



MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING  
WORTHINGTON ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD  
WORTHINGTON MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION

May 22, 2014

The regular meeting of the Worthington Architectural Review Board and the Worthington Municipal Planning Commission was called to order at 7:30 p.m. with the following members present: Richard Hunter, Chair; Kathy Holcombe, Secretary; Mikel Coulter; Amy Lloyd and Jo Rodgers. Also present were: Scott Myers, Worthington City Council Representative for the Municipal Planning Commission; Lee Brown, Director of Planning; Lynda Bitar, Planning Coordinator and Clerk of the Municipal Planning Commission and Melissa Cohan, Paralegal. Board members James Sauer, Vice Chair and Thomas Reis were absent.

**A. Call to Order – 7:30 p.m.**

1. Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Approval of minutes of the May 22, 2014 Meeting

Mr. Coulter moved to approve the minutes, and Mrs. Holcombe seconded the motion. All members voted, "Aye".

4. Affirmation/swearing in of Witnesses

**B. Architectural Review Board**

**1. Unfinished**

- a. Sign – **5655 N. High St.** (Thirty Four Corporation) **AR 19-14**

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from application. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Ms. Lauren Tonti approached the microphone and stated that her address is 4162 Maystar Way, Hilliard, Ohio 43026. Ms. Tonti said that she works for the company that owns and operates the property. She said over the past year, they have put quite a bit of work into the building next to the white house, to improve tenancy at both buildings. She said that both buildings have higher vacancies than they would like to see, and that is reason they are working on the new sign. Ms.

Tonti said there are several available suites in the 5655 N. High Street building that are built out for dental suites but could easily be converted into other medical uses. The owner is trying to attract that type of tenant.

Ms. Tonti said that she shows the available spaces to prospective tenants and their first question is if signage space is available. The owner would like to maintain multiple tenant names on the sign.

Mrs. Holcombe asked Ms. Tonti how many tenants could occupy the building. Ms. Tonti said that the building has three stories and approximately 16,000 square feet which can be split up. The smallest space is 300 square feet, and there is a current tenant which takes up half of one of the floors. She said that anywhere from fourteen, but less than twenty tenants could occupy the building. Ms. Tonti said that the number could vary greatly, but the proposed sign could only handle spots for fourteen tenants.

Mrs. Rogers asked Ms. Tonti what she thought about the staff's recommendations of moving the address up into the decorative element, and Ms. Tonti said that she would discuss the staff's suggestions with the owner.

Mr. Hunter said that when he drives past buildings he likes to be able to see the address numbers and the larger the size of the number the better. Mr. Coulter said that he agrees with Mr. Hunter, and that the address numbers should be moved up to the pediment and drop out the next two lines so there would be five panels instead of seven. Mr. Hunter asked Mrs. Bitar how much of a variance was requested for the sign. Mrs. Bitar stated that the request is to go from thirty square feet of sign allowed to eighty square feet as shown, per side, which includes the pediment that is nineteen square feet. Mr. Hunter suggested that Ms. Tonti talk with her owners about reducing the size of the sign and the amount of tenants on the sign. Mrs. Rodgers agreed that the sign will be more readable as people drive past.

Mr. Hunter asked Ms. Tonti how big the sign is for the white house, and Ms. Tonti said that she is not sure. Mrs. Bitar said that she could find out the size of the white sign before the next meeting.

Mr. Myers asked Ms. Tonti if she has tried to turn into the driveway while going southbound on High Street, and Ms. Tonti said, "yes". Mr. Myers asked Ms. Tonti if she tried to enter the driveway while a car was exiting, and she said, "no." Mr. Myer's asked Ms. Tonti how close she came to the sign while she turned into the driveway, and Ms. Tonti said that she is aware that the area has a very tight turn. Mr. Myers said that he banks at that branch, and he feels the sign needs to be moved back before cars hit the sign. He believes that the sign should be completely rebuilt and moved closer to the building. Mr. Coulter agreed with Mr. Myers suggestion. Ms. Tonti said that she will discuss these issues with the owners. There were no other speakers regarding this application. Mr. Coulter moved to table the application and Mrs. Holcombe seconded the motion. All members voted, "Aye". The motion was tabled.

### **Background & Request:**

The building and parcel at 5655 N. High St. do not front N. High St.; the frontage is along W. Selby Blvd. At the time of construction in the early 1960's, the building was given a N. High St. address and a freestanding sign to advertise the building was installed on a vacant N. High St. lot under the same ownership. Architectural Review Board approval was not required at that time and there is no record of other sign regulations. The sign is located south of the mostly vacant lot's drive (currently housing a seasonal garden center). That drive also allows access to Key Bank and the building at 5655 N. High St.

The existing sign is considered non-conforming because it is an off-premises sign; is larger than the allowable 30 square feet per side (approximately 64 square feet in area per side); is closer than 10' to the Right-of-way, and 35' to the side property line; and was designed to identify up to 14 tenants on each sign face, rather than the 3 tenants allowed in the current Code. Once a non-conforming sign is altered to an extent of more than fifty percent, it must be reconstructed to conform to the existing Code. The sign has been damaged over the years.

The applicant would like to install a freestanding sign, reusing only the existing sign base, as part of an effort to update the property.

### **Project Details:**

1. The proposed 9'2" high x 9'5" wide sign measures approximately 86 square feet in area per side, which includes a 2' high x 9'5" wide (19 square feet in area) pediment at the top. The existing base is concrete, measuring 19" high x 82" wide, and is proposed for reuse in the same location. Because the base falls within the 2' high x 8' wide allowable area for supporting structures, that area need not be included as part of sign area.
2. A non-illuminated aluminum sign cabinet with plastic changeable faces to accommodate up to 14 business names is proposed. The cabinet and faces are proposed in a light tan color called "Snow Goose", with the text being brown. The size and font of all lettering are proposed to match. The address and leasing information are shown on the sample sign.
3. The applicant would need variances from the Board of Zoning Appeals for sign area, location as an off-premises sign, front and side yard setbacks, and for the number of businesses displayed on the 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. The design guidelines recommend minimizing the size of signs; free-standing signs should be monument style and as low as possible, and have a base appropriate to the building; traditional sign materials and lighting are preferred (wood or composite to look like wood; individually mounted lettering is preferred; no cabinet box signs or exposed raceways; external or halo illumination) and bright colors are generally discouraged.

### **Recommendation:**

Staff is recommending *denial* of this application. The proposed sign does not meet the intent of the Worthington Design Guideline recommendations or the sign code. The size of the sign could be reduced by: putting the address on the pediment; eliminating/disallowing “For Lease” information; and reducing the number of tenant spaces. A new sign would be an improvement, but staff feels the proposed option is too far away from the standards. Just because this freestanding directory sign was in place in 1971 does not mean the style should be approved today, but a modified version of the proposed may be acceptable.

b. Demolition and New Grocery Store – **933 High St.** (Insite Real Estate, LLC/Fresh Thyme Farmers Market) **AR 14-14**

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mr. Hunter said the Board would like to hear concerns and comments about this matter, but that this particular piece of the application will be tabled and come back as a part of the final process. He said the Municipal Planning Commission needs to discuss and either move forward or not with the Planned Unit Development (PUD), which will be the change of zoning for this project. He said that the important features of this PUD will be for the sole use for this client, and Mrs. Bitar explained that office use will also remain an allowable use. Mr. Hunter said that the Board and Commission will still be responsible for reviewing the processes if this property should ever change.

The information in this item has been consolidated in PUD 02-14, Agenda Item #C,1,a below. Final ARB details and the Final Plan for the PUD will return for approval after the City Council approves a Preliminary Plan. Mr. Coulter moved to table this application, and Mrs. Lloyd seconded the motion. All Board members voted, “Aye”. The motion was tabled.

**2. New**

a. Garage Addition – **162 E. South St.** (Steve Cohen) **AR 20-14**

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Ronald Niemizc approached the microphone and stated that his address is 11381 Raccoon Ridge, Canfield, Ohio 44406. Mr. Niemizc said that he is the applicant’s father-in-law and he will be doing the work on the garage. Mr. Hunter asked Mr. Niemizc if he had any questions or concerns, and Mr. Niemizc said no. Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone else present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

**Findings of fact & Conclusions**

**Background & Request:**

The house and garage on this property were constructed in 1949, with a front porch and rear addition built in the last 5 years. There is a wooden shed behind the garage that has likely been

there since the other structures were built, and is in disrepair. This application is a request to demolish the shed and construct a new storage structure behind the garage.

**Project Details:**

1. The roof of the proposed 8' x 10' shed would tie into the hipped roof of the garage, with asphalt shingles over both to match the house. Proposed Hardi cement fiberboard shingles and clapboard siding to match the house are proposed, and would be painted green to match the house and garage.
2. The required side yard for accessory structures over 120 square feet is 8'. The 80 square foot shed combined with the existing garage area would be 320 square feet. A variance to allow the shed at 5' instead of 8' must be approved by the Board of Zoning Appeals for the proposed placement.

**Land Use Plans:**

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

There are recommendations in the Worthington Design Guidelines for new outbuildings to use design cues from older nearby structures, and be compatible in appearance with the house it accompanies.

**Recommendation:**

Staff is recommending *approval* of the application. The proposed shed demolition and garage additions meet the Worthington Design Guideline recommendations.

Mrs. Rodgers moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY STEVE COHEN FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO DEMOLISH A WOOD SHED AND CONSTRUCT AN ADDITION TO THE GARAGE AT 162 E. SOUTH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 20-14, DRAWINGS NO. AR 20-14, DATED MAY 1, 2014, BE APPROVED CONTINGENT ON A SETBACK VARIANCE BEING GRANTED BY THE BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS, AND BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.**

Mr. Coulter seconded the motion. Mrs. Bitar called the roll. Mr. Hunter, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Coulter, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye and Mrs. Rodgers, aye. The motion was approved.

**C. Municipal Planning Commission**

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

- a. Zoning for New Grocery Store – **933 High St.** (InSite Real Estate, LLC/Fresh Thyme Farmers Market) **PUD 02-14**

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Jeff Brown approached the microphone and explained that he is an attorney with the firm of Smith & Hale, 37 W. Broad St., Columbus, Ohio. Mr. Brown said he would like to first thank City Staff for all the time they have devoted to this application. Mr. Brown said that his client is very excited about being in Worthington. He believes the plan so far looks great, and that they followed the suggestions of moving the building to the north as far as possible along High Street. He said that in terms of the building elevation, they have showed a variety of options based on the various comments and they are interested in further input.

Mr. Brown said that he met with the property owners, the Webers', who now live behind the office condominiums, and they have asked for a nine foot board-on-board fence, and as long as the City will approve such fence, they are fine with making such change along that side of the property.

Mr. Coulter explained that he and Mr. Sauer met with the developers from InSite Real Estate and City Staff a few weeks earlier and spent a fair amount of time going through the floor and sight plan, and again the discussion came up about a front entrance to the grocery store. The original elevations gave an illusion of a front door and the plan seemed very confusing because the door was not actually an operative door. Although the City Code requires a front door, from an architectural and functional stand point, a front entrance is not possible. Mr. Coulter said that there are still some architectural elements that he would still like to address on the east elevation, but those decisions will not be made tonight. Mr. Coulter said they also discussed with Mr. Watterson, what would be necessary to get a left-hand turning lane on to High Street. In order to do that, the property would have to be about ten to twelve feet wider, or the building would have to be narrower. He said that they just need to work through the fine details and feels that the Board should be able to come to Agreement on a PUD that can be recommended to go forward to City Council. Mr. Coulter said that he appreciates the efforts that InSite Real Estate and their Architects have made to listen to the comments and coming up with options to resolve some of the issues.

Mrs. Holcombe agreed with Mr. Coulter's conclusion about not having a front entrance. She said after talking with the owners, she understands that they have tried every possible way to have a front entrance, and that is not possible. She said not having a front entrance is not a precedent that they want to set, but she is looking at the bigger picture, and how the community is going to benefit by having a grocery store in this location.

Mrs. Lloyd said that her opinions are similar to what has already been discussed, but she is still disappointed there will not be a front entrance. Mrs. Lloyd said that she is concerned about the redevelopment of this nearby intersection, and what would happen if Fresh Thyme would go away, what would happen in terms of the building. She said that some of the architectural improvements are good, and she is in favor of the brick. Mrs. Lloyd would like to hear more details about what the front will look like, and said she is not in favor of bricking the entire area in, but also does not feel that the entire wall needs to be glass.

Mrs. Rodgers asked if the Board was going to be discussing architectural details this evening, and Mr. Hunter said that architectural details are up for discussion, and the Board would like to

hear comments and concerns from the public as well. He also stated that whatever details are discussed this evening, he wanted the audience to understand that this is not the final discussion, and that the Board is not even close to hearing final details. There will be an ongoing effort, and they will be doing the best that they can to make this store fit into the community.

Mr. Hunter said they will be discussing Planned Unit Development this evening which will allow the developer to understand what is going to happen, but also allow the community to continue the input, and continue the process to work through Architectural Review. Mr. Hunter said that he hopes Fresh Thyme does not go away because they are backed well, and they have a business plan that is quite appropriate for the community. He said if something did happen with the economy, the Board still has a lot of control of what will happen to the building.

Mr. Brown asked Mrs. Rodgers if she had questions about the architectural details. Mrs. Rodgers said that she agreed with City Staff about option number five, using brick, and the simplified detailing on the building was a step in the right direction. She said that since the building will not be having a front entrance, she does not want to see something that appears to be a front entrance. Mrs. Rodgers said that would be confusing and frustrating for customers. She prefers the option number four type of look with a window, instead of a door. She also said she did not like the barn door look, on the front or back, and feels that would be out of character with what has been done with the rest of the building. Mrs. Rodgers would like to see a more classic brick structure.

Mrs. Lloyd said that she had a question about the two egress doors on the front elevation and if those doors would be glass. Mr. Brown said no, they will be glass doors with shutters. Mrs. Lloyd said that she was okay with the elevations that were being shown on the screen, and the barn door.

Mr. Myers said that he had a couple of questions regarding the development language. Mr. Myers made reference to the language presented at the meeting and asked if that language matched the drawings, and Mrs. Bitar said that words “substantially compliant” are used so what Mr. Myers was seeing is substantially going to be approved, but still allows for the changes of detail. Mr. Myers said that he wanted to have a discussion as to what substantial means before this matter comes before City Council. He said that the difference between an eight and nine foot fence, the elimination of three trees, and no parking for bikes on the back of the building are substantial, and asked if those changes are going to be made from the current drawings to what is finally approved. Mrs. Bitar said that this is why they have this process broken out to a preliminary plan, which is the basic zoning, and the final plan which goes back to the Planning Commission to work out those types of details. Mrs. Bitar said that the language can be put into the development text as the way the details are going to be, and there may be an Amended Development Plan that goes on to City Council for approval.

Mr. Myers asked Mrs. Bitar to look at example 3(b)(i)(i), “Bicycle parking shall be provided at locations noted in Exhibit C 200”. He said there is no substantial language there, and Mrs. Bitar said there should be. He said that he is concerned about the language of the development plan because that is what the Board will be voting on this evening. Mr. Myers said that he thought there was a height requirement for light poles, but he could not find that in the development

language, or what language address that issue. Mrs. Bitar said that she had that language in her Memo, but that language can also be inserted into the development text as well, and should be.

Mr. Brown said if Mr. Myers has a list of conditions or changes to be made, he would try to incorporate those changes into the documents that will be presented to City Council, under City Staff's supervision. Mr. Myers wants to make sure Mr. Brown has the correct documents that will allow him to develop the building while at the same time gives the City the correct PUD language. Mr. Myers also mentioned that he does like barn doors.

Mr. Myers also had a question about signage. Mr. Myers asked the Board if they were okay with not having details about the lighting of signs, and if those details can be discussed before the Architectural Review Board and Mrs. Bitar said yes. Mr. Myers said that his understanding is that signs would require variances, and the idea of a PUD is to be able to incorporate into the development text so they do not have to seek variances. Mrs. Bitar said that is correct, and that is the importance of approving the number of signs, the size and total area to be allowed. She said no lighting that is not currently in the code will be allowed.

Mr. Hunter said that the Board was ready to hear comments and concerns from the audience.

The first speaker was Julie Perkins, and she stated that she is an attorney that represents Tollgate Square Condominium Unit Owner's Association, which consists of twenty home owners, and is located directly across the street from the planned entrance for this store. She said she would like to address her clients' concerns, such as traffic, safety, and the architectural aesthetics. She said the foremost concern is the traffic issue with people coming from both sides of High Street going either direction. She said they do not feel the current plans address the potential traffic issues. The storm sewers and water are another major concern because there are currently no storm sewers in front of the Kinko's business, and the homeowners are experiencing water issues now. They want to be assured these plans are looking at the fact that this is not going to exacerbate current drainage issues. Another area of concern is with the demolishing of the current structure that is on the site. Ms. Perkins said there have been reports of rodent sightings, rats, and other vermin at the current structure and they want to make sure those are properly exterminated. Her clients are also concerned about the seating area in front of the store where there is no entrance. They are concerned the area will become a trash problem, and trash blowing onto their property, which is currently an existing problem from nearby businesses. She understands the architectural aesthetics are being tabled at this time, but her clients would like to express that they do not believe the proposed building has the high standards of Worthington in relation to the Orange Johnson House across the street. They are also concerned about the lighting, signage and overall appearance. The Association would also like to express their disappointment that they were not included in discussions like the other neighbors with adjoining properties were; they would like Fresh Thyme to consider their concerns as well.

The second speaker was Mary Damsel who stated that she lives in Tollgate Square. She said that she has been thinking about the safety problem. Ms. Damsel is concerned about the refrigerator trucks that will be coming up with meat and fresh produce, and turning into this narrow area, and maybe not hitting the curve quite right as the cars are exiting, and the north traffic light red, and the south traffic light green and all of the sudden the truck has to stop, and the exiting traffic is

stopped because they cannot maneuver around the truck. There is no place for the first car to back into because there will be tables in the way, and the whole line of traffic will need to move back to make room for the truck, and that is when someone will have a need for an emergency squad. She believes the store would be a better fit where the hardware store is located. She said that the United Methodist Children's Home area will also be developed and add to the traffic. She doesn't understand how the current plans will work, and how successful the Fire Department will be getting through the traffic.

The third speaker was Kari Garnes, and she stated that she lives at 970 High St., in the Tollgate Square Condominium complex. She said she does welcome the new store to the neighborhood and that she appreciates all the work the City has done on their Comprehensive Plan, the efforts that they are going through to get community involvement and communication regarding the United Methodist Children's Home property, and the multi-use plan along Wilson Bridge Road. She said they are also very pleased with the way the CVS was designed and how well the look fits within the community. She said that she noticed CVS has two entrances and they found a way to make that work. Ms. Garnes said that she recently found out that the house directly west of the Sprint Lube was just up for auction from HUD. She thought that might have been a nice property for the developer to purchase, or partner with the Sprint Lube, or the property to the north in terms of trying to come up with more entrances for traffic or access to a traffic light. She also discussed the development of an area in Clintonville, in between Dominion Boulevard and Weisheimer Road. on High Street., where there are Chipotle and Panera Bread restaurants and thought that they did a nice job with the stop light and entrances and the look of those buildings along High Street. She said water drainage and runoff is another concern, and there is a need for a storm sewer in that area, possibly on both the east and west sides of High St. in that particular area near Tollgate Square Condominiums. Ms. Garnes would like to be assured that the store employees will be constantly checking the area to remove trash so that it will not blow onto other neighboring properties. She believes there is a feral cat colony that lives near the area of 933 High St., and she would like to see the Humane Society or Cat Rescue group remove the colony from the property. Mr. Hunter said that the beginning of this new construction project should take care of that particular problem. Lastly, Ms. Garnes said that she was disappointed that the residents of Tollgate Square were not included in discussions in advance with the owners of Fresh Thyme.

Mr. Hunter asked the City of Worthington Director of Public Service, Mr. William Watterson if he would like to make any comments, and Mr. Watterson said he would be glad to. Mr. Watterson said that the site currently has two sewers that transport water from the High Street area and east of the High Street through the property. The first sewer is located under the building and was presumably constructed in the original creek channel that was there prior to the site being filled for development. Mr. Watterson said that the sewer is not a public responsibility at this point, and not in an easement. He said there is also a storm sewer along the south side of the site that was built following the City's Comprehensive Storm Drainage Study in 1973 because that private sewer under the building was determined to be deficient. Mr. Watterson said that this development has proposed the construction of a new storm sewer to replace both of those along the north side of the property. He said that location was considered to try to get the driveway as far north of the North Street traffic signal as possible to allow that signal and the entrances to operate most effectively so that the storm system actually does tie into the traffic

consideration in that respect. Mr. Watterson said that the current drainage system on site has no detention, the system was installed prior to the time detention was a requirement. He said there is very little pervious surface on the property. The new development proposes actually using part of the existing public sewer that is being abandoned for storm water underground detention, and constructing some additional underground detention. They also plan to use some pervious pavers along the west side of the site for storm water control. Mr. Watterson said that should improve the storm water on the site as far as runoff is concerned. Mr. Watterson said that he does not believe that will have any impact to the Tollgate Square drainage. Mr. Watterson said that drainage is a problem, and he has already met with the association representatives a number of times over several years about possible solutions to their issue. He said there is a storm sewer on High Street and there is an inlet north of Wilson Drive that would be available to them to tie into. The new storm sewer being constructed on the north side of the proposed site would create another opportunity, a little closer than the existing manholes on the west side for them to tie into, should they wish to make improvements to their private storm drainage system.

Mr. Watterson said that as far as traffic is concerned he would speak about that briefly. There are currently two entrances to the site now, and the developer has proposed only one entrance. He said the developer is entitled to the use of a curb cut no matter what the use of the site will be. Mr. Watterson said that moving the driveway to the north as much as possible, away from the traffic signal at North and High Street will create the best situation for that operation. Mr. Watterson said that there is a center turning lane on High Street, with left turns into Tollgate Square and left turns into the proposed development would be accommodated by that center lane.

The fifth speaker was Ms. Lisa Hallenback. She said that she is a resident of Tollgate Square and President of their Home Owner's Association. Ms. Hallenback asked if the letter her neighbor, Suzanne Youngblood, sent in would be part of the record and if the letter will be read allowed in her absence and Mr. Hunter said yes, the letter is automatically part of the record. Mrs. Bitar read the letter allowed, and a copy of the letter will be attached to the minutes, and on file in the Clerk's office.

The sixth speaker was Ms. Anna Patitucci. Mrs. Patitucci stated that her address is 86 W. North St., Worthington, Ohio. Mrs. Patitucci said that she loves the city and her neighborhood and has been impressed with all the work that has gone into this project so far. She said she and her family are eager for a new store. She said she is speaking as a resident and a mother of two small children. Mrs. Patitucci said that her neighborhood on W. North Street has approximately twenty children in the area less than ten years of age. She was not sure if this was the correct forum to raise this issue, but she wanted to raise the topic of vehicular traffic mitigation on W. North Street. She and her neighbors would like to discuss options of improved safety in the area, whether improved crosswalks, signage, stop signs, and speed bumps, whenever the appropriate time is to discuss that issue.

Mr. Myers said that Worthington City Council has formed a Pedestrian Bicycle Committee, about six months ago, along with the City Engineer, and they are specifically looking at pedestrian and bicycle access and movement throughout the entire city and how that can be improved. Mr. Myers mentioned that Council Member Mrs. Dorothy is on that Committee, and

he gave Mrs. Patitucci information so she can reach Mrs. Dorothy. Mr. Myers said Mrs. Patitucci should send her comments and concerns to Council Member Dorothy because that Committee is currently looking at those types of issues. Mr. Coulter mentioned that he and Mrs. Bitar are also on that same Committee.

The seventh speaker was Mr. Robert Weber, who stated that his address is 300 Greenbriar Court, Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Weber thanked the Commission and Mr. Brown and the developers for their time. Mr. Weber said that he understood that tonight's meeting was not intended to work out all of the necessary details, but after meeting with the developer's attorney, Mr. Jeff Brown, earlier, he discussed having a large fence built to buffer his property from the proposed store. Mr. Weber said that a nine foot fence would be good, but he believes a shadow box style of fencing would look better to prevent potential graffiti vandals from ruining the fence. He thought a shadow box style of fence would be more aesthetically pleasing, and would eliminate the concerns about potential vandalism. For the record, Mr. Weber said that he discussed with Mr. Brown about building the fence on the south side of the easement, which he currently owns and that the seven white pines he planted are to be preserved and stay. Mr. Coulter said that at the last presentation, the developers had come back with new lighting plan that showed zero foot candles and asked Mr. Weber if he was comfortable with that based on what he saw at the meeting this evening. Mr. Weber said that the improvements are encouraging and that he is depending on the Commission to make sure that the execution is solid. He feels that the store will be a good asset for the city, but he wants to make sure that his neighboring property is taken care of too.

Mr. Hunter said that the key difference between a shadow box and a straight fence is that a shadow box fence will not give you protection from car headlights. He said with cars pulling in and out of the parking lot, a shadow box fence would add a lot of light to the yard. Mr. Weber suggested a tight shadow box; board on board, with no gaps would be fine.

The eighth speaker was Mr. Adam Tomlinson, who stated that his address is 260 Greenbriar Ct., Worthington, Ohio. He said that his back porch, patio and door are within ten feet of the new eight foot fence. He wanted to thank the developers for moving the property forward on High Street, and making the area more aesthetically pleasing to look at. He also wanted to thank Patrick and Mr. Brown for reaching out to the neighbors, and apologized for the Tollgate contingent, because he has felt very welcomed and involved in the process. He hoped that Patrick's recent email to the neighbors regarding recent updates will be forwarded to the neighbors at Tollgate Square. He believes that the email will ease some of their concerns. Mr. Tomlinson said that he, his family and neighbors are very excited and thankful for this opportunity.

The ninth speaker was Ms. Connie Kobalka, who stated that her address is 674 Hartford St., Worthington, Ohio. She said she is not directly affected by this development, but she is very disappointed there will not be a front entrance. Ms. Kobalka said that there will be older people and parents with kids in strollers that will want to walk to the store, and she is very concerned about the traffic. Ms. Kobalka would like to ask the City Council, the ARB, and whoever is responsible would clearly look at how pedestrian traffic will get into the back of the property where the parking lot is. She asked if there will be a wider sidewalk. Mrs. Bitar explained that

there are two five-foot sidewalks proposed, one will be on the north side of the building, and one will be on the south side of the building. Ms. Kobalka was pleased to hear that. She said she is also concerned about crossing the area where the loading dock will be located. Mrs. Bitar said there will be a marked crosswalk, and she is hoping that Fresh Thyme will have a plan in place for when deliveries will be coming to assure everyone's safety across that area. Ms. Kobalka asked Mr. Myers if this will set a precedent of developing commercial areas without front entrances, and how can you prevent other developers from coming in and not having front entrances. Mr. Myers explained the situation that began about seven months ago. Mr. Myers explained the unique situation to Ms. Kobalka.

Mr. Myers said that he was asked to see if there is a possibility to have at least one eight foot sidewalk. He understands after looking at the plans there is not enough room for an eight foot sidewalk south of the property, and if an eight foot sidewalk was put in the north end of the property the driveway would be narrower. Mr. Myers said that his constituents would like to have sidewalks that can accommodate both pedestrians and bicyclists at the same time and five foot sidewalks probably will not help. He asked members of the Committee to look into the matter to see if they could figure something out that would accommodate both pedestrians and bicyclists.

Mr. Myers said that he wished he could agree with the audience about their CVS comments this evening, about how good the CVS building looks. Mr. Myers said that the property sits about three feet lower than what was originally planned, thousands of tax payers dollars have been spent on litigation with CVS over that particular property. He said they have not particularly been good citizens. Mr. Myers explained why the grocery store has to be located across the street from CVS, not on the east side of High Street, because CVS owns the property. CVS has a Non-compete Agreement. Some of the current issues are driven by CVS, a property that has clapboard walls that are going to rot because CVS will not maintain them, and they have two doors. Mr. Myers would much rather see a quality developer build the grocery store if he has to give up a front door.

Mr. Brown said that he and the developers will be happy to speak with the residents of Tollgate Square and see if there is anything they can do to help. He also said they will cooperate with the City's requirements for demolition. Mr. Brown said that maintenance of their property is very important; they also want to have a clean site. He said he will add a maintenance section into the Agreement in terms of policing their site. Mr. Brown said in terms of Mr. Weber's request, they will install the fence on the north side of the property. He said if the City is okay with a nine foot fence at that location that is what they will build. Mr. Brown said they are very excited about coming to the Worthington community. He mentioned there is still a list of items that will need to be finalized as they go through the final development plan and architectural review of all the details. He believes this is a good project, appropriate zoning, and with the changes that were suggested tonight, he's hoping the Commission will give their recommendation to City Council.

Ms. Kari Garnes wanted to make an addition comment about whether there is consideration to expanding the reduced speed limit of twenty-five miles per hour further north. Mr. Myers thought that was a good suggestion, and said he would talk to the other City Council members about that idea. He feels that the speed limit area could be pushed further north to Worthington-

Galena Road. Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Watterson if that is something that the City can do without going back to the state. Mr. Watterson said yes, the City can set the speed limit.

Mrs. Holcombe said that she liked the suggestion of the sidewalk on the south side of the property to make sure that people are safe around the loading dock area, and that area should be extremely well marked. Mr. Hunter liked Mrs. Bitar's suggestion about the planned hours of deliveries, and that should be in the development text. Mrs. Bitar said that is already in the development text, the hours of deliveries are stated as between 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. only. Trash disposal will be between the same hours.

Mr. Scott Nicholson, from InSite Real Estate, approached the microphone and stated that his address is 1400 16<sup>th</sup> Street, Oak Brook, IL. Mr. Nicholson said they like to have normal delivery hours between 6:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m., but because this store's location will be adjacent to a neighborhood with so many residents, that is why they trimmed the hours of deliveries to 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. They need a little bit of flexibility because of the nature of store collecting local produce from farmers, not from some huge four thousand square foot warehouse. Mr. Hunter asked Mr. Nicholson to work on the safety issue. Mr. Nicholson said, "Absolutely".

Mr. Hunter asked Mrs. Bitar about 4. E(4) about the maintenance of the western portion of the property will occur as needed and not less than quarterly. Mrs. Bitar said that the other changes should be included in the motion, such as adding a maintenance section, add in substantial compliance for the bicycle parking and for any other section that wording was left out and should have been included. Mrs. Bitar said that under the lighting section, the height of the light poles needs to be added to the PUD development text. She said along with the amended development text, plans will be amended to reflect the changes that were discussed, like the fence height.

There were no other speakers.

The information in this item should be used for consideration of AR14-14, Agenda Item #B,1,b above. Final ARB details and the Final Plan for the PUD will return for approval by the ARB and MPC after the City Council approves a Preliminary Plan.

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

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

The property at 933 High St. is comprised of 3 parcels with 2 office buildings (~40,000 square feet total) constructed in the early 1970's. A parking lot surrounds the buildings, with access from High St. by 2 drive entrances. The existing buildings are partially vacant and in disrepair. A proposal to construct a 57,000 square foot three story office building was approved by the MPC in 2009, but the applicant never went forward to City Council for approval because he could not find users for the proposed office space.

InSite Real Estate, LLC would like to purchase the property, combine the 3 parcels into 1, demolish the buildings and construct a new building and site to house Fresh Thyme Farmer's Market grocery store. Fresh Thyme is a new company and this store would be one of its first in Central Ohio.

The existing zoning is C-3, Institutions and Offices, so the applicant has applied to zone the property as a Planned Use District (PUD). Architectural Review Board approval is required for changes to this property.

**Project Details:**

Development Standards from the PUD code are *italicized* and information specific to this plan are in standard text:

1. Allowable Uses:

*The mix of uses allowed in a PUD shall meet changing economic and demographic demands; permit implementation of development standards, plans, studies and guidelines adopted by the City Council; and/or provide the opportunity to retain and enhance the character of the City, and the health, safety and general welfare of the inhabitants.*

The allowable uses would be Grocery and Office Uses (as defined in Section 1123.542 of the Codified Ordinances). Hours of operation would be between 7:00 am and 10:00 pm.

2. Design Regulations:

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

The site has been designed with the building at the southeast corner of the property. One drive entrance on the north side is proposed to allow the maximum amount of stacking for cars heading northbound and turning left into the site. Parking is proposed to the rear of the building. Adequate screening for the residential property owners to the north will be necessary. At the April 24<sup>th</sup> hearing, a residential property owner to the north voiced concern about the amount of traffic and the lack of screening along the north side of the drive. Three 4” caliper Sweet Gum trees and 30 Sea Green Junipers are now proposed along the north property line. Also, the fencing and landscaping north of that area are on the neighboring property.

Typically, the building entrance from the Right-of-Way would be preferred. Due to the City’s desire for the parking to be to the rear of the building and the store’s need to have a location in the store for food storage and preparation, Fresh Thyme is proposing only one entrance located in the rear adjacent to the parking lot.

When staff first began to meet with the developer, a High St. entrance was a major topic of conversation. The Comprehensive Plan and Design Guidelines were carefully considered regarding this matter, as were community needs and interest. The applicant went back to the drawing board a number of times, but was not able to make the additional entrance work with this site.

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

(1) Site Layout:

- A. The building is proposed 32.1' from the High St. Right-of-Way for the northern part of the property, which is approximately 50' from the road. There is additional Right-of-Way adjacent to the southern part of the property that was obtained for highway purposes at some point in time. For that portion of the High St. frontage the building is proposed at 1.4' from the Right-of-Way.
- B. Walkways and seating areas are proposed along the High St. side of the building, with a connection to the existing sidewalk at the south end. A connection is also needed at the north end. Sidewalks on the north and south sides of the building and a 26' wide drive aisle on the north side of the site would lead to the building entrance and parking lot to the rear. An additional seating area is proposed adjacent to the rear of the building, north of the store entrance. Specifications have been presented for tables, chairs, benches and trash receptacles. Six cart corrals are now proposed in the parking lot. One to two corrals are still being shown by the building, one in the same location as a bike rack. At the southwest corner of the building, a 2765 square foot (sf) enclosed area is planned for deliveries and trash.
- C. The parking lot would have approximately 111 parking spaces, including 5 accessible spaces. All parking is proposed to the rear of the building along the north, west, and south sides of the property. Access around the parking area would be by way of a 23' – 26' wide drive aisle circling the property. Additional parking is proposed in the middle. The turning radii have been designed to allow delivery vehicles comfortable access to the site. Landscape islands are shown throughout the parking lot.
- D. The combination of 3 parcels is requested as part of the approval.

(2) Building:

- A. One building is proposed which would have 28,800 sf devoted to the grocery store and 2765 sf for the enclosed loading and trash area. A variance from Section 1174.03 (f) which limits retail uses to 20,000 square feet in gross floor area would be needed as part of the approval. No accessory structures are proposed.
- B. The building is designed to look like a 2 story building with a flat roof, with the upper façade being a parapet that would screen the mechanicals on the roof. The main material planned for the building is a structural brick, which would be used for all 4 sides of the building. Brick pilasters

are included on the east, north and south elevations, and larger protruding corner elements are proposed. Other materials proposed are: a stone veneer water table; stone accents; metal coping; fiber cement siding and trim for the main entry gable (west elevation); and standing seam metal awnings above the windows. Samples have been provided, but specification sheets are needed for the brick and stone. After further review, the use of the stone veneer water table is contrary to architectural design in Worthington. Option 5 of the elevations shows an option without the stone veneer water table and cast stone decorations at the top of the pilasters.

- C. Proposed windows on the front and sides of the building are aluminum storefront style for the first and second floors. Second floor windows would have traditionally been smaller and simpler than first floor storefront windows. Due to these areas being the back of the store, and the second floor windows being false, shutters are proposed to screen the view through those windows. The rear windows are closer to the traditional fenestration seen in Worthington, with larger windows on the first floor and smaller windows on the second floor. The dark bronze windows should have wide muntins. Specification sheets will be needed.
- D. At the rear (main) entry, the stone in the water table would extend up to a gable which would have vertical fiber cement siding. Wood barn doors are shown on the plans that are fixed to the building, framing automatic sliding doors. On the front of the building, a more substantial feature is shown in the middle.

(3) Landscaping:

The submitted landscape plan shows a mixture of shrubs, ornamental grasses and perennials in planting beds along the north east and west sides of the building. Along the perimeter of the parking lot and in landscape islands 30 trees are proposed. Additional landscaping has been added at the west end of the parking lot and along the north side of the drive. Grass may not be the best option in the narrow areas at the perimeter of the site.

(4) Lighting:

Gooseneck lamps are proposed at locations around the building, with wall packs being proposed on the south side to illuminate the sidewalk. Decorative light fixtures are proposed for the parking lot. The poles should not be higher than 15', and the concrete bases should not be exposed. Light is not permitted to shine on adjacent properties, and the light source should not be visible from off of the site. The photometric plan does not indicate 0 footcandles of light at the property lines, which will be required. The latest photometric shows 0 footcandles at the north property line; as much as 0.2 footcandles at the south property line; 0.1 at the west; and 0.2 at the east. No light should spill onto the neighboring property lines and light sources should not be visible from

neighboring properties. A small amount of spillage (as shown) along High St. may be acceptable. Exact fixture styles can be decided with final review.

(5) Signage:

The applicant is proposing a freestanding sign along High St. and wall-mounted signs on the front and back of the building identifying Fresh Thyme Farmer's Market. Also, smaller product signs are shown above the windows on the rear elevation. The design guidelines recommend minimizing the size and number of signs; free-standing signs should be monument style and as low as possible, and have a base appropriate to the building; traditional sign materials and lighting are preferred (wood or composite to look like wood; individually mounted lettering is preferred; no cabinet box signs or exposed raceways; external or halo illumination) and bright colors are generally discouraged. Sign size limitations and design standards should be set with the PUD Preliminary Plan approval, but final design could be approved with the Final Plan and ARB approvals.

The freestanding sign is now shown as 24 sf/side with a 2' high x 8' wide base, located 8' from the right-of-way line.

In the most recent proposed Development Text, the applicant is suggesting the wall signs be limited in area to 80 sf each, and the secondary signage on the west elevation be limited to 45 sf of total area. Code allows 100 sf of signage per business, with 1 freestanding sign and 1 wall sign. Using that parameter, with 48 sf in the freestanding sign a 52 sf wall sign would be allowed, so that may be a reasonable maximum for the High St. wall sign. An additional wall sign in the rear also seems like a reasonable request with the same or slightly smaller size limitation, and not illuminated. If additional individual signs are allowed in the rear, they should also not be illuminated.

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

Properties north, west and south of the development would be screened with a new 8'-9' wood board on board fencing. The loading dock and dumpster would be inside the building. New fencing is proposed along the north property line at the rear, and the west and south property lines. A variety of plantings are proposed near the west property line.

- (d) Tract Coverage. *The ground area occupied by all Buildings shall be balanced with green space to soften the appearance of the development.*

Tract coverage as shown is similar to the existing development. The addition of landscaping around the building and parking lot should help soften the appearance of the development. Additional street trees may be desired, especially if the

existing trees at the front of the site get removed for installation of the new storm sewer. The trees should be saved if possible.

3. Traffic and Parking:

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

Safety to and from the site should be improved by reducing the number of curb cuts to one, and locating it on the north side of the property. No need for improvements in the Right-of-Way has been identified. Delivery Truck and service vehicles would only access the site between 7:00 am and 7:00 pm.

Room exists in the drive approach for 1 car to enter, 1 car to wait to exit left, and 1 car to exit right. Along the drive, there is stacking room for a dozen cars waiting to exit the site. Stacking room exists for at least 6 cars to turn left into the site.

With High St. being 5 lanes, ample room is available for emergency vehicles to travel along the road. Emergency vehicles should also be able to navigate through the parking lot.

(b) Parking:

- (1) Design. *Parking and service areas shall be designed and located to protect the character of the area.*

The parking lot is being screened with fencing and landscaping, which should protect the adjacent properties.

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

Per the existing Code, 200 spaces would be required. The shown 111 parking spaces should be adequate to serve the use.

- (3) Bicycle Parking. *Bicycle parking should be adequate to serve the proposed uses.*

Bicycle racks are proposed along High St. and near the store entrance. Exact style, number of racks and locations will need to be identified.

- (4) Cart corrals: Six cart corrals are shown in the parking lot, and 1 or 2 are along the building, south of the entrance. The exact style needs to be identified.

4. General Requirements:

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

No environmental issues have been identified. Storm water runoff from the site should be improved with detention of the water from the site.

Natural Features.

*The Municipal Planning Commission shall not recommend a PUD unless it finds that such development preserves, restores, maintains and/or enhances: (1) Natural Features and (2) the character of the surrounding neighborhood and community. The Municipal Planning Commission shall not recommend a PUD if it finds that the Natural Features on such property have been or will be removed, damaged, altered or destroyed in anticipation of development until agreement is reached between the applicant and the Municipal Planning Commission on permanent restoration of Natural Features. All healthy trees 6" caliper or larger shall be retained, or replaced with total tree trunk equal in diameter to the removed tree, and this shall be documented as part of an approved Natural Features preservation plan and/or landscape plan. In the event the Municipal Planning Commission determines that full replacement would result in the unreasonable crowding of trees upon the Lot, or that such replacement is not feasible given site conditions, a fee of four hundred fifty dollars (\$450.00) per caliper inch of trees lost and not replaced on such property shall be paid in cash to the City for deposit in the Special Parks Fund. Such deposits shall be used for reforestation on public property.*

Trees and the slope at the west end into the creek are the Natural Features of the site. The applicant is proposing saving as many trees as possible; removing invasive plant species and dead or dying trees; and adding turf mat and rip-rap as necessary to prevent erosion on the slope. Tree replacement must be evaluated. The most recent count shows 156" being removed and 123" being placed. The area at the front of the site where the storm sewer is proposed is not included in these numbers, and should be saved if possible. Also, there is a 20" tree in the drive entrance that will need removed.

Public Area Payments.

*The City Council shall determine whether a portion of such PUD should be dedicated on the plan to a public agency for park, playground or recreational uses. Such dedication may be required only if the City Council determines that there is a need for such property and that the dedication is related both in nature and extent to the impact that the proposed development will have on the parks and recreation system.*

There is no land to dedicate.

*Whenever commercial or industrial space is created as part of a PUD, then the developer or owner, as the case may be, shall make a cash payment to the City in the amount of one hundred dollars (\$100.00) per 1000 gross square feet of new or expanded commercial or industrial space for deposit in the Special Parks Fund. Such deposits shall be used for costs associated with the City's parks, playground and recreation areas. This section shall not apply to any PUD for which a dedication of land to the City was required pursuant to subsection (A) hereof.*

*The public area payment required by this section shall be made prior to the issuance of the building permit for the project.*

The required public area payment would be \$3000.

*Public Space Amenities. A minimum of one Public Space Amenity as approved by the Municipal Planning Commission shall be required for every five-thousand (5000) square feet of gross floor area of multiple family dwelling, commercial or industrial space that is new in the PUD. Public Space Amenities are elements that directly affect the quality and character of the public domain.*

Amenities are indicated as follows:

- An accessible plaza designed for public use
- Seat walls
- Decorative planters
- Bicycle racks
- Decorative waste receptacles
- Decorative pedestrian lighting is listed as an amenity but not shown.

5. Per Chapter 1174 of the Codified Ordinances, the Preliminary Plan submittal shall include the following:

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

A legal description has been submitted. The description and a Final Plat will need approval from the Franklin County Engineer's Office.

(b) *Names and addresses of owners, developers and the registered land surveyor, engineer or architect who made the plan*

The developer and future property owner is InSite Real Estate, LLC, 1400 16<sup>th</sup> St., suite 300, Oak Brook, IL 60523. The surveyor/engineer is Woolpert, One Easton Oval, Suite 310, Columbus, OH 43219. The architect is NORR, 719 Griswold St., Suite 100, Detroit, MI 48226.

(c) *Date, north arrow and total acreage of the site*

The submittal date was April 11, 2014; north arrows are shown on all pages necessary; and total site area is approximately 2.65 acres.

(d) *A topographical survey of all land included in the application and such other land adjoining the subject property as may be reasonably required by the City. The topographical survey shall show two foot contours or contours at an interval as may be required by the Municipal Planning Commission to delineate the character of the land included in the application and such adjoining land as may be affected by the application. Elevations shall be based on North American Vertical Datum of 1988 (NAVD88)*

See page C100.

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

See page C100 for the subject property and High St. Right-of-Way.

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

See page C100.

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

Trees and the slope at the west end into the creek are the Natural Features of the site. The applicant is proposing saving as many trees as possible; removing invasive plant species and dead or dying trees; and adding turf mat and rip-rap as necessary to prevent erosion on the slope.

(h) *A tree preservation plan showing all existing trees 6" caliper or larger*

Plan number C101 shows retention of the trees at the perimeter of the property. The trees internal to the site would be removed and re-planted with the development as shown on the landscape plan, C600. The tree preservation plan is C102.

(i) *A preliminary grading plan*

See sheet C300.

(j) *Preliminary design and location of Structures, Accessory Structures, streets, drives, traffic patterns, Sidewalks or Recreation Paths, parking, entry features, site lighting,*

*landscaping, screening, Public Space Amenities and other features as required by the City*

The preliminary finished floor elevation is 860.50, which is close to the existing grade. See design details above.

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

(1) Plan C300 shows:

- A. Connecting the new building to the existing 12” sanitary sewer along the south property line with a 6” lateral;
- B. Connecting the new building to the existing 6” water main on the west side of the High St. Right-of-Way with a 2” domestic water service;
- C. Using part of the existing 42” storm sewer as a detention basin;
- D. Installing a new 54” storm sewer along High St. and west at the north end to carry the existing flow running through the site;
- E. Installing 12” storm sewer at the north and south property lines;
- F. Installing pervious pavers and an underground storm water detention basin to collect the storm water from the site.

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

This provision is not applicable.

(m) *Proposed Easements*

An easement would be necessary for the bypass storm sewer along High St. and across the site, and is shown on the Final Plat. There is already an easement along the south property line for the existing sanitary sewer.

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

The entire site would be devoted to Fresh Thyme Farmer’s Market.

(o) *Proposed construction schedule*

A preliminary construction schedule has been submitted showing completion by the end of April, 2015.

(p) *Development Standards Text*

The Development Standards Text has been submitted, but will need additions and revisions.

- (q) The Municipal Planning Commission and the City Council may require any additional information.

**Land Use Plans:**

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

There are recommendations in the Worthington Design Guidelines to extend the pedestrian scale and walkability of the city's commercial heart. The Guidelines call for extension of the pleasant scale of Old Worthington into new areas; use of simple geometric forms and uncomplicated massing; parking areas located toward the rear; use of traditional materials, avoiding any use of glass with reflective coatings; and traditional design. Use traditional sizes, proportions and spacing for first and upper floor windows. 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 such as solar energy panels, bike racks, and rain barrels.

Worthington Comprehensive Plan Update & 2005 Strategic Plan

The plan calls this area the "Old Worthington Transition Area", and recommends the creation of an additional pedestrian-oriented neighborhood retail node, and targeting desired retailers. Shortly after completion of the plan, Jubilee Foods closed in 2006. Worthington residents have been asking for a small specialty grocery store in or near Downtown Worthington since that time.

**Recommendation:**

Staff is recommending the PUD application for Preliminary Plan be recommended to City Council for approval.

Mr. Coulter moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BYINSITE REAL ESTATE LLC FOR APPROVAL TO COMBINE THE PROPERTIES AT 933 HIGH ST. AND ZONE THE RESULTANT PROPERTY AS A PUD , AS PER CASE NO. PUD 02-14, DRAWINGS NO. PUD 02-14, DATED MAY 14, 2014, INCLUDING THE DISCUSSIONS THIS EVENING THAT HAS BEEN RECORDED BY MRS. BITAR BE RECOMMENDED TO CITY COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.**

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

## **2. Subdivision**

- a. Preliminary Plat – **1105 Beechview Dr. S.** (Jason Greene) SUB 04-14

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

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

The applicant has requested Preliminary Plat approval for the division of a property located at 1105 Beechview Dr. S. from 1 parcel into 2. The property is approximately 1.34-acres in size; the property owner would like to create a new 0.35-acre lot, leaving 1-acre with the existing single-family home. The property owner is requesting a variance to create a new lot that does not have the required minimum lot width of 80 feet at the building setback line.

The area was originally developed in Perry Township, Franklin County in 1952 as Beechview with lots ranging in size from approximately .50-acre to 2.9-acres in size with approximately 100 feet of road frontage. The existing home was constructed in 1956. The area was gradually annexed over the years to the City of Worthington and the City of Columbus by the property owners. The property in question was annexed from Sharon Township to the City of Worthington in 1990. The parcel is zoned R-10, Low Density Residence.

#### **Zoning Requirements:**

	R-10 Zoning	Lot #1	Lot #2
Lot Width	80'	Missing Info	69'
Lot Area	10,400 sq. ft.	43,560 sq. ft.	15,246 sq. ft.
Front Setback	30'	Missing Info	30'
Rear Setback	30'	Missing Info	30'
Rear Setback for Detached Accessory Structures	5' (<120 sf) 10' (e 120 sf)	Missing Info	N/A

Minimum Side Yard	8'	Missing Info	24' + (east side) Missing Info (west side)
Sum of Side Yards	20'	Missing Info	20' +

**Variations Requested:**

1. Both lots would likely require a variance for lot width.

**Additional Information:**

1. Approval of the Subdivision would allow a new lot to be created with a minimum of 69 feet of width of frontage where 80 feet is required.
2. The proposed lot would meet the minimum lot size for the R-10, however the lot would be the smallest lot in the neighborhood. The surrounding lot sizes range from approximately .50-acres to 2.9-acres in size.
3. There is a variety of deciduous and evergreen trees on the property. No change to the trees is proposed with this request
4. Access to the proposed lot will be from Beechview Drive. Beechview Drive is in the City of Columbus, all right-of-way permits would need to be approved by the City of Columbus.
5. Section 1101.06 (e) & Section 1173.08(a) - Public Area Payment – Requires \$500.00 per each new lot created and \$250.00 per new residential unit built. This is required per new or additional residential unit being built, and shall be deposited in the Special Parks Fund prior to the issuance of the building permit for the project.
6. Section 1103.10 requires sidewalks to be provided as part of the Subdivision process
7. A Subdivider’s Agreement will be required as part of the Subdivision process.
8. The effect of public facilities and sewerage and drainage facilities would be minimal.

**Land Use Plans:**

Worthington Comprehensive Plan

The 2005 Worthington Comprehensive Plan recommends residential development for the area.

**Preliminary Plat Missing Items:**

- Existing contours
- Existing utilities
- Easements
- Natural Features
  - Trees and significant landscaping
- Setback information
- Sidewalks

**Recommendations:**

Staff is recommending *tabling* or *disapproval* of the application. There are numerous missing items that are required for Preliminary Plat approval. The split would result in creation of two substandard lots.

Mr. Coulter moved to table this application. Mrs. Holcombe seconded the motion. All members voted, "Aye". The motion was tabled.

#### **D. Other**

Mrs. Bitar wanted to remind everyone that there is another meeting next Thursday, May 29, 2014, at 7:00 p.m. for an update on the United Methodist Children's Home (UMCH), in the same location as the meeting tonight. Extra seating will be available upstairs on the second floor of City Hall, 6550 N. High Street, Worthington, Ohio.

#### **E. Adjournment**

Mrs. Holcombe moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:41 p.m., and Mr. Coulter seconded the motion. All members voted, "Aye".