



MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
WORTHINGTON ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
WORTHINGTON MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION
May 25, 2017

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; Thomas Reis, Vice-Chair; Kathy Holcombe, Secretary; Amy Lloyd (arrived at 7:22 p.m.); and David Foust. Also present were: Lynda Bitar, Planning Coordinator and Clerk of the Municipal Planning Commission and Melissa Cohan, Paralegal (arrived at 7:06 p.m.) Commission member Tom Reis and Scott Myers, Worthington City Council Representative to the Municipal Planning Commission, were absent.

A. Call to Order – 7:00 p.m.

1. Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Approval of minutes of the May 11, 2017 meeting

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

4. Affirmation/swearing in of witnesses

B. Architectural Review Board

1. Sign – **634 High St.** (Kasa Yoga and Wellness) **AR 32-17** (Request for Reconsideration)

Mrs. Holcombe moved to reconsider this application and Mr. Hofmann seconded the motion. All members voted Aye to reconsider the application.

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

At the May 11th ARB meeting, Kasa Yoga and Wellness made a request to install a 32" wide x 24" high wall sign on the 1820's portion of the lodge building, to the right of the front door. The

business is planning to move to the lodge from its current location at 693 ½ High St. A reduction in size was discussed for the sign, and the Board ultimately approved a 22” wide x 10” high sign to match the sign at the original location. A brown border rather than blue was also approved.

The applicant tried the smaller sign (pictured in the packet) and felt it was too small, so is now asking for the application to be reconsidered so a sign that is sized between the original and the approved can be discussed. A motion to reconsider the application must be approved before discussion.

Project Details:

1. A 28” wide x 16” high sign is now proposed.
2. There is a stone marker on the building commemorating the erection date that is 30” wide x 20” high.
3. The sign would be constructed of sandblasted HDU, and would identify the business name, “kasa Yoga and Wellness”, and a logo. The proposed sign would have a white background, and aqua, orange and brown raised elements. The raised border is proposed to be brown.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

The Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance recommend signs be efficient and compatible with the age and architecture of the building. Use of traditional sign materials such as painted wood, or material that looks like painted wood, is the most appropriate material for projecting and wall signs. Be efficient in using signs. Consider the audience – small signs can cater to pedestrians and can provide plenty of information in a small area. Try to use as few and as small signs as are necessary to get the business message across to the public.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending approval of the sign as the proposed size would fit appropriately to the right of the door and be smaller than the commemorative marker. The proposed material would look like painted wood and be in character with the building and Old Worthington.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Ms. Katherine Yannucci, 7122 Bluffstream Ct., Columbus, Ohio, said she is the owner of Kasa Yoga and Wellness. She would like the Board members to reconsider the size of her sign because she placed the sign up against the building and believed the sign looked awkward. Ms. Yannucci said she would like the sign to be a little larger. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present to speak for or against this application and no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Hofmann moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY KATHERINE YANNUCCI OF KASA YOGA AND WELLNESS FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL A WALL

SIGN AT 634 HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 32-17, DRAWINGS NO. AR 32-17, DATED MAY 12, 2017, 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; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Sauer; Mr. Hofmann; and Mr. Foust, abstained. The motion was approved.

C. Architectural Review Board – New

1. Lighting – **649 High St. (The Worthington Inn) AR 45-17**

Findings of fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

The Worthington Inn was first used as a commercial building in the mid 1800's, after being constructed as a residence in 1834. In the 1980's, the original building was restored and an addition was constructed to house guests. In 2005, approval was given to convert the inn rooms to residential condominiums. At the time, balconies and carports were added at the rear of the site to make those units more marketable. Garage doors were approved in 2015 to enclose four of the carport parking spaces. The Worthington Inn is a contributing building in the Worthington Historic District.

In recent years, Bradford Pear trees were removed from the tree lawn along W. New England Ave. by the City. The property owner had some lighting associated with those trees that helped illuminate the sidewalk, that will no longer work without the trees. This application is a request for the addition of wall light fixtures to illuminate the sidewalk and highlight the building.

Project Details:

1. Six bronze canister shaped fixtures are proposed along the south wall of the Worthington Inn. The fixtures are in two sizes, both of which use 7 watt LED bulbs. On the two-story part of the wall, 3 fixtures would light up and down. For the lower part of the wall, 3 fixtures would light down only. A conduit painted to match the building would provide power.
2. Fixtures with 2700K LED flood lights are proposed toward the edge of the front balcony to illuminate the building.
3. The applicant installed the lighting to see what it looks like, and is now asking for approval.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Lighting: Use of fairly small lighting fixtures, and as few as possible, is recommended. Fixtures should not be overly ornate. Simple and smaller usually is better. Avoid excessive brightness.

Recommendation:

Staff feels the nighttime effect of the lighting is appropriate, but wishes the fixtures and conduit on the south wall were less noticeable during the day.

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar made a correction about a statement in the staff memo. The lamps to be used will have 7 watt bulbs instead of 75 watt bulbs. Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Kevin Showe, the owner of the Worthington Inn, said for the past thirty-five years they have been trying to deal with illumination issues. The main entrance to the building is on New England Avenue and there are safety issues with the lack of lighting and difficult for elderly patrons to get into the building. He said they used to have flood lights, but the light created problems for the diners. Mr. Showe said that some of the diners thought the restaurant was closed because the lighting was so dim. He said he wanted to light up the building to highlight the architecture, and so the pathway will be safer for patrons to walk to the main entry door. This will also improve the building's energy efficiency. Mr. Coulter commended Mr. Showe for the work he is doing but said he should have come to the Board to ask for permission before installing the lighting. He also said the conduit should not be exposed and felt the fixtures were not congruent with the age of the building. Mr. Coulter asked if there was a different way to light the building without showing the conduit, and if another type of fixture would be more appropriate and architecturally fitting for the building. Mr. Showe said the building was constructed between 1831 and 1852, and there are three layers of brick, plus on the inside there is a two by four wall, then dry wall and interior finishing. In order to put the conduit inside the building there would be a substantial amount of cost to go through all the layers of the building as well as interior repairs. Mr. Showe said doing the work that way would be very disruptive to his business and much more expensive. He said they are currently updating the exterior of the building and plan to paint the conduit to match the skin of the building.

Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Foust if he knew of an architectural detail that could be used to hide the conduit. Mr. Foust said he abstained from this application, but suggested putting the vertical conduit next to the downspout to help hide the conduit. Mrs. Holcombe said she agreed with Mr. Coulter and was not sure that just painting the conduit would make a difference. Mr. Showe said he surveyed the downtown historic area and conduits are prevalent everywhere. Mr. Coulter said Mr. Showe has done such a great job taking care of this building he just wanted to make sure he does not take a step backwards regarding the lighting. Mr. Showe said they had lighting in conjunction with the street trees but the City removed all the Bradford Pear trees without notice. Mr. Hofmann said it might be possible to use a belt in some way along the horizontal edge to hide the conduit, possibly using painted wood. Mr. Showe said he felt the use of a band on a federal style of building would not look appropriate. Mr. Hofmann said he liked the use of the up and down lighting he just had an issue with the execution. Mr. Showe said he looked at the lighting used on the Dewey's Pizza building and tried doing something similar. He said he looked at some traditional fixtures but they did not have the up and down lighting option. Mr. Sauer agreed the conduit needs to be minimized but he was not certain how that should be done. He said he did like the look of the lighting at night, and appreciated what Mr. Showe is trying to do. Mr. Sauer

suggested painting the fixtures the same color as the building. Mrs. Lloyd agreed and thought the conduit should be minimized and the fixtures could possibly be painted to match the building.

Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application.

Mr. Kevin Rohyans, 8 Sessions Dr., Columbus, Ohio, said they originally thought about using the same lights as Dewey's Pizza, but their lights looked a little too modern. They felt the lights they picked out would not draw attention to the lamp itself, but what the lighting could do. Mr. Rohyans said there is no other way to connect to the electricity without damaging the interior of the building.

Ms. Debbie Cameron, 266 E. Dublin-Granville Rd., Worthington, Ohio, suggested adding three post lights similar to what the City of Worthington already uses, or the use of Boston ivy to help hide the conduit.

Ms. Catherine Yannucci, 7122 Bluffstream Ct., Columbus, Ohio, suggested adding flower boxes to help hide the conduit.

Mr. Showe said he would have the fixtures painted and also see what other fixtures are available with the up and down lighting. Mr. Showe asked to table the application.

Mr. Sauer moved to table the application, and it was seconded by Mrs. Holcombe. All Board members voted, "Aye."

2. Building Color Modification – **2145-2185 W. Dublin-Granville Rd.** (George Sourvanos)
AR 36-17

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This shopping center was originally constructed in the 1950's, with a major addition and renovation completed in the late 1980's. At that time, the storefronts and signs were approved in a uniform manner. Over the years, many amendments have been approved including the addition of a gable at the east end, the addition of a patio, and multiple sign changes. In 2008, the eastern half of the building was approved for a facelift including new fascia and a change to the sign styles. In 2009, Cameron's was approved to paint its space a different color. Approval of this request would allow the entire center to be repainted.

Project Details:

1. The main building color is proposed to be Stonehenge Greige, with lighter Moth Gray for the trim and darker Sleeping Giant for the sign bands.
2. Sleeping Giant is also proposed for Cameron's, Sbarro and Up-towne Flowers.
3. The fascia is proposed as all one color (Sleeping Giant), and the Allstate sign would be removed.

Land Use Plans:Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Avoid using too many colors on a building. Consider using light and dark shades of the same color when choosing body and trim colors.

Recommendations:

The proposed color palette is appropriate for this building and location.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present and Mr. Billy Lafogiannis, 2425 N. High St., Columbus, Ohio, came forward. He showed a new rendering with all 3 gables and the adjacent walls, and the sign bands as the darker Sleeping Giant, the main building color Stonehenge Greige and the trim Moth Grey. Mr. Sauer asked what color the bottom of the soffit would be and Mr. Lafogiannis said the soffit and storefront trim would be painted "Moth Grey." Mr. Coulter asked if all three buildings, including Cameron's, would be painted "Sleeping Giant", and Mr. Lafogiannis said yes. Mr. Coulter asked if anyone else would like to speak either about this application. Keith Morehead, manager of Cameron's restaurant said while they like standing out with a different color, he thinks the proposed look will be an improvement. Mr. Sauer asked about the west and south sides. Mr. Lafogiannis said the south will be "Sleeping Giant. Ms. Nicki Sourvanos, 2425 N. High St., Columbus, Ohio, stated the rest of the back of the building will be painted Stonehenge Greige. Mr. Sauer asked if all the appurtenances on the back could be painted to match the building color. Ms. Sourvanos said they will consider doing that.

Motion:

Mr. Hofmann moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY GEORGE SOURVANOS FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO PAINT THE BUILDING AT 2145-2185 W. DUBLIN-GRANVILLE RD., AS PER CASE NO. AR 36-17, DRAWINGS NO. AR 36-17, DATED MARCH 8, 2017, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING WITH THE FOLLOWING CLARIFICATIONS:

- **THAT THE THREE PEDIMENT FRONTS WILL ALL BE PAINTED SLEEPING GIANT;**
- **THAT THE SIGN BANDS BE PAINTED SLEEPING GIANT;**
- **THAT THE MAIN BODY COLOR WILL BE STONEHENGE GREY AND WILL EXTEND AROUND THE BACK OF THE BUILDING;**

- **THAT THE TRIM AND ROOF FASCIA WILL BE MOTH GREY**
- **THAT THESE CONDITIONS WILL BE FOR BOTH EAST AND WEST ENDS OF THE BUILDING;**
- **THAT THE ALL STATE SIGN WILL BE REMOVED.**

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

3. Fencing – **561 Oxford St.** (Pelham Johnston & Eve Warnock) **AR 37-17**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This property is on the west side of Oxford St., four houses north of South St. The 44.86' wide lot is 150' deep and adjacent to an alley at the rear. The Homestead style house was constructed in the early 1900's and is a contributing property in the Worthington Historic District. The applicants would like to add fencing to enclose the property.

Project Details:

1. There is existing fencing on the south side of the property. This proposal would replace that fencing, and add fencing to the north side and between the garage and the side property lines. Fencing closer than 30' to the front property line would require a variance. The fencing is proposed to meet the front corners of the house which is 22' from the property line.
2. The existing wood fence has dog-eared pickets that are wider than the spacing between. The proposed dog-eared picket fence would be 4' high, and would have openings between pickets 3.75" and pickets 3.75" wide.

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.

Recommendation:

Placement outside of the required 30' front yard would be more appropriate.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Ms. Eve Warnock, of 561 Oxford St., Worthington, Ohio, said she wants to build the fence to keep her children safe. She has three large shade trees in the rear, so needs the sunlight on the south side of the house for the garden. She would like to

keep that fence even with the front of the house, but will move the fence on the north side to 30' from the front property line. Ms. Warnock said she has spoken with her neighbors on all sides of the property. To the rear, they will move the fence on the south side of the garage further east to allow the neighbor room to maneuver out of his property.

Mr. Foust explained to Ms. Warnock that the open space between the pickets needs to be at least as wide as the pickets. Mr. Sauer explained the horizontal members of the fence will face inwards towards her property and she said she understood both points. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

Motion:

Mrs. Holcombe moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY PELHAM JOHNSTON & EVE WARNOCK FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL FENCING AT 561 OXFORD ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 37-17, DRAWINGS NO. AR 37-17, DATED MAY 25, 2017, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

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

4. Additional Wall Sign – **7166 N. High St.** (Rodney Walker/Blaze Pizza) **AR 38-17**
(Amendment to AR 16-17)

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This commercial building was constructed in 2002, and the last original tenant, COSI, closed last year. The current tenants are Starbucks, Immediadent, Jimmy John's and SportClips. At the time of development, the building owner agreed to a unified theme for signage and awnings which included similar sizes, coordinated colors, and internally illuminated channel letters. Text styles were allowed to be different. As tenants have changed over the years, the basic premise of the sign package has been followed, except a larger variety of colors has been allowed. Currently, the signs are red, blue, green, white and black. The awnings, which were light and dark shades of burgundy, but now have been changed to black.

Blaze Pizza is moving into the former COSI space at the south end and received approval in February for signage, outdoor furniture, a CO₂ tank with enclosure, and to change the awnings and trash cans if those for the rest of the building change also. The signs approved were a wall sign on the front, and a projection sign on the side. Now the applicant would like to change the side

sign to another wall sign. The Board of Zoning Appeals approved two sign for the business, but did not specify which style needed to be used.

Project Details:

1. The sign on the front of the space (facing N. High St.) consists of individually mounted, 2' 3 ½" high internally illuminated orange channel letters spelling "BLAZE PIZZA". An orange logo is next to the name, as are 10 ½" letters saying "FAST-FIRE'D".
2. Previously, a 3' diameter projection sign was approved for the south side of the building. The sign would have been orange and internally illuminated, with white lettering saying "BLAZE PIZZA". Placement would have been on the easternmost sign band on the south side of the building.
3. Instead of the projection sign, the applicant is now proposing a wall sign on the westernmost sign band on the south side of the building. The sign would be similar to the front sign, with individually mounted internally illuminated orange letters and logo, but the size and arrangement would be different. The height of "BLAZE PIZZA" would be 2' with the logo between the words, and "FAST-FIRE'D" would be 5" high and mounted above.

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. 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. Exposed raceways or wiring are not desirable. The Architectural District Ordinance calls for design and materials to be compatible.

Wilson Bridge Corridor

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.
- Businesses occupying 25% or more of a building on a parcel abutting more than one Right-of-Way may have a wall sign facing each Right-of-Way.
- Businesses occupying 25% or more of a building abutting the I-270 Right-of-Way may have a wall sign facing each Right-of-Way. Such signs may have a non-illuminated background up to 200 square feet in area. The graphic portion of such signs shall not exceed 100 square feet in area.
- 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.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending denial of this application. The previously approved projection sign is more appropriate than a second wall sign in this location. Per the Wilson Bridge Corridor Code language, neither would be allowed for this business because it does not occupy 25% or more of the building. The two wall signs are very similar and would be seen simultaneously from many locations, which is not necessary.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Alex Brussow 21 Elmwood St., Grand Rapids, Michigan, said he measured the building to be 9,017 square feet and their leased space is 2,815 square feet from the outer dimension of the walls, which equals 31.2 % of the building's space. Mr. Coulter explained the Architectural Review Board (ARB) does not typically approve of two wall signs, but there have been exceptions. Mr. Coulter said he drove by the business recently one evening and believes if a second wall sign is approved the sign should be moved over near the entry door versus being on the corner. Mr. Foust said because of the location, he believes a second wall sign would be helpful to know the business is there, but should be on the eastern sign band. Mr. Sauer said he does not want to see more signage on the building, he felt there is already enough signage for the business.

Motion:

Mr. Hofmann moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY RODNEY WALKER ON BEHALF OF BLAZE PIZZA TO AMEND CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS #AR 16-17 BY INSTALLING A WALL SIGN INSTEAD OF A PROJECTION SIGN AT 7166 N. HIGH ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 38-17, DRAWINGS NO. AR 38-17, DATED MAY 8, 2017, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING WITH THE AMENDMENT THAT THE SECOND WALL SIGN BE LOCATED ABOVE THE SECOND BAY TO THE EAST ON THE SITE.

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

5. Screened Porch – **106 E. New England Ave.** (Epic Group Ohio/Schuette) **AR 39-17**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This Bungalow style house was constructed in 1866 and is a contributing property in the Worthington Historic District. In the late 1980's, a rear room addition and a deck were constructed. The current owners would like to enclose the deck with screen walls.

Project Details:

1. The applicant is proposing the use of T1-11 siding for the bottom of the walls, with wood trim and framing for the screens on top. The siding and trim are proposed to be painted white to match the trim on the house. The existing deck and stairs would remain.
2. A hipped roof structure is proposed that would cover the deck and tie in with the existing roof, creating a flat roof area adjacent to the house. New asphalt shingles are proposed for the sloped roof areas, and the flat roof would be covered with a membrane.
3. New gutters, downspouts and roof vents would also be included.

Land Use Plans:Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

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

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending approval of this application. The conversion of the deck into a screened porch is appropriate and the design is complimentary to the house.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Bob Dyas, 180 S. Riverview St., Dublin, Ohio, said he is the general contractor for the project, but the home owner is also with him to answer questions. Mr. Dyas said his architect was able to make a double hipped roof for the screened porch which will be trimmed in cedar and painted white like the house. Mr. Foust asked if the existing roof section would be re-roofed and Mr. Dyas said yes. Mrs. Holcombe said she loves the front porch and thinks this porch will be great. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak either for or against this application but no one came forward.

Motion:

Mrs. Holcombe moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY BOB DYAS OF EPIC GROUP OHIO ON BEHALF OF ROVIN SCHUETTE FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO ENCLOSE THE DECK AS A SCREENED PORCH TO THE REAR OF THE HOUSE AT 106 E. NEW ENGLAND AVE. AS PER CASE NO. AR 39-17, DRAWINGS NO. AR 39-17, DATED MAY 11, 2017, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

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

5. Front Door – **266 E. Granville Rd.** (Debbie Cameron & Bill McCarthy) **AR 40-17**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This two-story house was constructed in 2001 on a roughly 0.5 acre lot which is 96' wide. The house is 60' from the front property line. The structure has a brick façade, with vinyl lap siding on the sides and rear. In March of this year, the owners received approval to construct a detached garage and add features to the existing garage. This request is to replace the front door.

Project Details:

1. The existing door is a 6 panel metal door, painted gray, with a transom above and sidelights.
2. Proposed is an 8' fiberglass door with a curved panel on top, and a rectangular panel on the bottom, both made to look like wood planks. The door would have a prefinished cherry grain with a walnut stain. Divided side lights are proposed on each side.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

For newer buildings, simpler designed doors usually look better than more ornate ones. Avoid heavy ornamentation on doors and entrances. Design and materials should be compatible with the existing structure.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending approval of this application. The proposed door is appropriate for this house.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Ms. Debbie Cameron and Mr. Bill McCarthy, of 266 E. Granville Rd., Worthington, Ohio, said they are eliminating the transom and installing an 8' door. 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. Hofmann moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY DEBBIE CAMERON & BILL MCCARTHY FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS REPLACE THE FRONT DOOR AT 266 E. GRANVILLE RD., AS PER CASE NO. AR 40-17, DRAWINGS NO. AR 40-17, DATED MAY 11, 2017, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

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

6. Deck – **6162 Maxton Pl.** (Lee Fischer) **AR 43-17**

Findings of fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This two-story house was constructed in 2003 on the second lot north of E. Granville Rd. on the east side of Maxton Place. The property owner would like to construct a deck to the rear.

Project Details:

1. The proposed deck is about 30' wide x ~16' deep. The deck would wrap around an existing 3-season room and have stairs to exit at the northeast corner.
2. Construction of the deck would be with pressure treated pine, and a pre-built kit with wood rails and black aluminum pickets.
3. The deck floor would match the height of the 3-season room, which is about 24" above grade per the property owner. Because that height is not more than 3' above the adjacent grade, and the railing is not more than 4' high, a variance would not be needed to extend into the required 30' rear yard.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

There are recommendations in the Worthington Design Guidelines for additions and decks to be located as far to the rear as possible. Design and materials should be compatible with the existing structure.

Code Section 1149.06 (c)

Uncovered floor areas such as patios, decks and similar structures accessory to a dwelling shall be permitted to within not less than fifteen feet of the rear lot line provided that the floor level of the structure shall be not more than three feet above the adjacent grade prior to construction of the structure, and provided that railings, screens, posts or other enclosures shall project not more than four feet above the floor surface of the structure.

Recommendations:

The proposed railing style is not typical of those seen on decks in the Architectural Review District.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Lee Fischer, of 6162 Maxton Pl., Worthington, Ohio, said he wanted to clarify the deck will be approximately 24" above grade. He said he will seal the deck but does not plan to use stain. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Sauer moved:

Page 13 of 22

ARB/MPC Meeting May 25, 2017

Minutes

THAT THE REQUEST BY LEE FISCHER FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL A DECK AT 6162 MAXTON PL. AS PER CASE NO. AR 43-17, DRAWINGS NO. AR 43-17, DATED MAY 12, 2017, 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; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Sauer, aye; Mr. Hofmann, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye; and Mr. Foust, aye. The motion was approved.

7. Building Renovations – **25 W. New England Ave.** (Darin Ranker/ CBRS Worthington LLC)
AR 42-17

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This two-story commercial building was constructed in the late 1930's on a 50' x 135' parcel, which is in the C-5 Zoning District. The building covers most of the lot, with some greenspace in the front and a sidewalk along the west side. It is a contributing property in the Worthington Historic District. The building was reportedly constructed as a switch station, but was used most recently as office space, with the Worthington Chamber of Commerce occupying the first floor. The new owner, CBRS Worthington LLC, purchased the building at the end of 2016 and is planning to renovate the structure for use as the office for Datafield Technology Services. The applicant is requesting approval for those renovations which would include: replacement and addition of windows; the addition of a porch and balcony; new entrances; and a new roof.

Project Details:

1. Front:

Changes proposed for the front façade would give a different look for the building. The applicant would like to bring it more in line with Federal style architecture. Proposed for the front is a three-bay rather than the existing four-bay façade, with the entrance moving to the center, rather than off to the east side. The existing 8 over 8 double hung windows would be replaced with taller fixed 12-light black aluminum windows with 3-light transoms above (first floor only) or an inset brick detail (second floor only), and a precast stone header. The doors proposed for both floors would have similar treatment above and include sidelights, with the doors being all glass with black frames.

An 8'8" wide front porch is proposed with concrete steps leading to the front door. The base of the porch would be brick with a precast stone cap, and the railing would be black metal in a criss-cross pattern similar to the existing gate across the sidewalk west of the building. It is not clear how the top rails would look. For the second floor a balcony is proposed that appears to be about 5' wide. The balcony would likely have a matching

railing, although the elevation has the look of a smaller pattern in addition to the larger pattern. The fascia and soffits would be trimmed with black aluminum.

Brick detail is proposed at the corners and between the doors and windows, with precast stone panels near the tops and with light fixtures at the first floor level.

2. Roof:

The existing asphalt roof is proposed to be replaced with a standing seam zinc roof in Glacier Gray. Black soffits are proposed, with the fascia to be Skyline Steel and the gutters to be Glacier Gray.

A vinyl fence in Arctic Blend is proposed to screen the equipment at the rear of the roof.

3. Side and Rear Elevations:

Thin brick veneer is proposed to be added to the rear of the building, to match the existing brick as closely as possible. Precast stone banding and new downspouts would help divide the walls, facilitating the transition between the old and new brick.

On the west side, all of the windows are proposed for replacement with the same 12-light windows as in the front, and nine additional windows are proposed. A door toward the rear would be removed. On the east side, all three windows are proposed for replacement with front two windows to be 12-light and the rear window to have 6 lights. A door toward the front would be removed.

On the rear, the two second floor double hung windows would be replaced with a double hung 6 over 6 window and an awning 6-light window. Both appear to be operable. A horizontal window with 6 lights is proposed for the first floor. A new door is proposed on the rear elevation with a standing seam black awning above. An existing railing at the rear steps to the basement would be painted black.

4. Examples of other locations with similar architectural treatment are included in the packet.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

- **Windows:** If windows are missing or must be replaced, use new windows of the same size, design and profile (cross-section), to the greatest extent possible; wood windows are preferred.
- **Roofing:** When doing roof system repairs, retain historic materials as much as possible; when replacement is necessary, try to match the historic materials.
- **Building Color:** As is the case with some of Worthington's houses, the use of white or cream-colored trim on brick commercial buildings is a long tradition.
- **Landscaping:** While the architecture is of prime importance in a commercial district such as Worthington's, landscaping of building sites is also important.
- **Lighting:** Use of fairly small lighting fixtures, and as few as possible, is recommended. Fixtures should not be overly ornate. Simple and smaller usually is better. Avoid excessive brightness.

Recommendations:

Although the proposed would change the look of the building, elements of the renovation are in character with Old Worthington. The proposed fenestration is more typical than the existing, although fixed windows are not recommended. The continuation of brick on the sides and rear

and the addition and stone accents are improvements. Construction of a front patio and balcony could give a more welcoming feel to the building.

As is shown in the photographs submitted with the packet, dark windows have been used in Old Worthington. The black fascia and soffits, and the standing seam metal roof may not be appropriate.

Landscaping should be discussed.

Sign changes would need approval.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Courtland Bishop, 560 Morning St., Worthington, Ohio, said he wants to bring the building back to making it look more like old Worthington and more presentable. The building is not in good shape right now. Mr. Coulter mentioned Mrs. Bitar raised several questions earlier and he would like to hear the responses to those questions. Mr. Bishop said he would look at color ideas for the trim. He said he has lived in the Worthington area for forty-five of his fifty years and appreciates his surroundings and what the Board is responsible for doing. He thought when he did his research that the metal roof seemed appropriate for the building but said he is flexible with whatever the Board recommends. Mr. Darin Ranker and Mr. Chris Jolly, of Carney Ranker Architects, 5925 Wilcox Pl., Dublin, Ohio, said they are going to try to utilize some of the brick from the side of the building to patch into the front part of the building. They will use matching veneer to fill in as replacement. Mr. Sauer asked if the lintels would be cast stone, and Mr. Ranker said yes. Mr. Jolly said there would be steel to reinforce the openings. Mr. Ranker said he had a discussion with City's Building Official, regarding the openings of the windows on the east side and they will likely replace the windows in the same size.

Mr. Hofmann said part of the ARB's charge is determining whether a façade is worth respecting. He feels the face of the building represents a certain era, and the Board should ask the applicant to retain some of the character. Mr. Coulter said if the architecture is significant, there should be minimal change, but he did not feel the building was striking. Mr. Ranker displayed photographs from the late 1960's showing the original one story building, and the two story version that exists today. He said they are trying to base the new character on the original style but with taller windows, the center entrance and the 3-bay façade. Mr. Sauer said he has never liked the building, nor does he feel that just because something is old it deserves to be maintained. Mr. Hofmann said that is the challenge, to decide if the property contributes to a certain era, and whether maintaining the façade or just designing per that era is correct. He felt there are too many elements in the design that would not be accurate based on this era: the brick piers, the lintels, and the railing of the building did not seem like a good combination, and he did not feel a standing seam metal roof would be appropriate. Mr. Sauer said he did not mind seeing a deviation from what is already existing on the building. Mr. Hofmann pointed out the details of the original building, but acknowledged that when it was made two stories it lost some of the charm.

Mr. Foust said he was pleased with the taller windows, but he felt the railings almost looked contemporary as did the larger glass panel doors. He was wrestling with whether the all of the design elements fit together and whether they relate to other structures in the district. Mr. Foust said if it was actually a Federal style with all Federal design elements it would be easier to accept. Mr. Ranker said they tried to liken it to Federal style, feeling that was the closest to what they have. Mrs. Holcombe asked why a balcony is proposed. Mr. Bishop said he and his employees would like to sit on the balcony and be part of the community. Mr. Jolley added it would provide cover for the entrance.

Mr. Coulter said he did not have a problem with the thin brick in this application, but felt some of the other elements were out of character. He mentioned the doors should be divided light. Mrs. Holcombe said she liked addition of windows on the side, but she and Mrs. Lloyd mentioned the combination of the railings, lintels, piers on the front as being too much. Mrs. Holcombe felt the building had more of a contemporary look. Mr. Foust mentioned brick lintels may help, felt the pilasters were not appropriate, and thought faux chimneys would be great. Mr. Hofmann thought there were good design cues from the original building. Mr. Sauer asked if it is helpful to add building elements that have no function. Mr. Foust said yes, because the Board is trying maintain a look and feel for the District in line with Worthington's history. He mentioned the arch from the Griswold Inn could be replicated. Mr. Sauer said he is not in favor of replicating chimneys that have no function.

Mr. Coulter suggested tabling would be an option. Mr. Ranker asked for the Board to table the application.

Mrs. Holcombe moved to table the application, seconded by Ms. Lloyd. All Board members voted, "Aye" and the application was tabled.

8. Addition and Renovations – **529 High St.** (Matthew Althouse/Lennonheads) **AR 44-17**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This 3400 square foot classically detailed commercial structure was constructed in the early 1970's, and is currently home to Lennonheads Salon & Spa. The owner would like to construct an addition on the north and west sides of the building.

Project Details:

1. The addition would expand the building 14' to the west, and enclose much of the covered porch on the north side.
2. On the north side, gables are proposed at both ends that would extend out from the east-west gable on the existing building. The gables would have lap 6" cementitious lap siding which would be painted navy blue. The gable trim is proposed to be white with a light

green accent. The existing gables would be painted to match. All of the brick is proposed to be painted white.

3. Re-roofing the entire building with a dark blue metal roof is proposed. The cupolas and arcade columns and entablature would be eliminated with this proposal.
4. Windows with fixed shutters are proposed on the north and east sides of the building. The north side remaining covered patio area wall would be painted light gray. Two columns would divide the area into three sections, one of which would have a door and two would have storefront windows. The existing door on the east side would be removed, and a new door would likely be added on the west end of the south elevation. Details of the windows and doors are needed.
5. Two potential locations for the dumpster with enclosure are shown on the site plan, at the northwest corner and southeast corners. Details of the enclosure have been requested.
6. Variances would be needed for location of the addition in the required side yard, and placement of the dumpster enclosure in either location.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Construction of an addition to a commercial or institutional building should be approached in the same way as one for an existing home. Such a project involves important design considerations, since an addition can have a major impact on neighboring properties. Include the following considerations when planning an addition to a commercial or institutional building.

- Use exterior materials traditionally used on commercial and institutional buildings in Worthington. These most commonly include brick; frame construction is less common. New materials used on an addition do not necessarily have to match the original materials of an older building -- a frame addition with beveled siding, for example, could be appropriate on a masonry building -- but starkly modern materials such as rough-cut siding, plastics, metal surfaces or painted concrete block should be avoided.
- The addition should be subordinate to the main building. This does not necessarily mean that the addition must be smaller than the original, but it should be designed in a way that it does not overwhelm and dominate the original.
- Some architectural review boards require that additions be designed so that they are easily distinguished from the original building. While this is acceptable in Worthington, the Architectural Review Board does not require it. Matching the original building's design elements in an addition is acceptable.
- Generally, additions should be located as far as possible to the rear of the original building. There may be some instances, however, where building an addition on the front of the original building may be a preferable option. This would especially be true when an addition could replace a front parking lot.
- Paint only surfaces that have been painted before. Stone surfaces were seldom painted originally; painted brick surfaces tend to be more common on commercial buildings than residential. Poor weather resistance or damage to a wall were the usual reasons for painting brick, though sometimes it was just to change the building's look. While unpainted brick or stone should not be painted, if such a surface has been painted in the past, consider re-painting rather than removing the old paint. Avoid using too many

colors on a building. Consider using light and dark shades of the same color when choosing body and trim colors.

- While the architecture is of prime importance in a commercial district such as Worthington's, landscaping of building sites is also important.

Recommendation:

Staff feels the basic style and massing of the resultant structure are appropriate based on the existing building and this location. The proposed roof material and color, painting the brick and the green trim color may not be appropriate. Additional details are needed for the windows and doors.

The southern location for the dumpster may be preferable if the dumpster could be set back from the corner of the building. Details of the dumpster enclosure are needed.

Landscaping should be discussed.

Sign changes would need approval.

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar displayed the revised elevation, which had the entrance off center. Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Matthew Althouse, 855 Grandview Ave., Columbus, Ohio, said they are adding on to the building because of the growth of the salon. He said they will need a variance for the expansion of the west side of the building. They would like to add taller historical looking windows, but minimize the daylight which interferes with the stylists. There will be transoms above some of the fixed internal shutters. All of the windows around the building would be fixed. The cupolas will be removed. The parking lot layout will not be altered. Mr. Althouse did propose two dumpster locations. The current location is tucked behind the building on the west side. Mrs. Holcombe asked who owned the fence, and Mr. Althouse replied the fence belongs to his client. Ms. Jeannie Lennon, 1682 Glen Ave., City of Columbus, Ohio. Mr. Sauer asked Ms. Lennon if she had any conversations with the City about building into the setback area on the side. Ms. Bitar said a variance would be necessary to build the addition.

Mr. Althouse briefly discussed the redesign of the porch area, saying it was based the interior layout. Mr. Hofmann said they should have the contributing conversation about this building also, although it is certainly in need of renovation. He struggled with the porch and feels the design could be handled more sensitively, and ask if the wall could be pushed inward in order to keep the columns going. Mr. Hofmann said he also struggled with the siding on the pediments and their scale, and the water table. Mr. Sauer said he would like the building without the water table. Mr. Foust said he was wondering if the faux shutter look could be carried across the front to avoid the blank wall. He said the building sort of looks like a strip center because of the length of the building. Mr. Hofmann thought retention of the cupolas and board and batten siding may help give it a modern barn look. He referenced the Bungalow House in New Albany.

Ms. Lennon said since she is down the road from all the Frank Lloyd Wright homes, she wondered if she could switch her building to a mid-century look. Mr. Coulter said the look would be a pretty dramatic change. Mr. Hofmann said we are looking for a design done well. Mr. Foust wondered if there could be more interesting window details, or a different window pattern for the northern side of the building. Mr. Sauer thought full length windows around the door may be more inviting. Mrs. Bitar asked how the Board members felt about the brick being painted white. Mr. Coulter said he is not in favor of painting the brick white. Ms. Lennon said the brick will not be easy to match. Mr. Coulter said if the brick cannot be matched the Board could possibly reconsider the paint, but there are a number of good brick suppliers in town.

Ms. Lennon asked the Board again about how they felt about the standing seam metal roof and Mr. Sauer said he would not be in favor of approving a dark blue metal roof. Mr. Foust said he thought the standing seam metal roof in blue would be too bold looking for the area. Mrs. Holcombe said she would be okay with approving a metal roof, but not blue. Ms. Lennon said she wanted to clarify the roof top would be a dark navy color, not a bright blue.

Mr. Coulter thought a sign might help on the blank wall. He also said if the dumpster is going to be located at the southeast corner, to push the dumpster back as far as possible. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

Ms. Lennon asked to table the application.

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

D. Municipal Planning Commission

1. Amendment to Development Plan

- a. Sign – **350 E. Wilson Bridge Rd.** (MedVet Associates) **ADP 04-17**

Findings of fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This building was constructed in 1985 as part of the Cascade Corporate Center on a parcel which is about 3.8 acres in size. It was purchased in 2015 by MedVet, which is located at 300 E. Wilson Bridge Rd. The building houses offices for MedVet and Idexx Laboratories.

Approval is requested to allow the freestanding sign to be modified to a size larger than is allowed per the Code.

Page 20 of 22

ARB/MPC Meeting May 25, 2017

Minutes

Project Details:

1. There is an existing monument sign that sits west of the drive to the building, which is near I-270 over 400' from E. Wilson Bridge Rd. The stone sign has been refaced several times over the years. Most recently, it was covered with white aluminum, and ¼" thick, 10" high gray letters with a red accent spelling "IDEXX" were added.
2. Mounted on top of the existing sign would be a new 40' high x 12' wide x 12" deep blue aluminum cabinet. Routed characters backed with white polycarbonate identifying "MEDVET" and "ADMINSTRATIVE OFFICES & EDUCATION CENTER" would illuminate white at night. Individual address numbers are proposed on the existing concrete base, which is about 6" in height.
3. The above grade height of the proposed sign would be less than 6'.
4. The total sign area would be 60 square feet per side, which is 10 square feet per side larger than is allowed per the Code. A variance would be required, and must be granted by the City Council.

Land Use Plans:

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.

2005 Worthington Comprehensive Plan

This area is designated as the commercial office center of Worthington. The advantage of this area is the freeway visibility and access. Reinvestment in the existing buildings is encouraged to make the buildings more competitive in the market place.

Chapter 1181 – Wilson Bridge Corridor

The purpose is to promote the redevelopment of the Wilson Bridge Road Corridor into an area that will generate new economic growth within the City. The requirements are intended to foster development that strengthens land use and economic value; to encourage a mix of uses; to enhance the livability of the area; to augment pedestrian and bicycle connections; and to promote construction of high-quality buildings and public spaces that help create and sustain long-term economic vitality.

Signs:

(1) General

- A. All new signs, including sign face replacement, shall be subject to the provisions herein.
- B. The provisions in Chapter 1170 shall apply to all signs in the WBC unless otherwise stated in this section.
- C. Exterior lighting fixtures are the preferred source of illumination.

(2) Freestanding Signs

- A. 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.

B. 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.

C. Freestanding signs may include the names of up to eight tenants of that parcel.

D. Light sources shall be screened from motorist view.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending approval of this application be recommended to the City Council as the sign would be in character with the development. Although the size of the sign exceeds the requirement, the base is low enough to allow the sign to appear smaller. External illumination should be considered as it is preferred for the corridor.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked for the applicant and Mr. Terry Eddy, 300 E. Wilson Bridge Rd., Worthington, Ohio came forward. Board members had no questions or concerns. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

Motion:

Mrs. Holcombe moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY MEDVET ASSOCIATES TO AMEND THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN BY MODIFYING THE FREESTANDING SIGN AT 350 E. WILSON BRIDGE RD. AS PER CASE NO. ADP 04-17, DRAWINGS NO. ADP 04-17, DATED MAY 11, 2017, BE RECOMMENDED TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL BASED ON THE 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; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Sauer, aye; and Mr. Hofmann, aye. The motion was approved.

D. Other

There was no other business to discuss.

E. Adjournment

Mrs. Holcombe moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:50 p.m., seconded by Mr. Hofmann. All Board members voted, "Aye." The meeting was adjourned.