



MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
WORTHINGTON ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
WORTHINGTON MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION
June 8, 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; James Sauer; 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.

A. Call to Order – 7:00 p.m.

1. Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Approval of minutes of the May 25, 2017 meeting

Mr. Reis 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. Building Renovations – **25 W. New England Ave.** (Darin Ranker) **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. 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 on the first floor only. All of the windows would now have brick lintels above rather the previously proposed precast stone lintels. The doors proposed for both floors would have similar treatment above and include sidelights, with the doors being all glass with black frames. The doors on the second floor now show as divided light, while the first floor doors would have single panes of glass.

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 picket style rather than the previously proposed 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 have a matching railing. The fascia and soffits would be trimmed with black aluminum.

Brick detail is no longer proposed at the corners and between the doors and windows. Light fixtures are proposed on the sides of the front door, and would be 34" high.

2. Roof:

The existing slate roof is now proposed to be rehabilitated.

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. Enlarging the windows would require a no-build easement be established on the adjacent property. The applicant would like approval to replace the windows in the same size or enlarge the openings. 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 window well would be painted black.

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:

Staff is recommending approval as amended per the following observations:

- The proposed fenestration is more typical than the existing, although fixed windows are not recommended. Dark windows have been used in Old Worthington
- The continuation of brick on the sides and rear and the addition of stone accents are improvements.
- Construction of a front patio and balcony could give a more welcoming feel to the building. The proposed railing is typical of other railings in Worthington. The balcony fascia color could match the lighter color proposed for the fascia at the roof.
- The use of decorative brick lintels seems appropriate.
- Retention of the slate roof is appropriate.
- The light fixtures appear too large, so should be made smaller.
- Sign changes would need approval.

Although the proposed would change the look of the building, many elements of the renovation are in character with Old Worthington. Certain details were carried through when the structure was changed to two stories in the 1960's, but the overall look of the building changed and the charm of the original 1930's structure was lost.

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar displayed a new rendering, which showed light fixtures in a reduced size. Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Darin Ranker, of Carney Ranker Architects, 5925 Wilcox Pl., Dublin, Ohio, said they tried to simplify the façade based upon the comments made at the last meeting. In addition they saved the existing roof, and scaled down the proportions of the light fixtures. They replaced the precast stone with brick lintels and removed the brick piers. For the details of the office building, inside and out, Mr. Ranker introduced his co-worker, Mr. Christopher

Jolley, 5925 Wilcox Pl., Dublin, Ohio. Mrs. Lloyd asked if the brick detailing above the windows would be new, and Mr. Jolley said yes. Mr. Hofmann said he appreciated the changes and improvements. Mr. Sauer clarified the underside of the balcony would be black. Mr. Jolley said yes and the floor would be concrete for the porch and balcony. He felt the look was more sophisticated and did not mind the dark railings and dark balcony. Mr. Foust said he agreed the balcony would look nice in black. A revised landscape plan was presented.

Motion:

Mr. Sauer moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY DARIN RANKER ON BEHALF OF CBRS WORTHINGTON LLC FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO RENOVATE THE BUILDING AT 25 W NEW ENGLAND AVE., AS PER CASE NO. AR 44-17, DRAWINGS NO. AR 44-17, DATED MAY 31, 2017, BE APPROVED 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; Mr. Reis, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Sauer, aye; Mr. Hofmann, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye; and Mr. Foust. The motion was approved.

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

New drawings were not received in time for staff review, but were included in the packet.

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo and review of the new drawings:

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 board and batten siding and be painted black or white. 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 black metal roof is proposed. The cupolas and arcade columns and entablature would be eliminated with this proposal.
4. Windows with fixed shutters in the closed position are proposed on the north and east sides of the building. The north side windows by the entrance would be floor to ceiling. The

north side remaining covered patio area wall would be painted white. The existing door on the east side would be removed, and a new door would be added on the west end of the south elevation.

5. The dumpster with enclosure is shown on the site plan, at the southeast corner of the building. A detail of the brick enclosure to match the building was shown.
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.

Sign changes would need approval.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Matthew Althouse of Red Architecture, 855 Grandview Ave., Columbus, Ohio, and Jeanne Lennon, 6182 Glen Ave., Columbus, Ohio. Mr. Althouse said he took Mr. Hofmann's advice and made the changes between the two gables, and matched the proportions of the gables to the east elevation. The recessed area is now a board and batten. Mrs. Holcombe asked Mr. Althouse about the windows and he said the east side stayed in the same location, but there would be a fixed transoms and fixed wood shutters in the closed position on the outside. The rooms inside have high ceilings. Mr. Sauer asked if the shutters will look like they could be swung open. Mr. Althouse said yes, the black wood shutters will look operable, but will not functioning.

Mr. Hofmann said he thought the building would look nice with painted brick. He also thought a small half round would look nice in the face of the gables. Mr. Hofmann said he sent some ideas to Mrs. Bitar. Mrs. Holcombe said she likes the half round. Mr. Foust asked what material the board and batten is made out of and Mr. Althouse said he would be using a Hardi material. Mr. Foust asked if the windows would also be black and Mr. Althouse said he intends the store front to be black but the colonnade would be white. Mrs. Lloyd asked where the green trim would be and Mr. Althouse explained there will not be any green trim on the house. The gutters and fascia will have a black trim. Mr. Hofmann advised against the color of the fascia not matching and felt the color should be white. Mr. Sauer clarified everything above the windows would be white, and Mr. Hofmann said yes.

Mr. Foust asked about the roof. Mr. Althouse said the roof will be twelve inches on the center seam with a "T" profile. The color will be a satin black with a factory finish. Mr. Sauer said he was looking at the two additions on the front and the one is offset from the other end of the building by about a foot and a half. He said the front is almost symmetrical but it is not and that concerns him, and the entrance doors are not centered. He asked if those two things could be centered. Mr. Althouse said he could do that by shifting the gable, he was just trying to maximize the amount of square footage on the inside. Mrs. Holcombe and Mr. Coulter felt the west gable did not need to be moved. All agreed the columns and window frames should be matched up. Mr. Althouse said there was no change proposed for the landscaping. Mr. Coulter asked for comments from the audience and there were none.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY MATTHEW ALTHOUSE OF RED ARCHITECTURE ON BEHALF OF JEANNE LENNON FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO

CONSTRUCT AN ADDITION AND RENOVATE THE BUILDING AT 529 HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 44-17, DRAWINGS NO. AR 44-17, DATED JUNE 1, 2017, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING WITH THE FOLLOWING AMENDMENTS:

- **THAT THE GABLES, TRIM AND BRICK BE PAINTED WHITE;**
- **THE ROOF WILL BE BLACK;**
- **THAT THE FRONT ELEVATION WILL SHIFT TO BE SIMILAR ON BOTH ENDS;**
- **THAT THE ENTRY DOORS BE CENTERED;**
- **THAT THE COLONNADE BE CENTERED AROUND THE DOORS;**
- **THERE WILL BE HALF ROUND DETAIL IN EACH GABLE ON BOTH ENDS OF THE BUILDING.**

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

C. Architectural Review Board – New

1. Solar Panels – 220 E. Granville Rd. (Justin Hoff) AR 31-17

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following staff memo:

Background & Request:

This lot on the north side of E. Granville Rd. is 50’ wide and 260’ deep. The two-story house was constructed in 1979 and is accessed off of a circular drive that serves 4 houses. The front-facing gable of the garage, which extends out in front of the house, is about 125’ from the edge of the road.

The applicant is requesting approval to install solar panels on the garage roof.

Project Details:

1. Twelve 325 watt solar panels (2 rows of 6 each) manufactured by Canadian Solar Inc. are proposed on the east side of the garage roof.
2. The panels would be dark blue/black, placed on the slope of the brown roof sitting about 6” above the roof shingles. Initially the panels would have had aluminum colored framing at the edges, but at the meeting the applicant presented an option with black framing and racks.
3. Equipment placement is not addressed in the application.

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. Recently, the City Council adopted additional guidelines for solar panels (as shown in bold below):

Sustainability:

Sustainability can be achieved by ensuring the economic, environmental and social concerns of Worthington are addressed in a balanced manner. The City of Worthington and its Architectural Review Board are interested in encouraging sustainable design and building practices, while preserving the character and integrity of the Architectural Review District. The Design Guidelines as a whole work toward that end; and this section addresses additional measures for sustainability.

Recommendations:

- A. Energy conservation methods are encouraged. Making use of the existing buildings inherent efficiency features should occur first. Maintaining building components in good condition helps preserve energy, as well as retaining the integrity of the property. 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.
- B. 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.
- C. (i) 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 off a 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. With flat roofs, keep panels at least 5' from the edge of the roof, or place at the edge if a building parapet exists that will screen the panels.

(ii) Solar panels proposed for another location on a building or site visible from the principal right-of-way are to be strongly discouraged and may be acceptable only if their placement does not have an adverse effect on the architecture of the building, or the character of the site or Architectural Review District. The Board shall consider the following criteria to determine whether conditions exist to support an application for the placement of solar panels in a location visible from the right-of-way:

1. The inclusion of panels, visible from the right-of-way, shall not alter the historic character of a property and the character shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.

2. If panels are to be placed on a roof, visible from the right-of-way, the Architectural Review Board shall first identify functional and decorative features of the roof such as, but not limited to, the roof's shape, such as hipped, gambrel, and mansard; decorative features, such as cupolas, cresting chimneys, and weathervanes; and roofing material such as slate, wood, clay tile, and metal, as well as its size, color, and patterning and conclude that the addition of solar panels does not impact the functional or distinctive features.
3. Preservation of the architectural character of the structure and of the Architectural Review District shall be the Board's primary consideration and the efficiency of the installation shall only be considered once other considerations of the Guidelines have been satisfied.
4. Should efficiency be considered, the applicant shall have demonstrated that the addition of solar panels advances an over-all plan of energy efficiency and sustainability. As evidence of this requirement the Board shall consider the following and such other criteria as the Board considers appropriate:
 - i. The use of alternative methods of energy conservation such as awnings, insulation and landscaping.
 - ii. Other sustainable steps the applicant has taken including but not limited to, rain catchment systems, pervious pavement, native plantings, and energy efficient window systems, energy efficient mechanical equipment and appliances.
5. The Board's review shall apply to the entire Architectural Review District. A property's location in the Historic District, as that term is used in the application for National Register of Historic Places designation, or the identification in that application of a property as "contributing" or "non-contributing" shall be of no effect.
6. The Board shall consider all alternative technologies that may be available at the time of the application and approve the existing technology most consistent with the architectural guidelines.
7. If placed on a roof location visible from the right-of-way, the panels, working or faux, should cover as much of the roof as is possible to make them appear as one continuous unit.

The equipment to support solar panels should be screened from view.

- D. Bike racks and other methods of facilitating alternative transportation should be utilized.
- E. Streetscape elements should be of a human scale.
- F. Make use of recycled materials; rapidly renewable materials; and energy efficient materials.
- G. Use of natural and controlled light for interior spaces and natural ventilation is recommended.
- H. Minimize light pollution.

Staff Analysis:

With the understanding that solar panels seen from the right-of-way are strongly discouraged, the following information is presented based on the criteria to determine whether conditions exist to support this application:

1. The inclusion of panels, visible from the right-of-way, shall not alter the historic character of a property and the character shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.

As this building was constructed in 1979, it would not yet be considered historic.

2. If panels are to be placed on a roof, visible from the right-of-way, the Architectural Review Board shall first identify functional and decorative features of the roof such as, but not limited to, the roof's shape, such as hipped, gambrel, and mansard; decorative features, such as cupolas, cresting chimneys, and weathervanes; and roofing material such as slate, wood, clay tile, and metal, as well as its size, color, and patterning and conclude that the addition of solar panels does not impact the functional or distinctive features.

The gable roof has brown asphalt shingles. The color is a distinctive feature to be preserved.

3. Preservation of the architectural character of the structure and of the Architectural Review District shall be the Board's primary consideration and the efficiency of the installation shall only be considered once other considerations of the Guidelines have been satisfied.

If the ARB feels the panel color harms the character, the process would end at this point. If the character would not be harmed with a different color panel, or the panel or roof color would be changed to match, the ARB would continue to review.

4. Should efficiency be considered, the applicant shall have demonstrated that the addition of solar panels advances an over-all plan of energy efficiency and sustainability. As evidence of this requirement the Board shall consider the following and such other criteria as the Board considers appropriate:
 - a. The use of alternative methods of energy conservation such as awnings, insulation and landscaping.
 - b. Other sustainable steps the applicant has taken including but not limited to, rain catchment systems, pervious pavement, native plantings, and energy efficient window systems, energy efficient mechanical equipment and appliances.

The applicant sites the following:

- Replaced all windows with high efficiency windows in 2016
- Installed smart thermostat in 2016
- Purchased energy star appliances in 2015
- Replaced air-conditioning with energy efficient unit in 2012
- Installed rain barrels in 2011
- Compost food and yard waste
- Replaced incandescent light bulbs with CFL/LED light bulbs

- Open windows and use ceiling fans instead of air conditioning
5. The Board's review shall apply to the entire Architectural Review District. A property's location in the Historic District, as that term is used in the application for National Register of Historic Places designation, or the identification in that application of a property as "contributing" or "non-contributing" shall be of no effect.

Not applicable

6. The Board shall consider all alternative technologies that may be available at the time of the application and approve the existing technology most consistent with the architectural guidelines.

Solar shingles may be available soon.

7. If placed on a roof location visible from the right-of-way, the panels, working or faux, should cover as much of the roof as is possible to make them appear as one continuous unit.

It appears the installation would be uniform, but it is not clear how much of the roof would be covered.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending denial of this application due to the color of the solar panels not matching the roof.

Discussion:

Mr. Sauer asked if the guidelines require the Board members to evaluate the efficiency of the rest of the house. Mrs. Bitar said if you get to the point in the guidelines where everything else is okay, then efficiency is the next thing on the list to consider. Mr. Myers said if you remember from a previous application, the argument was made the only viable solution for placement of the panels was in a location that was visible from the right-of-way; any other location would not achieve efficiency. He said the discussion with City Council was efficiency should not be a primary consideration because that just amounts to a return on investment. If you had a twelve year return on investment and you put them in a visible location and a fifteen year return on investment in a non-visible location, the non-visible location should be considered. What was argued before was not financially viable to put them any other place than in a visible location. If that is the argument, you accept that argument, then you would consider, is this just to show off to the neighbors, or is this someone who is committed to sustainable practices? Mr. Myers felt the previous solar panel applicants were committed to sustainable practices. If you are going to argue cost as a primary motivation for putting them in a visible location you have to demonstrate you have done other things that could have possibly taken the place of solar panels. Mr. Myers said they did not want to totally eliminate solar panels so they came up with criteria for the district as a whole. Adding solar panels to the Anthem building would be different than the impact to a gateway property such

as at the corner of Evening Street and State Route 161. Mr. Myers said the applicant can argue they fit the exceptions to be allowed to have solar panels. Mr. Myers said for the Board members to check the boxes while considering the applications and make some notes next to each of items so if there is an Appeal to City Council they will have a better understanding of what the thought process was.

Mrs. Bitar referred the Board members to page 8 of the staff memo. Mrs. Bitar said after Mr. Myers' discussion her opinion changed on the impact to the roof. Mr. Myers asked how old the roof was. She said that was one of her questions, if the roof is going to be changed, then why not wait and do the panels at the same time with a black roof top. Mr. Myers said a person would not want to replace the shingles of an older roof before having to replace the panels. He felt solar panels may not even be around in the next ten years because of technology. Mrs. Bitar said the main reason staff recommended denial of the application was because the roof did not match the panels.

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Bob Sisco, representing Ohio Power Solutions, 3100 State Route 187, London, Ohio, along with the home owner, Mr. Justin Hoff, 220 E. Granville Rd., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Sisco said the solar shingle idea is all right, but it might be difficult to integrate roofing materials with electric. Mr. Sisco said his client's house sits far back in the cul-de-sac. He said the panels would cover the entire area of the brown roof, except for 6"-8" at the edges. Mr. Sisco was now proposing black framing and mounting bars so felt the black on black panels would look very nice, but be a little more expensive. Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Sisco the age of the existing shingles. Mr. Hoff purchased the house five years ago, and the age of the roof is undetermined, but appears to be in pretty good shape. Mr. Sisco said the UV Rays are what affect the roof, not the heat. He said they would remove and reinstall the panels at the time a new roof was necessary.

Mr. Sisco said his client installed energy efficient windows in 2016, installed a smart thermostat, and purchased Energy Star appliances and an energy efficient air conditioning unit in 2012. They have rain barrels, compost food and replace incandescent lighting with LED bulbs. Mr. Sisco said this is a 3.9 kilowatt system and said this will be the equivalent of planting 11,600 trees, taking 234,000 pounds of carbon dioxide out of the atmosphere. Mr. Sauer asked what the average life of this system is. Mr. Sisco replied, "Thirty years." Mrs. Holcombe asked why the garage was chosen instead of the house? Mr. Sisco said there are trees on the east side on the neighbors property that cast shadows on the house. Mr. Reis asked if the energy achieved from the panels will cover the cost to power the house. Mr. Sisco said the system will offset about sixty percent of their load. Mr. Hofmann asked what the efficiency difference is between the garage and the house if the panels were located on the house. Mr. Sisco said the efficiency would go down drastically because of the shadowing effect, probably reducing the amount by forty or fifty percent. They would need twice as many panels to achieve the same effect, and twice the cost. The cost of the proposed system would be recovered in about nine or ten years. Mr. Hofmann asked if the panels were located on the west side would that make a difference? Mr. Coulter explained a few degrees in position of the sun can make a great difference. The panels would need to be placed on the west side of the house, not the west side of the garage. Mr. Foust asked about the eight to ten

inches of space remaining not covered by panels. Mr. Sisco explained the amount of space is needed for water to reach the gutters, otherwise rain water would spill over the gutters. Mr. Hofmann felt the panels would be better on the west side of the house vs. the east side of the garage. Mr. Sisco said he could probably add a couple of panels to the upper west surface area of the roof on the house and still maintain the output. Mr. Hofmann asked Mr. Sisco to push the panels to the northern part of the west side of the house roof. Mr. Sisco asked if they could then go back to silver frames, and the Board agreed if it could not be seen that might be ok. Mr. Myers mentioned the pine trees blocking this property may be at the end of their life expectancy. Mrs. Bitar asked where the equipment would be and Mr. Sisco responded in the basement, and there will be a gray disconnect next to the meter box. Mr. Foust said if the changes are made that have been discussed he feels the Board members have followed the guidelines by City Council. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present to speak for or against this application and no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY JUSTIN HOFF FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL SOLAR PANELS AT 220 E. GRANVILLE RD. AS PER CASE NO. AR 31-17, DRAWINGS NO. AR 31-17, DATED APRIL 28, 2017, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING WITH THE FOLLOWING AMENDMENT:

- **THAT THE PANELS SHALL BE LOCATED AT THE NORTHWESTERN PORTION OF THE ROOF ON THE HOUSE;**
- **THAT THE PANELS AND FRAMING COLOR MAY BE SILVER IF THE VIEW FROM STATE ROUTE 161 IS OBSTRUCTED, IF NOT THE PANELS AND FRAMING SHALL BE BLACK;**
- **ALLOW FOR ADDITIONAL PANELS TO MEET THE ORIGINAL INTENT OF THE POWER PRODUCTION;**
- **BEFORE INSTALLATION THE PLACEMENT AND COLOR IS TO BE REVIEWED BY CITY STAFF.**

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

2. **Patio, Basement Windows & Signage – 752 High St. (COhatch) AR 41-17**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

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

The southern portion of the building will be occupied by COhatch, which was granted a Conditional Use Permit late last year to have an office in the building. COhatch offers office rentals and meeting spaces that are available by the hour, day, month or year. This office space would be in addition to the use at 659 High St. Also, a makerspace is proposed for the basement that would include things like a 3D printer, sound studio, art studio, photo studio and other equipment.

This is a request for approval to add a patio, replace the basement windows and add signage.

Project Details:

1. The proposed patio would be at the southeast corner of the building, with the main access from the door on the east side. The patio would extend around the west side with an unfenced area meant for general public use. The patio floor would be Bluestone on a compacted gravel base, with use of Oberfields Edington Wall Stone, or Rosetta Belvedere or Kodah Wall stones for a retaining wall to work with the grade. The color would blend in with the building foundation. The wall would be a few inches high on the west side to about 18" high on the east side. Around the outside edge of the patio, a 42" railing is proposed that would be black metal to match the railing on the front building steps. On the east side, three sections of 5'6" high wood fencing with 8' high support posts are proposed. A landscape plan has been put together by City staff to provide plant material along the outside edge of the patio. Additional landscaping is also desired along the east side, and will be added to the plan as soon as possible. An easement to plant on school property is being drafted.
2. A 14' x 14' pergola is proposed that would run from the eastern edge of the chimney to the southeast corner of the building. The 11'6" height would take the structure to just above the window's brick course. The structure would be made of Eastern Red Cedar, and is proposed with 6" x 6" support posts and framing, and 2" x 6" rafters. A fast-growing vine is proposed for the structure.
3. New basement windows are proposed for the building, most of which would match the size and style of the existing windows, although some may the opportunity to open a portion to allow ventilation. The exceptions are three windows the applicant would like to enlarge, one on the north side and two on the east side. The windows would either extend higher than the existing, or lower in combination with a window well. If there are wells, the design would be similar to the patio with use of the same stone and railings. The drawings specify stamped concrete, which is no longer being considered.

4. A sign is proposed on the south side chimney that would spell “COhatch” oriented vertically. The white vinyl sign would be stuck to the building with the texture of the brick to show through, looking like a painted sign. A matte finish is expected for the sign.
5. A small rectangular projection sign, similar in size to the Sew to Speak sign which is 34” wide x 27” high, is proposed south of the front door. The sign would look like wood, and have white lettering identifying “COhatch” and “Madery” in raised letters.
6. Lighting and furniture for the patio would need approval at a later date.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

In commercial districts fences and walls often are used to separate an outdoor seating area from the activity of the street. Traditional types of fences and walls include masonry walls, cast and wrought iron fences, wood rail or board fences, rows of trees and shrubs, or a combination of these. Paint or opaque stain are the preferred finishes for wood fencing, but leaving it to weather naturally is also acceptable (the paint or stain will give it a more finished look). Fences are not permitted in front of the building line so the building and storefronts can remain visible. Side and rear fences may be as much as six feet in height, especially when concealing trash containers and utility boxes. Set aside a maintenance budget for fencing and walls so they do not become deteriorated and unsightly.

Signs should be efficient and compatible with the age and architecture of the building. Use of traditional sign materials such as painted wood, or material that looks like painted wood, is the most appropriate material for projecting and wall signs. Colors for signs should be chosen for compatibility with the age, architecture and colors of the buildings they serve, whether placed on the ground or mounted on the building. Bright color shades generally are discouraged in favor more subtle and toned-down shades. Early 19th century signs usually were painted directly on the building or were painted on wooden signboards.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending approval of the proposed application. The patio size, shape and materials are appropriate. The proposed pergola is an open style which allows some view of the historic building behind, and the addition of landscaping and vines should minimize the impact of the structure. The projection sign is appropriate on the west side of the building. Signs painted directly on a building were not prevalent in Worthington, and typically would not be acceptable on this building, which was constructed in the 20th century and has always been publicly owned. That being said, the proposed style (vinyl which would look like a painted sign) does have a place in history, would not harm the brick, and may be a better, more subtle solution to advertising the business than other styles might be.

Discussion:

Mr. Brown explained part of the patio will be for public use and part of that landscaping is in the right-of-way on the Village Green. The landscape plan will have to go before City Council to be approved for the entire area along the Village Green Drive and the patio. The eastern side of the patio will be completely screened. Mr. Coulter asked if an easement was necessary. Mrs. Bitar

said not for the patio, but for the landscape screening south of the patio. Mr. Brown said the City's Law Director has drafted an Easement which will go to the school board allowing the City to plant south of the patio and assigning responsibility to the City to maintain all of the landscaping. Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mrs. Bitar swore in the applicant Mr. Joel Limes, 283 E. North St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Limes said they originally wanted bigger windows in the basement, but they have decided to keep the windows the same size. They would like to slightly decrease the amount of framing inside the window because they are trying to let in as much light as possible. Mr. Limes said they decided not to make a window well, which would have allowed for more light.

Mr. Brown said the City's Community Improvement Corporation (CIC) worked on the lease agreement to lease out the space and one of the caveats of the lease is to create this patio to be provided for public use. Mr. Sauer said he was in the area yesterday and noticed the lawn area between the building and the walk slopes. He asked if the intent is to flatten the area, and if so, is the area along the walk raised up? Mr. Limes said the area has to be angled a little bit for drainage purposes. He said with the landscaping going around in front the land could be raised up slightly to get to the level point. Mr. Sauer said he thought he understood the general sketch, but details were a little loose. He said in looking at the drawing there appears to be a post in front of a window. Mr. Limes asked Mrs. Bitar to refer to specific photograph and explained the post is east of the window. Mr. Foust asked if the furniture is considered part of the application and Mrs. Bitar said not today, but eventually. Mr. Foust said COHatch likes to make their look contemporary to make things pop. He said he would not want to see bright red chairs on the patio while everything else was earth tones. Mr. Brown explained those details will be coming back to the Board for further discussion. Mr. Sauer asked if there would be more landscaping on the east side of the fence and Mr. Brown confirmed there would be. Mr. Sauer asked if a landscaping plan would come back before the Board and Mrs. Bitar said no, they will be continuing the basic pattern that has already been established, but there will be taller plant material where the higher fence will be. Mr. Sauer asked if there would be planted material near the northwest corner of the building and Mr. Brown said that part of the plan needs to be approved by City Council. Two maple trees were removed a year or two ago with City Council's permission, and any additional landscaping must be approved by City Council because part of the land is the Village Green. Mr. Sauer said what he is leading to is the patio being proposed on the west side does not run the full length and Mrs. Bitar said no. He wanted to know if there would be planted material at the south entrance and Mr. Brown said yes. Mr. Myers said to the best of his knowledge the plan has not been finalized and they still need to secure an easement from the school because part of the landscape will encroach the school's property. Mr. Brown said the City's Arborist has been working on landscaping plans but they are not ready yet. All of the blank spaces will be filled in. Mr. Sauer asked if there was an alternative idea for COHatch's projection sign so the Sew to Speak sign would not be blocked. Mr. Coulter said if a person is standing on the sidewalk, their sign can still be seen. Mr. Myers explained a monument type of sign would not be allowed on the Village Green. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak either for or against this application.

Mrs. Bitar swore in the speaker, Ms. Kay Keller, 670 Morning St., Worthington, Ohio. She said the signage on the chimney was excessive for a historic building. She said she was not sure if

there has been a precedent set for doing a large sign such as that one. Ms. Keller was also concerned about the pergola and felt the look was too modern. Mr. Foust said the Board members have had some discussions about the pergola and they have advised they want the pergola to look as if it has been there forever. The fast growing vines should help with that look. Mrs. Bitar said staff is still struggling with the sign, but felt the alternative would be either a monument sign on the Village Green or some other type of wall sign that may not look as good on the building. Mr. Coulter said in terms of the sign on the chimney, in earlier days it was not unusual to have signs painted on buildings, such as Smith Hardware downtown, which you can style see today. Mr. Coulter felt it was important this sign would be vinyl that would be more easily removed if need be. Mr. Coulter said they also considered an acrylic sign that would adhere to the brick but the material is more modern and they did not think the material would look as good on the building. The proposed sign should look like it was painted. Mr. Brown pointed out the proposed signage meets the City's Code requirements.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY COHATCH FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO ADD A PATIO AND SIGNAGE, AND CHANGE THE BASEMENT WINDOWS AT 752 HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 41-17, DRAWINGS NO. AR 41-17, DATED MAY 11, 2017, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING AS AMENDED:

- **THERE BE NO PERGOLA POST IN FRONT OF THE WINDOW;**
- **FINAL BASEMENT WINDOW STYLES BE APPROVED BY STAFF.**

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

3. Shed – 164-168 E. Stafford Ave. (Carole Kozicki) AR 47-17

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This ranch style duplex was constructed in 1957 on a small (~8700 square foot) lot at the northeast corner of Stafford Ave. and Morning St. This is not a contributing property in the Worthington Historic District. The property owner would like approval to add a shed.

Project Details:

1. The proposed shed would be 7' x 7' x 8.6' high and placed at the northeast corner of the property, 5' from the side and rear property lines.

2. The Rubbermaid shed would be tan with brown doors and a brown roof. The structure is molded to have the look of lap siding, barn doors and asphalt shingles on the roof.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

New outbuildings should use design cues from older nearby structures, including form, massing, roof shape, roof pitch and height, materials, window and door types and detailing. Try to create a new building compatible in appearance with the house it accompanies.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending approval of this application. The proposed shed is appropriately sized for this property and would be placed in an acceptable location.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present and Ms. Carol Kozicki, 7080 Township Rd. 15, Centerburg, Ohio came forward. Ms. Kozicki said her tenant requested the shed because he has been carrying the lawn mower up and down the basement stairs every week to mow the lawn and she felt the request was very reasonable. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Hofmann moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY CAROLE KOZICKI FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO ADD A SHED AT 164-168 E. STAFFORD AVE., AS PER CASE NO. AR 47-17, DRAWINGS NO. AR 47-17, DATED MAY 24, 2017, 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. Reis, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Sauer, aye; Mr. Hofmann, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye; and Mr. Foust, aye. The motion was approved.

4. Fence – **6184 Maxton Pl.** (Robert C. Moses) **AR 48-17**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This property is on the north side of the Maxton Place cul-de-sac, backing up to the rear of the properties on Granville Square. The owner would like to enclose a portion of the pie-shaped rear yard.

Project Details:

1. The enclosed area would run out 10’ from both rear corners of the house, and extend to the rear property line. On the west side, the fence would also include an 18’ stretch along the rear property line where there is no neighboring fence. On the east side the fence would end at the neighbors existing fence.
2. A 4’ high black aluminum picket fence in 6’ wide panels is proposed. Gates would be installed on both sides of the house.

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:

Staff is recommending approval of this application, as the proposed fence style and placement are appropriate.

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar showed photographs of the existing temporary fence that would be replaced with the proposed aluminum fence. Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present and Mr. Robert Moses, 6184 Maxton Pl., Worthington, Ohio came forward. Mr. Foust said since the property is not highly visible, he is okay with the style of the fence. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Sauer moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY ROBERT C. MOSES FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL FENCING AT 6184 MAXTON PL. AS PER CASE NO. AR 48-17, DRAWINGS NO. AR 48-17, DATED MAY 25, 2017, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

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

D. Municipal Planning Commission

1. Conditional Use Permit

- a. Semi-public Use in R-10 – Lighting & Shed - **6121 Olentangy River Rd.** (Congregation Beth Tikvah) **CU 04-17**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

Beth Tikvah has been operating at this site as a Semi-public use in the R-10 Zoning District since 1978, with a recent addition of a Co-located Child Day Care Center, Nursery School and Preschool. Because these are Conditional Uses in R-10, any changes made to the building, property and operation must be approved by the Municipal Planning Commission. Over the years, the congregation has added onto the building, and modified the site with changes to the parking, landscaping and fencing.

Recently the congregation applied for and received a grant from the State of Ohio Emergency Management Agency to install security and safety features. An improvement to site lighting is proposed to make use of some of the grant money. Also with this proposal is a request to modify plans for a previously approved shed.

Project Details:

1. With a previous approval, bollards were proposed along the driveway to provide light for both pedestrians and vehicles. A sidewalk was also proposed at that time, which is still not planned for immediate construction. Now the congregation is seeking approval for 4 pole lights with 1 LED fixture each along the drive. The fixtures would be 12.5' above grade, and include shields at the back to block the light source from being seen by neighbors. Dimmers and motion sensors are being explored so the lights would not be on full power all night. Average footcandles along the drive would be 1.79.
2. The existing parking lot lighting consists of 3 poles with double fixtures located in the center islands of the parking lot. Proposed is reuse of the existing poles with new LED fixtures, and the addition of 2 poles, one toward the middle of the lot and one at the rear. The rear pole would only have one fixture, and would likely be installed in the future. The fixtures would all be mounted 12.5' above grade and have a color temperature of 3000K. Clarification is needed as to whether the color of the poles and fixtures would match the existing brown/bronze, and whether the base for the new poles would be the same design as the existing. Dimmers and motion sensors are being explored so the lights would not be on full power all night. Average footcandles would be 1.66.
3. As part of the 2015 approval for changes associated with the day care, a shed was proposed at the south property line near the southwest corner of the building. With this application, the shed would be located further west and have a height of 8' rather than 6'. The previous version would have been screened by the 6' fence on the property line. The shed is proposed to be 10' x 12', with the 10' sides and gables to the north and south. The walls are proposed to match the building color, and the roof shingles would match those on the building. Placement of the shed was approved in close proximity to the fence, which is on the property line.

4. The existing 6' wood fencing on the property line would be extended 24' to the west and connected north to the existing fence by the parking lot. Also, a 26' gate is proposed near the pavement to create a dumpster area that is screened from the north, west and south sides. The fence style would match the existing.

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 – Lighting in the driveway may help traffic, especially when people are parking in Shaker Square and walking to the synagogue.
2. Effect on public facilities – No effect has been identified.
3. Effect on sewerage and drainage facilities – No effect has been identified.
4. Utilities required – Electric would have a minimal change.
5. Safety and health considerations – The parking lot and driveway would likely be safer as a result of the lighting plan.
6. Noise, odors and other noxious elements, including hazardous substances and other environmental hazards – Nothing has been identified.
7. Hours of use – No change.
8. Shielding or screening considerations for neighbors – With this type of fixture and the proposed pole heights, the lighting should not go beyond the property line, and light sources should not be visible.
9. Appearance and compatibility with the general neighborhood – Low light levels are appropriate for residential neighborhoods. Although this shed would be used by a number of different people, sheds are typical in residential districts.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Conditional Use Permit Regulations

The following basic standards apply to conditional uses in any "S", "AR" or "R" 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 the use will not be hazardous, inconvenient or conflict with the normal traffic on residential streets, taking into account the relation to main traffic thoroughfares and to street intersections, parking, screening and the general character and intensity of development of the area. The provisions for parking, screening and signage shall also be specified by the applicant and considered by the Commission.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending approval of this application. The lighting is designed appropriately for a property in close proximity to residential. The proposed shed is typical of those erected on residential properties in the City.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Andy Shafron, 7128 Bluffstream Ct., Columbus, Ohio, representing Congregation Beth Tikvah, clarified he did not think the fifteen foot

pole would be cut down. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak either for or against this application.

Mr. Scott Whitlock, 6081 Olentangy River Rd., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Whitlock said he and his wife are in support of Beth Tikvah's application. He thanked Beth Tikvah for reaching out and communicating with the neighbors. He believed the matching roof on the shed will help the shed blend and liked the upgraded fence. Mr. Whitlock also liked the use of the 3000 Kelvin lamps which he felt would be a good choice for a residential area.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY CONGREGATION BETH TIKVAH FOR A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO MODIFY THE LIGHTING AND ADD A SHED AND FENCING AT 6121 OLENTANGY RIVER RD., AS PER CASE NO. CU 04-17, DRAWINGS NO. CU 04-17, DATED MAY 26, 2017, BE APPROVED AS REFERENCED IN THE LAND USE PLANS AND 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. Reis, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Sauer, aye; and Mr. Hofmann, aye. The motion was approved.

b. Office in C-1 - **451 E. Wilson Bridge Rd.** (Shannen Millard & Nancy Harris/ AVODAH Staffing & Recruiting) **CU 05-17**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

This building was constructed in 1988 in the C-1 Zoning District on a parcel that is approximately 0.6 acres. The building is positioned at the back of the property, with parking at the front adjacent to the E. Wilson Bridge Rd., Worthington-Galena, Huntley Rd. intersection.

This application is for approval of a Conditional Use Permit to allow an office use in the western space of the 3 tenant building, which was formerly occupied by Curves. The other tenants in the building are Yappy Greek and Golden China Express restaurants.

Project Details:

1. AVODAH Staffing & Recruiting is the business that would like to locate at this property. No more than 3 employees would work there. The expected number of visitors has not been identified.

2. Parking would be shared with the other businesses in the building in the existing lot in front, although the applicant has discussed the desire for directional signs designating parking for the business use in front of the space.

Conditional Use Permit Basic Standards and Review Elements:

1. Effect on traffic pattern – Parking appears to be sufficient for the use on the site, but it would be helpful to know how many visitors there would be on a daily basis.
2. Effect on public facilities – The effect should be minimal.
3. Effect on sewerage and drainage facilities - The effect should be minimal.
4. Utilities required - The effect should be minimal.
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 – The hours would be 8:00 am to 5:00 pm.
8. Shielding or screening considerations for neighbors – No changes are proposed.
9. Appearance and compatibility with the general neighborhood – The only change mentioned is the addition of an awning with a sign above the storefront. The business would likely add its name to the freestanding sign at the corner of the property.

Land Use Plans:

Comprehensive Plan

The Worthington Comprehensive Plan and 2005 Strategic Plan Update recommends upgrading the industrial corridor's aesthetics is important in attracting professional employees. Allowing the conversion of portions of the corridor to office or mixed office/industrial use may be beneficial.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending approval of this application. The site is small enough that no parking space is very far from the building. A small office use, though, is generally appropriate for this property.

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar said she recently learned the applicants were invited to park in the parking lot of the building next door, so their cars will not take parking spaces away from the site. Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Ms. Shannen Millard, 1904 Columbus-Sandusky Rd. S., Marion, Ohio, said she is the owner of AVODAH Staffing & Recruiting. Ms. Nancy Harris, 1290 Worthington Heights Blvd., Columbus, Ohio. Ms. Millard said in the future they would like to put a better awning, preferably black, on the building but they need to get permission from the building owner first. She said she is hoping to convince the neighboring tenant to choose a cloth awning also. Mr. Coulter asked if the exposed wood would be painted and Ms. Millard said yes, and the wood will also be covered by the black awning. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present to speak for or against this application and no one came forward.

MPC Motion:

Mr. Hofmann moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY SHANNEN MILLARD & NANCY HARRIS FOR A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO OPERATE AN OFFICE IN THE C-1 ZONING DISTRICT AT 451 E. WILSON BRIDGE RD. AS PER CASE NO. CU 05-17, DRAWINGS NO. CU 05-17, DATED MAY 26, 2017, BE APPROVED AS REFERENCED IN THE LAND USE PLANS AND FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

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

2. Subdivision

- a. Preliminary and Final Plats – **1033 High St.** (The United Methodist Children’s Home West Ohio Conference of the United Methodist Church) **SUB 01-17**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Background & Request:

The applicant has requested Preliminary Plat and Final Plat approval for the division of property surrounding the West Ohio Conference of the United Methodist Church from the larger property under current ownership of The United Methodist Children’s Home West Ohio Conference of the United Methodist Church. The 40.773 acre parcel to be divided is Lot 2 of the United Methodist Children’s Home Amended Subdivision from 1994, which created the 3.575 acre lot that Sunrise Senior Living occupies. The new parcel would be transferred to the West Ohio Conference, which would continue to use the property.

The majority of the existing parcel is zoned S-1, Special, and the frontage is zoned C-3, Institutions and Offices with pockets of C-2, Community Shopping Center. The proposed parcel would primarily be in the C-3 Zoning District. The entire property is in the Architectural Review District, which would not change with this request.

Details:

1. The new parcel would be 3.418 acres and designated as Lot 3 and the larger parcel that remains would be 37.345 acres and designated as Lot 4. The lots are numbered to distinguish them from the numbering in the previous plat, not because 4 lots are being created.
2. Wesley Blvd. would remain part of the larger parcel, and access would be granted to the new lot and retained for the Sunrise property. Vehicular access would not be allowed onto N. High St. for Lot 3.
3. All existing easements would remain in place and be represented on an exhibit with the Final Plat.

Land Use Plans:**Worthington Comprehensive Plan**

The 2005 Worthington Comprehensive Plan identified 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. The UMCH property was specifically addressed in that section of the plan, with concepts establish for mixed use development on the site.

The following objectives were established in the 2014 amendment to the Comprehensive Plan:

1. Consideration of the redevelopment potential of this site (UMCH) recognizing the critical resource and opportunity this 40+ acre site represents within the City.
2. Provision of a mix of desirable uses and green space that are compatible with surrounding neighborhoods and are currently underserved in Worthington.
3. Addressing the needs of current and future residents by providing new housing types/options that are underrepresented in the market and complement Worthington's current offerings.
4. Recognition of the financial goals of UMCH to enable it to continue its mission within the region.
5. Expansion of the City of Worthington's tax base by incorporating uses that allow for new or enhanced sources of revenue.
6. Preservation and integration of the existing natural features found on the site related to Tucker Creek.
7. Creation of a well-planned, vibrant, walkable, and integrated development of the highest quality that meets or exceeds current best practices for mixed use development, including the provision of communal space and complete streets.

Recommendations:

Staff is recommending approval of the application be recommended to the City Council. A comprehensive development plan has always been desired for the property, and construction of a building in place of the West Ohio Conference parking lot would be ideal. Regardless, if the West Ohio Conference wants to stay in its location and keep the parking, the creation of an additional parcel to facilitate the user should not make a difference to the City.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Ed Miller, representing EMH&T, 5500 New Albany Rd., Columbus, Ohio, came forward. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY THE UNITED METHODIST CHILDREN'S HOME WEST OHIO CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED METHODIST CHURCH FOR APPROVAL OF A PRELIMINARY PLAT AND A FINAL PLAT TO DIVIDE THE PROPERTY AT 1033 HIGH ST. AS PER CASE NO. SUB 01-17, DRAWINGS NO. SUB 01-17, DATED MAY 25, 2017, BE RECOMMENDED TO CITY COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL 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. Reis, aye; Mrs. Holcombe; aye; Mr. Sauer, aye; and Mr. Hofmann, aye. The motion was approved. Mr. Brown said this application will be heard by City Council on Monday, June 19, 2017.

E. Other

Mrs. Bitar said she wanted to discuss the lighting on the Worthington Inn. She said the fixtures have been painted to match the building and the conduit has been moved over to the downspout. The owner looked for other fixtures but could not find anything suitable that would blend in as well as the fixtures they already have. Mr. Coulter asked if the lights were LED and Mrs. Bitar said yes. Mr. Coulter said there is a way to install the fixtures and get rid of the conduit entirely. He said the fixtures can be fed through ethernet lines from the inside, but the project would not entail using conduit. He said there would be a direct connection from the back of the fixture. Mr. Hofmann liked the effect of the lighting but agreed with Mr. Coulter the conduit should be eliminated. He also felt there may be more suitable fixtures.

F. Adjournment

Mr. Reis moved to adjourn the meeting and Mrs. Holcombe seconded the motion. All Board members voted, "Aye." The meeting adjourned at 9:27 p.m.