both sides. Landscape screening shall consist of one of the following options at a minimum:

- One large evergreen tree with an ultimate height of 40' or greater for every 20 linear feet, plus one medium evergreen tree with an ultimate height of 20' to 40' for every 10 linear feet. Evergreen trees shall be at least 6' in height at the time of planting. Shrubs and ornamental grasses shall be incorporated into the setback area as to complement the tree plantings. A minimum of one shrub or ornamental grass, at least 24" in height, shall be

provided for every 5 linear feet. Shrubs and grasses may be planted in clusters and do not need to be evenly spaced.

- One large deciduous tree with an ultimate height of 50' or greater for every 25 linear feet, plus one medium deciduous tree with an ultimate height of 20' to 40' for every 15 linear feet. Shrubs and ornamental grasses shall be incorporated into the setback area as to complement the tree plantings. A minimum of one shrub or ornamental grass, at least 24" in height, shall be provided for every 5 linear feet. Shrubs and grasses may be planted in clusters and do not need to be evenly spaced.

Equipment: Exterior service, utility, trash, and mechanical equipment shall be located to the rear of buildings if possible and screened from view with a wall, fence or landscaping. Such equipment shall be completely screened from view. Materials shall be consistent with those used in the building and/or site. Equipment located on buildings shall match the color of the building.

Tract Coverage: A maximum of 75% of the property shall be covered with impervious surfaces.

Pedestrian Access: Sidewalks with a minimum width of 5', Recreation Paths with a minimum width of 10', or a combination of both shall be provided along all Rights-of-Way. Pedestrian connections from Sidewalks, Recreation Paths and parking lots to building entrances shall be provided.

Landscaping: There shall be landscaping that complements other site features and creates relief from buildings, parking areas and other man-made elements.

- Drought tolerant, salt tolerant, non-invasive, low maintenance trees and shrubs should be utilized.
- Deciduous trees shall be a minimum of 2" caliper at the time of installation; evergreen trees shall be a minimum of 6' in height at the time of installation; and shrubs shall be a minimum of 24" in height at the time of installation.
- Parking lot landscaping shall be required per the provisions in Chapter 1171.
- Seasonal plantings should be incorporated into the landscape plan.
- The approved landscape plan must be maintained across the life of the development.

Building Design:

- A principal building shall be oriented parallel to Wilson Bridge Road (or High Street), or as parallel as the site permits, and should have an operational entry facing the street.
- The height of a building shall be a minimum of 18' for flat roof buildings measured to the top of the parapet, or 12' for pitched roof buildings measured to the eave.
- Extensive blank walls that detract from the experience and appearance of an active streetscape should be avoided.
- Building Frontage that exceeds a width of 50' shall incorporate articulation and offset of the wall plane to prevent a large span of blank wall and add interest to the facade.
- Details and materials shall be varied horizontally to provide scale and three-dimensional qualities to the building.
- Entrances shall be well-marked to cue access and use, with public entrances to a building enhanced through compatible architectural or graphic treatment.
- When designing for different uses, an identifiable break between the building's ground floors and upper floors shall be provided. This break may include a change in material, change in fenestration pattern or similar means.

- Where appropriate, shade and shadow created by reveals, surface changes, overhangs and sunshades to provide sustainable benefits and visual interest should be used.
- Roof-mounted mechanical equipment shall be screened from view on all four sides to the height of the equipment. The materials used in screening must be architecturally compatible with the rooftop and the aesthetic character of the building.

Materials:

- Any new building or redevelopment of a building façade should include, at a minimum, 75% of materials consisting of full set clay bricks, stone, cultured stone, wood or fiber cement board siding. Samples must be provided.
- Vinyl siding and other less durable materials should not be used.
- Long-lived and sustainable materials should be used.
- The material palette should provide variety and reinforce massing and changes in the horizontal or vertical plane.
- Especially durable materials on ground floor façades should be used.
- Generally, exterior insulation finishing systems (EIFS), are not preferred material types.
- A variety of textures that bear a direct relationship to the building's massing and structural elements to provide visual variety and depth should be provided.
- The color palette shall be designed to reinforce building identity and complement changes in the horizontal or vertical plane.

Windows and Doors:

- Ground-floor window and door glazing shall be transparent and non-reflective. Above the ground floor, both curtain wall and window/door glazing shall have the minimum reflectivity needed to achieve energy efficiency standards. Non-reflective coating or tints are preferred.
- Windows and doors shall be recessed from the exterior building wall, except where inappropriate to the building's architectural style.
- For a primary building frontage of a commercial use, a minimum of 30% of the area between the height of 2' and 10' above grade shall be in clear window glass that permits a full, unobstructed view of the interior to a depth of at least 4'.

Lighting: All exterior lighting shall be integrated with the building design and site and shall contribute to the night-time experience, including façade lighting, sign and display window illumination, landscape, parking lot, and streetscape lighting.

- The average illumination level shall not exceed 3 footcandles. The light level along a property line shall not exceed 0 footcandles.
- The height of parking lot lighting shall not exceed 15' above grade and shall direct light downward. Parking lot lighting shall be accomplished from poles within the lot, and not building-mounted lights.
- For pedestrian walkways, decorative low light level fixtures shall be used and the height of the fixture shall not exceed 12' above grade.
- Security lighting shall be full cut-off type fixtures, shielded and aimed so that illumination is directed to the designated areas with the lowest possible illumination level to effectively allow surveillance.

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 than two freestanding signs on parcels 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.

Parking:

- Non-residential Uses. Parking shall be adequate to serve the proposed uses, but shall in no case exceed 125% of the parking requirement in Section 1171.01.
- Bicycle Parking. Bicycle parking should be provided and adequate to serve the proposed uses.

Public Spaces: A minimum of one Public Space Amenity as approved by the Municipal Planning Commission shall be required for every 5,000 square feet of gross floor area of multi-family dwellings, commercial or industrial space that is new in the WBC. Public Space Amenities are elements that directly affect the quality and character of the public domain such as:

- An accessible plaza or courtyard designed for public use with a minimum area of 250 square feet;
- Sitting space (e.g. dining area, benches, or ledges) which is a minimum of 16 inches in height and 48 inches in width;
- Public art;
- Decorative planters;
- Bicycle racks;
- Permanent fountains or other Water Features;
- Decorative waste receptacles;
- Decorative pedestrian lighting; and
- Other items approved by the Municipal Planning Commission.

Worthington Comprehensive Plan

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

meeting the needs of the City, providing green setbacks and meeting the Architectural Design Guidelines. The plan recommends promoting a high quality physical environment, encouraging the City to continue to emphasize strong physical and aesthetic design, and high-quality development. Also recommended is encouraging the private market to add additional commercial office space within the City.

Staff Analysis and Recommendation:

1. The proposed site plan generally reflects the discussions at the ARB meetings, and is appropriate for the site. Elimination of the sidewalk near Wilson Bridge Rd., and widening of the sidewalk near the buildings are appropriate. The more prominent planting area would be attractive, and the distance from the road would be safer for pedestrians.
2. Right-of-way vacation along both streets is now being shown and conforms to the request of the City.
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 and metal roofing, especially on the larger buildings, does not seem appropriate. The colors appear a bit more subtle than in previous submittals.
 - 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:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Jack Reynolds, of 37 W. Broad St., Columbus, Ohio, said he is an attorney with Smith & Hale. Mr. Reynolds said they are just looking at the overall picture and want to get feedback so they can move forward putting the individual buildings together. Mr. Reynolds turned the presentation over to the lead architect for the project, Mr. Steve Jackson, of 6 E. Rosemont Ave., Alexandria, Virginia. Mr. Jackson said buildings #5 (restaurant) and #6 (professional offices) were simplified and therefore changed the most. Other changes were more minor, such as the chimneys on building #1 were shortened, and the brick materiality was also slightly changed. Building #2 had some slight material changes, and building #3, the hotel building to the northeast side had some changes to the roof line. The chimneys and widow's walk have gone away and they greatly reduced the number of shutters. Mr. Jackson believed the buildings have a more simplified look with

a better color scheme. The form of the building has not changed much, nor did the height of the building change. Mr. Jackson said minor revisions happened to building #4; the white portico structure was removed to reduce some of the complexity of the building. A stone base and planter wall were added to the hotel building. Building #5, the restaurant building, was pulled back further away from High Street so patio space could be added, and the roofline was simplified. Building #6, the professional office building now has a gabled roof structure in the middle of the building.

Mr. Reis said Mr. Jackson improved the overall concept, and he liked the adjustments. He felt the simplified roofline on the hotel, and getting rid of the widow's walk were improvements. Mr. Reis also liked the addition of patio space on High St., and he believed the patio would engage the community from a pedestrian perspective. Mr. Reis hoped the trees would grow quickly to the size that were shown in the renderings.

Mr. Hofmann asked Mrs. Bitar to refer to the perspectives portion of the presentation, the one showing the main circle of the hotel. Mr. Hofmann asked what the driving changes were to the hotel and Mr. Jackson explained the changes were driven by the hotel branding. A more simplified roofline was desired, getting rid of the chimneys and getting rid of the railings fit their more commercial look. They did not like all of the shutters so they reduced the number of those.

Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Jackson if the hotel branding department understands that the Architectural Review Board (ARB) may want some of the items to come back to be discussed before moving forward, to keep things in the nature of the Worthington character. Mr. Coulter said he agreed with Mr. Reis about the improvements. He liked the village type of atmosphere. Mr. Coulter said some of the architecture that changed he was not so sure about because he liked the chimneys and the railings on top. Mr. Coulter, Mr. Hofmann and Mr. Sauer all liked the earlier drawings of the hotel, which included the chimneys, widow's walk and shutters. Mr. Hofmann believed building #5 had the greatest improvement but was concerned with the mansard on #6. Mr. Foust said he did not feel building #6 had much presence on High St. because there was not an entrance off of High St. He said clearly building #5 is more pedestrian friendly. Mr. Foust said what would help the mansard roof is the windows looking more traditional, as they do on Building #4 with an angled element rather than a curved element above. Mr. Coulter and Mr. Foust pointed to the use of similar elements to tie the N. High St. buildings in with rest of the project. Mr. Hofmann felt generally the breakdown of forms and materiality of the project was nice. Mrs. Lloyd agreed the changes are moving in a positive direction. She asked if building #6 was all office. Mr. Jackson said they are planning for the future. The two-story office building will have an entrance that faces an internal street. Mr. Jackson agreed to take a look and see how he can enhance the presence of building #6. Mr. Coulter explained some of the buildings along High St. between Wilson Bridge Rd. and Dublin-Granville Rd. do not have front entrances, and the feedback from the community is the Board members missed the boat on that feature. The community would like to see more buildings with entrances off of High St. Mr. Hofmann asked if there would be retail space available on the ground floor which would allow for awnings over the front entrances. Mr.

Jackson explained the buildings are still flexible enough to accept retail in the future. He said all tenants generally request modifications when moving into a new building. Board members agreed in the absence of a front entrance, some focal element on the east side would be helpful. Mrs. Lloyd asked Mr. Jackson what was going on between the two brick facades of Building #5. Mr. Jackson explained that is a low roof area between the two buildings. He said he first wanted to create two buildings with gabled roof tops to keep the scale down to break down the size of the building. The center portion of the building has a lower part between the buildings that sort of resolve themselves to keep them separated. The area also provides space for mechanical equipment for the restaurants.

Mr. Sauer was concerned about the mansard style roof of Building #5 and felt a different style of roof would give the building on High St. more presence. Mr. Sauer said the building looked as if it would sink into the ground when compared with the building #5. Mr. Sauer said building #5 has enough height and mass and is all one color and because of that reason he believes the building has more presence. Mr. Sauer he wanted to discuss the buildings along Wilson Bridge Rd. and asked if the proposed right-of-way would become the new right-of-way and Mrs. Bitar said yes, the City is asking for the additional land to be dedicated as right-of-way. Mr. Sauer said the Wilson Bridge Road Corridor Guidelines states buildings with 50,000 or more square feet need to be twenty feet from the right-of-way; he asked if the hotel will have to move further south. Mrs. Bitar said due to the right-of-way dedication, and the amount of building massing adjacent to the right-of-way, that would not be necessary. Mr. Sauer asked how many restaurants were proposed for Building #2. Mr. Jackson replied two restaurants were originally proposed, but the spaces could be reduced and allow for possibly three or four restaurants. Mr. Sauer said he wanted everyone to understand the sidewalk will be up close to the building on W. Wilson Bridge Rd., even though just the service doors will be facing that side of the buildings. People will not be able to look inside the building from the sidewalk. Mr. Sauer felt the hotel massing was fine; treating the buildings on High St. as single building works well; but expressed concern with Buildings #1 & #2 being broken down into smaller buildings. He did not think they looked genuine, and thought if they were broken down into fewer designs and not repetitive they would be more believable.

Mr. Hofmann said as a counterpoint, he and Mr. Foust preferred the village form. He felt the design would work well in reality, looking better than the elevations, and does not mind the individual building look. Mr. Hofmann said he understood artistic license and doing finishes differently. Mr. Foust said there was similar development in Old Dublin that he has always liked. Mr. Reis said he might warm up to the previous scheme for the hotel, but he does agree with Mr. Hofmann and likes the way the buildings are broken up and the site lays out. He felt Mr. Jackson is on the right track with the design. Mrs. Holcombe explained she was not at the last ARB meeting, but she liked the village look because the buildings appear to look old as if they have been there for a while. Mr. Foust pointed out to Mr. Jackson the Board will need more details on the store fronts and how their styles will be tied into the buildings. Mr. Coulter suggested Mr. Jackson have a conversation with City staff to discuss what the ARB has approved in the past. Mr. Jackson said he would provide more details about the store fronts. He said they are focusing on the hotel buildings first because that is driving the project. In the

near future, Mr. Jackson said they would like to discuss the lighting, signage, transformers, take another look at the site plan again and provide more landscaping design, make sure all the trash and loading information is identified. Mr. Coulter explained the site plan to the audience showing the buildings will be further from residential than the existing hotel.

Mr. Sauer said he would like to see more landscaping on the south side of the buildings to soften the area which borders residences, and more planting near the central street where there will be more pedestrian traffic. Mr. Jackson said he still needs to talk with landscapers but also plans to add planters which will enliven the area also. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application.

Mrs. Bitar swore in Ty Wait, of 324 Weydon Rd., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Wait asked for clarification if building #5 would have a patio on the High Street side, and Mrs. Bitar said yes. He asked the Board members to consider figuring out a way to mitigate the noise that would be coming from Interstate 270 and High Street and be heard from the proposed High Street patio. Mr. Wait said if the presence is too close to the road people will not want to go outside and sit there.

Ms. Judy Anderson, of 510 Olenwood Ave., Worthington, Ohio, said she appreciates everything that has been done to push the setbacks and sidewalks away from Wilson Bridge Rd. She is concerned about the traffic and the safety of pedestrians. Ms. Anderson said because of the buildings 4-story height, she feels like there will be a wall there because the structure is only thirty-six feet from the road. She said she would like to see the building pushed further away from the road. Ms. Anderson said she does like the overall concept.

Mrs. Bitar swore in Mrs. Jane Rosandich of 140 Caren Ave., Worthington, Ohio. Mrs. Rosandich said she was happy to see the architect provided the type of drawing she requested at the last ARB meeting so the residents could see the homes in comparison with the proposed buildings. Mrs. Rosandich feels the proposed buildings will encroach the corner of Caren Ave. and High St. and asked if the architect would provide a drawing that would show the view from the other side of the street. Mrs. Rosandich feels the buildings are still too close to High St., and she does not want people parking in front of her house or in front of the stop sign.

Mr. Jack Reynolds requested to table the application.

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

2. New

- a. New Gasoline/Convenience Store Station – Extension of Approval with Amendments – **2182 W. Dublin-Granville Rd.** (United Dairy Farmers, Inc.) **AR 128-16** (AR 45-14)

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Page 18 of 29

ARB/MPC Meeting December 8, 2016

Minutes

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

A new UDF convenience store and gas station at the northeast corner of W. Dublin-Granville Rd. and Linworth Rd. was approved by the Architectural Review Board in September of 2014. ARB approvals are valid for 18 months, but can be extended by the Board. This request would not only act as an extension of the original approval, but also minor changes and clarifications are proposed.

The development would be on 2 adjacent parcels, 1 located in Columbus and 1 in Worthington. Both jurisdictions approved plans for the new station. In addition to the ARB approval, the parcel in Worthington was rezoned to the C-4 Zoning District, and a Conditional Use Permit and variances were granted to accommodate the use. The total lot size for the 2 parcels after right-of-way dedication and transfer of a portion on the north side to Linworth Baptist Church is about 1.5 acres. The Worthington lot was home to a bank building which was demolished in the last year. The Columbus lot has the existing UDF which closed a couple of weeks ago and is slated for demolition.

Project Details:

1. As part of the plan, the applicant was approved to have a right-in/right-out entrance on West Dublin Granville Road, and a full access point on Linworth Road. Also, a southbound left turn lane on Linworth Road is required to be constructed by United Dairy Farmers. The owner must also install sidewalks along both frontages and crosswalks to allow pedestrians to move about the area safely.
2. The landscape plan is not proposed to change. A 48” high black metal fence is still proposed along the east property line, including adjacent to the parking lot to the north now owned by the church.
3. Building:
 - The new building continues to be proposed as all brick, with a water table with a brick pattern around the entire building (see detail on A11).
 - The 7/12 roof pitch with a hipped roof would remain the same with this submittal.
 - The proposed storefront is anodized aluminum, extending across part of the front of the building. East of the entrance, smaller windows are now proposed to accommodate an interior beverage area. The windows are proposed to be tinted.
 - A horizontal prefinished flush metal panel system is proposed for the gables and on the canopy.
 - On the east elevation the storefront windows for the seating area have shifted to the north, and the patio with pergola is proposed adjacent.
 - Other elements are the same as the previous approval including: wall sconces, fiberglass columns with brick bases; louvered gable vents; wood trim; fiberglass roof shingles; and roof vents.
 - Decorative trim is proposed around the rear service doors.
 - Screening for the mechanicals on the rear of the roof is proposed.

4. Twenty-nine dark brown bollards with silver reflective stripes at the top are now proposed across the front of the building.
5. A brick enclosure with high impact PVC doors with a horizontal panel design is proposed for the dumpster at the west end of the building. The enclosure shown is larger than was originally approved.
6. The applicant was proposing 2 wall signs, one on the canopy and one on the building, and a freestanding sign. The wall signs would consist of internally illuminated channel letters with white faces. The “UDF” initials on the front of canopy would be the only sign on the Worthington side of the property. The latest submittal showed additional signs on the canopy in both jurisdictions. A freestanding sign would be placed on the Columbus side of the property, likely in the right-of-way that was dedicated. Approval is needed from the City of Columbus.
7. The light poles were proposed to have a ground to fixture height of 15’, including a 2’ exposed concrete base. The detail on sheet A1 shows the fixture at 17’ above grade. Two similar fixture styles have been submitted. Both styles have optional shields for the fixtures adjacent to the east side so light would not spill onto the residential property. The LEDs for both come in 5000k or 4000k color temperature. As was approved by the ARB, the photometric drawing indicates light levels no greater than 30 footcandles in any location.
8. U-shaped pipe bollards near the pumps are shown as gray with a yellow top in the submitted material.
9. A transformer is proposed near the northeast corner of the property. A variance would be needed for its location in proximity to the property lines.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Comprehensive Plan Update & 2005 Strategic Plan

A neighborhood retail service center should be established at the West Dublin-Granville Road and Linworth Road intersection to create a commercial node for the community.

Worthington Design Guidelines

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

Setbacks: Unimpeded pedestrian access to the front building facade from the sidewalk should be a primary goal.

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: Traditional materials such as wood and brick are desirable in newer areas, but other materials are also acceptable. These include various metals and plastics; poured concrete and concrete block should be confined primarily to foundation walls. Avoid any use of glass with highly reflective coatings. Some of these may have a blue, orange, or silver color and can be as reflective

as mirrors; they generally are not compatible with other development in Worthington. Before making a final selection of materials, prepare a sample board with preferred and optional materials. Windows: Use traditional sizes, proportions and spacing for 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.

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

Signage: While the regulations permit a certain maximum square footage of signs for a business, try to minimize the size and number of signs. Place only basic names and graphics on signs along the street so that drive-by traffic is not bombarded with too much information. Free-standing signs should be of the “monument” type (standing vertically, mounted on a ground-level base and not on a pole); they should be as low as possible. Such signs should have an appropriate base such as a brick planting area with appropriate landscaping or no lighting. Colors for signs should be chosen for compatibility with 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 this application with the followings modifications:

- The parking lot light fixtures should be kept to no higher than 15’ above grade, including the base.
- Especially given the number of bollards by the building, the silver reflective stripes should be eliminated. The pipe bollards by the pumps should not be yellow - all white or with white tops would be more appropriate.
- The window tinting should be non-reflective and as light in color as possible to achieve the desired interior effect.
- At the residential property line, the illumination should not exceed 0 footcandles. Also, color temperature is typically approved to be no greater than 2700K. Selection of different fixtures may be necessary. The color of the light poles and fixtures should be brown (bronze) or black.
- Although the freestanding and wall signs are not all in Worthington, the sign package should conform to the Worthington Design Guidelines and Codified Ordinances as closely as possible. Additional signs should not be added to the canopy and the freestanding sign should be smaller (≤ 30 sf/side) with a brick base to match the building.
- The transformer must be screened with landscape material and be a color to blend in with the screening.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Donald Plank, of 145 E. Rich St., Columbus, Ohio, stated he is an attorney representing the applicant and owner (United Dairy Farmers) for this matter, and along with him to answer questions was the architect and operations person for this matter, Mr. John Johnston. Mr. Plank said he wanted to remind the Board members that part of the project is in Worthington and part of the project lies within the City of Columbus. The signs currently located on the site will no longer be there. The ground sign will be located within the City of Columbus. Mr. Plank said the City of Columbus allows for larger signage but they are committed to making sure the sign is no larger than forty feet. He said he will keep the Worthington City staff informed of when the hearing will be so they will have the opportunity to give their input. Mrs. Bitar asked if thirty square feet per side is not acceptable. Mr. Plank explained they had to give away right-of-way to the City of Columbus which pushed the whole site back quite a bit. Mr. Plank said typically, signage has to be fifteen feet from the right-of-way, but they will be forty feet from the roadway and right up against the right-of-way. There will be a large amount of green space between the roadway and the sign. Mr. Plank said they will be asking the City of Columbus for a zero lot line variance. Mr. Sauer asked if there were photographs of the east property line because he did not see a landscaping plan for that side. Mrs. Bitar explained the applicant is committed to whatever landscaping is there now, and adding landscaping to the satisfaction of the condominium association next door. She explained the applicant has been working with the condominium association all along to make sure the screening will be adequate.

Mr. John Johnston said he is the architect for United Dairy Farmers (UDF) out of Cincinnati, Ohio. He explained the scalloped areas on the map shows what is still existing as far as mature trees and shrubbery. He said they have had many meetings with the nearby residential community concerning what will be happening at the site. Some of the old cedar trees are no longer healthy so they will be mixing the approved landscaping plan into what is existing, therefore creating a nice blending of what was there before with the new this spring. Mr. Johnston explained the building is essentially the same. He said they were tardy in getting back to the Board with details because they hired an interior designer out of New York City to help remodel the store. They took three identical stores in Cincinnati and gutted them and replaced the interiors with the new designs. The store in Worthington will be the first real store with the new design. Some of the things on the interior design will affect the design on the outside. He believed the plans have all been updated to Mrs. Bitar's previous comments in terms of the height of the light poles, and other details. He said the project is ready to move forward, but there are a few details needing some direction from city staff such as the bollards. Mrs. Bitar also suggested taking the reflective element away, but Mr. Johnston would like to keep that. He said the whole purpose of the bollards is to protect the structure of the store and the people inside the store in the event of a severe incident. Mr. Johnston believes the bollards will blend well with the site, and said they have been using them for the past two years. The bollards work well, and accomplish the intent of what they are trying to do.

Mr. Coulter said there were three things he would like Mr. Johnston to discuss further. Mr. Coulter said he does not have a problem with Mr. Johnston using bollards in front of the store, but he does have an issue with the number of bollards being used. He felt the number of bollards was

excessive. The second issue he would like Mr. Johnston to address was the signage on the canopy. Mr. Coulter said he could not control what the City of Columbus wants to do on the west side but the Board does have some controllability on the east side. Mr. Coulter would like to know what is going to be done on the City of Columbus side versus the City of Worthington side. His third question was in regards to the safety rails around the pumps, and if Mrs. Bitar's suggestions would be taken into consideration because her suggestions were pleasing from a visual standpoint.

Mr. Johnston said the sign on the building will have block letters in red, spelling United Dairy Farmers. The canopy will have the letters UDF with a tri-colored logo, and the letters will be white with a dark blue trim piece. One sign will face Dublin-Granville Rd., and the other sign will face Linworth Rd. The bollards are designed to keep people from hitting the gas dispensers, while at the same time the customer is aware of the type of protection that UDF is providing. The bollards used are relatively high so someone smaller in stature can see the top of the bollard, and the color yellow is used to heighten awareness. Mr. Johnston explained they tried using stainless before, but when the bollard becomes damaged it will begin to rust. The stainless would also be severely damaging to a vehicle. Mr. Johnston said he would be willing to paint the bollards white as was suggested even though they will show all the scratch marks more easily. He also prefers to use the u-shaped bollards because of the fit for the situation. In regards to the number of bollards in front of the store, Mr. Johnston said the importance is to make sure a car cannot get between the bollards to damage the structure or injure people. Spacing the bollards further apart might be okay, but typically he positions the bollards in line with the mullions. Mr. Hofmann suggested extending the brick further out but Mr. Johnston said that would also be problematic to repair. Mr. Johnston said the bollards have been very successful in the past, and the patio with outdoor seating also needs the same protection. Mr. Hofmann explained a brick wall would not only be a psychological divide but the bollards could also be placed inside the wall. Mr. Hofmann said he agreed with the chairman about the number of bollards. He felt a reduced number of bollards would still be effective. Mr. Johnston said if he placed the bollards six feet apart, a car would be able to drive in between the bollards. He said unfortunately, the stores have had these types of accidents happen in great numbers. Mrs. Holcombe agreed there were too many bollards. Mr. Johnston said he wished the Board members could visit one of the newer stores. He felt the UDF store located at Demorest and Clime Roads would be the closest to view. Mr. Johnston said he will look at the issue.

Mr. Hofmann appreciated the changes on the inside, but felt the impact to the front elevation was negative. Mr. Johnston explained the location of the beverage area and wanting to hide the equipment. Mr. Coulter suggested the glass panels could still match those west of the door, but with spandrel glass on the bottom portion. Mr. Hofmann said or the whole façade could be reworked. Mr. Johnston was not convinced spandrel glass was a good solution. Mrs. Holcombe said the elevation does not look correct even though there were changes to the interior. Mr. Coulter explained there still needs to be some tweaking done to the final details, but this will not hold up the building permit and moving forward.

Mr. Reis said he did not have a problem with the number of bollards, especially if they were painted to match the brick. He also said the UDF stores are easily identifiable and would like to see UDF comply with Worthington's signage regulations.

Mr. Foust expressed concern with lighting, especially under the canopy. Mr. Johnston said they will be using a flush panel LED and complying with the photometrics the Board has required. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

Mrs. Bitar asked for clarification on the elevation concerns. Mr. Hofmann said it feels there has been a reaction to the interior, but not a concern for the exterior. Mr. Coulter suggested the application could be tabled, but Mrs. Bitar said if the plans are not approved in some form a building permit cannot be issued.

Mr. Sauer tried to determine how many bollards would be appropriate so the applicant would have guidance. Mr. Coulter said his preference was they be cut by 1/3. Mrs. Bitar asked for clarification about what level the lamps will be and Mr. Johnston said the company prefers using 4000k, and platinum lamp poles. Mrs. Bitar suggested black lamp poles because the color would make the poles less noticeable. She said the motion can exclude lighting and the applicant can have that discussion later.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY UNITED DAIRY FARMERS, INC. TO EXTEND AND AMEND AR #45-14 TO CONSTRUCT A NEW GASOLINE/CONVENIENCE STORE STATION AT 2182 WEST DUBLIN-GRANVILLE RD., AS PER CASE NO. AR 128-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 128-16, DATED OCTOBER 28, 2016, BE APPROVED, , AND BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING WITH THE FOLLOWING AMENDMENTS:

- **THE BOLLARDS AT THE GAS PUMPS BE PAINTED WHITE**
- **THE BOLLARDS IN THE FRONT OF THE STORE, THE EAST SIDE OF THE FRONT ELEVATION AND THE LIGHT POLES AND FIXTURES ARE EXCLUDED FROM THIS APPROVAL.**

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.

b. Solar Panels – **661 Evening St.** (Allen Eiger & Joanne Dole) **AR 129-16**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Page 24 of 29

ARB/MPC Meeting December 8, 2016

Minutes

Background & Request:

This ranch style house was built in 1955 and is not a contributing structure in the Worthington Historic District. The homeowner would like to add solar panels to the roof.

Project Details:

1. The owner is proposing the addition of 17 solar panels – 12 on the rear of the gabled roof and 5 on the south side of the front gable above the garage. The number and placement of panels would achieve the efficiency and productivity goals of the homeowners.
2. The panels would be black, placed on the slope of the gray roof sitting several inches above the roof shingles.

Land Use Plans:Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

In 2011, Sustainable Features were added as a review element in the Architectural Review District to encourage sustainable design and building practices, while preserving the character and integrity of the Architectural Review District. It is recommended to place solar panels in a location that minimizes the visual impact as seen from the right-of-way and surrounding properties. Generally, panels should be located on roofs in the following manner: the rear 50% of the roof of the main building; the rear inside quadrant of the roof of a main building on a corner lot; or on accessory structures in the rear yard. On sloped roofs, place panels flush along the roof unless visibility is decreased with other placement.

Staff Analysis and Recommendation:

Ideally all of the panels needed for this project would be placed on the rear of the house. If it is necessary to place 5 panels on the front to make the project viable, placement on the south side of the east-west gable should have the least visual impact of any location on the front of the house. Panels that have the lowest possible profile above the roof should be used. Sustainable practices were meant to be encouraged in the District, and not every property is in a position to have solar panels placed in a location that minimizes visual impact.

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar swore in additional people that arrived for the meeting. Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Ms. Joanne Dole, of 661 Evening St., Worthington, Ohio, said she is the property owner and looks forward to adding solar panels to her home. She said when the Worthington Solar Co-Op started, she attended the meeting and decided to use the contractor that was selected by the Co-Op. The solar contractor was present at the meeting to help answer technical questions. Mrs. Dole said she would like to have five of the panels on the south side of her home to get the maximum solar production.

Mr. Foust said the Board members have looked at various types of technologies and improved products throughout Worthington to fit in through the historical district such as sky lights, and the Board came up with design guidelines to place the sky lights on the back portion of the roof on the homes whenever possible, and the same with satellite dishes. He said the Board also has strict

requirements of air conditioners. Mr. Foust explained the Board has also supported the use of a newer material called Hardi-plank, instead of aluminum or vinyl siding, because of its durability. The Board has also been very restrictive about plastic fencing and they have been very careful as to where that can occur. He said he puts solar panels in that same category. Mr. Foust said he does not know of anyone within the community that is opposed to the idea of solar panels in general or clean energy but over time they have come up with some good compromises. He feels this is a good time to set some guidelines for solar panels in the historical district. Mr. Foust said he would like to see all of the panels on the rear of the home. He said the ARB Board members are charged with representing the Architectural Review Board Design Guidelines to the community. He said there might be room for compromise. He would like to see all seventeen solar panels placed on the rear of the home, but he realizes that may not be the most productive place for the panels. As an alternative spot, he suggested placing the solar panels on the flat roof part of the home. Mr. Coulter said he would like to take the opposite view. He asked Mrs. Bitar to show the photographs of the home down the street that recently had solar panels approved. Mr. Coulter said he could understand Mr. Foust's viewpoint if the house was one of the contributing properties but this is not an older home. He said driving down the street you really cannot tell there are solar panels on the roof. Mr. Coulter said the new technology for solar panels are thinner, smaller and much more powerful than the older panels. He explained that he lives across the street from this house and he does not have a problem with the addition of solar panels. Mr. Coulter said he would like to know if panels were not able to be placed on the south side of the home, would the panels on the back side of the home produce enough power to equal the power as if placed on the south side of the home. Mr. Robert Cisco, of 3100 St. Rt. 187, London, Ohio, said he is the owner of Ohio Power Solutions. Mr. Coulter asked if the southern panels were moved to the western side of the house, would they generate the same amount of energy. Mr. Cisco said there could be a reduction as much as 16 percent for the output of energy.

Mr. Hofmann asked if there would be any energy reduction if the panels were placed on the flat portion of the roof. Mr. Cisco said he was not sure if that area could handle the weight of the panels. Mr. Hofmann said he is concerned about setting a precedent in the district. Mr. Sauer suggested approving this application and see what the roof looks like after completion. If the Board members disagree with the structure they could develop guidelines of how to move forward with other homes which might want solar panels. Mr. Foust agreed with Mr. Sauer about setting up some guidelines. Mr. Brown said there were some guidelines set up in 2011. Mrs. Lloyd said she did not have a problem with the five panels being placed on the south façade because she did not feel the panels will be very visible.

Mrs. Holcombe said she does not want to see a precedent set and mentioned she did not vote in favor of the previous home on Evening St. being approved. She preferred the panels to be placed on the back of the home. Mr. Reis agreed the panels would look best on the back of the applicant's home. Mr. Foust asked how much of an impact the panels will have on the electric bill and Mr. Cisco said possibly an 88% reduction on the electric bill. He said residential investors of the solar paneling system usually recoup their investment within about eight years. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and a few people raised their hands.

Mr. Bill McDonald, of 631 Seabury Dr., Worthington, Ohio, said he was excited to talk about solar energy because he and his wife just installed solar panels on their house. He said they have a 5.7 kilowatt system on three roof tops, two of which face south. Mr. McDonald said the south facing roof panels are very important for energy efficiency. He said he empathizes with the views from Mr. Foust and the others with their roles as ARB members because the precedent is set. The Board already approved a house on Evening St. that has east facing panels, and there are several letters of support. Mr. McDonald urged the Board members to support his neighbor's application to have south facing solar panels.

Mrs. Marybeth McDonald, of 631 Seabury Dr., Worthington, Ohio, is also in support of her neighbor's solar panels. She felt the panels will only be marginally visible from the street.

Ms. Joanne Leussing, of 613 Evening St., Worthington, Ohio, said she is the home owner with the solar panels facing Evening St. She is in support of her neighbor's solar panel project, and said she has never received a negative complaint about her solar panels from any of her neighbors. Ms. Leussing said she likes to address climate change with renewable energy. She was happy to address questions at the past 4th of July event about how she liked her panels. Ms. Leussing said her electric bill has also been greatly reduced. She reiterated her support for her neighbor's project and urged the Board to approve the application. Mr. Hofmann asked Ms. Leussing if her home is a contributing home and she said no, her home was built in 1958.

Ty Wait, of 324 Weydon Rd., Worthington, Ohio, said he is also in support of the solar panel project.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY ALLEN EIGER AND JOANNE DOLE FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO ADD SOLAR PANELS AT 661 EVENING ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 129-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 129-16, DATED NOVEMBER 7, 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, nay; Mr. Reis, aye; Mr. Hofmann, nay; Mrs. Lloyd, aye; and Mr. Foust, nay. The motion was approved.

c. Fence – **215 E. Granville Rd.** (Rebecca Ament) **AR 130-16**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This property is 57' wide and 192' deep, with a two-story house built in 1853 fronting on E. Granville Rd. At the rear of the property there is a 12' strip that gives access from Plymouth St. to a two-car detached garage constructed in the early 2000's.

This request is to replace the existing picket fence at the rear of the property.

Project Details:

1. The fence would run from the southwest corner of the house west to the property line and head south about 71', stopping and starting again at a tree on the property line. At the south end, the fence would go around the drive to the garage. Small sections would connect the garage and the house to the existing fence owned by the neighbors to the east. Gates are proposed at the northeast, northwest and southwest corners.
2. The proposed cedar fence would be 42" high with pickets that taper down at the posts. The picket width would be 4" and there would be 2" spacing between the pickets. The fence would be left a natural cedar color.

Land Use Plans:Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

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

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Ms. Rebecca Ament, of 215 E. Granville Rd., Worthington, Ohio, handed out a drawing which listed the types of fencing her neighbors have, along with the measurement of picket spacing for each fence. Mr. Sauer said he did not have a problem with the fence as proposed considering the similarity of the fences on the abutting properties. Mr. Hofmann said he was concerned about setting a precedent since the fence would be facing Granville Rd. Ms. Ament said she has two small dogs and wants to make sure they are contained within the yard. There was further discussion about picket spacing, but the Board realized the spacing was adequate. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak either for or against this matter and no one came forward.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending modification of this application to have the spacing between the pickets equal to the picket width to create an open style fence as is called for in the Design Guidelines.

Motion:

Mr. Hofmann moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY REBECCA AMENT FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO CONSTRUCT A FENCE AT 215 E. GRANVILLE RD. AS PER CASE NO. AR 130-16, DRAWINGS NO. AR 130-16, 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.

D. Other

There was no other business to discuss.

E. Adjournment

Mr. Hofmann moved to adjourn the meeting and Mr. Reis seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 10:09 p.m.