



MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING  
WORTHINGTON ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD  
WORTHINGTON MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION  
February 28, 2019

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; Edwin Hofmann; David Foust; Amy Lloyd (arrived 7:07 p.m.) and Richard Schuster. Also present were: Lee Brown, Director of Planning & Building; and Laney Nofer, Planning & Building Assistant. Scott Myers, Worthington City Council Representative to the Municipal Planning Commission was absent.

**A. Call to Order – 7:00 p.m.**

1. Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Approval of the minutes of the February 14, 2019 meeting

The minutes were not ready for approval and will be voted on at the next meeting.

4. Affirmation of witnesses

**B. Architecture Review Board – New**

Mr. Coulter explained the applicant for 41 W. South St., Worthington, Ohio, had asked to have their application tabled.

1. Basement Window Replacement & Landscaping – **137 E. Granville Rd.** (Mark Goyer/ Sharon Memorial Hall) **AR 112-18**

Mr. Brown reviewed the following from the staff memo:

**Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

**Background & Request:**

This building was built as a residence in 1861 and used as such until 1946. After WWII, voters approved a War Memorial Levy and the building was purchased and dedicated as Sharon Memorial Hall in 1947. When zoning was established in 1971, the property was zoned R-10, Low

Density Residence, which allows for single family dwellings and public and semi-public uses. Many community groups and organizations used the building until 1975, at which time the Sharon Township Trustees moved their offices and police department into the building. The Township moved its operations to E. Wilson Bridge Rd. in 2009 and the building was renovated. Attempts were made by the Sharon Memorial Board, the entity responsible for Sharon Memorial Hall, to find public and semi-public users for the building that would generate revenue and allow maintenance of the building and site. After no users were found, the VM, Veterans Memorial zoning district was created in 2010, the property was rezoned from R-10 to VM, and the space was leased to small office users. Sharon Memorial Hall is listed on the National Register of Historic Places and is a contributing building in the Worthington Historic District.

Three basement windows were replaced with glass block windows in 2015 without approval. Due to existing landscaping, the windows were not noticed until overgrown shrubs were removed last year. This is a request for approval of the windows, and the installation of new landscaping.

**Project Details:**

1. Two of the glass block windows are on the west side of the building, and one is on the east side facing the parking lot. The windows measure 36” wide x 28” high. The dividers between the blocks appear gray, and there are vents that are framed in white.
2. Three Green Mountain Boxwoods are proposed near the glass block windows on the west side, and Blue Ivory Hostas would be between and to the side of the shrubs. New plant material is also proposed at the front of the building and along the walkway leading to the front door.

**Land Use Plans:**

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

The Worthington Design Guidelines recommend if historic windows are too deteriorated to repair cost-effectively and replacement is justified, the preferred option is an in-kind replacement in the same material and design. New windows made of substitute materials such as aluminum, vinyl, or clad wood can be acceptable if they provide a reasonably good match for the windows being replaced. Be sure that window designs are appropriate for the style or time period of the house. Avoid use of inappropriate window designs. Avoid enlarging or downsizing window openings to accommodate stock sizes of replacements. Also avoid permanent blocking in of windows.

Compatibility of design and materials, exterior detail and relationships, and window treatment are standards of review in the Architectural District ordinance.

**Recommendation:**

Glass block is generally not appropriate for historic buildings; the material would not have been typical for the time period this building was constructed. Although vents are needed in these windows, they destroy the symmetry of the glazing and add a second inconsistent feature. If the vents were gray instead of white, they would be less visible. Evergreen shrubs are appropriate to screen the windows.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Ms. Valerie Kerbler, 6521 Proprietors Rd., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Schuster asked Ms. Kerbler if she was aware that she needed to come before the Board to ask for permission to install the windows. Ms. Kerbler said she was unaware who authorized the change for the windows. She said she is the Treasurer for the organization and responsible for paying the bills. Ms. Kerbler said when the bushes were removed, she realized the windows were there.

Mr. Mark Goyer, 159 Chaucer Ct., Worthington, Ohio, said the windows were replaced in 2015 and no one sought approval at that point in time. Mr. Goyer said he was not involved with the hall at the time, but no one sought approval, but that was not done on purpose. He said a resident late last year noticed the glass block windows when the shrubbery was removed. He stated that they plan to replace the shrubbery in early spring with boxwood shrubs to screen the windows. Mr. Schuster asked Mr. Goyer if there had been any security concerns in the past and Mr. Goyer replied, "No."

Mr. Foust said he noticed the window were set back several inches inside the framing and was wondering if some type of window could be placed over the glass block that would disguise what is there now without creating a great deal of change or cost. Mr. Coulter suggested painting the white vinyl portion may help. Mr. Goyer said the new landscaping would cover all the windows.

Mrs. Holcombe said the Board was against glass block windows in the historical district but if landscaping would cover the windows, she felt that would fine. Ms. Kerbler said they would be installing the landscape next month when the weather is warmer, and they can work with the ground. Mr. Hofmann agreed that painting the surrounding trim of the windows would help, such as a dark gray. (For the record, Mrs. Lloyd joined the meeting at 7:07 p.m.).

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

Dr. Cal Taylor said he was erroneously given credit for the glass block windows, but he had not been on the Sharon Memorial Board since 2013. He said the Treasurer was on the Board at the same time he was on the Board and when the bill was paid in 2015. He felt there was some discrepancy in the dates of what transpired. Dr. Taylor said they had asked for seven Permits out of nine which were granted for the building and glass block windows were not one of the requests at that time, nor were they on the capital improvements plan for the building, so the glass block windows did not come from him. Dr. Taylor reminded the Board there are federal, state, and local design guidelines for historic buildings and Sharon Memorial Hall is a historic building. He said in 1976 the building was added to the National Register for Historic Places and he spent five years trying to keep it from demise and decay with various improvements over time in the amount of \$65,000.00 dollars and hundreds of hours of work. Dr. Taylor said the windows were in excellent condition when he left, and no one had brought up an issue there was a problem with the windows. He said when the windows have become very visible with the lack of landscaping and the National Historic Guidelines suggest not using materials that were different from the original materials, but rather find something that can be made to be similar and that is in the Code of Federal Regulations as well as the State Historical Preservation Guidelines and the Worthington Design Guidelines.

Dr. Taylor did not feel the greenery would cover the windows and he noticed the shutters were falling apart and the front porch is broken off underneath the supporting pillars. Three of the windows in the kitchen did not have working locks. He said there are security issues elsewhere throughout the building. The door to the basement is unable to be locked, unless it had been fixed in recent years. The vegetation is now reduced to sedum, spirea, and there were beautiful flowers in front, including daffodils and hostas. Dr. Taylor said there is a herd of seven deer that roam the area frequently and the deer love hostas and arborvitae. Mr. Coulter reminded Dr. Taylor the Board was primarily discussing the glass block windows, and the landscape plan. Dr. Taylor said he would not have proposed the glass block windows.

**Motion:**

Mr. Reis moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY MARK GOYER, PRESIDENT OF SHARON MEMORIAL HALL, FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO ALLOW GLASS BLOCK WINDOWS TO REMAIN AND LANDSCAPING TO BE INSTALLED AT 137 E. GRANVILLE RD., AS PER CASE NO. AR 112-18, DRAWINGS NO. AR 112-18, DATED FEBRUARY 14, 2019, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.**

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

**2. Shed – 676 Oxford St. (Charles C. Roberts) AR 16-19**

Mr. Brown reviewed the following from the staff memo:

**Findings of fact & Conclusions**

**Background & Request:**

A two-story house was constructed in 1915 on this property which is 48.125' wide and 252.25' deep. The structure is a contributing building in the Worthington Historic District. The house has a gable roof and a cross-gable at the front and has had several additions and renovations over the years. In 2013, a 30' x 20' garage with HardiePlank lap siding was approved in place of a shed that was behind the house. The owner at the time intended to re-side the house with HardiePlank at some point but was never able.

This is a request to install a shed behind the garage.

**Project Details:**

1. Placement of the proposed 10' x 16' shed would be 4' behind the garage, and 8' from the north side property line. The size and location would meet Code dimensional requirements.
2. The proposed shed is called a "Vinyl Barn" in the submitted information due to the gambrel roof and white vinyl siding. Roofing material would be black metal, which appears to have standing seams. The structure is proposed with a double door on the south side and

windows and a single door on the east side. It is not clear if there would be windows on the other sides, and if the windows and doors would also be white.

**Land Use Plans:**

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

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

**Recommendation:**

A shed of this size and placement is appropriate for the property. A structure with a gable roof, cementitious siding, and asphalt shingles would be more compatible with the house and district. The gambrel roof style is not consistent with the house and garage, or other structures in the area. Vinyl siding is not preferred. Although the house still has vinyl siding, the garage has cementitious siding and is in closer proximity to the shed.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Charles Roberts, 676 Oxford St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Schuster said he was not comfortable with the roof design. He felt the roofing materials should be the same as the house. Mr. Roberts said the reason they chose the design was because the barn across the street has a metal roof and they gained a lot of storage space with that type of roofline, and the roofline was not unpopular for a barn built in the 1900s. Mr. Roberts said they chose the siding they did because the builder did not offer Hardiplank, and they felt the vinyl's horizontal lines were similar to the Hardiplank.

Mr. Hofmann said he struggled with the Dutch lap and the roofline and Mr. Roberts had already established a consistent set of lines on the property with the addition of the garage. Mr. Hofmann said he would be okay with the vinyl but preferred to see a typical horizontal sided of appropriate width. Mrs. Lloyd asked where the door and window would be located. Mr. Roberts explained the door would be at the end of the shed while the window would be on the side to get maximum sunlight into the shed. Mrs. Holcombe asked why Mr. Roberts wanted to move the shed closer to the house. Mr. Roberts stated to keep it in line with the setback for the garage and out of site. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present to speak for or against this application, but no one came forward.

**Motion:**

Mrs. Holcombe moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY CHARLES C. ROBERTS FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL A SHED AT 676 OXFORD ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 16-19, DRAWINGS NO. AR 16-19, DATED FEBRUARY 15, 2019, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING AND AMENDED THAT THE ROOFLINE WILL HAVE A GABLED ROOF, NO DUTCH LAP SIDING, MUST USE LAP SIDING THAT IS TO MATCH THE COLOR OF THE GARAGE. VINYL LAP SIDING IS PERMITTED.**

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

3. Addition – **41 W. South St.** (J.S. Brown & Company/Yang) **AR 18-19**

The applicant requested to table the application. Mr. Reis moved to table the application. Mr. Schuster seconded the motion. All Board members voted, “Aye,” and the application was tabled.

**B. Architecture Review Board - Unfinished**

1. Stafford Village Redevelopment – **Northeast Corner of Hartford St. and Stafford Ave.**  
(Brian Kent Jones Architects/National Church Residences) **AR 14-19**

&

**C. Municipal Planning Commission**

**1. Planned Unit Development – Preliminary Plan - Unfinished**

- a. Stafford Village Redevelopment – **Northeast Corner of Hartford St. and Stafford Ave.**  
(Brian Kent Jones Architects/National Church Residences) **PUD 01-19**

Mr. Brown reviewed the following from the staff memo:

**Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

**Background & Request:**

Stafford Village was developed in the early 1970’s, and is entirely owned by National Church Residences, which according to its website “... is the nation’s largest not-for-profit provider of affordable senior housing and services.” The company’s headquarters are in Upper Arlington. The main part of the apartment complex is at the northeast corner of Stafford Ave. and Hartford St. Other units are located further to the north, and at the southwest corner of North and Hartford Streets. Also, houses at 862, 868 and 874 Hartford St. were recently purchased by National Church Residences.

The Planned Unit Development (PUD) application is a rezoning request to re-develop the main portion of the complex, which is on ~3 acres and contains 58 dwelling units, as a new senior housing development with 85 dwelling units. Current zoning is a combination of AR 4.5, R-10 and R-6.5. All three of the single-family houses would also be part of the PUD and are contributing buildings in the Worthington Historic District. The southern two houses are proposed to remain and the northernmost house (874) is proposed to be demolished. An Architectural Review Board application is included with the request but should not be approved until such a time that the property is rezoned. Approval of a subdivision may be needed at some point in the future to combine the properties and alter property lines for the single-family houses.

**Project Details:**

Preliminary Plan Requirements:

- (1) *A legal description and vicinity map showing the property lines, streets, existing Zoning, and land uses within 300 feet of the area proposed for the PUD;*

A legal description of the 2.792 acres piece of land currently housing the apartments is included in the packet. The single-family house properties do not have legal descriptions. A vicinity map has been provided showing a combination of single- and multi-family units north of E. Stafford Ave. and east of Morning St., and Hartford Park and the library to the south.

- (2) *Names and addresses of owners, developers and the registered land surveyor, engineer or architect who made the plan;*
- National Church Residences 2245 North Bank Dr., Columbus OH 43220 - Owner
  - Brian Kent Jones Architects, 448 W. Nationwide Blvd., Loft 100, Columbus, OH 43215
  - pH7 Architects
  - The Kleingers Group, PE Services – Civil Engineers
  - David Hodge, Attorney

- (3) *Date, north arrow and total acreage of the site;*

Provided.

- (4) *A topographical survey of all land included in the application and such other land adjoining the subject property as may be reasonably required by the City. The topographical survey shall show two foot contours or contours at an interval as may be required by the Municipal Planning Commission to delineate the character of the land included in the application and such adjoining land as may be affected by the application. Elevations shall be based on North American Vertical Datum of 1988 (NAVD88). In lands contiguous to or adjacent to the flood plain of the Olentangy River, existing contours shall be shown in accordance with the elevations set forth in Chapter;*

Sheets A-2 & A-3

- (5) *Existing Structures, parking and traffic facilities, Easements and public Rights-of-Way on the subject property as well as within 300 feet of the area proposed for PUD;*

Sheet A-3

- (6) *Existing sewers, water mains, culverts and other underground facilities within the tract and in the vicinity, indicating pipe size, grades and exact locations;*

Sheet A-3

- (7) *The location of Natural Features and provisions necessary to preserve and/or restore and maintain them to maintain the character of the surrounding neighborhood and community;*

Sheets A-3 and B-15

- (8) *A tree preservation plan showing all existing trees 6" caliper or larger;*  
Sheets B-15 and B-8: A list and plan are included showing trees 6" diameter at breast height (DBH) and larger, with species, condition, and recommendations. Many trees at the perimeter of the site are proposed to be retained, including a 56" Pin Oak at the rear of the site. Clarification is needed regarding trees to be removed and replaced.

- (9) *A preliminary grading plan;*

Sheet B-7: The site is relatively flat and proposed grades would be similar to existing grades.

- (10) *Preliminary design and location of Structures, Accessory Structures, streets, drives, traffic patterns, Sidewalks or Recreation Paths, parking, entry features, site lighting, landscaping, screening, Public Space Amenities and other features as required by the City;*

The project is designed as one large building with a façade that gives the look of many connected separate buildings with varying architectural styles, many of which are found in Worthington. A variety of roof shapes would hide the flat roof behind that would house mechanical equipment for the building. A roof plan is shown on Sheet B-11. The units along the street rights-of-way would have exterior entrances with walkways leading from the public sidewalk. Interior entrances are also proposed for those units, as well as the other units in the building. Walks are proposed around much of the perimeter of the building. Other entrances would be at various locations on the exterior and in the garage. Two courtyard areas are proposed on the E. Stafford Ave. frontage that would help to add relief to the south side of the building and add gathering areas for the residents. Walkways are proposed to connect to these areas from the public sidewalk.

Predominant building materials will be brick, cementitious fiberboard, stucco and asphalt shingles.

Along the street frontage of the site, the structure would be two stories, with placement about 17' from Hartford St. (excluding porches), and 20' from E. Stafford Ave. (excluding porches). The center section of the building is proposed as three stories, with the first floor being structured parking. Parking is also proposed on a surface lot at the northeast area of the site, in a lot south of the houses on Hartford St., and three parallel spaces are planned along E. Stafford Ave. Bicycle parking locations have not been identified. The entrance to the site would be from E. Stafford Ave., with an emergency access planned for Hartford St. on the parcel with the house that is proposed



for demolition. For this access removable bollards and grass pavers are proposed. Details for this access, as well as whether the main drive and parking area can accommodate turning movements for Worthington's ladder truck must be worked out with the Worthington Fire Department. Also, a traffic study has not been presented.

In addition to parking lot trees, other trees and shrubs are proposed around the site. East of the drive and adjacent to the surface parking in the rear several sections of 3' high walls are proposed to screen cars from the residential neighbors. Confirmation from those property owners that the proposed screening is acceptable is needed. Proposed tract coverage for buildings is 41.5%.

Sheets B-12 & B-13 show the lighting plan for the site. A combination of pole lights and wall packs is proposed. The proposed 15' high pole lights are shown in the main parking lot and courtyards. The black poles and fixtures would have a 2'6" exposed concrete base if in the parking lot, and a near grade base in the courtyards. The proposed fixtures would have the light source in the top and an aluminum reflector. The brightness and color temperature of the LED lights is not identified on the plans. Rectangular LED Wall packs are proposed to be mounted around the building at 12' high in 11 locations. Included are lights proposed to illuminate the parking area on Hartford St. The brightness and color temperature have not been identified.

The applicant is citing the courtyards along E. Stafford Ave. as Public Space Amenities.

Monument signs are shown near both drive entrances and at the southwest corner of the property.

- (11) *The proposed provision of water, sanitary sewer and surface drainage facilities, including engineering feasibility studies or other evidence of reasonableness of such facilities;*

Existing utilities have been identified and proposed connections are shown. Locations of fire hydrants, FDCs and a fire flow analysis are needed for the Fire Department.

- (12) *Parcels of land intended to be dedicated or temporarily reserved for public use, or reserved by deed covenant, and the condition proposed for such covenants and for the dedications;*

No land would be dedicated.

- (13) *Proposed Easements;*

The need for utility easements has not been identified.

- (14) *Proposed number of Dwelling Units per acre;*

The applicant is proposing 85 dwelling units which is approximately 28 units/acre. The following types of units are proposed: 34 micro; 6 one-bedroom; 15 one-bedroom plus; 17 two-bedroom; and 13 two-bedroom plus. The size of each has not been stated.

(15) *Proposed uses, including area of land devoted to each use;*

The only use would be “Senior residential” which means multi-family facilities with occupancy restricted to age fifty-five and over. Social rooms, limited staff and garages may be included. Unit sizes may vary and be as large as typical apartments. Facility programming space throughout the interior to accommodate a full range of congregate services, dining, health, and wellness.

(16) *Proposed phasing of development of the site, including a schedule for construction of each phase;*

Information is needed.

(17) *Homeowners or commercial owners' association materials;*

Information not needed.

(18) *Development Standards Text; and*

Included in packet.

(19) *Any additional information as required by the Municipal Planning Commission and the City Council.*

### **Land Use Plans:**

#### Worthington Comprehensive Plan Update & 2005 Strategic Plan

Promote increased residential densities around Old Worthington provided it addresses targeted housing markets, meets the architectural design guidelines, does not significantly impact the historic fabric, and provides interior parking. This should occur primarily within the first block to each side of High Street.

#### Code Section 1174.05 PUD Development Standards and Development Standards Text

Development Standards Text shall be a comprehensive narrative detailing the Development Standards for the proposed development, including without limitation the following:

(a) Design Regulations:

(1) Character. The proposed PUD shall consist of an integrated and harmonious design with properly arranged traffic and parking facilities and landscaping. The PUD shall fit harmoniously into and shall not adversely affect adjoining and surrounding properties, Roadways & public facilities.

(2) Design. Site layout, Buildings, Accessory Structures, landscaping and lighting shall be compatible with or enhance the surrounding neighborhood and community.

(3) Screening. Commercial and industrial uses, including parking facilities and refuse containers, shall be permanently screened from all adjoining residential uses.

(4) Tract Coverage. The ground area occupied by all Buildings shall be balanced with green space to soften the appearance of the development. Total Lot/tract coverage shall be set forth in the PUD documents.

(b) Traffic and Parking:

(1) Traffic. Adequate ingress and egress shall be provided as part of the PUD. The proposed PUD shall be located so that reasonably direct traffic access is supplied from major thoroughfares and where congestion will not likely be created by the proposed development. Where potential congestion may be alleviated by installation of Improvements on streets abutting the development, the developer shall be required to pay the cost of the construction of Improvements and shall dedicate or deed lands necessary for street widening purposes when so required by the City. A traffic study shall be provided by the applicant as required by the City.

(2) Parking. Parking shall adhere to the following standards:

A. Design. Parking and service areas shall be designed and located to protect the character of the area.

B. Non-residential Uses. Parking shall be adequate to serve the proposed uses, but shall in no case exceed one-hundred and twenty (120) percent of the parking requirement in Section 1171.01.

C. Residential Uses. There shall not be less than one parking space per Dwelling Unit.

D. Bicycle Parking. Bicycle parking should be adequate to serve the proposed uses.

(c) General Requirements:

(1) Environment. The City may request environmental studies for the property, and may request and receive reports and studies from any agency having jurisdiction over the property, indicating whether there are any environmental issues that would affect the property and/or surrounding properties with the proposed development.

(2) Natural Features.

A. The Municipal Planning Commission shall not recommend a PUD unless it finds that such development preserves, restores, maintains and/or enhances: (1) Natural Features and (2) the character of the surrounding neighborhood and community.

B. The Municipal Planning Commission shall not recommend a PUD if it finds that the Natural Features on such property have been or will be removed, damaged, altered or destroyed in anticipation of development until agreement is reached between the applicant and the Municipal Planning Commission on permanent restoration of Natural Features. All healthy trees 6" caliper or larger shall be retained, or replaced with total tree trunk equal in diameter to the removed tree, and this shall be documented as part of an approved Natural Features preservation plan and/or landscape plan. In the event the Municipal Planning Commission determines that full replacement would result in the unreasonable crowding of trees upon the Lot, or that such replacement is not feasible given site conditions, a fee of four hundred fifty dollars (\$450.00) per caliper inch of trees lost and not replaced on such property shall be paid in cash to the City for deposit in the Special Parks Fund. Such deposits shall be used for reforestation on public property.

(3) Public Area Payments.

- A. The City Council shall determine whether a portion of such PUD should be dedicated on the plan to a public agency for park, playground or recreational uses. Such dedication may be required only if the City Council determines that there is a need for such property and that the dedication is related both in nature and extent to the impact that the proposed development will have on the parks and recreation system.
  - C. Whenever any new Dwelling Units are created as part of a PUD, then the developer or owner, as the case may be, shall make a cash payment to the City in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250.00) per each new Dwelling Unit created for deposit in the Special Parks Fund. Such deposits shall be used for costs associated with the City's parks, playground and recreation areas. This section shall not apply to any PUD for which a dedication of land to the City was required pursuant to subsection (A) hereof.
  - D. The public area payment required by this section shall be made prior to the issuance of the building permit for the project.
- (4) Public Space Amenities. A minimum of one Public Space Amenity as approved by the Municipal Planning Commission shall be required for every five-thousand (5000) square feet of gross floor area of multiple family dwelling, commercial or industrial space that is new in the PUD. Public Space Amenities are elements that directly affect the quality and character of the public domain such as:
- A. An accessible plaza or courtyard designed for public use with a minimum area of two-hundred fifty (250) square feet;
  - B. Sitting space (e.g. dining area, benches, or ledges) which is a minimum of sixteen (16) inches in height and forty-eight (48) inches in width;
  - C. Public art;
  - D. Decorative planters;
  - E. Bicycle racks;
  - F. Permanent fountains or other Water Features;
  - G. Decorative waste receptacles;
  - H. Decorative pedestrian lighting; and

Worthington Design Guidelines

Planning for the development of a new site should include an inventory and evaluation of features, and the development should retain those that add scenic or historic value (historic buildings, topographical features, mature trees) or that help integrate the new development into the existing cityscape (existing landscaping, roads, paths, sidewalks). In Worthington, new developments should build upon the past excellence and successes of established neighborhoods.

Observe the form, massing and scale of existing nearby houses and neighborhoods. Note that not all buildings will have the same characteristics. Scale, in particular, can vary considerably within a single block. In any new development, try to have a range of form, massing and scale similar to that found nearby and typical of Worthington. Observe the setback of adjacent and nearby structures in the area where a new building or development will be placed. ...the most appropriate setback is one that matches the prevailing setback along the streetscape.

Roof shapes for new buildings should be appropriate to the style or design of the building. Contemporary materials that simulate traditional ones are appropriate, but the preferred option is to use true traditional materials such as wood siding. Incompatible contemporary materials

should be avoided. These include rough-sawn siding, diagonal siding, plywood panel siding, and similar obviously modern materials. Brick has long been a traditional material in Worthington. For newly-constructed buildings, the contemporary practice of applying a brick veneer over a frame structure is appropriate in Worthington. Stuccoed surfaces generally are not typical of Worthington architecture and should be avoided. Also avoid coating foundations with stucco or using shaped stucco to simulate stone.

For new buildings, multiple-paned windows generally are not appropriate. The exception is a building being built in a particular style -- such as Federal, Greek Revival or Colonial Revival -- that would have employed this window type. When in doubt, simple 1 over 1 double-hung sash windows are usually the simplest, least expensive and most appropriate choice. When using multiple-paned windows, avoid designs with horizontally-proportioned panes. This type of window had panes with vertical proportions -- taller than they are wide --and using panes that are wider than they are tall throws off the proportions of the entire window. Using the excellent precedents of Worthington's many historic structures, carefully design the pattern of window openings; window sizes and proportions (they must be appropriate for the size and proportions of the wall in which they are placed); pattern of window panes and muntins; and trim around the windows. Good quality wood windows are more readily available and more affordable than in the past. True wood windows are always the first preference. Aluminum- or vinyl-clad windows can be appropriate, but primarily on secondary facades and less conspicuous locations. All-aluminum or vinyl windows are not prohibited but are not encouraged.

**Recommendations:**

Use Considerations:

Senior Residential is an appropriate use for this site.

Design Considerations:

- Parking is typically desired to be screened from streets by buildings or landscaping. The proposed site plan generally reflects that notion, except for the lot along Hartford St. which may need additional landscape screening. The amount of proposed parking would likely be sufficient, however there may still be residents and guests that park along Hartford St. and E. Stafford Ave. near those unit entrances. The proposed spaces in the right-of-way along E. Stafford Ave. may be acceptable with the planting of additional vegetation. Bicycle parking should be included. Access issues, as stated previously, must be addressed with the Fire Department. A traffic study has been requested but not supplied.
- New construction in Old Worthington should employ scale, form, and massing similar to and compatible with existing building designs. Although there are other two-story structures in Old Worthington, the structures in the immediate vicinity of this project are at a much smaller scale than this building. Lower building heights and roof lines may be warranted. The proposed hipped roofs and cupolas on the three-story portion of the building seem out of proportion.
- The proposed pole light fixtures may allow a view of the light source at 15' high. The intensity and color of the lights are needed. Also, when exposed bases are used for light poles, coloring the base to match the poles is typically required. The proposed wall packs do not seem to compliment the building. Lighting parking areas with wall lighting,

as is shown for the Hartford St. lot, is not preferred.

- Review of Public Space Amenities is needed. The proposed courtyards do not feel like something the public would use. Benches along Hartford St. and E. Stafford Ave. should be considered.
- The preliminary utility plans need further review. The Fire Department needs to be assured that fire flow and hydrant access is adequate to serve this building.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Brown gave a brief overview of the project and the request before you tonight.

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. George Tabit, Vice-President of Senior Housing Development for National Church Residences, said they began the process over a year ago and had discussions with their stakeholders about what to do regarding the redevelopment of Stafford Village which has reached the end of its useful life and is at a point where it needs to be redeveloped so they can continue to offer affordable housing to low income seniors. He said they have had over 43 meetings so far and he looked forward to hearing from the community.

Mr. Tabit said there were some lingering questions about their commitment to affordable housing. They are proposing to build 65 apartments and to include 34 affordable apartments as part of that. The residents will be invited back at their current rent, which on average is approximately \$500.00 per month. The rent will not exceed thirty percent of their income.

Mr. Schuster asked how the size of the micro suites would compare to the existing apartments for seniors. Mr. Tabit said some of the current apartments have 385 square feet and some have 500 square feet. The newly constructed apartments would be 550 to 600 square feet or more. There would also be more amenity space.

Mr. Tabit stated that he wanted to reiterate the six key issues identified by the stakeholders and parking was one of the issues. Mr. Tabit said currently, each unit has a half space of parking. There are a lot of cars parking on Hartford Street which has been the source of a lot of aggravation for a lot of the neighboring residents. He said they have also heard people want to keep the area as greenspace. People want affordable senior housing that is close to home, and they want to help expand those options. The neighbors seem to really sense the openness of the community and want to see porches so people can interact with one another. He said he also heard design was paramount and the importance of detail for a custom fit to blend into the historic district and people value a diverse community. Mr. Tabit said he heard concerns about height, and they can address that issue, but part of the need for the height is for parking underneath the building. He said they are proud of their plan and feel it is a good balance and meets all the priorities.

Mr. Brian Jones, 503 S. Front St., Columbus, Ohio. He said he is the design architect for the project and their company specializes in working with historic architecture. Mr. Jones said they are also working with another architectural firm PH7 and they have a well-rounded team. Mr. Jones reviewed the slide show with the audience. He said they are looking at the integration of pedestrian ways linking the existing connection in the community back to the village core and really try to develop within the neighborhood of Stafford Village. Mr. Jones said there would be a variety of porches, they would not look the same. He also gave an overview of what the landscaping would look like. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak

for or against this application.

Mrs. Suzanne Seals, said she has lived at 123 W. New England Ave., Worthington, Ohio, for thirty-eight years. She said historic Worthington has a lot of charm, appeal and character that has increased the value of Worthington real estate and the neighborhood has become more in demand. A neighbor of hers who moved to the area from Dublin several years ago told her they were looking for a neighborhood that was not cookie cutter. She said Worthington's character is unique and authentic and there were specific elements in the neighborhood that make people want to live in Worthington. Mrs. Seals said Worthington's Design Guidelines does a good job of defining the elements that make Worthington feel like home. She discussed some of the quotes from the Guidelines and said the current proposal appeared to be more institutional and does not look like home because the project filled the lot and the homes do not feel cozy or intimate. Specific elements relate to the pleasant character, strong sense of place, they form a cohesive community, that feels like home. Buildings should be small in scale. This proposal is not cozy or intimate. Mrs. Seals said the development does not blend well into the neighborhood. Needs to meet the blend and balance of the architecture and site elements that gives Worthington neighborhoods their charm. This development does not meet any of the guidelines or blends in with the neighborhood. It will overwhelm the neighborhood. This is only the first of the rebuilds that they will want to do in our neighborhood. We must get it right the first time. Compatibility with the neighborhood is key. She said the monolithic structure is wrong for the neighborhood and does not fit the site, nor have the character for the historic district. This will be the end of our historic district if it is approved.

Mrs. Seals said she was glad to hear there is a commitment to provide long term affordable housing for the low-income neighbors. It think it would be unforgiveable to take away their housing. This is the responsible thing to do.

Ms. Kimberly Weiss, 910 Stafford Ave., Worthington, Ohio, said they recently moved into the neighborhood about four months ago. She said she has concerns about having to live in the midst of such a huge construction project and is concerned about how her children will be able to walk to school and the library, and how this project would affect the Farmer's Market, and if the street they live on would be closed. Kids will have to walk in the road to get to and from school, library etc.... How will these residents get out if there is a fire, are they only on the first level? Ms. Weiss said she liked one of the speaker's ideas about turning the Hartford and Morning into one-way traffic.

Ms. Yvonne Braylin (Cox), 414 E. Clearview Ave., Worthington, Ohio, said she has lived in the neighborhood for over thirty years and she appreciated everything National Church Residences is trying to do, but felt the project was too massive, and belonged on a street such as High Street not back in their neighborhood. This is my neighborhood. You would never let me do something like this on my own property. You don't even realize they are there now when you walk by the site. This plan should be on High Street, not in the neighborhood. It is dense. The houses across the street are impacted. The site has reached the end of their lifetime, she wanted to know why the buildings lifetime were ending.

Mr. Jeff Gagne, 890 Morning St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Gagne said this project was in his

backyard. He was uncertain how his property values would be affected, but felt the project was too massive. This project is a disgrace and unbelievable considering the Guidelines that everyone must live by. Mr. Gagne said he knew some of the current residents and they were happy with the way things were now. The economy of scale is too big. There is 40-acres across the street from City Hall on the Children's Home property, why are we not putting something like this on that site. Who knows if they will follow the rules? Mr. Gagne said he also saw someone put a notice in his mailbox five days ago, and that he believed that was illegal. I believe this is a federal offence.

Mrs. Ann Dover, 895 Hartford St., Worthington, Ohio, wanted to clarify that at the intersection of Morning and Stafford is an apartment building sat on a rise, and is actually above the neighboring site.

Mr. Bill Alsnaur, 544 White Oak Pl., in the Rush Creek area. Mr. Alsnaur said there is a lot coming over the next year, and there were four properties that would be majorly impacted and if the project would be done bit by bit he was not sure if that was fair to the City or the citizens that live around the four areas. He said Stafford Village was first, then Rush Creek and the Harding property, and the way the project is going now he will have a parking lot eight feet from his bedroom window instead of a forest and an ecosystem going on the Harding site. Mr. Alsnaur said he heard apartment units would be going in behind the Anthem building and the Children's Home area may be developed. There is a larger decision to make, I am sure when this was built that they tore down houses. This is the only quadrant where there is commercial. They should sell off the property for individual residential homes and use that money to buy property at the Children's Home site to build. They should build on the Children's Home site, just down from the Senior Center and it would be on High Street instead of a neighborhood. Then we have restored a neighborhood to a single-family neighborhood. There is a lot of potential. He felt the smaller homes (one-story) could be rebuilt in this neighborhood and senior center could be built on the Children's Home property.

Ms. Lyndsay Greer, 356 Pingree Dr., Worthington, Ohio, said she lived about a block away from Stafford Village. She said she appreciated National Church Residences (NCR) was committed to helping the current residents, however she still had concerns about the massive size of the building, and she would like to see Architectural Review Board (ARB) Guidelines followed but she had not seen NCR do any real changes to address that. This is a massive new build in my neighborhood. A developer should know better than to try to do this in my neighborhood. The Guidelines are out there, the builder knew what they were getting into. Ms. Greer said she was a new resident to Worthington but she was shocked to see a developer propose something that would flagrantly violate ARB Guidelines.

Mr. James Dover, 895 Hartford St., Worthington, Ohio, said he heard comments about the way things used to be ninety years ago, but things have changed, and the units being discussed are now dumps. He said if you have not been inside one of the units then people do not know what they are. Mr. Dover said he is a resident that pays market rent to live in the area. He said he is not a millionaire, but if the buildings were torn down, you might be to build four to six mansions in the same area. He said he grew up in Wyoming, Ohio, which is a little smaller than Worthington, and the high school there was rated number two in the State of Ohio. Neither one of his parents graduated from high school but they lived in the area because they wanted their children to get a



descent education. Mr. Dover went on to graduate from Miami University and after the Army, he graduated from Chase Law School. Mr. Dover said he respected the residents desire to maintain things the best that they can, but a lot of their proposals would mean other people may not have the opportunity to grow up in beautiful Worthington, to go to incredible Worthington Schools and he felt that was a shame. Mr. Dover felt their neighborhood should not be compared with Rush Creek. He said people that are talking about affordability are only talking about one side of the issue, but he hoped they could come up with a plan most people could live with even though not every person would be happy.

Mr. Blair Davis, 1 Hartford Ct., Worthington, Ohio, said he wanted to have a brief discussion about the size of the project. He stated that the average Home Depot is 100,000 sq. ft, and that this building would be approximately 132,000 sq. ft. in size. Which is a Home Depot and all the surrounding houses in size. He asked Mr. Brown to put his display up on the overhead projector for the Board and the audience to see. He said he was trying to figure out how tall the building would be. Mr. Davis said the building would be as tall as him times eleven. He showed a picture of a red balloon by the Old Worthington Library to show how tall this building would be compared to the library. It would also be taller than Kilbourne Middle School. The trees shown on the plan completely misrepresent what is being shown. These trees are too tall, and unrealistic in size. These pictures are complete fairytales. Mr. Davis referred to a photograph and said the building would be as tall as the red balloon. He said most of the current residents do not have cars and the future residents would have cars. The current staff is two, and the proposed staff could be up to eight, and they will need more and more parking. There would also be more health care workers since there would be affluent people living here, thus needing more parking spaces and there would be food delivery everyday because the building will have a restaurant facility. Residents will still park on the street since there are front doors on these apartments towards Hartford and Stafford. I have had a car park across the street from my driveway for years because the resident lives closer to Hartford. We will have USPS, UPS, FedEx and Amazon making deliveries daily, and with the affluence of those proposed to be living in these units, I am sure this will increase.

Mr. Davis said Kilbourne middle school will now house sixth, seventh and eighth grade children and they will also be adding on to their building, so there will be two construction projects next door to each other on Hartford Street one hundred yards apart. He said he was not sure how big the addition would be, but the addition would be built in their parking lot. The parking lot is already too small for the school, and there will be a fifty percent increase in staff who will also need to find parking and make the area more congested. Where are these people going to park, they will park on Hartford, Morning and Stafford and Hartford Court. There will also be fifty percent more busses going down the street, and fifty percent more pick-ups and drop offs. There will also be more squad runs. My house already looks like a red disco and will dramatically increase with this development. Mr. Davis said the developer told them the parking would be negligible, but he felt that would not be true. He said he wanted to address the current buildings. Mr. Davis said he has been a contractor for forty-five years and he has been inside many of the buildings. I have been in many of these buildings, and he said the way they are being you would think the City's Building Inspector might slap a condemned sign on them soon, but the reality is the rooftops were all replaced last year along with exterior trim and redid the brick work and pointed it all. The electric company came out and spent two weeks putting in underground service cable so the exteriors of the buildings should be perfectly fine for the next twenty-five years. Is

there an issue with the inside of the buildings. Mr. Davis said he tried to figure out what the rents were, and he was told by George that the rents go from \$400.00 dollars to \$800.00 per month. He said he came up with an average of that to be \$34,000.00 a month in rents and could not believe NCR could not find some money in that rent. He also heard that some of the residents would be willing to pay more rent if they could stay.

Mr. Davis said he also had a copy of NCR's tax returns and they are sitting on one huge pile of cash. Only a tiny portion of that would remodel all of the buildings easily. Mr. Davis said NCR made a generous offer of \$10,000.00 to relocate the residents which would amount to \$570,000.00 that they would lose. Mr. Davis asked if they could use the \$10,000.00 per unit and remodel them instead. Ten thousand dollars would go a long way to fixing up a 400 square foot apartment. You would then get 50 happy residents, and 50 happy trees, and provide greenspace and leave our neighborhood intact.

Mr. Davis said he wanted to step back and take an overview of the project. They are going to raze the building, cut down fifty trees, two years dislocation of residents, two years of construction noise, mud, traffic, and left with a huge building and a major impact on a neighborhood. So, what is the net gain; twenty-eight additional residents. All of this for only twenty-eight people. He said that hardly seems worth it to him. Mr. Davis said he believed the people working for NCR were good people and they do laudable work, but they are on a mission and their mission is go forth and build but he said he would have a caveat to that mission and that is to go forth but build appropriately and harmoniously but not just destroy.

Mrs. Linda Smith, 8 Hartford Ct., Worthington, Ohio, said she enjoyed looking out her window and seeing Stafford Village and the view was pleasant. She said if this project was allowed to go through it would not be in character with the neighborhood because she believed the building is too massive. She felt they took different architectural features from area Worthington buildings and slapped them on this project. Mrs. Smith felt the colors were also wrong. She said she agreed with her neighbor, Mr. Davis, and they do not like the idea of this building being built because there would be construction workers clogging up their court. She would like to see no parking signs installed for their court if the project moves forward. Mrs. Smith was also sick about the destruction of the beautiful sycamore tree.

Ms. Emily Baker, 510 Evening St., Worthington, Ohio, said she has lived in Worthington for 27 years. She said she is the past president and current member of the Old Worthington Association, she raised her family in Worthington, and she intends to stay. Ms. Baker said she was on the Board when they were able to get Worthington's sixteen blocks registered on the National List of Historic Places. She mentioned that for everyone to understand her level of interest, but she debated whether to share her opinions after being behind the scenes at recent events. Ms. Baker said Stafford Village is squarely in the middle of the historic district. She felt this project is a commercial development and would chip away at what is now a residential neighborhood because the historic district is the heart of the community. She felt the project was out of scale with the rest of the neighborhood because the building is too tall, three stories in many places, and higher than what is designed in Worthington's Design Guidelines even for commercial structures. She felt the developer would be the only one benefiting from the new structure. Ms. Baker was concerned about the loss of the trees and felt the proposed drawings were unrealistic. She said as

a horticulturist, she questioned the viability of the plant materials, and the three stories of shade for the pocket parks. Ms. Baker said the historic district in Worthington would not be changed for the better. She said she concurred with many of her fellow residents and she has become anxious about opening up envelopes about development issues. She said there are Guidelines in place and there is zoning for a reason and the rules must be followed. If the Guidelines are not defined enough then changes need to be addressed before these issues roll over everybody.

Ms. Ellen Scherer, 112 E. New England Ave., Worthington, Ohio, said she had already sent a letter to Mr. Brown, but after attending both meetings, she asked that the developer to listen to the residents. She said the preponderance is in favor of reasonable scale and following the existing guidelines.

Ms. Karen Roderick, 993 Hartford St., Worthington, Ohio, said whatever is decided would set a precedent for what is decided in the future. She said when you build a three-story building you have set a precedent. She was concerned if this project is allowed at Hartford Street and Stafford Avenue then something similar could be built at the corner of Hartford and North Streets. She wanted the Board to think about that as the meetings go forward and to keep the historical status.

Mr. Brown said all the letters were distributed to the Board members and have been posted on the City's website on the project page if anyone else wants to see what has been submitted.

Mr. Coulter explained the discussion would next be opened to the Board members, and there would be time afterwards for more public discussion.

Mrs. Holcombe said she would like to hear the discussion concerning the sycamore tree. Mr. Tabit said they wrestled with the issue tremendously about what to do, and how it would fit in the development. He said the tree is near the end of its life. Roto Rooter had visited because there was a problem underneath the slabs of the existing buildings that had to be repaired and was a tremendous nuisance to the resident. The sewer lines are at the point that they are all needing to be replaced. Mr. Tabit said the site needed to be redeveloped if they are going to continue to be of service to the residents. They need to find a way to subsidize the costs of 34 affordable senior apartments and the only way to do that was to add market rate apartments that would generate the revenue that they need. He said they did that in a very sensitive way by balancing those issues as well as parking and the feel of the community. Mr. Tabit said they were able to keep many trees including a large 56" Pin Oak tree, but when it came time to make a decision between a tree and being able to serve more affordable apartments, they chose being able to serve more residents.

Mrs. Lloyd said she heard a lot about scale and massing of the project and what will this project look like compared to the surroundings. She asked him to discuss how accurate the renderings were in terms of the scale, massing and trees, and exactly how they are situated on the property. Mr. Tabit explained his design team includes Brian Jones, who is the design architect; and Mike Healy, from PH7, who is the architect of record. Mr. Tabit explained Mr. Jones had a family emergency, so he had to leave the meeting early.

Mr. Mike Healy, 448 W. Nationwide Blvd., Columbus, Ohio, said there was a lot of effort made to graphically show the trees as accurately as they could. He said they did a lot of photo canvassing

of the neighborhood and tried to get the models as accurate as they could and that is why they showed the drawings with the existing trees and not with the future trees. Showed the renderings with and without the trees. Mr. Healy said the photo that was shown with the balloon was not accurate because the balloon was shown at the height of the cupola which was not an accurate representation of the true height. The renderings will better show the scale and massing of the buildings. The reference to the 100,000 sq. ft. Home Depot is misleading, our footprint is much smaller and on three levels where a Home Depot is spread out across the site.

Mr. Foust stated that he didn't have any specific comments about the proposal and the building but wanted to thank everyone for their participation at the meeting and the expression of new ideas. There is a lot of information to digest to get to the best end result.

Mr. Reis stated that he respected the comments of the residents and respects what NCR has done. There are a few things that they need to look at. This is an element in this community that we need, and how it ends up, I hope that we can convince both sides that this is what we need to do. asked if there was a drone type of video shown of a person walking down the street along side the adjacent homes and what the future project would look like, excluding new trees, showing just the trees that would be there after the building was completed. It would be nice to see the height at the street levels vs. the height of the three stories. He said people would have a better sense of scale.

Mr. Hofmann asked Mr. Tabit how he was digesting the information that he received at the meeting. After 43 meetings, he said the information and comments have come from a lot of different directions. He asked about the ability to make some of the changes in massing and the footprint on the site. Would these be considered. Mr. Tabit said the information is mainly a matter of opinion, and they continue to hear the same opinions from the same people but there are also people that have submitted letters of support who are not at the meeting and accept what they are doing. Mr. Tabit said he received a letter from Kristen Senff, who lived within the historic district and she felt the design was of high quality. He also references a letter of support from Aaron Domini who is a resident on Morning Street across from the park. We are listening carefully and have heard a lot of great ideas that will help us make some changes.

Mr. Schuster said one thing they all have in common is everybody wants affordable senior housing, but they also know that they do not get that for free and there has to be a mechanism in place to make that self-sustaining. Mr. Schuster said what would be helpful for him and others would be to know what the shortfall is to cover affordable housing and what is the minimum level of market rate apartments required in order to make that self-sustainable. Mr. Tabit explained they are at the minimum level now. He said they worked incredibly hard to come up with a design that would do that. If they could have worked the numbers with just 80 apartments, that is what they would have proposed.

Mr. Coulter stated that the application was working with the City to see if there is a way to write into the PUD agreement that you would always have a certain number of affordable units, that is extremely important to me. I would want to see this in perpetuity, and always have that base number. He understands you are working with Mr. Lindsey on that, so he was happy to see that moving forward. Mr. Coulter explained to the audience what they are seeing on the screen as it

relates to the parking garage and the roof height above and the roof shapes. We stress four-sided architecture on our projects. These interior elevations do not seem to match the level of detail that you were paying to the exterior, or what would be the street side of the project. Mr. Coulter said he would like to see more detail on the street side elevations, and he reminded everybody the property is zoned for three stories, but that does not mean they would approve three stories. Mr. Coulter said he has seen parking garages that have been sunk down a level to help limit the height of the building and would like to see the parking garage portion sunk down for this building. Sinking them half a level helps with the overall height, and still allow for ventilation of the garage. He stated that he was not sure a copula was necessary, that might be another way to help bring the height down. This would be something that I suggest you look at to help with the height. Mr. Coulter also asked for them to use quality materials which would last a long time, longer than twenty-five years to thirty years so the building will not have to be torn down and re-built. We would like to see style and integrity as it relates to anything in the historic district. There seems to be a lot of different styles mentioned tonight, and I see where you are coming from, however it needs to be sensitive and thought out for the building. Mr. Coulter asked what would be done with the remaining two houses and if those houses would become offices. Mr. Tabit said the houses would be returned to single family uses, it might be an office during the construction phase. Mr. Coulter asked about the restaurant comment and where that would be. Mr. Tabit said they are calling the restaurant a bistro because there would not be a full kitchen available, it is a place for the residents to gather. The place would be more like a quick stop to get a panini and a cup of soup. If someone was visiting a relative or friend, they would be allowed to purchase from the bistro, but Mr. Tabit did not believe it would generate any traffic. Mr. Coulter said he had been concerned about the traffic on Hartford Street for years and was surprised they were allowed to have on-street parking. Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Brown if there was any thought to a traffic study. Mr. Brown said the developer was working on a traffic analysis for the project to see what impact there would be along Stafford, Hartford and North Streets. Mr. Coulter said the Board would eventually want to see what the windows and trim would look like when they get to that point of discussion. He said he was concerned about the scale of it, but also understood the financial side of the issue to make it viable.

Mr. Coulter said he had visited some of the other NCR sites around town and they have been very well kept and he did not see anything that was disturbing, and that they were all well-kept. In regard to construction sites, Mr. Coulter said no one likes the mess, the noise, or congestion but there are some things the city can do to work with contractors and developers to mitigate some of that. He said there are controls that can be put into place.

Mr. Brown added additional detail to the traffic analysis that is currently underway, that our consultants have been involved with the meetings with the schools so that there can be some coordination between the two projects, that they are not two separate silo projects. Mr. Coulter asked if we have an application from the schools, Mr. Brown replied "No sir".

Mr. Jim Ventresca Thanked Mr. Tabit and said he appreciated the feedback from the Board and Commission members. He liked Mr. Coulter's idea about having the parking garage a half story below ground and he wanted to hear more of a discussion about the alternatives to help reduce the height. Mr. Coulter explained the developers have the right to accept recommendations made by the Board or not and they have the right to bring in other alternatives. He said one of the things

the Board is charged with is as they look at the Design Guidelines it their responsibility to make suggestions that the developer can take or not take. They can take suggestions made by anyone in the audience. Mr. Coulter said they often see things change, such as the Fresh Thyme and Holiday Inn projects, and on other projects around town. Just because the developer may have accepted a suggestion made by someone does not guarantee a positive vote. The developer may take a look at the suggestions and come back stating the reason(s) something would not work. Mr. Coulter said they wanted to get through the public comments first before the Board members had their discussion so people would not think they were trying to steer development one way or another.

Mr. Blair Davis, 1 Hartford Ct., Worthington, Ohio, said affordable housing was a great thing, but they currently have 57 units now and after the new ones are built there would only be 34 affordable apartments and that will be a net loss. He said he did not understand why they are not just keeping what they have and updating the units.

Ms. Karen Rogers, asked what 55 and over meant. She said many grandparents take care of their grandchildren. Mr. Brown replied to Ms. Rogers and said that was clearly defined in Worthington's Codified Ordinances. He said people that are under the age of 55 can visit but they are not allowed to be a permanent resident. Ms. Rogers asked about temporary issues, and if the grandparent could temporarily house children, and Mr. Brown said he would have to consult with the City's Director of Law. Mr. Bennet said there would actually be 65 affordable apartments.

Ms. Yvonne Cox, 414 E. Clearview Ave., Worthington, Ohio, would like keep the footprint the way it currently is. She asked if there was a solution between what is being proposed and what would be the preference of the residents if there would be more open space. She felt a bistro was not necessary in a residential area and if that could be eliminated in favor of more green space and possibly a covered walk-thru, and make the building feel less massive.

Mr. Tabit requested to table the application. Mr. Foust moved to table the application, seconded by Mr. Reis. All Board members voted, "Aye," and the application was tabled.

#### **D. Municipal Planning Commission**

##### **2. Planned Unit Development – Preliminary Plan - Unfinished**

- a. **Stafford Village Redevelopment – Northeast Corner of Hartford St. and Stafford Ave.**  
(Brian Kent Jones Architects/National Church Residences) **PUD 01-19**

The applicant requested to table the application. Mrs. Holcombe moved to table the application seconded by Mr. Foust. All Board members voted, "Aye," and the application was tabled.

#### **E. Other**

There was no other business to discuss.

#### **F. Adjournment**

Mr. Reis moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. Hofmann. All Board members voted, "Aye," and the meeting adjourned at 9:10 p.m.