



MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING  
WORTHINGTON ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD  
WORTHINGTON MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION  
July 25, 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; David Foust and Richard Schuster. Also present were; and Lee Brown, Director of Planning and Building and Lynda Bitar, Planning Coordinator. Commission member Edwin Hofmann and Board member Amy Lloyd were absent. Scott Myers, Worthington City Council Representative, was also absent.

**A. Call to Order – 7:00 p.m.**

1. Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Approval of the minutes of the July 11, 2019 meeting

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

4. Affirmation of witnesses

**B. Architecture Review Board – Unfinished**

Mr. Foust moved to remove the following item from the table, seconded by Mr. Schuster. All Board members voted, “Aye.”

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

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.

Updated items are in bold.

The Board tabled this item on June 27, 2019 to give the applicant time to address the comments made at the meeting.

**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 with vinyl shingles** above nested in the larger gable **which would also have vinyl shingles**.
2. A second story is proposed by extending the northern part of the 10:12 pitched gable up to a point ~~8'—10' higher~~ **higher than the existing roof, but not as high as was previously proposed**; and the southern part of the roof would be ~~constructed to look like a large a~~ shed dormer **that is smaller and more proportional than the previous version**. The rear would then go down at a ~~5.5:12~~ **2.5:12** pitch to the existing rear wall of the house. **The rear dormer would have a rubber roof due to the shallow slope.**
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:**

**Although the proposed modifications would change this structure, the changes to the roof line and dormer have a more traditional feel than the previous submittal.**

**Recommendation:**

Staff recommended approval of this application, as the request seemed consistent with the comments and recommendations previously made by the Board.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. T.J. Bowen, 860 Oxford St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Bowen said they really reduced the mass after they heard the concerns from the previous meeting. He said they reduced the egress on the second floor, and he hoped the Board members were pleased with the changes. Mr. Brown stated that staff felt this proposal addressed the previous comments and concerns from the Board members and thank Mr. Hofmann for taking the time to meet with the applicant and their contractor over a holiday weekend. Mr. Coulter asked if the new stone would match the existing stone. Mr. Bowen explained nothing was being done with the stone, the stone would be the same. Board members had no other 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. Reis moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY CHRISTY AND TJ BOWEN FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO CONSTRUCT ADDITIONS AND RENOVATE THE HOUSE AT 860 OXFORD ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 67-19, DRAWINGS NO. AR 67-19, DATED JULY 11, 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, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Foust, aye; and Mr. Schuster, aye. The motion was approved.

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

Mrs. Holcombe moved to remove the following item from the table, seconded by Mr. Foust. All Board members voted, “Aye.”

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.

**Updated items are in bold.**

**The Board tabled this item on June 27, 2019 to give the applicant time to address the comments made at the meeting.**

### **Project Details:**

1. ~~The proposed two-story addition would be 18' wide and 7' deep. The site plan indicates the addition will be in line with the rear attached garage, but the renderings show the addition extending further south than the garage.~~ **The site plan and the renderings have been modified to accurately reflect what was discussed at the meeting.** Clarification is needed regarding placement. Either way, the addition would extend further south than the front of the house. **The second story addition with a shed roof has been bumped back to be in line with the existing shed dormer towards the front of the house. This reflects the discussion at the meeting.**
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.~~ **The gutters will be white 6" aluminum gutters to match with what is currently on the house. The soffits and fascia on the addition will be painted arctic white to match the rest of the house.**
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.~~ **The existing windows are one over one vinyl windows with no muntins.**
5. **The Board pointed out at the last meeting that there appeared to a window added to the front elevation to the right of the front door. The applicants discovered that there was an existing window in this location at one point in time and would like to reinstall a window in this location that would match with all the other windows being replaced in the house.**

### **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 seems to address the previous staff and Board comments made at the meeting on June 27, 2019.**
- ~~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".~~ **The new windows will match the windows discussed at the previous meeting. The windows will have exterior muntins and will be six over six in style.**
- ~~Placement of downspouts should be identified as they may accentuate the presence of the addition.~~
- **The additional window to the right of the front door seems to provide balance and should be a positive way to provide additional natural light to the home.**

#### **Recommendation:**

Staff recommended approval of this application, as the request seemed consistent with the comments and recommendations previously made by the Board.

#### **Discussion:**

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicants were present. Mrs. Alainna Greene, 1105 Beechview Dr., Worthington, Ohio, said she was representing 784 Morning Street. Mr. Josh Greene, 1105 Beechview Dr., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Brown stated that staff felt this addressed all the comments and concerns heard from the Board at the previous meeting. Board members 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. Foust moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY FAMIGLIA HOMES LLC ON BEHALF OF ROBERT AND MERYDITH GREEN FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO CONSTRUCT AN ADDITION AND REPLACE WINDOWS AT 784 MORNING ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 69-19, DRAWINGS NO. AR 69-19, DATED JUNE 14, 2019, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.**

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

### **C. Architecture Review Board – New**

#### **1. Rear Deck – 6699 N. High St. (Schoedinger Funeral & Cremation Services) AR 72-19**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

#### **Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

##### **Background & Request:**

The current Schoedinger mortuary and parking was approved in 1993 and opened to the public in 1994. This is a request to add an exterior deck that would connect to a remodeled interior space for use by families experiencing a loss.

##### **Project Details:**

1. The proposed deck area is roughly 44' x 37' and located on the west side of the building at the south end. The deck is designed with a wood frame and proposed with Azek for the flooring, fascia, skirting and 3'6" railing. The color for the Azek is proposed as Coastline which is a light gray with the look of faded cedar. Access to the deck would be by way of a ramp on the west side and through two new French doors from the existing building. A "See-through" fireplace is proposed on the wall between the new doors.
2. Two 20' wide mechanical awnings are proposed to attach to the building which would together cover almost the entire width of the building. The awnings could extend out 11'8" from the wall when needed. The hardware and awning colors have not been identified.
3. An aluminum and glass 6' x 4'6" overhead door is proposed on the building at the north end of the deck. It would be adjacent to an interior bar. The color of the framing has not been identified.
4. Light fixtures are proposed on posts around the deck and mounted to the building next to the doors. Each fixture could accommodate four 60 – 120 watt candle style bulbs.
5. Sofas, chairs end tables and bar stools with tables are proposed. The illustration indicates the furniture is dark wicker, or looks like darker wicker, with neutral pillows and red and blue ceramic tables.
6. A new window and replacement of the existing window are proposed on the south side of the building. The new window will have a matching soldier course of brick to the existing. Shutters are with the existing window but are not mentioned for the new window. A new pilaster is proposed at the southwest corner.

##### **Land Use Plans:**

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Materials: Traditional materials such as wood and brick are desirable in newer areas, but other materials are also acceptable. These include various metals and plastics; poured concrete and concrete block should be confined primarily to foundation walls. Use traditional window sizes, proportions and spacing for first and upper floor windows. Doing so will help link Old Worthington and newer areas through consistent design elements. Use simple door and trim designs compatible with both the building and with adjacent and nearby development. Decks and patios should be limited to the rear of buildings. Compatibility of design and materials and exterior detail and relationships are standards of review in the Architectural District ordinance.

#### Worthington Comprehensive Plan

The 2005 Worthington Comprehensive Plan identifies the High Street Corridor (Extents Area) as a place where consistent site design should be encouraged such as landscape screening and interior planting of surface parking areas, and the location of large parking areas should be to the rear of the site. The plan recommends promoting a high-quality physical environment, encouraging the City to continue to emphasize strong physical and aesthetic design, and high-quality development.

#### **Recommendation:**

Staff recommended approval of this application. The proposed design and materials were complementary to the existing building.

#### **Discussion:**

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Randy Schoedinger, 6699 N. High St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Schoedinger said they did the same project with their Zollinger Road location a few years ago. He said he has seen a trend of bringing more natural sunlight into buildings and the addition with the fireplace and the bar will allow for a more comfortable setting for services and people can bring food in for their event. Mr. Coulter asked if the outdoor area would have speakers and Mr. Schoedinger said no. Board members had no other 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. Reis moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY SCHOEDINGER FUNERAL AND CREMATION SERVICES FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO ADD A DECK TO THE REAR OF 6699 N. HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 72-19, DRAWINGS NO. AR 72-19, DATED JUNE 26, 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. Coulter, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Foust, aye; and Mr. Schuster, aye. The motion was approved.

2. Shed – 184 E. Granville Rd. (Mark Spence) AR 74-19

#### **Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

#### **Background & Request:**

Page 7 of 25

ARB/MPC July 25, 2019

Minutes

This house was originally built in 1930 and is two-stories with a gabled roof and a one-story addition to the rear. In June of 2015, approval was granted to construct a 9' x 9' addition with a deck at the northeast corner of the house, and amendments were approved later that year and in March of 2016. In September of 2018 the Board approved a planter that was built without approval on the eastern edge of the deck, and string lighting for the deck. The property recently transferred, and the new owner would now like to construct a new shed behind the existing 2-car garage.

**Project Details:**

1. A new 10' x 14' shed is proposed to be located directly behind the existing 2-car garage and will be 8' from the side property line.
2. The existing lot is 50' wide and 259' deep in size. The lot is extremely deep.
3. The proposed shed is a wood-framed structure and a gabled roof with a copula on top. Smart side vertical siding will be used. There will be a double door and a single door for entry and two small windows that will have shutters and window boxes.
4. The shed will be painted similar to the color of the house. The body of the shed will be painted gray (Pencil Sketch N500-4), trim will be painted white (Navajo White 22), window boxes and transoms will be painted white (Bit of Sugar PR-W14) and the accent color on the doors will be a lighter shade of gray (Galactic Tint N510-2). The roofing materials will match the material on the existing house. Please see application materials.
5. There is an existing detached 2car garage on the property.

**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 2-car garage is 432 sq. ft. in size and does not provide enough storage. The shed would not be visible from the street and would permit the property owner the ability to store equipment out of site from the neighbors. The shed would provide much needed storage for the new homeowners.
2. The proposed shed will be 8' from the side property line.
  - a. Code requires a minimum of 5' from the side property line.

**Recommendation:**

Staff recommended approval of this application, as the proposed shed was compatible with the Design Guidelines and was not visible from the public right-of-way

**Discussion:**

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mrs. Suzanna Spence, 184 E. Granville Rd., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Foust said he felt the shed was appropriate for the site. Mr. Coulter said he liked the style. Board members had no other 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. Foust moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY MARK SPENCE FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL A SHED AT 184 E. GRANVILLE RD. AS PER CASE NO. AR 74-19, DRAWINGS NO. AR 74-19, DATED JULY 1, 2019, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.**

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

3. Rear Window Modification – **86 W. North St.** (Anna Patitucci & Luca Filippi) **AR 75-19** (Amendment to AR 116-18)

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

**Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

**Background & Request:**

This Cape Cod was built in 1939 and is a contributing building in the Worthington Historic District. The eastern portion of the structure has a gable roof that is lower than rest of the building. The house has wood lap siding which is painted a light green color, and asphalt shingle roofing. A one-story rear addition was added in the late 1980's and replaced with a larger one-story addition in the late 1990's. Also in the late 1980's, a rear shed dormer was added on the west side of the roof. The dormer was expanded in the late 1990's.

At the January 10, 2019 meeting, the applicants were approved to construct additional dormers to make the eastern part of the upstairs usable (~250 sf), and a portico for the front entrance. This request is to modify a proposed rear window.

**Project Details:**

1. The originally approved window was to be double hung style to match others in the house. To accommodate interior design, the owners would like to have a smaller window at the east end of the second floor addition.
2. The proposed window would be awning style with 6 horizontally oriented lights. The color, material and trim are proposed to match the other windows.
3. A drawing of the front elevation showing changes to the front dormer and porch roof as approved by the ARB is included in the packet.

**Land Use Plans:**

**Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance**

Cape Cod style houses are characterized by having three-bay facades, rectangular form, gabled roofline with roof dormers, brick or wood siding, a central entrance, multiple-paned windows with shutters and classical detailing around the entrance and in the cornice.

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.

**Recommendation:**

Staff recommended conditional approval of this application based on the grid pattern of the window giving the look of vertically oriented lights rather than the proposed horizontal lights.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Luca Filippi, 86 W. North St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Foust said he concurred with staff comments about the windowpanes that they should be taller than they are wide. Board members had no comments or concerns. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present to speak for or against this application, but no one came forward.

**Motion:**

Mr. Reis moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY ANNA PATITUCCI & LUCA FILIPPI FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO MODIFY A REAR WINDOW WITH THE WINDOW PANES TO BE VERTICAL ORIENTED AT 86 W. NORTH ST. AS PER CASE NUMBER AR 75-19, DRAWINGS NUMBER AR 75-19, DATED JULY 2, 2019 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; Mr. Reis, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Foust, aye; and Mr. Schuster, aye. The motion was approved.

4. Front Porch Remodel – **88 W. Granville Rd.** (Bill Porteus) **AR 76-19**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

**Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

**Background & Request:**

This cottage style house was built in 1919 and is a contributing structure in the Worthington Historic District. The structure has a full front porch which is a significant feature on the front of the house, and the owner would like approval to reconstruct it due to water damage and decay.

**Project Details:**

1. The owner intends to replace the columns, floorboards, railing and skirting for the porch. Also, handrails are proposed along the steps, and will require a variance for placement in the required front yard.
2. Porch elements are proposed to be replaced with wood. The white columns appear to have slightly different capitals which are shown flush with the porch roof rather than extending beyond. The floorboards appear to be the same in style as the existing and would be Dovetail (SW 7018) gray. A new wood railing is proposed that would have panels in Natural Choice (SW 7011), and trim boards in Bunglehouse Gray (SW2845) which

matched the house color. The rendering shows the opposite color selection. The skirting is proposed to change from lattice to a vertical pattern, having Bunglehouse Gray for the borders and the lighter Natural Choice for the rest. Clarification is needed on the style.

3. In the renderings, a wood handrail is shown. Since that submission, the owner has decided on a black metal railing with an arch below the top rail.

### **Land Use Plans:**

#### Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

From about 1915 on, porches generally were simplified and more integrated into the design of the house. Simple square or tapered columns were common. Avoid ornamentation such as spindles and scrollwork unless they were traditionally used on the porches of similar buildings. Design and materials should be traditional, and compatible with the existing structure.

### **Recommendation:**

Staff recommended conditional approval of this application, based on the following:

- The columns be placed properly with the capitals extending out from the porch roof.
- Design details of the columns, porch railing, and skirting be clarified and acceptable.
- Colors of all elements are clarified.
- Handrail should match the style of the house. The arched element does not relate to anything.

### **Discussion:**

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Bill Porteus, 88 W. Granville Rd., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Porteus said he asked for a courteous inspection and was told by the inspector to increase the amount of railing around the porch and add a handrail for the stairs. Mrs. Bitar said clarification is needed from the building inspector if the railing needed to be higher. Mr. Porteus said he preferred a lower handrail. Mrs. Bitar said she agreed and did not believe a higher rail would be appropriate for the porch. Mr. Porteus said he preferred keeping the handrail as it was originally proposed because raising the height would change the look. Mrs. Bitar asked Mr. Porteus about the skirting. Mr. Porteus said he did not believe the lattice work was appropriate for the house and he would like to clean up that area a little. He said he preferred verticals with even spacing. The column style would not be changing. Mr. Foust said he agreed leaving the handrail at the current height would look best and staff should follow up with the building department. Mrs. Bitar asked if the inspector measured the height of the porch above the adjacent grade and Mr. Porteus said he was not present at the time the inspector was at the house. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak for or against this application, but no one came forward.

### **Motion:**

Mr. Reis moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY BILL PORTEUS FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO MODIFY THE FRONT PORCH AT 88 W. GRANVILLE RD. AS PER CASE NO. AR 76-19, DRAWINGS NO. AR 76-19, DATED JULY 11, 2019, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE**

**STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING AND AMENDED TO INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING:**

- **PORCH RAILING SHOULD BE THE SAME HEIGHT UNLESS REQUIRED TO BE HIGHER BY CODE**
- **PORCH RAILING PANELS TO MATCH BASE COLORS OF HOUSE' TRIM TO BE WHITE**
- **REPLACEMENT COLUMNS TO MATCH EXISTING AS CLOSELY AS POSSIBLE**
- **METAL HANDRAIL ALLOWED FOR STAIRS IF NEEDED – STYLE TO BE SIMPLE RAIL WITHOUT ARCH**

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

**5. Exterior Painting – 50 W. New England Ave. (Worthington Historical Society) AR 77-19**

**Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

**Background & Request:**

This building, known as the Old Rectory, is a Greek Revival style building that was originally constructed circa 1845 as a parsonage for St. John's Episcopal Church. When the church sold the building in 1924 to a private owner it was moved to 799 Hartford St., functioning first as an apartment building and then as offices for the Worthington Board of Education starting in 1965. The schools constructed an addition to house more offices to the rear in 1974. In the late 1970's, the Worthington Historical Society acquired the building and moved it to its current location where it is used as a museum and offices for the Society.

The applicant is requesting approval to change the trim colors on the 1945 part of the building. Typically, the ARB does not review painting a structure, but because this building is a prominent historic structure and the changes involve the window, shutter and door colors, staff felt Board review was warranted.

**Project Details:**

1. The applicant is proposing to paint the southern 1945 part of the structure Sherwin Williams "Dune White" which is very similar to the existing white shade of the building.
2. For the older part of structure, the shutters are proposed to be painted Benjamin Moore Chrome Green, which reportedly looks like black. The window sashes would be Sherwin Williams "Tricorn Black", and the front door would be Benjamin Moore "Chrome Green". Currently the front door and windows are white and the shutters are black.
3. Evidence was submitted with the application citing the use of dark colors for windows and shutters on houses of this era, and photographic samples are also included.

**Land Use Plans:**

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Color is a major design element with significant impact upon a building's character. In Worthington some colors are more appropriate than others, depending upon a building's age, style, and setting. The city has a flexible policy giving building owners freedom in color selection but recommends avoiding colors inappropriate for Worthington's architecture. In the past, color use varied with time period. Early- and mid-19th century buildings often were painted white, but fairly bright colors such as red, blue, yellow, dark green and even orange were used, sometimes as body colors for buildings and sometimes as trim. After about 1860, typical colors included greens, reds, oranges, and olives that were fairly dark and rich. The body color was usually lighter, with trim painted in darker compatible colors; sometimes the opposite was true. Color patterns were simple, usually with only two different colors used for body and trim. Traditionally, bright colors were not used in Worthington.

People often prefer lighter rather than darker colors for both body and trim. Indeed, the brighter colors sometimes used in the past often do not seem "right" for today's tastes. Even on older buildings that might have used brighter colors in the past, lighter color schemes can be appropriate. Before re-painting, research original paint colors. It is possible to chip or scrape down through paint layers to expose earlier colors. Once historic paint layers are exposed, match current color chips for color selection (most paint stores and manufacturers have "historic" paint palettes designed for older buildings). If original colors can't be discovered or are unacceptable, then consider alternate colors chosen according to the time-period guidelines above or from color palettes developed for use on historic buildings.

**Recommendation:**

Staff recommended approval of this application. Re-painting the Old Rectory in colors similar to the existing was appropriate. The most noticeable change would be to the windows, but the applicant had shown evidence from houses of that era with the same color treatment.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Frank Shepherd, 600 Keys Ln., Worthington, Ohio, distributed color samples to the Board members. He said the current shutters are Black Forest Green, and they would like to paint the shutters Chrome Green. Mr. Shepherd said they felt green was appropriate for the time period of the home. The windows would be painted black and the body of the building would be painted Dune White. The front door of the old rectory would be the same Chrome Green. Mr. Shepherd said their research determined the colors were appropriate for the 1850s. Mrs. Holcombe asked Mr. Shepherd how soon they would like to paint and he said sometime next year.

**Motion:**

Mr. Reis moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY THE WORTHINGTON HISTORICAL SOCIETY FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO PAINT THE OLD RECTORY AND ADD SHUTTERS TO THE FRONT GABLE WINDOW AT 50 W. NEW ENGLAND AVE. AS PER CASE NO. AR 77-19, DRAWINGS NO. AR 77-19, DATED JULY 12, 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; Mr. Reis, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Foust, aye; and Mr. Schuster, aye. The motion was approved.

**6. Solar Panels – 130 E. South St. (Icon Solar/Isaacson) AR 78-19**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

**Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

**Background & Request:**

This two-story vernacular house was constructed in 1950 and is a contributing property in the Worthington Historic District. This application is a request to install solar panels.

**Project Details:**

1. The applicant is proposing installation of 53 solar panels. Five are shown on the eastern side of the hipped roof on the main house; 24 would be on the two-story rear addition; and 24 are proposed for the freestanding garage roof.
2. The 1 1/3” thick panels would be mounted on a metal railing system and sit about 5” above the roof.
3. The color of the proposed panels would be black; but the color of the railing system has not been specified. The existing roof on the house is gray.
4. Location of the supporting equipment has not been specified.

**Land Use Plans:**

**Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance**

Place solar panels in a location that minimizes the visual impact as seen from the right-of-way and surrounding properties. Generally, panels should be located on roofs in the following manner: the rear 50% of the roof of the main building; the rear inside quadrant of the roof of a main building on a corner lot; or on accessory structures in the rear yard. On sloped roofs, place panels flush along the roof unless visibility is decreased with other placement. With flat roofs, keep panels at least 5’ from the edge of the roof, or place at the edge if a building parapet exists that will screen the panels.

Solar panels at another location on a building or site may be acceptable if their placement does not have an adverse effect on the architecture of the building, or the character of the site or Architectural Review District. The equipment to support solar panels should be screened from view.

**Recommendation:**

Staff recommended partial approval of the application. The 5 panels proposed for the front of the house roof would be easily seen from the right-of-way and should not be included. The others would comply with the Design Guidelines.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Jason Isaacson, 130 E. South St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Coulter said they would likely approve of the panels except the five panels proposed for the front of the house. Mr. Foust said he wished Mr. Myers was at the meeting because he crafted the guidelines that set the direction Board members should take and he concurred with City Staff. Mr. Brown reminded the Board of the history of the development of the guidelines for solar panels and gave an example of where the Board modified the location of the solar panels to be in compliance with the adopted guidelines. The five front panels would not be in compliance with the directions from City Council. Mr. Isaacson said there was a trend of houses in the neighborhood that have panels directly on the front of their homes. Mr. Coulter said he was aware of that and explained because of the panels, that led to the big discussion with Worthington City Council. Mr. Brown explained there were two houses that were approved for solar panels and that led City Council to develop new guidelines for the panels. Mr. Isaacson said he understood.

**Motion:**

Mr. Reis moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST JASON ISAACSON FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL SOLAR PANELS EXCEPT FOR THE FIVE PANELS AT THE FRONT OF THE HOUSE AT 130 E. SOUTH ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 78-19, DRAWINGS NO. AR 78-19, DATED JULY 12, 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, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Foust, aye; and Mr. Schuster, aye. The motion was approved.

- 7. Wall Sign – **2285 W. Dublin-Granville Rd., Suite 116** (Signarama/The Hills Jewelry) **AR 80-19**

**Findings of fact & Conclusions**

**Background & Request**

In 2014 & 2015, the property owner of this land at the southwest corner of W. Dublin-Granville Rd. and Linworth Rd. annexed, rezoned, subdivided, created a Development Plan, and received Architectural Review Board approval to redevelop the property as a neighborhood commercial site. Final approval was given for Linworth Crossing in 2015, and Sign Criteria were developed and approved in 2016 (see Land Use Plans below). The use of colors other than the approved requires approval by the ARB.

The Hills Jewelry is planning to locate in Suite 116 and would like to use a color other than the approved.

**Project Details:**

1. Black lettering spelling “THE HILLS” would be 15.5” high; “jewelry” would be below with an overall height of 23.75”.
2. A gold line is proposed on both sides of “jewelry”. A sample of the gold color is needed.
3. All characters would be 1 ½” thick HDU/PVC mounted to the wall.

**Land Use Plans:**

Linworth Crossing Development Plan

Approved Sign Criteria per the Development Plan:

- This tenant space is permitted up to 28 square feet of sign area.
- Maximum character height is 24”.
- Black gooseneck LED lights are above all signs.
- All signs will consist of 1 ½” thick non-illuminated dimensional letters and logos, centered in the sign band area. The font style can vary.
- The proposed color palette for the signs is red (PMS #7621); blue (PMS #541); green (PMS #561); and PMS Black C.
- Proposed logos must be approved by the ARB.

**Recommendation:**

Staff recommended approval of this application, as the gold sign color should not detract from the rest of the center.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. The applicant was not present at the meeting, however Mrs. Bitar suggested moving forward with the approval. Board members had no questions or concerns. Mr. Coulter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak either for or against this application, but no one came forward.

**Motion application:**

Mr. Reis moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY SIGNARAMA WORTHINGTON ON BEHALF OF THE HILLS JEWELRY FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO ADD A WALL SIGN AT 2285 W. DUBLIN-GRANVILLE RD. , SUITE 116, AS PER CASE NO. AR 80-19, DRAWINGS NO. AR 80-19, DATED JULY 12, 2019 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; Mr. Reis, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Foust, aye; and Mr. Schuster, aye. The motion was approved.

8. Modification to Modular Classrooms – **885 Evening St.** (Tim Gehring/Evening Street Elementary) **AR 81-19** (Amendment to AR 24-19)

**\*Mr. Coulter abstained from hearing the following Agenda item due to a professional conflict and left the room for the discussion and vote.**

### **Findings of fact & Conclusions**

#### **Background & Request:**

As was previously discussed, Worthington Schools has been evaluating its facilities and has begun making changes to upgrade facilities and accommodate enrollment numbers. Some of the solutions involve permanent changes such as construction of additions, and other situations warrant temporary solutions. In order to accommodate increasing enrollment at Evening Street Elementary, the applicant was approved to add modular classrooms.

As part of the previous approval, the existing chain link fence was to remain, and the applicant is to return within 4 years to extend the approval if needed. Also, a specific design for the building was approved, and the immediate neighbors and the Schools agreed to a landscape plan.

This application addresses modifications to the previous approval.

**Updated items are in bold.**

#### **Project Details:**

1. Site details:
  - **The building is now ~111' from the Evening St. property line, which is 9' further than the previous approval.**
  - **On the north side, the ramp is proposed west of the door rather than east.**
  - A connection to the north door would be made with a canopy covered walkway that would allow for pedestrian and bike access along the south side of the school as there is now.
  - **The existing storage building has been removed.**
  - **The ARB originally approved retention of the chain link fence near Evening Street. The neighbors requested and the schools agreed to remove the fence, so ARB approval is needed for the change.**
  - **A revised landscape plan was agreed to by the neighbors and the schools, and includes street trees in addition to the other evergreen and deciduous trees previously proposed.**
2. Building details:
  - **The design that was part of the previous approval did not correctly represent the layout of the actual building. The positioning of the windows and condensing units and the addition of an electrical panel are now shown in photographs, and represented in building elevations. The elevations also show the addition of trim around the windows and condensing units and the proposed darker and lighter shades of gray as were previously approved.**
  - Six classrooms and two restrooms would be part of the modular building which is 70' wide x 98' long. Hardiepanel stucco panels exist on the walls and would be added as skirting to extend to the ground.

- The gutters and downspouts would match the background.
- Steps are proposed on the south side with a metal roof and rail.
- A metal canopy system with metal columns would connect from the modular building to the south door of the school.
- Wall packs are proposed above both doors and would be full cutoff style fixtures.

**Land Use Plans:**

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Use simple door and trim designs compatible with both the building and with adjacent and nearby development. Compatibility of design and materials and exterior detail and relationships are standards of review in the Architectural District ordinance.

**Recommendations:**

Staff recommended approval of this application. Although temporary structures are not typically desired, staff understood the need in this situation and would like the building to look as good as possible for the time it is in place.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Reis thanked Mr. Brown and staff for going above the call of duty to resolve this. He said he was out of town when he heard about the issues and then became unglued because the Board members worked so hard to make the plan happen. He applauded Mr. Brown for the amount of time he spent with the neighbors and the schools to come to an understanding. Mr. Reis said he also applauded the neighbors for having some flexibility and patience throughout this process.

Mr. Jeff Eble, Director of Business for Worthington Schools, 200 E. Wilson Bridge Rd., Worthington, Ohio, apologized to everyone. He said they had multiple architects doing multiple things. Mr. Eble said there was a lack of communication with the drawings as to what was a mock up for color and what was an actual drawing for modules that were coming to the site. Mr. Eble said he appreciated the neighbors' willingness to work with him and come to a resolution and apologized for making this a more difficult process than it needed to be.

Mr. Schuster asked if the noise from the air conditioning units had been resolved and Mr. Eble said the air conditioners have not been turned on yet so they are unaware if there is an issue or not. Mr. Brown said once the units are energized, there is still the possibility of baffling the noise per their original approval. Mr. Eble did not think the units would be noisy, but once they get the units fired up they will be able to determine the noise level. Mr. Reis asked if there was anyone present to speak for or against this application.

Ms. Eugenia Martin, 148 E. North St., Worthington, Ohio, said she was asked by the neighbors to do a preliminary evaluation of the proposed landscaping. She said she is a landscape architect and based upon her evaluation of how the landscape is proposed and giving regard to the longevity of the pods being in place she felt 3-5 more evergreen trees needed to be planted with a layered effect to help mitigate the sound and visual issues and to help protect the nearby property values. Ms. Martin suggested planting the trees further back from where the street trees are located and reduce the number of street trees down to 5 to lessen the chance of choking the plant material in the long

run because she felt the pods may be in that location longer than they are supposed to be. She said that was her professional recommendation.

Ms. Martin said her personal comment is that the schools need to take a hard line and redistrict because this is not a good place for kids to learn. This is not a conducive learning environment and you are putting the children in a temporary structure versus something permanent.

Mr. Foust asked Ms. Martin's opinion about the street trees because there are currently six proposed. He said he wanted whatever was approved to be very clear and Ms. Martin explained how the trees should be planted and that they should be forty feet on center. Mr. Reis said he believed there should be a very accurate placement of the trees, a very accurate number of trees, a very accurate understanding of the caliper of trees and the plants be defined in a plan and be reviewed by city staff with the neighbors so the Board can give their approval. Ms. Martin said there were no sizes listed for the street trees. She said what is typically done if a resident wants a street tree, the tree can be an inch and a half caliper. Ms. Martin recommended a 3 to 4-inch caliper of tree which would also help block the view of the roof decks of the modular unit. Mr. Reis said wherever the neighbors would like the additional buffer that is where it should go. Mr. Reis said the schools need to understand they have to plant the accurate sizes of trees, whatever the plan calls for because he does not want to have the same meeting again and again because the trees are a half inch too small of caliper or three feet less in height than what was approved. What is approved needs to be planted and maintained.

Mr. Brown explained the City's Arborist recommended the street trees to be a two-inch caliber instead of three or four, because the larger caliber of trees struggle to grow. The two-inch caliber trees would grow faster. The larger street trees that were planted in front of the Fresh Thyme store struggled and two of those trees have already died.

Mr. Reis said the Board has bent over backwards to make everyone happy and then the schools went ahead and did what they wanted to do, so this time the schools are going to do what the Board and neighbors want them to do. Ms. Martin said once the trees are planted, they must be watered and diligently taken care of in order to survive. She also recommended the investment of good soil for the trees.

Mrs. Jenna Reik, 802 Evening St., Worthington, Ohio. Mrs. Reik said they were frustrated and disappointed and that the trailers were thoroughly discussed at the previous meetings. She said they filed an Appeal of the original approved plan to Worthington City Council. She said they have gone through several discussions with City Staff and the School District and subsequently dismissed their Appeal. What they agreed upon was not delivered by the School District. Mrs. Reik said they are tired of discussing the trailers and simply want what was agreed upon. She said there are not just a few things that differ from what was agreed upon. Mrs. Reik said they learned through the Appeals process that the School District is held to a different standard than homeowners since they are a government entity. She said they only have to show a reasonable effort to conform with design standards. As of today, no effort has been shown and nothing they agreed upon has been delivered by the School District. She said there was a whole different list of items that were agreed upon which affect their property the most such as:

1. The south side of the building had no windows and there were supposed to be four.
2. There are two huge electrical boxes on the southeast corner which her property looks directly at and they were not on the plan otherwise they would have asked for them to be moved.
3. There are four air conditioners on the east side facing neighboring properties but only two and one smaller one on the west side during the April 25<sup>th</sup> ARB meeting, Mr. Hofmann asked if some or all of the units could be moved to the west side in order to help with the noise and look of the units. They were told that was not possible, but it was possible because there are less visible units they can see now.

Mrs. Reik said she and her neighbor met with the representatives from the School District and the City on Monday, July 22, 2019, and they supplied her with a color wheel of colors to choose from. She gave her opinion of the colors to use. Mrs. Reik said she had little faith what was agreed upon would be executed and she thanked Mr. Reis for his comments about this plan needing to be clear and followed through with what was approved.

Mr. John Reik, 802 Evening St., Worthington, Ohio, said when they dropped their Appeal two months ago, it was on the condition that the School District follow through with the approved plans and work with them on the fencing and landscaping. The School District said they would do the best that they could to make the best of the situation at the last meeting, but since then they have spent countless hours dealing with issues concerning the modular units. He said they realize the schools need the trailers, and they were never really opposed to the trailers, but they were opposed to the location of the trailers. Mr. Reik said they looked at the serial numbers of the air conditioning units and they are twelve years old. He said the main contention they have is with holding people accountable and policing the situation and he wanted to make sure the approved plan comes to fruition.

Mr. Seth Cramer, 806 Evening St., Worthington, Ohio, said he wanted to echo the comments of his neighbors and this has been a ludicrous and embarrassing process. He said the schools are supposed to be teaching integrity, but he felt that was missing from this process.

Mr. Cramer thanked the representatives from the School District for their time but felt the schools should be redistricting to solve the current issues. He felt there was \$300,000 tax dollars being wasted for no reason. Mr. Cramer also thanked Mr. Brown for his time and willingness to help. He wished the City would have had some teeth to been able to stop the project when they realized the project was not following the approved plan. Mr. Cramer said he is also concerned about noise from the air conditioning units and was stunned the contractor lied about the units being new. Instead they are twelve-year-old used units and guaranteed to be noisy. He and his neighbors created a list of things they would like to see done in order to make the best of a bad situation. The list was distributed to all of the Board members for review and then Mr. Cramer discussed the itemized list and the possible solutions for noise reduction from air conditioning units. He said he would like to see all of the landscaping done by Thanksgiving 2019, and if plantings die, he would like to have them replaced within one month. Mr. Ebel said it would depend when the tree died. If the tree died in the middle of the summer, then the tree would be replaced in the fall when the temperatures were cooler. Mr. Cramer wanted to confirm the fence facing Evening Street would

be removed, from the south end of the tennis court and all the way to the north now where the fence currently exists.

Mr. Reis asked the School District representatives to make sure that whoever is watching over the construction of their projects that they make darn sure that what was approved by the ARB Board, the brick color, the trim on the window, the landscaping, where the asphalt goes, where the service goes, where the plantings go, that the plan is followed to the T. If not, everything will be ripped out. Mr. Reis continued to say they have been scrutinized by City Council on several occasions where they have bent after the fact and they are not going to bend anymore. What has been approved needs to be followed or come back for reconsideration before the work is done. He said the facilities people had better be on site when things are built in the future and the work is done right, the way the Board approved.

**Motion:**

Mr. Foust moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY TIM GEHRING ON BEHALF OF WORTHINGTON SCHOOLS TO MODIFY CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS #24-19 TO PLACE MODULAR CLASSROOMS FOR EVENING STREET ELEMENTARY SCHOOL AT 885 EVENING ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 81-19, DRAWINGS NO. AR 81-19, DATED JULY 12, 2019, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING WITH THE CONDITION THE APPLICATION TO EXTEND THE APPROVAL PERIOD IS EXPECTED WITHIN FOUR YEARS AND INCLUDING THE SUBMITTED DOCUMENT LABELED AS EXHIBIT A TO BE PART OF THE MOTION.**

**\*Exhibit “A” dated July 25, 2019 is attached at the end of the meeting minutes.**

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

**\*Mr. Coulter returned to the room and the dais.**

9. Wall Sign – **905 High St.** (Jersey Mike’s Subs/Worthington Center LLC) **AR 79-19**

Mr. Brown reviewed the following from the staff memo:

**Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

**Background & Request:**

This building was constructed in 1965, having a two-story structure to the south and a one-story structure to the north. In recent years the owner has made improvements to the façade and signage. A mix of uses has always been present in this neighborhood commercial building.

Subway recently vacated the northern tenant space and Jersey Mike's Subs would now like to operate in the same space. The applicant would like approval to replace the existing Subway signage.

**Project Details:**

1. A new sign is proposed in the band above the storefront. There are 2 existing gooseneck lights above that will remain. The sign would all be 8' wide x 2' high, made of 2" thick routed HDU with raised border and copy. It would have a burgundy background with beige lettering and trim. The sign will read: Since 1956 Jersey Mike's Subs.

2. For the freestanding sign, the applicant will be replacing just the face with new acrylic with Since 1956 Jersey Mike's Subs on the sign. The sign background is opaque as is the rest of the freestanding sign.

**Land Use Plans:**

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

The Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance recommend signs be efficient and compatible with the age and architecture of the building. Use of traditional sign materials such as painted wood, or material that looks like painted wood, is the most appropriate material for projecting and wall signs. While the regulations permit a certain maximum square footage of signs for a business, try to minimize the size and number of signs. Place only basic names and graphics on signs along the street so that drive-by traffic is not bombarded with too much information. Signs must be distinctive enough to be readily visible but avoid incompatible modern colors such as "fluorescent orange" and similar colors. Bright color shades generally are discouraged in favor more subtle and toned-down shades.

The Architectural District Ordinance calls for design and materials to be compatible.

**Recommendation:**

Staff recommended approval of this application as it was consistent with the previously approved signage for the center.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Coulter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Tyler Washington, 905 High St., Worthington, Ohio, said only the signage would change. The use would remain the same. Board members 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. Reis moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY JERSEY MIKE'S SUBS FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS FOR SIGNAGE AT 905 HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 79-19, DRAWINGS NO. AR 79-19, DATED AUGUST 24, 2016, 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, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Foust, aye; and Mr. Schuster, aye. The motion was approved.

## **D. Municipal Planning Commission**

### **1. Conditional Use Permit**

- a. Ancillary on Premise Waiting & Dining – **905 High St.** (Jersey Mike’s Subs/ Worthington Center LLC) **AR 70-19**

Mr. Brown reviewed the following from the staff memo:

### **Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

#### **Background & Request:**

This building was constructed in 1965, having a two-story structure to the south and a one-story structure to the north. In recent years the owner has made improvements to the façade and signage. A mix of uses has always been present in this neighborhood commercial building.

A Conditional Use was approved by the Municipal Planning Commission in 1993 to permit Subway to operate an on-premise dining/waiting area (nonalcoholic) in this space. Subway recently vacated the space and Jersey Mike’s Subs would now like to operate in the same space.

#### **Project Details:**

1. The hours are similar to Subway; however, Jersey Mike’s Subs is not open in the early morning hours and does not offer breakfast.
2. Vehicular and foot traffic should be similar to the previous use.
3. The interior layout will be the same as Subway’s previous layout.
  - a. Updates and modifications to the interior will follow the Jersey Mike’s Subs branding.
4. There is parking in front of and behind the building to accommodate vehicular traffic.

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

1. Effect on traffic pattern – The number of trips to the property would be similar to the previous use. Morning traffic would be less since Jersey Mike’s Subs does not offer breakfast.
2. Effect on public facilities – No effect has been identified.
3. Effect on sewerage and drainage facilities – The effect would not change.
4. Utilities required – No new utilities would be required.
5. Safety and health considerations – Restaurants would be reviewed by Columbus Public Health.
6. Noise, odors and other noxious elements, including hazardous substances and other environmental hazards – None have been identified.

7. Hours of use: Monday – Sunday 10:00 AM to 9:00 PM
8. Shielding or screening considerations for neighbors – No changes are necessary.
9. Appearance and compatibility with the general neighborhood – No exterior changes are proposed. The only exterior changes will be to the wall sign and the freestanding sign. All other changes are interior.

**Land Use Plans:**

Worthington Conditional Use Permit Regulations

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

Definition:

"Ancillary on-premise dining/waiting area" (nonalcoholic) means a dining or waiting area that is clearly incidental and subordinate to the primary use of the structure and with seating limited to a counter or table(s) in conjunction with carry out food service such as doughnuts, ice cream, sandwich or pizza shop not selling or serving alcoholic beverages.

Worthington Comprehensive Plan

A good mix of restaurant and niche retail shops are appropriate for Old Worthington.

**Recommendation:**

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

**Discussion:**

Board members 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. Reis moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY JERSEY MIKE’S SUBS FOR A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO ALLOW ANCILLARY ON-PREMISE DINING/WAITING AREA IN THE C-1 ZONING DISTRICT AT 905 HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. CU 06-19, DRAWINGS NO. CU 06-19, DATED JULY 12, 2019, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE PLANNING GOALS OF THE CITY, AS REFERENCED IN THE LAND USE PLANS AND ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.**

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

**E. Other**

There was no other business to discuss.

**F. Adjournment**

Mr. Schuster moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mrs. Holcombe. All Board members voted, "Aye," and the meeting adjourned at 9:13 p.m.