



MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
WORTHINGTON ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
WORTHINGTON MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION
September 14, 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; and Melissa Cohan, Paralegal.

A. Call to Order – 7:00 p.m.

1. Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Approval of minutes of the July 27, 2017 meeting

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

4. Affirmation/swearing in of witnesses

B. Architectural Review Board – Unfinished

Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Foust to discuss the photograph on display. Mr. Foust said CoHatch was one of the items to be reviewed this evening and the building in the photograph was the same location at 752 High St. He said this building was the third one to be built at the site and was a public school constructed in 1870, which replaced a brick school, and prior to that there was a log cabin style school on the site. The school in the photograph was demolished in the 1920's and then the library was constructed on the site, which is now the location of CoHatch. The bell that was used for the old public school building is the same bell used in the tower at Kilbourne Middle School, which apparently was brought from settlers from Connecticut in 1803. Mr. Foust said some of the pieces of stone trim have survived and are located around town used as edging in some of the resident's flower beds.

1. Sign - **510 High St.** (Signarama) **AR 61-17**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

In 1999 this building underwent a renovation that included an addition to the building, and installation of a freestanding sign. The sign box was enlarged in 2008 to be 30 square feet in area per side to advertise a second tenant in the building; the color and sign faces were changed in 2011.

A request was heard at the last meeting to install new sign faces in the existing box, and tabled with the Architectural Review Board asking for simplification of the sign. A modified version is included with the packet.

Project Details:

1. With this application the sign box would remain white and the background of the sign faces would continue to be white. The existing brick base would remain, as would the address on the side of the sign box facing the street. External illumination is in place and would continue to be used instead of the internal light sources.
2. The top part of the sign faces would identify “Jerman Family Dentistry” with “Jerman” being part of a logo that includes a tooth. The graphics and text would be in black vinyl. The bottom part of the sign would say “IntrinsicCare CHIROPRACTIC” in black, gray, and fuchsia. Proposed text sizes are now more uniform, being either 6.6” or 4”, and orange has been eliminated leaving black, white, gray and varying degrees of fuchsia. Four letter styles are still shown.
3. More colors and styles than the Code allows are still proposed for the sign faces, so variances would be needed.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Place only basic names and graphics on signs along the street so that drive-by traffic is not bombarded with too much information. Free-standing signs should be of the “monument” type; they should be as low as possible. Such signs should have an appropriate base such as a brick planting area with appropriate landscaping or no lighting. Colors for signs should be chosen for compatibility with the age, architecture and colors of the buildings they serve, whether placed on the ground or mounted on the building.

Worthington Sign Code

1170.03 DESIGN REQUIREMENTS.

(c) **Styles.** Signs shall be comprised of not more than two styles of lettering plus one logo. A logo is an emblem, character, pictograph, trademark or symbol used alone to represent a business, organization, entity or product. There shall be not more than three sizes of all such lettering, including a logo.

(d) Colors. Not more than four colors, including black and white, shall be used on any sign.

Recommendation:

The sign faces have been changed to more closely meet the Code requirements, so are simpler than previously proposed.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. David Mayer, 7282 Innisfree Lane, Dublin, Ohio, said the photograph on display was the latest version of the sign. Mrs. Bitar explained if the chiropractic font could be made larger as shown on the sign to match the four inch font the only variance needed would be for the styles. She said the applicant is permitted to have two styles plus a logo and the sign currently has four styles plus a logo. Mr. Sauer said he liked both signs. Mrs. Lloyd preferred the sign on display because she felt the sign would be easier to read from the street. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak for or against this application and no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY SIGNARAMA ON BEHALF OF UA GROUP LTD. FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL NEW SIGN FACES IN THE FREESTANDING SIGN AT 510 HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 61-17, DRAWINGS NO. AR 61-17, DATED SEPTEMBER 5, 2017, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING AND THAT THE NEW SIGN WILL BE IDENTICAL TO THE SECOND IMAGE SHOWN 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.

C. Architectural Review Board - New

1. Signage - **695 High St.** (AR Workshop Worthington) **AR 65-17**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This commercial building was constructed in the early 1900's and has mainly housed retail on the first floor, with a mix of personal services and office on the second floor. A business called AR Workshop Worthington is locating at the rear of building in the space formerly occupied by Wren House. This is a request for new wall and projection signs for the business.

Project Details:

1. The proposed 3 ½' high x 8' wide wall sign is proposed above the arched entrance to the building on the north side. The sign would match the width of the arch. Construction would be of wood with the background painted white and include lettering and graphics in black, gray and aqua. As proposed, there are 3 styles of text and a logo, so the applicant may remove the address from the sign.
2. A 2' x 2' projection sign is proposed on the east face of the building near the north corner. The wood sign would be installed on a black decorative bracket, with similar colors and graphics as the wall sign. The bottom of the sign would need to be at least 6'8" from the ground.

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.

Worthington Sign Code

1170.03 DESIGN REQUIREMENTS.

(c) Styles. Signs shall be comprised of not more than two styles of lettering plus one logo. A logo is an emblem, character, pictograph, trademark or symbol used alone to represent a business, organization, entity or product. There shall be not more than three sizes of all such lettering, including a logo.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending the wall sign be reduced in size so it is narrower than the building arch, and modified to have no more than 2 styles of text plus a logo and 3 sizes. The painted wood signs are in character with the building and Old Worthington.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicants were present. Ms. Stacy Stultz and Ms. Jen Blosser, 695 High St., Worthington, Ohio were in attendance. They stated that the screws on the sign would be gray in color. Mr. Coulter asked if the size of the signs met the sign code and Mrs. Bitar replied yes. Mr. Hofmann said he thought the projection sign is a good idea. He asked if the bracket could be installed below the capital and not on the capital and the applicant replied yes. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak for or against this application and no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY AR WORKSHOP WORTHINGTON FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL WALL AND PROJECTION SIGNS AT 695 HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 65-17, DRAWINGS NO. AR 65-17, DATED AUGUST 23, 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; Mr. Reis, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Sauer, aye; Mr. Hofmann, aye; and Mr. Foust, aye. The motion was approved.

2. Fence - 59 W. New England Ave. (Richard & Deanna Stovall) AR 66-17

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This Bungalow was originally constructed in the early 1900's and is a contributing building in the Worthington Historic District. In 2016 approval was granted to modify the front porch, convert the rear deck to a screened porch, and install a fence around the property. As installed, the fence is 3' high with 1" x 4" pickets and 2 ½" spacing between. This proposal would modify fencing at the southeast corner of the property.

Project Details:

1. The applicants would like to add a 6' high solid gate 8' south of the northeast corner of the garage to help with screening the neighbors' trash cans from view. Initially the owners hoped to add a longer stretch of higher, solid fencing, but are now just proposing the gate.
2. The additional 8' of fencing along the east property line would match the other lower, open style fencing recently constructed on the property.

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. The 6' gate should be mostly hidden from view and is a reasonable solution for screening.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Richard Stovall, 59 W. New England Ave., Worthington, Ohio, said he was looking forward to completing his project. Board members had

no questions or concerns. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak for or against this application and no one came forward.

Motion:

Mrs. Holcombe moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY RICHARD K. & DEANNA J. STOVALL FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO ADD FENCING AT 59 W. NEW ENGLAND AVE. AS PER CASE NO. AR 66-17, DRAWINGS NO. AR 66-17, DATED AUGUST 30, 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, aye. The motion was approved.

3. Signage & Patio Fence - **2285 W. Dublin-Granville Rd., Suites 123-125** (Jeanne Cabral Architect/Tomatillo's & Diamond's Ice Cream) **AR 67-17**

Findings of fact & Conclusions

Background & Request

In 2014 & 2015, the property owner of this land at the southwest corner of W. Dublin-Granville Rd. and Linworth Rd. annexed, rezoned, subdivided, created a Development Plan, and received Architectural Review Board approval to redevelop the property as a neighborhood commercial site. Several businesses are now open in Linworth Crossing.

This request is for outdoor seating and signage for Tomatillo's and Diamonds, which plan to locate at the western end of the site.

Project Details:

1. Originally signs were proposed above all three suites, and in colors other than approved as part of the sign criteria for the development. Upon notification, the applicant brought the signs into compliance with the previously approved criteria. The proposed non-illuminated red and blue lettering is shown on the drawing in the packet.
2. A 3' high black iron railing is proposed to enclose the concrete patio at the northwest corner of the building.
3. The submitted patio plan shows 8 round 4-top tables and 4 rectangular 2-tops, but specification sheets were submitted showing square aluminum tables with 4 chairs each. If the general style is approved, the exact shape and number of tables and chairs should not matter.

Land Use Plans:**Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance**

The Worthington Design Guidelines recognizes outdoor seating and tables for use by patrons as giving an open feel and being pedestrian-friendly. Fences and walls are traditionally used as boundary markers and security features. In commercial districts they often are used to separate a storefront or an outdoor seating area from the activity beyond. The Architectural District Ordinance calls for design and materials to be compatible.

Recommendations:

Staff is recommending approval of this application, as an outdoor seating area in this location is desirable, and meets with the previously approved development plan. The railing style is simple, and complementary to the design of the shopping center. The signs meet the criteria previously approved for the center.

Discussion:

Mr. Sauer asked to see other photographs of the shopping center. Mrs. Bitar displayed photographs of the other outdoor seating area. Mr. Reis asked if the railing at the Borgata restaurant is different than what would be installed at Tomatillo's and she replied yes, the fence would be more of a picket style. Mr. Coulter asked if the fence was a picket style due to State Liquor regulations and Mrs. Bitar said no, the style is what the applicant wants to have and the Board did not specify there should be a uniform style of railing for the center. Mr. Sauer said he would prefer to see the same style of railing used throughout the center. Mr. Sauer asked if the two foot stone wall would suffice instead of the railing. Mrs. Bitar referred to the architect to answer the question. Mr. Sauer expressed concerns over the placement of the fencing and the stone wall. Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Ms. Jeanne Cabral, of 2939 Bexley Park Rd., Columbus, Ohio the architect for the project, said the wall is too short, and that we need to provide a pathway to the handicapped parking area to the west. Mr. Sauer said there is another restaurant at the other end of the building serving alcoholic beverages outside so he would like to see the continuity continued with the railing. Mr. Hofmann asked where the main entrance for the restaurant would be, and she replied the southernmost door (easternmost door). Mr. Hofmann stated that he would be okay with the different style of fencing because the location would be on the other end of the building. Mr. Sauer said that since we are starting out new, that there should be some consistency in the rails and that they should be the same. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak for or against this application and no one came forward. Mr. Sauer asked an additional question related to the signage, it seems to fill up more of the space above the storefronts than the other signs. Mr. Coulter said that Ms. Bitar stated it met the sign standards established for the development.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY JEANNE CABRAL ARCHITECT FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO ADD SIGNAGE AND AN OUTDOOR SEATING AREA FOR TOMATILLO'S AND DIAMONDS AT 2285 W. DUBLIN-GRANVILLE RD., AS PER

CASE NO. AR 67-17, DRAWINGS NO. AR 67-17, DATED SEPTEMBER 1, 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 RAILING MATCH THE EXISTING RAILING AT THE CENTER;**
- **THAT THE GATES SWING OUTWARD FOR EXITING PURPOSES;**

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 - 315 W. Dublin-Granville Rd. (Matthew Smith/Edwards) AR 69-17

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This split level was constructed in 1961 in the Kilbourne Village subdivision on a lot which is almost 1/3 acre with a slightly irregular shape. Recently, the property owners to the east at 307 W. Dublin-Granville Rd. were approved to install a 6' black aluminum picket fence along their west property line as part of the guard for the swimming pool. This applicant would like to enclose the remainder of the rear yard for 315 W. Dublin-Granville Rd.

Project Details:

1. A 4' high black aluminum fence matching the style of the neighbors' 6' fence is proposed for the south and west property lines. The plan shows the fence extending into a sanitary sewer easement on the south side of the property, which would not be permitted. A revision is expected.
2. Gates are planned near the back corners of the house, and at the southeast corner of the lot.

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. Design and materials should be compatible with the house and neighborhood.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending approval of this application if amended to install the fence outside of the easement. The style is appropriate.

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar said the applicant would now like to have a split 3-rail fence with a black wire mesh fence on the inside to keep their dogs in the yard instead of the original proposal in your packet. She explained where the fence would be located on the site and said the back yard is pretty secluded with vegetation and both style of fences should be fine. She explained that the fence could not be permitted to be located in the easement at the rear of the property, which was when the applicant proposed a different style of fencing. The applicant felt that the wood would be more natural for the site, and fit the in better on the site considering the vegetation on the site. Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant is present. Mr. Matt Smith, of 315 W. Dublin-Granville Rd., Worthington, Ohio stated that they felt this style would be more appropriate and would help keep the deer out of the backyard. Board members had no questions or concerns. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present to speak for or against this application and no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Foust moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY MATTHEW SMITH FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL FENCING AT 315 W. DUBLIN-GRANVILLE RD. AS PER CASE NO. AR 69-17, DRAWINGS NO. AR 69-17, DATED SEPTEMBER 1, 2017, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING AND AMENDED TO INCLUDE A THREE RAIL FENCE WITH WIRING MESH ON THE INSIDE.

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, aye. The motion was approved.

5. Lighting - 752 High St. (CoHatch) AR 70-17

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

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, and COhatch was approved for office space in the southern part of the building. Makerspace is proposed for the

basement that would include things like a 3D printer, sound studio, art studio, photo studio and other equipment.

Building modifications and the addition of a pergola and patio were approved in June and construction is nearing completion. Lighting for the patio is proposed with this application.

Project Details:

1. Low voltage ground lighting is proposed around the landscaping framing the patio.
2. At the edge of the patio on the inside of the landscaping, low voltage lights that angle up are proposed.
3. String lights are proposed to hang from the pergola.
4. A spot light is proposed to shine up on the sign on the chimney.
5. All fixtures would be Volt brand and have a bronze finish.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Lighting fixtures in a commercial district need to be considered carefully and selected so they enhance the district's historic character. 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 string lighting does not enhance the historic character of the building or of Old Worthington. That type of lighting may be appropriate at the holidays, but not year round for this building. Small fixtures that light down from the inside of the pergola posts may be an option. The other proposed lighting should be appropriate, except the spot light on the sign may not be necessary with the ambient light from the patio and City Street lights.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked what materials would be used to construct the tables and Mrs. Bitar replied cedar, the same material used to build the pergola, but she was uncertain as to what material the top would be made of and referred the question to be answered by the applicant. Mr. Sauer asked if the original drawings had the retaining wall going all the way around the patio and Mrs. Bitar said the drawings may have shown the wall going further. Mr. Brown said the same area is where they will be obtaining a six-foot easement from the school which is the area that will be landscaped. He also stated that once the landscaping is installed that the retaining wall, fencing and rails would not be as visible. Mr. Coulter asked if the City would be responsible for the landscaping and Mr. Brown said yes. City Council will be approving a landscape easement at their meeting in October. Following City Council's approval, we would record the easement. He said they are currently working with the City Arborist to get the landscaping installed. Mr. Brown also stated that there would be additional work on the lawn area towards SR-161, and that the damaged sidewalk leading to Kilbourne Middle School would be replaced in the coming weeks. Mr. Sauer asked for clarification related to the retaining wall, and Mrs. Bitar reiterated what Mr. Brown stated that you would not be able to tell once the landscaping was installed. Mr. Sauer asked if all of the posts are

in for the fence and Mrs. Bitar said yes, however this is not the finished product. All the fence post are installed at this time. Mr. Brown said that the fence drops down to a railing that will go towards the corner of the building, this railing would match the railing that is on the front of the building. Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present, and Mrs. Bitar swore him in. Mr. Matt Davis, Founder and Community Orchestrator of COHatch, discussed the handicap ramp, materials being used to make the furniture, and possible ideas for electrical fixtures. Mr. Davis also said that he is working with the City to determine the best way to address the issues with accessibility to the public portion of the patio. The ramp would need to be ADA compliant. Mr. Davis said he would like to use some type of string lighting for the pergola. He stated that lighting the area has been extremely difficult to determine how to appropriately light the area. He stated that they really needed overhead lighting for the patio area for events. We are open to other options if the Board or Staff has any ideas. Mr. Coulter asked what the material of the outdoor table would be, Mr. Davis replied that they have three options: concrete or galvanized aluminum. Mr. Sauer asked for clarification on the patio furniture. Mr. Davis overviewed the furniture and stated that it was easier to purchase furniture that is on sale at the end of the season vs. spending \$5,000 on furniture that is not on sale. He would also like to install a fire pit on the patio in the future. Mr. Foust said the Board has struggled in the past with businesses wanting to use string lighting. He said one thought that might work would be instead of randomly stringing the lights maybe follow the patterns on the pergola and have them stapled to the pergola, but he does not know how the other Board members would feel about that because they put some people through the mill about stringing lights outside and he is concerned a precedent will be set by stringing lights on the Village Green. Board members discussed various ideas for lighting. He also stated that he had a fear of setting a precedent by allowing string lights on the Village Green. Mr. Sauer said he was not comfortable with string lighting for this particular building. The formal architecture of the building does not seem to lend itself to the randomness of the string lights. Mr. Hofmann suggested that the lighting follow the joist of each row of the pergola. Mr. Reis said the lighting following the joist might work but felt Mr. Davis should come back to another meeting with more details of what lighting would be used and how the lighting would be installed. He did not believe stapling the lighting to the pergola would be a good idea. Mrs. Holcombe asked about the landscape plan related to Mr. Davis's comment that vines would be planted to help soften the pergola. She stated that once the vines would grow up on the pergola that string lights might work, however at this time you should propose something different. She said she would be against using string lights because she was against using string lights for a business on the south edge of Worthington. Mrs. Holcombe was not against the use of wicker furniture and thought the furniture would look very nice. She suggested the use of some up and maybe some down lighting for now to get things started. Mr. Reis thought down lighting could be used where the fence sits high. Mr. Coulter said the Board would be willing to approve lighting for the pergola but not the use of string lights, but they are open to some other solution and willing to work with Mr. Davis. Mr. Davis stated that he felt that it was also a safety issue to have adequate lighting on the patio area. Mr. Sauer asked Mr. Davis if he was open to the idea of using lighting connected to the posts and Mr. Davis replied yes. Mr. Brown said he has seen trees used to hold fixtures that had light shining downward and to consider the idea as well. Mr. Sauer asked for clarification on how the patio would be connected to the sidewalk. He was not impressed with the idea of just using concrete to make the connection. He thought that it would be nice to match the bluestone. Mrs. Bitar clarified that the texture of the

bluestone might be an issue if you are going up the ramp to the patio. Mr. Brown said that staff would continue to work with the application to get things worked out concerning the ramp. Mr. Coulter explained the Board members were okay with everything presented at the meeting except for the use of the string lights. Mr. Foust asked if the lighting will be turned off at night, or would they leave the lighting on all night. Mr. Davis said that it would be on timers and turned off at night. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak for or against this application and one person came forward.

Mr. Kevin Rohyans, wanted to say he is in support of the use of string lights in Worthington. He was happy to see something lively going into this space and asked the Board to reconsider the use of string lights because he felt the high quality string lights would give the space more ambiance.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY COHATCH FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO ADD LIGHTING FOR THE PATIO AT 752 HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 70-17, DRAWINGS NO. AR 70-17, DATED AUGUST 29, 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 FURNITURE SHOWN THIS EVENING BE APPROVED AND THAT ANY ADDITIONAL FURNITURE THAT IS PLACED ON THE SITE BE REVIEWED BY CITY STAFF PRIOR TO INSTALLATION AND THAT THE STRING LIGHTS NOT BE INSTALLED AND THAT ALTERNATIVE LIGHTING BE PREPARED AND RESUBMITTED TO THE BOARD.

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.

6. Directional Sign - 90 E. Wilson Bridge Rd. (Worthington Area Chamber of Commerce) AR 71-17

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

The AAA building was constructed in the mid-1970's on a 4.8 acre parcel with frontage on three rights-of-way. A second building currently housing a barber shop is toward the northeast corner of the parcel. Directional signage has been in place on this site to assist AAA customers as well as customers of other tenants. This request would modify an existing sign to advertise a new tenant.

Project Details:

1. The Worthington Area Chamber of Commerce moved into the eastern part of the AAA building recently. The space was previously occupied by the Social Security office.
2. Reuse of an existing directional sign near the walkway to the chamber office is proposed. The new roughly 4' x 2' aluminum panel would be installed in the existing frame, which would be re-painted. The sign face is proposed with a white background, the red and blue chamber logo, and a blue arrow pointing toward the entrance.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Guideline recommendations for signage include being efficient in using signs. Try to use as few and as small signs as are necessary to get the business message across to the public. Signage is a standard of review per the Architectural District ordinance.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending approval of this application, as the proposed directional sign modification is in character with the property.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Ms. Katherine Paugh, P.O. Box 68, Worthington, Ohio, said the directional sign will take care of many issues, one of which will alleviate the people coming in to apply for Social Security even though the Social Security office moved over ten years ago. She said people also get confused looking for AAA offices. 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 THE WORTHINGTON AREA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO MODIFY A DIRECTIONAL SIGN AT 90 E. WILSON BRIDGE RD., AS PER CASE NO. AR 71-17, DRAWINGS NO. AR 71-17, DATED SEPTEMBER 1, 2017, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

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.

7. Signage - **910 High St.** (Signcom Inc./PetPeople) **AR 64-17**

&

D. Municipal Planning Commission

1. Amendment to Development Plan

Page 13 of 35

ARB/MPC Meeting September 14, 2017

Minutes

a. Signage - **910 High St.** (Signcom Inc./PetPeople) **ADP 05-17**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

Two buildings were approved at this location south of the CVS building in 2007 when CVS was approved, and revised in 2016. Construction is nearing completion, and PetPeople is planning to move into the northern building. These applications are a request for signage.

Project Details:

1. The applicant would like to install a sign over the High St. entrance and a sign over the parking lot entrance. A variance is needed to have more than one wall mounted sign.
2. The proposed High St. sign would be 16' wide x 2'6" high, with the rear being 15' wide x 2'6" high. Placement of the front sign is proposed centered on the fascia; the rear sign is shown over a brick detail.
3. Construction would be of HDU (high density urethane), with ½" high raised borders and graphics. The background color is proposed as green (PMS #7496) and the border and lettering would be white.

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. While the regulations permit a certain maximum square footage of signs for a business, try to minimize the size and number of signs. Place only basic names and graphics on signs along the street so that drive-by traffic is not bombarded with too much information. Signs must be distinctive enough to be readily visible, but avoid incompatible modern colors such as "fluorescent orange" and similar colors. Bright color shades generally are discouraged in favor more subtle and toned-down shades.

Recommendation:

Staff feels two wall mounted signs are appropriate for this building given the two entrances, but the sign on the rear should be made smaller to better fit between architectural details and because a larger sign is not warranted.

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar stated that the proposed sign on the rear of the building should be smaller to not overlap with the brick detail on the building and fits better in the area. The sign does not need to be as large since you already know that you are going to the PetPeople building from the rear parking lot. The style of sign seems appropriate for the development. Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant

was present. Mr. Ron Dee, 6950 Worthington-Galena Rd., Worthington, Ohio, said the size of their sign is very important for their main entrance. He said the main entrance will really be the rear parking lot vs. the High St. entrance since there is no parking on High St. Mr. Dee referenced the size of the signs at Fresh Thyme Farmers Market on the front side, rear side and a large monument sign in front of their development. He also referenced the number of signs on the CVS building on the corner of High St. and North St. He feels the size of the sign is very important to us. He said the sign on the front of the building is sixteen feet long while the sign in the back is only fifteen feet long. Mr. Dee said he agreed with the staff comments about keeping the sign within the brick line, and was willing to adjust the rear sign on the building. Mr. Sauer felt both signs were too large and said the sign in the back seems too crowded so he would like to see the sign in the back be smaller in height. He also stated that the roofline would block the lower part of the sign on the front of the building, and that the sign would like its sitting on the building, not resting on the roof. Mr. Hofmann asked for clarification that the applicant is looking for a variance to have two signs, but do the size of the proposed signs meet code. Mrs. Bitar stated that she they would meet what our Code would allow. Mr. Dee countered that the buildings to the south would have five signs like what they are proposing. Mr. Sauer said that he would not allow them to have signs like that on their building. Mr. Dee argued that they should have more signage since the surrounding buildings would have more signs. Mr. Sauer stated that he does not believe this has anything to do with this application. Mr. Foust also felt the sign needs to fit within the sign bands. There needs to be a line of brick around each of the signs. Mr. Sauer said if two brick courses are left at the top and two brick courses are left at the bottom, that would leave nine brick courses in the middle which equals twenty-four inches. He said a sign around twenty-four inches would be much better than thirty inches. Mr. Foust said the sign facing the parking lot does not need to be as big as the sign facing High St. because the sign in back is for pedestrians. Mr. Dee asked if the size of the sign is within the allowable code, and Mrs. Bitar said yes. She said the Worthington Design Guidelines clearly specify using the smallest signage possible to still be effective, however that may not be the same thing. Mr. Dee stated that he felt that they were being more restricted than the CVS signage. Mrs. Bitar replied that she did not believe that the CVS signs were more than 2-feet in height. Mr. Foust said if someone came to the Board asking for a six foot by four foot sign the Board would not allow that because the sign would conflict within the elements of the building and the sign needs to be appropriate for the building and the features on the building. Mr. Dee again argues that CVS has numerous signs on their building, what if we wanted another sign on our south elevation. Mr. Coulter stated that you would not see it. Mr. Brown said he the sign will need a variance and will have to be forwarded to City Council for approval since this is an Amendment to the Development Plan. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak for or against this application and no one came forward.

ARB Motion:

Mr. Hofmann moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY SIGNCOM INC. ON BEHALF OF PETPEOPLE FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL WALL SIGNS AT 910 HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 64-17, DRAWINGS NO. AR 64-17, DATED AUGUST 17, 2017, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS

IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING WITH THE AMENDMENT THAT SIGN BE REDUCED TO TWENTY-FOUR INCHES IN HEIGHT AND THAT THE LENGTH IN PROPORTION BE REDUCED AND THAT THERE BE TWO BANDS/COURSES OF BRICK EVENLY DISPLAYED AROUND THE SIGN FOR BOTH THE FRONT AND THE REAR SIGN OF THE BUILDING

Mrs. Holcombe 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 as amended.

MPC Motion:

Mr. Hofmann moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY SIGNCOM INC. ON BEHALF OF PETPEOPLE TO AMEND THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR THE PROPERTY AT 910 HIGH ST. BY INSTALLING WALL SIGNS AS PER CASE NO. ADP 05-17, DRAWINGS NO. ADP 05-17, DATED AUGUST 17, 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.

C. Architectural Review Board - New

8. New Buildings - **6699 N. High St.** (Schoedinger Funeral & Cremation Services) **AR 68-17**

&

D. Municipal Planning Commission

1. Amendment to Development Plan

b. New Buildings - **6699 N. High St.** (Schoedinger Funeral & Cremation Services) **ADP 06-17**

&

2. Conditional Use

a. Mortuaries in C-3 - New Buildings - **6699 N. High St.** (Schoedinger Funeral & Cremation Services) **CU 11-17**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

The property occupied by Schoedinger is comprised of 4 acres on the west side of N. High St. Although the land still shows as 3 separate taxing parcels, the city views the land as all one parcel because the lots were combined through a platting process in 1993. The current mortuary and parking was approved in 1993, and opened to the public in 1994. These applications are a request to construct three additional buildings on the site to accommodate corporate offices, human and pet crematories, and garages.

Project Details:

1. General:
 - The existing 13,000 square foot building would remain in the center of the site, with the three new buildings proposed to the north and south.
 - The entire site would be connected by way of new and old pavement and painted crosswalks.
 - All new buildings would be constructed with brick or lap siding. Doors and trim would be white. Material samples and details are needed.
 - New signage would need approval.
2. Building A – Schoedinger Pet Funeral Services to include a pet crematory
 - 4140 square foot one-story building with hipped roof at south end of site
 - Main entrance on east side and service entrances on west and north sides
 - 100' from east property line; ~150' from west property line; 18' 1" from south property line – variance needed from Code Section 1175.02 (c)
 - Parking in front of building about 35' from the right-of-way – variance needed from Code Section 1149.08 (c)
3. Building B – Corporate offices, human crematory, viewing room and garage
 - 15,832 square foot two-story building with hipped roof and adjacent one-story garage
 - Main entrance on east side with service entrances on west and south sides, and garage doors on east and west sides
 - ~125' from east property line; ~145' from west property line; and 15' from north property line - variance needed from Code Section 1175.02 (c)
 - Use of existing parking in front of building with addition of accessible spaces.
4. Building C – Garage for Hearse parking
 - 2488 square foot one-story building with hipped roof
 - 5 double garage doors to accommodate 10 vehicles
 - West of Building B; 31'9" from west property line - variance needed from Code Section 1149.03 (a); ~30' from north property line - variance needed from Code Section 1175.02 (c)
 - Additional/new parking in front of and at building's southeast corner
5. Landscaping is shown for Buildings A & B, but not for Building C which is the closest to residential. Details are needed.
6. Lighting – Several pole lights are proposed for relocation. Additional proposed lights wall-

mounted lantern style fixtures.

7. Storm water management should be addressed. Other utilities would be accessed from N. High St.
8. Crematories - Information has been submitted about the regulations regarding crematories, and should be discussed.

Conditional Use Permit 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 – Traffic to the site will increase.
2. Effect on public facilities – No effect has been identified.
3. Effect on sewerage and drainage facilities – Further information is needed.
4. Utilities required – Existing.
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 based on the applicants’ statement and EPA regulations.
7. Hours of use – Consistent with existing use – typical office hours plus services evenings and weekends.
8. Shielding or screening considerations for neighbors – Landscaping plans needed for Building C
9. Appearance and compatibility with the general neighborhood – Generally compatible.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

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

Setbacks: Parking areas should be located toward the rear and not in the front setbacks if at all possible. Unimpeded pedestrian access to the front building facade from the sidewalk should be a primary goal. Building up to the required setback is desirable as a means of getting pedestrians closer to the building and into the main entrance as easily as possible.

Roof Shape: Generally, a traditional roof shape such as gable or hip is preferable to a flat roof on a new building. Roof shapes should be in scale with the buildings on which they are placed. Study traditional building designs in Old Worthington to get a sense of how much of the facade composition is wall surface and how much is roof.

Materials: Traditional materials such as wood and brick are desirable in newer areas, but other materials are also acceptable. These include various metals and plastics; poured concrete and concrete block should be confined primarily to foundation walls. Avoid any use of glass with highly

reflective coatings. Some of these may have a blue, orange, or silver color and can be as reflective as mirrors; they generally are not compatible with other development in Worthington. Before making a final selection of materials, prepare a sample board with preferred and optional materials.

Windows: On long facades, consider breaking the composition down into smaller “storefront” units, with some variation in first and upper floor window design. Use traditional sizes, proportions and spacing for first and upper floor windows. Doing so will help link Old Worthington and newer areas through consistent design elements.

Entries: Primary building entrances should be on the street-facing principal facade. Rear or side entries from parking lots are desirable, but primary emphasis should be given to the street entry. Use simple door and trim designs compatible with both the building and with adjacent and nearby development.

Ornamentation: Use ornamentation sparingly in new developments. Decorative treatments at entries, windows and cornices can work well in distinguishing a building and giving it character, but only a few such elements can achieve the desired effect. Traditional wood ornamentation is the simplest to build, but on new buildings it is possible to use substitute materials such as metal and fiberglass. On brick buildings substitute materials can be used to resemble the stone or metal ornamental elements traditionally found on older brick buildings. As with all ornamentation, simple designs and limited quantities give the best results.

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

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

Worthington Comprehensive Plan

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

The plan recommends promoting a high quality physical environment, encouraging the City to continue to emphasize strong physical and aesthetic design, and high-quality development. Also recommended is encouraging the private market to add additional commercial office space within the City

Worthington Conditional Use Permit Regulations

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

Staff Analysis:

1. Parking is not desired in such close proximity to N. High St. Reduction of the proposed parking in front of Building A would be beneficial. If the business can accommodate the majority of services with on-site parking, providing for maximum size events should not be expected.
2. The general design of the buildings is compatible with the existing building. The prominence of the garage on Building B gives the building a residential look, which is not in character with one of the main commercial corridors in the City. Use of different colors or materials for the garage and door may be helpful.
3. Location of crematories on the site do not present a concern based on the analysis of the applicant and the equipment provider, and EPA regulations.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending discussion of all details of the project, with use of the following motions when appropriate:

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Underhill, Attorney, New Albany, Ohio, Mr. Mark Ford, Architect with Ford & Associates, 1500 W. 1st Ave., Columbus, Ohio, and Mr. Randy Schoedinger, Schoedinger Funeral Homes, 6699 N. High St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Underhill said Schoedinger would like to relocate their corporate headquarters and crematory services from downtown Columbus to Worthington, but the Chapel will remain downtown. Schoedinger would be bringing forty-five (45) new jobs to the city along with \$2.7 million dollars in payroll. They believe this is a good location because of its proximity to the highway, Worthington is a great community. Mr. Underhill said they would like to keep the two curb cuts that already exist for the property and they want to make sure they provide adequate parking. He said only on a rare occasion would over flow parking be needed. Mr. Underhill said the existing building's design would not be changed. The crematory services would be located to the southern part of the site and the building would hold three crematory units, as well as a crematory for pets. The new

building would be located fifteen feet from the property line while Building C would be used for parking the hearses. The Schoedingers' have invested in the best and most up to date equipment possible which should eliminate most of the concerns people would have such as odors, and reducing the amount of emissions. He said emissions would be less than that of a fast food restaurant and a very low amount of noise, in fact a person standing next to the unit while in service would be able to make a telephone call. Mr. Schoedinger said they recently had the opportunity to take a look at moving their corporate offices from where his family business has been since 1917. They chose the Worthington location for several reasons, one of which is because they are focusing on the northern end of Franklin County. Since they purchased the land in Worthington and moved in, in 1994, they have not used the north acre nor have they cared for the lot in the past ten years. Mr. Schoedinger said he has tried to sell the acre of land not in use, but there is only one curb cut so anything new would have to share the curb cut. There are currently 160 parking spaces which is more than all of their other funeral homes have. Mr. Schoedinger said they did send a letter to the neighbors, with an invitation to call with any questions and one neighbor called back. Mr. Schoedinger said they began their pet crematory services in 1995 and there could be approximately fifteen to twenty of those cremations per day, and on the human side of the crematory, possibly five cremations per day. Mr. Reis asked if the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) had any issues with the emissions, and Mr. Underhill said no. This type of use is highly regulated by the Ohio EPA. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to ask questions.

Mr. Matt Reid, 6680 Hayhurst St., Worthington, Ohio, said he lives near the proposed addition but he did not receive a letter regarding the hearing this evening. He said his father passed away a year ago and was cremated, and he plans to have himself cremated when the time comes, so he has nothing against the business. Mr. Reid said he has three young children who are still having a difficult time trying to grasp what death means. He stated that this is a great community and it has a growing economy. He also stated that many children are not ready to grasp death, and you are putting kids and the schools to have to deal with the questions. It should be up to the parents to explain death and not put it onto someone else. He asked if the building is approved if trees, such as evergreens, could be planted to block the view from the south side of the property. Mr. Reid also asked if the business plans to increase their amount of cremations that they have to go back to the Board for permission to do so. He felt maybe the crematory would be better suited in another location in Worthington such as Huntley Road or near Busch Blvd. He also brought up an example of an issue in Connecticut related to a crematorium related to emissions and odors. Mr. Reid asked if there would be increased traffic in the evenings and if there were any recent complaints.

Mr. Brown said he recently spoke with the City of Worthington Police and Fire Chiefs and they had received about three calls per year from people curious to know what was going on with the property. Some people saw smoke in the atmospheric conditions and called to make sure the building was not on fire, but they have not had any complaints relating to emissions. Mr. Brown

also said if the funeral home were to increase the number of crematory units they would have to come back to the Board for permission because they would be amending their Conditional Use.

Ms. Beth Mitchell, 58 Larrimer Ave., Worthington, Ohio, said she was representing her neighbor, Miriam Solomon, who lives at 6949 Hayhurst Street, because she was unable to attend the meeting. Ms. Solomon had serious reservations about building a crematory in the neighborhood and suggested putting the crematory somewhere in a more industrial area, which there are many within a ten minute drive from Worthington. Ms. Solomon is strongly opposed to the crematory. Her parents were exterminated in crematories in World War II and she would feel very uncomfortable and may have to move. She also fears the crematory would reduce her home's value. Ms. Mitchell said she did not find out about this meeting until a couple of days ago, and she would have liked to have received a letter since her property is close to the proposed development. Ms. Mitchell said she was not sure if Mr. Schoedinger reached out to the Worthington Estates area or not. Ms. Mitchell asked the Board not to approve anything this evening to give more residents time to ask questions.

Ms. Sarah Gold, 6741 Hayhurst St., Worthington, Ohio, said she also heard about the meeting two days before the meeting, and did not receive a letter from Schoedinger. Ms. Gold said she sees the crematorium as an industrial business. The Board members have spent so much time discussing the aesthetics of the gateway to the city and she felt the crematorium is not appropriate so close to a residential neighborhood. She was also concerned about toxins being released in the air. Ms. Gold said she loved everything that has been done to make the city beautiful but she does not feel the crematorium fits within the neighborhood. The City has spent all this time and money on beautifying our gateway to the City with new signage and lighting, this seems too industrial for the area. This use does not you feel safe or welcoming to our community. There is going to be fumes, emissions and toxins. Pollution and traffic is going to be an issue on the site. If the volume goes up, so will traffic, and you will overwhelm High St. Can't they sell off their lot, can't the City help them find someone to buy it. I have lived here for over 40-years.

Mr. Devin Woodyard, 6650 Hayhurst St., Worthington, Ohio, said his family owns and operates funeral homes. He said he is a friend of Mr. Schoedinger, and hoped his comments would not jeopardize their friendship. We are in the process of putting in one of these units are one of our facilities. Mr. Woodyard said he was not concerned with the addition of the crematory, his concerns were with the volume of business. He said Schoedinger's care center, would also be relocated to Worthington, which is where the bodies are prepared, and then shipped out to different chapels. Mr. Woodyard said if Schoedinger handles 2,200 - 2,300 bodies and families per year that means a person will be coming back and forth 2,200 - 2,300 times to handle the bodies. All the cremations at this location would intense and we would be importing people for cremation to the area. He also stated that there would 15-20 pets a day, that's 4,000 pet cremations a day. I'm not concerned with the crematorium, however the volume is concerning to me. He said he would

like to know if the \$2.5 million dollars in payroll would all be coming through Worthington, or does it go to different areas.

Mr. Palmer Moore, 6700 Hayhurst St., Worthington, Ohio, said he purchased his home twenty-five years ago, and there was a big open field across from Blue Cross and Blue Shield, but he understood the property was commercial. Mr. Moore said he could not have had a nicer neighbor, there has been very little traffic, and every once in a while someone important dies and the parking lot fills up. He stated that he contacted Randy and asked questions related to the proposed use, but did not realize the volume of people that would be cremated. He asked that Mr. Schoedinger install a fence on his property since his property was the only property without a fence. Mr. Moore said Worthington Estates is the best place to raise kids, and the values of the community and he does not want to see a factory in his backyard, this is not a homey funeral parlor. The traffic would have to go up. He said he could not understand why he could not have chickens a hundred and fifty feet away from his neighbor but his neighbor can burn a bunch of bodies a hundred and fifty feet away. There is a State law that references you cannot have a crematory within 200-yards of a residence, however that was shot down by the Supreme Court. Why was it 200-yards at one time, why did it change?

Mr. David Werner, 6690 Hayhurst St., Worthington, Ohio, wanted to express his opinion that he is not in favor of this project. He said do you all know of Inland Products? If you have ever been downtown on a warm summer day near one of the crematories, there is a horrible odor in air. They process animals. They are talking about bring that to our backyard in volume.

Mr. Schoedinger apologized to the residents who did not get letters regarding the proposal. He said he mailed letters to all of the abutting properties. Mr. Schoedinger said they may receive a body about once every three hours so there should not be a significant impact on traffic to the site. Our funeral homes handle approximately 2,500 families a year, that's about 7 guests a day at all of our funeral homes. That relates to about 1 vehicle every 3 hours. He said 85% of pet deaths occur at veterinarian offices so the pets are picked up around town in the morning from various offices and the vehicle returns in the afternoon so there will not be any traffic impact regarding pet deaths either. Ninety percent of their customers picking up their pets cremated remains do so from the nearest chapel. There was a reference to Inland Products, we are not a rendering facility, and that is a completely different type of system and operation. That use is not a crematory. Mr. Schoedinger said he did not think there would be much impact as to whether there are two cremations per day or five. He said they have been a good neighbor in Worthington and a good community partner. We feel this adds to the community and brings good jobs to the community. This will be the first pet funeral home in the state of Ohio.

Mr. Brown said he wanted to add to the discussion of notices that the City did send out notices last Wednesday, (September 6, 2017), to the adjacent property owners to let them know about the

meeting, the signs were posted on the property and then Mrs. Bitar sent out an email blast last Friday, September 8th, 2017, and the information was posted to the City's website.

Mr. Coulter asked if there were any additional questions. He then asked Mr. Ford if he wanted to address Mrs. Bitar's comments related to architecture, however before we get to the architecture it may be advisable to request this item to be table to address all the comments we heard here tonight. A small neighborhood meeting might be appropriate to address any questions.

Mr. Coulter asked about the landscaping to help screen and buffer the use from the neighbors. He also asked about the residential looking garage door on the northern building, and stated that it doesn't seem to fit, a carriage house door might be more of a fit. He doesn't have too many concerns with the architecture. Is there anything we can do better related to the parking out towards High St.

Mr. Foust said he used to work for a company that sold incinerators to hospitals so he is aware of how they operate. He said a properly operated system would not generate a lot of smoke or noxious gas, but there have been situations at Rutherford-Corbin's Funeral Home. He said he has driven up High Street late at night and driving through clouds of black smoke coming out of the stacks because the after burner was not working. Mr. Foust said anytime a business abuts residential property there will be questions about second and third shift operations at night such as lighting, noise and noise. Mr. Foust said they just dealt with a situation with Fresh Thyme grocery store where trucks were showing up at 5:00 a.m. with their engines running waiting for the store to open up at 6:00 a.m. Sometimes dumpsters are emptied late at night, sometimes people lock their doors which causes the horns to honk because people do not realize they can lock their car doors without setting the horns off. There is the potential for a lot of noise at night and he would like some clarification what will be going on late at night. He said the other issue was whether or not variances would be needed.

Mr. Myers said the Board has tried hard to get the parking moved off of High Street and put the parking behind the buildings. Mr. Ford explained they originally had planned to move Building A forty feet closer to the street but there would have been problems needing variances in regards to the setback, so they flipped the parking back to the front. Mr. Myers asked how badly the parking spaces were needed in front of Building A. Mr. Ford said he would have to ask Mr. Schoedinger about that, but they could possibly eliminate the parking spots in front of Building A. Mr. Sauer said he would like to know more about the operations of the business and how this business compares with Rutherford's in terms of volume. He said he would like to see this matter tabled so the owner could address some of the neighbors' concerns.

Mr. Sauer mentioned the reduction in parking in front of Building A, we have been trying to reduce parking towards High St. The existing parking that is out front has a lot of nice landscaping that helps screen and camouflage the parking from those on High St. Residential character, Building B the south façade just does not look friendly, the rest of it looks really nice. This needs to be

addressed. I would like to find out more about the operation and get a better understanding of the process. Rutherford has been used as a reference, I would like to better understand their operation to help with this review to better understand the volume and scale of each operation.

Mr. Brown reminded the Board members there would not be a second ARB meeting in month of September, so the next meeting would be October 12, 2017.

Mr. Schoedinger said there were a few other things he wanted to discuss. He said in regards to the operation of their business, after hours, from 7:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. there will be one person staying in the building overnight, a licensed funeral director that answers the telephone. There will also be another person whose sole responsibility is to pick up bodies if someone passes overnight. There will not be much traffic, possibly three trips during the night to pick up bodies. Mr. Schoedinger said some of his clients want the peace of mind of seeing their loved one being put into the cremation container and wait while the person is being cremated. He said over the years some funeral homes have gotten a bad reputation of doing bad things so he wants his customers to be assured their loved one was properly cared for, and for that reason, he cannot locate this portion of the business in an industrial area. He offered everyone to tour their crematory located in downtown Columbus, Ohio, to see what he was talking about. Mr. Foust asked if there would be any cremations between 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. and Mr. Schoedinger said no.

Mr. Reis said his first concerns were about emissions and some of the residents had the same concerns. He said that he felt a lot of attention should be put towards addressing this issue. He said he would like Mr. Schoedinger to the residents, the Board, and the City, the assurance there would be no problems with emissions, or excessive smoke. He stated that he would want to know that there would not be emissions, and compare these emissions to other uses, possibly a Wendy's, McDonald's or other uses that might have a burning function and share this information with us.

Mrs. Lloyd asked why the pet crematory would be separate and Mr. Schoedinger said for customer experience. Mr. Schoedinger stated someone coming to a funeral for their loved one would not want to see a funeral for a pet in the next room.

Mr. Hofmann said that he appreciates you being such a great community member, and appreciates you wanting to relocate to Worthington with your headquarters to our community. This is an emotional topic for everyone. Is there not a way to bring everything to Worthington, except for the crematorium portion of the proposed use? Can it be located somewhere else in the community. Referenced other technologies that might be coming online and available as options in the future.

Mr. Sauer moved to table both of the applications, seconded by Mr. Hofmann. All board members voted, "Aye", and the application was tabled.

Mr. Myers suggested working with staff in the outreach and notification to the various interest groups to better explain in detail.

b. Ancillary Retail in I-1 - **6384 Proprietors Rd.** (New Avenue Architects & Engineers/Ohio

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This property is on the east side of Proprietor's Rd., adjacent to the railroad, and has 3 buildings that were built in the 1980's. In the front there is a two-story office building; to the south is a one-story office building; and to the rear is a larger one-story building which houses Sullivan Builders and Ohio Beer Co. Ohio Beer Co. is a distributor of local craft beers, and is at the north end of that rear building. As the company has walk-in traffic, it would like to designate an area for ancillary retail, which is a Conditional Use in the I-1 Zoning District.

Project Details:

Ohio Beer Co. has been operating in the building, unaware of the zoning requirements to have a Conditional Use Permit for the retail part of the operation. The area being leased is 7549 square feet, and the retail area is 576 square feet (7.6%) Limited consumption for tasting by vendors would also take place in the retail area.

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 – Retail traffic would only be on Fridays and Saturdays. The typical number of customers has not been identified.
2. Effect on public facilities – No effect has been identified.
3. Effect on sewerage and drainage facilities – The effect would not change.
4. Utilities required – No new utilities would be required.
5. Safety and health considerations – None have been identified.
6. Noise, odors and other noxious elements, including hazardous substances and other environmental hazards – None have been identified.
7. Hours of use – Friday 10:00 am – 6:00 pm, and Saturday 9:00 am to 3:00 pm.
8. Shielding or screening considerations for neighbors – Several wall signs and a sandwich board sign have been in use by the company. The Board of Zoning Appeals approved a painted wall sign and a sign above the entrance. The others are to be removed.
9. Appearance and compatibility with the general neighborhood – No change to building or site.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Conditional Use Permit Regulations

The following basic standards apply to conditional uses in any "C" or "I" District: the location, size, nature and intensity of the use, operations involved in or conducted in connection with it, its site layout and its relation to streets giving access to it, shall be such that both pedestrian and vehicular traffic to and from it will not be hazardous, both at the time and as the same may be expected to increase with increasing development of the Municipality. The provisions for parking,

screening, setback, lighting, loading and service areas and sign location and area shall also be specified by the applicant and considered by the Commission.

Ancillary Retail definition:

"Ancillary retail/service" means a retail or service facility that is clearly incidental and subordinate to the primary use of a structure. Such retail or service facility shall not occupy more than ten percent (10%) of the gross floor area of the structure where located.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending approval of this application. The proposed business would meet the basic standards for conditional uses.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Adam Brandkamp, 6384 Proprietors Rd., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Sauer asked if the Board was approving the hours of the retail side of the business and Mrs. Bitar said yes. Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Brandkamp what the hours of operation would be and Mrs. Bitar responded 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on Friday, and 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. on Saturday. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone else who wanted to speak for or against this application and no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Hofmann moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY STEVEN SCHWOPE OF NEW AVENUE ARCHITECTS & ENGINEERS ON BEHALF OF OHIO BEER CO. FOR A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO ALLOW ANCILLARY RETAIL IN THE I-1 ZONING DISTRICT AT 6384 PROPRIETORS RD., AS PER CASE NO. CU 07-17, DRAWINGS NO. CU 07-17, DATED JULY 7, 2017, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE PLANNING GOALS OF THE CITY, AS REFERENCED IN THE LAND USE PLANS AND ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING AND AMENDED THAT THE RETAIL HOURS WILL BE TWO DAYS PER WEEK, FRIDAYS FROM 10:00 A.M. TO 6:00 P.M. AND SATURDAYS 9:00 A.M. TO 3:00 P.M.

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.

- c. Restaurant in C-5 - Patio Use - **649 High St.** (The Worthington Inn) **CU 08-17** (Amendment to CU 02-03)

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following in the staff memo:

Findings of fact & Conclusions

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. The Worthington Inn is a contributing building in the Worthington Historic District.

A restaurant has been part of the Worthington Inn since the mid-1800's. In 2003, a Conditional Use Permit was approved allowing outdoor seating for the restaurant on the sidewalk in the right-of-way. Consumption of alcohol was not previously permitted at that seating unless a permanent barrier had been erected. With approval of the Designated Outdoor Refreshment Area (D.O.R.A.) by City Council, physical barriers are no longer required to allow consumption of alcohol outside of the restaurants along High St. There is a stipulation that patrons must purchase the alcohol inside the restaurant, and can carry it outside in a designated cup if they stay in a signed area to consume the drink. Also, temporary signs on stanchions prohibiting alcohol beyond the seating area would be required.

The Worthington Inn would like to allow patrons to consume alcohol at the sidewalk seating area, and hopes to have a revised seating plan approved.

Project Details:

1. The D.O.R.A. would allow patrons to consume alcohol at the tables on the sidewalk and elsewhere during special events, after purchasing the alcohol inside of the restaurant in a designated D.O.R.A. cup.
2. Originally, 6 two-top tables were approved for placement along the back edge of the sidewalk in front of the inn and the patio area to the north. Potted topiaries were also placed along the property line. Now, approval of the current configuration is sought, with tables just in front of the patio area consisting of a rectangular table with 6 seats and 2 two-top round tables. Also, umbrellas are placed east of the smaller tables and in the middle of the large table.
3. The City requires at least 5' of the sidewalk area be left unobstructed for pedestrians, and overhead obstructions should be at least 6'8" above the sidewalk.

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 – Pedestrian traffic may be impeded with the larger table and the two separate umbrellas. When patrons are sitting on both side of the table and a server is there, the clear space is limited. The height and placement of the freestanding umbrellas would not allow the easy flow of pedestrian traffic.
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 – No new utilities would be required.
5. Safety and health considerations – None have been identified.
6. Noise, odors and other noxious elements, including hazardous substances and other environmental hazards – None have been identified.

7. Hours of use – 7:00 am – 12:00 am as was originally approved.
8. Shielding or screening considerations for neighbors – Not applicable.
9. Appearance and compatibility with the general neighborhood – Not applicable.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Conditional Use Permit Regulations

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

Worthington Comprehensive Plan

A good mix of restaurant and niche retail shops are appropriate for Old Worthington. Market to desired retail users that are targeting the authentic town center with pedestrian-oriented store plans and products.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending the larger table and freestanding umbrella are not appropriately placed in the right-of-way. At the very least, the free-standing umbrellas should be eliminated.

Discussion:

Mr. Reis asked questions to Mrs. Bitar related to the DORA where alcohol could be purchased on the patio or on the public portion of the patio. Mr. Myers responded with the struggle Council went through in working with these rules and regulations related to the point of purchase for an alcoholic beverage.

Mr. Hofmann referenced that there is still an open issue with the sconces on the building down W. New England Ave. Mrs. Bitar said that this has not been addressed at this time and will be coming back in October for formal review.

Mr. Sauer said just to clarify we are just looking at the tables out in the public ROW and approve the umbrellas and their locations. Mrs. Bitar stated that the umbrellas need to be moved back out of the walkway area. Mr. Rohyans stated that the umbrellas were moved back further out of the way to not create an issue.

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Kevin Rohyans, 8 Sessions Dr., Columbus, Ohio.

Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone who wanted to speak for or against this application and no one came forward.

MPC Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY THE WORTHINGTON INN TO AMEND CU 02-03 TO OPERATE A RESTAURANT IN THE C-5 ZONING DISTRICT AT 649 HIGH ST. AS PER CASE NO. CU 08-17, DRAWINGS NO. CU 08-17, DATED AUGUST 11, 2017, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE PLANNING GOALS OF THE CITY, AS REFERENCED IN THE LAND USE PLANS AND ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

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

- d. Restaurant in C-5 - Patio Use - **627 High St.** (Charlotte Harden/La Chatelaine) **CU 09-17**
(Amendment to CU 10-92)

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

A Conditional Use Permit was originally approved for La Chatelaine French Bakery and Café to operate a restaurant at this location in 1992. The operating hours were to be 7:00 am to 9:00 pm every day. Ten tables were approved for the patio in front of the building. This request would amend the hours of operation to be in line with the Designated Outdoor Refreshment Area (D.O.R.A.) policy, and would accommodate additional tables on the patio.

Project Details:

1. To allow participation in D.O.R.A. events, the request is to extend the hours to 10:00 pm Sunday - Thursday, and 11:00 pm Friday – Saturday. Temporary signs on stanchions would be used at the edges of a D.O.R.A. event area. Regularly, alcohol would be limited to La Chatelaine’s patio.
2. The style and number of tables and chairs on the patio has changed over the years, but all versions have been acceptable. Currently there are 14 tables with chairs in the area.

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 – No effect has been identified.
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 – No new utilities would be required.
5. Safety and health considerations – None have been identified.

6. Noise, odors and other noxious elements, including hazardous substances and other environmental hazards – None have been identified.
7. Hours of use – 7:00 am -10:00 pm, Sunday – Thursday; 7:00 am – 11:00 pm Friday – Saturday.
8. Shielding or screening considerations for neighbors – Not applicable.
9. Appearance and compatibility with the general neighborhood – Not applicable.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Conditional Use Permit Regulations

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

Worthington Comprehensive Plan

A good mix of restaurant and niche retail shops are appropriate for Old Worthington. Market to desired retail users that are targeting the authentic town center with pedestrian-oriented store plans and products.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending approval of this application, as the changes are in line with the D.O.R.A. regulations and appropriate for Old Worthington.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Ms. Charlotte Harden, 627 High St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

MPC Motion:

Mr. Hofmann moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY CHARLOTTE HARDEN ON BEHALF OF LA CHATELAINE TO AMEND CU 10-92 BY MODIFYING THE HOURS AND SEATING FOR A RESTAURANT IN THE C-5 ZONING DISTRICT AT 627 HIGH ST. AS PER CASE NO. CU 09-17, DRAWINGS NO. CU 09-17, DATED AUGUST 24, 2017, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE PLANNING GOALS OF THE CITY, AS REFERENCED IN THE LAND USE PLANS AND 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; and Mr. Hofmann, aye. The motion was approved.

- e. Recreational Facility in I-1 - **651 Lakeview Plaza Blvd., Suite D** (Diversion Dance Collective, LLC) **CU 10-17**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This 14 acre development includes 5 buildings constructed in the late 1980's and early 1990's and roughly half of a retention pond. The uses on the site consist mainly of office, warehousing, and light manufacturing in suites that are roughly 2000 – 5000 square feet in area. The applicant would like to locate a dance studio in suite D, which is considered a Recreational Facility per the Code.

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

1. Effect on traffic pattern – Parking is available adjacent to the building, and would generally be used in the evenings when other businesses in the building are closed. Many of the customers would be youth who are dropped off for lessons.
2. Effect on public facilities – No effect has been identified.
3. Effect on sewerage and drainage facilities – The effect would be minimal.
4. Utilities required – No new utilities would be required.
5. Safety and health considerations – None have been identified.
6. Noise, odors and other noxious elements, including hazardous substances and other environmental hazards – None have been identified.
7. Hours of use – Mainly between 4:30 pm and 9:30 pm.
8. Shielding or screening considerations for neighbors – Not applicable.
9. Appearance and compatibility with the general neighborhood – Signage would match that of the other businesses on the property.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Conditional Use Permit Regulations

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

Recommendations:

Staff is recommending approval of the application, as the proposed use would be appropriate at this location due to the minimal impact to the site and neighboring businesses.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Ms. Elizabeth Berry, 651 Lakeview Plaza Blvd., Worthington, Ohio, did not have any comments. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone to speak for or against this application and no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY DIVERSION DANCE COLLECTIVE, LLC FOR A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO OPERATE A RECREATIONAL FACILITY AT 651 LAKEVIEW PLAZA BLVD., SUITE D., AS PER CASE NO. CU 10-17 DRAWINGS NO. CU 10-17, DATED AUGUST 31, 2017, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE PLANNING GOALS OF THE CITY, AS REFERENCED IN THE LAND USE PLANS AND FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

Mr. 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.

f. Wholesale Business in I-1 - **530 Lakeview Plaza Blvd.** (Custom Distributors, Inc.) **CU 13-17**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This multi-tenanted building was constructed in 1986, and is located on the northwestern end of Lakeview Plaza Blvd. The applicant, a wholesale business dealing in high end kitchen appliances, plans to lease 12,500 square feet to be used as warehouse, office and showroom space. No retail sales are planned for the site.

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 – Five employees and wholesale clients would be able to park adjacent to the suite.
2. Effect on public facilities – No effect has been identified.
3. Effect on sewerage and drainage facilities – The effect would be minimal.
4. Utilities required – No new utilities would be required.
5. Safety and health considerations – None have been identified.

6. Noise, odors and other noxious elements, including hazardous substances and other environmental hazards – None have been identified.
7. Hours of use – Operating hours are cited as normal business hours.
8. Shielding or screening considerations for neighbors – No change to the building or site is proposed except for signage typical of other businesses in the building.
9. Appearance and compatibility with the general neighborhood – No change to building or site.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Conditional Use Permit Regulations

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

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending approval of this application, as the proposed business would be appropriately located on Lakeview Plaza Blvd.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Rob Schmidt, said he is an attorney with Porter Wright Morris & Arthur law firm, and representing his client for 530 Lakeview Plaza Blvd., Worthington, Ohio, and he did not have anything else to add to the presentation. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak for or against this application and no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Sauer moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY CUSTOM DISTRIBUTORS, INC. FOR A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO OPERATE A WHOLESALE BUSINESS AT 530 LAKEVIEW PLAZA BLVD., AS PER CASE NO. CU 13-17, DRAWINGS NO. CU 13-17, DATED SEPTEMBER 1, 2017, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE PLANNING GOALS OF THE CITY, AS REFERENCED IN THE LAND USE PLANS AND FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

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.

D. Other

Mr. Brown reminded the Board members there will not be a second meeting in September, so the next meeting will be Thursday, October 12, 2017. He stated that at the last City Council meeting they approved the appointment of the new Law Director, Tom Lindsey. His first day will be September 28, 2017. He is currently the Assistant Law Director for the City of Upper Arlington. Mr. Lindsey has stated that he would like to attend the ARB, MPC and BZA meetings to get a better understanding how the meetings operate. Quick update that the Holiday Inn withdrew their application to rezone at the City Council meeting, so they will continue under their existing zoning, so the process will only involve ARB for the architecture and BZA for variance to deviate from the height requirement of 3 to 4 stories and for the building setbacks along Wilson Bridge Rd. and High St. or any other variances that might be needed. They will be going this path instead. We will hopefully see something from them in October. No update at this time on the UMCH site. No update at this time concerning OhioHealth.

E. Adjournment

Mr. Reis moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. Sauer. The meeting adjourned at 10:16 p.m.