



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

June 26, 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; James Sauer, Vice Chair; 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. Commission members Kathy Holcombe, Secretary; 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 June 12, 2014 meeting.

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

4. Affirmation/swearing in of Witnesses

B. Architectural Review Board

1. Unfinished

- a. Site and Building Renovations – **966 Proprietors Rd.** (ERJV Properties LLC) **AR 27-14**

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Bob Jones approached the microphone and stated his address is 966 Proprietors Rd., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Jones said he could remove the request for the forty five foot extension for the curb cut and eliminate the need to re-do the access road. Mrs. Bitar asked Mr. Jones if he would be paving the access road to the back, from the drive approach to the side of the building. Mr. Jones said no, because he would need to expand the curb cut in order to do that

project, to facilitate easier turns. Mr. Jones said one item that Mrs. Bitar did not mention that was on the plan was the intent to install a new fence.

Mrs. Bitar said there is a fence there now that blocks some of the equipment from the Railway Museum. The applicant plans to replace the old fence with a new fence that will be as close to the property line as possible.

Mr. Jones said he was not sure if he needed a variance for the type of fence that he will be installing; the style will be a shadow box board on board, rather than a chain link fence. Mrs. Bitar explained that a variance will not be necessary for the style of the fence. Mrs. Bitar asked Mr. Jones if the fence would be six feet tall, and Mr. Jones said no, the fence will be eight feet tall. Mr. Jones said the building will have a new overhang, new roof treatment, new shingles and brick on the pilasters. Mr. Sauer asked to see the colored rendering. Mr. Jones explained that the rendering is what the building will look like when finished.

Mr. Hunter said he noticed a few things when he took a look at the building earlier in the day and he has several questions. Mr. Hunter said there are some old tank supports in the rear of the building that were left behind when Worthington Foods Laboratory occupied the building and he asked Mr. Jones if he would be removing those. Mr. Jones said if he was going to do the entire project, which included upgrading the vacant lot, then he would have removed the old equipment. Mr. Jones said when he is ready to update the vacant lot, he will bring in the necessary equipment that is needed to remove the tank supports.

Mr. Hunter said he noticed the screening for the dumpster only screens the dumpster from the building and not from the public. Mr. Jones said he can fix that, and will screen the dumpster from the public. Mr. Hunter said he does not have a problem with the fence moving, but the guy wires for the museum's overhead gantry for their trolley poles are right at that fence. Mr. Jones said he understood and has already had a conversation with the caretakers of the museum about that situation. Mr. Jones said he may sell the museum a portion of the property, but they are still in discussions. Mr. Jones said he can work on the fence project last because there are some questions about how to correctly move the fence back to the property line, and what they should do about the poles. Mr. Jones said a couple of the poles are on his property and a couple of poles are on the railroad's property, but all of the museum's guy wires on his property.

Mr. Sauer said he is very pleased to see the improvements Mr. Jones is proposing for the building. Mr. Sauer referenced Mrs. Bitar's concern for the tree located near the driveway. Mr. Sauer asked Mrs. Bitar if there was a possibility to have two drives with the tree on the island in the middle. Mr. Jones said he was not sure if there would be enough room because there is also a fire hydrant located in the same area. Mr. Sauer said that the fire hydrant is just about at the property line and there should be enough room. Mr. Jones said the reason he was requesting a forty five foot curb cut is because that is the maximum allowable amount for a curb cut, and he just wanted to extend the already existing curb cut to that size. Mr. Jones said Mr. Sauer's idea makes more sense to have two drives. Mr. Jones said he may need a variance for the third cut. Mrs. Bitar said that a variance would be needed, but Mr. Jones could request one at the same time he requests a variance for the building's roof. Mr. Jones asked Mrs. Bitar what the required

width of an access drive is. Mr. Sauer asked if fourteen feet would be allowable. Mrs. Bitar said that she believes that would be a reasonable width and a supportable variance if there is one needed. Mr. Jones asked if he could amend the drawings and present them to the Board of Zoning Appeals next week and Mrs. Bitar said yes.

Mr. Sauer asked if Mr. Jones would enclose the entire area around the dumpster by putting doors on the front, and Mr. Jones agreed. Board members had no other questions. Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone in the audience that would like to speak either for or against this application and one speaker came forward.

Mr. Gary Anagnostis approached the microphone and stated his address is 990 Proprietors Rd., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Anagnostis said the changes Mr. Jones is making to the building will be great. He said the only concern he has is the fence line. Mr. Anagnostis said in 1987 there was a lease agreement between the owners of 966 Proprietors and the Railway Museum for one dollar per year. He said one of the Board members mentioned the lease to him. Mr. Anagnostis said the museum has two large containers to store equipment they had planned to move, or lease or buy land from the neighboring property, but believes the price is too high and the purchase will not occur. He said the other concern is security. If the fence is taken down before the other fence is installed, he is concerned about their equipment and the safety of others that may be walking around the museum. Mr. Anagnostis wants to make sure something is up in place, either moving the existing fence that is up against the poles while they build the other fence or possibly building the fence inside and tearing the other fence down. Mr. Hunter explained Mr. Anagnostis will have to work out that issue between the two property owners. There were no other speakers.

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This application was tabled without discussion at the last hearing. This packet includes drawings that were amended since the last submittal.

This building was originally the retail store for Worthington Foods, and was considered part of the same parcel that extended to E. Granville Rd. In 2005, the Worthington Foods property was purchased by a developer who split the property into two parcels: the northern piece that houses 966 Proprietors Rd.; and the southern piece which is the Worthington Station office condominiums. Both parcels were kept in the Architectural Review District.

The current property owner would like to improve the building and site.

Project Details:

1. For the site, the proposal involves:
 - Removing the existing chain link fence and Ohio Railway Museum stored material, and constructing a new 8' high shadow box fence nearer to the property line
 - Relocating a utility pole from the front of the site to the north side

- Adding dark bronze 4” square, 10’ high light poles with rectangular fixtures
- Replacing the concrete ramp to the loading dock on the front of the building
- The south side of the building has a man door; an overhead door; a dumpster partially screened by a wood fence; and an existing gravel lot
- Removing the freestanding sign
- Moving shrubs from the front to the north side to screen mechanicals on the east side of the building; installing additional landscaping near entrance

2. Plans for the building include:

- Removing existing shingles, gutters, and downspouts
- Adding an 3’ – 4’ overhang for the roof on all sides, with a 6’ wide overhang at the entrance
 - A variance would be required for extending into the front setback with the new roof overhang above the entrance. Application has been made to the Board of Zoning Appeals.
- Adding Dutch gable vents and new shingles for the entire roof
- Adding brick accents to the pilasters and a brick water table on the north, south, and west sides of the building
- Adding decorative brackets and window boxes
- Repainting existing EIFS and trim

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Commercial sites should be developed in a way that is complementary to the architecture and land uses around them. Exterior detail and relationships are to be reviewed.

Recommendation:

The new design elements proposed for the building are complimentary to the newer buildings to the south and add character. Proposed lighting changes, particularly the relocation of the pole at the front of the lot, are appropriate.

Mr. Coulter moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY ERJV PROPERTIES LLC FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO MAKE CHANGES TO THE BUILDING AND SITE AT 966 PROPRIETORS RD., AS PER CASE NO. AR 27-14, DRAWINGS NO. AR 27-14, DATED JUNE 17, 2014, AND THAT:

- **THE EXISTING CURB CUT WILL STAY AS IS AND AN ADDITIONAL CURB CUT 14’ WIDE CAN BE ADDED WITH PROPER VARIANCES AS REQUIRED;**
- **THE DUMPSTER WILL BE SCREENED ON ALL SIDES;**
- **THE EXISTING TREE BE RELOCATED AS NEEDED TO ACCOMMODATE THE NEW DRIVE AT THE OWNERS EXPENSE, AND**

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

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

2. New

a. Fencing – 688 Hartford St. (Rebecca & Marcus Hitt) AR 21-14

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mrs. Rebecca Hitt approached the microphone and stated her address is 688 Hartford St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Hunter asked Mrs. Hitt if she had any comments or questions. Mrs. Hitt said she has a dog and that is the reason she is installing the fence between her house and the garage, to keep the dog from running into the street. Board members had no questions. 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 is a Cape Cod and was built in 1938. This property is 43’ wide and extends roughly 252’ to the east. There are 2 parcels, each of which is 126’ deep. The rear parcel is currently fenced in on the south and east sides, and shares open space with the property to the north, which is fenced in on the north and east sides. The homeowners would like to install the fencing necessary to enclose the rear yards, keeping the area with the neighbors to the north open.

Project Details:

1. Four foot high dog-eared cedar picket fencing is proposed. The pickets would be 1” x 4” with spacing between pickets equal to the picket width, and stained after installation.
2. A 10’ section of fencing would be between the house and garage, and include a gate. The other proposed fencing would replace a section of chain link fencing along the north property line. The chain link extends from the back of the house to the east end of the front parcel.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Fencing should be open in style; constructed with traditional materials; 3’ to 4’ in height; in the back yard; and of simple design, appropriate for the house style. Design and materials should be compatible with the existing structure.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending *approval* of this application. The proposed fencing meets the Design Guidelines recommendations.

Mr. Sauer moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY REBECCA & MARCUS HITT FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL FENCING AT 688 HARTFORD ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 21-14, DRAWINGS NO. AR 21-14, DATED MAY 20, 2014, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

Mrs. Rodgers seconded the motion. Mr. Hunter, aye; Mr. Sauer, aye; Mr. Coulter, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye and Mrs. Rodgers, aye. The motion was approved.

b. Skylights – **709 Wesley Ct. (Carol Rice) AR 31-14**

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. The applicant came forward. Board members had no questions. Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

The Village Green Condominiums were constructed in 1980, and are comprised of 7 units. The subject of this application is the easternmost unit in the building to west, bordering the south property line.

Project Details:

1. Two skylights are proposed for placement on the south side of the roof, 21” from the peak and 44.5” from the eastern edge.
2. The Velux skylights would be 21” x 45 ¾” plus flashing, with the color being Neutral Gray. The roof is a brownish/taupe shade, per the applicant, which should allow the skylights to blend in with the shingles.
3. This condominium is adjacent to a residential backyard to the south, and near the west side of the Pub Out Back so visibility should be limited.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Roofline additions such as skylights and dormers can be appropriate on rear elevations of existing buildings but generally should be avoided on sides and front elevations. Design and materials should be compatible with the existing structure.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending *approval* of this application. The proposed skylights would be on the rear of the structure, not readily visible, and should blend in with the roof.

Mrs. Rodgers moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY CAROL RICE FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL SKYLIGHTS AT 709 WESLEY CT., AS PER CASE NO. AR 31-14, DRAWINGS NO. AR 31-14, DATED JUNE 4, 2014, BE APPROVED 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; Mr. Sauer, aye; Mr. Coulter, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye and Mrs. Rodgers, aye. The motion was approved.

c. Addition & Renovation – **51 W. North St.** (Kevin & Mollie Turner) **AR 32-14**

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Kevin Turner approached the microphone and stated his address is 51 W. North St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Turner said he will be using the same materials the house already has; the addition will match the house. Board members had no questions. Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application, and no one came forward.

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This house was reportedly constructed in 1820 at 777 High St., current location of the Griswold Center, and moved to W. North St. in 1919. The west wing was added in 1919; the kitchen in 1956; and the breezeway and garage in 1990. The current owners have made a number of modifications to upgrade the existing house, including windows and roofing. This proposal is to construct a small addition to the east and north sides of the 1956 addition to enlarge the kitchen.

Project Details:

1. The proposed addition would add 115 square feet to the existing 120 square foot kitchen. The roofline would be extended 6' to the east, leaving one arch of the breezeway still visible on the front elevation. A new wall would wrap to the north of the existing kitchen adding 3' to the north side of the kitchen, but still set back quite a bit from the original house. The existing door is planned to move to the east side, with 2 double-hung windows being added to the north.
2. The proposed siding would match the 6" white wood lap siding on the house. The windows to the north and one to the east would match the 6 over 6 divided light windows in the existing house.

3. The back of this house faces the rear yard of a residence on Oxford St., so there is limited visibility.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

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

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending approval of this application. The proposed addition is appropriate in design and materials to the existing house, meeting the intent of the Design Guidelines.

Mrs. Lloyd moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY KEVIN & MOLLIE TURNER FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO CONSTRUCT AN ADDITION AT 51 W. NORTH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 32-14, DRAWINGS NO. AR 32-14, DATED JUNE 12, 2014, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

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

d. Reroof – **783 Oxford St.** (J.F. Baker’s sons/Heitkamp) **AR 33-14**

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Ms. Holly Heitkamp approached the microphone and stated that she lives at 783 Oxford St., Worthington, Ohio. Board members had no questions. 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:

This Cape Cod style house was constructed in 1952, and has been added onto over the years. The house is white with black shutters. The applicant would like to reroof the house.

Project Details:

1. The front portion of the existing house and the garage are currently covered with light gray 3-tab asphalt shingles. The back of the roof is covered in a black rubber roofing material.

2. Proposed for the front of the house are black dimensional asphalt shingles. The back of the house roof is proposed to stay as is.
3. No change is proposed for the light gray garage roof.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Appropriate shingle colors depend on the building's predominant colors. An outbuilding should be compatible in appearance with the house it accompanies.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending *approval* of this application. The proposed roofing is appropriate for this house. The garage should be considered for reroofing also to match the house.

Mrs. Rodgers moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY J.F. BAKER'S SONS FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO REROOF THE HOUSE AT 783 OXFORD ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 33-14, DRAWINGS NO. AR 33-14, DATED JUNE 10, 2014, BE APPROVED 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; Mr. Sauer, aye; Mr. Coulter, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye and Mrs. Rodgers, aye. The motion was approved.

- e. Change to Approved House Color – **140 W. New England Ave.** (RAS Construction/Cooke)
AR 34-14

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Steven Cooke approached the microphone and stated his address is 140 W. New England Ave., Worthington, Ohio. Board members had no questions. Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This Cape Cod style house was constructed in 1962, and has been modified and renovated over the years. Last year the homeowners gained approval from the ARB for the following: conversion of the rear screened porch into a sunroom; construction of a small mudroom; new windows in the house; removal of aluminum siding and replacement with Hardiplank; extension of a rear dormer; and installation of a patio with built-in barbeque and seat wall. During the approval process, the siding was specified as pale yellow. The homeowners are now requesting a different color.

Project Details:

1. The color the homeowners would like to use is a dark turquoise shade. Two very similar shades have been presented; an option is requested.
2. Existing brick would not change, and the trim and rear sunroom would remain white.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

There is a flexible policy giving building owners freedom in color selection, but there is a recommendation to avoid 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.

Traditionally, bright colors were not used in Worthington. In the years between about 1880 and 1900, when architectural designs became more complex and ornamental, color followed suit. Three colors on a single building became more common, and there was a re-introduction of lighter colors such as pale yellow or light green that had seen less use during the 1870-1880 period. Blues and grays saw some use as trim colors but generally were not used as body colors. After about 1900, architectural design entered a period of reaction to the heavy, ornate compositions of the late 19th century. Architects used simpler, plainer designs and turned to the classical forms and ornamentation of the past. In the Colonial Revival and other styles of this period, colors tended to be lighter and cooler, including creams, yellows, grays, and white. This trend generally continues today. 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.

Recommendation:

Staff is recommending approval of this application. It is difficult to associate this 1960’s Cape Cod with a particular color palette, and the proposed colors could have been used in Worthington. The homeowners should be permitted to decide.

Mr. Sauer moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY RAS CONSTRUCTION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO CHANGE THE HOUSE COLOR TO ONE OF THE COLORS PROVIDED AT 140 W. NEW ENGLAND AVE., AS PER CASE NO. AR 34-14, DRAWINGS NO. AR 34-14, DATED JUNE 13, 2014, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

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

C. Municipal Planning Commission

1. Subdivision

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

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application, and mentioned the concerns from neighboring property owners. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Josh Greene and Ms. Alainna Greene approached the microphone and stated they live at 1105 Beechview Dr. S. Mr. Jason Greene stated his address is 5441 Archway Drive, Columbus, Ohio. Mr. Josh Greene said after the large rainfall we recently had there is clearly a drainage issue.

Mr. Josh Greene said he has hired a plumber to trace the drainage line. Mr. Greene said there is a culvert that runs underneath his driveway that catches the overflow of storm water and then flows into the creek. He said they have also hired a civil engineer to make a commendation for a drainage and grading plan. Mr. Greene said when they purchased the property there was a handful of dead trees on the property and they have already commissioned an arborist to replace some of those trees. Mr. Greene said he understood that yard waste pick up took place on Fridays. He said he spoke with Jaime from the Service Department and she explained that he could cut the tree down any day, so he chose Thursday because waste pick up took place on Friday. Mr. Greene said he is looking for guidance as where to go from here because he has never been through this sort of process. Mr. Greene said they want the lot to build on it for their own use.

Mr. Coulter asked Mrs. Bitar if the property lines could be adjusted so that a variance is not required, and Mrs. Bitar said that adjustment had already been done. Mr. Greene said there is also a green space issue. The neighbors across the street are used to looking at more green space so they have adjusted the location of the house and moved it ninety feet back from the street which is more than any of the other houses in the neighborhood.

Mr. Sauer said he has read many letters in opposition to this project and he understands the neighbors concerns about setting this type of precedent. He said he is not convinced that this is the right thing to do.

Mr. Hunter said there is a major swale through the property and a water flow problem. He said there was an application about eight to ten years ago where someone was trying to split a lot in the far eastern end of this subdivision, and there was the same concern back then. Mr. Hunter said if the property owners decided to move away, the lot split would still remain.

Mr. Coulter said he is not necessarily opposed to the lot split but before he could vote he would need to see an engineered design by a civil engineer that has been vetted by Mr. William Watterson, the City's Engineer, and that he agrees the drainage problem would be taken care of, and not transfer the drainage issue to someone else's property.

Mr. Sauer noted there is a list of items and materials that have not been provided yet, but even with those items, he said he is not certain he could approve this project. Mr. Hunter agreed with Mr. Sauer and said he had the same opinion. Mr. Coulter mentioned there are two other Commission members who are not present at the meeting this evening. Mr. Hunter said the matter could be heard at the next meeting in July, but he wanted to clarify that one of the Commission members that is not present has already expressed his opinion in a public email that he is not in favor of the lot split. Mr. Hunter asked Mr. Greene how he would like to proceed. Mr. Greene said he would like to table the application.

Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application, and several individuals raised their hands.

The first speaker was Ms. Jean Cesario, and she stated her address is 5954 Stuart Lane, Worthington, Ohio. She explained she is representing the neighbors on Beechview Circle, Beechview Drive South, Beechview Drive East, and Beechview Drive North, Stuart Lane and Flora Villa. Ms. Cesario brought in exhibits and distributed them to all Board members. Mr. Hunter explained the exhibits will be part of the record.

Ms. Cesario said she is representing her neighborhoods collective objection to the proposed subdivision of the lot on Beechview. She said many of the residents that were unable to attend the meeting have mailed in their comments. One of the exhibits was a petition with 58 signatures from area residents in opposition to the subdivision. She said those signatures equated to forty three surrounding property owners who do not support the subdivision of 1105 Beechview Drive. Forty four property owners were surveyed. Exhibit number two was a map with red shading showing the property owners who oppose the subdivision. There were three properties that were not communicated with, and one property owner chose not to have an opinion. There were several property owners who showed up at the meeting to show their opposition to the subdivision.

Ms. Cesario stated that she and her neighbors want to protect the aesthetics of their neighborhood, and their property values. She said as a collective group they have a special type of neighborhood in Worthington, different from all of the rest because of their larger lots, green spaces with many trees and they want to keep it that way. Ms. Cesario said the property owners in her area have a paid a premium per square foot because of the green spaces and larger lots and they are asking for the Board's help to protect their investment. She stated that she and her neighbors feel the subdivision of any lot would have a negative impact to their properties, and set a dangerous precedent for other potential applications in the future. Ms. Cesario said that one of the neighbors that could not attend the meeting is a realtor that has lived in the area for twenty years that sold ten homes in their neighborhood because of the green spaces and larger lots, and the country within the city feel. They want to preserve what they have.

Ms. Cesario said there are also other concerns that have already been addressed through emails, and some discussion at the meeting, so she did not want to repeat those discussions, such as drainage, the close proximity of the home to 1099 Beechview Drive South, that area already has two houses to the east of the property so they feel that would be crowding that part of the

neighborhood, and make the area look haphazardly planned, and tree preservation was already addressed. She said when the application was originally made, the applicants had planned a three story house, and now they are showing a ranch style of home, which is fine, but she wanted to make a point that once the lot split is approved, anything could be built on the property and that could be a problem for the neighborhood's aesthetics as well. Ms. Cesario said the property owners in her neighborhood are routinely asked to sell their homes for their larger lots so developers can build more homes on them, so that is why they are in opposition of setting such a precedent. She said that she and her neighbors respectfully request that the Planning Commission reject the application submitted for 1105 Beechview Drive. Please see other letters and emails that are also part of the record.

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This application was tabled at the May 22, 2014 meeting without discussion. Previously proposed were 2 lots that did not meet Code requirements. The current plan shows lots that would meet the dimensional requirements set forth in the Code.

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 area was originally developed in Perry Township, Franklin County in 1952 as Beechview with lots ranging in size from approximately 0.50 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'	81.74'	97.38'
Lot Area	10,400 sq. ft.	35,458 sq. ft. (0.814 acres)	23,479 sq. ft. (0.539 acres) Area includes right-of-way
Front Setback	30'	30'	30'
Rear Setback	30'	30'	30'
Rear Setback for Detached Accessory Structures	5' (d120 sf) 10' (>120 sf)	Exceeds minimum	No existing structure
Minimum Side Yard	8'	Exceeds minimum	No existing structure
Sum of Side Yards	20'	Exceeds minimum	No existing structure

Additional Information:

1. The existing lot has an irregular shape as do the resultant lots.

2. There is a variety of deciduous and evergreen trees on the property. No change to the trees is proposed with this request; however, a more specific tree preservation plan may be needed.
3. More detailed drainage information in the form of a preliminary grading plan is needed to assess the potential impact to the surrounding properties.
4. A house rendering is included but would not be part of the approved application.
5. 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.
6. Section 1101.06 (e) & Section 1173.08(a) - Public Area Payment – Payments of \$500.00 per each new lot created prior to the subdivision being recorded, and \$250.00 per new residential unit before issuance of a Building Permit are required for deposit in the Special Parks Fund.
7. Section 1103.10 requires sidewalks to be provided as part of the Subdivision process
8. A Subdivider's Agreement will be required as part of the Subdivision process.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Comprehensive Plan

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

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Comprehensive Plan

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

Preliminary Plat Missing Items:

- Proposed name of the Subdivision
- Names and addresses of owners, developers
- Boundary lines of the proposed Subdivision indicated by solid heavy lines and the total approximate acreage encompassed therein, not including the public right-of-way
- Existing sewers, water mains, culverts and other underground facilities within the tract and in the vicinity, indicating pipe size, grades and exact locations
- Existing Zoning classifications and dimensional requirements – Zoning district and required side yard setbacks not shown
- Location of Natural Features – trees, other vegetation, water features and topography
- Easements
- Lot numbers
- Parcels of land intended to be dedicated for public use (right-of-way)
- Building setback lines shown graphically with dimensions – Are the dimensions shown the desired setbacks, or are the minimum requirements expected?
- Sidewalks

Recommendations:

Staff is recommending tabling of the application. There are missing items that are required for Preliminary Plat approval.

Mr. Coulter moved to table the application. Mr. Sauer seconded the motion. Mr. Hunter and Mr. Coulter voted, “Aye”, and Mr. Sauer voted, “Nay”. The motion to table failed. Mr. Hunter asked Mr. Josh Greene if he would like to withdraw his application and Mr. Greene said yes.

2. Amendment to Development Plan

- a. Parking Lot and Landscaping Modifications – **835 Proprietors Rd.** (Simsbury Investments, LLC) **ADP 06-14**

Staff is requesting this item be tabled pending the receipt of additional information.

Mr. Sauer moved to table the application, and Mr. Coulter seconded the motion. Mr. Hunter, Mr. Sauer and Mr. Coulter all voted, “Aye” to table the application.

D. Other

Comprehensive Plan Update – United Methodist Children’s Home Site

The proposed changes to the plan were labeled “Draft 5/23/2014”. The pages currently in the plan were included for reference and labeled “City of Worthington Comprehensive Plan & 2005 Strategic Plan for Worthington”. Also included in the packet was a memo from Jeffry Harris regarding Worthington’s commercial real estate market conditions. The Municipal Planning Commission was being asked to make a recommendation on the changes to the City Council.

Mrs. Bitar swore in the people that planned to speak.

Mr. Hunter said this update for UMCH is an open discussion for the public as well as the Commission. Mr. Chris Hermann and Mr. Jeff Harris will both be part of the dialogue.

Mr. Jeff Harris said he prepared a Memo for the meeting this evening, which was already distributed to Board members. Mr. Hunter wanted to explain to the members of the audience who were not at the previous Comprehensive Plan Update that there was a large discussion about the need for an office space component, and there were figures discussed which Mr. Hunter questioned. Mr. Jeff Harris, the City’s Economic Development Manager, will be giving a narrative of his statistical report and graphs.

Mr. Harris said he and staff on a quarterly basis, since 2010, have compiled statistical data from the Columbus Board of Realtor regarding commercial office, retail and industrial space for Worthington. He said the data is tracked primarily to check the City’s performance in relation to the neighbors along the northern I-270 arc to determine how we are doing with our vacancy rates, our average rent rates, and the condition of the properties the City has in the inventory. Mr. Harris stated the City does not own any of the commercial property that is tracked; the property is all privately owned and managed. He said the city interacts with brokers, developers and others to try to locate as many companies that pay good wages to get into those spaces. Any space vacant in Worthington does not generate income tax.

The report Mr. Harris put together for the Board was based on first quarter 2014 data, and he found that across all commercial property types in Worthington, there is industrial, retail and office, there was a total of 592,000 square feet of vacant property, out of an entire inventory in Worthington of over six million square feet of commercial property. There were some comments made at the previous MPC meeting with much higher numbers of vacant space reported. Someone asked why more office space was needed on the UMCH site if there is already so much vacant space within the city. Some of the data that residents were pulling off of the City's website was incorrect. Mr. Harris explained the City uses a third party vendor to update the website that would allow potential users to peruse the site for vacant property. Apparently there are a number of commercial properties within that statistical data that do not belong to Worthington. Mr. Harris said he has reached out to the vendor to fix those mistakes.

Mr. Harris said he looks at three commercial property corridors in Worthington, the first being Huntley Road/Proprietors Road, Wilson Bridge Road and High Street. Mr. Harris said the City has less than ten percent vacant commercial space. He said there are some nuances in the data that make him worry, that he would like to point out. The City has zero Class A office space in Worthington. Nearby cities have anywhere from five to seven percent Class A space such as the City of Hilliard, and the City of New Albany has thirty three percent Class A office space. That means when a company is successful and growing and wants to have a more prestigious and higher profile, higher class amenity office space and they are already located in Worthington, there is nowhere else for them to go. He has seen companies move out of Worthington to nearby cities that have shinier office space around the I-270 arc. Brokers who have clients looking for classy office space will not even bring them to look at Worthington's vacant property because we do not have any Class A office space. Mr. Harris said the second worrisome nuance is that Worthington has the second lowest price point on the market. A low price point might be good for a new business coming to Worthington, but on the flip side there is a lot of cheap space, with no classy amenities.

Mr. Harris said our commercial building inventory is among the oldest within our peer group. Our average build year across all properties is about 1973. The City has a strong position in overall quantity of commercial space, a much better position than nearby suburbs with six million square feet of space; however we are somewhat weaker in the quality of that space because the City has no Class A office space to offer to the market. The Crawford-Hoying development that is currently being built behind the Shops at Worthington Place will be the first Class A office space. There will be twenty three thousand square feet of office space in that location.

Mr. Hunter asked Mr. Harris to define Class A office space. Mr. Harris said that Class A is defined as having the most prestigious facilities with rents that are above average usually in the top thirty to forty percent of office rents charged in an area. The buildings have high standard quality finishes, state of the art mechanical HVAC systems, exceptional accessibility and offer a commanding, prominent presence within an area. He said to think curb appeal. The buildings are intended to meet the current needs of both current and future tenants, whatever those needs may be. Those properties are typically maintained and kept at a condition that is much higher in standard than those of ordinary property with minimum standards.

Mr. Sauer asked Mr. Harris if buildings drop out of Class A space due to age. Mr. Harris said if there is a significant amount of remodeling a building could stay as Class A space. Mr. Sauer asked if the amount you would have to invest in remodeling a building be more than just building a brand new building. Mr. Harris said that is correct. Mr. Harris said the most economical position would be to run the building as the building is with a good solid revenue stream.

Mr. Hunter explained the UMCH property will remain within the Architectural Review District and that is why he asked two representatives that are unable to vote to make comments.

Mr. Hunter asked the Board members for their comments. Mrs. Rodgers said the first concept she was concerned about was the five-story building along High Street. She said in theory that is not a bad idea but when she thinks about the landscape as you are going south on High Street, she would rather see four-story buildings with the fourth story terraced. Mrs. Rodgers felt five stories would be too large. She also noticed that parking decks were encouraged. Mrs. Rodgers said she was impressed when she did the development tour in the Grandview Yard area. The parking decks were visually attractive, and doubled the parking. Mrs. Rodgers made reference to the Worthington Estates edge, she said she knows the property owners who come around the curve would probably also like to see that edge come around the curve. She believes some sort of buffer for the corner properties is necessary. Mrs. Rodgers said throughout the plan differentiated architecture is mentioned, and she does not want this area to look like a new development. She wanted to know why cul-de-sacs are discouraged. Mrs. Rodgers said she agreed with the comment that the amount of park space should increase with density. She believes the plan lacked enough park space. Mrs. Rodgers also wanted to comment on operational building entries must be provided along High Street regardless of the parking orientation. She said there was a huge discussion on that earlier with the new grocery store Fresh Thyme going in, and that type of drive did not work out, but that type of development will be crucial in the future.

Mr. Coulter specified report page number 92 about the comment about the five-story structure and he believes that should be taken down to three stories. He has seen what has happened in the Upper Arlington area, and he said he feels like he is driving inside of a tunnel with the large structures so close to the road. He said he not necessarily opposed to terracing the back and going to a fourth story, he said the east side of the property there could be a five-story building, but not along High Street. Mr. Coulter said he agreed with Mrs. Rodgers comment about cul-de-sacs. He believes cul-de-sacs should be encouraged. He said he grew up on a cul-de-sac, he has built a house on a cul-de-sac, and has witnessed the culture of the families that reside in a cul-de-sac, and he really likes them. He said would not want to discourage cul-de-sacs but if the developer does not want to put them in then that is fine. Mr. Coulter said he would be very careful with the use of retention ponds because they can be very hazardous. He said many municipalities are getting away from them; they are managing their storm water with underground storage pipes. He said there could be a run off to Tucker Ravine and incorporated into that area, but he would not create one. He then referenced page number 93; there is a reference for single family detached homes on small lots with rear alley garages. Mr. Coulter

said the sample area of development they looked at was Harrison West. Mr. Coulter felt that example was not appropriate, and suggested adding a different rendering as a replacement. He said Harrison West does not represent the Architecture they are looking for. Mr. Coulter referenced page 94 and urged that the word substantial be eliminated. He does not want to see the same proposals as along Lane Avenue. Mr. Coulter referenced page 99, in the last paragraph that discusses public private partnerships, he said he whole heartedly approves that concept. He would like to see that paragraph moved further up in the document for earlier recognition. Mr. Coulter said he believes the plan is great. A lot of work has been put into this project by MKSK and Mr. Hermann, and the community. The Board members greatly appreciate the input from the public and groups such as WARD, and OWA, and all the others that have gone on walking tours, bus tours, etc.

Mrs. Lloyd said her comments were going to be a little more general. She said the efforts all around have been really great, from Mr. Hermann and his associates, the City's efforts, and all of the public meetings that have taken place, and all of the tours. Mrs. Lloyd feels the City will be more prepared for what may come forward from a developer. She said she has been thinking a lot about driving down High Street, and pulling all of the buildings to the front of the site, and the comments about building heights. She feels that concept needs to be explored as things come forward. She mentioned the Lane Avenue project, and how that area has taller building structures due to the feasibility for the project. Mrs. Lloyd said that at the end of the day, when this property is developed, the City will have something that is truly integrated into the community.

Mr. Sauer said his biggest concern about the recommendations is to pull the buildings up to High Street. He said he totally disagrees with that concept. Mr. Sauer referenced page 88, and read from the existing plan, "the design character of the High Street Corridor is by nature different from that in the historic core, the area is more suburban in style with broad and green front yards, deeper and wider parcels, and increased setbacks and large off street parking lots". Mr. Sauer said deep lots, with green yards and mature trees make this area pleasant to drive through. He said he feels very strongly about and whole heartedly agrees with that statement. Mr. Sauer said that every time he is out traveling and he returns home and he loops around I- 270, and he gets off at the exit and drives south down High Street, he says to himself, "wow, I'm really fortunate to live in this area". Mr. Sauer said as you drive further south arriving into the historic district, the buildings are up close, but they are on a much different scale, a gradual progression. The UMCH area is not the center of Worthington, and he believes the buildings need to respect the setbacks that you find in this area, which is buildings pushed further back. When buildings are pushed further back, you can accept three and four story buildings. Mr. Sauer asked how much business the people in these buildings are expecting from pedestrians walking up and down High Street. He would suggest very little. Mr. Sauer noted that most of the parking is in the back of the buildings, which he feels is more appropriate, but the plan states that all of the entrances should be on High Street, so people are expected to park in the back and walk into the front entrance, and he did not feel that would work. He questioned the whole concept of pulling everything up close to High Street. Mr. Sauer said he liked what is being proposed for Tucker Creek, but he questioned the need for additional park space and asked, "How greedy as a City do we want to be". He said residents would end up paying for that, he thinks that having the Tucker Creek ravine area would be very pleasant to walk through, and a nice gift to the community. Mr.

Sauer said the developer may find that having green spaces in their developments will be an asset and that concept should be encouraged. The green space would be for the advantage of the housing area that is being developed and should not be a requirement of the City to be turned into public space, parks, and so forth. Mr. Sauer thought the density of the neighborhood core was a little high. He said that any access into Evening Street should be restricted to only residential type traffic. There is also some question as to whether or not the conference center and the Sunrise Senior Center would be part of the development. There needs to be some work on the entrance to the site.

Mr. Hunter said he likes the general tone of the entire document. He said in many ways the plan is better than what was accomplished in 2005 to represent the community. Mr. Hunter said that overall, the City will be guided by what comes forward to the Boards and Commissions from developers who want to invest in the community. He likes the idea of having generalities and words and phrases that the Boards can work with and come up with a plan that meets the needs of the community. Mr. Hunter said several things jumped out at him. First of all he said he is not in favor of cut through streets, or commercial traffic going anywhere near any of the existing residential neighborhoods. He said Evening Street was a problem that existed before the UMCH property was put together in this plan. Mr. Hunter also said this property is not going to cause Evening Street to be a mess; Evening Street is already a mess because of the existing situation. He believes the traffic should be restricted to residential. Mr. Hunter believes in adding a few blocks of residences to the back area of the Children's Home that would access Evening Street directly, and then having the rest of the area go through a serpentine mess to get there. Mr. Hunter said that saying we cannot have access to Evening Street is not something that should be in the document. He said in general all of his other comments have been discussed already. Mr. Hunter said his opinions reflect that of Mr. Coulter and Mr. Sauer as far as commercial development along High Street. Sidewalks should not start with five story buildings; he suggested taking a look at the Anthem property and seeing how that works, and how the green space de-emphasizes the size of the building. The setback with green space minimizes the building's presence. He does like the idea of having entrances he can walk across from one building to another or restaurants, but also having entrances on the backs of building for employees to enter through where the parking lot is. He feels that a public entrance should be on High Street the same way they suggested with the Fresh Thyme store. Mr. Hunter suggested another change, and referenced page 94, he agreed with Mr. Coulter's suggestion. Mr. Hunter said that he was not in favor of alleys either, they are difficult for the City to maintain, and difficult to get garbage trucks through. He also is not in favor of retention ponds because they are a maintenance nightmare, but water control needs to be in the plan.

Mr. Hunter then asked the audience if there was anyone that wished to speak and several people raised their hands.

The first speaker was Mr. Tom Dalcolma who stated his address is 2216 Castle Crest, Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Dalcolma stated he is a Developer and Realtor, and he has leased and sold buildings in Worthington. He said he was at the City council meeting when Mr. Hermann made his proposal and a resident asked why we needed more office space when there is vacant space already. Mr. Dalcolma thanked Mr. Harris for explaining the need for Class A office

space. He said he sees the need from a different perspective because he is more involved with that type of business. Mr. Dalcolma said that Worthington has zero Class A space, and the City has the highest amount of Class B space. He wanted to reiterate the need for Class A space, and creating real estate that is conducive to commercial activity. Mr. Dalcolma said this would be a great office market if we had the product to serve. He said that executives want to live near where they work, and once the interchange is fixed, he feels there will be a big resurgence, and that needs to be communicated to the citizens so they understand the concept. Mr. Dalcolma said many of the lease signs people see up and down High Street are just advertising signs for real estate, and not necessarily for open lease space. Those signs are up year round whether or not there is a spot available or not. Mr. Sauer asked Mr. Dalcolma if the office buildings up on Wilson Bridge are beyond salvage. Mr. Dalcolma said that most of those buildings are owned by institutions that are not local and they are not interested in fixing up the buildings.

Mr. Dalcolma said for example, he had a client about five years ago that wanted to buy one of the Officescape buildings. Those buildings were owned by the General Motors Pension Fund at the time, and managed by a firm out of Boston, the Asset Manager, and they would not sell his client a building. His client wanted to re-skin the building, completely modernize the interior and exterior and turn the building into Class A office space, but the owners were not interested. The building is now owned by a Canadian company that has the same ideas. Once one building begins renovation, that may encourage some of the other buildings to follow along, and they will be able to get higher rents. Mr. Dalcolma left copies of his statistical reports of market research for the Board members.

The next speaker was Mr. Richard Lamprey who stated he lives on Stenton Street in the Worthington Estates area of Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Lamprey thanked Mr. Harris for spending time with him and clarifying information. Mr. Lamprey understood that a third party provided incorrect information on the City's website. Mr. Lamprey asked if the Board members would like comments and changes in the language of the plan from the residents. Mr. Hunter said he regards this document as a conceptual guideline that is not cast in stone. The developers and the people who have the money that want to do something will come before the Board. He said the Board will give the developers guidance. Mr. Hunter said the Board will need to see full plans before they can comment on how density will fit the area. Mr. Lamprey asked if the suggestions at the meetings would be implemented into the plan. Mr. Hermann said he would talk with City staff and possibly make revisions, and present those at the next meeting.

Mr. Sauer asked Mr. Hermann what are some of the housing types that residents would like to have come to the City, and present that information at a future meeting. Mr. Coulter said the developer should identify those needs. The Board can identify the parameters in which the developers need to work and then they can come forward with a product that fits the need, something that will work out financially, but at the end of the day, the Boards and the Commissions will have a say as to whether or not they have a workable product.

Mr. Lamprey said he will suggest to his neighbors that they submit comments and changes that they would like to see, and Mr. Hunter said Mr. Lamprey is welcome, but they will need to balance any changes that will benefit the community as a whole.

The next speaker was Kristen Peterka who stated she lives at 6571 Masefield Street in Worthington, Ohio. Ms. Peterka said she came to the meeting this evening to show her support for the multi-use plan. She feels very strongly about a mixed use development scenario. Ms. Peterka said she previously worked for a City for many years and she found that often times when they were looking at growth they would have a small vocal minority come out and oppose that vision, and oppose that growth and she understands the needs of those people, but there are members of the community who support vision and support growth. She also appreciated the fact the Board is looking at the entire community and not just one neighborhood. She likes the idea of attracting new businesses to our community and feels the City needs this investment for the future. Ms. Peterka said she plans to stay in Worthington for the next thirty years, and the City not only needs to look at sustainability, but the ability to grow and continue to grow. She said thank you for making this such a thoughtful plan.

The next speaker was Mr. Michael Bates who stated he lives at 6560 Evening Street, Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Bates said he lives in the Worthington Estates area, and is representing the WARD group. He wanted to thank the City staff and Mr. Hermann and MKSK for being very generous with their time and going through the public comments, the planning, the bus tour, and all of the things Mr. Coulter mentioned at the beginning of the meeting. Mr. Bates said WARD is trying to stay focused on green space, the density and connectivity issues, and he is heartened to hear the Board is concerned with the very same issues addressed in the Comprehensive Plan. He just wanted to say thank you.

Mr. Hunter said the next step will be the meeting of the ARB/MPC Board on July 24, 2014.

Mr. Coulter moved to table the matter, and Mr. Sauer seconded the motion. All members voted, "Aye".

E. Adjournment

Mr. Coulter moved to adjourn the meeting at 10:30 p.m., and Mr. Sauer seconded the motion. All members voted, "Aye". The meeting was adjourned.