



MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
WORTHINGTON ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
WORTHINGTON MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION
June 27, 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; Kathy Holcombe, Secretary; Edwin Hofmann; David Foust; Amy Lloyd; and Richard Schuster. Also present were Scott Myers, Worthington City Council Representative; and Lee Brown, Director of Planning and Building. Commission member Thomas Reis, Vice-Chair, was absent.

A. Call to Order – 7:00 p.m.

1. Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Approval of the minutes of the June 13, 2019 meeting

Mr. Foust moved to approve the minutes, and Mrs. Lloyd seconded the motion. All Board members voted, “Aye,” and the minutes were approved.

4. Affirmation of witnesses

B. Architecture Review Board

1. Landscaping, Signage and Painting the Canopy, Bollards & Bike Rack – **6600 N. High St.** (FC Bank) (Amendment to AR 06-17 & AR 45-16)

Mr. Brown reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

Approval was granted on May 14, 2015 for demolition of the 3 buildings on the site, and construction of a new two-story office building to serve as the corporate office and a bank branch with drive-thru for FC Bank. On June 25, 2015 lighting, landscaping and window details were approved. A permit was issued in October of 2015 to begin construction on the site. In February of 2016 amendments to the windows and roof screen, and a flagpole were approved. On May 12, 2016 the signage was approved and amended again on January 26, 2017. The Board of Zoning

Appeals approved a variance for two wall mounted signs and for a monument sign that exceeded size requirements. The building opened for business in November 2016.

New signage was installed on the site without Architectural Review Board approval in 2018. City staff notified the applicant that they needed to get approval for their new signage and that there were issues with the existing landscaping. The recently installed signage is to actually be replaced as part of this application. FC Bank recently went through a rebranding process and is in the process of updating all exterior signage and exterior features at their facilities and would like to replace and update landscaping on the site.

Project Details:

1. A freestanding sign and one wall sign are included with this application. Variances were previously granted for having a freestanding sign larger than is allowed and having more than one wall sign and for total sign area.
2. The freestanding sign will remain and have new letters and logo attached.
 - The existing free-standing sign is 8' wide x 51" high cabinet faced with smooth cast stone, on an 8' wide x 2'8" high base with brick veneer to match the building. Cast stone caps are proposed for the top of the base and sign and would extend slightly beyond the edges. Sign area would be approximately 55 square feet per side, including the base.
 - Clarification needed on how they plan to fill in the holes left by the previous sign.
 - Cardinal red, slate gray and black border painted aluminum reverse channel letters and logo are proposed to be mounted on the sign faces. White LED illumination would shine to the rear from inside the letters giving a halo effect. The depth of the characters is proposed to be 3.5" and the distance between the back of the letters and the sign face is proposed as 1.5".
3. A cast stone panel with the bank's logo raised 1/2" is in the center of the front elevation. The raised panel is 8' wide x 3'8" high (29.3 square feet in area). The cast stone logo appears to have the desired separation from the soldier course and lintels.
 - a. The application states that the previous "Bridges" logo will be replaced by the bank's new logo (Cardinal). The design will be a cardinal head. The color and size of the stone area is to remain the same. Information was not provided with the dimensions of the Cardinal; however the panel area would not exceed previous approval.
4. Five inch deep non-illuminated channel letters with the logo were originally installed at the edge of the canopy above the entrance. The letters were 75" wide x 20" high, and the logo was 51" wide x 24" high. Sign area was would be 75" x 44" or 22.9 square feet. The aluminum letters and logo are proposed to be green and gray.
 - a. The current canopy sign is 72" wide x 15" high with a sign area of 7.5 square feet.
 - b. The proposed sign is 96" wide x 19" high with a sign area of 12.6 square feet.
5. Exterior Changes:
 - a. The green metal canopy which wraps around the southwest corner of the building will be painted slate gray to complement the signage.
 - b. Twenty-seven bollards located in the drive-thru area on the east side of the building will be painted slate gray.

- c. The bike rack located at the southeast corner of the building will be paint slate gray.
- 6. Landscaping:
 - a. Proposing to install ornamental grasses (35 Karl Forester Grasses) along the eastern portion of the site on the east side of the retaining wall.
 - b. Replacing dead and dying shrubs throughout the site with the following:
 - i. Spirea – 5
 - ii. Barberry – 1
 - iii. Karl Forester Grasses – 6
 - iv. Liriope Variegated – 21
 - v. Mint – 3
 - vi. Juniper – 1
 - vii. Sawtooth Oak – 2

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

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.

While the architecture is of prime importance in a commercial district such as Worthington’s, landscaping of building sites is also important. Landscaping works with other site elements such as paving and street furniture to create the district’s sense of high quality.

A small amount of landscaping can have a positive impact; this is already easy to see in the many well-landscaped spots in Worthington’s commercial district. Small, well-executed and well-maintained landscaping is appropriate for the relatively small spaces here and provide relief from the “hardscape” of buildings, streets, and other man-made elements. Plant materials should be selected for appropriate size, shape, color, and “pedestrian friendliness” (avoid, for example, thorny species that can catch dresses or scratch children). Pots or planters permit moving plants and flowers around for best effect.

Have a regular maintenance program for landscaping, paving, furniture and other streetscape elements. Small details such as weed-filled planters or accumulated litter can give a strong negative impression. Do not plant any more than can be maintained easily. Fences may be helpful for screening transformers, gas meters, and communication equipment. Also consider using plantings for this purpose but be sure they do not interfere with meter-reading or maintenance of equipment. Keep functional items such as trash containers, transformers and electrical boxes orderly and well screened.

Color can have a significant impact upon a building’s design and appearance, and the Architectural Review Board encourages the use of colors appropriate to the buildings and the overall character of Worthington. There is a policy of flexibility in color use, and the Board can provide information on appropriate selections. There are no hard and fast requirements for particular colors or color

combinations. Once again, however, it will be instructive to study Worthington's existing commercial/institutional building stock to get a sense of appropriate colors and combinations of colors.

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. It may be acceptable to paint new brick walls. Generally, lighter colors should be used for this purpose, with darker colors for trim. Prepare a color board showing proposed colors. The Architectural Review Board encourages early reviews of such elements before planning goes very far.

Staff Analysis:

- Clarification is needed on how the holes will be filled in from the previous sign.
- Information is needed concerning the cast stone panel that will replace the existing "bridges" stone panel.
- Exterior color changes continue to complement the existing architecture and color scheme on the building. The rooftop standing seam metal roof will remain green. The use of the slate gray on the canopy trim, bollards and bike rack will complement the building and tie it to the colors found in the rebranding efforts of FC Bank.
- The proposed landscaping will replace and complement the existing vegetation on the site and provide an additional screening to the property to the east.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of this application, as the proposed sign modifications, exterior color adjustments and landscape improvements were compatible with the Design Guidelines.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. The applicant was not present at the meeting. Mr. Coulter asked if the application should be tabled. Mr. Brown said he has been working with the applicant for the past six months and it would be okay to discuss the project. Mr. Brown explained the original sign would be removed and the new sign would be compliant with Code; the orange raceway would no longer be there. The new sign would be four inches taller in height. Mr. Coulter said he was not comfortable moving forward without the applicant being present. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak for or against this application, but no one came forward. Mr. Hofmann moved to table the application, and it was seconded by Mr. Schuster. All Board members voted, "Aye," and the application was tabled.

2. Painted Exterior Brick – 11 W. New England Ave. (Felicity Beck/Wacked Hair Salon) AR 50-19

Mr. Brown reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This commercial building was constructed in 1960 and added onto and remodeled in the late 1980's, when the wood shake mansard roof and brick façade were added. The space was formerly

a dentist's office but has been occupied by Wacked Hair Salon since 2000. The most recent approved change was replacement of the existing wood railings on the front and side porches with black wrought iron railings.

The applicant is seeking approval for a paint job that is already complete.

Project Details:

1. The building walls were formerly a variegated brown brick but have now been painted a shade of white.
2. The cedar shakes on the mansard roof were brown wood color and have been painted gray. The trim and porch columns were also painted gray.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Paint only surfaces that have been painted before. Stone surfaces were seldom painted originally; painted brick surfaces tend to be more common on commercial buildings than residential. Poor weather resistance or damage to a wall were the usual reasons for painting brick, though sometimes it was just to change the building's look. While unpainted brick or stone should not be painted, if such a surface has been painted in the past, consider re-painting rather than removing the old paint.

Staff Analysis & Recommendation:

The brick façade and wood shake mansard roof were added to this 1960's commercial building in 1980 to bring it more in character with Old Worthington. The Design Guidelines state to only paint surfaces that were painted before and that paint should not be removed due to the damage that may be caused. Therefore, the only decision that is possible is to allow the painted brick and shakes to remain. The only saving grace is the brick was not historic, having only been installed in 1980.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mrs. Felicity Beck, 11 W. New England Ave., Worthington, Ohio. Mrs. Beck apologized for not going through the proper process. She said she had photographs on her telephone where her husband documented the brick was not holding up well and had begun to break down. Mrs. Beck said her husband did the painting and she was unaware he did not take the proper steps before painting the building. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present to speak for or against this application, but no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Foust moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY WACKED HAIR SALON FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO ALLOW THE PAINT TO REMAIN AT 11. W. NEW ENGLAND AVE., AS PER CASE NO. AR 50-19, DRAWINGS NO. AR 50-19, DATED MAY 20, 2019, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

Mrs. Holcombe seconded the motion. Mr. Brown called the roll. Mr. Coulter, aye; Mrs.

Holcombe, aye; Mr. Hofmann, aye; Mr. Foust, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye; and Mr. Schuster, nay. The motion was approved.

3. Replace Garage Siding & Side Entry Door – **700 Evening St. (William Mirick) AR 59-19**

Mr. Brown reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

The structure is a two and ½ story brick American Foursquare that was constructed in 1926 with a two-story 787 sq. ft. addition that was approved by the Board on June 22, 2006. The addition accommodated a larger kitchen, breakfast room, bathroom and second floor office. The property owner would like to replace the man door to the garage and the existing Masonite siding on a single car garage that was constructed in 1973.

Project Details:

1. Siding will match the 4” lap siding that is installed on the house and will be painted white to match.
2. The existing Masonite siding is 10” lap siding and is twice the size of what is on the existing house. The applicant will match the 4” lap that is currently on the house.
3. The existing side man door is a wood door with a single pane glass window. The applicant has stated that the new door will be a similar and would be a wood door with a window. Clarification is needed.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Wood Siding Recommendations - Existing historic wood siding should be retained and repaired as required. Such siding gives historic buildings a texture and appearance important to their character. Most siding is painted to weatherproof it and keeping the paint in good shape is very important.

If paint consistently blisters or peels off wood siding, look for moisture coming from leaking gutters or downspouts; leaking supply or drainpipes on the interior; wall insulation that has collected moisture; or ground moisture rising into the siding. Correct these conditions and dry out the siding before painting again. Repairs to damaged siding should be done with new wood that exactly matches the appearance of the existing. Historic wood siding should not be covered over or removed if it is repairable.

Wood siding is the preferred exterior material for new buildings, additions to existing buildings, or new garages and outbuildings. The siding should be used in one of its traditional forms: shingle, board-and-batten, shiplap or beveled siding. If replacement siding is installed over or in place of wood siding, it should be located only where the original siding was used. Avoid removal of or damage to window and door surrounds, ornamental elements such as eave brackets, and decorative panels or shingled areas. The new siding should match the thickness and width of the old as closely as possible. Consider removal of existing replacement siding, including cement-asbestos, but only

if the underlying original siding is in good condition or can be repaired.

Staff Analysis:

- The proposed lap siding for the garage will now match the size of the lap siding on the existing home.
- The new siding will also match the existing color on the house.
- The existing one-car garage is located to the rear of the primary structure.
- This property is a very deep lot with extensive vegetation at the perimeter.
- The side man door needs replaced, and the applicant has stated that the new door would be similar in style with a window and would be constructed of wood.
 - Clarification is needed on whether this new door will be wood, fiberglass or metal. Possible options might be best for the applicant.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of this application, as the proposed siding and man door replacement was compatible with the Design Guidelines.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Bill Mirick, 700 Evening St., Worthington, Ohio. All Board members felt the change was appropriate for the house. There were no questions or concerns. 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 WILLIAM MIRICK FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO REPLACE THE SIDING AND SIDE MAN DOOR ON THE GARAGE AT 700 EVENING ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 59-19 DRAWINGS NO. AR 59-19, DATED JUNE 3, 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; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Hofmann, aye; Mr. Foust, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye; and Mr. Schuster, aye. The motion was approved.

4. Shed – **92 W. North St.** (Stephen Gill & Rachael Teitt) **AR 61-19**

Mr. Brown reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This structure is a one and ½ story Colonial Revival Influence constructed in 1948 with a major two-story addition added to the rear of the home in 1962 that is more modern in style than the front portion of the home. There is also an existing single-car carport to the rear of the house that was

constructed in 1960. The new homeowners would like to install a shed for storage towards the rear of the site.

Project Details:

1. A new 8'x10' shed is proposed towards the rear of the lot that would have a rear setback of 150'+ and a side setback of 5' from the eastern property line.
2. The existing lot is 50' wide and 412' deep in size. The lot is twice the size in area of what is required by Code and is extremely deep with a stream running through the property.
3. The proposed shed is a wood-framed structure and a gabled roof. The style is the Alpine Gable with 12" overhang. Primed Smartside vertical siding will be used. The sidewalls will be 6'6" with 4 pitch with no loft. There will be a standard 52" double door and small window. No shutters are proposed.
4. The shed would be painted Taupe to match the house. The roofing materials will match the material on the existing house.
5. There is an existing detached one-car carport on the property near the house with an existing shingle roof.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

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

Staff Analysis:

1. The existing carport does not provide for any exterior storage that is not visible from the street or the neighbors. The shed would provide much needed storage for the new homeowners.
2. The Service & Engineering Department provided the following comments:
 - a. There is an existing 10' wide sanitary sewer easement that runs east to west through this property in the general location of where the applicant would like to install the shed. City staff has asked that the shed be shifted outside of this easement. It appears that if the shed were to be moved a minimum of 10'-15' to the north that it would be outside of this easement. There is an existing 12' sanitary sewer line in this easement.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended conditional approval of this application, as the proposed shed was compatible with the Design Guidelines with the following condition:

- Shed location must be located outside of the 10' sanitary sewer easement.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Stephen Gill and Rachel Teitt, 92 W. North St., Worthington, Ohio. The house and shed will both be painted beige with white trim so they will match. Mrs. Holcombe confirmed the shed would not be placed within the sanitary sewer easement and Ms. Gill said yes. She said the shed would be placed five feet from the property line. No variance would be required.

Motion:

Mr. Foust moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY STEPHEN GILL AND RACHEL TEITT FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL A SHED AT 92 W. NORTH ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 61-19, DRAWINGS NO. AR 61-19, DATED JUNE 7, 2019, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING WITH THE CONDITION THAT THE SHED LOCATION BE LOCATED OUTSIDE OF THE 10' SANITARY SEWER EASEMENT.

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

5. Wall Sign – 634 High St. (Aimee Pruitt/Radiant Yoga & Wellness) AR 62-19

Mr. Brown reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

On May 25, 2017 Kasa Yoga and Wellness made a request to install a 32” wide x 24” high wall sign on the 1820’s portion of the lodge building, to the right of the front door. The Board originally approved a reduced size sign of 22” wide x 10” high sign to match the sign at the original location. A brown border rather than blue was also approved. The applicant came back to the Board stating that they felt the sign was too small. At that meeting the Board approved a 28” wide x 16” high sign that was constructed of sandblasted HDU and identified the business name and a logo. The sign had a white background, and aqua, orange and brown raised elements. The raised border was brown. The new owner of the yoga studio would like to have a new sign to direct her patrons to Radiant Yoga + Wellness. It appears that a sign has already been installed without approval by the Architectural Review Board.

Project Details:

1. A 28” wide x 16” high sign is proposed. This matches the previous signs approval.
2. The sign would be constructed of sandblasted HDU, and would identify the business name, “Raidiant Yoga + Wellness”, and a logo. The proposed sign would have a white background, and black and gold raised elements. The raised border is proposed to be black.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

The Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance recommend signs be efficient and compatible with the age and architecture of the building. Use of traditional sign

materials such as painted wood, or material that looks like painted wood, is the most appropriate material for projecting and wall signs. Be efficient in using signs. Consider the audience – small signs can cater to pedestrians and can provide plenty of information in a small area. Try to use as few and as small signs as are necessary to get the business message across to the public.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of the sign as the proposed size fits appropriately to the right of the door. The proposed material looks like painted wood and is in character with the building and Old Worthington.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Ms. Aimee Pruitt, 634 High St., Worthington, Ohio. Ms. Pruitt said the sign in place is only a temporary sign, pending the approval for the real sign. Board members felt the sign was appropriate for the location and they had no questions or concerns. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present to speak for or against this application, but no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Schuster moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY AIMEE PRUITT OF RADIANT YOGA + WELLNESS FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL A WALL SIGN AT 634 HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 62-19, DRAWINGS NO. AR 62-19, DATED JUNE 13, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

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

6. Fence – **120 E. Granville Rd.** (Ryan & Katherine Coffman) **AR 63-19**

Mr. Brown reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

The structure is a one and ½ story wood bungalow that was constructed in 1920 at the corner of E. Granville Rd. and Morning St. The property shares a driveway and access point with the neighboring property to the west. The Board approved several alterations to this property in 2011 and 2012 related to windows, doors, deck, patio and front porch additions. On June 13, 2019 the Board approved the new owners to install two egress windows in the two basement bedrooms on the west side of the house along the driveway. The owners would now like to install a 4’ high black metal 3-rail fence around their property that would be in the front building setback.

Project Details:

1. The property owners are proposing a 4' high metal 3-rail fence with 4" circle details. Please see attached materials.
2. Three gates will be installed, one at the side of the garage and house, one on the side facing E. Granville Rd. and another one facing Morning St.
3. The fence would be located behind the existing vegetation along E. Granville Rd. and Morning St.
4. The proposed fence would be located on the Morning St. side of the property; however, the fence would be in the front setback for Morning St.
5. The applicants stated that the fence was needed for a dog.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Fences have long been used to mark property boundaries, to restrict access to properties by people and animals and for decorative purposes. They serve these traditional purposes in Worthington and can add to the character of a neighborhood when they are well executed and properly cared for. The Codified Ordinances of Worthington do not allow front yard fences, with the goal of maintaining an open, friendly feel and avoiding barriers between neighbors. However, there are many other kinds of fences, both natural and man-made, that can be used to protect and enhance a property.

Many traditional fence types are appropriate for use in Worthington. Earlier examples, typical of early- to mid-19th century homes, include rail fences, vertical board fences, and low masonry walls. From the mid-19th century into the early 20th century, cast and wrought iron fences were very popular, especially located in side yards. After about World War II, newly built homes often had metal "cyclone" type fencing or wood stockade fences, but these would be appropriate only for back yards of homes from this period. In some locations, vinyl may be a suitable substitute for traditional fence materials. It is best used in simple designs without extensive ornamentation.

Select fencing appropriate for the house's period and style. As noted, front yard fences are not permitted by city ordinance. Side yard fences should be open in style (avoid solid, opaque fences that block all views) and three to four feet in height. In the back yard, generally avoid fences over four feet in height; higher fences are discouraged but may be appropriate where a commercial use abuts a residential property. In all cases, no fences higher than six feet are permitted. Brick masonry walls should use the best quality of brick, since they are so exposed to weathering. Avoid salvaged brick that may include "interior wall" brick that can disintegrate rapidly.

Consider using natural plant materials instead of fences. Various bushes and shrubs can be used to mark property lines or to set off private areas such as rear patios. Some of these may be evergreens; some may lose their leaves in the fall. Get good advice from a nursery or professional arborist about plant size, shape, rate of growth and care before choosing a natural fencing material.

Whether natural or man-made, all fencing materials require maintenance. Do not let plants get overgrown or full of litter; keep wood fences painted or coated with opaque stain; keep metal fences from rusting; and watch for mortar loss and other deterioration in masonry walls.

Staff Analysis:

1. The proposed fence would be in the front setback for Morning St.
 - a. A variance from the Board of Zoning Appeals would be required for the placement of a fence in the setback.
2. Fences are not recommended to be in the setback.
3. The proposed style of fence would be appropriate for the area to the north of the existing house and east of the garage that would be outside of the setback area.
4. Other methods for containing a dog might be more suitable than permitting a fence in the setback.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended denial of this application as presented, as the proposed fence location did not meet Code and was not compatible with the recommendations found in the Design Guidelines.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Ryan Coffman, 120 E. Granville Rd., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Coulter asked if the same material would be used for the steps and Mr. Coffman said yes. Mr. Foust said he felt what was proposed at the meeting was a reasonable compromise from what was originally presented. 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 RYAN AND KATHERINE COFFMAN FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS FOR THE INSTALLTION OF A FENCE AT 120 E. GRANVILLE RD. AS PER CASE NO. AR 63-19, DRAWINGS NO. AR 63-19, DATED JUNE 27, 2019, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING AND AMENED TO INCLUDE THE STAIR RELOCATION TO THE REAR OF THE PROPERTY.

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

7. Retaining Wall, Steps & Shed – 55-57 W. South St. (Tina Jacobson) AR 65-19

Mr. Brown reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This American Foursquare is a duplex that was constructed in 1905 and is a contributing building in the Worthington Historic District. Additions to add a carport on the east side and a second story to the rear were approved in the 2000's. On January 10, 2019 the Board approved the replacement of sixteen windows on the house with Marvin aluminum glad wood windows. The applicant would

now like approval for a retaining wall and steps that are already under construction without Board approval. The property owner would also like permission to demolish an existing shed and construct a new shed on the property.

Project Details:

1. Retaining wall will be made of block and will have a stone face made of Ohio Tan cultured stone to match the stone on the Ohio limestone on the house. There will be a concrete cap that will be buff in color and the grout will be a brushed butter join, light tan in color.
2. Steps will be replaced with tumbled pavers to match the walkway.
3. The stone foundation for the house will also be re-grouted to match the color of the new wall and to fix damaged grout on the existing house.
4. The wall height starts at grade then goes up to 3' in height in the area that runs between the two driveways.
5. A new 8'x10' to 8'x12' shed is proposed towards the rear of the lot that would have a rear setback that exceeds 50'+ and a side setback of 2' from the eastern property line.
6. The existing lot is 72.5' wide and 209' deep in size. The lot is 15,153 sq. ft. in area.
7. The proposed shed is a wood-framed structure and a gabled roof with a height of approximately 10'. Primed Smartside vertical siding will be used. The sidewalls will be 7' with 5/12 roof pitch. There will be a standard 52" double door and small window. No shutters are proposed.
8. The shed will be installed on a concrete pad to ensure the integrity of the shed.
9. The shed will have vinyl siding that will match the house. The roofing materials will be dimensional shingles.
10. There is an existing attached one-car carport (Porte-cochère) on the east side of the house that was previously approved by the Board.

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.

Staff Analysis:

1. Service & Engineering Department Comments:
 - a. The retaining wall must be located outside of the public right-of-way.
 - b. A survey is needed to show the true location of the retaining wall.
 - c. The proposed stone and concrete cap will not be permitted to hang over the sidewalk.
 - d. A Right-of-way Work Permit might be needed from the Service & Engineering Department.
2. The retaining wall material complements the stonework on the existing foundation for the house, however staff is unsure on whether a retaining wall should be approved in this location. There are other examples of retaining wall throughout Old Worthington, however they are typically approved by the Board prior to construction and are located outside of the public right-of-way. The neighboring house to the east has a low stone retaining wall that compliments the stone on the foundation of the house.

3. The shed will be required to go before the Board of Zoning Appeals for a variance to permit the shed to be located 2' from the property line instead of the required 5' in the Code.
 - a. The site is extremely vegetated, making visibility of the shed for the street near impossible.
 - b. The property owner has stated that the shed would stick to far out into the yard and would require the removal of additional trees and vegetation if it was placed at 5'.
 - c. The shed is being installed in the location of the previous shed. No previous variance was found for the placement of the shed to be removed.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended conditional approval of this application with the following condition:

- The retaining wall must be located outside of the public right-of-way and no portion of the stone wall and cap shall be permitted to hang over the sidewalk.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Ms. Tina Jacobson, 55-57 W. South St., Worthington, Ohio, and Mr. Bob Sellen, Ms. Jacobson's contractor, 4356 Bittercreek Dr., Westerville, Ohio. Mr. Schuster asked Ms. Jacobson how long the shed had been in the current location. Ms. Jacobson said a very long time. She tried to replace the floors a couple of times but still continued to have problems. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak for or against this application, but no one came forward. A variance for the shed would also be required.

Motion:

Mr. Schuster moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY TINA JACOBSON FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL A RETAINING WALL, STAIRS AND SHED AT 55 W. SOUTH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 65-19, DRAWINGS NO. AR 65-19, DATED JUNE 14, 2019 BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING WITH THE CONDITION THAT THE RETAINING WALL MUST BE LOCATED OUTSIDE OF THE PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY AND NO PORTION OF THE STONE WALL AND CAP SHALL BE PERMITTED TO HANG OVER THE SIDEWALK.

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

8. New Baseball Scoreboard – **300 W. Granville Rd.** (Jen Goebbel/Thomas Worthington High School) **AR 66-19**

Mr. Coulter recused himself from the dais. He said he was currently doing work for Worthington Schools so he would refrain from hearing the application.

Mr. Brown reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

Thomas Worthington High School has a baseball field on the north side of the building. There is an existing scoreboard at the northeast corner of the field that the applicant is requesting approval to replace.

Project Details:

1. The new scoreboard would be in the same location as the existing, which is greater than 60' from the north property line as is required by Code for such structures. Vegetation exists between the scoreboard and the fence.
2. Dimensions for the structure are 25' wide x 15' high.
3. The scoreboard would be red with non-illuminated "CARDINALS" in Royal Blue and a logo at the top. The score and statistics below are proposed as digital numbers. Non-illuminated advertising space would be at the bottom.
4. Nothing would be illuminated on the rear of the scoreboard.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

New accessory structures in the Architectural Review District should be compatible with the site.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of this application. The new scoreboard should have a positive impact on the school property.

Discussion:

Mrs. Holcombe asked if the applicant was present. Mrs. Jen Goebbel said she was representing Thomas Worthington High School as the Athletic Director, 300 W. Dublin-Granville Rd., Worthington, Ohio, and along with Mrs. Goebbel was the Head Baseball Coach, Mr. Chris Olson. Mrs. Goebbel said they are hoping to replace the original scoreboard for Thomas Worthington High School. Mrs. Goebbel said she has received many complaints that people can no longer read the scoreboard. She said the new technology would allow for LED bulbs which would make the scoreboard brighter and more visible. Mr. Foust asked if there would be a sponsor for the season and Mrs. Goebbel said there were two significant sponsors, Ohio Health, and a heating and cooling company owned by a local resident. She said she is currently waiting for artwork from both sponsors. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak for or against this application, but no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Foust moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY JEN GOEBBEL FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL A NEW SCOREBOARD FOR THE BASEBALL FIELD AT THOMAS WORTHINGTON HIGH SCHOOL, 300 W. DUBLIN-GRANVILLE RD., AS PER CASE NO. AR 66-19, DRAWINGS NO. AR 66-19, DATED JUNE 14, 2019,

BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

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

9. Additions and Renovation – **860 Oxford St.** (Christy & TJ Bowen) **AR 67-19**

Mr. Coulter returned to the dais and Mr. Brown reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This house was constructed in 1950 and described as “Vernacular” style as part of the Worthington Historic District. The 2716 square foot structure is currently 1 ½ stories and finished with stone and lap siding on the exterior. The owners would like to add onto and remodel the house to make it more livable for their family.

Project Details:

1. A front porch is proposed that would extend out 8’ from the house and be 28’ in width. To accomplish that addition, the roof over the existing bay window would be removed and a new shed roof would extend above the area and be supported by columns. The front elevation shows reconfiguration of the front gable on the north side of the house to include the front door in its boundaries. The door would then have a new open air gable above nested in the larger gable.
2. A second story is proposed by extending the northern part of the 10:12 pitched gable up to a point 8’ – 10’ higher, and the southern part of the roof would be constructed to look like a larger shed dormer. The rear would then go down at a 5.5:12 pitch to the existing rear wall of the house.
3. A 15’ wide x 24.6’ deep area at the southeast corner of the house would be filled in to create additional kitchen space, and bedrooms would be added on the second floor above.
4. Materials would be as follows:
 - All new double 5” vinyl lap siding in deep granite with a woodgrain texture.
 - Vinyl “Shake” style shingles are proposed for the shed dormer and the front gable in the same color.
 - New vinyl windows in white are proposed for the second floor addition and to be added on the sides. The exterior molding style shown is to suggest the appearance of wood windows.
 - The proposed front door would be black with three lights over two raised panels.
 - Twelve-inch square fiberglass columns are proposed for the front porch.
 - The existing stone and windows on the front of the house would remain.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

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

Staff Analysis:

The proposed modifications would totally change this structure and conflict directly with recommendations in the Design Guidelines. Although the house is newer than many in the District and “Vernacular” in style, rather than older and a particular style, the structure as it sits today is part of the fabric of the community. In addition, the features of the resultant structure give the feel of a more modern house, with the configuration of the roof structure, massing, and vinyl siding. Options to keep the additions to the rear and be subordinate to the original house should be explored.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended denial of this application.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. T.J. Bowen, 860 Oxford St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Bowen said they love living in Worthington, and his wife is originally from Worthington, and he moved from California to live in Worthington. He said they purchased their home two years ago knowing that the home would need some adjustments. Their upstairs area is unlivable. Their ceilings are very low. Mr. Bowen said he is 6’5” tall, his wife is 6’2” tall and they are raising three boys that will also be very tall. The main room in the front of the house has no egress and they cannot stand up in the shower in the bathroom. They would like to add windows to the bedrooms upstairs for egress purposes. Mr. Bowen said their house is vernacular style and they have noticed several other similar houses in their neighborhood using stone, lap and shake siding. He said he shared the plans for the project with all of the neighbors and obtained letters of support from them. Mr. Coulter acknowledged the letters of support were shared with the Board members electronically. Mr. Bowen said they put a lot of thought into their project and do not want to do anything that is out of character with the neighborhood.

Mr. Hofmann said he appreciated the concerns for the second floor and ceiling height. He asked Mr. Ross, the contractor, how much taller the home would be. An exact answer was not given, but Mr. Ross said the roofline could be adjusted and what appears as 2-D on paper is different than what the house would look like in person. Mr. Ross said compromising the height of the ridge is something they could do very easily. Mrs. Lloyd asked what the actual difference in height was. Mr. Ross said he would guess about five or six feet. Mrs. Lloyd said she agreed with what Mr. Ross said about 2-D drawings. She felt the drawing was heavy up top until she drove past the property and because of the way the house sits up on the property the house would probably be okay. Mr. Foust said he also drove past the property and concurred with City staff’s thoughts. He said part of his concern is the second-floor section with the windows. Mr. Foust said he would like to see the front part of the house keep what it has now. Mr. Foust said he has seen some houses done in the Grandview and Arlington areas. One house was cut down the middle from the roofline because the city required them to keep the look of the front of the house, so they built a

whole new house on the back half. He said he was not suggesting that for this situation, but he would like to see the front of the house retain what it has now regarding the original character. If the applicant wanted a covered front porch on the front of the house, there would probably be a way to do that, but he had concerns with the second-floor front with the windows. Mr. Foust said he would rather see the front of the house remain the same and have the addition more towards the rear. Mr. Hofmann said he would like to see the massing reduced but he did like the idea of a covered porch. Mr. Foust agreed and felt that could be done without changing the existing front of the house. Mr. Coulter suggested that Mr. Bowen take into consideration the comments from the Board and incorporate them into new drawings then schedule a meeting with City staff and a few of the Board members to review the new drawings. Mrs. Holcombe said she liked the dormer and that many houses in the neighborhood also had dormers. She also like the front porch but felt the four windows with the bay window below looked awkward, especially with a front porch. Mrs. Holcombe felt the plans needed to be tweaked a little bit. Mr. Schuster said he liked what Mr. Bowen was doing, but felt the look was a little too modern. He hoped they could come to a compromise because he would like the family to stay in the neighborhood. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present to speak for or against this application.

Ms. Amy Sumner, 870 Oxford St., Worthington, Ohio, said she lives next door and was fully in support of the design. She has been in the Bowens home and said their upstairs is unlivable and she would like for them to be able to remain in their home. Ms. Sumner said if a variance would be needed to complete the project, she was also in support of that too.

Mr. Bowen requested to table the application. Mrs. Holcombe moved to table the application, seconded by Mrs. Lloyd. All Board members voted, "Aye," and the application was tabled until the July 25th, 2019, meeting.

10. Canopy Removal – **6750 N. High St.** (Worthington 17, LLC/Former Anthem Site) **AR 68-19**

Mr. Brown reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This property was originally developed in the late 1960's as an office for Ohio Medical Indemnity, which was most recently Anthem Blue Cross and Blue Shield. The property is made up of 9 parcels totaling 19 acres of land and houses a 200,000 square foot building and many acres of parking. In recent years, Anthem has reduced the number of employees at this office, and ultimately plans to relocate all its employees to other locations. As a result, the property was sold at the end of last year to Lawyers Development Corporation. On May 24, 2018 the Board approved several exterior changes and improvements to the building and site. The owner would now like to remove an existing concrete canopy at the rear entrance to the building.

Project Details:

1. Removal of an existing concrete canopy that is in poor condition on the rear of the building.
2. The existing canopy is approximately 24' x 12' in size.
3. Design of a new canopy has not been completed at this time.

4. The applicant has stated that the new canopy would be designed to be more in line with the existing building and the enhancements made as part of the redevelopment of the property and would provide a fresh look to the eastern elevation.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

The standards of review in the Architectural District ordinance are:

1. Height;
2. Building massing, which shall include the relationship of the building width to its height and depth, and its relationship to the viewer's and pedestrian's visual perspective;
3. Window treatment, which shall include the size, shape and materials of the individual window units and the overall harmonious relationship of window openings;
4. Exterior detail and relationships, which shall include all projecting and receding elements of the exterior, including but not limited to, porches and overhangs and the horizontal or vertical expression which is conveyed by these elements;
5. Roof shape, which shall include type, form and materials;
6. Materials, texture and color, which shall include a consideration of material compatibility among various elements of the structure;
7. Compatibility of design and materials, which shall include the appropriateness of the use of exterior design details;
8. Landscape design and plant materials, which shall include, in addition to requirements of this Zoning Code, lighting and the use of landscape details to highlight architectural features or screen or soften undesirable views;
9. Pedestrian environment, which shall include the provision of features which enhance pedestrian movement and environment, and which relate to the pedestrian's visual perspective;
10. Signage, which shall include, in addition to requirements of Chapter 1170, the appropriateness of signage to the building;
11. Sustainable Features, which shall include environmentally friendly details and conservation practices.

Design and materials should be traditional, and compatible with the existing structure.

Staff Analysis:

1. The proposed demolition of the rear entrance canopy is not visible from High St. and from most of the surrounding properties due to its location and the change in elevation on the site.
2. A timeframe for the redesign of the rear entrance was not submitted with the application. Staff would ask that a new design needs to be submitted and approved by the Architectural Review Board within 6-months.
 - a. The proposed timeframe would provide the applicant ample opportunity to get a new design approved by the Board.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended conditional approval of this application with the following condition:

- ARB approval of a new design for the rear entrance within 6-months.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Bob Meyers said he owns Worthington 17 LLC, and his address is Leveque Tower, Suite 1600, 50 W. Broad St., Columbus, Ohio. Mr. Meyers said this demolition is the beginning of a larger plan for the rear entrance of the building. He said he plans to come back to the Board to discuss plans for a more dramatic rear entrance with a terrace and gardens. Mr. Meyers said the new entranceway would be very complimentary and people would no longer have to stoop over to enter the building. Mr. Schuster asked Mr. Meyers if he was okay with a six-month window to come back to the Board with the plans for the new design and Mr. Meyers said yes. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present to speak for or against this application, but no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Foust moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY WORTHINGTON 17, LCC FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS FOR DEMOLITION OF A REAR CONCRETE CANOPY AT 6740 HIGH ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 68-19, DRAWINGS NO. AR 68-19, DATED JUNE 14, 2019, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING WITH THE CONDITION: THAT THE APPLICANT RECEIVE ARB APPROVAL OF A NEW DESIGN FOR THE REAR ENTRANCE WITHIN 6-MONTHS.

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

11. Addition & Window Replacement – 784 Morning St. (Famiglia Homes/Greene) AR 69-19

Mr. Brown reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This structure was originally constructed in 1923 and is categorized as a Farmhouse in the Worthington Historic District. The structure appears to be more of a salt box style, with what would typically be the side of the structure facing the front of the 50’ wide lot. In the late 1970’s, the house was renovated, including the addition of a second-floor deck on the south side of the house.

The application before you is for approval to construct an addition for a master bath and kitchen in place of the deck on the south side, and to replace all windows in the house.

Project Details:

1. The proposed two-story addition would be 18’ wide and 7’ deep. The site plan indicates

the addition would be in line with the rear attached garage, but the renderings show the addition extending further south than the garage. Clarification is needed regarding placement. Either way, the addition would extend further south than the front of the house.

2. The roofline appears to match the slope of the dormer on the front of the house but would be higher and extend out further. Asphalt shingles are proposed to match the existing roof. White gutters and downspouts are proposed for the new addition, although it is unclear where the downspouts would be placed as they are not shown on the drawing.
3. Proposed for the addition is 7" Hardie lap siding in Night Gray, with Arctic White trim to match the siding that was approved for the house in 2015. Black vinyl board and batten shutters are proposed for the new windows in the addition to match those that were installed on the front and south side of the house in 2015.
4. All of the windows in the house are proposed to be replaced with Pella 250 Series double-hung white vinyl windows with muntins, and white metal trim on the outside. The applicant has not indicated the material and quality of the existing windows.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

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

Retention and repair of existing historic windows is always preferable to replacement. Because they usually comprise so much of a building's exterior surface, windows are a major part of its character. Keeping them is one of the most important ways to protect that character. Even non-original windows may be of sufficient age and design quality to warrant their retention. 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. This usually means real wood windows with true through-the glass muntins (if appropriate) in dimensions and profiles that duplicate the originals. Window suppliers have become very good at doing such work at reasonable prices, but this still may take some persistence and hunting around. New windows made of substitute materials such as aluminum, vinyl, or clad wood can be an acceptable second choice if they provide a reasonably good match for the windows being replaced. Number of panes, real muntins, and correct profiles still are important.

Be sure that window and door designs are appropriate for the style or time period of the house. Design and materials should be traditional, and compatible with the existing structure.

Staff Analysis:

- The proposed addition would add to the unusual style and placement of this house due to the structure extending further out from the house and being two stories.
- If the windows are original to the structure retention should be considered. If replacement is necessary, the exterior trim should be a cementitious material to match the siding, the profile/look of the all vinyl windows should be analyzed, and if muntins are proposed they should look like true divided light and not have "Grilles-Between-the-Glass".

- Placement of downspouts should be identified as they may accentuate the presence of the addition.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended denial of this application, as the request seemed inconsistent with the Design Guidelines.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicants were present. Mrs. Merydith Green said she and her husband Bob live at 784 Morning St., Worthington, Ohio, and Mrs. Alaina Green and Mr. Josh Green, the Contractors for Famiglia Homes, 1105 Beechview Dr. S., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Foust made a suggestion of adding dormers to the roofline. He said there were several other homes that were built in the 1920's and 1930's with a similar look. Mr. Bob Green, the homeowner, said at some point the Architectural Review Board (ARB) approved an addition back in the 1980's because the house used to have a Cape Cod style and was facing the other street. Mrs. Green said the house is small and they would like to keep their family in the community, but the house is small, and they are trying to do the best they can with what resources they have. Mr. Coulter suggested the applicants should work on the drawings and come back to the Board for approval.

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

C. Municipal Planning Commission

1. Amendment to Development Plan

- a. Freestanding Sign & Parking – **438 E. Wilson Bridge Rd.** (Rush Creek Investors, LLC) **ADP 05-19**

Mr. Brown reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

Rush Creek was developed in the early 1980's at the intersection of E. Wilson Bridge Rd. and Worthington-Galena Rd. The site has three separate buildings on the site totaling 107,410 sq. ft. of office, warehousing and one restaurant on approximately 11.7-acres with two access points that is in the Restricted Industrial: Research & Office (I-1 District).

This property is in the Northeast Gateway project that is currently underway and is moving along on schedule. Right-of-way and easement acquisition are expected to be wrapped up this summer. Construction of the Huntley Rd. waterline improvements and improvements to downstream sections of Rush Run will begin late summer, continuing through the winter months. Necessary building demolition will begin this fall, to be immediately followed by the relocation of gas and electric utilities. Finally, road construction is anticipated to begin in the summer of 2020, with substantial completion targeted for late 2021.

As part of the Northeast Gateway project, the City is purchasing approximately 30'+ of the property along E. Wilson Bridge Rd., closing a secondary access point to Worthington-Galena Rd. and realigning the main entrance on E. Wilson Bridge Rd. with the proposed realignment of Worthington-Galena Rd. This project will also impact two existing freestanding signs and the required setback and screening for parking. The applicant has made application for an Amendment to Development Plan with Variances for a reduction in setback for their freestanding sign and the required setback from the public right-of-way.

Project Detail:

1. Removal of two existing freestanding signs. One located at the corner of E. Wilson Bridge Rd. and Worthington-Galena Rd. and another to the west of the main entrance to E. Wilson Bridge Rd. as part of the Northeast Gateway Project.
2. Replacing three existing freestanding signs with one new sign that will be installed 7' from the new right-of-way line where Code requires 10'. The new sign will act as an entry feature to the east of the realigned entrance.
3. The new sign will be placed in the same location as the existing freestanding sign for the restaurant.
4. The new freestanding sign will be approximately 11' high where Code permits the sign to be up to 15' in height.
5. The sign will be approximately 47.5 sq. ft. per side with the internally lit acrylic letters with Rush Creek being ½" dimensional (PVC) letter mounted with stand offs.
6. The sign will have Rush Creek as the development's name and will list the addresses for all three buildings.
7. The current parking setback is approximately 30', which will be reduced to 7' after the City purchases 31.5'+ for the Northeast Gateway.
8. The existing earthen mound, trees and landscaping will be removed as part of the Northeast Gateway project.
9. No additional trees and/or landscaping have been proposed at this time.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Development Plan Regulations

Location and Character of Development: The following regulations, conditions and procedures shall apply to the development of institutional, office or industrial developments in "C- 3" or "I-1" Districts.

The proposed institutional, office or industrial development or combination thereof 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; or where such congestion shall be alleviated by presently projected improvements of access thoroughfares, by properly arranged traffic and parking facilities and landscaping which shall be an attractive development and which shall fit harmoniously into and shall have no adverse effects upon the adjoining or surrounding development.

(c) Design Regulations. The following regulations shall apply to office, research and restricted industrial developments in "C-3" and "I-1" Districts.

- (1) Building heights. No building shall exceed three stories or forty-five feet in height, except as modified by Section 1149.04.
- (2) Yards. No building shall be less than thirty feet distant from any boundary of the tract on which the office, research or industrial development is located. Loading, parking and storage shall be permanently screened from all adjoining properties located in any "R" District by building walls, or a solid wall or compact evergreen hedge at least six feet in height. All intervening spaces between the street pavement and the right-of-way line and intervening spaces between buildings, drives, parking areas and improved areas shall be landscaped with trees and plantings and properly maintained at all times.
- (3) Tract coverage. The ground area occupied by all the buildings shall not exceed in the aggregate thirty-five percent (35%) of the total area of the lot or tract.
- (4) Parking space. Notwithstanding any other requirements of this Zoning Ordinance, there shall be provided at least one off-street space for each employee of the maximum working shift. Parking areas will not be located closer than twenty-five feet to any adjoining lot line in any "R" or "C" District and shall be set back at least thirty feet from the street right-of-way line. The parking area shall be graded for proper drainage and improved so as to provide a durable and dust-free surface.
- (5) Access drives and illumination of parking areas. Access drives shall be at a minimum interval of 300 feet, and illumination of parking areas shall be so arranged as to reflect the light away from adjoining premises in any "R" District.

A request for the change, adjustment, or rearrangement of buildings, parking areas, entrances, heights, or yards may require approval of the Municipal Planning Commission. The Commission can approve or disapprove the proposed amendment with no further review by Council if the amendment substantially conforms to the standards established by the final development plan and it complies with the Planning and Zoning Code. Otherwise, the request would be heard by Council.

Staff Analysis:

1. There are currently two signs that identify the development and one that identifies a restaurant in the building closest to E. Wilson Bridge Rd.
 - a. The proposed signage will take 3 freestanding signs down to one freestanding sign that will be placed in the same location of the old freestanding sign for the restaurant.
 - b. The new sign will also only identify the development itself and not individual tenants.
2. The proposed signage meets Code requirements for size, however, does not meet Code requirements for 10' from the public right-of-way.
 - a. The old freestanding sign is 7' from the newly proposed public right-of-way.
 - b. Existing utilities are already in this location.
 - c. The applicant would like to utilize this same location for the new sign.
3. The new public right-of-way on the north side of E. Wilson Bridge Rd. will have a 7' tree lawn, 5' sidewalk and 1.5' back of the sidewalk for a new right-of-way of 13.5' from the curb.
4. The new setback for the parking lot will be 7' between the new public right-of-way line.
5. The existing earthen mound, trees and landscaping along E. Wilson Bridge Rd. will be removed as part of the Northeast Gateway.

- a. The applicant needs to address how do you plan to meet the in-lot landscaping tree requirement for a tree for every 6-parking spaces?
- b. Landscaping should be added in the 7' area between the existing parking lot and the proposed new 5' sidewalk that will run along E. Wilson Bridge Rd.
- c. Section 1171.02(h) requires a tow inch DBH (diameter, breast, height) tree truck size for every 6 parking spaces.
 - i. There are 39 parking spaces that face E. Wilson Bridge Rd., so 7 trees would be required to be planted in this area.

Recommendations:

Staff recommended conditional approval of an Amendment to Development Plan with the following condition:

- A landscape plan must be submitted showing the installation of trees and other landscaping to be installed in this 7' area that runs parallel to E. Wilson Bridge Rd.

City Council will need to grant a variance to deviate from the Codified Ordinances for sign setback and parking setback.

Discussion:

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Craig Moncrief, an attorney from the Plank Law firm, 11 E. Town St., Columbus, Ohio. Mr. Craig said they have been working on a landscape plan and ideally they would like to work with the City because this is an awkward situation. There is only seven feet left so the City is trying to find a way for this to compliment each other and that way his client can match the City's shared use path and add landscaping around it. Mr. Moncrief said there was previously a sign in the same location so the utilities are still in place to connect the new sign. Mr. Coulter said he did not have a problem with the sign and asked if there were any issues in regard to the City's Code. Mr. Brown said the sign met the Code but the Code requires that the sign be ten feet away from the Right-of-Way; however in this situation it is seven feet. Mr. Myers asked if the sign was the only amendment to the development plan. Mr. Brown explained there were two variances, the sign distance from the Right-of-Way, and second one is the setback for the parking lot. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak for or against this application, but no one came forward.

Motion:

Mr. Hofmann moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY DONALD T. PLANK ON BEHALF OF RUSH CREEK INVESTORS, LLC FOR APPROVAL OF AN AMENDMENT TO DEVELOPMENT PLAN THAT WILL REQUIRE A VARIANCE FOR SETBACK FOR A FREESTANDING PARKING LOT AT 438 E. WILSON BRIDGE RD. AS PER CASE NO. ADP 05-19, DRAWINGS NO. ADP 05-19, DATED JUNE 14, 2019, BE RECOMMENDED TO CITY COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL 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 WITH THE CONDITION THAT A LANDSCAPE PLAN MUST BE SUBMITTED SHOWING THE INSTALLATION OF TREES AND OTHER LANDSCAPING TO BE INSTALLED

IN THIS 7' AREA THAT RUNS PARALLEL TO E. WILSON BRIDGE. RD. AND APPROVED AT THE STAFF LEVEL.

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

D. Other

Mr. Myers said there seemed to be quite a few requests for approval of work that has already been done. He asked Mr. Brown to touch base with the Director of Communications and have her add an article addressing that issue for the next newsletter to be mailed out or maybe issue a press release.

E. Adjournment

Mr. Hofmann moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mrs. Holcombe. All Board members voted, "Aye," and the meeting adjourned at 9:05 p.m.