



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

September 11, 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; Thomas Reis; Amy Lloyd and Jo Rodgers. Also present were: Lee Brown, Director of Planning & Building; Lynda Bitar, Planning Coordinator and Clerk of the Municipal Planning Commission; and Melissa Cohan, Paralegal. James Sauer, Vice Chair and Scott Myers, Worthington City Council Representative for the Municipal Planning Commission were absent.

**A. Call to Order – 7:30 p.m.**

1. Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Approval of minutes of the July 24, 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. New**

- a. Dormer Addition – 1 Hartford Ct. (Blair Davis) AR 44-14

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Blair Davis, 1 Hartford Ct., Worthington, Ohio, approached the microphone and gave a brief description of the project. Board members did not have any 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 originally built in 1949, and various additions and alterations have been constructed over the years. This proposal would add a rear dormer, which would allow for construction of a bathroom and closet on the second floor.

### **Project Details:**

1. The proposed 18' wide shed dormer would be constructed on the west side of the gabled roof, toward the north end of the house.
2. The materials for the dormer are proposed to match the existing house.

### **Land Use Plans:**

#### **Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance**

Additions should be subordinate and located as far to the rear as possible. Compatibility of design and materials, exterior detail and relationships, and window treatment are standards of review in the Architectural District ordinance.

### **Recommendation:**

Staff is recommending *approval* of this application. The proposed dormer is properly sized and placed, and of a design complementary to the existing house.

Mrs. Rodgers moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY BLAIR DAVIS FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO CONSTRUCT A DORMER ADDITION AT 1 HARTFORD CT., AS PER CASE NO. AR 44-14, DRAWINGS NO. AR 44-14, DATED AUGUST 14, 2014, 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; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Coulter, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye and Mrs. Rodgers, aye. The motion was approved.

b. New Garage – 123 W. North St. (Tom Zack) AR 46-14 (Amendment to AR 40-14)

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Tom Zack approached the microphone and stated his address is 123 W. North St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Hunter explained that Mr. Zack had already attended the Board of Zoning Appeals meeting and his request for additional square footage was approved. Mr. Zack said he brought the garage in line with the rest of the house in terms of the height. Board members had no other questions.

## **Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

### **Background & Request:**

The main portion of this 1940's vernacular style house is 1 ½ stories with dormers, and there is a single story extending across the rear of the house. At its July 24, 2014 meeting, the ARB approved renovations to the house, and demolition of the freestanding garage. The new garage proposed with that application was not approved due to the size and massing. A smaller version is proposed with this application.

### **Project Details:**

1. The proposed three-car garage is 24' x 38', with a 12 over 8 gabled roof, three overhead doors and an upstairs storage area. Gabled dormers are proposed on the front and a shed dormer is proposed on the rear elevation. Two double-hung windows are shown on each side, with a man door on the west side. Vinyl siding, painted to match the house color, and roof material to match the house are proposed.
2. Due to the size of the garage, a variance for accessory structure area exceeding 850 square feet was approved at the September 4, 2014 BZA meeting.
3. The house extends across two 50' wide lots that must be combined with this proposal.

### **Land Use Plans:**

#### **Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance**

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

New outbuildings should use design cues from older nearby structures, including form, massing, roof shape, roof pitch and height, materials, window and door types and detailing. The Guidelines recommend new outbuildings be compatible in appearance with the house they accompany.

### **Recommendation:**

Staff is recommending *approval* of this application. The proposed garage is complementary to the house.

Mr. Reis moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY THOMAS R. ZACK FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO CONSTRUCT A NEW GARAGE AT 123 W. NORTH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 46-14, DRAWINGS NO. AR 46-14, DATED AUGUST 25, 2014, BE APPROVED 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; Mr. Coulter, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye and Mrs. Rodgers, aye. The motion was approved.

- c. New Window – **850 Hartford St.** (Tim Lai Architect/Lagrotteria) **AR 47-14** (Amendment to AR 28-14)

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Paul Miller approached the microphone and stated his address is 2510 Unit B Summit St., Columbus, Ohio. Board members did not have any questions.

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

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

This house was constructed in 1977 with the rear breezeway and garage original to the home. An application was approved to convert the breezeway into additional kitchen space in June. The homeowners would like to install an additional window as part of that project.

#### **Project Details:**

1. The previous approval allowed for enclosure of the breezeway with wood walls and white vertical cement board siding. Two awning style windows were approved on the north side of the former breezeway area, and two smaller windows were approved in the existing house to let more light into the kitchen.
2. The additional window proposed in this application would be adjacent to the former breezeway area on the north side.
3. The proposed window would match the others in the house.

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

##### **Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance**

Use materials traditionally found in Worthington; window materials such as clad wood can be acceptable if they have the correct profiles.

When reviewing applications in the Architectural District, the Board should give consideration to the size, shape and materials of the windows and the overall harmonious relationship of openings.

#### **Recommendation:**

Staff is recommending *approval* of this application. The proposed window is appropriate.

Mrs. Rodgers moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY TIM LAI ARCHITECT TO AMEND CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS AR 28-14 BY ADDING A WINDOW AT 850 OXFORD ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 47-14, DRAWINGS NO. AR 47-14, DATED AUGUST 27, 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; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Coulter, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye and Mrs. Rodgers, aye. The motion was approved.

d. Signage – **5598 N. High St.** (Collage Salons of Worthington/Nicklaus) **AR 48-14**

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. David Creighton approached the microphone and stated he is renting this space from the Nicklaus family. The Nicklaus family still owns the building. Mr. Creighton said the building was originally built as if there were two different shops, but there never were. He said he is planning to split the space. This sign will be on the north side of the banner, which is completely in Worthington. Mr. Creighton said about three feet of the south end of the store is located within the City of Columbus. Mr. Creighton said he has spoken with two of the Nicklaus daughters and they remember the original sign was a celery green color. He said the daughters also remember the sign had a beaker with bubbles. Mr. Creighton said he obtained the picture from the Nicklaus Museum. He said the building is not the greatest in repair, but the creative contractors that he has spoken with suggested leaving the building as in, and not updating the building like the Verizon store across the street. Mr. Creighton said that the type of sign he has picked out is retro-chick. Mr. Coulter said that normally this type of sign might have difficulty getting approved, but he likes the sign, and believes it is eclectic. Mr. Coulter said he agrees the sign matches the era of the building. Mrs. Rodgers said she likes the style of the sign for the building; however she is not comfortable with approving neon. She said she is comfortable with the sign as the sign was proposed initially, but the Board has typically drawn a line against neon. Mrs. Rodgers said if she approves neon for this sign because the tenant is within twenty feet of the Worthington border, then what will she have to say to the person that asks for neon within forty feet of the Worthington border. She said she does like the retro feel of the sign though. Mr. Hunter said there are two other stores in Worthington with neon. One of the stores is at the far north edge of Worthington, and is part of their retro look of the 1920's. The other store is the Dairy Queen and he said there would be a lot of upset people if that sign was ever removed. Mr. Hunter said that the fact that the sign is mirroring what was already there in a historic sense sets the sign apart from allowing neon anywhere else.

Mr. Creighton asked why neon is discouraged. Mrs. Rodgers explained that neon is the not the feel of old Worthington that they are trying to protect in the town. Mr. Coulter said he feels comfortable with the design because the sign fits in with how the center was originally constructed. Mr. Hunter suggested not adding any more neon to the lower end of the sign. Mrs. Holcombe asked if the store would be divided in half, and Mr. Creighton said yes. Mrs. Holcombe asked what type of signage would be located to the south of the proposed sign. Mr. Creighton said the name of the business next door will be titled, "The Pharmacy". Mr. Creighton said he is still tossing around ideas, but he plans to have a similar 50's era sign. Mrs. Holcombe said she liked the proposed sign. 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 neighborhood shopping center was built in 1953, with the northern part of the building being in the City of Worthington and the remainder in the City of Columbus. This space was most recently occupied by Colonial Music, but was formerly Nicklaus Drugs. A new business called Collage Salons is planning to move into part of the space, and is requesting approval for signage. The proposed signs have been designed to be similar to the original Nicklaus Drugs signage and logo.

### **Project Details:**

1. The wall sign is proposed as individual letters spelling “Collage” mounted on top of the north half of the original stainless steel mounting banner above the storefront, plus a small box with “SALONS” mounted to the banner, in the shape of the Nicklaus Drugs logo.
2. The individual letters would be in the same font as “Nicklaus Drugs” was in the original sign. The letters are proposed on a stainless steel wrapped backer board with exposed celery green neon outlining the letters.
3. If the box sign is internally illuminated, the background would need to be opaque with the light shining through only the letters.
4. Because the freestanding sign is in Columbus, the proposed panel is not subject to ARB approval. The design, however, would match the proposed wall signs.

### **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; 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).

### **Recommendation:**

Staff is recommending approval of this application. The proposed wall-mounted sign would be appropriate for this center.

Mr. Reis moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY COLLAGE SALONS OF WORTHINGTON FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL A NEW WALL SIGN AT 5598 N. HIGH ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 48-14, DRAWINGS NO. AR 48-14, DATED AUGUST 29, 2014, 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; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Coulter, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye and Mrs. Rodgers, nay. The motion was approved.

e. Shed – **570 Evening St.** (Todd Bradham) **AR 49-14**

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mrs. Bitar said the proposed shed will be two hundred square feet. The original memo stated that the shed would be 10' x 12' but those dimensions were incorrect. The shed will be 10' by 20'. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Todd Bradham approached the microphone and stated his address is 570 Evening St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Bradham said he needs extra storage room because his garage is too small. He wants to clean up the clutter in the back yard. Mr. Hunter asked if the vegetation in the photograph was on Mr. Bradham's property, and Mr. Bradham said yes. Board members had no other 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 is a 1940 Colonial Revival style with a one-car attached garage. The homeowner would like to add a shed for additional storage space.

**Project Details:**

1. The proposed shed is 10' x 20', and would be located in the northeast corner of the property – 12' from the rear property line and 10' from the side property line.
2. A shed with a gabled asphalt shingled roof and lap siding is proposed. The colors would be brown to blend with the vegetation.

**Land Use Plans:**

**Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance**

The Guidelines call for outbuildings to be compatible in appearance to the house they accompany. The ARB reviews the compatibility of design and materials.

**Recommendation:**

Staff is recommending *approval* of this application. The proposed shed is complementary to the house and appropriate for the District.

Mrs. Holcombe moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY TODD BRADHAM FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL A SHED AT 570 EVENING ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 49-14, DRAWINGS NO. AR 25-14, DATED AUGUST 29, 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; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Coulter, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; Mrs. Lloyd, aye and Mrs. Rodgers, aye. The motion was approved.

Mr. Hunted stated that Agenda items f,g, and h would be put on hold while the Architectural Review Board is recessed in order to reconvene as the Municipal Planning Commission. Mr. Hunter stated that the Municipal Planning Board is a five member Commission with a three positive vote for approval. The first item that will be heard will be the Subdivision without Plat at 6335 Plesenton Dr., SWOP 01-14.

- f. Demolition and New Gasoline/Convenience Store Station – **2182 W. Dublin-Granville Rd., (UDF) AR 45-14**

See Agenda Items #C,2,b and #C,3,a below.

- g. Multi-Family Dwellings – **39 & 41 W. New England Ave.** (Showe Worthington LLC/Masonic Lodge) **AR 50-14**

See Agenda Item #C,2,c below.

- h. Multi-Family Dwellings – **634 High St. and 41 E. New England Ave.** (Showe Worthington LLC/Masonic Lodge) **AR 50-14.**

See Agenda Item #C,3,b below.

**C. Municipal Planning Commission**

**1. Subdivision Without Plat**

- a. Division into Two lots – **6335 Plesenton Dr.** (Kevin Baxter/Bohm) **SWOP 01-14**

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Kevin Baxter approached the microphone and stated his address is 150 Highmeadows Circle, Powell, Ohio, 43065. Mr. Baxter said he is representing the Bohm Family. 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:**

Page 8 of 36

ARB/MPC Meeting September 11, 2014

Minutes

The applicant has requested approval for the division of the property at 6335 Plesenton Drive from 1 parcel into 2. Plesenton Place was originally platted with 7 lots in 1955 with several additions in 1956, 1959 and 2002 bringing the total number of lots to 34 lots. The area in question was platted in 1959 as Addition No. 2 to Plesenton Place with lots that range in size from 1.2-acres to 2.9-acres in size, with lots exceeding 100 feet of road frontage.

The house at 6335 Plesenton Drive was built in 1976 on the western portion of lot #13. The lot is on the southwest corner of Plesenton Drive and Olentangy River Road.

In order to create a new parcel, both parcels will need to meet the current requirements in the Planning and Zoning Code. The proposal before you today meets the Planning and Zoning Code requirements.

The parcel is zoned R-16, Very Low Density Residential

**Zoning Requirements:**

	<b>R-16 Zoning</b>	<b>Lot #13-A (House)</b>	<b>Lot #13-B (New Lot)</b>
Lot Width	100'	274'±	190' – Plesenton Drive 156' Olentangy River Road
Lot Area	16,000 sq. ft.	40,598 sq. ft.	18,252 sq. ft.
Front Setback	30'	30'	30'
Rear Setback	30'	30'	30'
Rear Setback for Detached Accessory Structures	5' (<120sf) 10' (e 120sf)	Existing 240 sq. ft. shed 44'	5' 10'
Side Setback for Detached Accessory Structures	5' (<120sf) 8' (e 120sf)	Existing 240 sq. ft. shed 12.5'	5' 8'
Minimum East Side Yard	10'	~75'	30' Platted Setback
Minimum West Side Yard	10'	~60'	10'
Sum of Side Yards	25'	~135'	25'

**Additional Information:**

1. Approval of the Subdivision Without Plat would allow for the creation of a new 18,252 sq. ft. corner lot that could have a single family home constructed in the future.
2. There are numerous planting beds, gardens, retaining walls and heavy vegetation on the property. No change to the existing vegetation is proposed at this time with this request.
3. The site does have a change in grade as you go from Olentangy River Road to the west. The proposed new lot is on the relatively flat portion of existing lot #13.
4. Access to the proposed lot will be required from Plesenton Drive. No access to Olentangy River Road will be permitted.

5. The effect of public facilities and sewerage and drainage facilities would be minimal.
  - a. Existing 30” sanitary sewer line in a 20’ easement along the southern property line.

Proposed lot will be required to connect to the sanitary sewer line along the southern property line.

- b. Existing 6” water line along the north side of Plesenton Drive.
- Proposed new lot will be required to connect to the water line.
- c. Stormwater drains to the southeast along Olentangy River Road towards the Clark & Carhart Ditch that runs along the southern property line.

6. 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.

7. Section 1103.10 requires sidewalks to be provided as part of the Subdivision process, the applicant would need a variance from the Board of Zoning Appeals or City Council to waive the sidewalk requirement.

- a. If the applicant chooses to do so, staff would be supportive for the following reasons:
    - i. Topography and existing vegetation on the site.
    - ii. Plesenton Place is a 34 lot development with one access point to Olentangy River Road.
    - iii. There is an existing access at the entrance to the development to the bike path that runs along Olentangy River Road.

**Land Use Plan:**

Worthington Comprehensive Plan

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

**Recommendation:**

Staff is recommending approval of the application. The proposed request exceeds zoning requirements for lot size and road frontage in the R-16 District.

Mr. Reis moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY KEVIN BAXTER FOR APPROVAL OF SUBDIVISION WITHOUT PLAT FOR THE PROPERTY AT 6335 PLESENTON DRIVE INTO TWO LOTS AS PER CASE NO. SWOP 01-14, DRAWINGS NO. SUB 01-14, DATED AUGUST 26, 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; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Coulter, aye and Mr. Reis, aye. The motion was approved.

**2. Conditional Use Permit**

a. Personal Service in C-3 Zoning District – **1000 High St., Suite D (Qing Xu) CU 07-14**

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Ms. Rene Wa approached the microphone and said she is representing the applicant who is still on her way to the meeting. Mr. Hunter asked what the operating hours of the other nearby businesses. Mrs. Bitar said Dr. Pardi may be able to address the question of other businesses operating hours. Dr. James Pardi approached the microphone and stated his address is 1000 High St., Worthington, Ohio. Dr. Pardi stated the bakery is only open for pick up business on Thursday and Friday; Dr. Lordo is not at the office on Fridays and Dr. Hamm is not at the office on Mondays; and the barber shop is not always open either. Dr. Pardi said the only business in the center that is open daily from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. is the insurance company. He said the rest of the center's tenants have staggered hours. Board members had no other 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 multi-tenant building at the southeast corner of High St. and Wilson Dr. currently houses a variety of businesses, including a dentist, hair salon and insurance agent. The applicant is requesting approval to locate a massage business, which is a conditional use in the C-3 Zoning District as a personal service.

**Project Details:**

1. The proposed massage spa would be open 9:30 am – 9:30 pm, 7 days a week.
2. The operation would initially include 2 massage therapists and 1 front desk receptionist, with 8 to 10 customers a day expected.
3. Parking is available in the private parking lot in front of the space.

**Zoning Code:**

Worthington Conditional Use Permit Regulations

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

**Recommendation:**

Staff is recommending approval of the application. The impact of the proposed business in this location should be minimal.

Mr. Coulter moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY QING XU FOR APPROVAL OF A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO OPERATE A PERSONAL SERVICE AT 1000 HIGH ST. AS PER CASE NO. CU 07-14, DRAWINGS NO. CU 07-14, DATED AUGUST 12, 2014, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.**

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

ARB

1. New

f. Demolition and New Gasoline/Convenience Store Station – **2182 W. Dublin-Granville Rd., (UDF) AR 45-14**

MPC

2. Conditional Use Permit

b. Gasoline/Convenience Store Station in C-4 Zoning District – **2182 W. Dublin-Granville Rd. (UDF) CU 08-14**

3. Rezoning

a. C-3, Institutions and Offices to C-4, Highway and Automotive Services – **2182 W. Dublin-Granville Rd. (UDF) REZ 02-14**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Donald Plank approached the microphone and stated he is the attorney representing the applicant (UDF), and his address is 145 E. Rich St., Columbus, Ohio. Mr. Plank introduced the applicant's architect, Mr. John Johnston. Mr. Johnston stated his address is 3955 Montgomery Rd., Cincinnati, Ohio 45212.

Mr. Coulter asked if one would be able to turn left into the site when heading east on St. Rt. 161, and Mr. Johnston said no. Mr. Johnston said his company had a traffic analysis done, and that analysis was reviewed by three jurisdictions: the City of Columbus, the City of Worthington, and the Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT). He said he was able to avoid a fourth jurisdiction because a portion of the property is actually located in Franklin County, and not annexed, but he agreed with the Franklin County Engineer to annex the property when the purchase has been completed.

Mr. Hunter asked if a turning lane would be added in that area. Mr. Plank said a left turn lane would be added southbound on Linworth Rd. Mr. Johnston said he does not believe there are any road improvements planned for Dublin-Granville Rd.; the improvements will be strictly on Linworth Rd. Mrs. Bitar said the right-of-way will be there in the future when other improvements are ready to be made to that intersection.

Mr. Johnston said showed a colored elevation with all brick, showing the different styles of brick, such as herringbone and basket weave, that could be incorporated into the design. One of the other items of discussion is the use of synthetic stucco, or Dryvit, for the gable face on the building and the fascia of the canopy. He said they use those types of products for their durability and weathering capabilities. Mr. Johnston said the product sometimes can get dirtier because of the location of the material, but the product is permanent and long lasting. Mr. Johnston said after he had conversations with the City of Worthington, he went back to his Dryvit representative, and he was told there is a new material that is mixed into the Dryvit which makes the product shed dirt. When Mr. Johnston showed the original board to Mrs. Bitar, the product had a heavier and rougher texture, but typically what they use now is a sandier texture.

Mr. Johnston said in terms of the gables, he feels the gable on the canopy is a very important part. He feels that the gable helps break up the long distance of the canopy. Mr. Coulter stated there are three Architects sitting on the Board and they are very familiar with the products he is discussing. Mr. Coulter said as far as the canopy at the pump islands he can somewhat understand the use of stucco there, but at the gable ends he would rather see material such as Hardi Plank, because that material is more traditional around Worthington. Mr. Coulter mentioned the shopping center across the street as an example because they have used Hardi Plank on the building. Mr. Coulter said the height of the roof on the main body is too high. He said as he looks at the elevation, the height looks completely out of proportion. Mr. Coulter said he does not have a problem with the gable in the middle where the doors are proposed. He agreed the gable helps break up the long façade.

Mr. Reis asked Mr. Johnston the rationalization of the height, and if the area was going to be used for storage. Mr. Johnston explained the building will be fifty-five feet deep, and the height was established as a ratio because of the depth of the building. Mr. Johnston said he thought the roof was a 5/12 pitch, but thought the building could be lowered. He felt a three twelve pitch would be too low. He said UDF has twenty of these types of stores around Ohio right now. Mr. Johnston said as far as the gable, he understands the look with Hardi Plank, but if Hardi Plank is used, there will be dissimilarity between the gable and the canopy. He said the Dryvit material has a cohesive element that will bring the two elements together. Mr. Coulter said if Mr. Johnston had to make a choice, then to use Hardi Plank in both places. Mr. Johnston said if Hardi Plank is used in both places then the building will look like a Super America. He said personally, as an Architect, he did not believe that Hardi Plank would look as nice. Mr. Johnston said he feels the materials chosen are very complementary, and very pleasant to the eyes. He said those are his personal comments, but he is happy to discuss this further with the City of Worthington.

Mrs. Lloyd said the drawings show a 7/12 roof pitch. Mr. Johnston said the roof should be a five to twelve pitch. Mrs. Lloyd said she would like some clarification on that.

Mrs. Lloyd said that she liked Mr. Coulter's suggestion of using Hardi Plank. She said she understood what Mr. Johnston was saying about the canopy but was wondering if there are some vertical elements that could be broken up.

Mr. Hunter asked to go back to the discussion of the Dryvit and the Hardi Plank, and the drawing of the canopy. Mr. Hunter said considering the distance between the two, he was not concerned with having a different material on the canopy versus the building. Mr. Hunter asked Mr. Coulter if was okay with Hardi Plank on the building and Dryvit on the canopy, and he said yes, that is what he suggested originally. Mr. Coulter would prefer Hardi Plank on both, but he was okay with just Hardi Plank on the building.

Mr. Coulter said if the elevations were drawn at 7/12 then he would like to see them drawn at four twelve. Mr. Hunter said he did not hear anyone on the Board saying that UDF should not be there; he believes what is proposed is much better than what is located there now.

Mr. Johnston said he has worked on this project for ten years now, and there is a desire for UDF to stay. Mr. Hunter explained this matter may be tabled this evening, and the next meeting is in two weeks. Mr. Johnston said that would be fine. He said he understood that may be the case when he spoke with Mrs. Bitar earlier. Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Johnston about the shingles. Mr. Johnston said they would be an architectural shingle of weathered wood, which is what they typically use.

Mr. Coulter asked about the lighting levels. He said Mrs. Bitar mentioned the forty to fifty foot candles versus the thirty. Mr. Coulter said he did like the use of LEDs. Mr. Johnston said everything inside and outside of the stores will have LED lighting. He said the light levels at the canopy are higher than maybe what other people have, but this is a high security situation for convenience stores. Lighting is also important for the employees of the store so they can see what is going on at the gas facilities. The light levels that have been proposed are the light levels they like to have. Mr. Johnston said all of the light fixtures are flush mounted, and the light is directed down. There will not be high glare coming from the light of the fixture. Mr. Johnston said he can adjust the fixtures on the perimeter to guarantee there will be a zero lot line. He said the lights with the high illumination, with less than one foot candle, there is a substantial amount of trees on that side of the property where the condominiums are located. Mr. Johnston said he brought a drawing incorporating a picture of a zero lot line fixture with shades to guarantee no light spillage.

Mr. Reis asked if the gable on the back is for mechanicals, and Mr. Johnston said yes. Mr. Johnston said the gable he was looking at is basically a ventilating and insect screen to protect against birds.

Mr. Brown asked for opinions about the style of lighting being proposed by the applicant. He said the style is not typical of what the Board sees. Mr. Coulter asked if the lights were the standard height and Mrs. Bitar said no, city staff explained that light poles should not be taller than fifteen feet. Mr. Johnston said the light poles have a two foot concrete base and a seventeen foot pole. He said he will make that adjustment. Mr. Coulter explained they do not have a problem with the concrete base; the height of the poles will need adjusted. Mr. Johnston said that with the adjustment of the poles, they may need to add a couple more fixtures to illuminate the site. Mr. Hunter reminded Mr. Johnston this site location is next to a residential

development, so it is critical to have zero footcandles at the lot line and maximum fifteen foot high poles.

Mrs. Lloyd stated there will be bollards all across the front of the building so she would like to know what colors the bollards will be. Mr. Johnston said the bollards will not be yellow as depicted in the drawings. The bollards will be a brown tone with a white stripe. Mr. Coulter asked about the fiberglass columns and if those will be used as in the drawing and Mr. Johnston said yes. Mrs. Bitar asked about the columns for the canopy. Mr. Johnston said the canopy columns will be steel wrapped with a brick pilaster. Mrs. Bitar asked about the guards that are at the pumps. Mr. Johnston said that those guards are structural steel and they will be yellow so you can see them as a driver comes up. Mrs. Rodgers asked if the guards could be white, and Mr. Johnston said yes, any light color would be okay.

Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone in the audience that wished to speak either for or against this application. He also mentioned that this item will be tabled and come back to the Board for further discussion in possibly two weeks. Mrs. Bitar mentioned that there were a few people in the audience that would like to speak about this application.

Mr. Brown asked Mr. Hunter if the style of the light poles were okay. Mr. Coulter said he was okay with the style of the lights; the problem was with the height. Mr. Coulter asked if Mr. Brown had a different style of lighting in mind. Mr. Brown said he was thinking about the lighting used at the apartments and trying to tie some things together. Nothing else was mentioned about the lighting. Mr. Hunter turned the microphone over to the audience.

The first speaker was Mr. Kevin Keiser who stated his address is 5500 Olentangy River Rd., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Keiser said he is representing the neighboring property to the north. He said he would like to express his concerns for the rear façade of the building. Mr. Keiser suggested the dumpster be shielded the way Wendy's enclosure is across the street with wood doors. Mr. Keiser said he is disappointed to hear proposed building is all brick with two delivery doors, and maybe a few lights should be added. He felt there should be more detail added to help break up the long façade, like trim and raised panels added to the doors. He said he also was not very excited about having to look at the HVAC unit on the roof. He said his building and the building across the street have the HVAC units on the ground. Mr. Keiser reiterated there is a big expanse without much detail, not very pretty to look at, and maybe those areas could be spruced up.

Mrs. Bitar asked Mr. Johnston if he is still proposing to use the same brick on the rear that is being used on the front, and Mr. Johnston said yes. She explained that she does not have a good feel for what that will look like. Mr. Johnston displayed a picture for everyone to view. Mrs. Bitar explained that Mr. Johnston was showing a soldier course type of treatment along at a water table height, with a different pattern of brick below. Mr. Coulter said there will be some type of architectural detail on the brick. Mr. Hunter said a colored rendering would be very helpful. He said that typically the Board sees a lot more detail at Architectural Review than Mr. Johnston maybe be used to in other jurisdictions.

Mr. Johnston said the molding on the back doors that Mr. Keiser suggested is unnecessary, but at the same time he will be happy to take care of that. Mr. Hunter said the building will be visible to a lot of traffic on Linworth Rd. Mr. Johnston said he will get a better picture of what the brick will look like above and below. Mrs. Holcombe said that she believes the dumpster enclosure should be made of brick like Wendy's restaurant. She said the Board did approve Wendy's dumpster. Mr. Johnston said the enclosure is brick, but he will take a look at Wendy's gates.

Mr. Coulter asked Mrs. Bitar to show the pictures of the roof at the back of the building, the rear elevation. He asked if there would be mechanical equipment behind the gable and Mr. Johnston said yes. Mr. Johnston said there was going to be Dryvit inlay on the triangles, the top was a ventilation louver and the rest of material is screening for air intake. On the right hand side are low compressors and there would be solid screening there.

Mrs. Bitar asked if the equipment would be screened by the metal panel and Mr. Johnston said yes.

Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Johnston what type of material he plans to use for vertical walls that will be chiseled. Mr. Johnston said the vertical wall is basically a shingle that is carried down. All of the items on the roof will be painted to match the shingle, all of the vents and all of the exhaust fans. Mr. Coulter asked what type of lights will be used along the back wall. Mr. Johnston said he will continue the coach type of light. He said there will be illumination in the back, but not bright. Mr. Coulter asked about the material where the outdoor seating will be and if the seating will be cedar. Mr. Johnston said the material for the pergola is a pressure treated stained wood and the seating elements are vinyl clad steel which is an open type web material. There were no other speakers.

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

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

This property is an unusually shaped lot of approximately 1.03-acres in size with frontage on Dublin-Granville Road and Linworth Road. The lot currently surrounds an existing UDF that is located in the City of Columbus at the intersection of West Dublin-Granville Road and Linworth Road. The existing UDF lot is approximately 0.84-acres in size. To allow for the redevelopment of the site the applicant would like to utilize the 1.03-acre parcel in the City of Worthington.

The total lot size after right-of-way dedication and transferring a small portion of the lot to Linworth Baptist Church will result in a total lot size of 0.894-acres. The applicant would like to demolish the vacant bank (1,519 sq. ft.) in the City of Worthington and the existing UDF (3,138 sq. ft.), including pumps and canopy to construct a new 4,480 sq. ft. convenience store, gasoline pumps, ice cream parlor and outdoor patio area for customers as part of the redevelopment of the two parcels.

The applicant is being required to dedicate additional right-of-way along West Dublin-Granville Road and Linworth Road as part of the redevelopment of these two lots. The applicant is being required to dedicate approximately 30 feet of frontage along West Dublin-Granville Road and

approximately 5 feet of frontage along Linworth Road to allow for offsite improvements related to the redevelopment of the site.

The applicant will only be permitted a right-in/right-out on West Dublin Granville Road with a full access point on Linworth Road. The applicant will also be required to install a southbound left turn lane on Linworth Road at the intersection. The applicant will be required to install sidewalks along their frontage on both roadways, this will allow pedestrians to move about the area safely. The applicant has also stated that they have been working with the condominium owners of Strathaven of Worthington located to the east about providing an additional path to those residents to the UDF site. This portion of West Dublin-Granville Road does not have sidewalks along the north side of the roadway.

#### **Architectural Review Details:**

1. Approval is needed to demolish the bank building.
2. The new building is proposed as all brick, with some accent rows. A color rendering will be shown at the meeting. The proposed storefront is anodized aluminum, extending across most of the front of the building. Dryvit is proposed for the gable above the front door and on the face of the canopy. Typically Dryvit is not approved for large elements. Other elements include: wall sconces, fiberglass columns with brick bases; louvered gable vents; wood trim; fiberglass roof shingles; and roof vents.
3. A brick enclosure is proposed for the dumpster.
4. The east side outdoor seating area would have a pergola, and metal tables for seating. Photographs are included in the packet.
5. Material samples will be available at the meeting.
6. The applicant is proposing 2 wall signs, one on the canopy and one on the building, and a freestanding sign. The wall signs would consist of internally illuminated channel letters with white faces. The "UDF" initials on the front of canopy would be the only sign on the Worthington side of the property; however, the other signage is typical of what is approved in the District.
7. Photometrics have been submitted and need further review. In addition to the building lights, pole lights and canopy lights are proposed. Photographs are included in the packet.

#### **Conditional Use Requirements:**

1. Basic Standards & Review Elements:
  - a. Effect on traffic patterns-
    - i. The applicant has submitted a traffic study that has been reviewed and approved by all jurisdictions involved. The UDF and vacant bank currently have 4 curb cuts, the number of curb cuts will be reduced to 2 for the site. Again, the applicant will have a right-in/right-out only on West Dublin Granville Road and a full access point to Linworth Road.
  - b. Effect on public facilities-
    - i. The two sites will operate as one. There should not be a negative impact.
  - c. Effect of sewerage and drainage facilities-

- i. Central water and sewer serves both sites today; this will continue with the redevelopment of the site.
    - ii. Stormwater should improve with the redevelopment of the two lots with improvements in drainage requirements since the sites were developed. The redevelopment will be required to meet the stormwater management manual for the City.
  - d. Safety and health considerations-
    - i. Traffic issues should be improved with the redevelopment of the site, limiting access to West Dublin-Granville Road and by the installation of sidewalks. The layout of the site will also improve the safety of the pedestrians and vehicles on the site.
  - e. Noise, odors and other noxious elements, including hazardous substances and other environmental hazards-
    - i. The applicant will be replace the existing underground storage tanks with new underground storage and tanks and up-to-date gas pumps.
  - f. Hours of use-
    - i. No restrictions have been proposed at this time. Staff believes that this is a 24 hour operation.
  - g. Shielding or screening considerations for neighbors-
    - i. The applicant has stated that they have been in correspondence with the neighboring condominium owners at Strathaven of Worthington to discuss the addition vegetation and fencing along the eastern boundary of the site. The applicant has moved the trash dumpster enclosure from the east side of the building to the west side of the building and adding an outdoor patio area on the east side of the building as a result of meetings with the neighbors.
  - h. Appearance and compatibility with general neighborhood-
    - i. The area is a node of commercial development at the intersection of Linworth Road and West Dublin-Granville Road. There is existing residential development along the north side of West Dublin-Granville Road east of the proposed redevelopment. The applicant states that the proposed design has been used in other residential communities. This will be discussed and reviewed by the Architectural Review Board.
- 2. The Commission has the power to give due regard to the nature and condition of all adjacent uses and structures, and may impose additional requirements and conditions as necessary for the protection of the neighboring properties and the public interest.
  - a. The applicant has been in discussion with the property owners to the east and the business owner directly to the north that they will ultimately share a common access point to both properties as part of this redevelopment.
- 3. Additional requirements for Conditional Uses in any "C" District as it pertains to the site layout and relationship to the street. Both pedestrians and vehicular traffic to and from the site shall not be hazardous. Parking, screening, setback, lighting, loading and service areas and sign locations shall be considered.
  - a. The applicant has provided sidewalks along both roadways in addition to sidewalks connecting the sidewalks to their site. The applicant has also provided

crosswalk locations to direct pedestrians on the site to the sidewalks and the store. As previously mentioned, the applicant has proposed to add a sidewalk to the condominiums to the east at their request.

- b. The applicant will be providing additional vegetation and fencing along the eastern property line in addition to the landscaping that will be added along the frontage screening the parking area from the roadway.
- c. Lighting will be required to be at zero foot candles at the property line.
- d. The delivery area will be on the north side of the building.

**Rezoning:**

- 1. In order to operate a Gasoline/Convenience Store Station on this property, rezoning from C-3, Institutions and Offices to C-4, Highway and Automotive Services is necessary.
- 2. The map below shows the area, which is a mixture of zoning categories. C-4 is across the right-of-way to the south at Wendy's; and there is a BP station across the right-of-way to the west in Columbus.



- 3. Due to the right-of-way donation requirement and the jurisdictional line, a number of variances would be needed: front yard setback for building and fence; rear yard

setback for building; setbacks at the jurisdictional line for the building; side yard setback for parking; number of required parking spaces; and drive aisle width.

### **Land Use Plans:**

#### Worthington Conditional Use Permit Regulations

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

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

Recommends that a neighborhood retail service center be established at the West Dublin-Granville Road and Linworth Road intersection to create a commercial node for the community.

#### Worthington Design Guidelines

The site is located in the Architectural Review District for the City of Worthington. 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.

**Recommendation:**

Staff is recommending *approval* of these applications, except the ARB application may need tabled for lighting level adjustments. This project allows for the redevelopment of a key intersection in the City of Worthington and the City of Columbus.

Mr. Coulter moved to table the application. Mrs. Holcombe seconded the motion to table. All members voted, "Aye". The motion was tabled. Mr. Hunter asked when the deadline was for submitting information for the next meeting and Mrs. Bitar said tomorrow, August 12, 2014. She explained to Mr. Johnston that submitting something on the following Monday would be acceptable.

Mrs. Bitar explained the Conditional Use Permit should also be tabled at this point, but the Board may want to consider the zoning application to go from C-3 to C-4 knowing that the general idea of this is going to go forward and on to City Council. She said rather than going to the Board of Zoning Appeals, to have the variances approved as part of the rezoning.

Mr. Coulter asked why Mrs. Bitar suggested tabling the application for the Conditional Use Permit. Mrs. Bitar said typically Conditional Use Permit applications are approved with details. She said the permit could be approved contingent upon the rezoning being approved which would be fine, and since Architectural Review has to come back, approving both the applications at the same time would be better.

Mr. Coulter moved to table the MPC-Conditional Use Permit application and Mrs. Holcombe seconded the motion. All members voted, "Aye". The application was tabled.

Mr. Hunter said he did not see any reason to table the rezoning. Board members had no other questions or concerns. Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone in the audience that wished to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward. Mrs. Bitar suggested that the variances be approved as part of this motion.

Mr. Coulter moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY UDF FOR TO REZONE THE PROPERTY AT 2182 WEST DUBLIN-GRANVILLE RD. FROM C-3 TO C-4, AS PER CASE NO. REZ 02-14, DRAWINGS NO. REZ 02-14, DATED AUGUST 22, 2014, BE RECOMMEND TO CITY COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.**

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

A five minute recess was taken.

ARB

1. New

g. Multi-Family Dwellings – **39 & 41 W. New England Ave.** (Showe Worthington LLC/Snow House) **AR 51-14**

MPC

2. Conditional Use Permits

c. Residential in C-5 Zoning District – **39 & 41 W. New England Ave.** (Showe Worthington LLC/Snow House) **CU 09-14**

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Chris Peterson approached the microphone and stated his address is 45 N. 4<sup>th</sup> St., Columbus, Ohio. He explained he was going to leave the bulk of the presentation to the team that he brought with him this evening, but he is willing to help answer questions. Mr. Carter Bean approached the microphone and stated his address is 4400 N. High St., Columbus, Ohio 43214. Mr. Bean said what they are presenting are renderings, less of the technical information but more of the character and aesthetics. He said they are trying to make the transition from commercial to residential. Mr. Bean showed renderings on the overhead projector with the proposed townhomes surrounding the Snow House. The Snow House sits up in front, and does encroach on the right of way, and they are wrapping around the Snow House with three town homes and then forming two clusters of two on the east side of the site adjacent to the two story commercial building, tucking the parking behind. There is a large commercial parking lot immediately adjacent.

Mr. Bean showed additional renderings, saying you can begin to see the character and the scale of the structures being proposing. He said they are not at all out of character with modern building and certainly in character and detail with a lot of the other residential structures around the neighborhood. Mr. Bean said typically the brick structures in Worthington are conducive to the more public or commercial structures and the residential structures are very much siding oriented. He said they tried to make that distinction by going with the siding. Mr. Bean said looking southeast towards the Snow House you will see some of the new construction on the right. Mr. Bean said as Mrs. Bitar had already mentioned, he is doing his best to address the street. Most of the vehicular traffic and parking will be behind the buildings. Mr. Bean said the units will have front doors facing the right-of-way, and they will also have rear doors to access the common space that will be created for their residents, with benches, and common grills.

Mr. Reis asked if Mr. Bean is planning any changes to the Snow House and Mr. Bean said currently no, but he mentioned the back of the house where there is a fire escape located. He said the fire escape would be removed and the balcony would remain for the residents use. Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Bean if he will still make fire code requirements if he gets rid of the fire escape and Mr. Bean said yes, because the house will be a single family residence. Mr. Coulter asked why apartments versus condominiums. Mr. Peterson said they are planning these units to be finished as condominiums would, but said at the moment he does not believe there is a

demand for condominiums. These units will be rentals and possibly condominiums sometime in the future.

Mr. Hunter said he disagrees with the market demand not being there for three bedroom condominiums, and he knows several people that might be interested. Mr. Peterson said he would be interested in knowing who those people are that may be interested as he moves forward with the project. Mr. Hunter urged Mr. Peterson to not skimp on the quality.

Mr. Coulter said as you look at the Snow House today you see a wonderful building. He said he is concerned with the scale of the other structures that are proposed to be built. Mr. Coulter feels the Snow House is being dwarfed by the other structures. Mrs. Holcombe agreed. Mr. Hunter believes the pitch of the roof tops make the buildings look so much larger. Mr. Bean said the new buildings do sit back from the Snow House. Mr. Bean said when he gets to the drawings for the Lodge Apartments there is a rendering showing the roof top slope facing the road which may be more appropriate for this location.

Mr. Coulter asked Mrs. Bitar if there are density issues with this site plan, in terms of structure versus open land. He said he understands there will be parking in the back, but it almost seems like this area is getting crowded, like you could put your hand out the window and reach your neighbor. Mr. Bean said this area is an urban setting, and that is the look they are going for, having a tight cluster. Mr. Bean next showed pictures of a development on Gay St. in downtown Columbus which showed that the units had urban courtyards instead of actual green grass. Mr. Coulter said the courtyards are fine. Mrs. Bitar said this type of building meets the City's Code requirements for the C-5 Zoning District, which allows eighty percent lot coverage. The City's maximum lot coverage has always been just buildings. Mrs. Bitar said that particular requirement in the Code did not consider parking surfaces, so not all impervious surfaces were included.

Mr. Peterson said his family has owned the Snow House for over thirty years, and they want to continue to own it. He said they were really focusing on the 2005 Comprehensive Plan to try and create an urban village. Mr. Peterson said he has had some success with the conversion of the Worthington Inn into condominiums, and some of those units are rentals.

Mr. Hunter wanted to mention he did not like the idea of carports. If there is enough mess around the carports, the mess will be easily seen. Mr. Hunter said he does not see any benefit of a carport over a garage. He would be okay if there were not walls inside the garage, but as long as the structure looks like a garage, that would be a benefit. Mrs. Holcombe asked how many guests parking spots there will be. Mr. Peterson said there will be two parking spaces per unit. He said they did not consider additional visitor parking spots.

Mr. Hunter said the Board would probably not be voting on this application this evening. Mr. Peterson said they were prepared to fully hear the comments and do as much work as they could in short order to try to get ready for the next meeting.

Mr. Michael Clevenger approached the microphone and stated his address is 46 W. New England Ave., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Clevenger said what people are looking at is what he will be seeing from his front porch, and he believes the development looks lovely. He does not feel the houses look too big, and he likes the residential character of the buildings. Mr. Clevenger feels this would be a wonderful addition to the neighborhood. Mr. Hunter said the Comprehensive Plan discusses living downtown, and he likes the idea himself. He asked if there was anyone else that wanted to comment on this application. Mrs. Steffanie Haueisen asked if the Masonic Lodge Apartments were part of the same development as the Snow House Apartments and Mr. Hunter said no, these are two separate developments. Mrs. Haueisen said she had comments she wanted to make about both entities. Mr. Peterson said he does not own the Lodge yet, he is under contract to purchase the Lodge. The Lodge will be purchased under a separate legal entity. Mr. Peterson said from an operational standpoint there will probably be one single manager operating both properties. There will be two different addresses, two different mailboxes, two different legal entities, but a singular property manager. Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone that wanted to speak about the Snow House Apartments to come forward and speak now before moving on to the next Agenda item. There were no other speakers.

## **Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

### **Background & Request:**

This site includes two structures, the Snow House and a commercial structure. The Snow was built in 1814 by John Snow, who was an influential leader of the Masonic Lodge and held early lodge meetings at the house. The Federal style house features a symmetrical five-bay façade, and is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. It was used as a residence until approximately 1930; was an annex to the Worthington Inn; and most recently has housed an expansion of Igloo Letter Press. The commercial structure was constructed around 1920, likely as a garage/carriage house/utility shed, and was converted for commercial use. Most recently the Candle Lab and Igloo Letter Press have been located in the building.

The request, called the Snow House Apartments, involves conversion of the entire property into a multi-family dwelling development. No façade changes are proposed for the Snow House; demolition of the commercial structure is proposed. The Snow House would be converted back to a single dwelling unit, and 7 townhouses would be constructed on the remainder of the site.

### **Project Details:**

1. Three townhomes are proposed west and south of the Snow House, with shared parking to the south. Four more townhomes are proposed to the east of the property, with a drive separating them from the Snow House and other units. A carport for 8 vehicles is proposed at the southwest corner of the property. A mixture of landscape and hardscape elements is proposed between and around the units including: ornamental and shade trees; shrubs; perennials; sidewalk and patio surfaces of brick, concrete and stone; seating areas; ornamental fencing and gates; fire features (pits); grills; and benches.
2. The two-story Snow House would retain its all brick façade. The new structures are proposed as two-story structures with 6” Hardieplank lap siding in Duxbury Gray, with Monterey White trim and Arroyo Red accents. Variation in colors between buildings

may be appropriate. Charcoal Gray standing seam metal is proposed for gable trim and the porch roof above the rear entrances to units SH4 & 5. Antique Slate asphalt shingles are proposed for the roofs. Wood columns and trim; single hung 6 over 6 Andersen windows; and Carolina Lanterns coach lamps are also proposed.

3. The size of the dwelling units range from the Snow House at 1225 square feet to 1648 square feet in area.
4. Surface parking for 8 vehicles is proposed adjacent to the units south of the Snow House, and the proposed carport would be south of the parking. The proposed parking would provide 2 vehicle spaces per dwelling unit. The three-sided carport would be finished to match the dwellings, and include lighting in the ceiling to illuminate the area below, and false windows. Additional lighting would be provided in the parking area and near the dumpster by way of poles with decorative fixtures. The height shown on the photometric plan is 15' ¾". The fixture is slightly different than is shown on the cut sheets. The color of the poles and fixtures would be black. Typically, light that spills onto neighboring properties is not permitted. Also, exposed concrete bases are not preferred for the light poles.

### **Land Use Plans:**

#### Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Infill sites should be developed in a way that is complementary to their neighborhoods and that integrates well with surrounding building designs and land uses. Compatibility with the neighborhood should be the primary consideration. New structures should complement the form, massing and scale of existing nearby structures. Also, building placement and orientation are important design considerations. Most main entrances should face the street and garages should avoid facing the street.

These sites often have features -- sometimes man made and sometimes natural -- that can serve as unique enhancements to a development; or that can help a new development blend in well with the existing character of the city. Man-made features might include fences, stone walls, gardens and plantings, and historic buildings. Natural features might include watercourses, distinct topography, and mature trees. Planning for the development of a site should include an inventory and evaluation of features, and the development should retain those that add scenic or historic value (historic buildings, topographical features, mature trees) or that help integrate the new development into the existing cityscape (existing landscaping, roads, paths, sidewalks).

#### Worthington Comprehensive Plan

Village centers like Old Worthington are logical places to add residential density in and behind the main corridor. Such residential development adds more pedestrian activity, increases the market base for the retail stores, and can be designed as a product that is attractive to young professionals and empty nesters. In Worthington, redeveloping residential lots within the first High Street block requires expertise to prevent it from tearing into the historic fabric of the City. Such development must be evaluated on a case-by-case basis, but it would be critical to be appropriate for the site in scale and design while at the same time creating a continuous street front. One of the most effective methods for adding residential units in this area is to rediscover and recapture the upper floor spaces in existing and new development along the corridor.

The pedestrian-friendly, mixed-use nature of Old Worthington is historically appropriate. Its success indicates that there are significant land use lessons to be applied to redevelopment efforts in Worthington. It appears there may be new opportunities for mixed-use development in appropriate locations. The history of the High Street corridor indicates long-term success for a linear commercial development approach.

#### Worthington Conditional Use Permit Regulations

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

#### **Recommendation:**

Staff is recommending *tabling* of these applications to work out the details, but feels the project is in line with the Comprehensive Plan recommendations and would have a positive impact.

Mr. Coulter moved to table the ARB application. Mr. Reis seconded the motion. All members voted, "Aye". The motion was tabled.

Mr. Coulter moved to table the MPC application. Mr. Reis seconded the motion. All members voted, "Aye". The motion was tabled.

#### ARB

1. New
- h. Multi-Family Dwellings – **634 High St. & 41 E. New England Ave.** (Showe Worthington LLC/Masonic Lodge) **AR 50-14**

#### MPC

3. Rezoning
- b. Planned Unit Development – **634 High St. & 41 E. New England Ave.** (Showe Worthington LLC/Masonic Lodge) **PUD 03-14**

#### Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mr. Bean presented drawings for the proposed units. He said the approach here is similar as the Snow House Apartments in trying to form a transitional area from commercial to single family residential. He said even within the small development there is a step down transition from west to east, from the Lodge to the larger pairs of town homes, to the single unit. Mr. Bean discussed the rendered site plan close up. He said that parking behind the 1955 building will remain with a similar configuration, but they have extended the parking to the north and west around the 1955 building to accommodate more

spaces. Mr. Bean said from a parking standpoint, the Masonic Lodge is handled by the surface units and carports while the other structures have their own parking. The pairs of town homes will have single garages with single spaces outside, and the single unit will have a two car garage with additional parking outside.

Mr. Bean said the single unit sits back for a couple of reasons. He said the single unit is being used as a transitional step down within the development, and there are some very nice pine trees that sit close to the walkway. Mr. Bean pointed out the sloped roof of one of these units may be appropriate next to the Snow House. He said turning the roof line parallel with the road, instead of perpendicular with the road, and secondly a low sloped pitched roof on the porch would be less dominant.

Mr. Bean said there would be very few changes to the 1820 & 1955 buildings on High St. An arched door will be added, and where the bushes are in front of the 1955 building they are proposing to add window wells to add light into the lower units. He explained the door in the center of the photograph and currently serves as the main entrance to the Lodge facility would be one that the residents would be able to use to transition from front to back. Every unit in the building would have its own vertical circulation and entrance. There is not a common lobby that breaks off into several units. Each unit will have its own entrance. The resident of the 1820 unit would have a visible but private patio area in front of the building. All of the units except for the 1820 building will be flats on each of the three floors, rather than townhomes. The lower level units will only occupy the lower level, so it is important to get light into those units.

Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Bean about the lower level units and if the building code requires those units to have window wells as a second means of egress since there will be bedrooms down there. Mr. Bean said the building falls under the commercial code, and since they are sprinkling the building, a second means of egress would not be required. Mr. Reis asked Mr. Carter if he would be replacing all of the windows. Mr. Bean said the front windows would not be replaced. They will be replacing the windows in the back. The windows will be more complimentary to the windows that are on the front. Mr. Reis asked if all of the trim would be repainted and Mr. Bean said yes. Mr. Bean said the slate roof will stay.

Mr. Bean said there will be common space provided for the residents that live in the Lodge. There will be pavers (brick or cementitious), a grill area, fire pit, and seating. The carport will be to the left of the building. He said this common area will be a very nice private space.

Mr. Coulter said what he has not seen on the site plan yet, and Mr. Bean has not mentioned, is where the condensing units will be placed. Mr. Bean said there will be ten units in the Lodge portion, and six of the condensing units will be located on the north side of the 1820 building which would be tucked between the 1820 building and south back wall of Dewey's. The remaining four units they are proposing at the southeast corner will be between the east wall of the 1955 building and the west wall of the proposed carport, which is bounded on the south by the fence of the play area for the Methodist Church. Mr. Bean mentioned the yellow boxes on the drawings are where the transformers will be located. He said they have not finalized where they will be installing the electric meters, but it will be on the east side of the building. Mr. Bean

said there will be substantial landscaping around all of the buildings. Mrs. Bitar asked Mr. Bean if he is planning to screen the condensing units that are by the playground and Mr. Bean said yes. Mrs. Bitar said the area already looks pretty tight. Mr. Bean said he may relocate the condensing units to the end of the carport and screen that area.

Mr. Coulter asked if Mr. Bean thought about selling the single family unit at some point in the future, fifty foot would be the typical width. Mr. Bean said they are not planning to split the unit off at this time. Mr. Coulter asked Mrs. Bitar if there would be an issue with the east side lot of the single family unit and if a variance would be needed? Mrs. Bitar said she was not certain what the east side dimension was. Mr. Bean said eleven point one feet. Mrs. Bitar said if this was in the R-10 Zoning District the eight foot setback would be met.

Mr. Reis believes this is a pretty good plan, and has been well thought out. He thinks the use of the existing buildings as garden apartments are nice. Mrs. Holcombe agreed and thinks this is a great use of the space. She liked the fact that the front of the buildings were not changing. Mr. Hunter said he was glad to see that someone local was stepping up to purchase this property. Mr. Coulter said the open carports would look so much better if they had garage doors. He said the garage doors would add true value, more than what the garage doors would actually cost. He said this would change the whole character versus another property around the corner that also has a carport. Mr. Coulter said to look at the elevation of the single family home, and take a look at the roof; the roof looks huge and out of balance versus what is below on the home.

Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone in the audience that wanted to speak about this application and a few people raised their hands.

The first speaker was Mrs. Steffanie Haueisen who stated her address is 587 Fox Lane, Worthington, Ohio. She stated she is a Trustee of the Worthington Historical Society and has lead numerous tours in the downtown area, and she cannot tell you how important the 1825 addition to the Masonic Lodge is. Mrs. Haueisen said Aurora Buttles took four months to build this addition, and she hoped that everyone present has been able to see the second story vaulted ceiling that he built by himself. She said this is a unique building to this area, and attracts tourism to Worthington. Mrs. Haueisen said she is truly distressed at the idea of this building becoming lost to the public. She said she understands that the building is for sale, and the need for this building to be used, but she believes this is an absolute travesty. Mrs. Haueisen said that Aurora Buttles also built the Snow House in 1818. She said she can live with the Snow House as long as the front is not changed, but to lose the Masonic Lodge to a private residence, and changing the arched ceiling in any way, is truly a travesty. Mrs. Haueisen said she believes the City will regret losing this as a historic site to visit. Secondly she said she wonders why every single bit of green space has to be used in old Worthington. She said there have been traditional single family dwellings with owner occupants. All she said she is hearing is the word "rental" and all she can see are roof tops, asphalt and a lack of trees. Mrs. Haueisen said she was very upset at the loss of the Masonic Lodge.

The next speaker was Mr. Brett Holland of 135 W. Clearview Ave., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Holland believes this is a great project. He said both the Snow House and the Masonic Lodge

are great buildings. Mr. Holland said he was wondering why there were two units on his drawing. Mr. Peterson said that was a typo, and that the 1820's building will be just one unit. Mr. Holland said that his biggest concern about units one, two, three and four is that they are fairly large units, and they will only have one garage space and one singular drive. He said that he realizes that will count as two spots, but in reality he believes that these two thousand square foot units will be occupied by more than one person, and that will put additional cars somewhere else. He's very happy to see that a sidewalk and lighting will be added, and he is all for progress, but this project will take an "Army" to build, and he wanted to know where the "Army" was going to park while this is going on. He wants to make sure that the sidewalk remains clear and mud free at all times for the people that need to park for some of the downtown businesses. Mr. Holland said there is a pizza place that is underserved in the parking department and creates a little bit of a strain on some of the downtown parking through there. He agreed with what was being said about the roof lines and he believes that the single family home is a great transition. Mr. Holland said he also wished these units were condominiums and not rentals, and wondered about pricing. Mr. Peterson said he has not finished going through and pricing each individual unit yet, and each unit will be different, but the average rents will be from \$1,500.00 to \$3,000.00 per month.

The third speaker was Ms. Sunny Allen of 665 Hartford St., Worthington, Ohio. Ms. Allen said she has lived in Worthington since 1967 in the same house. She said her family watched their street go from having seven rental units to having single family homes. She said she is concerned that this project is going to be jammed into two single family lots with five dwelling units, and ten multiple units on the Masonic Lodge site. Ms. Allen said this will create traffic, noise and congestion. She said that every year there is a Farmer's Market and her street is practically un-passable because of the congestion every Saturday morning from May 1<sup>st</sup>, to the end of October. She said he and her neighbors are silently suffering. Ms. Allen feels that this project will have a negative impact on her neighborhood.

The fourth speaker was Mr. Michael Clevenger of 46 W. New England Ave., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Clevenger said he was speaking on behalf of the Masonic Lodge, and there were two other members of the Lodge that were present at the meeting, a Presiding Officer, and another past Presiding Officer. He wanted to speak as owners of the property and address the concerns about the historic nature of the 1820's building. Mr. Clevenger said this was not an easy decision for the Lodge. He said in fact this was gut wrenching. Mr. Clevenger said that Colonel Kilbourn arrived in 1803 and the Lodge started operating. The Lodge building was built in 1820 and then the new building was constructed in 1955. He said there is a direct descendant that is an active member and serves with the Lodge, Mr. John Snow, who is a historian. There are members of the Lodge who are preservationists. Mr. Clevenger said they were fortunate to find a developer who was sensitive to the character of the building. He said he cherishes history but the Lodge would not survive long term owning the property. Mr. Clevenger said they tried to keep the old building but no one else wanted the rest of the property. They either wanted all of the property, or nothing. He said they are turning over history to a custodian that will respect and preserve the building to the best of their ability. Mr. Clevenger said the Masonic Lodge is going to move temporarily and meet somewhere else. He said they are hoping to come back to Worthington

with a permanent solution. Mr. Clevenger said that Mr. Showe tried to preserve a spot for the members of the Lodge.

Mr. Peterson said thank you. He also wanted to point out those individuals that are concerned about this project that they are doing their best to preserve the historical elements that are within the building. There will also be Masonic elements throughout the personal units. He said with regard to the 1820's building, the ceiling will not change.

Mr. Michael Duffey was the next speaker. Mr. Michael Duffey approached the microphone and was sworn in by Mrs. Bitar. Mr. Duffey said he was not going to discuss his opinions about the buildings but he did want to discuss the Church's parking lot, which is essentially a City parking lot. The City pays for the maintenance of the lot, and the lot is used as one of the primary parking lots for the downtown region. Mr. Duffey said that many people use the Church's lot to visit the downtown businesses such as Rivage, Graeter's, House Wine, etc..., and a preschool is also located at the church. Mr. Duffey said a tremendous number of strollers go down that road and there is no sidewalk that he could determine on the rendering. Mr. Hunter said there will be a sidewalk on the east side of the street. Mr. Duffey said that will be relief for the new buildings, being able to see cars coming and going will be a concern for many people, and the area is already too difficult for two cars to pass by because of the width of the driveway.

Mr. Brown said he received one letter from Mr. Smith of 49 E. New England Ave., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Hunter said the letter is part of the record of the meeting.

Mr. Hunter said he likes history, he shares history, he said his wife's family came to Worthington in the 1800's, and they had a business here that started in 1913 and closed in the 1990's. He said the process for this building could be so much worse than what they are facing because the building is privately owned. Mr. Hunter said the City does not have the resources to buy a lot of properties. Mr. Hunter said he likes the plan, but he does not like carports.

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

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

The applicant is in contract to purchase the Masonic Lodge property, which consists of 3 parcels:

1. The original two-story brick building constructed in 1820, which most recently served as the Ohio Masonic Museum; on the National Register of Historic Places
2. An addition to the south constructed in 1957 with parking behind, which most recently housed the offices and meeting space for the Lodge
3. An "L" shaped parcel with ~143' of frontage along E. New England Ave. (a.k.a. 41 E. New England Ave.), extending to the rear of the 1820 building, and including the existing drive to the Worthington United Methodist Church parking lot.

This request involves combining the three parcels; rezoning the resultant parcel as a PUD to allow conversion of the Lodge buildings to residential and construction of new multi-family residential, consisting of 4 townhouses and a single-family dwelling unit along E. New England Ave.; and ARB approval for the changes to the site.

**Project Details:**

1. 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 project makes use of the historic lodge buildings, provides infill development along E. New England Ave., maintains and formalizes the drive entrance to the Worthington United Methodist Church/Municipal parking lot, and adds a pedestrian walkway from the lot to E. New England Ave. The proposed single-family structure on the east side of the drive is intended to buffer the existing single-family residential property from the proposed townhouses on the west side of the drive. The additional residential units should not adversely affect the surrounding properties.

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

Site layout: The layout of the site would not substantially change with this proposal. Parking for the Lodge residential units is proposed in place of the current Lodge parking, and behind the older buildings, with the addition of carports in both areas. The access drive to the parking lot would remain in the same location, and a sidewalk is proposed on the east side of the drive.

Buildings: The existing historic buildings are proposed to house 10 units, 1 in the older part of the building and 3 on each of the 3 floors in the newer part of the building. The exterior changes planned involve the replacement of windows and the addition of balconies and stairs to access the units on the north and east sides; the addition and replacement of windows on the south side; and installation of a door in place of a window on the front of the connector between the buildings. New window/door wells are proposed but the details are not provided. The size of the dwelling units in the lodge range from 1163 square feet to 2997 square feet in area.

West of the drive from E. New England Ave. to the parking lot, 2 two-story structures with 2 townhomes each are proposed. Each unit would have a garage and drive from the access drive to the parking lot. Building entrances are proposed on the north and south of the northern building; on the north face of the southern building; and on the east face at the southern end for unit ML4. All 4 townhomes would have a western door leading to a patio area. The new structures are proposed as two-story structures with 6” Hardieplank lap siding in Fairview Taupe, with Almira White trim and Space Black accents. Charcoal Gray standing seam metal is proposed for gable trim and the porch roofs above the rear patios and ML4 entrance. Variation in colors between buildings may be appropriate. Antique Slate asphalt shingles are proposed for the roofs. Wood columns and trim; single hung 6 over 6 Andersen windows; and Carolina Lanterns coach lamps are also proposed. The size of the dwelling units in

the lodge range from 2164 square feet to 2222 square feet in area.

East of the drive from E. New England Ave. to the parking lot, a 1776 square foot two-story single-family unit is proposed. The new structure is proposed with 6" Hardieplank lap siding in Duxbury Gray, with Monterey White trim and Arroyo Red accents. Charcoal Gray standing seam metal is proposed for the gable trim and porch roofs. Antique Slate asphalt shingles are proposed for the roof. Wood columns and trim; single hung 6 over 6 Andersen windows; and Carolina Lanterns coach lamps are also proposed. A freestanding 22' x 22.5' garage is proposed south of the house, with access to the public drive.

Two three-sided carports, 7 & 10 stalls, are proposed. They would be finished to match the townhomes, and include lighting in the ceiling to illuminate the area below and false windows. Details are needed for the windows. Brick for the carports should be explored.

Landscaping: A mixture of landscape and hardscape elements is proposed between and around the units including: ornamental and shade trees; shrubs; perennials; sidewalk and patio surfaces of brick, concrete and stone; seating areas; ornamental fencing and gates; fire features (pits); grills; and benches.

Lighting: In addition to the coach lamps on the structures and the fixtures inside the carports, light poles are proposed in the parking area and pedestrian walkways. The height shown on the photometric plan is 15' <sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub>". The fixture is slightly different than is shown on the cut sheets. The color of the poles and fixtures would be black. Eight foot high poles are discussed in the text for pedestrian walkways. Typically, light that spills onto neighboring properties is not permitted. Also, exposed concrete bases are not preferred for the light poles.

- c. Screening. *Parking facilities and refuse containers shall be permanently screened from all adjoining residential uses.*

The only residential lots this property adjoins are east of the single-family unit. Shrubs and trees are proposed on that lot. Screening is proposed for the dumpster. Mechanical equipment, including condensing units, must be shown on the plans and screened.

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

The applicant is representing that 77% of the site would be covered with this proposal. If this property were in the C-5 Zoning District, 80% would be the maximum lot coverage.

- 2. Traffic and Parking:

- a. Traffic. *Adequate ingress and egress shall be provided as part of the PUD.*

With dedication of the drive easement, and an easement from the church, adequate ingress and egress would be provided.

- b. Parking. *Parking shall adhere to the following standards:*

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

The parking is designed behind the buildings, partially screened by landscaping and carport.

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

Two spaces per dwelling unit are proposed.

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

Public bike racks are not shown. Residents would have room to store bicycles in the units.

3. General Requirements:

- a. 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.*

A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment revealed no recognized environmental conditions.

b. Natural Features.

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

B. *The Municipal Planning Commission shall not recommend a PUD if it finds that the Natural Features on such property have been or will be removed, damaged, altered or destroyed in anticipation of development until agreement is reached between the applicant and the Municipal Planning Commission on permanent restoration of Natural Features. All healthy trees 6" caliper or larger shall be retained, or replaced with total tree trunk equal in diameter to the removed tree, and this shall be documented as part of an approved Natural Features preservation plan and/or landscape plan. In the event the Municipal Planning*

*Commission determines that full replacement would result in the unreasonable crowding of trees upon the Lot, or that such replacement is not feasible given site conditions, a fee of four hundred fifty dollars (\$450.00) per caliper inch of trees lost and not replaced on such property shall be paid in cash to the City for deposit in the Special Parks Fund. Such deposits shall be used for reforestation on public property.*

A Tree Preservation Plan has been submitted, but the applicant is still determining the status of the trees.

- C. Public Area Payments. *Whenever any new Dwelling Units are created as part of a PUD, then the developer or owner, as the case may be, shall make a cash payment to the City in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250.00) per each new Dwelling Unit created for deposit in the Special Parks Fund. Such deposits shall be used for costs associated with the City's parks, playground and recreation areas. 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 \$3750.

- D. Public Space Amenities. *A minimum of one Public Space Amenity as approved by the Municipal Planning Commission shall be required for every five-thousand (5000) square feet of gross floor area of multiple family dwelling, commercial or industrial space that is new in the PUD. Public Space Amenities are elements that directly affect the quality and character of the public domain such as: An accessible plaza or courtyard designed for public use with a minimum area of two-hundred fifty (250) square feet; Sitting space (e.g. dining area, benches, or ledges) which is a minimum of sixteen (16) inches in height and forty-eight (48) inches in width; Public art; Decorative planters; Bicycle racks; Permanent fountains or other Water Features; Decorative waste receptacles; Decorative pedestrian lighting; and Other items approved by the Municipal Planning Commission.*

Six Public Space Amenities would be required. The permanent easement for the driveway, the sidewalk and associated lighting and landscaping may suffice.

4. Other
- a. A Final Plat is needed, with Proposed Easements shown
  - b. Proposed uses for the site should be in line with C-5 Zoning District uses, except that Residential Uses would be permitted.
  - c. Proposed phasing of development of the site, including a schedule for construction of each phase is needed.

**Land Use Plans:**

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Infill sites should be developed in a way that is complementary to their neighborhoods and that integrates well with surrounding building designs and land uses. Compatibility with the neighborhood should be the primary consideration. New structures should complement the form, massing and scale of existing nearby structures. Also, building placement and orientation are important design considerations. Most main entrances should face the street and garages should avoid facing the street.

These sites often have features -- sometimes man made and sometimes natural -- that can serve as unique enhancements to a development; or that can help a new development blend in well with the existing character of the city. Man-made features might include fences, stone walls, gardens and plantings, and historic buildings. Natural features might include watercourses, distinct topography, and mature trees. Planning for the development of a site should include an inventory and evaluation of features, and the development should retain those that add scenic or historic value (historic buildings, topographical features, mature trees) or that help integrate the new development into the existing cityscape (existing landscaping, roads, paths, sidewalks).

#### Worthington Comprehensive Plan

Village centers like Old Worthington are logical places to add residential density in and behind the main corridor. Such residential development adds more pedestrian activity, increases the market base for the retail stores, and can be designed as a product that is attractive to young professionals and empty nesters. In Worthington, redeveloping residential lots within the first High Street block requires expertise to prevent it from tearing into the historic fabric of the City. Such development must be evaluated on a case-by-case basis, but it would be critical to be appropriate for the site in scale and design while at the same time creating a continuous street front. One of the most effective methods for adding residential units in this area is to rediscover and recapture the upper floor spaces in existing and new development along the corridor. The pedestrian-friendly, mixed-use nature of Old Worthington is historically appropriate. Its success indicates that there are significant land use lessons to be applied to redevelopment efforts in Worthington. It appears there may be new opportunities for mixed-use development in appropriate locations. The history of the High Street corridor indicates long-term success for a linear commercial development approach.

#### Worthington Conditional Use Permit Regulations

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

#### **Recommendation:**

Staff is recommending *tabling* of the ARB application, but possibly recommending approval of the MPC application to City Council. Staff feels the project is in line with the Comprehensive Plan recommendations and would have a positive impact.

Mr. Reis moved to table the ARB application. Mr. Coulter seconded the motion. Mrs. Bitar called the roll. All members voted, "Aye".

Mr. Coulter moved to table the MPC application, and Mrs. Holcombe seconded the motion. Mrs. Bitar called the roll, and all members voted, "Aye".

#### **D. Other**

Mrs. Bitar said the construction drawings for Fresh Thyme are in her office and she is working with them about the details and making sure those details are in line with what was approved. She said they are at the point of discussing signage and would like to get the Board's opinion this evening. Mrs. Bitar said Fresh Thyme would like to have internally illuminated signage. Staff has told them all along that back lit signage or with the faces lit rather than internally illuminated was what would be preferred in this part of the city, and to go with this development and the character of the building the ARB has already approved. Mrs. Bitar showed photographs of the proposed signage. The letters are raised from the face, and they have a green halo on the outside edge. Mrs. Bitar said that during the daytime the letters would be green and at night they illuminate white. That is what Fresh Thyme would like to have.

Mr. Coulter asked what type of signage was approved for their store on Sawmill Rd. Mrs. Bitar was not sure. Mr. Hunter said he did not like this precedence, and this type of neon sign does not fit in with the community. Mr. Hunter feels they would get a better punch out of the sign if the letters are face lit or haloed with the elbow features that they were originally proposing. Mrs. Bitar said she was hoping for some texture and character for this sign. She said she also received a picture of a freestanding rectangular sign that is internally illuminated. Mrs. Bitar said the light only shines through the letters, like other signs that have been allowed on High St., but the sign has no character. The Board members agreed. Mrs. Rodgers said the sign in the photograph fits with the building the sign is attached to.

Mrs. Bitar said Fresh Thyme is not proposing illumination for the smaller signs along the back. The base of the freestanding sign would be brick and the size would be the dimensions that were already approved. Mr. Coulter said the signs that are shown are not in character with the architecture of the building. Mrs. Bitar agreed. Mr. Coulter felt the signs were poorly executed.

#### **E. Adjournment**

Mr. Reis moved to adjourn the meeting at 10:55 p.m. and Mrs. Holcombe seconded the motion. All members voted, "Aye". The meeting was adjourned.