



MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING  
WORTHINGTON ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD  
WORTHINGTON MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION  
January 8, 2015

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

A. Call to Order – 7:30 p.m.

1. Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Oaths of Office

Mrs. Bitar asked Commission member Mr. Sauer and Board members Mrs. Lloyd and Mr. Hofmann to please stand, and raise their right hands. All four affirmed they would faithfully uphold the duties of their positions.

4. Election of Officers

Mr. Coulter moved to re-elect the Board members as they presently are today: Mr. Hunter, Chairperson; Mr. Sauer, Vice-Chairperson; and Mrs. Holcombe, Secretary. Mr. Reis seconded the motion. All Board members voted, "Aye". Mr. Coulter also moved to nominate Mr. Hunter to remain in his position to represent the Municipal Planning Commission on the Board of Zoning Appeals, with Mr. Sauer as the back-up. Mr. Reis seconded the motion. All Board members voted, "Aye".

5. Approval of minutes of the December 11, 2014 meeting

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

6. Affirmation/swearing in of witnesses

## **B. Architectural Review Board**

### **1. Unfinished**

#### **a. New House & Garage – 138 W. Clearview Ave. (Hal Lieberman) AR 61-14**

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Hal Lieberman approached the microphone and stated his address is 345 Forest St., Columbus, Ohio. Mr. Lieberman asked if the Board wanted to see a tree placement plan or a full fledged landscape plan. Mr. Hunter said the Board wants to see a full landscape plan. Mr. Lieberman said he would provide a landscape plan at the next Board meeting. He said he wanted to get approval for the layout of the home first, and then he will have the landscape company put the plan together. Mr. Lieberman said for colors, he plans to put a black rooftop on the home, and the color of the siding he plans to use is called "Mountain Sage". Color samples were distributed to the Board members for review. The trim color will be very similar to pearl, and the shutters will be painted black. Mrs. Bitar asked Mr. Lieberman what material the shutters will be made of and Mr. Lieberman said the shutters will be plastic or some type of composite.

While viewing a picture of a similar house that Mr. Lieberman built, Mrs. Holcombe asked Mr. Lieberman if he built that particular house from the ground up and Mr. Lieberman said, "Yes." Mr. Sauer said the detail above the windows is wider than the actual windows, and he was not sure if that style is traditional or typical but asked why the trim is that particular width. Mr. Lieberman said that style of detail is something he picked up by observing houses on the east coast. He was not sure if that style of detail is typical in Worthington, but the look is typical for homes in the Williamsburg area of Virginia. He said he would be happy to change the look if this was unacceptable. Mr. Hunter suggested having the trim boards of the windows be the same size as the trim so they will match. Mrs. Lloyd agreed with Mr. Hunter. Mrs. Holcombe said she liked the crown molding over the window, but felt the molding extends over too far. She said the window has the appearance of looking modified. She said there are similar houses in Worthington with molding over the window, but the shutters should match and be larger as if the shutters were to close they would cover up most of the window. Mr. Lieberman said he would be happy to make that change. Mr. Sauer said the shutters do appear to be narrower than normal, and asked if the shutters were only available in one size. Mr. Lieberman said the shutters come in various sizes, and he can order larger shutters. Mr. Sauer said he noticed shutters on the east side of the house but only a portion of the west side had shutters. Mr. Lieberman said he could add additional shutters. Mr. Sauer said he would like more detail about the doors that are coming out of the back side of the house. Mr. Lieberman said slider doors are proposed on the back of the house. Mr. Sauer said those doors might want to have the same head detail and Mr. Lieberman said he can add that.

Mr. Hofmann said he had a few questions regarding the materiality, such as the cornice element above the windows, doors, and the treatment around the main entry and asked Mr. Lieberman if

2

Page 2 of 16

ARB/MPC Meeting January 8, 2015

Minutes

those were pre-made materials. Mr. Lieberman said the cornice material is Fypon, and is not built out of wood because he believes that wood becomes a high maintenance issue for the home owner. Mr. Hofmann said he was concerned about the use of plastic shutters not being in character with that of the neighborhood and that might require some discussion. Mr. Hofmann said he believes the HardiePlank is a good material, but instead of the five inch lap could a more historic four inch lap be used instead. Mr. Lieberman said he believes the home next door has a five inch lap. Mr. Hofmann said he also believes the proportion of the eaves and the basic trims of the roof lines could be a bit deeper to make the home look more historic. Mr. Lieberman said there are one foot overhangs on the soffits. Mr. Hofmann said not so much the overhangs but what is read in elevation, the literal edge of the eave, that dimension, is a bit thin for the size of the house. He said if that is thicker, that would be more in character with the rest of the homes in the neighborhood, and would give more proportion to the roof line. Mr. Sauer asked if Mr. Hofmann was referring to the fascia board and Mr. Hofmann said yes. Mr. Hofmann said, "If Mr. Lieberman is going to build this house by hand, then by all means let's make it feel like it's by hand and therefore also belongs more in the neighborhood, particularly on a corner lot across from a school." Mr. Hofmann told Mr. Lieberman he has stumbled into a pretty predominant block and that is probably why there is agitation from the neighbors. He said he also agrees with the other Board members that have mentioned the incongruity of the windows and what is going on with the porch.

Mr. Sauer said a question was raised as to whether or not there needed to be windows on the other sides of the garage. Mr. Coulter said people will not be able to see the east side of the garage so he was fine without a window. Mrs. Lloyd said she believes the garage window on the west elevation could be simplified. She also said the Board has not typically seen many shutters on garage windows. Mr. Sauer said if Mr. Lieberman had not intended to put shutters on the back of the house then he does not see the need to put shutters on the garage window. Mr. Sauer also said he was fine with the cornice.

Mr. Hunter said he would like to see more detail about the backside gable. Mr. Hunter asked Mrs. Bitar about the east elevation and if there was concern for fire ratings. Mrs. Bitar said the garage walls will probably have to have fire rated material but is allowed to have an opening. Mr. Reis said looking back at the color rendering of another home that Mr. Lieberman built, he said the window sill still seems to be flat, and he would like to see more of a projection on the sill. Mr. Reis said he would rather see a sill rather than the trim board across the bottom of the window. Mr. Sauer thought that made more sense. Mr. Coulter said he liked that idea but typically you would not see that in wood frame construction. Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Lieberman if he is proposing to use an all vinyl window and Mr. Lieberman said yes. Mr. Coulter said they have approved those in the past for replacement windows, but he would rather see Mr. Lieberman consider a wood clad window whether vinyl or fiberglass or metal versus just a plain all vinyl window. Mr. Hofmann said he believes that is fair, if the material on the rest of the house is made of modern ilk then that is where to begin looking at what is appropriate. Mr. Hofmann said if Mr. Lieberman is putting an elemental piece on top of the window then an elemental piece can go on the bottom of the window. Mrs. Holcombe agreed and said that she believes the windows are a critical piece to this project. She reiterated what Mrs. Bitar said

earlier, that this house should blend into the neighborhood and not look like a new build. Mrs. Holcombe said the cost for the treatment for the windows can be recaptured.

Mr. Hunter said he wanted to go back to the discussion about the shutters. Mr. Reis said he was okay with shutters on the front and west side of the house. He did not feel that shutters were needed on the back of the house. Mr. Sauer noted the shutters need to be wider. Mrs. Bitar asked what the foundation of the house will be and Mr. Lieberman said the foundation will be a poured wall, and there will be basement windows on the west side of the house. Mrs. Bitar asked Mr. Lieberman what type of basement windows would be used and Mr. Lieberman said he would be using standard basement windows that are not glass block; possibly an awning window with a mullion down the middle.

Mr. Hofmann asked why the garage was pushed past the setback line and if the garage could sit on the setback line. Mr. Lieberman said he was trying to get a more open view since the garage was moved closer to the house. He did not want this home to look like a patio home. Mr. Hunter asked Mr. Coulter to review his notes and list the concerns that the Board members still have. Mr. Coulter's notes read as follows:

- The windows need to be a wood window with a vinyl or other similar cladding with a sill depth of a deeper dimension to show a shadow line;
- The landscape plan has yet to be presented, reviewed and approved;
- The shutters are to be installed at the locations shown on the drawings and should be half the width of the window;
- The basement windows will be on the west side, and they will not be glass block;
- The colors as presented this evening are accepted;
- That the pediment and window sill will be adjusted to match the width of the windows;
- The slider doors will have the same detail as the windows
- The fascia heights be adjusted to have a taller profile - 1" x 8";
- No shutter on the garage window.

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

The first speaker was Ms. Peggy Barnum of 120 W. Clearview Ave., Worthington, Ohio. Ms. Barnum explained she was feeling ill and did not relish speaking the last time she composed a letter to this Board she felt that her letter was ignored, and was left out of the printed minutes unlike pro-development letters that have been embraced and read aloud here. Mrs. Barnum stated that, "City representatives in alliance with developers have conveniently ignored zoning ordinances, that is laws, prior city leaders created to minimize the destruction of open green space and mature trees that current city representatives ardently promote in search of the almighty buck with no regard for the opposition – those of us who prefer to curtail city center development out of concern for density and quality of life issues. I will introduce my sister

Carol, who is not a resident of Worthington, and is going to help. We both grew up in Worthington and have pointed ideas about saving its tradition.”

Ms. Carol Barnum approached the microphone and stated her address is 1608 Sandy Side Dr., Columbus, Ohio. Ms. Barnum stated her sister, Peggy Barnum, “Continues to oppose the building and lot split at the former Sheban home, now called 138 W. Clearview Ave. Zoning ordinances are a community statement on green space. The Sheban’s by 1999 owned three originally platted small lots which have since the late 1940’s been one oversized beautiful single home on the big corner lots you may see on all but one corner in a two or greater block area. Previous Clearview buyers often bought more than one of the approximate fifty foot wide by one hundred and fifty foot deep lots dedicated back in the late 1920’s. Shebans elected to combine all their lots to make one tax bill – a combination – in 2004. That would require a lot split when later Shebans or Hamilton or Sheban’s realtor together or sequentially decided it was the best way for Hamilton to buy and Shebans to move on with a substantial sales price that apparently made all happy.” Ms. Barnum’s letter continued to read as follows:

“How is a lot split evaluated after a combination?

Mr. Sheban started a lot split at SUB 01-13; MPC-ARB 06-17-13. At the June 27, 2013 meeting Mr. Hunter hit the nail on the head and said he could not vote for the split because it was below the current community standards and that the green space attached to the Sheban’s home had great value. Zoning expresses green space community standards. The application was tabled. The Sheban to Hamilton + Sinno Properties LLC happened on July 18, 2013 with apparently \$458,000 dollars and likely commission to her Real Living Realtor. By March 14, 2014, Mr. Hamilton is openly in the picture and the planning staff favors the lot split he wants. One planning staff chart nicely shows the R-10 Zoning rules that the split ought to comply with. Eighty foot wide lots, fifty foot on the west part, seventy-five feet on the east part, which is short too. R-10 requires 10,400 square feet. The west part of the lot would be seven thousand nine hundred and forty two while the east part would be eleven thousand nine hundred and twenty-five square feet.

Staff read section 1149.01 footnotes (d) and (f) to show corner lots get  $2/3 \times 30 =$  twenty feet as a setback, (d) and (f) shows 12-31-71 zoning ordinance that approximately grandfathered fifty foot existing lots, twelve hundred + square foot houses and six or eight foot side yards though not entirely clear what staff meant on these. Over twenty people voiced their objections to the lot split but council and ARB/MPC unanimously allowed it. Mr. Holland’s massive construction at 135 W. Clearview generated unanimous approvals by the ARB and BZA {items at June 28, 2012, July 5, 2012, and May 13, 2013}. It is notable that some tiny problems got variances, a satellite dish, windows, I think they were vinyl and condensing units. But this was no lot split, no sidewalks were required and Mrs. Rodgers was concerned that Mr. Holland’s hedge remained intact. See section 1123.76 “variance” with relax requirements.

The rationale used for Mr. Hamilton’s lot split was the fifty foot lot on the west used to exist in 2004. The combination could apparently just be undone. Lots of fifty foot lots are all over

Worthington. The variances could trump R-10 zoning. Mr. Brown noted at the council meeting on those original three Sheban lots that nothing required trees to come down with the lot split – ultimately approved – but sidewalks were required. So like the 35 Howard Avenue demolition property section 1107.07 (d) has been read to require sidewalks by a lot divider. It is not entirely clear if having a gutter or a curb on the street where the lot is located makes that all so clear.

Mr. Nordstrom noted at the council meeting the city likes to get sidewalks with somebody else's money. The Sheban's hedge with trees apparently didn't have the value Holland's hedge had, as they are marked for destruction with a sidewalk to nowhere apparently if the split lot buyer was going to build or not. My sister Peggy had also objected to the ignoring section 1105.05 that ought to have blocked the establishment of a fifty foot wide by one hundred and fifty foot deep lot.

Why should Mr. Hamilton who bought the property get to plead Sheban's tax bill convenience excuse? Why even should the Sheban's have had that excuse? If you don't meet the zoning requirements or don't even come close to the zoning requirements, you don't get the split. Section 1129.05 There is no difficulty, you bought the problem. You caused the problem. ARB/MPC and council ought not to variance the rules, property by property, until the increased density of the comprehensive plan is fully implemented.

Last Monday night Mr. Nordstrom preferred the three hundred square foot sign that was three times the limit. Rules in Worthington ought to have more value than the growth and "progress" decisions we are currently seeing. Do all of the splits require sidewalks? Look at these items:

June 26, 2014	1105 Beechview Dr. South
September 9, 2010	6161 McBurney Place
SWOP 03-10	6367 Linworth Place/6736 Lakeside Circle East
SWOP 01-14	Plesenton Dr.
	35 Howard Ave.

Yes sidewalks; sidewalks not even mentioned; sidewalks mentioned to go to the BZA to request the requirement be removed. The pattern is not any clearer than the curb/ no curb issue already noted. May it be argued an environmental feature like a pretty hedge could defeat a sidewalk requirement? Peggy hopes so. Once my sister lost on the lot split arguments and Mr. Hamilton listed the lot with a new realtor, not the Sheban's, she called and talked about her interest in purchasing the lot. Peggy Barnum wanted to buy the lot, keep it unsullied and maybe combine it with the Sheban's old house and lot in the future. Then Mr. Hamilton switched back to the Sheban's old realtor who apparently is with a new company. By now Fairfax Homes and Mr. Lieberman move forward with the Planning Commission's apparent blessing to build a house.

Peggy objects to that.

Mr. Hamilton's LLC split off the big property in the LLC to Ms. Sinno's and his own sublots. At \$128,000 on November 20, 2014, Fairfax Homes is the owner now. When Mr. Lieberman, at

the October 23, 2014 ARB/MPC meeting, noted Mr. Hamilton had not told him about knocking down trees and putting in sidewalks, Mr. Myers later observed there have been several meetings that might have let him know even if Mr. Hamilton preferred to keep Mr. Lieberman in the dark.

So, if Mr. Lieberman and his company know he has to get all these variances to make a lot of money off 138 W. Clearview Avenue, why does ARB/MPC have to hand variances to him? R-10 property says 'No go', then 'no go'. Just like Mr. Hunter observed before, nothing has changed. Why ruin a perfectly good property? So does ARB/MPC feel bad the developers/investors have worked so hard to get nothing? Even back at the Sheban hearing, no marketable lot was promised. See page 8 of the ARB/MPC October 23, 2014 meeting minutes; why should two Board members talk about plans for 138 W. Clearview Ave. or Ms. Bitar talk about them and to whom? And is Mr. Lieberman to talk to them about how he might build? I don't know what that means. Peggy Barnum hopes it means no you can't; this is R-10; and it stays R-10; and you don't get substantial variances.

Look at the balance of section 1149.05. If three or more of the contiguous lots owned by the same person {at zoning ordinance adoption at December 13, 1971}, no single lot shall be used in violation of section 1149.01 and section 449.02. I think the lot split was error and that error need not be compounded with putting a building on it.

Last, Mr. Sauer talked at some length at one ARB/MPC meeting about the disconnect on the sidewalks. It isn't recorded in the approved minutes but we were happy to hear "this is stupid", in a general comment on the problem. The sidewalks are a mistake. The split was a mistake, and we hope it stops here." This is the end of Ms. Barnum's letter.

Mr. Brown said he wanted to clarify one thing in regards to the sidewalks. He said he disagrees this is a sidewalk to nowhere. There is an elementary school across the street and the sidewalk is needed for safety. Ms. Barnum said she is talking about the sidewalk that knocks out a tree and a hedge. Mr. Brown said he was uncertain as to what Ms. Barnum was talking about but said a life is worth saving and more important than saving a hedge. Mr. Brown said that City Council did approve the lot split and sidewalks are required. He said what is before the Board tonight is the request for the house on the lot and the only possible variance that has been requested right now is for four inches for a side property line. Ms. Barnum said she was going back to the bottom line question of, "Do you pass new zoning laws or do you use the zoning laws that you have now and say, not here, not here". Mr. Brown said the city was platted in 1803, and a zoning code that was adopted in 1971, and there are completely different standards. There are lots throughout the city that vary from forty to sixty feet wide to two hundred and five hundred feet wide. That is what makes Worthington unique, there is not a one size fits all. Mr. Hunter said the Board of Zoning Appeals is in place to discuss those items as they come up. Mr. Hunter said the Board can adjust for the need; the code is not set up to be absolute laws. The code establishes the Board of Zoning appeals for the process that is used throughout the community to help the community continue to grow. The lot split has already been approved and the Board at this point has no power to undo that. Mr. Hunter asked Mrs. Bitar how many variances have been

requested for this lot. Mrs. Bitar said the variances that have been requested for placement of the garage and side entrance in proximity to the east side property line.

Mr. Myers said he would like to clarify the record, “The standard for variances is exceptional or unusual hardship, our code states to afford a justice and address practical difficulties to interested persons which would include landscape features, preservation of trees, preservation of grade, so it is not a standardless whimsical approach. There are codified standards as to how a variance may be granted.”

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

**b. New Storefront – 661 High St. (Jonathan Barnes Architecture & Design) AR 71-14**

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application, presenting a version of the drawings received today without muntins in the windows. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Jonathon Barnes approached the microphone and stated his address is 1925 Concord Rd., Columbus, Ohio. Mr. Barnes said he takes the responsibility for changing the muntins. He said they are fake muntins and not original to the property. Mr. Barnes said he believes the muntins are not appropriate for the windows and they are trying to restore the historic integrity to the building. An older photograph of this building was shown to the Board members. He said the muntins are actually just a fake grid.

Mr. Reis asked Mr. Barnes, from an ADA perspective, if there is any way the front entrance can be sloped? Mr. Barnes was uncertain if that could be done to the front entrance and thought that he could possibly change another entrance to the building for ADA compliance, such as on the rear or side of the building. Mr. Sauer said there was a similar issue with a store front to the north. Mr. Coulter said he was originally in favor of saving the muntins, but he researched some old photographs and noticed there was just plate glass in the front windows, as what is being proposed. Mr. Coulter said even though a ramp could not meet ADA requirements, he would like to see Mr. Barnes take a look at that and see if they can ramp up the entrance so a handicapped person would be able to enter the building. He thought the use of a ramp at the back entrance would be very cumbersome because of the elevation difference. Mr. Sauer said he agreed with Mr. Coulter. Mr. Sauer was glad to see that Mr. Barnes has recessed the door. Mr. Hunter said he took a closer look at the window grids a couple of days ago and agrees they do not belong on the windows. 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:**

The owners of this building, which currently houses Worthington Hardware, Sassafras Bakery and the Old Bag of Nails, are planning to divide the Worthington Hardware space, creating a 3000 square foot tenant space just north of Sassafras Bakery. The building was originally constructed in 1875 and remodeled in the late 1900's. Worthington Hardware is planning to close in the near future.

**Project Details:**

1. Exterior changes to create the new tenant space would involve installation of a double door with a transom above in the center of the space, which has three windows. The center window would be removed and the wood framed door would be installed recessed into the existing space, and include lighting above.
2. Elimination of the muntins, but retention of the glazing, trim, pilasters and sills on the side windows is proposed.
3. The location for signage has been identified on the panel above the transom, with the exact sign details to come at a later date.

**Land Use Plans:**Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

- There are recommendations in the Worthington Design Guidelines to use exterior materials traditionally used on commercial buildings in Worthington.
- Real or simulated multiple-paned storefronts can be found in many Worthington commercial buildings. This type of window is common in pre-Civil War buildings, when smaller glass panes were typical. Later storefronts usually had large single panes of glass. In such buildings, the large panes should be retained and not replaced with multiple panes.
- Compatibility of design and materials and exterior detail and relationships are standards of review in the Architectural District ordinance.

**Recommendations:**

Staff is recommending *approval* of the application.

Mr. Coulter moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY JONATHON BARNES FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO CHANGE THE STOREFRONT AT 661 HIGH ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 71-14, DRAWINGS NO. AR 71-14, THAT WERE REFERENCED THIS EVENING, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.**

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

2. **New**

- a. Door and Window Alterations – **5758 N. High St.** (John J. Copich/Animal Hospital of Worthington) **AR 01-15**

&

**C. Municipal Planning Commission**

1. **Conditional Use Permit**

- a. Animal Hospital in C-3 Zoning District - **5758 N. High St.** (John J. Copich/Animal Hospital of Worthington) **CU 01-15**

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application, indicating the front building entrance would be retained. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant was present. Dr. George Norris approached the microphone and stated his address is 31 E. Southington Ave., Worthington, Ohio. Dr. Norris said the practice has outgrown the veterinary hospital with the things that they are doing now, and they need more space. Dr. Norris said they are a month behind on doing dentals, so they are moving that unit over so they can do more than four or five dentals a day. He is also making room for the rehabilitation for large breed dogs, a water unit where they have a tread mill. There is a real need for that in the community. Dr. Norris said MedVet has one but they are also backed up. Dr. Norris said they will continue the grooming. He also said there is a need to change the air in the office so they will be installing a well designed exchange unit and putting a false ceiling in the back part of the office. They will also be installing an exit door on the south side of the building to help traffic flow. The exchange units will be placed on the roof and the general public will not be able to see them, except the abutting property to the north who recently took down a few trees. He said he did not have anything to do with the tree removal and he believes that they should put plant a few trees to replace the ones that were removed. 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 building was purchased in 1999 by the owner of the Animal Hospital of Worthington, which occupies the building to the south, and converted to a Veterinary Care Center from a tool rental facility. At the time, improvements were made to the building and site, and the parking lot was connected to the south. Now, the applicant is requesting approval to change the building to accommodate an extension of the Animal Hospital rather than a Veterinary Care Center, which currently allows for 40 kennels and a grooming business.

**Project Details:**

1. Changes proposed to the exterior are being dictated by the interior remodeling.
2. New doors are proposed on the south elevation: 1 would replace an existing window; the other would take the place of a vent. The additional space left by the vent would be filled in with block and painted to match the rest of the wall.
3. The new use would have 14 dog runs vs. 40 dog runs in the current facility.

**Land Use Plans:**

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

- The Worthington Design Guidelines recommend the use of simple door and trim designs compatible with the building.
- Primary building entrances should be on the street-facing principal facade. Rear or side entries from parking lots are desirable, but primary emphasis should be given to the street entry.
- Compatibility of design and materials and exterior detail and relationships are standards of review in the Architectural District ordinance.

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.

**Recommendations:**

Staff is recommending *approval* of the application with the condition the front door remains on the building. The doors on the south side should be fine, but removal of the front door and replacement with a window is not acceptable. The use should be acceptable in this location.

Motion for ARB application by Mr. Reis:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY JOHN J. COPICH FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO ALTER THE DOORS AND WINDOWS AT 5758 N. HIGH ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 01-15, DRAWINGS NO. AR 01-15, DATED DECEMBER 16, 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; Mr. Sauer, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Coulter, aye; Mr. Reis, aye, Mrs. Lloyd, aye and Mr. Hofmann, aye. The motion was approved.

Motion for the MPC application by Mr. Sauer:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY JOHN J. COPICH FOR A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO OPERATE AN ANIMAL HOSPITAL IN THE C-3 ZONING DISTRICT AT 5758 N. HIGH ST. , AS PER CASE NO. CU 01-15, DRAWINGS NO. CU 01-15, DATED DECEMBER 16, 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; Mr. Sauer, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Coulter, aye and Mr. Reis, aye. The motion was approved.

## **2. Amendment to Development Plan**

### **a. Signage – 7029 Huntley Rd. (The Granite Guy) ADP 01-15**

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the facts from the application. Mr. Hunter asked the applicant if he had anything further to add. Mr. Robert Buess approached the microphone along with a female representative from the business. Mr. Buess said his customers are having a difficult time trying to find their location. He said for some reason customer GPS units are sending them north of Interstate 270. Mr. Buess said all of the other numbers on the same side of the street as his business has an even address, but his location has an odd address. There are three other similar businesses in the same area. Mr. Buess said most of the customers looking for the granite stores use the entrance off of Huntley Road. He said when they get a customer looking for Stone City, they direct the customer to the correct location and ask them to come back and visit them after talking with who they were originally looking for. They do not try to mislead customers. Mr. Buess said they have had customers looking for Granite Guy but inadvertently go to one of the other stone businesses and the other businesses mislead the customer into thinking that they found the Granite Guy. He said they just ran a Valpak Ad for \$5,200.00, and their customers are getting side barred by the other competitor stone businesses while looking for the Granite Guy. The female representative said they did not want to use sandwich board signs but the other stone company in the middle started using them with “an obscenely low price right” and sat the signs near their front door. Granite Guy has had to put their own signage out to direct their customers to the correct location. Mrs. Holcombe asked how long the signs have been put up, the ones on the front and back of the building. Mr. Buess said the sign on the front of the building was approved about a month ago. He was not sure about the sign in the back of the building. Mr. Buess’s assistant said the signage problem is not just a customer issue; they are also having trouble with suppliers making deliveries to the correct business. Slabs were going to the wrong buildings. She said employees at dock doors just accept deliveries, and then she has a problem getting her deliveries from the other nearby businesses. She has also had trouble getting packages from FedEx and UPS. Mrs. Holcombe asked if the problem of getting missed packages has been resolved by the new signage and Mr. Buess said that problem is not the

suppliers, that problem has been resolved, the problem is getting their clients to find out where they are located. Mr. Buess's assistant said that customers normally only buy granite once, so she only has one opportunity to sell to them and hope to get a referral. The sign on the dock door has helped.

Mr. Hofmann said the problem appears to be the building, the building looks as if there is one big business there. Mr. Hofmann asked Mr. Buess if he has had any conversations with the landlord to see if they could paint the building or use awnings. Mr. Buess said he has tried, but the landlord is very strict. He was unable to use his own logo colors because of the landlord's restrictions. Mr. Hunter explained the sandwich board signs and the sign on the glass window also needed to go. Mr. Buess's assistant said they will be vacating that part of the building in January so all of that will go. Mr. Hunter said the freestanding sign also needs to conform with the code. Mr. Myers said he believes the sign problem belongs to the landlord of the building. He would like to see the landlord come back to the Board with an entire package that takes care of the sign. Mr. Reis agreed with Mr. Myers. Mr. Myers said the tenants might also want to renegotiate the size of the sign. Mr. Myers said that he would like to see the motion not include approval for the freestanding sign so the landlord can take care of the problem.

Mrs. Bitar said the other thing the landlord could take a look at is directional signage around the property that would be of benefit to all of the businesses.

Mr. Myers said he believes the sign on the loading dock is a critical sign. He knows where this business is located, and he has visited this business before, and he believes that this sign is necessary. Mr. Myers said this business is hard to see from Worthington-Galena Road. He would like to see the landlord come before the Board to address the issues for all of the tenants. Mr. Myers also suggested telling the landlord about recap money that is now available to help fix up the facades of the businesses.

Mr. Hunter said since the building has a front of Worthington-Galena Rd., and another front on Huntley Rd., that defines a hardship for signage. Mr. Hunter said he is very comfortable with both of those signs going forward. He believes the sign on the loading dock should be reduced in size. Mr. Hunter asked if there was anyone that would like to speak either for or against this application and no one came forward.

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

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

This property has frontage on both Huntley Rd. and Worthington Galena Rd. The applicant's storefront is located at the west end of the building, along Worthington Galena Rd., with the loading dock in the rear facing east. Another business selling a similar product (Stone City) is located at the east end of the building facing Huntley Rd., with a loading dock facing west. Both businesses have installed signs near their storefronts and above the loading docks. Approval of this application would allow The Granite Guy to keep both signs. Stone City will also need to apply for approval if they want to keep both signs.

**Project Details:**

1. There is a 4' x 10' sign above the entrance facing Worthington Galena Rd. identifying The Granite Guy's showroom entrance. The sign consists of white lettering on a blue, black and gray background. On the rear of the space above the loading dock entrance, an 8' x 16' version of the same sign is mounted to the building. Both signs are constructed of Coroplast with a vinyl overlay.
2. Variances for excess sign size and number of wall signs would be necessary to keep the existing signs.
3. Stone City at the east end of the building has two signs that are each approximately 3' x 12' in size.
4. The addition of tenant panels for both businesses to the freestanding sign takes the sign out of compliance with the Code by displaying too many sizes and styles of text and too many colors on the signs.
5. The Granite Guy has temporary signs around the site and an almost completely covered window area on the south side of the building. The Code does not allow temporary signs or window signs covering more than 25% of the window area, so variances would be needed, or removal of the temporary signs and window sign would be necessary.
6. Permits were not obtained for many of the signage changes.

**Land Use Plans:**Development Plan Amendment Ordinance

If an amendment does not conflict with the character or integrity of the development, but an additional variance is required, the approval must be by City Council.

Worthington Comprehensive Plan Update & 2005 Strategic Plan

An area plan focusing on the Proprietors/Huntley Road corridor should be developed that makes recommendations for repositioning it in the market place to make it attractive and competitive in the region. Because of the age and types of uses located here, this compact area is experiencing significant change and has the opportunity to reinvent itself. Issues such as building renovation, aesthetics, and possible road and infrastructure improvements should be addressed.

**Recommendation:**

Staff feels two signs may be warranted, but the sign above the loading dock should match the size of the sign on the front, or the size of the Stone City signs. The temporary signs and the window sign should not be allowed. The freestanding sign panels should be modified so there are no more than 2 font styles, 3 sizes and 4 colors used on the sign.

Mr. Coulter moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY THE GRANITE GUY TO AMEND THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR 7029 HUNTLEY RD. AS PER CASE NO. ADP 01-15, DRAWINGS NO. ADP 01-15, DATED DECEMBER 17, 2014, BE RECOMMENDED TO CITY COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE**

**STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING WITH THE FOLLOWING AMENDMENTS:**

- **THAT THE SIGN ON THE BACK SIDE OF THE BUILDING BE REDUCED IN HEIGHT TO MORE CLOSELY MATCH THE HEIGHT OF THE STONE CITY SIGN BY TRIMMING THE BLUE WITHIN AN INCH OF THE LETTERS**
- **THAT THE PYLON SIGNAGE BE ADAPTED TO COME INTO COMPLIANCE WITH THE SIGN CODE AND BE REVIEWED BY CITY STAFF**
- **THAT THE WINDOW GRAPHICS ON THE SOUTH SIDE STOREFRONT BE REMOVED**
- **THAT ALL OTHER SIGNS THAT MAY BE AROUND THE SITE FOR THE GRANITE GUY BE REMOVED**

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

Mrs. Bitar explained that staff will need a new sign permit, and if in compliance then the applicant would not need to come back before the Board. Mr. Sauer asked if a tenant can amend a development plan and Mrs. Bitar said yes, anyone can be the applicant on an amendment to development plan application, but the property owner's signature is required.

**D. Other**

Mr. Hunter presented a Resolution of Appreciation expressing the best wishes of the Worthington Municipal Planning Commission and Architectural Review Board to Jo Rodgers for her outstanding service to the community.

**RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION**

Expressing the Appreciation and Best Wishes of the Worthington Municipal Planning Commission and Architectural Review Board to Jo Rodgers for her Outstanding Service to the Community.

WHEREAS, Jo Rodgers has diligently served the City of Worthington as a member of the Architectural Review Board since 2010; and,

WHEREAS, Jo has worked to preserve and enhance the unique character of old Worthington and the entire Architectural Review District; and,

WHEREAS, Jo has always been willing to make herself available for assistance to applicants and training opportunities; and,

WHEREAS, Jo dealt with colleagues on the Commission and Board with the utmost respect and dignity; and,

WHEREAS, Jo is well respected and brought exceptional personal integrity to her position on the Architectural Review Board; and,

WHEREAS, the Municipal Planning Commission and Architectural Review Board recognize and appreciate the service rendered by Jo Rodgers during her tenure on the Board and wish her well in future endeavors.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Municipal Planning Commission and Architectural Review Board of the City of Worthington, County of Franklin, State of Ohio:

SECTION 1. That on behalf of the community, the Municipal Planning Commission and Architectural Review Board hereby expresses to Jo Rodgers sincere appreciation for her outstanding contributions and dedicated service and extends to her best wishes in future pursuits.

Mr. Hunter said they were very heartfelt words from him, and the Commission, and signed by Mrs. Bitar as the Clerk of Court, and Mr. Hunter as the Chairperson. Mrs. Rodgers said thank you very much.

Mr. Myers said that the Recap Program is now available to help with the improvement of buildings in the industrial corridors. He asked the Board members to keep in the back of their minds of what they would like, a long range vision for what the Board would like the two strips to look like. He said the industrial corridor does not look that good right now and now is the time to try to dress the area up. Mr. Myers said that is why he would like to see the landlord of the Huntley Road building because the landlord is part of the reason the building looks that way. He said the building has gone from looking fairly descent to what the building looks like now. Mr. Myers said that City Council is trying to do a better job of communicating with the other Boards and Commissions. Mr. Hunter agreed that the corner where the GE building is looks like a mess and needs to be cleaned up.

Mr. Brown said that he wanted to remind everyone that on Tuesday, January 20, 2015, the Masonic Lodge will be before City Council, and if any of the Board members are available they are welcomed to attend the meeting.

#### **E. Adjournment**

Mrs. Holcombe moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:37 p.m. Mr. Coulter seconded the motion. All members voted, "Aye". The meeting was adjourned.